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Notice from the Council of the Pali Text Society

Editorial Notice
In *The Annual Report of the Librarian of Congress* for 1905, it is reported that the Library of Congress, Washington, D.C., had acquired a set of Burmese manuscripts containing the basic Buddhist canon. The manuscripts, which are spoken of as “the Rockhill gifts”, were bought by Rev. W.H.S. Hascall, who was a missionary in Lower Burma. The exact number of manuscripts is not given in the report, but three volumes of the Sutta-piṭaka are mentioned, five volumes of the Vinaya-piṭaka, and seven volumes of the Abhidhamma-piṭaka. Each series is said to contain Pāli texts, nissayas (word-by-word translations into Burmese), and Aṭṭhakathās (commentaries).

A detailed list of titles is given. The titles are transcribed following Burmese pronunciation, and it is fairly easy for someone familiar with Burmese to recognize which works are indicated. “Thote the let kon”, for example, is “Sutta-[Piṭaka] Silakkhan[dha-vagga]”.

The report goes on to mention manuscripts which include Jātaka stories and “certain examples of other books of doctrine or of ritual.” This last category includes some tikās and manuscripts in Burmese. The Burmese titles are less easy to guess than the Pāli ones. The books of ritual include three Kammavācā manuscripts, “one on wood and one on a composition metal which contains silver. The third is a very beautiful and old specimen of the service on strips of ivory with the ancient round Pali text in heavy lacquer”.

Additional manuscripts were acquired more recently by the Library of Congress and catalogued by Daw Khin Thet Htar in 1985.

---

1Pages 42-46, 182.
2U Thaw Kaung, Chief Librarian of the Universities' Library, Rangoon, inspected this “ivory” Kammavācā and said that it is not of ivory. 

*Journal of the Pali Text Society*, XIII, 1-31
The following list gives
(1) the call number,
(2) the title by which the text is best known in the West (Burmese texts with a Pāli title are given in Roman script; for those in Burmese I have given the titles in transliteration and in Burmese script using a font developed by U Sein Aye),
(3) titles used in the manuscript [on wood covers, on covering leaves, in the margins, in colophons—all variants are not included, as slight variations in spelling abound],
(4) the language used—Pāli, Burmese, or word-by-word translation (nissaya)—when this is not obvious from the title,¹
(5) the numbers of the leaves (using the Burmese numbering system)² or the total number of leaves (for some of the texts catalogued by Daw Khin Thet Htar),
(6) the author, if known, for lesser known works and Burmese nissaya (the authors of standard commentaries, etc., are not given),
(7) the date,³
(8) references to the same or similar texts found in catalogues of Burmese manuscripts or reference books when I thought it would be useful. If an item is missing, the information is not known to me.

The older group of manuscripts are listed in H. Poleman, A Census of Indic Manuscripts in the United States and Canada (New Haven, Conn.: American Oriental Society, 1938).⁴ I have

¹The titles used in Burma often specify "pālī-tō" for Pāli (-tō being an honorific suffix) or "nissaya" (spelled many different ways, e.g.: nisaya, nisya, nissya, nissara, etc.).
²For an explanation of this system, see Bur MSS I, p. xviii. The numbering is usually based on combining vowel signs with consonants. There is one case in the manuscripts here of a leaf numbered with the Burmese character for "1" plus the vowel "ā" (Burmese-Pāli 100, last f.).
³On converting Burmese dates into those of the Gregorian calendar, see Bur MSS I, pp. xixf. The scribes frequently made mistakes in the dates. I have made a guess at the correct date and given the scribe's date in parenthesis (e.g., Date: 1839 [3938 !]).
⁴Several Kammavācā texts (Poleman, p. 339) are listed as "on exhibition".

Therefore retained the old numbers (Burmese-Pāli 1-80). I include the information on dimensions (given to the nearest tenth of an inch) and the number of lines on one side of a leaf given by Poleman. Manuscripts catalogued more recently were given numbers beginning "Burmese manuscript 1", etc. I have renumbered these, adding them to the old list (beginning Burmese-Pāli 81).¹

I wish to thank Louis A. Jacob, Head of the Southern Asia Section, and other members of the staff of the Library of Congress for their aid and encouragement in preparing this list. I am particularly grateful to Heinz Braun, who carefully proofread this list and made many valuable corrections and suggestions.

Abbreviations


¹One MS mentioned by Poleman (no. 6327: Kammavācā, ff. 1-4, 12-13, 16; tamarind-seed script; lacquered cloth leaves with decorated wood covers; 19.6x3.75; 6 lines) is identified as being: John Davis Batchelder Deposit 7 (Rare Book Department). Its present whereabouts are not known and so it is not included in this list.
Burmese-Pāli 1. MS not found. Poleman (no. 5542) assigns this number to the description corresponding to Burmese-Pāli 47.

Burmese-Pāli 1a, 1c.
(1a) Dhammasaṅgaṇī nissaya, ff. ka-ñö. Date: 1763. Cf. Poleman, no. 5516 (19.9×2.3; 8 lines).
(1c) Dhammasaṅgaṇī, ff. ka-ṭhū. Cf. Poleman, no. 6437 (19.75×2.1; 8 lines).


Burmese-Pāli 2b. Visuddhimagga nissaya (part 4), ff. ka-mā. Bur MSS II 341. Cf. Poleman, no. 5517 (20×2.5; 9 lines; "Vibhaṅga" [sic]).

Burmese-Pāli 2c. Sumanagalavilāsini (Mahāvagga-āṭṭhakathā) nissaya (Sut Mahāvā ṣṭhakathā nissaya), ff. raṁ-nyu. Date: 1875 [2875 !]. Cf. Poleman, no. 6304 (20.5×2.3; 8 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 2d. Vinaya-piṭaka, Mahāvagga-ṭīkā. (Sivalivaththuka) (Burmese) ff. ka-maṁ. Cf. Poleman, no 5503 (18.75×2.2; 9 lines).

(A) Cittasambhūta-jātaka (no. 498), ff. ga-yu.
(B) Sivi-jātaka (no. 499), ff. yi-ṇā.
(C) Rohaṇa-jātaka (no. 501) (Rohanta-), ff. ca-chè.
(D) Haṃsa-jātaka (no. 502) (Cuḷhaṃsa-), ff. cho-jo.
(E) Satigumba-jātaka (no. 503), ff. jo-jaṃ.
(F) Bhallāṭṭiya-jātaka (no. 504), ff. ghā-ṭa.
(G) Somanassa-jātaka (no. 505), ff. tā-ṭhū.
(H) Campeyya-jātaka (no. 506), ff. the-ṭhū.
(I) Mahāpalobhana-jātaka (no. 507), ff. gho-ṇū.
(J) Hatthipāla-jātaka (no. 509), ff. ṅe-dā.
(K) Ayohara-jātaka (no. 510), ff. di-dhè.
(L) Kiṃchanda-jātaka (no. 511), ff. dho-pī.
(M) Kumbha-jātaka (no. 512), ff. pu-pho.
(N) Jayaddisa-jātaka (no. 513), ff. pho-bhe.
(O) Chadanta-jātaka (no. 514), ff. phè-ru.
(P) Sambhava-jātaka (no. 515), ff. rű-lo.
(Q) Mahākapi-jātaka (no. 516), ff. lo-va.
(R) Paṇḍaranāgarāja-jātaka (no. 518) (Paṇḍara-), ff. sa-hō.
Cf. Poleman, no. 6536 (19.75×2.1; 9 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 3a. Sumanagalavilāsini (Pāṭikavagga, Pātheyya-vagga-āṭṭhakathā) nissaya (Sut Pāṭheyya pāḷi-tō nissaya), ff. ka-jha. Cf. Poleman, no. 5547 (20.25×2.4; 8 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 3b. Vinaya-piṭaka, Mahāvagga, nissaya (Mahāvā nissaya), ff. ka-ta. Date: 1783. Cf. Poleman, no. 5502 (19.5×2.4; 11-10 lines).


Burmese-Pāli 4.
(B) Mraṃ mū tarā: cā ( сфере ) (Burmese), ff. tham-bhō. Date: 1889. There is a gap in the numbering between the two texts.
Cf. Poleman, no. 5528 (18.75×2.4; 10 lines).


Burmese-Pāli 4b. (A) Puggalapaṭṭati, ff. ka-ghu.
(B) Puggalapaṭṭati nissaya, ff. ka-ju. 
Cf. Poleman, no. 5523 (19.4×2.4; 9 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 4c. Terasakaṅda-ṭīkā [Sāratha-dīpani, or Pāli-muttaka-vinaya-vinichchaya-saṅgaha, or Vimatvinodani ? See Bode, p. 102, no. 10 and Forch, p. v.], ff. ka-ri. Date: 1850. Cf. Poleman, no. 5521 (19.6×2.25; 9 lines). Forchhammer lists a manuscript entitled Terasaka tika and says it is on the first two rules of the Pārājikas of the Pātimokkha and that it is by Sāriputta of Sri Lanka. This reference was brought to my attention by Heinz Becht. Cf. Burmese-Pāli 26.


Burmese-Pāli 5b. Suttavibhaṅga (Pārājikakāṇḍa) nissaya, ff. ka-juā. In Burma, the title “Pārājika” refers to the four Pārājika rules and the other rules through the thirty Nissaggiya rules (Vin III) [See Cop Pa (Burm.) 18.] Date: 1762. Cf. Poleman, no. 5507 (18.75×2.1; 8 lines).


Burmese-Pāli 6c.
(A) Sammohavinodani nissaya (Samo aṭṭhakathā), ff. katho.
(B) Abhidhammatthasāṅgaha nissaya (Saṅgruih adhipṭt), ff. tö-bho. 
Cf. Poleman, no. 5518 (7.1×2.25; 10 lines).


Burmoese-Pāli 7c. Paṇcappakaraṇāṭṭhakathā (Paṇca-pagruiṇ āṭṭhakathā).
(A) Puggalapaṇṇatti-āṭṭhakathā, ff. ka-hu.
(B, C) Kathāvatto-āṭṭhakathā and Yamaka-āṭṭhakathā (Yamuik āṭṭhakathā) (Pāli), ff. nū-thō.

Burmoese-Pāli 8.
(A) Bhikkhu-pāṭimokkha nissaya, ff. ka-cā.
(B) Bhikkhunī-pāṭimokkha nissaya, ff. ca [sic]-nū.


Burmoese-Pāli 10. Petavatthu nissaya, ff. ka-tā: Date: 1878 (Sakka-rāj 124; I assume it should be Sakka-rāj 1240). Cf. Poleman, no. 5510 (20.1×2.6; 10 lines).


(A) Mīgacakkha-jātaka (no. 538) (Temi-), ff. ka-gā:.
(B) Nimi-jātaka (no. 541) (Nemi-), f. thi [sic]-nā.
(C) Bhūriddatā-jātaka (no. 543), ff. nī-pā:.
Date: 1878. Cf. Poleman, no. 5511 (19.25×2.6; 10 lines).

Burmoese-Pāli 13. Nām nissaya Dakhinavam (title on paper on wood cover: Nām tikā), ff. ci-bhu. Date: 1847 (3847 !). This seems to be part 3 of the text, coming after part 2 of Burmoese-Pāli 54. Cf. Poleman, no. 5535 (20×2.25; 10 lines).

Burmoese-Pāli 14.
(A) Nissaya of texts of the Abhidhamma-Piṭaka (includes Dhammasaṅgaṇī nissaya and Kathāvatto nissaya, (perhaps others), ff. khi-gē.

Burmoese-Pāli 15. Leaves from several different manuscripts.
(A) Sīrī-jātaka nissaya (no. 284), ff. nī-nē. Date: 1865.
(B) Desakkamadīpāni nissaya, ff. ye-sō. Date: 1844.
(C) Ther(agāthā) (?) pāli-tō, ff. ka-gaṃ. Date: 1861.
(E) Chadipāpālasutta nissaya, ff. che-chā:. Owner: Rhaṃ Muninda.
(F) Bhikkhu-pāṭimokkha (Bhikkhu-paṭimokkha (Pāli), ff. khi-ga. Owner: Rhaṃ Muninda. Date: 1861.
(G) Khuddasikkha ff. gē-nī. Owner: Rhaṃ Muninda. Date: 1861.
(I) Dhammacakkappavattana-sutta nissaya (Dhammacakrā), ff. ci-caṃ. Author: Rhañ Munindajā.


(K) Mahāsama-sutta (D II 253-62), ff. khaṃ-gi. Owner: Rhañ Muninda.


Cf. Poleman, no. 5513 (19.9x2.25; 8-10 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 16. Dhammadipada-atṭhakathā nissaya, ff. ka-sā:. The ticket with this MS says this is the first part.


(A) Mahā-ummagga-jātaka (no. 542, Fausbøll’s no. 546) (Mahā pāth), ff. cā-či.

(B) Bhūridatta-jātaka (no. 543), ff. dī-ṅo.

(C) Candakumāra-jātaka (no. 544, Fausbøll’s no. 542 [Khantahāla-]), ff. nō-tār.

(D) Vidhurapāṇḍita-jātaka (no. 546, Fausbøll’s no. 545) (Viḍhūra-), ff. tha-dho.

(E) Mahā-Nāradakassapa-jātaka (no. 545, Fausbøll’s no. 544) (Nārada-), ff. dhō-pi.

(F) Vessantara-jātaka (no. 547) (Vessantarā-), ff. pu-mam.

Date (throughout): 1837. Cf. Poleman, no. 6418 (19.5x2.6; 11 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 18.

(A) Nimi-jātaka (no. 541) (Burmese) (Nemi cakā pre).

(B) Gun-tō phwaṅ (ṭ ə o s o 5 ə ę e) (Burmese). See Bur MSS II 402.

(C) No title found (nissaya style).

(D) Maṅgala-sutta nissaya (Khp 2ff.; Sn 258-269) (Maṅgalā sāra).

(E) Yamaka nissaya and Paṭṭhāna nissaya (Yamuik pāṭhan nañi:).

(F) Paramatthavisesa-mañjū nissaya.

(G) Mahāsama-sutta nissaya (see Burmese-Pāli 15 [L]).

(H) Sutta(vāṇassā)-vandanā nissaya (Sutvandanā).

(I) No title found (Burmese).

ff. ka-the. Date: 1863. Cf. Poleman, no. 5531 (19.75x2.25; 9 lines).


Burmese-Pāli 21. MS not found. This number is mentioned in Poleman [no. 6295: “Samantapāśādikā”, ... ff. 1-132, 1-95... with wood covers and pegs. 19.4/75x2.25/.3. Dated: Th. 1131 (=1769).] I have not been able to determine if this is one of the MSS of that title in this list.


Burmese-Pāli 23. Tathāgata nissaya (Ubhato-Vibhaṅga Khāndhaka-Parivāra) pāli āṭṭhakathā [samantapāśādikā], ff. se-ryi. Date: 1866 (2866 !). Cf. Poleman, no. 5532 (19.5x2.25; 9 lines).
Burmese-Pāli 24.  
(A) Desanasāṅgaha (Burmese), ff. kā-nī.  
(B) Sut nak sandhi nissaya, (steder, sted, sted, sted) ff. go [sic]-cō. Date: 1862.  
Cf. Poleman, no. 5533 (18.9×2.2; 9 lines).


At least one f. (f. kt) is missing. A separate paper with this MS has written on it "Burmese-Pāli no. 70" (no MS with no. 70 has been located).

Burmese-Pāli 27. (A) Buddhavaṃsa nissaya (Buddhavaṅ pāṭh nissaya), ff. ka-tō. Date: 1866.  
(B) Buddhavaṃsa, ff. ka-gañ. Date: 1865.  
Cf. Poleman, no. 6424 (19.75×2.4; 9 lines).

Buremese-Pāli 28.  
(A) Puggalapaṇṇatti, ff. ka-gā.  
(B) Kathāvatthu, ff. ka-vañ. Date: 1865.  
(C) Teyyasamvāsamakavinicchaya (Burmese), ff. dū-bē.  
Cf. Poleman, no. 6312 (19.5×1.8; 7 lines).


Burmese-Pāli 30. Dīgha-nikāya, Mahāvagga (Sut Mahāvā), ff. ka-ṭu. Cf. Poleman, no. 6302 (19.75×2.2; 8 lines).

Cf. Poleman, no. 5520 (19.25×2.1; 8 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 32a, b, c, d. Samantapāsādikā.  
(32a) Vinayavibhaṅga commentary [from Pācittiya to the end] (Bhikkhu Pācī atṭhakathā; Pācīyādi atṭhakathā), ff. ka-cha.  
(32b) Mahāvagga commentary (Mahāvā atṭhakathā), ff. cha-ṭhe.  
(32c) Cūḷavagga commentary (Cūḷavā atṭhakathā), ff. ḍhō-du.  
(32d) Parivāra commentary (Parivārā atṭhakathā), ff. dē-bhī.  
Date: 1878.  
Cf. Poleman, no. 6284 (18.75×2.2; 9–10 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 33. Suttavibhaṅga nissaya (Pācī pāḷi-tō nissaya), ff. ka-sī. Cf. Poleman, no. 5501 (18.75×2.2; 8 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 34.  
(A) Suttavibhaṅga (Pārājika pāḷi-tō) (see Burmese-Pāli 5b), ff. ka-ṭhaṃ.  
(B) Ādiṭkappā (Burmese), ff. ka-jhi. Date: 1884.  
Cf. Poleman, no. 6290 (19.9×2.1; 9 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 35. Samantapāsādikā (Mahāvagga) nissaya (Sut Mahāvā atṭhakathā nissaya), ff. ka-mū. Date: 1914. Not found in Poleman.


