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The scholar-monks of the reform era approached the composition of literature with a mindset that was akin to a form of technological determinism or, better still, philological determinism. For they viewed the state of their scriptures and the degree to which the monastic community adhered to those texts as the principal cause of the social and political upheaval in which they had found themselves. At the same time, they believed that by better preserving their scriptures and, in particular, by improving their understanding of them through further exegetical work they could actively change these conditions. This was nothing new, of course, and reflected longstanding Buddhist beliefs about the interdependence between the moral character of a particular historical era and the state of the Buddha’s teachings.¹ What seems to have changed or at least come to a head during the reform era was the attitude of scholar-monks towards implementing new philological technologies in preserving and protecting the coherence of their religious literature.² One such technology introduced after the 1165 reforms was a new system of Pali grammar, the Moggallānavyākaraṇa (‘Grammar of Moggallāna’), modelled on older, derivational grammars in the Sanskrit tradition. This grammar introduced new approaches to language that helped change how monks thought about and approached their sacred texts.

The term vyākaraṇa or ‘grammar’ as it is most often translated in English refers to the discipline of analysing (lit. dividing) language into its constituent parts, such as nouns, verbs, roots, bases and suffixes.³ The post-seventh-century commentator Dhammapāla, echoing older Brahmanical interpretations in the Sanskrit tradition, defines vyākaraṇa as ‘the means by which one analyses (byākaroti) and explains (byācikkhati) different words and their meanings’.⁴ There is a longstanding connection between Hinduism and the oldest Sanskrit grammatical works, namely, Pāṇini’s Aṣṭādhyāyī (‘Eight lectures’, early to mid-fourth century BCE), Kātyāyana’s vārttikas or ‘annotations’ on the Aṣṭādhyāyī, and Patañjali’s Mahābhāṣya (‘Great commentary’, mid-second century BCE), the oldest surviving exposition of Pāṇini’s grammar that is ostensibly a commentary on Kātyāyana’s annotations.⁵ At least
since Patañjali, Hindu grammarians have viewed vyākaraṇa as the first and foremost of the so-called vedāṅgas, that is, the six disciplines or limbs (aṅga) that help preserve the Vedas and Vedic ritual. Early in its history, however, the discipline spread outside of the Vedic sphere and transitioned from being a technology of liturgy to also one of literature. Sheldon Pollock has described in detail how grammar developed into a prestigious discipline within the literary culture of the royal court; kings patronized grammatical scholarship, competed with rival courts in the grammatical works they produced, and their knowledge of grammar was praised as an integral part of just rule. For much of its history, then, grammar was an ecumenical science used by priests and poets alike and ‘a support shared by all’, in the words of the fifth-century grammarian Bhartṛhari.

The comparable role grammar played in Buddhist intellectual life from an early period has received relatively little attention. Buddhist Sanskrit grammarians reinterpreted the religious origins of vyākaraṇa and viewed Pāṇini as a Buddhist inspired by the Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara. Grammar was used to interpret Buddhist Sanskrit scriptures, though Buddhists writing in Sanskrit did not view the discipline of grammar as exclusively an exegetical tool. Rather scholar-monks also saw grammar as a useful weapon in debates with other religious competitors and, as a result, categorized the discipline as an ‘external’ (Sk. vāhya) knowledge due to the fact it was directed ‘outwards’, towards others. They further considered grammar, more broadly, to be part of a buddha’s omniscient knowledge and thus as an important object of study for one who aspired to achieve the state of buddhahood. Towards the end of the first millennium, like their Brahmanical contemporaries, Buddhist grammarians further composed grammatical works, occasionally for royal patrons, but also, we can speculate, for their own intellectual and political ends.

Pali grammar became an important scholarly discipline for the Theravada Buddhist tradition in the second half of the first millennium. Prior to that, early commentators such as Buddhaghosa relied upon Sanskrit grammars, such as Pāṇini’s Aṣṭādhyāyī, in the interpretation of Pali scripture. The earliest known Pali grammar, the Kaccāyanavyākaraṇa (‘Grammar of Kaccāyana’), was likely composed in around the seventh century, though a number of Pali grammarians from the tenth century onwards believed that the work was composed by the Buddha’s disciple Mahā Kaccāyana. While Pali grammatical works were more singularly rooted in the exegesis of scripture than the Sanskrit grammars of their Buddhist counterparts, in the reform era we begin to see a transition from purely exegetical approaches to language to those that were more analytical in nature.

Pali vyākaraṇa never became a courtly discipline in reform-era Sri Lanka, though it did develop associations with political power within the
Saṅgha’s own monastic hierarchy. During the reform era, for instance, all the monks to hold the high office of ‘grandmaster’ were grammarians. The forest-monk and Sanskrit grammarian, Diṁbulāgala Kassapa, held the position of leader of the Saṅgha during the 1165 reforms, though he was not referred to as grandmaster. Sāriputta, his pupil, was the first to be acknowledged officially with this title and early in his career authored a Sanskrit grammatical commentary, the Cāndrapañcikālaṅkāra (‘Ornament to the extensive commentary on Candra’s grammar’). Our Pali grammarian Moggallāna subsequently attained the position of grandmaster, presumably after Sāriputta’s death. Saṅgharakkhita then ascended to the role in the reign of Vijayabāhu III (1232–6), administered monastic reforms and composed a commentary on Moggallāna’s grammar during his tenure too. His pupil, Medhaṅkara, author of a grammatical handbook, the Payogasiddhi (‘Practical construction’), and a member of the Diṁbulāgala forest fraternity, succeeded him in turn and led further monastic reforms during the reign of Parākramabāhu II in 1266.

