

The Syntax of Disagreement

Ole Holten Pind[†]

ABSTRACT—The Pali grammarians claim that certain types of genitive or locative absolute constructions express disagreement (*anādara*). The purpose of this short note is therefore to examine if the claim of the various Pali grammarians is intrinsically supported by the evidence of the Pali Canon.

KEYWORDS: Pali grammar, absolute clauses, Kaccāyana, *Rūpasiddhi*

The famous Pali grammarian Kaccāyana (approximately sixth century CE) formulates a rule about the use of the genitive and locative absolute that signifies disagreement.

The relevant *Kaccāyanasutta* reads:

|| *anādare ca* || 307 ||

The commentary, the *Kaccāyanavutti*, explains:

anādare chaṭṭhī vibhatti hoti sattamī ca || *rudato dārakassa pabbaji* |

rudantasmim dārake pabbaji ||

This example of disagreement states that in spite of the fact that the boy was crying, (his father) left (the family) to become a monk (*rudato dārakassa pabbaji*). The example is formulated in the genitive absolute, and it is followed by a similar example in the locative absolute (*rudantasmiṃ dārake pabbaji*) to show that similar genitive and locative phrases constructed with the same noun, and with a present participle in the genitive or locative, are used with the same intention. The two examples are, however, not traceable in the Pali Canon.

The question is whether it is possible to find examples in the Tipiṭaka of similar genitive or locative constructions that express disagreement. The central Pali grammar, the *Rūpasiddhi*, which is based on Kaccāyana and its commentary, solves the question. The grammar states in *sutta* 308:

anādare gamyamāne bhāvavatā liṅgamhā chaṭṭhivibhatti hoti, sattamī ca.

If lack of respect is understood, the sixth case morpheme or the seventh are inserted after the *liṅga* (that is, the grammatical gender) of the noun together with the (verbal) action.

The Sutta is followed by an example that illustrates the intended type of syntax. It reads:

akāmakānaṃ mātāpitunnaṃ rudantānaṃ pabbaji, or mātāpitusu rudantesu pabbaji.

The genitive and locative examples state that in spite of the fact that his mother and father were crying as they did not wish it, he went forth. The example is derived from the well-known description when the Bhagavat left his parents' home to become a monk. The narrative is recorded at D I 115 and 131:

samaṇo khalu bho gotamo akāmakānaṃ mātāpitunnaṃ (Be -ūnaṃ) assumukhānaṃ rudantānaṃ kesamassuṃ ohāretvā kāsāyāni vatthāni acchādetvā aḡāasmā anagāriyaṃ pabbajito.

In addition, the *Rūpasiddhi* quotes a verse from Ja VI 548 10 that illustrates the use of the genitive absolute:

ākoṭayanto so neti, sivrājassa pekkhato.

While being cast to the ground he is carried away, in spite of the fact that Sivirāja is watching.

The Jātaka quotation is followed by a verse line from *Nāmarūpapariccheda* 1210 c-d:

maccu gacchati ādāya, pekkhamāne mahājane.

Death goes away with (the dead) even though a large group of people is watching.

The commentator Buddhaghosa explains in the *Sumaṅgalavilāsini* (Sv I 284 17–20) and *Papañcasūdanī* (Ps II 170–171) that the genitive expression of the *Dīghanikāya* passage (*akāmakānaṃ* which means *anicchamānānaṃ*) is used in the sense of disagreement (*anādaratthe*). And he continues explaining that the sense of *assumukhānaṃ* is that their faces were covered in tears (*assūhi kilinnamukhānan ti attho. rudantānan ti kanditvā rodamānānaṃ*).

The use of the locative to express disagreement is found in the passage in the *Mahāparinibbānasuttanta* which records Ānanda's inability to understand the many signs that the dying Bhagavat gave him, as a result of which he failed to ask him to stay on for a *kappa* for the benefit of many people, out of compassion for the world, for the full benefit and pleasure (*sukha*) of gods and humans. The interesting locative readings of the *suttanta* are, as indicated below, recurrent:

so ākaṅkhamāno, ānanda, tathāgato kappam vā tiṭṭheyya kappāvesaṃ vā ti evam pi kho āyasmā ānando bhagavatā oḷārike nimitte kayiramāne oḷārike obhāse kayiramāne nāsakkhi paṭivijjhitum; na bhagavantam yāci tiṭṭhatu, bhante, bhagavā kappam, tiṭṭhatu sugato kappam bahujanahitāya bahujanasukhāya lokānukampāya atthāya hitāya sukhāya devamanussānan ti, yathā taṃ mārena pariyuṭṭhitacitto (D II 103; 115, 117, 118; 135ff).

Thus it is obvious that the evidence adduced by the Pali grammarians supports the idea that the same type of expressions are found in canonical Pali. All of them quote text from the Pali Canon that illustrates the use of the genitive and locative absolute to express disagreement.

The important grammarian Moggallāna presents a careful summary of the previous grammarians' presentation of the syntax of disagreement.

Moggallāna's argument occurs at Mogg II 37:

chaṭṭhī vānādare.

Or the genitive is for expressing disagreement.

*yassa bhāvo bhāvantarassa lakkhaṇaṃ bhavati, tato chaṭṭhī bhavati
sattamī vānādare gamyamāne.*

Whenever an action characterises another action, then the sixth case-form or the seventh is introduced if disagreement is understood.

ākoṭayanto so neti sivrājassa pekkhato (Ja VI 548 10*),

maccu gacchati ādāya pekkhamāne mahājane (Nāmarūpapariccheda 1210 c–d).

Thus Moggallāna supports the evidence of the Pali Canon and the other Pali grammarians' statements.

REFERENCES & ABBREVIATIONS

References and abbreviations to Pali texts follow the system adopted by the *Critical Pali Dictionary*. Volume and page references are to Pali Text Society editions.

All translations are the author's own. By the same author, see also *Kaccāyana and Kaccāyanavutti*. Bristol: Pali Text Society, 2013.