Not found in Poleman.

Burmese-Pāli 39. (A) Sumanāgalavilāsinī (Silakkhandha-vagga), ff. ka-đi. Date 1768.

(B) Sumanāgalavilāsinī (Silakkhandha-vagga) nissaya, ff. ka-phā. Date: 1778.
Cf. Poleyman, no. 6370 (18.75×2; 7 lines). Cf. Burmese-Pāli 1b.

Burmese-Pāli 40. MS not found. [Poleyman, no. 6417: "Vessantarājātaka". "This and the following item (Burmese-Pāli 17) together comprise the complete jātaka. ff. 277-396, 1-94... 19.5×2.4; 9 lines"]

Burmese-Pāli 41. Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha.

(A) Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha nissaya (Saṅgriḥ nissaya), ff. ka-jaṃ.  
(B) Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha, ff. ṅa-ṭha.  
(C) Saṅgriḥ adhibbāy (Burmese), ff. ṅo [sic]-bhō. Date: 1888.
Cf. Poleyman, no. 6647 (18.1×2.2; 9 lines), identified there as "Eight books of Pali grammar in 2 vols".


Burmese-Pāli 44. Kaccāyanā (Saddā pāli Saddā nissaya).


Burmese-Pāli 46. MS not found. [Poleyman, no. 5538 refers to Burmese-Pāli 46, but the description fits Burmese-Pāli 64.]


Burmese-Pāli 48. Kaccāyanā (Saddā athak thup nam: kyoñ:).

Chapters: (1) Taddhit[a] nissaya, ff. ka-ca; (2) Ākhyāt[a] (Ākha) nissaya, ff. ci-ḍā; (3) Kibbidhāna (Kit) nissaya, ff. dī-dhe; (4) Unāṭ[i] kyam: [nissaya], ff. dhe [sic]-bo. Date: 1821-1825. Cf. Poleyman, no. 6481 (20.25×2.6; 10 lines), identified there as "Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha".

Burmese-Pāli 49. Vinayāḷaṅkāra-ṭikā. (A Vinaya compilation.)

Author: Tipiṭakaḷaṅkāra of Tiriyaṇappabba, ff. ka-bam. Date: 1858. Cf. Poleyman, no. 6494 (19.6×2.25).


---

1Poleyman's description corresponds to Burmese-Pāli 47, but he says this is Burmese-Pāli 1. He says Burmese-Pāli 47 is a "text on sacred law in a Burmese dialect... 9ff. of parchment paper, rolled in a cotton wrapper with tying cord. 12.4×18.1; 31 lines". (Poleyman, no. 5557.) This manuscript is now not a part of the Burmese-Pāli series.
Burmes-Pāli 51. Abhidhammaṭṭhasaṅgaha (Saṅgruhī pāḷi), ff. ṇho-ṇè.

Burmes-Pāli 52. Abhidhānappadīpiṇā, ff. khu-gha: Date: 1870.


Burmes-Pāli 54. Dakkhināvamsa nissaya (Dakkhiṇāvān nissaya) (Part 2), ff. ge-ci. Date: 1835. This seems to precede Burmes-Pāli 13. Cf. Poleman, no. 5530 (19.4×2.4; 9 lines).

Burmes-Pāli 55. Lokanīti, ff. ka-kū. Two detached leaves of a nissaya (f. wi and f. ssē) are also included. Date: 1865. Cf. Poleman, no. 6530 (19.6×2.25; 9 lines).

Burmes-Pāli 56. Suttavibhaṅga, (Pārajikāṃ nissaya), ff. kajā:. Date: 1762. Cf. Poleman, no. 6507 (19.1×2.5; 10 lines), identified there as “Namakkāra”.


Burmes-Pāli 58. Mahājanaka-jātaka nissaya (no. 539) (Mahājanakka jāt; Janakka nissaya), ff. yaṃ-jhu. Cf. Poleman, no. 5512 (18.9×2.1; 9 lines).


Burmes-Pāli 60. Dhammasaṅgani, ff. ka-ḍa. Date: 1778. Cf. Poleman, no. 6440 (20×2.9; 11 lines).

Burmes-Pāli 61.

(A) 'Oñ khraṅ rhac pāṭh (ə̀ ə̀ ə̀ ə̀ ṇ ə̀ ə̀ uć: uć ə̀) (Burmes), ff. che-chō. In red ink on covering leaf: “Poṅ le Ù Paññā Parit kri pāḷi …”. Cf. Poleman, no. 6511 (no dimensions given).

(B) Ratanā rhwe khyuin (ŋ o ə̀ ə̀ ə̀ ə̀ ə̀ ə̀ ə̀) (nissaya style), ff. chaṃ-ch[aː].

Burmes-Pāli 62. Lokanīti, ff. ka-ko. Date: 1858. Cf. Poleman, no. 6531 (19.5×2.8; 8 lines).

Burmes-Pāli 63. Lokanīti (nissaya), ff. [ka]-ko. Date: 1874. Several leaves are broken. Cf. Poleman, no. 5526 (19.1×2.3; 9 lines).

Burmes-Pāli 64. Vinayasaṅgaha (Vīnaṅ Saṅgruhī pāḷi-tō), ff. ka-lō (plus one unnumbered leaf). Cf. Bur MSS II no. 304. Cf. Poleman, no. 5538 (19.9×2.75; 9 lines); this is incorrectly said to be Burmes-Pāli 46. Poleman describes a manuscript as being Burmes-Pāli 64 [no. 6523 (7.4×2.4; 8 lines), identified there as “Manjala-sutta” (Maṅgāla-? with only 7 ff. (date: Th. 1213 = 1849)]. I have not found a MS corresponding to this description.


Burmes-Pāli 66. (A) Suttavibhaṅga (Pārajika) (First part), ff. kē-ko, khi-khu, jiṭ-tē.

(B) Suttavibhaṅga (Pārajika) nissaya, ff. ka-tī. Date: 1808.

See Burmes-Pāli 5b. Cf. Poleman, no. 6292 (19.6×2.4; 8 lines).


Burmes-Päli 69. Visuddhīpanī nissaya, ff. ka-khya. Date: 1866. Cf. Poleman, no. 5527 (20.25x2.75; 12 lines). He suggests this is the “Visuddhimaggadīpanī”.

Burmes-Päli 70. MS not found. Not mentioned in Poleman. A separate paper with Burmes-Päli 26 has written on it “Burmes-Päli no. 70”.

Burmes-Päli 71. Pātimokkha nissaya, ff. ka-gha. Author: Ariyālankāra. Date: 1786. Cf. Poleman, no. 5497 (19x2.4; 8 lines). Parts of the text have been eaten away by insects.


Burmes-Päli 73.

(A) Lokanīti nissaya, ff. dhu-pi. Date: 1849. Many leaves badly damaged.

(B) Lokanīti nissaya, ff. vi-se.

Abhidhammattha-saṅgaha (5 copies):

(C) Abhidhammattha-saṅgrihī, ff. khu-gè.

(D) Abhidhamma-saṅgrihī, ff. khu-gè, chā-jhe. Date: 1840.

(E) Saṅgrihī nissaya (actually in Pāli), ff. ka-khī, khū-khe. Date: 1871.

(F) Saṅgrihī pāli, ff. no-tā.

(G) Abhidhamma-saṅgrihī (Pāli), ff. ka-[kī].

Cf. Poleman, no. 6479 (19.5x2.2; 9 lines).

(H) Puttovāda mrui, phat (♀♀♀♀♂♂♂♀♂♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀♀女足篇。
(L) Kammavācā, ff. ka-ke. Modern Burmese script. Cf. Poleman, no. 6332 (10.1×2; 5 lines).

(M) Paritta (Paritā kri: pāli-tō), ff. ka-kā:. Date: 1893. Cf. Poleman, no. 6513 (18.1×2; 8 lines).

(N) Jinālanka-kā-tikā nissaya, ff. ka-kha. Date: 1821. Cf. Poleman, no. 6500 (18.1×2;8; 8 lines).

(O) Tam tā: ū: taññ sa muñ: (ном: ถี่ ถี่ ถี่ ถี่ ถี่; nissaya), ff. ka-[khi]. Date: 1852. Cf. Poleman, no. 5548a (18.1×2; 8 lines).

(P) Kammavācā, ff. ka-ke. Date 1788. Modern Burmese script. Cf. Poleman, no. 6331 (10.1×2; 5 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 77. MS not found. This number is cited in Poleman [no. 6305: “Samantapāsādikā” (215ff. Palm leaves with lacquered wood covers and tying cord. 19.7×2.2; 8 lines)]. I have not been able to determine if this is one of the MSS with that title in this list.

Burmese-Pāli 78. Lokanīti nissaya, ff. ka-ghā. Date: 1738. Cf. Poleman, no. 5525 (19.25×2.2; 8 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 79. Samantapāsādikā (On the first section of the rules, see Burmese-Pāli 5b) (Pāṭikkāṇ aṭṭhakathā), ff. ka-ghyū. Cf. Poleman, no. 6293 (19.1×2.1; 7 lines).


Burmese-Pāli 81. Jinaṭṭhapākāsani (Burmese), 299ff. Author: Kyi-thē-le:-thap charā-tō (1818-1895 or 6). Date: 1876.

Burmese-Pāli 82. Dīgha-nikāya-tikā (Mahāvagga) (Linaṭṭha-vāṇṇanā), ff. ka-ḍaṁ. Date: 1765.


Burmese-Pāli 84. Mūla-Moggallāna nissaya, ff. ka-phe (perhaps incomplete). Date: 1876.

Burmese-Pāli 85. Bhikkhu-vibhaṅga, ff. ka-tā:.

Burmese-Pāli 86. Mahā-ummagga-jātaka (no. 546) (Mahosathā-jāt nissaya), ff. ka-ṭho, plus two leaves numbered f. ḍe and f. ṃ; they have the same title (Maho-gāt [sic] nissaya) but seem to be from a separate MS.


Burmese-Pāli 88. Abhidhammatthavibhaṅṇa (Ṭikā kyō nissaya), 164ff. Date: 1855.

Burmese-Pāli 89. Vinayālanka-kā-tikā nissaya, 331ff. Date: 1924.

Burmese-Pāli 90. Vinaya-piṭaka, Mahāvagga (Mahāvā pāli-tō), 224ff. Date: 1834.

Burmese-Pāli 91. Samantapāsādikā (On the first part of the rules) (Pāṭikkāṇ aṭṭhakathā nissaya, pathama sut[t]a), 266ff. Date: 1895.

Burmese-Pāli 92. Vinaya-piṭaka, Cūḷavagga (Cūḷavā pāli-tō), 221ff. Date: 1920. The first leaves are damaged.

Burmese-Pāli 93. Jātaka Stories (?), 370ff. Date: 1877. Identified by Daw Khin Thet Htar as Paramathajotikā [sic]. “Ekanipāt[a], Dukanipāt[a], jāt[aka] aṭṭhakathā”. The Tika-nipāta is also said to be included.
Burmes-Pāli 94. Rūpasiddhi nissaya, 268ff. Date: 1914.

Burmes-Pāli 95. Sumaṅgalavilāsinī, 166ff. Date: 1795. See Burmes-Pāli 1b.

Burmes-Pāli 96. Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha (Saṅgruih nissaya sac), 320ff. Date: 1844.

Burmes-Pāli 97. Abhidhammatthavibhāvanī-ṭīkā nissaya (Ṭīkā kyō nissaya sac), 300ff. Date: 1858. Author: Mañiratanā charā-tō Rhaṅ Aриyalaṅkāra (b. ca. 1708). The author was also known as Ne-raṅ: charā-tō.


Burmes-Pāli 99. Eleven texts:
   (A) Maṅgala-sutta nissaya, ff. ka-ku.
   (B) Apraṅ 'on khraṅ: [Atṭhajayamanāgalagāthā] (♀ ♂ ♂ ♂ ♂ ♂ ♂ ♂) (Burmes), ff. kū-kō. Date: 1890.
   (C) Atwaṅ: 'on khraṅ: (♀ ♂ ♂ ♂ ♂ ♂ ♂ ♂) (Burmes), ff. kō-kha.
   (D) Ratanā-sutta nissaya (Ratanā rwhe khyuin), ff. khā-khu.
   (E) Namakkāra nissaya, ff. khū-gi.
   (F) Mahāsamaṇa-sutta nissaya, ff. ņo [sic]-chā;
   (G) Dhammacakkappavattana[-sutta] nissaya, ff. chi-ja.
Date: 1835 [sic].
   (H) Anattalakkaṇa-sutta nissaya, ff. jā-jhè.
   (I) Maggaṅ rhac pāth anak (♀ ♂ ♂ ♂ ♂ ♂ ♂ ♂ ♂ ♂ ♂ ♂ ♂ ♂ ♂ ♂ ♂ ♂) (Burmes), ff. jho-ña.
   (J) Dhāraṇa paritta nissaya, ff. ņā-ńè. See Bur MSS II 217.
   (K) Mahāsatipaṭṭhāna-sutta nissaya, ff. ţō [sic]-tī.

Burmes-Pāli 100. Kammaṭṭhāna-dīpanī kyam: (Burmes with some passages in Pāli), ff. tē-ńè, f. 1ā. Date: 1888. This is a text on Kammaṭṭhāna (meditation).

Burmes-Pāli 101. Astrology chart; 5 small leaves sewn together. Date: 1842.


Burmes-Pāli 103.
   (A) Māṭikā, ff. ka-kī.
   (B) Māṭikā nissaya, ff. ki-ja. Author: Paṭhama Bā: karā charā-tō Rhaṅ Dhammābhīnanda. Date: 1891. This is the same nissaya as Bur MSS I no. 30.
   (C) Dhātukathā, ff. jā-ńu. Date: 1891.
   (D) Dhātukathā nissaya, ff. tū-ńu.
   (F) Saddavutti (Burmes), ff. dā-dō. Cf. Bur MSS I no. 15.
   (G) Sandhi pud cac (Burmes), ff. dām-bhā (?). See Bur MSS I, nos. 35, 135, “Pud cac” or “Saddā kri: pud cac”.

Burmes-Pāli 104. Samantacakkhudipani kyam: (Burmes with some Pāli), ff. ka-ra. Author: Muṃ-rwe: charā-tō (See Bur MSS II no. 360). Date: 1876. “Questions and answers on various beliefs in Buddhism as it appears in the Theravāda Buddhist canonical texts”. (Note by Daw Khin Thet Htar.)
Burmese-Pāli 105. Mukhamatthadīpanī (also known as Nyāsa), ff. ka-pū. Date: 1848. Commentary on Kaccāyanabyākarāṇa. Chapters: (1) Sandhī, ff. ka-go; (2) Nāma (Naṃ), ff. gō-jā; (3) Kāraka, ff. jha-ṭi.


Burmese-Pāli 111. Abhidhammatthavibhāvanī nissaya (Ṭīkā kyō nissaya), ff. ka-lē. Author: Janinda [f. lē]; Re ca krui charā-tō, 1748-1822).


Burmese-Pāli 119. Kammavāca, 26ff. Gilded palm leaves (only one wood cover). Tamarind-seed script.