Despite its important place in Buddhist intellectual culture, grammar has been almost entirely overlooked in the academic study of Buddhism. One possible reason for this is that Pali vyākaraṇa and Sanskrit vyākaraṇa, in particular, have generally been studied within the fields of philology and linguistics. Commonly understood as a poor imitation of its Sanskrit counterpart, traditional Pali grammar has languished among what the historian of science Otto Neugebauer famously defended as ‘wretched subjects’, that is, premodern scientific disciplines viewed as debased or flawed. Wilhelm Geiger (1882–1945), for instance, lamented the ‘slavish imitation’ of Pali grammars on the Sanskrit grammatical tradition and their ‘artificial’ grammatical constructions not found in any attested canonical literature. This chapter aims to unmoor the study of traditional Pali grammar from the empiricist character of such assessments by exploring from a social and historical perspective why grammar was thought to be so important for the reform era, how it shaped new ways of thinking about language and literature, and also what it can tell us about the monastic community’s engagement with Sanskrit literary culture.

4.1. The Changing Purpose of Grammar

When in around the seventh century a scholar-monk known as Kaccāyana composed the first Pali grammar for the language of scripture his work soon inspired a number of commentaries and other independent grammars, most of which are no longer extant. Among these early works, still available are Vimalabuddhi’s Mukhamattadīpanī (‘Straightforward illuminator’), an influential tenth or eleventh-century commentary, and the grammar’s eleventh
or early twelfth-century handbook, Cōḷa Buddhappiya’s Rūpasiddhi (‘Construction of [word] forms’). Writing at the Thūpārāma in the old capital of Anurādhapura in the aftermath of the unification of the Saṅgha in 1165, the scholar-monk Moggallāna brought the dominance of the Kaccāyana grammatical tradition in Sri Lanka to an abrupt end with the composition of a new grammatical system consisting of a set of rules, the Moggallānayākarāṇa, a paraphrase on those rules, the Moggallānavutti, and an extensive commentary, the Moggallānapaṇḍitā. Moggallāna in his colophon to the Moggallānapaṇḍitā explicitly connects the composition of this new grammatical system with the monastic reforms that had taken place in the years before. That a new grammar was considered to be a necessary outcome of the 1165 reforms raises the question about the role the discipline was thought to play in the unification and purification of the Saṅgha.

The early grammarians presented Pali grammar as essentially a tool used for the exegesis of the Buddha’s discourses. The author of the Kaccāyanaavyākarāṇa, for instance, writes at the outset of his work that he composed his grammar in order to ‘understand well the right meaning of the discourses of the Teacher’.

Centuries later, Vimalabuddhi adds in his Mukhamattādīpanī that studying grammar has a further incidental (anusaṅgika) purpose. A monk who understands grammar, he states, lives according to the meaning of scripture and as a result becomes joyful in the knowledge that he is behaving appropriately. This joy leads to other calming emotions, such as satisfaction (pīti) and happiness (sukha), which help produce a composed mind that can achieve spiritual insights. Here Vimalabuddhi evokes a longstanding causal connection in Buddhist thought between studying authoritative scripture (pariyatti), good practice (patipatti) and the attainment of spiritual insight (pativedha), and places the study of grammar as its foundation.

In his own discussion on the purpose of the discipline, Moggallāna similarly presents grammar as the foundation of the same causal sequence of spiritual development: grammatical knowledge, followed by scriptural knowledge, followed by good practice and culminating in spiritual insight. His discussion differs, however, in two main ways. Moggallāna first speaks of the loss of one’s status within the Saṅgha’s hierarchy as a result of not knowing grammar. He stresses that an individual who does not know grammar cannot become a teacher of others or lead legal rites within the Saṅgha. He further differs from older grammarians in explicitly justifying the study of the discipline in terms of the need to counter religious decline. There he argues that without grammar, scripture would completely disappear, followed by practice and then finally by insight:

For one who is ignorant of grammar is not skilled in the doctrine and discipline, and since he is not skilled in them he is not able to practise
according to the Dhamma. In losing his practice he partakes only in the suffering of cyclic existence and is not able to become a support (i.e. a teacher) for the faithful renunciates, the noble sons. For only those who know grammar are able to train noble sons in the doctrine and discipline, having checked the wording according to the meaning and the meaning according to the wording, and are able to complete this or that legal act (kamma) among the disciplinary acts, such as the probation ritual (parivāsa), having recited the legal formulae (kammavācā) in accordance with it (i.e. the discipline). No other can do this. He who does not know grammar, moreover, and who does not practise accordingly eliminates also the three-fold true Dhamma. To explain:

He who does not know grammar destroys scripture, which is only based on it (i.e. grammar). Then when this is destroyed, practice, which is based on scripture, is destroyed. And then realization, which is based on practice, is also destroyed. For the Bhagavan has said this: ‘Monks, these two conditions lead to the confusion and destruction of the true Dhamma. What two? An incorrectly placed expression and the misunderstanding of meaning. If an expression is misplaced, monks, the meaning in turn is liable to be misunderstood. These two conditions, monks, lead to the confusion and destruction of the true Dhamma.’

This is the fault in not knowing grammar. Moggallāna likely raised the issues of education and legal rites here due to the fact that grammar in the reform-era curriculum was a testing ground for monks who aspired to leading positions in the monastic community’s educational hierarchy. The Daṁbadeṇiya edict of Parākramabāhu II highlights a Vinaya regulation that after higher ordination a monk could undertake a five-year period of study with a teacher in order to be declared ‘independent’ (Sin. niṣrayamukta), that is, he could move freely without permission. The highest course of study as part of its curriculum was delivered by a leading monk (nāyaka) and included the study of grammatical texts. Once these texts were memorized the monk was examined on them and finally released from dependence on his teacher, with the request that he would occasionally recite these works in front of the monastic community from time to time. Grammar was studied widely, then, since knowledge of the subject was also a means by which a monk could achieve independence and a high rank within the Saṅgha.