Burmese-Pāli 121. Kammavāca, ff. kha-khe. Note on card: “A Kammavāca written in Burmese script on gilded palm leaves. The inlay of the wood covers consists of colored glass and semi-precious stones”. Note on ticket: “A Breviary of scripture, relating to membership of the Assembly ... This is so much of the book as would be held by one monk at the ordination service (Sa-hymn writing [tamarind-seed script])”. Cf. Poleman, no. 6334 (19.3×3.9; 6 lines).
Index of Titles

Abhidhammattha-asaṅgaha 41 (B), 51, 72, 73 (C, D, E, F, G); nissaya 6c (B), 41 (C), 96; Burmese 41 (C)
Abhidhammatthavibhāvanī (Tikā kyō) nissaya 88, 111
Abhidhammatthavibhāvanī-tīkā nissaya 97
Abhidhānappadi-pīkā 52, 103 (E)
Ādikappa 34 (B)
Aggikhandhopama sutta 15 (H); nissaya 15 (J)
Ākhyāt[a] nissaya 48 (2)
Anatālakkhaṇa-sutta nissaya 99 (H)
Anumodanā 4 (A)
Anusaya 108 (1)
Apraṇī 'on khraŋ: 99 (B)
Astrology chart 101
Asitī rāc kyiṭ 76 (D)
Atwaṅ: 'on khraṅ: 99 (C)
Āyatana 108 (7)
Ayogaha-jātaka 3 (K)
Āṭṭhayamaṅgalagāthā 99 (B)
Āṅguttara-nikāya 7
Bhāllāṭṭha-jātaka 3 (F)
Bhikkhu Pācit āṭṭhakathā 32a
Bhikkhu-pāṭimokkha 15 (F); nissaya 8 (A)
Bhikkhunī-pāṭimokkha 59; nissaya 8 (B)
Bhikkhuvihaṅga 85
Bhikkhunīvihaṅga 83
Bhūrīdatta-jātaka 12 (C), 17 (B)
Buddhavaṃsā 27 (B); nissaya 27 (A)
Campeyya-jātaka 3 (H)
Candakumāra-jātaka 17 (C)
Chaddanta-jātaka 3 (O)
Chadīpapālasutta nissaya 15 (E)
Chagadīpāna nissaya 14 (B)
Chandakumāra 17 (C)
Chuttanippān 47
Citta 108 (3)
Cittasambhūta-jātaka 3 (A)
Cūḷadesanālaṅkāra 43
Cūḷahāṃsa-jātaka 3 (D)
Cūḷavagga, Vinaya-Piṭaka 9, 92; nissaya 19, 29
commentary 32c
Dakkhiṇavāṃ kāraka kyam: 112
Dakkhinavaṃsā (Dakkhināvan) nissaya 54
Dānabheda nissaya 76
Dānaphaluppati nissaya 7c (D)
Desakkamadīpanī nissaya 15 (b)
Desanasāṅgaha 24 (A)
Dhamma 108 (3)
Dhammacakkappavattana-sutta nissaya 15 (I), 99 (G)
Dhammapada-āṭṭhakathā nissaya 16
Dhammasaṅgāni 1c, 60; nissaya 1a, 14 (A)
Dhūtakathā 103 (C); nissaya 103 (D)

A Note on the Transliteration of Burmese Used Here

My transliteration of Burmese is very close to the system used in Bur MSS I and II. I have transliterated one vowel and the tones differently, however:

The vowel I transliterate by “è” is transliterated by “ai” in Bur MSS.
The three tones used in Burmese are indicated in Bur MSS by superscript numerals. (This will be changed in Bur MSS III.) I have used a system based on the similarities between Western scripts and the signs used in Burmese: For tone one, “e”, “è”, and “ui” I use a subscript full stop after the vowel (e.g. mruï). For tone two, I use a long “o” (e.g. kyō). For tone three, a colon is added (e.g. ca:).
Dharga paritta nissaya 99 (J)
Digha-nikāya, Mahāvagga 30
Digha-nikāya-tīkā 1d;
Mahāvagga 82
Eighteen Jātaka stories 3
Guptā-phoṭa 18 (B)
Hatthipāḷa-jātaka 3 (J)
Hamśa-jātaka 3 (D)
Indriya 108 (4)
Janakka nissaya 58
Jātaka 3, 12, 15 (A), 17, 18
(A), 58, 86, 93
Jayaddisa-jātaka 3 (N)
Jinatthapakāsani 81
Jinālāṅkāra-tīkā nissaya 76 (N)
Kaccāyanabākaraṇa 105
Kaccāyanā 44, 48, 105
Kammāvāca 75, 76 (B, L, P),
113-122 (nissaya 116)
Kammathādhipani kyam 100
Kathāvatthu 28 (B), 68; nissaya
5a, 14 (A), 31; atṭhakathā
7c (B)
Kaṅkhā vitaraṇi nissaya 50
Khandha 14
Kaṇḍhāhāla-jātaka 17 (C)
Khuddasikkhā 15 (G); nissaya 8
(C)
Kibbidhāna (Kit) nissaya 48 (3)
Kimchanda-jātaka 3 (L)
Kumbha-jātaka 3 (M)
Kāraka 105 (3); nissaya 44 (3)
Līnathavāṇaṇā 1d, 82
Lokāntī 55, 62; nissaya 63, 73
(A, B), 78
Maggiṃ rhac paṭh ṇ anak 99 (I)
Mahā-Nāradakaṣṣapa-jātaka 17
(E)
Mahāpalobhāna-jātaka 3 (I)
Mahājanaka-jātaka 58
Mahākapi-jātaka 3 (Q)
Mahāsāma-sutta 15 (K);
nissaya 15 (L), 18 (G), 99
(F)
Mahāsatipaṭṭhāna-sutta nissaya
99 (K)
Mahā-ummagga-jātaka 86
Mahāvagga, Digha-nikāya 30
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STUDIES IN THE PÅLI GRAMMARIANS

I

Buddhaghosa's References to Grammar and Grammarians

Introduction

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

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

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

1 For the nature of this grammar cf. Franke, Gramm., pp. 14-20 and Norman, Pâli Literature p. 163.
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indigenous Pāli grammar and lexicography, claimed that certain of the grammatical terms found in the commentaries ascribed to Buddhaghosa reflected an old Pāli grammatical system. This claim is questionable since the available evidence can hardly be said to justify the assumption of a full-fledged system of Pāli grammar before Kaccāyana. Apart from the fact that Buddhaghosa invariably uses a peculiar terminology for denoting the individual case relations, and that he uses the term bhāvanapūnāsaka to denote the adverb, there is hardly a single grammatical term of any importance found in Buddhaghosa’s works that does not have a parallel in Sanskrit grammatical terminology.

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

\[
paccattaṃ upayoṣaṃ ca karaṇaṃ sampaddāniyaṃ \\
nisakkaṃ sāṅvacaṇaṃ bhummāṃ ālapaṇāthamaṇ.\]

On the contrary, according to Buddhapiya’s Rūp-ṭ it is quoted from the Mahāniruttī which, from the available evidence, appears to be an old commentary on Kacc. The verse was probably conceived by the author of the Mahāniruttī as a summary of the terminology used in the āṭṭhakathās.

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

An instance of such canonical exegesis is found in the verse that Buddhaghosa invariably quotes in connection with his interpretation of the canonical stereotypes “ekāṃ samayaṇ” and “tena samayena”:

\[
tam tam aṭṭhaṃ apakahrittā bhummena karanena ca \\
aṅgatara samayo vutto upayogena so idhā ti.\]

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

---

4Cf. Franke, op. cit. pp. 3-5.
5This term is not mentioned among the terms quoted by Franke, op. cit. pp. 3-4. Aggavaṃsa has devoted a whole paragraph to it in the Saddānīti [cf. Sadd 717, 15 foll.] because, as he says, it is the designation that is used in the scriptures (sāsane vohāro) in contrast to the term kriyāvīsesana [= sa. kriyāvīsesana] which is used in grammar (saddatasāthe). The meaning of this peculiar term is probably “a term in the neuter that qualifies a verbal action”. The term bhāva is borrowed from Sanskrit grammar.
7Cf. e.g. Rūp 116, 20; Sadd 60, 32. In the context of the case terminology it is interesting to note that the term for the vocative, āṭṭapanam, is used in the same sense in the Niddesa section of the Vinaya [cf. Vin III 73, 33]. Unfortunately we are not in a position to trace the other terms back to the canon. It therefore remains uncertain when and under what circumstances they came to be an integral part of the exegetical and grammatical terminology of the Pāli.
9An analysis of the available fragments of Mahāniruttī will be treated in Studies in the Pāli Grammarians II.
10Cf. Sv 33, 27-28; Ps I 9, 31-32; Spk I 11, 32-33; Mp I 13, 25-26. In order to make the verse fit the context, Buddhaghosa quotes it in a slightly edited version in his comment on “ekena samayena” in Sp 108, 13-14.
Whenever Buddhaghosa quotes this verse, it is followed by a grammatical quotation which he ascribes to the porāṇās. In Buddhaghosa this normally means the atṭhakathācariyās:

porāṇā pana vannayanti: "tasmiṃ samaye ti vā, tena samayenā ti vā, tam̐ samayan ti vā abhilāpamattabhedo esa. sabbattha bhummam eva attho" ti.\(^{11}\)

The old ones, moreover, make the comment that "tasmiṃ samaye", or "tena samayena", or "tam̐ samayan" is merely a difference of expression. In all [three] cases the sense is nothing but locative.

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


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

In several instances, however, Buddhaghosa explicitly refers his readers to grammar (saddasattha = sa. sabdaśāstra) or grammarians (saddalakkhanaavidū,\(^{14}\) saddavidū, akkharačintākā) for information about points of grammar that will justify his own grammatical analyses of the

---

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

\(^{12}\) Cf. Sp VIII [indexes]. For unknown reasons the terms bhāva and bhāvalakkhana [e.g. at Sp 108,1] are not recorded in the indexes. The terms accantasamyoga and nimitta (v. s.v. nimittasattha) have erroneously been omitted from the index of grammatical terms. They are found, however, in the index of words and subjects.

\(^{13}\) It is interesting that Vjh [Be 1960 57,26–27] on Sp 189,25 (nimittasattha) quotes a Pāli version of a Sanskrit verse which is quoted in Mahā-bh ad Pān II 3 36 as an illustration of nimittasaptami.

\(^{14}\) The actual meaning of this term is "those who know the rules of grammar", i.e. grammarians. "saddalakkhana" stands for grammar in Buddhaghosa’s works; cf. the usage of sabda and lakṣana in Sanskrit grammar; v. Renou, Vocabulaire s. vv.
Pāli. This gives rise to the rather interesting problem of trying to identify the grammatical source or sources to which Buddhaghosa refers.

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

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

Visuddhimagga

1 [Vism 8,2–6]

---

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

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

ken’ athena silan ti. silanasthena silam. kim idam silanam nāma. samādhānaṃ vā: kāyakammādinam susīlyavasaṃ avippakīṃṇatā ti atho; upadhāraṇaṃ vā: kusalānaṃ dharmmānaṃ patiṭṭhānavasena [so read with v.l.] ṛdhrābhavāti ti atho. etad eva h’ ettha [v.l. hi ettha] athadavāyaṃ saddalakkānaṇadī anujānanti.17

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

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

16 Cf.: aṭṭhe pana “sīratttho sīlatttho sīlatttho” ti evamādinā nayen’ ev’ ettha atthaṃ vannayanti, Vism 8,8-10. This is probably a reference to Vimuttimagga. For a translation of the passage in question see The Path of Freedom p. 8.

17 Qu. Paṭis-a 15,30-35.
traditionally ascribed to the Pāṇinians. Cf. sa-Dhātup I 556: śīla samādhau and sa-Dhātup X 332: śīla upādharāne. 18

2 [Vism 210,21–28]

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

bhāgyavā bhaggavā yutto bhagehi ca vibhättavā
bhattavā vantagamano bhavesu bhaggavā tato ti.

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

tattha, vaṇṇagamo vaṇṇavipariyayo ti adikan niruttīlakahānām gahevā, saddanayena va pisodārādipak-Sadhukhālakahānām gahevā, yasā lokiyalokuttara-sukhābhīninbhattakaṃ dānasālādīpārappattāṃ bhāgyam

21 Cf. Dhammapāla’s commentary: ādikan ti ādisaddena vaṇṇavikāra, vaṇṇalopo, dhātuathena niyojanaṃ ca tī imam tiridham lakkhanam saṅgarhāti. saddanayena ti byākaranāyena. pisodārinām saddanām akatāganabhāvato vuttam piso ... pe ... gahevā tī pakkhipanam eva lakkhanam. tappariyapattakāranam hi pakkhipanam [Vism-mh Be 1960 I 253,16–20]. Cf. also Vism-mh Be 1960 II 252,3–4: vaṇṇāgamaviparyayavikāravināsaddātuathavisesayogēhi pañcadvidhassa niruttillakkanassa vaṣena, and see next.

22 The original Sanskrit version was identified by H.C. Warren; cf. Vism (ed. HOS) p. 173,30.
The grammatical method (saddanaya) consists in analysing the word “bhagavan” as if it were a member of the class of word forms (ākriti ga) belonging to the gaṇapātha “prṣodarādi,” to which Pāṇini refers in Paṇ VI 3 109: “prṣodarādini” yathopadīṭam: [the elision, insertion and modification of letters that are observed in such cases as] “prṣodara”, etc., follows the way in which they are stated [by the experts in etymology].

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

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

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

vannāgamo, vannāpivaryāya,
dve cāpare vannāvikaraṇā, dhātānām athāhāsīyena yogo, tadd uccate anācavidadham nirottan ti


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

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

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

3 [Vism 310,18–22]

In this example Buddhaghosa discusses briefly the etymology of the word satta (= sa. sattra) as it occurs in the passage (= Paṭis II 130,26 foll.: sabbē sattā averā abyāpajjhā … attānām parihantu, etc.) upon which he is commenting. First he quotes S III 190,2–6\(^2\) where the word is defined in terms of a human being who is attached to (satta = sa. sakta) and clings to (visatta = sa. viṣakta) the khandhas. He continues:

\[ \text{rūḷhisaddena pana viṭarāgesu pi ayaṃ vohāro vattati yeva, vilivamaye pi vijanīvise tālavaṇṭavohāro viya.} \]
\[ \text{akkharaṇītakā pana athaṃ avicāreṇā nāmamattam} \]
\[ \text{etan ti icchanti. ye pi athaṃ vicārenti te sattayogena} \]
\[ \text{[so read for Ee satvāyogena] sattā ti icchanti.} \]

However, because it is a conventional term (rūḷhisadda), this designation also applies to those who are without desire, just as the word “palm fan” (tālavaṇṭa = sa. tālavrnta) applies to a particular kind of fan, although it is made of split bamboo. But the grammarians (akkharaṇītakā) maintain that it is a mere name (nāmamattam) without considering its meaning. Some people who take its meaning into consideration maintain that beings are called “sattā” [ = sa. sattra, mfn.] because they are possessed of “satta” [= sa. sattra, n.], intelligence.

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

4 [Vism 423,23–25]

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

\[^{26}\]Rūpe kho Rādha yo chando yo rāgo yā nandi yā tanhā tatra satto tatra visatto tasmā satto ti vuccati. vedanāyā saññāyā sañkhāresu viññāne yo chando yo rāgo yā nandi yā tanhā tatra satto tatra visatto tasmā satto ti vuccati ti.

\[^{27}\]Qu. Paṭis-a 604,36–38 and 57,20–22.
älokapipariggahena mahājutikattā pi dibbam, tiro-
kuddādiggataḥ rupasassanaṇa mahāgatikattā pi dibbam.
tāṃ sabbam sadasatthānusārena veditabban. 28

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

As in the first example from Vism, Buddhaghosa’s commentary
deals with a question of semantics: the meaning of the root \( \sqrt{div} \). Since he
uses the terms mahājutikattā and mahāgatikattā in order to define
the meaning of the epithet “dibba”, one would assume that this grammatical
reference too is to sa-Dhārup where the two meanings juti (to light) and
gati (to move), among others, are ascribed to \( \sqrt{div} \). Cf. sa-Dhārup IV 1
divū: kriyāvijayiyavahārayahārayutisuntamadvasavapnakāntigatisu.
Dhammapāla’s ṭīkā supports the assumption. 29

5 [Vism 518,27–32]

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

yathā vuttānaṃ [i.e. in S II 25,17] etesam
jarāmaranādānaṃ paccayato va paccayasamāhato vā
idappaccayāṭa ti vutto. tatrāyaṃ vacanattho: imesam
paccayā idappaccayāṭa; idappaccayāṭa eva idappaccayāṭa;
idappaccayānaṃ vā samīho idappaccayāṭa. lakkhaṇaṃ
pan’ ettha saddasatthato pariyesitabban. 30

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

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

28An identical passage is found in Sp 163,7-9 ad VIn III 5,1: so dibben.
29Evam vihāravijayacakavanhi jutigatisakkhiṇaṁ āthaṇaṁ vasena imassa abhihitthāmassa dibbakaṁhāvasiiddhiḥ. saddavidi ca tesa eva athasu divasaddam icchanti ti vuttam “tāṃ sabbaṁ saddasathānusārena veditabban” ti [Vism-mht Be II 56,27-57,2 ad loc.]; cf. also mahājutikattā mahāgatikattā ti etesa “saddasatthānusārena” ti vuttam [Vjb Be 1960 51,27-28 ad Sp 163,7-9]; ke ci pana jutigatitheṣu pi saddavidū divā-saddam icchanti ti mahājutikattā mahāgatikattā ti idam eva dvayaṁ sandhāya vuttam. tasmā “saddasatthānusārena veditabban” ti idam dibbaṁ jotayati ti dibbam [Sp-1 Be 1903,10-12 ad Sp 163,7-9]; Sadd 475,24 foll.
30This text is identical with Spk II 41,7 foll., q.v.
31Cf. devaśabdātā śvarīrte talpratayo bhavati. deva eva devaṭa [Kāś ad loc].
32On this term cf. Renou, Terminologie s.v.
that it means arising dependently (paticca) and correctly so (samma), that is, without reference to such causes as those which the heretics imagine, namely, Primordial Matter (pakati), The Person (purisa) and the like.36

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

saddhabheda ti paṭiccasaddo ca pañ’ āyam samāne kattari pukkakāle payujjamaṁ atthisaddhikaro hoti. seyyahidam: “cakkhuḥ ca paṭicca rūpe ca uppaṭṭajjī cakkhuviññānaṁ” [= S II 72,4] ti. idha pana bhāva-sādhanena uppādasaddena saddhiṃ payujjamaṇo

35 Cf.: grāmādibhyah talpratayyo bhavati, tasya samūḥah ity etasmin viṣaye. grāmānāṃ samūḥah grāmātā; janatā; bandhītā; saḥāyatā [Kāś ad loc.]
36 Cf.: idappacayyata eva idappacayyata ti tā-saddaṃ padam vaddhitam; na kiṃci aththaram; yathā devo eva devatā ti. idappacayyānaṁ vā samūhī idappacayyati ti. samūhahathām tā-saddaṃ āha, yathā janānam samūhā janatā ti [Vism-mḥ Be 1960 II 228,19-22 = Spk-pṛ Be 1960 II 50,22-26; Be om. na kiṃci aththaram and reads samūhaθatho tā-saddo; and adds imam athhaṃ sandhāyaḥ: lakkhaṇanā ... pe ... vedītabban ti]. Vism-sn 1250,15-16 refers correctly to Pāṇ ṣ IV 2 37 and 43, but does not identify the other source, i.e. Pāṇ ṣ V 4 27.
37 Cf.: ye pi mahānti: idappacayyānaṃ bhūvo idappacayyati, bhūvo ca nāma yo ākāro āvijjādham anūkāro ṛddhipūrabham hetu, so tasmin samkhāravikāre paṭiccasamuppādasamañña ti, tesam tam na yujjati, Vism 520,15-18.
Because of word disjunction": again, when the word "paticca", provided that the agent is the same (samāne kattā), is used in the sense of [the action expressed by the verb to which the absolute suffix is added] being anterior in time [to the action expressed by the finite verb], it achieves its meaning (athasadīdhikaro). As, for instance, [in the following sentence]: “After having come into contact with the eye and the sense objects, eye consciousness arises [= S II 72,4]”. In the present case, however, when [the word “paticca”] is used together with the word “uppāda” which is an action noun (bhāvasādhana), it leads to word disjunction since the agent is not the same, and so it does not achieve any meaning at all. Therefore, also because of word disjunction, paticcasamuppāda is not mere arising.

What is important for Buddhaghosa to point out in this connection is that, in order for the term “paticcasamuppāda” to be meaningful, it is necessary for the two actions expressed by the absolute form “paticca” and the action noun “samuppāda” to have the same agent (kattā). If this were not the case, there would be no connection between them in terms of their having the same agent. To illustrate this point Buddhaghosa quotes a well-known passage from Saṃyuttanikāya where cakkhuvinñāna, by implication, represents the identical agent of the successive verbal actions expressed by “paticca” and “uppajjai”. The opponent, however, generalizes the scope of meaning of “paticcasamuppāda” to such an extent that it becomes virtually impossible to interpret it with reference to specific agents and specific causes and conditions. Consequently, the action expressed by the term “paticca” would not at all relate, by virtue of identity of agent, to the action expressed by “uppāda”.

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

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

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

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

39On the paradox which this interpretation entails see the following.
40Cf.: samānah kartā yayoḥ dhātvartayos tatra pūrvakāle dhātvarte vartamāṇad dhāhoḥ kṛtā prayayo bhavai [Kāś ad loc.].
41Cf. the grammarians’ objection: na yuktā esa padārthāḥ, kim kāraṇam ? ekasya hi kartur dvayoḥ kriyayaḥ pūrvakālayām kriyāyām kṣāvidhir bhavaiti. tad
implications, pointed out by the grammarians, of a strict Pāñinian interpretation of “paticca”, by taking the absolute suffix as indicating an action that takes place simultaneously with the action expressed by the action noun “samuppāda”. For this interpretation they could refer to one of Katyāyana’s vrāttikas on Pāñini’s sūtra, which allows for interpreting “paticca” as expressing an action that is simultaneous with the action expressed by “samuppāda.”

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

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

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

yathā: snātvā bhuṅkta iti. na cāsau pūrvam utpāda akṣicd asti, yaḥ praṇītaṃtārakālaṃ utpadaye. na cāpy akṣaraññī kriye ti, AkBhāṣ 454,14.

42 Cf.: vyāddyā svaśītity upasaṃkhyānaṃ apīravakāravāti, vārt. 5 ad loc. Vasubandhu refers to this vrāttika in his reply to the grammarians: sahaḥhāve 'pi ca kṛtvādi dipam prāpya tamo gatam; āsyaṃ vyāddyā śete vā, paścāt cait kim na saṃvṛte, AkBhāṣ 455,7-8. Cf. Vism-sn p. 1254,12: dipam prāpya tamo vīgacchati.

43 Cf.: the following passage from Mahānāma’s [first half of the sixth century A.D.] commentary on Pāṭis: nimītaṃ patisankhā nāraṃ uppajjati [Pāṭis II 63,34-35], kāmaḥ ca na pāḍhānam jāniyā pachchā nāraṃ uppajjati; vohārasena pana “mānaḥ ca paticcama dhamaṃ ca uppajjati manovihāran” ti ādini viyā evam vuccati. Saddasathavāda 'pi ca “āṭiccam pāṇipāyitā tamo vīgacchati” ti ādīsu viyā samānakāle 'pi imam padam icchanti [= Pāṭis-a 567,12-16 ad loc.]; for the reference to grammarians cf. the parallel passage from AkBhāṣ quoted supra.

44 Cf.: samāne kattāni ti ekāsmin yeva kattari uppajjanakiriyāya yo kattā, tasmin yeva paccayanakiriyāya ca katubhūte ti attho. yathā “nhatvā bhūjāti; bhutvā sayati” ti. pubbakāle ti idānta ca tvā-saddānam padānam yebhuyyena purimakālakiriyāya dipanato vuttam. na idaṃ paticcasaddassu purimakālathātā. evaḥ hi “cakkhuḥ paticcāḥ” ti niḍāsnavacanam niṣadītobhena samsaṃdeyya. atha vā, kāmaḥ c' ettha ubhīnnaṃ kriyānaṃ samakālaṃ uppajjanakiriyāya pubbe paccayanakiriyāya asambhava. taḥāḥ pi phalakiriyāya hetukiriyā purimakālo viyā vohāритum yuttā evam ettha hetupalavavathānām supākataḥ hoti ti upacārasidham purimakālam gahetvā vuttam pubbakāle ti. athāsādhiḥkaro ti vākyatthavatāvāthākaro. paticcasamuppādo ti hi ettha vākyatthavabodho ida arthasadhiḥ ti adhippeto. payujjāmāno paticcasaddo uppādasaddena vuccanānānaṃ smaṇṇānaṃ katu bhāvato ti padam ānēvā yojitabhamb. ayaḥ h' ettha attho “cakkhuḥ ca paticcā rūpe ca upppajjati cakkhuvihāran” ti ādīsu paccayanakiriyāya, uppajjanakiriyāya ca viśeṣam eva katā ti samānakattuṭa labbatī. paticcasamuppādo ti ettha pana uppādasadda bhāvasādhanaśātya kriyā va vutta ti samānakattukalakhano sādhatthayaṃ yevan samḥāvati ti. tenāḥ “saddabhedam gacchati” ti. apasadappayo hoti ti attho. na c' ettha parpadayo [= Pāṭis III 4 20] “appavva' nanām pabbato, atikammam pabbatam nādi” ti ādīsu viyā yāpyā lakkahaneutherfordayo “siham divyā bhavaṁ hoti, ghaṭām pīrvātī bālam jāyate, ‘dhan’ ti karvā dando patiyo” ti ādīsu viyā. n' ev' ettha saddadhado. na hi hathatale āmalakam viyā sabbhatthayaṃ paccakham katvā hitānam maheshin vacane akharaśiṣṭakānam vippalāpo avasaṃ labhati. labhati, vāyukkhiya saddasiddhito “nhatvā gamanam, bhutvā sayanam” ti ādīsu viyā ti. evam ti na ca kīcchī atham śādhe, yādī pi paccakam padato labhatī, vāyukkhiya pana ti yajujya, taṃ samadassadānādabhāvīyā viyā asambhandhatthāyā nirathakham hoti ti adhippyo [Vism-mhā Be 1960 II 231,18-232,17 ad loc.]; cf. also ibid. p. 238,1-4: samānakāle tāva: andhakāram nihantvāsa, uditō 'yaṃ dipākaro ... keci pana "mukham bhūjāya sayati", which is an echo of the discussion in AkBhāṣ, for which v. note 42 supra.
Buddhaghosa was conversant with the Sanskrit grammatical tradition, which in all likelihood is identical with Pāñinian grammar. This conclusion is furthermore corroborated by the evidence found in the āṭṭhakathās ascribed to Buddhaghosa. In the following a number of references to grammar and grammarians found in these works will be analysed.

Samantapāsādīkā

1 [Sp 204,25–32 ad Vin III 13,5–6]

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

athavā kiṃci dukkhaṃ nānubhosi ti atho: karaṇatthe sāmivacanam anubhavanatthe ca jānānā. athavā kiṃci dukkhaṃ na sarasi ti atho: upayogatthe svāmivacanam saranatthe ca jānānā. vikappadvaye pi purimapadassa uttarapadena samānavibhättilopo

datthabbo. tam sabbaṃ saddassathānusārena nālabbham.

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

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

It has not been possible to find any justification in traditional Indian grammar for adding supposedly elided case morphemes in the way suggested by Buddhaghosa, but the grammar which justifies his interpretation of jīvā constructed with the genitive in the sense indicated above can easily be identified. In both cases it is based on the application of two Pāṇini sūtras. The first alternative is undoubtedly based on Pāṇ II
3 [50+] 51: ājñā 'vidarthasya karaṇe: the verb ṣāthi, when not used in the sense of "to know", is constructed with the genitive in the sense of the instrument kāraka.46 The second is based on the subsequent sūtra Pāṇī II 3 [50+] 52: adhiṣṭhādayesaṁ karaṇaṁ: verbs, when used in the sense of "remembering" [cf. sa-Dhātup II 38] …, are constructed with the genitive in the sense of the object kāraka.47

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

46Cf. Kāś ad loc.: jānātā avidarthaṃ jñānārthaṃ karaṇe karaṇe saṣṭhi vibhaktir bhavati: sarpiṣo jānīte, madhuno jānīte.
47Cf. Kāś ad loc.: adhiṣṭhādayesaṁ karaṇaṁ karaṇe saṣṭavena vibhaktis saṣṭhi vibhaktir bhavati … mātuḥ smarati.
48Cf. Sāriputta ad loc.: yadā jānātā-saddo bodhanatho na hoti, tadā tassa payoge "sappino jānātī, madhuno jānātī" ti ādisu viya karanatho sāṃvivacānas saddasattvadī ichchanti tī āha: "kīci ... pe ... " ti. tenāhā: "karaṇa- ... pe ... " ti. ettho ca "kīci ... pe ... " ti kaceti dukkhaṇa karaṇabhūtena visayam nārabhosi ti evam attā roddhobbo. "kīci" ti etthāpī hi karaṇatho sāṃvivacanassa lopo kato. ten eva ca vakkhati "vikappā- ... pe ... " ti. yadā pana jānātī-saddo saraṇatho hoti, tadā saraṇathānām dhātu-saddānaṁ payoge mātu sarati, pitu sarati, bhātu jānātī ti ādisu viya upayogatthe sāṃvivacanam saddasattvadī vadanti ti āha: "athavā ... pe ... " ti. kassaci dukkhaṇa anubhūtattāt attāna anubhūtan appamattakam pi dukkham pariyesamāno pi abhāvato yeva na sarati ti attho. "vikappadavye ... " ti anubhavana-saraṇathavasena vutte dutiyabatāyavikappadavye. "purinpadassa" ti = kīci ti padassa. "uttarapadena" ti dukkhaṇa ti padena. "samānavibhattilopo" ti

2 [Sp 209,27–210,1 ad Vin III 16,5]

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


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

uttarapadenasamānassa sāmivacanassa lopo. kassaci dukkhaṇa ti vattabbe vikappadavaye pi purimapade sāmivacanassa lopo karā kīci dukkhaṇa ti niddeso kato [Sp-œ Be 1960 II 4,17–5,6].
In this grammatical analysis, Buddhaghosa focuses on a syntactical peculiarity of the sentence complement (upapada) “attthi”, which systematically requires construction with the future tense, whereas, from a semantical point of view, the implied tense in such a context is to be interpreted as present. The grammarians mentioned by Buddhaghosa in this case are undoubtedly identical with the Pāñjinians since the analysis is based on Pāṇini 3 [145+] 146: kimkīlayantartheśu īṛt: the future (denoted īṛt) is used when [the words] “how comes it?” (kimkila) or [the words] meaning “is it possible?” (asti) [are syntactically constructed with it], and the action is either not likely to take place, or not to be tolerated.

3 [Sp 288,12–15 ad Vin III 42,13–14]

kathāṁ hi nāma so bhikkhave moghapuriso sabbamattikāmayam kutikāṁ karissati [= Vin III 42,13–14] ti idāṁ atitaththe anāgatavacanam akāśi ti vuttam hoti; tassa lakṣaṇam saddassatthato pariyesitabbaṁ.

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

---

49As noted by Sāriputta in his comment, the usage of the future tense in a construction like this is exclusively present in meaning. Cf. his commentary ad loc.: anokappanāmarisanyathavasena ti ettha anokappanam asaddahanam. amarisanāna samahanam. anagatavacanam anagatasaddappayo. aṭṭho pana vattamānakālīko va. tenāḥ “paccakkham pit” ti. na marisayāmi ti na visahāmi [Sp-τ Be 1960 II 9,1-3].

50Cf. Kāś ad loc.: anavakṣaṇaparyāsany oh iti vartate. ... kimkīlayantartheśu upadesu anavakṣaṇaparyāsany oh dhāthoh īṛt pratrayo bhavati. ... asti nāma tatrabhavān vṛṣalāṁ yājayaśyati. ... na śaddadhate, na marṣayāmi.

mud?”, it is explained that the future (anāgatavacanaṁ) is used in the sense of the past (atitaththā); the rule (lakṣaṇam) for this should be sought in grammar (saddasatthato).

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

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

---

51Cf. Kāś ad loc.: kimvytta upapade garhāyāṁ gamyamāṇāyāṁ dhātoh liṅṭha pratraya bhavataḥ. sarvalakārāṇāṁ apavādaḥ. liṅgarāṇam lāṭo 'pari-grahārtham.

52Cf. Kāś ad loc.: kathami upapade garhāyāṁ gamyamāṇāyāṁ dhātoh liṅ pratrayo bhavati, cakkālā lāṭ ca. vibhāṣāgarāṇam yathāśvam kālavasye vihiṃṣānām abādhanārtham.

53Cf.: kathām hi nāma mādīso samāṇam vā brāhmaṇam vā vijīte vasantaṁ haneyya vā badheyya vā pabbājeyya vā, Vin III 44,15-17.
shows that he identified the reference to *saddasattha* with Pāṇī III 3 144.\(^{54}\)

4 [Sp 296,13–14 ad Vin III 44,19]

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

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{vipācenti ti viṭṭhārike karonti, sabbaṭṭha patṭharanti;} \\
\text{ayañ ca attho saddasatthaṁ sāsārenā veditabbo.}
\end{align*}
\]

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

Grammar in this case is, as in the previous examples from Vism, in all probability identical with sa-Dhātup. Cf. sa-Dhātup X 109: *pacī vistāravacane.*\(^{55}\)

5 [Sp 480,26–481,6 ad Vin III 88,2–4]

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

\[
\text{eso yeva kho āvuso seyyo yo amhākaṃ gihiṇam aṅhamahāṇassa uttaranussadhammassa vanno bhāsito ti.}
\]

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

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

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

\(^{54}\)Cf. Sāriputta ad loc.: *saddasathavidūhi kimsaddayoge anāgatavacananassa icchitattā vuttaṃ “tassa lakkhaṇam saddasathatho pariyesitabbā” ti [Sp-1 Be 1960 II 117,14-16].

\(^{55}\)Cf. Sadd 528,26: *pacī vitthāre.*
anāgatasambandhe pana asati na etehi yo tasmiṃ khaṇe bhāśito 'va yasmā [CeBeSe so; Ee tasma] na yuyjai, tasmā anāgatasambandham katvā yo evaṃ bhāśito bhavissati so seyyo ti evam ettha athhko veditabbo. lakkhanaṃ pana saddassathato pariyesitabbaṃ.

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

The rule to which Buddhaghosa refers here as a justification for complementing the verbal form bhāśito with the future form bhavissati [from 'bhāśī], is found in Pāṇi III 4 1: dhātusambandhe pratyāḥ: affixes are [valid in denoting a time other than the one for which they have been specifically enjoined] when they are used for [establishing] a relation between [the meanings of] the roots [in question].