Moggallāna’s emphasis on religious decline may reflect the wider eschatological concerns motivating these monastic reforms. Descriptions of the reforms that took place in 1165, c. 1232 and 1266 all emphasize a perceived deterioration in the monastic tradition, as discussed in chapter two, and it seems
likely that these eschatological considerations also informed Moggallāna’s view of grammar as the first line of defence in delaying the destruction of Buddhism. That Moggallāna had such eschatological concerns in mind when writing his grammar is supported by its earliest interpreter, Saṅgharakkhita, who wrote a commentary to his teacher’s work in the third quarter of the thirteenth century. There, in elaborating on this passage, he specifically evokes the source of this eschatological prophecy, Buddhaghosa’s fourth- or fifth-century Aṅguttara Nikāya commentary, where the commentator describes in detail how, over a five-thousand-year period after the Buddha’s death, there would be the gradual disappearance of ‘five aspects’ of the Buddhist tradition, namely realization, practice, scripture, signs of monasticism such as robes, and the Buddha’s relics. Saṅgharakkhita connects Moggallāna’s discussion of religious decline with this passage by quoting the following three verses that Buddhaghosa appends to his prophecy:

As far as the Suttantas remain and the Vinaya shines
they illuminate the entire world as when the sun has arisen.
When the Suttantas are no more and the Vinaya has been lost
there will be darkness in the world as when the sun has set.
When the Suttanta is being preserved, practice is preserved.
Steadfast in practice, the wise do not lose their freedom from bondage.

Saṅgharakkhita creatively reframes Buddhaghosa’s short poem here by placing before these verses his own opening couplet that presents the study of language, that is, grammatical practice, as the basis of scriptural knowledge. He writes:

One who would study the three baskets without having studied language
stumbles on each word (at every step) like a blind elephant in a forest.

Saṅgharakkhita thus connects Moggallāna’s initial discussions about religious decline with traditional eschatological theory. The association in Saṅgharakkhita’s mind between grammar and eschatology suggests that he too saw grammar not only as the foundation of one’s personal spiritual development but, from a civilizational perspective, also as the basis for protecting the world from impending darkness. In this regard we can speculate that the very real, exegetical connection between understanding the rules of the Pali language and studying its literature had, in the minds of some scholar-monks of the era, become generalized into an ideal connection, where the study of grammar took on a magical or apotropaic role in forestalling the impending disappearance of the religion.
4.2. The Information Order of Reform-era Grammarians

Reform-era grammarians differed from their predecessors not only in their aims but also in their radical rejection of tradition, dispensing with the older Kaccāyana grammar and adopting and better adapting new models of grammatical analysis from other Sanskrit grammars. This new orientation owed much to the wider reforming mentality of the era, characterized by the need to stem religious decline, but also to the availability of new intellectual resources, described in chapter two, that allowed scholars to rethink the ways in which they were taking care of their sacred language and scriptures. The sources Moggallāna used to create a new organizational framework for his sacred language provide an insight into his ‘information order’, that is, the historical ‘knowledge flows’ through which his work was produced.\(^4^2\)

Moggallāna wrote his eponymous grammar at the Thūpārāma in the southwest of Anurādhapura, nestled equidistantly between the main monasteries of the three fraternities, the Mahāvihāra, Abhayagiri and Jetavana.\(^4^3\) Prior to the Cōḷa invasions, the Thūpārāma’s affiliation with any one particular fraternity was contested and evidence suggests that it maintained an administrative autonomy in the sectarian landscape of the old capital.\(^4^4\) The location of the Thūpārāma was deemed particularly sacred since it housed the Buddha’s collar-bone relic and it was thought to occupy the same abstract topological space in Anurādhapura as the site of the Buddha’s passing in the ancient Indian town of Kuśināra.\(^4^5\)

Moggallāna’s sources reflect the wider changes in Sri Lanka’s religious and political alliances discussed in chapter two. His grammar reveals, for instance, strong intellectual ties with the scholarly communities of northeast India, in particular the Bengal region, as well as an increasing rivalry with Cōḷa scholar-monks in South India. While most of the Sanskrit works Moggallāna used betray no religious affiliation, based on the little information we know about the authors of these works it seems that his sources were largely Buddhist and monastic.

Moggallāna’s main opponent and representative of the older Kaccāyana grammatical tradition was the South Indian scholar-monk Buddhappiya. Buddhappiya presided as head monk over two monasteries in Nāgapattaṇa, modern day Nagapattinam, namely the Bālādityavihāra and Cūḍāmanivarmavihāra, and perhaps led his own reforms of the monastic community in Cōḷa country prior to those that took place in Sri Lanka in 1165, resulting in a schism in what monks had regarded as their shared ‘circle of influence’ (maṇḍala).\(^4^6\) The latter monastery, in particular, is historically significant since it was built by the ruler of Śrīvijaya, Māravijayottuṅgavarman, of the Śailendra dynasty in 1005/6 and
continued to receive endowments from Cōḷa kings throughout the eleventh and twelfth centuries.\textsuperscript{47}

We can speculate that Buddhappiya’s close ties with the Cōḷa court may have contributed to the split that took place between the monastic orders in South India and Sri Lanka. This schism manifests itself intellectually throughout Moggallâna’s grammar but it is worth highlighting two main points of linguistic controversy. First, Moggallâna directly argues against Buddhappiya in his very first rule in claiming that Pali has forty-three sounds, including short $e$ and $o$, in its syllabary rather than the forty-one enumerated by the Kaccâyana tradition.\textsuperscript{48} Second, Moggallâna, again partly in opposition to Buddhappiya, radically reduces the scope of the Pali dative case. He argues that Kaccâyana grammarians were overly influenced by Sanskrit grammars in ascribing many of the functions they do to the dative. He instead argues that most of these functions should be subsumed under an expanded Pali genitive case.\textsuperscript{49}

In terms of Sanskrit sources, Moggallâna modelled his grammar on the Cândrayâkarâna (‘Grammar of Candragomin’), a work that was composed by Candragomin, who, according to late Tibetan tradition, was a Buddhist layman and resident at the monastery of Nàlandá in northeast India.\textsuperscript{50} Possibly written in the fifth century his work is second only to Pâñini’s Aśtâdhyâyî in its influence on South Asia’s indigenous grammatical traditions.\textsuperscript{51} A Buddhist monk called Dharmadâsa composed a paraphrase (vṛtti) for the Cândrayâkarâna possibly in the late fifth or sixth century and Moggallâna also nearly always follows his explanations when writing his own paraphrase on rules borrowed from the Cândra grammar.\textsuperscript{52} Moggallâna’s use of the Cândra tradition of Sanskrit grammar was mediated by two Sanskrit commentaries composed by scholar-monks from Sri Lanka prior to the reforms. A prolific tenth-century scholar known as Ratnamati, discussed in chapter two, composed an influential commentary, the Cândrapañcikâ (‘Extensive commentary on Candra’s grammar’), on Dharmadâsa’s paraphrase.\textsuperscript{53} This work, in turn, was commented upon by Sâriputta in a work known as the Cândrapañcikâlaṅkâra.\textsuperscript{54}