The problem which Pāṇini addresses in this sūtra is that the usage of a particular suffix is generally restricted to the specific tense value that is attached to it. For instance, according to Pāṇi III 2 85 a word like “agnistomayājīn” has a past tense value. It denotes a person who already has performed the agniṣṭoma. But in a sentence like “agnistomayājy asya putro janitā”: “he shall have a son who will perform the agniṣṭoma”, a word with a past tense value (“agnistomayājīn”) is construed with a word that has a future tense value (“janitā”). In such a case the future tense value of janitā takes precedence over the past tense value of agniṣṭomayājīn, which thus assumes a future value. The same is the case in a sentence like: kṛtaḥ kataḥ śvō bhavitā: “the mat will be made tomorrow”. In this clause the future tense value of bhavitā takes precedence over the absolute tense value of the past participle kṛtaḥ.57

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

6 [Sp 500,18–20 ad Vin III 95,3]

ukkheṭito [= Vin III 95,3] ti idam āriyamaggena uttāsitatta ... svāyam attha saddassathatato pariyesitabbo.

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

Here Buddhaghosa is concerned with the meaning of ut + 'khit. In this case too, grammar is probably identical with sa-Dhātup. Cf. sa-

57Cf. Kāś ad loc.: dhāvarthanam sambandho viśeṣanaviśeṣyabhāvaḥ. tasmin sati ayathākālokaḥ api pratyāḥ śādhaḥ bhavanti. ... kṛtaḥ kataḥ śvō bhavitā. ... tatra bhūtaḥ kālaḥ bhavisyatākālaḥ abhisambadhyānāṃ śādhaḥ bhavati. viśeṣanam guṇavād viśeṣyakālaṃ anurūdhyaḥ, tena viparyayo na bhavati.
58Cf.: “anāgatasambandhe pana asati” ti bhāśito bhavissati ti pāṭhāsṛṇam katvā anāgatasambandhe asati. bhāśito ti atihavacanam kathāṃ anāgatavacanena sambandham upagacchati ti aha “lakkhanaṃ pana saddassathato pariyesitabban” ti. idāse hi thāne “dhātusambandhe paccayā” [= Pāṇi III 4 1] ti iminā lakkhanena dhāvarthe sambandhe asati ayathākālohiḥ iti paccayā śādhaḥ bhavati santi [≠ Kāś ad Pāṇi III 4 1] ti saddassathavihā sattanti [Sp-ṭ Be 1960 II 278,21–26 ad loc.].
Dhātupāla 324: khit trāse. This assumption is corroborated by Sāriputta’s tikā ad loc.59

7 [Sp 584,16-21 ad Vin III 163,21,30]

It is not clear how we are to interpret Buddhaghosa’s reference to grammar (saddalakhkānaṃ) in this case. The two words he comments upon (duṭṭho doso) occur in the following passage: yo pāṇa bhikkhu bhikkhum duṭṭho doso appaṭtino ... anuddhamseyya: “whatever monk, offended, indignant, and ill-tempered, would defame a monk ...” [= Vin III 163,21-22]. The niddesa presents the following gloss on the two words: duṭṭho doso ti kupito anattamano anabhīraddho āhatacitto khilajāto [= Vin III 163,30-31], but this gloss obviously does not clarify the question of how to construe them. The past participle duṭṭho [from ṣṭus] presents no problem, but doso does. In this particular context it can only be interpreted as an adjective which in meaning is related to, if not synonymous with, duṭṭho and derived from the same root.60 This, apparently, is also the view of Buddhaghosa, who seems to interpret doso as a derivative of the causative stem of ṣṭus:

“duṭṭho doso” ti, dūsito c’ eva dūsako ca, uppanne hi dose puggalo tena dosena dūsito hoti: pakatibhāvanā

jahūpito, tasmā duṭṭho ti vuccati. paraṇ ca dūseti vināseti, tasmā doso ti vuccati. iti duṭṭho doso ti ekasses ev’ etām puggalassass dassitam [v.l. nidassanam], tena vuttaṃ duṭṭho doso ti dūsito c’ eva dūsako cā ti. taṇha saddalakhkānaṃ pariyesitabbān.

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

The question is whether Buddhaghosa actually wants his reader to refer to grammar for information on the derivation and meaning of duṭṭha and doso. It is clear that his purpose is to show that the two terms are mutually opposed, in the sense that one (duṭṭha) is intransitive (kammasādhana), whereas the other (doso) is transitive (kattusādhana), which, of course, is reflected in their respective meanings. This is also the way in which Sāriputta understands Buddhaghosa. But in addition he points out that the reason why Buddhaghosa says that a person who is dūsito is one who is shocked, is because ṣṭus is read [in the Dhātupāla]
in the sense of alteration (vikatiyām paṭhitattā). This remark seems to point to the fact that we are dealing with yet another reference to sa-Dhātup, which in view of the other references to sa-Dhātup is likely to be true. In that case it must be a reference to sa-Dhātup IV 76: duṣa vaṅkṛte.

8 [Sp 770,33–37 ad Vin IV 38,2-3]

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

uijhāpentī [= Vin IV 38,2-3; this reading is recorded as a variant by the ct., which reads uijhāyantī]; Dabbaṃ Mallaputtamaṃ bhikkhū uijhāyantī ... tam āyasantaṃ tehi bhikkhūhi avaṭṭhāpentī avaṭṭhāya olokaṃpentī lāmakato vā cintāpentī ti attho. lakkhaṇaṃ pan’ ettha sadasasatthānaṃsa ārāna vediṭṭhabbaṃ.

The definition (lakkhaṇaṃ) is this time found in sa-Dhātup I 957: dhyai cintāyāṃ. The identification is, if Sāriputta is correct, confirmed by his explicit reference to the Dhātupāṭha, with the remark that, since verbal roots have multiple meanings, the root ṣjhe has also the meaning of “looking down upon”.

Sumaṅgalavilāsinī

1 [Sv 43,13–15 ad D I 2,9]

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

tatha andhassa pabbatārohanam viya niccaṃ na hoti ti acchariyaṃ. ayam tāva saddanayo.

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

---

62 Cf. dūṣīto ti duṭṭhasaddassa kammāsaddhanatām dasseti. dūsayati param vināsetī ti dūsako; iminā dūsayati ti doṣo ti dosasaddassa katussaddhanatā vutta. “pakatiṭhāvam jahāpito” ti dusasaddassa vikatiyām paṭhitattā vuttaṃ [Sp-ṭ Be 1960 II 347,15-18 ad loc.].

63 Cf. tatiye dhātupāthe jhesaddo cintāyāṃ pathito ti āha “lāmakato vā cintāpentī” ti ādi. ayam eva ca anekathattā dhātunāṃ olokanatho pi hoti ti daṭṭhabbaṃ [Sp-ṭ Be 1960 III 24,17-19 ad loc.].

64 Cf. Mp I 113,11-13 ad acchariyamanusso.

65 Cf. saddasathāṃ anugato nayo saddanayo. tatha hi anabhiṭhavutike acchariyosaddo icchito. ten’ ev’ āha “andhassa pabbatārohanam viya” ti [Sv-ṭ I 67,17-18 ad loc.].
The saddanaya to which Buddhaghosa refers here is in all likelihood identical with Pāṇī VI 1 147: āścaryam anitye: the word ‘āścaryam’ [is formed with the augment suṭ = s-] in the sense of something unusual.66

2 [Sv 245,16–19 ad D I 87,7–8]

In this case Buddhaghosa selects the following clause for a grammatical comment: Ukkatāma ajjhāvasati ti, and continues:

upasaggavasen’ ettha bhūmathe upayogavacanam veditabbam ... tath’ [Ee tath’] eva lakṣānaṁ [CeBe so; Ee na-] saddasatthato [so read with v.l. and Sv-t] pariyesitabbaṁ.

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

The definition which Buddhaghosa has in mind in this case is Pāṇī I 4 [45+46+] 48: upānvadhyaṁ vasak: [the place of the action] of \( \sqrt{\text{vas}} \), when preceded by [the prepositions]upa, anu, adhi, and ā [is called “karma” (= the object kāraka)].68

3 [Sv 481,3–5 ad D II 55,3]

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

tatāyaṁ anuttānapadaṇṇanā. Kurūṣu viharatī ti, Kurū nāma jānapadino rājaśāpakā, tesam nivāso eko pi janaṇa rūḷhisaddena Kurū ti vuccati: tasmān Kurūsa janaṇade.69

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

---

66Cf. anityatayā viṣayabhūtayā adbhuta vatam iha upalaksyate, tasminn āścaryam nipātaye [Kāś ad loc.].
67Cf.: “saddasatthato pariyesitabban” ti etena saddalakṣānaṁuyyogato vāyam saddapayogo ti dasseti. upa, anu, adhi, ā iti evampubbake vasanakriyādāre upayogavacanam eva pāpinnat ti hi saddavidā icchanti [Sv-pṭ Be 19601 376,5–9]. For an identical analysis cf. Ps III 414,24–26 ad M II 164,6.
68Cf. Kāś ad loc.: upa, anu, adhi, ā iti evampūrvavya vasater ādhāro yah, tat kārakam karmasatittham bhavati. Sv-pṭ ad loc. would seem to represent a slightly edited version of Kāś. Cf. note 67 supra.
69Qu. Ps I 225,4–6; Cf. the identical passages in Sv 279,4–7 ad D I 111,2: Aṅgusu; 294,4–6 ad D I 127,2: Magadhusu and 672,3–8 ad D II 253,3: Sakktesu.
their habitation is singular, their state is denoted by the conventional term “Kurū [in the plural]”. [Consequently the loc. pl. “kurūsu” means] “in the Kuru state”.

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

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

The first sūtra quoted by Dhammapāla is Pāṇī I 2 51⁷⁰: lūpi yuktavat vyaktivacane⁷¹: In the case where [a taddhita affix] is elided [provided that the elision is denoted by “lūp”], the gender and number [of the derivative from which they are elided] are the same as when they are joined [to the original word]. The purpose of this sūtra is to explain why certain words that are considered to be derivatives retain the gender and number of the word from which they are derived. For example, the word Paṭcālāh is masculine plural, but applies to a single janapada.

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

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

We cannot know, of course, whether Buddhaghosa was actually thinking of these Pāñinian sūtras when he wrote his commentary. Dhammapāla may be right when he identifies Buddhaghosa’s source with Pāṇī I 2 51-52. But the possibility cannot be excluded that the actual sūtras Buddhaghosa had in mind were the following sūtras 53-55: tād aśisyaṃ samjñāpraṃaṇatvāt. lubyogāprakhyānāti. yogapramāne ca tadabhāve ’darsanam syāt. In these sūtras Pāñini explains why it is unnecessary to establish those complicated rules of derivation described in 51-52 in order to explain usages that in the final analysis are on convention.⁷⁵

⁷⁰ Cf. Sv-pi II 103,6-7 (Ee is utterly confused): akharacintakā hi idisesu ṭānesu yuttte viya [so read with Be (= sa. yuktavat); Ee suttesu; cf. v. l.]. idisalīngacananā [so read with Be; Ee vīlinga; cf. v. l.] icchanti. In this quote Dhammapāla is replacing the archaic vyakti with līnga.

⁷¹ Cf. vyaktih = stripongnapamsakāni. vacanam = ekatvadvitvabahutvāni. Paṭcālāh = kṣaṇiyāḥ pumilīgā bahuvacanavisyāyāḥ. teṣām nivāso janapadah. yathā teṣu kṣaṇiyāṃ vyaktivacane tadvaj janapade bhavataḥ: Paṭcālāh, Kuravah [Kāś ad loc.].

⁷² Cf. Sv-pi II 103,11-12: tattvasanē janapadasadde jātisadde ekacanan eva.

⁷³ Cf. ajāteh iti kim? Paṭcālāh janapadah... ājātāhaya ca yuktavabdābhāva-pratisedhāh. teta jātīdvaraṇa yāni viśeṣanānī teṣām api yuktavabdāhavo na bhavati: Paṭcālāh janapado ramanīya [Kāś ad loc.].

⁷⁴ Cf. Paṭcālānām nivāso janapado Paṭcālāh [Kāś ad loc.].

⁷⁵ Cf. Kāś ad SS: drṣyate ca sampratī vināya kṣaṇiyāsambandhena janapadesu paṭcālādisadbhādāḥ, tato avasyate nāmaḥ yoganimitākāḥ. kim tarhi rūḍhirupaṇaiva tatra pravṛttāh.
Papañcasūdanī

1 [Ps I 59,26–28 ad M I 6,27]

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

Sāvatthī ti Savathassa isino nivāsaṭṭhānabhūtā nagari,
yathā Kākandi, Mākandi, [Ce v.l. adds Kosambi; Ee om., cf. Ps-pt] ti. evam akkharacintakā.⁷⁶

"Sāvatthī" is a city which has status as the place where the rṣi Savattha was living, as for example Kākandi and Mākandi. This is the opinion of the grammarians.

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

⁷⁶Qu. Pj I 110,15-18; Paṭiss-a 532,16-18. Pj I adds after Mākandi ti evam iṭhilingavasena Sāvatthi vuccati. Cf. also Ud-a 55,13-16; Ps II 389,30-390,2 ad M I 320,26: Kosambiyaṁ.

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

⁷⁷Cf. yathā Kākandi Mākandi Kosambi ti yathā Kākandassa isino nivāsaṭṭhāne māpitā nagari Kākandi; Mākandassa nivāsaṭṭhāne māpitā Mākandi; Kusambassa nivāsaṭṭhāne māpitā Kosambi ti vuccati. evam Sāvatthī ti daseti [Ps-pt I 140,15-18]; cf. Ps II 390,1-2: Kusumbassa nāma isino assamato avidūre māpitā ti pi eke.
2 [Ps I 129,32–33 ad M I 24,1]

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

bhaye kodpe pasamsāyaṁ turite kotūhalacchare
hāse soke pasāde ca kare āmenditaṁ budho.⁷⁸


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

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

In any case, there is a clear relation between the various functions which the verse ascribes to āmendita and the corresponding definition of āmredita found in Pāṇ VIII 1 [2+] 8: vākyāder āmantrit-

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

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

tattha Kosambiyan ti evaṁnāmake nagare. tassa hi [so read with v.l.; Ee kiri] nagarassa ārāmapokkhariṇādisu
tesu tesu ṭhānesu kosambarakkha vaussannā
ahesum, tasmā Kosambi ti saṅkhām agāmasi.
Kusumbassa nāma isino assamato avidūre māpitattā ti
pi eke.

In this case [the locative] “in Kosambi” means in a city thus named. Because there was an abundance of Kosamba trees in various places of this city such as in the parks and by the lotus ponds or the like, it was called Kosambi. Some [grammarians] are of the
opinion that [it is called Kosambi] because it was constructed not far from the hermitage of the ṛṣi Kusamba”.

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

Manorathapūraṇī

1 [Mp I 17,12–15 ad A I 1,7]

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

\[
\text{bhikkhavo tā āmantanākāradipanāṃ, tāt ca bhikkhaṇa-}
\text{sīlatādīguṇayogasiddhātā vuttāṃ; bhikkhaṇaśīlatā-}
\text{guṇayutto pī hi bhikkhu, bhikkhaṇadhammatāguṇa-}
\]

yutto pī bhikkhu, bhikkhane sādhukāritāguṇayutto pī
ti saddavidā maṁhanti.\(^{81}\)

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

The grammarians to whom Buddhaghosa refers as his source for this grammatical analysis are definitely Pañjinians. The three qualities (śīlata, dhammatā, sādhukārita) which he enumerates in order to define the scope of meaning of the term bhikkhu are identical with those mentioned in Pañ III 2 134: ā kveḥ tacchilataddharmatatsādhukāriṣu: from this sūtra to sūtra 177 [the affixes that are being described are used] in the sense [of agents] having such a habit (śīla) or such a nature (dharma) or such a skill (sādhukārin). This rule covers Pañ III 2 168 where Pañjini deals with derivatives from desiderative roots and inter alia vbhikṣ: sanāśanṣabhiṣka uḥ.\(^{82}\) It is obvious that Buddhaghosa must have had both sūtras in mind when he wrote this grammatical comment.

\(^{81}\)This text is also found in Ps I 13,29–33 and Spk II 1,19–2,3.

\(^{82}\)Cf. sanantebhyo dhātubhyah āśamser bhikṣeṣ ca tacchilādīṣu kartrṣu uḥ prayayo bhavai [Kāś ad loc.].
2 [Mp III 76,15–20 ad A II 37,22–23]

In this case Buddhaghosa focusses on the usage of the preposition “antarā” in the following passage: ekam samâyana Bhagavā antarā ca Ukkaṭṭhaṃ antarā ca Setabbyaṃ addhānamaggapatiṣṭhito hoti: “Once Bhagavā was on his way between Ukkaṭṭha and Setabbya”. He continues:

antarāsaddena pana yuttattâ upayogavacananaṃ katam. edisesu ca thānesu akkhacintakā ‘antarā gāmaḥ ca nadiḥ ca yāti’ ti evam ekam eva [v.1. ettha] antarāsaddam payuñjanti, so dutiyapadena pi yojetabbo hoti, ayojiyamāne upayogavacanam na pāpunāti. idha pana yojetvā eva [v.1. evam] vutto iti.83

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

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

Conclusion

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

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

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

84 Cf.: antarā tvām ca mām ca kamandaluḥ ... yuṭtagrahanaṃ kim? antarā Takṣasaṅkham ca Pāṭaliputram Sruṇhaysa prākaraḥ [Kāś ad loc.].

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

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

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

It is, in fact, difficult to explain these references to Sanskrit grammar unless we assume that there was no clearly defined system of Pāli grammar in existence when Buddhaghosa was writing his commentaries. It appears from the way in which he often presents his analyses that they were conceived as a sort of complement to the explanations embodied in the atṭhakathās. In such instances the grammarians’ statements are sometimes contrasted with the explanations of the atṭhakathās. This too seems to prove that there was no full-scale Pāli grammar available to Buddhaghosa as a reference work.

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

In a subsequent article I shall analyse references to and fragments from Pāli grammars that were presumably written in the tradition of Kaccāyana’s grammar, the importance of which is beyond doubt in the development of the Sinhalese Pāli grammatical tradition.
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86Cf. Mhv XXXVII 217.
THE STŪPA CULT AND THE EXTANT PĀLI VINAYA

One of the more curious things about the Pāli Vinaya as we have it is that it contains no rules governing the behaviour of monks in regard to stūpas. In this respect it is, among the various Vinayas that have come down to us, unique: “tous les Vinayapiṭaka ... à la seule exception du Vinaya pāli, contiennent”, according to A. Bareau, “d’intéressantes données concernant la construction et le culte des stūpa”.¹ Professor Bareau seems to see the absence of such “données” in the Pāli Vinaya as a function of the chronology of the compilation of the various Vinayas, and seems to suggest that the absence of such material in the Pāli Vinaya results from the relatively earlier date of the ‘closing’ of its compilation.² Gustav Roth explains the absence of such rules in the Pāli Vinaya in a somewhat different way: “The Pāli tradition apparently did not include such a section, as the compilers of the ancient Pāli canon were governed by a tradition according to which the construction and worship of a stūpa was the concern of laymen, and not of monks. Therefore, there was felt to be no need for a particular stūpa-section to be included in the Khandhaka-section of the Pāli Vinaya”.³ There is, however, a passage in a 12th Century Sinhalese Katikāvata, or monastic
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code, a passage in the Visuddhimagga, and several passages in the Sutta-vibhaṅga, which might suggest quite a different possible explanation.

The Mahā-Parākramabāhu Katikāvata, which has come down to us in a 12th Century inscription from Galvihare, was promulgated as a part of one of the many attempts to “purify” or “reform” the Śrī Lankan Sangha, and its authors claim that it “was formulated also without deviating from the tradition of the lineage of preceptors [ādurol = ācāryakula] and after the consultation of Dhamma and Vinaya”. One of the sections intended to regulate the daily life of the monks says, in part, in Ratnapala’s translation:

“They should rise at dawn and pass the time walking up and down (for the sake of bodily exercise). Thereafter they should wear the cīvara covering themselves properly with it and after they have finished cleaning the teeth and have attended to the duties specified in the Khandhaka such as the duties pertaining to Śūpas, the great bodhi-tree, the temple terrace, the teachers, the Theras, the sick and the lodging places (dahagab māṁbo aṅgaṇa-vatu-du ādūru-vat tera-vat gilan-vat senasun-vat ā kandu-vatu-du sapayā), should if need arise enter the refectory ... ”6


5 Ratnapala, The Katikāvatas, 38, 129; 304.

6 Ratnapala, The Katikāvatas, 40, § 12 (text); 131-32 (translation). Exactly the same reading of the text was given earlier by de Zilva Wickremasinghe, and his translation of it differs only very slightly: “... and have attended to the duties specified in the Khandhaka, such as those rules of conduct in respect of the Dāgābas, etc.” (Epigraphia Zeylonica 2 (1928) 271, 275). (The version of this passage repeated in the Dathbadeni Katikāvata, which “belongs to the reign of king Parākramabāhu II (1236-1270 A.D.)”, differs slightly: dahagab mahābo

It would appear from his translation that Ratnapala understood the Katikāvata to be saying that all the “duties” enumerated here were “specified” in the Khandhaka, and that he assumes that Khandhaka—here refers to the portion of the Vinaya so named. But this would suggest, if Ratnapala’s interpretation of the text is correct, that the authorities who drafted this Katikāvata in the 12th Century knew — and presupposed that their intended audience knew — a Khandhaka which contained rules concerning “duties pertaining to Śūpas”. The Khandhaka-vatta, or “duties specified in the Khandhaka”, were, again according to Ratnapala, specifically identified by Mahāsvāmi Śāriputra — a leading figure and Vinaya authority contemporary with the promulgation of the Katikāvata — with “the major and minor duties enumerated in the Vatta-khandhaka, i.e. Vin II 207-30”. Śāriputra, then, also understood Khandhaka-vatta to refer to the text of the Vinaya, and his specificity, in fact, should make it easy to locate these rules. But when we look at Vin II 207-30 it becomes clear that although there are now rules there regarding “the teachers, the Theras, the sick and the lodging places”, Vin II 207-30, as we have it, does not contain a word about śūpas. This might suggest either that Śāriputra was wrong in his identification of the Khandhaka-vatta with these specific pages, or that the compilers of the Katikāvata knew — and expected contemporaries to have — a Vinaya different from the one we have, a Vinaya which had a fuller text of Vin II 207-30 than the one that has come down to us. Oddly enough, even if Śāriputra was wrong in his specific identification we are still left in much the same position: even if the Katikāvata is not specifically referring to Vin II 207-30 it must at

āṅgana-vatu-du ādūru-vat tera-vat gilan-vat senasun-vat ā vatu-du sapayā (61, § 96). It is hard to know for certain whether the omission here of kandu- is anything but scribal. It is not noted by Ratnapala, nor reflected in his translation, 158, § 96).

7 Ratnapala, The Katikāvatas, 193, 197; cf. 290. References to the Pāli Vinaya are here and throughout to the Pali Text Society edition by H. Oldenberg.
least be referring to the Vinaya, and it is not just in Vin II 207-30 that there are no references to “duties pertaining to stūpas”; there are no references to such duties anywhere in the Pāli Vinaya that we know. It is, however, not just the authors of our Katikāvata who appear possibly to have known a Pāli Vinaya different from the one we have.

Buddhaghosa refers on several occasions in his Visuddhimagga to the Khandhaka and there is, I think, no doubt about what he understood by the term. In one place he says: ubhāto-vibhanganipariyāpannam vā adibrahmacariyakam, khandhakavattapariyāpannam abhisamācarikam, which Pe Maung Tin translates as “Or, that which is included in both the Vibhanga’s is the ‘major precept’; that which is included in the Khandhaka duties is the ‘minor precept’”. At another place he refers to the “proper duties” promulgated by the Blessed One in the Khandhaka (yan tām bhagavatā... khandhake sammāvattām paññattām) and then quotes a passage similar to that found in our Katikāvata which is found now at Vin II 231. It seems fairly obvious, then, that when Buddhaghosa uses the terms Khandhaka or Khandhaka-vatta he is always referring to the text of the “canonical” Vinaya which he knew. This is of some importance because in yet another passage in his Visuddhimagga he refers his readers to the Khandhaka for rules regarding many of the same things that the Mahā-Parākrama-bāhu-katikāvata refers to. The passage in question reads:

āgantu kām pana bhikkhum disvā āgantu kāpapājītaṁ kātabba va. avasesāni pi cetiya-anāvatta-bodhiya-anāvatta-uposatha-anāvatta-bhojanasālājāntihāra-ācariyaupajjāhāya-āgantu-gamikavattādīni sabbāni khandhakavattāni pūreṇabbān’ eva

which Pe Maung Tin translates as:

“On seeing a guest-monsk, he should give him the greetings due to a guest. All the remaining Khandhaka duties should be performed, such as the duties of the shrine-yard, the yard of the Bo-tree, the sacred-service hall, the dining-hall, the fire-room, the duties towards the teacher, the preceptor, guests”.

It is clear from his translation that Pe Maung Tin understood Khandhaka in the Visuddhimagga to be a proper name or the title of a work. Rhys Davids and Stede before him understood the term in the Visuddhimagga in the same way. Citing the same passages we have cited above from the Visuddhimagga Rhys Davids and Stede defined khandhakavatta as “duties or observances specified in the v. khandha or chapter of the Vinaya which deals with these duties”. But if these scholars are correct, then it is hard to avoid concluding from the passage just cited that, like the authors of the Katikāvata who knew a Khandhaka containing rules “pertaining to stūpas”, Buddhaghosa knew a Khandhaka...
that contained rules concerning “the shrine-yard” or cetiyaṅgaṇa. Since he was — again like the authors of the Kātikāvata — giving practical instructions to his “readers” it is again difficult to avoid the assumption that he assumed that they would know or be able to consult a similar Khandhaka. But, although the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya preserved in Chinese, for example, has rules concerning that Professor Barelle translates as ‘l’enceilte du stūpa’, that and although the Sanskrit version of the Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya has rules regarding the stūpāṅgaṇa, the Pāli Vinaya as we have it does not have a single reference to the cetiyaṅgaṇa or stūpāṅgaṇa.

Unless Ratnapala, Pe Maung Tin, Rhys Davids and Stede are all wrong in their interpretation of the compound khandhakavatta, unless, in short, we do not understand what the term actually refers to, these two passages — one from the 5th Century Visuddhimagga, the other from a 12th Century Sinhalese Kātikāvata — seem to suggest that there is a distinct probability that the Pāli Vinaya, like virtually all the other Vinayas known to us, had once contained specific “duties pertaining to stūpas” and “duties of the shrine-yard”. It is, moreover, not just sources external to the Pāli Vinaya like the Visuddhimagga and Mahā-

Parākramabāhu-katikāvata which seem to suggest that this Vinaya may have originally contained such rules. There are indications within the Pāli Vinaya itself which would seem to point to much the same conclusion.

Although, as we have already noted, the Pāli Vinaya as we have it, and more particularly the Khandhaka, has no rules specifically governing behaviour in regard to stūpas, stūpas — or at least cetiyas — are taken for granted as an integral part of the monastic life in at least four passages in the Sutta-vibhanga. We might look briefly at these.

In discussing the passage from the Visuddhimagga above I have assumed that Buddhaghosa’s cetiyaṅgaṇa was the Pāli equivalent for the Mūlasarvāstivādin stūpāṅgaṇa and of the “l’enceilte du stūpa” found in the Chinese Vinayas. Given the narrative uses and descriptions of the cetiyaṅgaṇa in Buddhaghosa it would be hard to argue otherwise. But if this equivalence of cetiya and stūpa holds here it may hold elsewhere as well. Two of the four passages from the Sutta-vibhanga which concern us, for example, deal with property rights in, and the tripartite economic structure of, Buddhist monastic establishments. The first of these — Vin III 266 — reads:

samghassa parinatam aṅhasamghassa vā cetiyassa vā parināmeti, āpati dukkaṭassa. cetiyassa parinatam aṅhasetiyaṃsa vā samghassa vā puggalassā vā parināmeti, āpati dukkata. puggalassā parinatam aṅhapuggalassā vā samghassa vā cetiyassa vā parināmeti, āpati dukkata.

And I.B. Horner translates the passage as:

“If he appropriates what was apportioned to the Order for another (part of the) Order or for a shrine, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he appropriates what was apportioned to a shrine for an Order or for an individual, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he appropriates what was apportioned to an individual for another individual or for an Order or for a shrine, there is an offence of wrong-doing”.16

This passage, and the virtually identical passage at Vin IV 156, can, I think, only represent the Pāli versions of similar discussions of property rights found in Sanskrit in the Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya and in several Vinayas now preserved in Chinese. In the Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya, for example, we find:

bhagavān āha āvān sannipātīyassu laksitavyaṁ kiṁ sambhinnakāri na vā iti yadi sambhinnakāri saṁghikam staupikam karoti staupikam vā saṁghikam ēva adhārmikam ēva

“The Blessed One said: ‘Having assembled the whole community, this is to be considered: is this a (case for) making a full division [or: ‘mixed distribution’], or is it not? If there is a full division (and) it takes what belongs to the Saṅgha as what belongs to the stūpa, or what belongs to the stūpa as what belongs to the Saṅgha — such (a procedure) is not in conformity with the Dharma (de lī bu chos dang mi mthun pa yin pas)”.

In regard to the Chinese Vinayas Professor Bareau notes, for example, that “les Sarvāstivādins parlent aussi des biens inépuisables du stūpa, qui sont inaliénables. Les biens qui sont donnés en offrande au stūpa ne peuvent être utilisés à d’autres fins. On ne doit pas les mélanger avec les biens de la Communauté des quatre directions, ni avec les biens consistant en nourriture, ni avec les biens à partager”.

It would seem fairly certain that the Sutta-vibhaṅga passage, the Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya passage, and the Sarvāstivādin material summarized by Bareau are all dealing with the same basic concern: the distribution of property to, and the ownership rights of, the different corporate or juristic entities within a monastic establishment. The fact that in exactly similar contexts the Sarvāstivādin and Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinayas speak of stūpas or that which “belongs to the stūpas” (staupika), and the Pāli Sutta-vibhaṅga speaks of cetiyyas, would seem again to suggest that the two terms are equivalent, that cetiyya in these contexts is the Pāli equivalent for stūpa. It is interesting to note that the Pāli preference for cetiyya may in fact represent a relatively late South Indian influence on the vocabulary of the Pāli Vinaya. At Nāgarjunikoṇḍa, for example, what elsewhere would be called a stūpa is, in the inscriptions, consistently referred to as a cetiyya.²⁰

---

¹⁷ N. Dutt, Gilgit Manuscripts, Vol. III, Part 2 (Srinagar: 1942) 145.15-146.1; D.T. Suzuki, The Tibetan Tripiṭaka, Peking Edition (Tokyo-Kyoto: 1955) 41, 284-2-2 foll. I am not altogether sure I have completely understood this passage. The text is extremely terse and the technical meaning of sambhinnakāri is not well established. I have followed my understanding of the Tibetan translation and the problems do not in any case affect my point here: discussions of property rights similar to those in the Pāli Sutta-vibhaṅga which occur in the Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya refer frequently to staupika or indicate that what is buddhasantaka is to be used for the stūpa; cf. Gilgit Manuscripts III 2, 143.11; Peking, Vol. 44, 95-3-4 foll.; etc.


²⁰ cf. G. Schopen, “On the Buddha and His Bones: The Conception of a Relic in the Inscriptions of Nāgarjunikoṇḍa”, Journal of the American Oriental Society 108 (1988) 536. Apart from the odd rule “qui interdisent de faire un stūpa avec la nourriture puis de le démolir et de le manger” which the Pāli Vinaya shares with that of the Mūlasarvāstivāda according to Bareau (Bulletin de l'École française d'extrême-orient 50 (1960) 271 — if that is what thiṇṇikāta actually means), the only actual occurrence of the term stūpa in the Pāli Vinaya occurs in the bizarre story concerning “the group of six nuns” found at Vin IV 308-09. Here it said that “the Venerable Kapipata the Venerable Upāli’s preceptor” destroyed the stūpa that “the group of six” had built for one of their deceased members. This story of an uncharacteristically violent and almost sacrilegious act may be peculiar to the Pāli Vinaya. The same rule appears to be explained by a very different story in the Mahāsāṃghika-Bhikṣuni-Vinaya, for example (A. Hirakawa, Monastic Discipline for the Buddhist Nuns. An English Translation of the Chinese Text of the Mahāsāṃghika-Bhikṣuni-Vinaya (Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series, No. XXI) (Patna: 1982) 284-86). It may also be related to what
But if cetiya in these contexts, and in the compound cetiyāṅgana, is the Pāli equivalent of stūpa, then it is equally possible that it is being used in the same way in the two remaining passages we must mention from the Sutta-vibhaṅga. Saṅghādisesa V prohibits monks from acting as “go-betweens” (saṭṭicarita) but notes that “there is no offence if it is for the Order, or for a shrine, or if he is ill; if he is going on business, if he is mad, if he is a beginner” (anāpatti saṁghassa vā cetiyassa vā gilānassa vā kariṇyena gacchati, ummattakassa, aḍikammikassā ti).20 Similarly, in the Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga, Pācittiya XLIV, which prohibits nuns from doing household work, cooking, etc., it is said that “there is no offence if it [cooking, etc.] is a drink of conjey, if it is for the Order; if it is for worship at a shrine ...” (anāpatti yāgapuṇe saṁghabhatte cetiyapūjāya ... ).21 If Pāli cetiya in these two passages does not refer to what in other Vinayas would be called stūpas it is hard to know what it could refer to. The cetiya in these passages is an “object” for whose worship nuns can properly prepare food and for whose sake monks can engage in

appears to be an explicitly local Sri Lankan resistance to stūpas for the local monastic dead. At least the argument against the erection of stūpas for “virtuous puthujjana monks” found in the Sri Lankan commentaries is a purely local one: puthujjanaḥ kharṇam hi thūpe anuṇāyamāne tāmampanndiśe gāmaṇṭṭānām okāsa ca na bhaveyya tathā aṭṭhesu thānesu, “for were a stūpa to be allowed for puthujana monks there would be no room for any villages or cities in Tambapannadīpa (Ceylon), likewise in other places” (P. Masefield, Divine Revelation in Pāli Buddhism (London: 1986) 23). To what degree this resistance was purely literary remains to be seen although Longhurst already long ago noted that “the stūpas erected over the remains of ordinary members of the Buddhist community were very humble little structures. The ashes of the dead were placed in an earthenware pot and covered with a lid, and the humble little stūpa erected over it. Plenty of Buddhist stūpas of this class may still be seen in the Madras Presidency and also in Ceylon” (A.H. Longhurst, The Story of the Stūpa (Colombo: 1936) 14).


activities otherwise forbidden to them. It is unlikely therefore that the term here could be referring to local or non-Buddhist “shrines” — the only other “objects” generally referred to by the term in Pāli canonical literature.22 These considerations, and the fact that the use of Pāli cetiya for stūpa is virtually assured — as we have seen — elsewhere in the Sutta-vibhaṅga would certainly support the possibility that it is so used here as well.