Both Ratnamati and Sâriputta may have had personal ties with the monastic communities of northeast India. Dragomir Dimitrov has recently argued that it was this same Ratnamati, using the name Ratnaśrîjñâna, who composed an inscription at the sacred site of Bodh Gayâ as well as a commentary on Daṇḍin’s Kâvyâdarsâ (‘Mirror of literature’) in northeast India.\textsuperscript{55} Sâriputta’s Sanskrit commentary was lost in Sri Lanka and is only known about through quotations in other reform-era works. Dimitrov, however, has published a facsimile edition of a manuscript of a commentary on Ratnamati’s work entitled the Candrâlaṅkâra, which was copied in 1116 at the Somapura Mahâvihâra, a monastery located near the modern-day village of Paharpur in Bangladesh, and identifies this work with Sâriputta’s lost commentary.\textsuperscript{56} Recorded quotations
from Sāriputta’s commentary in works from Sri Lanka unfortunately fall outside the material covered in this fragmentary manuscript and so this attribution, while possible, cannot as yet be confirmed. If the work is indeed Sāriputta’s then the early date of the manuscript would suggest that the island’s monastic community likely had close contact with this monastery in Bengal.

One of the keenest observers of Moggallāna’s source material was the fifteenth-century polymath Śrī Rāhula. He was the head monk of the academy of Toṭagamuva, the personal tutor of king Parākramabāhu VI (1411–66) and a distant relative of Sāriputta. In 1458 he composed the Moggallānapancañcikāpradīpaya (‘Lamp on Moggallāna’s extensive commentary’), a Sinhala commentary on the Moggallānapañcikā, and later also a commentary on Piyadassi’s grammatical handbook. In this latter work Śrī Rāhula confirms that Moggallāna knew the Čandra grammar, its paraphrase by Dharmadāsa and its commentaries composed by Ratnamati and Sāriputta. He also notes, furthermore, that Moggallāna had mastered many other Sanskrit grammars, including Pāṇini’s Aṣṭādhyāyī, its paraphrase, Jayāditya’s Kāśikāvṛtti (‘Benares paraphrase’) and a commentary, Jinendrabuddhi’s Kāśikāvṛttiapañcikā (‘Extensive commentary on the Benares paraphrase’) as well as the Kātantravyākaraṇa (‘Little grammar’) with its paraphrase and commentary by Durghasimha and Trilocanāsā respectively. These other commentaries that Śrī Rāhula states Moggallāna used, namely, Jinendrabuddhi’s seventh-century Kāśikāvṛttiapañcikā and Trilocanāsā’s eleventh-century (?) Kātantrapañcikā (‘Extensive commentary on the Little grammar’) are both traditionally associated with the Buddhist monastic intellectual culture of northeast India.

Śrī Rāhula’s Sinhala commentary is useful in and of itself in ascertaining a reliable picture of the full scope of Sanskrit source material available to the monks of the reform era. His work is renowned in Sri Lanka for the sheer breadth of texts he had at his disposal in his library at Toṭagamuva in 1458. The commentary thus provides a snapshot of the Sanskrit knowledge preserved in Sri Lanka in the middle of the fifteenth century. Śrī Dharmārāma, who edited Śrī Rāhula’s ‘Lamp’ in 1886, lists fifty-nine quoted works in his introduction. Almost half of these works were Sanskrit philological texts, principally grammars and lexica (see Table 4.1).

The diversity of Śrī Rāhula’s source material is quite astounding, all the more so since much of this knowledge was lost in Sri Lanka in the subsequent centuries of colonial rule. What is interesting from the perspective of the reform era’s intellectual history, specifically, is the concentration of sources from the tenth to twelfth centuries and the focus on the region of Bengal. This connection seems to have persisted even after the 1165 reforms since Śrī Rāhula cites Sena dynasty works, such as Puruṣottamadeva’s Bhāṣāvṛtti.
While there was likely an ornamental, stylistic purpose in citing such a diverse array of works, it seems on occasion too that Śrī Rāhula used his Sanskrit archive to provide historical explanations for Moggallāna’s more unusual linguistic observations. By way of example, in his paraphrase on rule 4.80 Moggallāna

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Aṣṭādhyāyī</td>
<td>Pāṇini</td>
<td>300–400 BC</td>
<td>N.W. India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Vārttika</td>
<td>Kātyāyana</td>
<td>300–400 BC</td>
<td>S. India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Mahābhāṣya</td>
<td>Patañjali</td>
<td>200–100 BC</td>
<td>N.W. India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Kātantravyākaraṇa</td>
<td>Śravavarman</td>
<td>100–200</td>
<td>S. India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Cāndravyākaraṇa</td>
<td>Candragomin</td>
<td>100–200</td>
<td>S. India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Amarakośa</td>
<td>Amarasiṃha</td>
<td>500–600</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Kāśikāvṛtti</td>
<td>Jayāditya</td>
<td>600–700</td>
<td>Kashmir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Kāśikāvṛtti</td>
<td>Jinendrabuddhi</td>
<td>after 700</td>
<td>Bengal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Śaṅkāṭyanavyākaraṇa</td>
<td>Pālyakīrti</td>
<td>800–890</td>
<td>W. India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Rūpāvatārā</td>
<td>Dharmakīrti</td>
<td>900–1000</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Halāyudhakośa</td>
<td>Halāyudha</td>
<td>900–1000</td>
<td>W. India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Cāndrapaṇcikā</td>
<td>Ratnamati</td>
<td>900–1000</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Śabdārthacintā</td>
<td>Ratnamati/ Ratnaśrījñāna</td>
<td>900–1000</td>
<td>N.E. India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Bhāgavṛtti</td>
<td>Vimalamati</td>
<td>900–1000</td>
<td>Bengal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Vopālitakośa</td>
<td>Vopālita</td>
<td>900–1000</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Bhāṣyapradīpa</td>
<td>Kaiyāṭa</td>
<td>1000–1100</td>
<td>Kashmir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Anunyāsa</td>
<td>Indumitra</td>
<td>1000–1100</td>
<td>Bengal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Kavikāmadhenu</td>
<td>Subhūticandra</td>
<td>1000–1100</td>
<td>Bengal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Kātantrapaṇcikā</td>
<td>Trilocanadāsa</td>
<td>1000–1100</td>
<td>Bengal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Bhāgavṛttipaṇcikā</td>
<td>Śrīdhara</td>
<td>before 1100</td>
<td>Bengal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Cāndrapaṇcikālāṅkāra</td>
<td>Sāriputta</td>
<td>before 1165</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Pāṭrīkaraṇatīkā</td>
<td>Buddhānāga</td>
<td>1100–1300</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Viśvaprakāśa</td>
<td>Maheśvarakavi</td>
<td>1111/12</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Vaijayantīkośa</td>
<td>Yādavaprakāśa</td>
<td>1100–1200</td>
<td>S. India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Trikāṇḍaśeṣa</td>
<td>Puruṣottamadeva</td>
<td>1100–1200</td>
<td>Bengal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Bhāṣāvṛtti</td>
<td>Puruṣottamadeva</td>
<td>1179–1209</td>
<td>Bengal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Sārasvatavyākaraṇa</td>
<td>Anubhūtisvarūpa</td>
<td>1200–1400</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
explains that the word vaṇṇa (caste, class, complexion; Sk. varṇa) means ‘celibate ascetic’ (Sk. brahmacārin) when combined with a possessive suffix –ī (i.e. vaṇṇī, Sk. varṇin). This sense is not attested in the Pali canon and would likely be unfamiliar to the average monastic reader. In an extraordinary demonstration of his learning, Śrī Rāhula quotes an explanation of the term brahmacārin from Śrīdhara’s eleventh-century (?) Bhāgavruttipaṅcikā (‘Extensive commentary on the Bhāgavrūtī’), followed by a definition of the Sanskrit varṇin in the sense of ‘ascetic’ from Puruṣottamadeva’s twelfth-century Trikāṇḍaśeṣa (‘Appendix to the three chapters [of the Amarakośa]’), and then turns to the opening verse from Bhāravi’s sixth-century court epic, the Kirātārjunīya (‘On Kirāta and Arjuna’), where the word is used in the same sense.

There is not a single reason for this sudden engagement with a wide range of Sanskrit grammatical literature associated with the Bengal region. As discussed in chapter two, the rise of the Cōḷas in South India led to a strengthening of ties between Lāṅkā and the Cōḷa empire’s adversaries, in particular the kingdoms of northeast India. It is possible too that increased trade and mobility between Sri Lanka and northeast India – perhaps along the new trade routes established during Cōḷa rule – may have further facilitated the exchange of monks and Buddhist knowledge. Finally, we can also speculate that another factor contributing to the movement of texts outside of northeast India in the twelfth century specifically was the weakening of Pāla rule in Bengal, the rise of the Senas, who more openly favoured Hindu groups, and the imminent threat of the Turkic invasions of northern India.

4.3. Moggallāna’s New Philology and the Creation of Order

Contact between Sri Lanka and Bengal cannot in and of itself explain cultural change, however. Why did scholar-monks decide to take up these Sanskrit texts and use them as a model for their own grammatical works? Descriptions of scholarly practice from the reform era suggest that monks thought new textual practices would establish a better order for their sacred language and scriptures and thus help stem the decline of their community and society. This connection is reflected in the common metaphors authors use to describe the effects of both their new textual practices and the process of reform. Authors frequently employ the terms ākula ‘confused’ and its negation anākula or nirākula ‘unconfused’, in particular, to compare the disordered nature of their textual tradition and the behaviour of monks prior to the reforms with the order of their texts and community after the reforms. In the colophon of his paraphrase, for instance, Moggallāna juxtaposes the ‘ordered’ nature of his work with the ‘order’ brought about in the previously ‘disordered’ Saṅgha by
the reforms of Parākramabāhu I in 1165.69 His student, Saṅgharakkhita, further favourably contrasts Moggallāna’s grammar with the perceived disorder of the older Pali grammatical tradition.70

In using the Cāndravyākaraṇa as a model for his grammar, Moggallāna radically differentiated his system from the style of earlier Pali grammatical texts. Moggallāna adopts a similar means of grammatical description to the Cāndra grammar in that he composed his main work using short aphorisms or sūtras connected by the principle of ellipsis (Sk. anuvṛtti), whereby the whole or part of one sūtra may be used to make sense of another. The sūtra genre had a long history in Sanskrit writing, with brevity and economy praised as the principal virtue of scholarly discourse. (There is a Sanskrit maxim that compares the happiness at shortening an aphorism to the birth of a son.)71 In Sri Lanka, this form of writing, while not unknown, was not widely studied or used in Pali and Sinhala texts prior to the reform era.72 The older Kaccāyana grammar, for instance, was modelled on the Sanskrit Kātantravyākaraṇa, a work more concerned with the simplicity of descriptive detail than with the brevity of its analytical model.73

To understand how such aphorisms work, take, for example, a series of rules in Moggallāna’s grammar, which he has adapted from the Cāndra grammar, prescribing some of the functions of the fifth or ‘ablative’ case (see Table 4.2).

These statements below may be quite meaningless for most readers of this book who are unfamiliar with traditional Sanskrit grammar. But if we look beyond the strange style and technical terminology the basic mechanisms at work are quite simple.