If we keep in mind, then, the equivalence of cetiya and stūpa which seems virtually certain in two cases in the Pāli Sutta-vibhaṅga, and likely in two more, it would appear that the Pāli Sutta-vibhaṅga, although it has no rules specifically governing behaviour in regard to stūpas or cetiyas, takes such behaviour, and the existence of stūpas or cetiyas, very much for granted when it deals with other matters. The rules governing the division of property, acting as a “go-between”, cooking foods, etc., all take the stūpa or cetiya and activity undertaken in regard to it as established and fully integrated elements of the monastic life. This, of course, makes the complete absence of rules specifically concerned with stūpas or cetiyas in the Khandhaka even more striking, and would seem to provide yet another argument for concluding that the Pāli Khandhaka must originally have contained such rules. But if — as the Mahā-Parākramabāhu-katikāvata, the Visuddhimagga, and the Sutta-vibhaṅga seem to suggest — the Pāli Vinaya had originally contained such rules, then the fact that they are no longer found in the Vinaya known to us could, apparently, only be explained by assuming that either they had inadvertently dropped out of the manuscripts or, perhaps, were intentionally written out.

The comparatively very recent date of the vast majority of the surviving manuscripts for texts in the Pāli canon, coupled with the long and troubled history of their transmission — especially after the 12th Century — could easily account for the loss of material from these texts on a fairly large scale, and makes an uninterrupted transmission of our Pāli texts extremely unlikely. In fact the historical situation would suggest that the transmission was probably interrupted not once, but on several different occasions. It is, therefore, possible to think that the loss of “the duties pertaining to Stūpas” could have occurred in just this way. There is at least one consideration, however, which renders this possibility less forceful and may in fact suggest quite a different process.

In the Vinayas surveyed by Barea — those of the Mahāsāsaka, Dharmaguptaka, Mahāsaṅghika, Sarvāstivādin and Mūlasarvāstivādin — the rules regarding stūpas, though concentrated in the various

---


24 As one of the many possible sources for the troubled history — both internal and external — of the Sri Lankan Saṅgha from the 12th Century on, see Ratnapala, The Kātikāvātas, 219-32; for Burmese see E.M. Mendelson, Sangha and State in Burma. A Study of Monastic Sectarianism and Leadership (Ithaca & London: 1975) 31-118; for Thailand, Y. Ishii, Sangha, State and Society. Thai Buddhism in History (Honolulu: 1986) 59-66; etc.

Kṣudrakavastus, are scattered throughout this vastu and, in some of the collections, in other vastus or divisions of the Vinaya as well. They do not occur as a single block. Assuming that much the same held for the Pāli Vinaya, that although concentrated in a single vastu rules regarding stūpas would have been scattered throughout it and elsewhere in the Skandhaka, it would be easy enough to see how some of these scattered rules could have been lost through accidents of transmission, but that all such rules would have been lost in this way seems very unlikely. In light of this the total absence of rules regarding stūpas in the Pāli Vinaya would seem to make sense only if they had been systematically removed. But acknowledging the possibility — if not the likelihood — of such a systematic removal having actually occurred is one thing; knowing why it might have occurred is something else again.

One might be tempted to try to explain any removal from the Pāli Vinaya of rules regarding stūpas by referring to the purported prohibition of monastic participation in the stūpa/relic cult which is supposed to occur in the Mahāparinibbāna-sutta. This, however, will raise many more questions than answers and, in fact, leads us to much the same conclusion that consideration of the Kaṇkaṭāvata, the Visuddhimagga, and the Sutta-vibhaṅga suggests. First of all — as I hope to show in some detail elsewhere — the “injunction” addressed to Ānanda concerning sarīra-pūjā has nothing to do with an ongoing cult of relics or stūpas. This can be shown from the Mahāparinibbāna-sutta itself and

---


26 The supposed “injunction” occurs, of course, at D II 141,18 (= Mahāparinibbāna-sutta V.10). Although the details will have to be given elsewhere, it can, I think, be convincingly shown both that sarīra-pūjā does not refer to “worship of the relics” but to what we might call “preparation of the body” prior to cremation, and that even as late as the Milindapaṭha the “injunction” at D II 141 was not understood to apply to all monks. Moreover, if this “injunction”, by itself, were to account for the absence of rules regarding stūpas in the Pāli Vinaya we would expect to find that other schools who had a similar text of the Mahāparinivṛtta-sūtra would also have no such rules in their Vinayas, but this is not the case.
related texts, but it is equally clear from other sources as well that any
discomfiture with monastic participation in stūpa or relic cult activity is
distinctly modern. In the Udāna version of the story of “Bāhiya of the
Bark Garment”, for example, there is a clear directive to monks to build
stūpas: “... having seen (the body of Bāhiya, the Blessed One) addressed
the monks: ‘you, monks, must take up the body of Bāhiya of the Bark
Garment! Having put it on a bier, having carried it out, you must
cremate it, and you must build a stūpa for it! For monks, a fellow-monk
has died’.” (... disvīṇa bhikkhū āmantesi: ganṭhātha bhikkhave Bāhiyassa
dāruciṇyassa sarīrakam mañçacakam āropetvā niḥartvā jāpetha thūpah c'
assa karotha, sabrahmacāri vo bhikkhave kālandkato ti).27 The Apadāna
version of the same story has the Buddha saying to the monks: ... thūpam
karotha pūjetha, “You must build a stūpa! You must worship it!”28 That
these texts give expression to very early practice concerning the disposal
of the monastic dead is confirmed by some of the earliest archeological
and epigraphical evidence that we have. There is, for example, the group
of stūpas of the local monastic dead at the monastery complex at Bhāja,
“probably one of the oldest Buddhist religious centres in the Deccan”;29 or
the old stūpa of the “forest dweller” Gobhūti built by his monk pupil at
Bedā;30 or Stūpa no. 2 at Sāñcī which held the mortuary remains of the
local monastic dead, and which Bénisti has recently argued is older even
than Bharhut:31 this stūpa appears to have been established and largely
funded by monks and nun.32 The same early kind of evidence proves the
early and massive monastic participation in the cult of the relics and stūpa
of the historical Buddha at Bharhut, Sāñcī and Pauni.33 Clear evidence
for the active participation of monks and nuns in the stūpa/relic cult is found
as well at other sites. At Pangoraria, in Madhya Pradesh, at a very old
monastic site, the yaśī, or shaft, and umbrella of the main stūpa — both
of which were very finely worked — were the gift of a bhiksuni and her
disciples according to the inscription on the shaft which dates to the 2nd
Century B.C.E.34 The inscriptions on the Bhātiprulol relic caskets, which
have been dated variously from the 3rd to the 1st Century B.C.E., show
that monks (samara) took an active and prominent part in the enshrining
of the relics of the Buddha (budhasarīra) there, both as donors and

---

27 P. Steinthal, Udāna (London: 1885) 8,21 (I,10).
28 Bhikkhu J. Kashyap, The Apadāna (II) — Buddhavamsa-Carivāpiṭaka
125,16 (54,6,216).
29 See S. Nagaraju, Buddhist Architecture of Western India (c. 250 B.C. — c.
A.D. 300) (Delhi: 1981) 113-30; 329-30; on the inscriptions associated with
these stūpas see also D.D. Kosambi, “Dhenukākaṭa”, Journal of the Asiatic
30 Nagaraju, Buddhist Architecture of Western India 107-8; 329.
31 M. Bénisti, “Observations concernant le stūpa no 2 de Sāñcī”, Bulletin
32 For the donative inscription connected with the mortuary deposit see J.
(Delhi: 1940) 294, although its interpretation there is perhaps not entirely free
of problems. Of the 93 donative inscriptions from Stūpa No. 2 at Sāñcī published
by Majumdar nearly 60%, or 52, record the gifts of monastics: monks — nos.
631, 638, 640, 644, 646, 647, 648, 655, 656, 657, 669, 675, 677, 688, 691,
693, 694, 695, 702, 709, 716, 719, Būh xvii, xviii, xix, xx, 803, 820; Nuns —
nos. 662, 663, 664, 668, 672, 674, 678, 700, 703, 706, 708, 713, 714, Būh
xxi, 759, 812; Female disciples — nos. 637, 645, 673, 704; Male disciples —
nos. 632, 633, 634, 671.
33 For monastic donors at Bharhut and Sāñcī see G. Schopen, “Two Problems
in the History of Indian Buddhism: The Layman/Monk Distinction and the
Doctrines of the Transference of Merit”, Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik
10 (1985) 23-24 and notes, although the Sāñcī count there is based on the old
publications. For Pauni see S.B. Deo & J.P. Joshi, Pauni Excavations
34 H. Sarkar, “A Post-Asokan Inscription from Pangoraria in the Vindhyan
Range”, in Sri Dinesadhik. Studies in Indology. Shri D.C. Sircar Festschrift,
members of the gothi or “committee” that undertook the project. Of the many early inscriptions from Amarāvati recording gifts of monks connected with the stūpa cult we might note that “in Maurya characters” which records the gift of a dhamakathika or “preacher of the Dharma”. An inscription dating from the 2nd/1st Century B.C.E. from Guntupalli indicates that the “steps leading to the circular brick chaitya-griha” were the gift “of the pupil of the Thera, the Venerable Namda”. An early 1st Century C.E. inscription from Karle says: “a pillar containing a relic (sasariro thabo), the gift of the Venerable Satimita, a reciter (bhānaka) belonging to the Dharmottariya School, from Soparaka”. A Kharoshthi inscription from 32 B.C.E. records the gift of relics made by a monk which were given to “the Mahiṣāsaka teachers”. If it is true, therefore, as Rhys Davids asserted long ago, that the Pāli Vinaya “enters so great length into all the details of the daily life of the recluse”, then — oddly enough — this archeological and epigraphical evidence would seem to argue for the fact that either the Pāli Vinaya must have originally contained rules referring to such activity, or the Pāli Vinaya was unknown or had no influence at these early Indian sites, and they are among the earliest that we can know.

---


40 T.W. Rhys Davids, Buddhist Suttas (Sacred Books of the East, Vol. XI) (Oxford: 1900) xlv; my emphasis.

Sri Lankan literary data too suggests monastic concern with and involvement in the relic/stūpa cult from the very beginning and, in so doing, would strongly suggest that pre-modern Sri Lankan tradition could not have understood the “injunction” in the Mahāparinibbāṇa-sutta — or any other passage in the canon — to prohibit monastic participation in the cult. Mahinda, the monk par excellence and nominal founder of Sri Lankan monasticism, is presented by the tradition itself as intending to leave the island because “it is a long time since we have seen the Perfect Buddha, the Teacher... There is nothing here for us to worship”. The reigning king is puzzled and responds “But, sir, did you not tell me that the Perfect Buddha has entered Nirvāṇa?”; to which the Monk Mahinda responds in turn: “When the relics are seen (or: are present), the Buddha is seen (or: is present)”. The king promises to build a stūpa; the Monk Mahinda appoints another monk to fly to India to procure relics; he succeeds; and Mahinda stays.41 The ‘moral’ of this tale, written by a monk about a monk, seems obvious: the continuance of Buddhist monasticism in Sri Lanka depended on procuring a relic and building a stūpa so that the monks would have an object of worship. The relic and stūpa cult were, therefore, seen by the author of the Mahāvamsa as a primary concern of the monastic community and a necessary prerequisite for its continuance. That such a pivotal part of the institution would have been left out of the rules that governed the early community seems very unlikely.

It would seem, then, that there is much to suggest the likelihood of the interpretation of the Kaṭikāvā and Visuddhimagga passages, and of the data in the Sutta-vibhanga, presented here. But even if this interpretation turns out not to be entirely correct, in considering it we have come upon further considerations which seem to indicate at least

that the absence of rules regarding stūpas in the Pāli Vinaya is much more problematic for the historian than has heretofore been recognized. If the interpretation presented here is correct, the Pāli Vinaya, like all the Vinayas had such rules and they were removed at a comparatively recent date. If this interpretation is not correct, and if the Pāli Vinaya did not contain such rules, then it either could not have been the Vinaya which governed early Buddhist monastic communities in India, or it presents a very incomplete picture of early and actual monastic behaviour and has — therefore — little historical value as a witness for what we know actually occurred on a large scale at all of the earliest monastic sites in India that we have some knowledge of. The whole question clearly deserves further consideration.

Bloomington Gregory Schopen

PATNA DHARMAPADA

Part I: Text

The Manuscript

In the Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society 21 (1935) pp 21ff., Rāhula Saṅkṣṛtyāyana described his second visit to Tibet in a search for Indian manuscripts in the summer of 1934. He lists among the MSS he saw at Ngör monastery a Dharmapada (34.1.159). It is not clear when he photographed this MS, but it was presumably during his next visit to Tibet, in 1936 (Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society 23 (1937) pp 1ff.). Since the photographs were taken to Patna, where they are held by the K P Jayaswal Research Institute, I will refer to this MS as Patna. Editions of this MS have been made by N S Shukla (The Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dharmapada, Patna 1979), and G Roth (The Patna Dhammapada, in The Language of the Earliest Buddhist Tradition, Göttingen 1980, pp 93-135). My transcription is based on a photograph of the original photographs, made available to me through the kindness of Prof. Dr H Bechert, der Direktor des Seminars für Indologie und Buddhismuskunde der Universität Göttingen.

The script of Patna can be classed among those called by Bühler (Indian Palaeography, English edition, Bombay 1904, p 48) Proto-Bengali. He gives among his examples the Deopāra Inscription of Vijayasena (Table V, column XVIII; EI 1 (1882) p 308), dated by Kielhorn in EI 1 to the end of the eleventh century AD; and the Cambridge MSS Add.1699, 1-2 (Table VI, column X) dated 1198-9 AD. To these can be added the Gayā Inscription mentioning Govindaṭāla (EI 35 (1963-4) p 238) dated 1175-6 AD. All three texts are in Sanskrit, and so contain for the most part different conjunct consonants from Patna.

A comparison of Patna with the Gayā Inscription shows a very close similarity between all the single akṣaras found in both texts, with the exception of visarga. (No examples of initial i- and u-, single cha, jha,
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ta and dha occur in the Gayâ Inscription.) The few conjuncts they have in common, eg sta, sta, stha and ndra, are also very similar, but ku is different, Gayâ retaining the basic shape of ka, while Patna does not. The inscription also begins with the same symbol (for siddham) as is found in Patna.

The Deopâra Inscription, although recognisably the same script, is not so closely related to Patna, but does confirm the signs for initial i- and u-, jha, ta and dha, and exhibits clearly such conjuncts as ṇca and ṇja. It agrees, however, with the Gayâ Inscription against Patna in its signs for ku and visarga.

The Cambridge MSS Add.1699, 1-2 are in a more flamboyant hand, but basically the signs are very similar to Patna. In this case the similarity includes ku and visarga, but initial i- differs somewhat. The symbols used to number the leaves of Patna resemble closely those used in Cambridge MS Add.1699, 2.