Table 4.2: A comparison of rules in the Moggallāna and Cāndra grammars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moggallāna grammar</th>
<th>Cāndra grammar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.28 pañcamy avadhismā74</td>
<td>2.1.81 avadheḥ pañcamī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.31 rite dutiyā ca [#2.28 pañcamī] The second case and [the fifth case occur after a nominal stem co-occurring with] rite ‘apart’.</td>
<td>2.1.84 ṛte dvitiyā ca [#2.1.81 pañcamī] The second case and [the fifth case occur after a nominal stem co-occurring with] ṛte ‘apart’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.32 vināññatra tatiyā ca [#2.29 pañcamī #2.31 dutiyā ca] The third case, [the fifth case and the second case occur after a nominal stem co-occurring with] vinā ‘without’ and aññatra ‘except’.</td>
<td>2.1.85 vinā ṭṛtiyā ca [#2.1.81 pañcamī #2.1.84 dvitiyā ca] The third case, [the fifth case and the second case occur after a nominal stem co-occurring with] vinā ‘without’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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First, rule 2.28 begins Moggallāna’s discussion of the fifth or ablative case and consists of two words. Literally it means, ‘fifth, after limiting point’. To understand what is meant here we must supply an implicit verb ‘to be’ – which I translate as ‘occurs’ – and also understand that the ‘limiting point’ refers to the word denoting the point from which an action occurs. In the sentence, ‘he flies from London to Singapore’, for instance, London acts as the limiting point for the act of flying and thus in English takes the ablative preposition ‘from’. In the Pali sentence gāmasmā āgacchatu (‘let him come from the village’) the village (gāma) acts as the limiting point for the act of movement and thus takes the fifth case suffix –smā. The rule thus prescribes the fifth case after a noun that denotes such a limiting point.

If we skip over a few rules and turn to 2.31 and 2.32 we can further see the principle of ellipsis at work. Rule 2.31 consists of three words and literally means ‘without, and the second’. Here we must also include the word ‘fifth’ from 2.28 to understand that both the fifth (‘ablative’) and the second (‘accusative’) cases occur after a noun alongside the word ‘apart’ (rite). For example, one can use the fifth case and say rite dhammā ‘apart from the doctrine’ or the second and say rite dhammaṃ. More than one word can be introduced through this mechanism of ellipsis too. In 2.32 which literally means ‘without, except, and the third’ we must understand that the fifth, second and third cases occur after a noun alongside the words ‘without’ (vinā) and ‘except’ (aññatra). One can say, for instance, vinā dhammā ‘without the doctrine’, using the fifth case, or vinā dhammaṃ and vinā dhammena, using the second and third cases respectively, without altering the meaning of the expression.

Moggallāna was the first grammarian to produce a faultless piece of technical writing of this style in Pali and he acknowledges in the opening to his commentary that not everyone in the Saṅgha would be familiar with it. When commenting on the very first rule of his grammar he writes that ‘this statement might be meaningless – some kind of speech of a mad man or such like’. He introduces this possibility only to demur, of course, and adds: ‘or it may be meaningful like the [Buddha’s] statement: “mind is the forerunner of all things”’. Grammatical aphorisms are meaningful, he states, because the meaning of each aphorism should be sought in its paraphrase or vutti (Sk. vṛtti).

Most works of grammar composed using sūtras are accompanied by a paraphrase that rewrites the rules in plain language making all the implied information explicit. As mentioned, a Buddhist monk called Dharmadāsa composed a paraphrase for the Cāndra grammar possibly in the late fifth or sixth century and Moggallāna nearly always follows his explanations when writing his own paraphrase. Take the paraphrases in both works on the rules 2.32 and 2.1.85, which we have just discussed above:
After restating the meaning of the sūtras in simple prose each paraphrase usually introduces a series of practical examples. Dharmadāsa’s example here ‘without wind’ (vinā vātena) alludes to possible sentences such as ‘the tree fell without a gust of wind’. Moggallāna does not follow his Sanskrit sources blindly, however, and is sensitive in adapting Sanskrit grammatical theory to the Pali language. He introduces the word aññatra ‘except’ into the rule, for instance, in order to cover the particularities of his scriptural language and includes a canonical quotation in support: ‘I must not be approached by anyone except the one who brings alms-food’ (Dīgha Nikāya II 237). This sentence is taken from the Mahāgovinda Sutta, an account of the Buddha’s past life as a young Brahmin royal steward, Mahāgovinda, who undertakes a meditative retreat in order to visit the heavens and see the gods.

It is important to understand that the act of placing Pali within such an organizational framework was not simply a descriptive practice of a modern, linguistic kind. Rather, it was inherently creative in that such grammatical analysis established the idea of Pali as an object of knowledge and associated it with scholarly and monastic virtues: economy, regularity and orderliness. These ideas could then be generalized for scripture in its entirety, since the ‘canon’ described by these grammars was not the actual canon but rather select phrases, ‘symbols of grammatical knowledgeability’, that had circulated among scholars as a synecdoche for the Pali canon as a whole. As an access
discipline for any monk wishing to ascend the monastic hierarchy and study Pali scriptures, grammar must have served for many as one of the first ways they engaged in any scholarly fashion with their sacred texts and thus, with respect to the literary value of their scriptures, grammar could be said to have shaped ideas about the Pali canon as much as it described it.

Moggallāna further takes care to place his canonical sentences among stock grammatical examples from the Sanskrit tradition, such as the example ‘without wind’ mentioned above. Since they are unmarked only a careful reader would be able to distinguish the canonical quotations from the non-canonical. This ambiguity encourages the reader, furthermore, to imagine the Pali language as grammatically complete, despite the fact that certain grammatical expressions, as Wilhelm Geiger lamented, may be unattested in the canon. Far from being a methodological flaw, we can view this treatment of Pali as an attempt to go beyond the purely exegetical character of the Kaccāyana grammar and to represent the boundless, expressive capacity of the Pali language as a whole. It is Moggallāna’s interest in investigating the workings of Pali as a language beyond simply establishing the meaning of scriptural sentences that further distinguished his approach from his predecessors, and it is to this issue we will now turn.

4.4. From Exegetical to Analytical Approaches to Language

A certain exegetical pragmatism characterized the way early commentators and grammarians used vyākaraṇa to analyse scriptural language. For the commentators in particular, grammar was only thought about insofar as it could help resolve linguistic problems in the interpretation of the canon and as such their grammatical analysis often reveals a willingness to bend the scope of the Sanskrit grammars they used to suit their exegetical needs. The Kaccāyana grammar represented a large improvement on the analysis of the commentators but even it confused rudimentary principles of Sanskrit grammar and slowly lost much of its coherence due to the additions and clarifications of later grammarians who prioritized exegetical comprehensiveness over the integrity of the metarules of the discipline.

We see in Moggallāna’s works and those of his students an interest in the analysis of language as an object of knowledge outside of the narrow confines of exegetical utility. The impetus for this change appears to have been a number of Sanskrit philological works composed by the tenth-century Sri Lankan monk Ratnamati, in particular his Čāndrapañcikā, a commentary on Dharmadāsa’s Čāndravṛtti, and his Šabdārthacintā (‘Reflections on words
and meanings’), a work of grammatical philosophy. Dragomir Dimitrov and Mahesh Deokar have recently revealed the large extent to which the Cāndrapañcikā served as the model for much of Moggalāṇa’s own autocommentary, the Moggallānapañcikā. 81 Dimitrov has noted Ratnamati’s deep interest in grammatical philosophy in both his Cāndrapañcikā and Śabdārthacintā and has shown that his ideas about the metaphysics of semantics (artha) particularly influenced Moggalāṇa and his students.82

The ability to isolate semantics as an object of philosophical analysis can be understood as a by-product of the derivational nature of most Sanskrit grammars, where meaning conditions the introduction of affixes.83 In the Pāṇinian and Cāndra grammatical traditions, for instance, there are implicit analytical distinctions between what we can think about as semantics, syntax, morphology and phonology, with no one-to-one correspondence between them, that is to say these traditions can explain how one and the same meaning may be represented by different syntactic roles, which then can be represented by different cases, and which, in turn, can be represented by different case-endings. Moggalāṇa throughout his grammar and commentaries assumes similar analytical distinctions in the derivational process.

To understand the distinction between these differing domains, take, for example, the sentences (1) puruso rukkhaṃ chindati (‘the man cuts the tree’) and (2) purusena rukkho chijjati (‘the tree is cut by the man’). To form these sentences derivational grammars begin with a common semantic base: the man is the doer, the tree is the object and cutting is the present action. At a syntactic level, these can correspond – either through operational rules or according to convention (vivakṣā) – to an agent, an accusative and either an active or passive verb.84 In terms of morphology, the first case reflects the agent and second case denotes the accusative, whereas in the passive, the third case denotes the agent and the first case reflects the accusative.85 Finally, the grammarians assign the relevant suffixes corresponding to these cases. For a skeletal framework outlining these analytical distinctions, see Table 4.4.86

Distinguishing these different levels and allowing for variation between them enables precision and consistency in grammatical analysis. Take, for instance, a canonical sentence Moggalāṇa analyses in his discussion of the accusative: ‘the body will lie on the ground’ (kāyo paṭhavim adhisessati). This sentence comes from a verse in the Dhammapada: ‘Not long alas, and it will lie this body, here upon the earth. Discarded, void of consciousness, useless as a rotten log.’87 In this sentence the ground paṭhaviṃ is in the second case and is syntactically an accusative (lit. *the body lies the ground), though it has the sense of the locus of lying down. Moggalāṇa observes that the second case is used ‘as there is the desire to speak of the accusative (kamma) in the sense of
### Table 4.4: The derivation of passive and active sentences in the Moggallāna system

**Sentence 1: purugo rukkhaṃ chindati ‘the man cuts the tree’**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>purusa</th>
<th>rukkhā</th>
<th>√chid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Semantic level</td>
<td>doer</td>
<td>object</td>
<td>present time, doer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Abstract syntactic level</td>
<td>agent</td>
<td>accusative</td>
<td>present tense, active (vattamāna, kattari)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Morphological level</td>
<td>1st case, singular</td>
<td>2nd case, singular</td>
<td>present tense, passive (vattamāna, kammavat)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Phonological level</td>
<td>purusa ‘the man’</td>
<td>rukkhā ‘the tree’</td>
<td>chindati ‘cuts’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sentence 2: purusena rukkho chijjati ‘the tree is cut by the man’**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>purusa</th>
<th>rukkhā</th>
<th>√chid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Semantic level</td>
<td>doer</td>
<td>object</td>
<td>present time, object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Abstract syntactic level</td>
<td>agent</td>
<td>accusative</td>
<td>present tense, passive (vattamāna, kammavat)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Morphological level</td>
<td>1st case, singular</td>
<td>1st case, singular</td>
<td>present tense, passive (vattamāna, kammavat)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Phonological level</td>
<td>purusena ‘by the man’</td>
<td>rukkho ‘the tree’</td>
<td>chijjati ‘cut’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the locus’. Here Moggallāna analytically distinguishes between morphology (‘the second case’), syntax (‘the accusative’) and semantics (‘locus’) and flexibly prescribes an accusative in the sense of locus of an action rather than in the sense of the object of an action, as is most common.

There is far more going on in this analysis than merely an exegetical need to understand the sentence. In the 2,000-year history of reading the Dhammapada there appears to have been little confusion about what this verse meant. The earliest Pali commentators argued that the second case of paṭhavī was governed by adhi–, and treated adhi as an indeclinable particle rather than the preposition of the verb.98 Buddhappiya in his Rūpasiddhi follows the commentators and uses this example to illustrate the use of the second case with certain indeclinable particles.99 He complicates matters, however, in that later in his grammar he again cursorily refers to the same example under a different grammatical rule appointing ‘the second case in the sense of the third or seventh cases’.99 Moggallāna, it seems, demanded a higher degree of consistency in the analysis of language based on a systematic application of a single grammatical model.92 In light of our discussion above about the changing purpose of grammar, we can hypothesize that this degree of rigour was ultimately motivated by a need to protect Buddhism, underpinned by a belief in an ontological connection between the order of sacred language and that of society.

The results of the reform era’s grammatical turn can be compared, albeit anachronistically, with the way the rather differing scientific aims of modern linguistics transformed the analysis of European languages. Compare, for example, the history of interpreting English phrases, such as ‘to walk the streets’, as in Shakespeare’s Twelfth Night: ‘I do not without danger walk these streets’.93 The earliest interpreters of such expressions simply inferred that there had been the elision of a preposition ‘through’ or ‘in’ before ‘these streets’. Even the first modern linguists, such as Otto Jespersen, merely appealed to the ‘vague’ and ‘indistinct character’ of the English object when explaining why ‘walk’ takes a direct object here. It is only relatively recently, however, that linguists have thought in a similar way to interpret ‘streets’ as a ‘locative object’, where the object has a locative sense.94

This desire to describe the order of language at its most fundamental level extended to a philosophical investigation of the deeper semantic structures underpinning the Pali language. Moggallāna borrowed from the Sanskrit commentary of his predecessor, Ratnamati, a theory of five unvarying ‘meaning elements’ (padattha) that words can possibly signify, namely the sense of the word itself (sakattha), a universal (jāti), a quality (guna), a particular (dabba) or an activity (kriyā).95 Following their Sanskrit counterparts, reform-era Pali grammarians were interested in how the ontological relationship between these elements formed the semantic basis of syntax.96 This relationship was
thought of as one of dependency, where elements were described either as qualified (visessa) by other elements or as doing the qualifying (visesana). In the expression ‘the white cloth’, for instance, the cloth is a particular (dabba) characterized or qualified by a quality (guna), namely the colour white, and it is this real semantic connection that underpins the syntactic relationship between the words ‘white’ and ‘cloth’.

This form of analysis extended to whole sentences. Take, for instance, the Pali sentence kaṭe nisīdati devadatto (‘Devadatta sits on the mat’) that Moggallāna refers to as an example to illustrate the locative case. Here we have three ‘meaning elements’, namely, two particulars, Devadatta and the mat, and an activity, sitting. What is happening metaphysically? Reform-era grammarians would say, following their Sanskrit sources, that a particular, the mat, supports another particular, Devadatta, in whom subsists an activity of sitting. This kind of thinking informs Moggallāna’s original definition of a locus as ‘a support for an activity, in so far as it supports either the agent or object, which is the [ultimate] locus of the activity.’ There was a widespread adoption of this type of metaphysical analysis among reform-era grammarians. The first grammar of Sinhala, for example, the late thirteenth-century Sidat Saṅgarāva (‘Handbook of sound and meaning’), contains a chapter on the meaning elements and analyses Sinhala syntax in a similar way.

The more philosophical orientation of reform-era grammarians is no better illustrated than by Saṅgharakkhita’s Sambandhacintā (‘Reflections on syntactic relationships’) the first treatise composed in Sri Lanka on the philosophy
Saṅgharakkhita begins his work with a lengthy discussion on the five ‘meaning elements’, how they relate to each other and how they can be spoken of using words in a syntactically coherent sentence. This work demonstrates that scholars were now thinking about Pali primarily in terms of a real, semantic level and only secondarily in terms of the variable distribution of syntactic categories, morphology and phonology. It is simply due to a speaker’s intention, he states, that one can speak of the same underlying meaning elements in multiple possible ways. One can say variously ‘the pot cooks’, ‘he cooks in the pot’ or ‘he cooks with the pot’, for example, about the same ontological event. His commentator, Gotama, uses theatre as one of his analogies to describe how the same meaning element can adopt various syntactic roles in speech. He states that a meaning element, just like a single actor, has the capacity (śakti) to adopt the costume of the characters of Rāma or Rāvaṇa, that is, it can adopt different syntactic functions and can be spoken of in terms of these functions just as the same actor can be referred to as either ‘Rāma’ or ‘Rāvaṇa’.

This form of analysis will not strike those familiar with Sanskrit grammar as unusual and there is scope for a more fulsome appraisal of this philosophical development than I have been able to give here. What is important from a historical perspective, however, is that scholar-monks were thinking about their sacred language with deep semantic structures rather than phonetics as a starting point and that their approach was increasingly analytical rather than simply exegetical. Taken in light of the way scholar-monks described grammatical practice in the reform era, it seems likely that monks were so concerned about establishing a strong grammatical foundation for the Buddhist tradition that they sought order not only in the organized style of Sanskrit grammars but also in contemporary philosophical views on the deep semantic structures underpinning linguistic usage. The philosophy of language can be seen in this regard as part of the wider cultural work of grammar, namely providing an organizational plane on which the monastic community’s sacred canon and language could be established as an ordered and coherent object, bringing into being, as a result, an orderly monastic community and in turn a favourable social and political climate.

4.5. Summary

Scholar-monks of the reform era wrote in Pali primarily to stem the premature decline of their religious tradition. As the acknowledged foundation and access discipline for scriptural study, grammar was seen as playing a pivotal role as the first line of defence against the degeneration of Pali syntax.
of Buddhism. During the reform era in particular, characterized by social and political upheaval and confusion, sensitivity to traditional ideas of religious decline were heightened. In an unprecedented intellectual feat, scholar-monks decided to abandon their old grammatical tradition – much like many abandoned the old sacred capital of Anurādhapura after the Cōḻa invasions – and started anew with a different system of rules, the *Moggallāna-vyākaraṇa*, that would form the basis of philological activity in the centuries to come. In seeking to explain their age of confusion, scholar-monks blamed their older textual practices and sought out new forms of textual order, presumably as a way of pushing back against the harsh political conditions they had endured prior to 1165 and subsequently after Parākramabāhu I’s demise in 1186. The framework for this new order was found in the Sanskrit texts that had become available due to intensified contact with monastic centres in northeast India. These new intellectual resources combined with the reform mentality to produce an improved, analytical system of grammar, one that was not only based on understanding Buddhist scriptures and the Pali language but was focused too on establishing linguistic order at its most deep and fundamental level.
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