The same type of script is used in the MS of the Bhikṣuṇī Vinaya (Bhi Vin) of the Mahâsaṅghikalokottaravadâns, also photographed in Tibet by Saṅkṛtyâyana, and edited by G Roth (Patna 1970). Roth describes the MS and script in his introduction (pp XVIII-XXVII), and reproduces six leaves of the MS (facing p XXVI). A comparison of Patna with this photograph reveals a very close resemblance (the Bhi Vin MS is better and more clearly written). Again, as in the other examples of the script, the language of the Bhi Vin is basically Sanskrit, and so uses different conjunct consonants. The two scripts are not absolutely identical: Bhi Vin always uses for medial -i- a sign above the akṣara very similar to nāgari -e, whereas Patna uses sometimes a vertical to the left arching over the akṣara, and sometimes a simple arch. Bhi Vin’s initial i- has not the right vertical found in Patna (and in the Deopâra Inscription). Bhi Vin’s la and sa have a double arch (this is true of almost all the other examples discussed), while Patna sa is closer to ga, and la to nāgari ta (in this Cambridge Add.1699, 1 agrees). The forms of ttha differ, Patna resembling the nāgari form. None of these examples has -a written as a hook above the akṣara as Patna has occasionally (cf eg the final syllable of vijñeyã, 3 A vi), but this practice can be seen in the Cambridge MS Add.1643 (1015 AD).

These comparisons suggest that Patna can be dated in the second half of the twelfth century AD.

The photograph of the MS is not easy to read. Some of the leaves are overlapped by others; drawing-pins obscure some lines; and some of the leaves are blurred. In addition, the script itself can be ambiguous: s and m are indistinguishable, as are v and b, t and bh, and tt and tu; p, y and d can also look very alike, as can ś and g. Subscript r in tr is particularly hard to be sure of, and it will be seen that I accept its presence much more rarely than Roth or Shukla.

It is clear that disagreements over readings are very probable, especially when we have no exact parallel in another text. I have recorded all occasions where Roth and/or Shukla differ from my reading, even where their readings are obviously printing errors. Unless I comment otherwise, I am convinced of my reading, either because I believe the MS testimony is clear, or because a parallel supports one possible alternative rather than another.

I have transcribed what the MS has, as far as I can, without any editorial work of correcting, or making consistent, and supplying missing words or syllables (in square brackets) only if we can be certain of what they must have been. On a few occasions I have placed in round brackets possible alternative readings, or have added hyphens to make clear how I understand the text. I have also bracketed with < > obvious mistakes. Otherwise I say with the last Patna scribe: yathâ dr̥ṣṭaṁ tathâ likhitam iti pariḥ̥āro ‘yam asmadiyah.
siddham namah sarvabuddhadhammamrayyasamghebhyaḥ 1 B i
Sh ornam namah sarvabuddhadhammayasamghebhyaḥ

1 Dhp 1  Uv 31:23  Mkv 25  GDhp 201

manopürvvaṅgamā dhammā manośreṣṭhā manojavā 1 B ii
manasā ca praduṣṭena bhāṣate vā karoti vā
\[tato naṁ dukham anneti \]
\[cakram vā vahato padaṁ \]

a Sh -pūrvaṃ-
e Sh dukkham anveti fn: ‘MS dukkhamanneti’

2 Dhp 2 (= Nett 133, Peṭ 24)  Uv 31:24  Mkv 25  GDhp 202

ma[nopūrvvaṃ]gamā dhammā manośreṣṭhā manojavā 1 B ii
manasā ca prasannena bhāṣate vā karoti vā
\[tato naṁ sukham anneti \]
\[cchāyā vā anapāyini \]

The end of this leaf is overlapped by leaf 18 B.

b R manodbhavā
e Sh anveti fn: ‘MS sukhamanneti’
f Sh chāyā

3 Dhp 15  Uv 28:34  GDhp 205

iha śocati precca śocati
\[pāpakam[mo ubhaya]\textit{ttha} śocati \]
1 B iii

so śocati so vihaṃṇyati
dṛśṭā kammakileśam āttano 1

b R pāpakamme [ubhaya] Sh pāpaka[mnobbhya]
The end of the leaf is overlapped by leaf 18 B. All that is visible here is -m, and a mark consistent with a second -m-, preceded by a sign which can be -e, or the first half of -o. Almost certainly it is the latter, cf 4b: \textit{kapatumño}. At 4c, with a similar sign visible, R restores so.
c Sh vihanyati fn: ‘MS vihaṇṇyati’

4 Dhp 16  Uv 28:35  GDhp 206

iha nandati precca nandati
\[kapatumño ubhayattha nandati \]
so nandati \[\textit{[dati]} \] 1 B iv
dṛśṭā kammaviśuddhim āttano 1

b Sh kapatuño fn: ‘MS kapatumño’
c R s[o pramo] Sh [so pramo]

5 Dhp 3  Uv 14:9

ākroṣi maṁ avadhī maṁ ajini maṁ ahāsi me
\[ye tāni upanahāyanti \]
\[veraṁ tesaṁ na sāmyati \]

a Sh [sī maṁ]

6 Dhp 4  Uv 14:10

ākroṣ[si maṁ] avadhī maṁ ajini maṁ ahāsi me 1 B v
\[ye tāni nopanahāyanti \]
\[veraṁ tesaṁ upaśāmyati \]
7 Dhp 7  Uv 29:15  GDhp 217

śubhā śnupaśśiṁ viharantaṁ
[bojanam]mhi amāṭṭaṁñūf
  indriyesu asaṁvṛtaṁ
  kuśīdaṁ hinaṁvīryaṁ
  taṁ ve prasahate māro
  vāto rukkham ve dubbalaṁ

  c Sh amāṭṭaṁñūf fn: MS ‘amāṭṭaṁñūf’
  d Sh kaśīdaṁ
  f Sh rukkhaṁ R dubbalaṁ

8 Dhp 8  Uv 29:16  GDhp 218

aśubhānupaśśiṁ viharantaṁ
  indriyesu susaṁvṛtaṁ
bhojanamhi ca ma[ ]
  ddham āraddhavīryaṁ
  taṁ ve na prasahate māro
  vāto selaṁ ve parvataṁ

  b R indriyesu  c R [ṭṭaṁñū sa] Sh [ṭṭaṁñū sa]
  e R tam  f Sh parvataṁ

9 Dhp 328  Uv 14:13

sace labheya nipakaṁ sapraṁñām
sādhhinccaṁ sādhuviḥāradhiṁ
adhibhyayaABBaṇi pariśra[ ]
careyā tenāttamano saṁmā

  a Sh sapraṁñām fn: ‘MS sapraṁñām’
  c R pariśra[vāni] Sh pariśra[vāni] The akṣara half-obscured
  looks more likely to be -v- than -y-.

10 Dhp 329  Uv 14:14

na ce labheya nipakaṁ sapraṁñām

sādhhinccaṁ sādhuviḥāradhiṁ
rāja ve rāṣṭarāṁ vijitame prahāya
eko ccare mātaṁgāranne ve nāgo

  a Sh sapraṁñām R rāṣṭaṁ
  d Sh care

11 Dhp 330  Uv 14:16, 14:16/

ekassa carītaṁ śreyo
nāsti bāle bītiyaṁ
eko ccare na ca pāpāṁ kavyā
appussuko mātaṁgāranne ve nāgo

  b Sh vibhiyaṁ (?)  c Sh care

12 D III 182 = A II 18

chandadosabhayaṁ mohā
ychīrate tassa yaśo
kālapkhe ve candramā

  b R abhivattati  d Sh kala-

13 D III 182 = A II 18

chandadosabhayaṁ mohā
āpūrate tassa yaśo
šuklapkhe ve candramā

  b R nābhivattati  c Sh yaśso

jamavarggaḥ
Apramāḍa

14 Dhp 21  Uv 4:1  GDhp 115

aprāmāḍo amatapadāṁ  pramāḍo maccuno padām  l  2 A iv
aprāmattā na mṛtyanti  ye pramattā yathā matā  ll

15 Dhp 22  Uv 4:2  GDhp 116

etāṁ viśeṣatatāṁ nyāttā  aprāmādaṁhi paṇḍitā  l
aprāmādāde pramodanti  ayirāṇāṁ gocare ratā  ll  2 A v

a R taṁ ... nāttā  c R pramodante

16 Dhp 23  Uv 4:3  d GDhp 156f

te jhāyino sātatiṁ  niccaṁ dṛṣṭharaṇamā  l
phusanti dhirā nibbāṇaṁ  yogacchimaṁ anuttaraṁ  ll

17 Dhp 26  Uv 4:10  GDhp 117

pramāḍam anuyujjanti  bālā dummedhino janā  l  2 A vi
aprāmādaṁ tu medhāvī  dhanāṁ sreṣṭhaṁ va rakkhati  ll

18 Dhp 29  Uv 19:4  GDhp 118

apramatto pramattasu  suttesu bahujaṁgaro  l
abalāśsāṁ va sīghrāsāso  hettā yāti sumedhāso  ll  2 B i

19 Dhp 28  Uv 4:4  GDhp 119

pramāḍam apramāḍena  yāda nudati paṇḍito  l
prāṃṇāprāśadāṁ āruhya  āsoka śōkiniṁ prajāṁ  l

parvvatatḥa va bhoma śṭite  dhiro bāle avecchāti  ll

c R -prāsādaṁ Sh praṇāa-
e Sh parvata-

20 Dhp 172  Uv 16:5  GDhp 122

pūrvve cāpi apramajjitta  yo pacchā na pramajjati  l  2 B ii
so imaṁ lokāṁ prabhāseti  abhramutto va candramā  ll

a Sh pūrvve cāyaṁ  This line is overshadowed by leaf 18B.
d R abhramutte ve The mark after -it- could be the right vertical of -o, or a following -e, but since we require a meaning of iva, not vai, it seems perverse not to take it as -o.

21  Uv 16:6

pūrvve cāpi apramajjitta  yo pacchā na pramajjati  l
so imaṁ visattikāṁ loke  sati samativattā  ll  2 B iii

a Sh pūrvve cāpi
b R pacchā na ve(?) ve is unmetrical, and appears rather to be a partly crossed-out mistake in the MS.

22 Dhp 32  Uv 4:32  GDhp 73

apramādagaru bhikkuḥ  pramāde bhayadaṁśino  l
abhavvo parihaṇāya  nibbāṇasseva santike  ll

a Sh apramādagaru
23 Dhp 31 Uv 4:29 GDhp 74

apramādagarū bhikkhu śaṃyojanam anuṭṭhulaṁ
dharmaghīva gacchati

2 B iv

a Sh apramādagarū d R dahan

R has divided vv 23-26 differently, presumably following the punctuation of the MS. cf 37.

24 Dhp 327 ab Uv 4:36ad cd Uv 4:27cd GDhp 132cd

apramādaratā hota saṃ cittaṃ anurakkhattha
dugga uddharatthānanāṃ pake sanno va kusāro

ab = R 23ef cd = R 24ab
b R sa-cittaṃ d R Sh paṃke

25

pramāde pramudino nipakā śīlasmāṇīrtha

te ve kālena prāchchanti yattha pratto na socati

ab = R 24cd cd = R 25ab
d Sh pathe pratto

26

pramāde pramodetha na kāmaratisandhave
evaṃ viharan ātāpi sānta cittotpādhu

cetośamatham anuyutto dukkhassantakaro siyā

ab = R 25cd c-f = R 26

2 B vi

c R viharanātāpi Sh vihara lābhādi
e R ce tu

27 Dhp 168 Uv 4:35 GDhp 110

uṭṭhaye na pramajeyā dharmam sucaritam care

dhammacāri [ ] āeti aśīm loke paramhi ca

28 Dhp 24 Uv 4:6 GDhp 112

uṭṭhānavato satimato

sucikammassa niśāmmakārīṇo

samyyatassa ca dhammajīvino

apravattassa yāso āsā yassa vaddhati

29 Dhp 25 Uv 4:5 GDhp 111

uṭṭhānena pramādena samyyamena damena ca

dipaṃ kayirātha medhāvi yam ogho nādhipūrati

a Sh -pramādena
b Sh saṃyyamena fn: ‘MS saṃyyamena’

30 Dhp 280 Uv 31:32 GDhp 113

uṭṭhānakālamhi anuṭṭhihāno

yuva balī ālasiko upoko

saṃsannasaṃkappamano kusīdo praṇāya māggaṃ alaso na yeti

d Sh praṇāya ... peti
31 Dhp 167 Uv 4:8 GDhp 121
hīnāṁ dhāmaṁ na sevayā pramādēna na samvase I 3 A iii
micchādṛṣṭiṁ na sevayā na sīyā lokavaddhano II
c R micchādṛṣṭiṁ

32 Dhp 259 Uv 4:21 GDhp 114
na tāvatā dhammadharo yāvatā bahu bhāṣati I
yo tu appam pi sottāna dhammaṁ kāyena phassaye I 3 A iv
sa ve dhammadharo hoti yo dhamme na pramajati II

33 Dhp 371 Uv 31:31 GDhp 75
dhammaṁ vicinātha apramattā
mā vo kāmgunā bhramemśu cittaṁ I
mā lohagude gilam pramatto 3 A v
kraṇḍe dukkham idan ti dahyamāno II
c R lohagude d Sh krande

Brāhmaṇa

34 Dhp 383 Uv 33:60 GDhp 10
chinna sūtram parākṛamma bhavam prāṇuda brāhmaṇa I
saṁkhāraṁ khaṭaṁ niṭṭā अकथासो सि ब्राह्मणः II 3 A vi
c Sh niṭṭā
d R akathāsos i Sh akathāṁ sosi brāhmaṇa The mark R and Sh interpret as anusvāra, I take as the tail of -nd- in the line above (3 A v), cf eg 235: mūṇda-, and 247: śaṇḍām.

35 Uv 33:64
yamhi dhammaṁ vijāneyā vṛddhamhi daharam vā I
sakkacca naṁ nammeyā aggihotram va brāhmaṇo II
a Sh vijāneya b Sh buddhamhi

36 Dhp 392 Uv 33:66 GDhp 3
yamhi dhammaṁ vijāneyā sammasambuddhadesitaṁ I 3 B i
tam eva apacāye yā aggihotram va brāhmaṇo II
b R -seśitaṁ c R apacāpeyā

37 Uv 33:8 GDhp 1
na jaṭāhi na gotreṇa na jāccā hoti brāhmaṇo I
yo tu bāhati pāpāni anuttthulāni sabbaśo II
bāhanā eva pāpānam brāhmaṇo ti prauccati I 3 B ii

ef = R 38ab R was presumably following the MS punctuation, which is not rarely to be disregarded, as a glance at 39 would show; and certainly it should be disregarded here.
a Sh jaṭāhi
c R vāhati Sh yo tta vāhati I write bāhati, and bāhanā in pāda e, although b and v are indistinguishable, because of the word-play with brāhmaṇa-.
e R Sh vāhanā
vāri pukkharapatte vā 
ērāgre-r-iva sāsavo 

yo na lippati kāmesu 
tam aham brūmi brāhmaṇām

= R 38c-f

a R Sh -patre
b R Sh ērāgrer iva
c R lipyati Sh limpati

udayaṁ tapati ādicco
rātrim ābhōti candramā

sannaddho khattiyo tapati
jhāyin tpati brāhmaṇo

atha sabbe ahorāte
buddho tapati tejasā

= R Sh khatriyo
c R Sh -rātre

c R Sh khatriyo
e R Sh -rātre

c R Sh khatriyo
e R Sh -rātre

yassa pāram apāram vā
pārāpārāṁ na vijjati

vitajjarama vīṣaṇyuttam
tam aham brūmi brāhmaṇām

a R yasya pāram

yadā dayesu dharmmesu
pāragū hoti brāhmaṇo

athassa sabbe saṃyogā
attham gacchanti jānato

a R yayesu Sh padesu

d, y and p can be very similar in the MS. I read dayesu as being a more likely form than yayesu, and at least more related to the parallels in Dhp and GDhp than padesu.

sa khu so khinaśaṁyogyo
khiṇamānapunabhavo

saṃghāvasevi dharmattheho
saṃghaṁ na upeti vedagū

3 B v

a Sh sakhumo
c R saṃghāvase vī

Dhp 408 (= Sn 632) Uv 33:17 GDhp 22

akakkaśiṁ vinnapañiṁ
girāṁ saccam udīraye

tāya nābhīṣape kaṇci
tam aham brūmi brāhmaṇām

da Sh vinnapañiṁ
c Sh tāpa nābhi śame

d R aham

Dhp 404 Uv 33:20 GDhp 32

asaṃṣaṭtham gṛhaṭṭthehi
anagārehi cūbhayaṁ

anokasāriṁ appicchaṁ
tam aham brūmi brāhmaṇām

3 B vi

b Sh anagāre hi
d Sh aham brūmi brāhmaṇām

Dhp 391 Uv 33:16 GDhp 23

yassa kāyena vācāya
manasā nāsti dukkataṁ

saṃvṛtaṁ trisu ṭhānesu
tam aham brūmi brāhmaṇām

3 B iv

b Sh saṃvṛtaṁ trisu
c Sh saṃvṛtaṁ trisu
d R aham

Dhp 389 Uv 33:63 GDhp 11

mā brāhmaṇassā prahare
nāsya mucceya brāhmaṇo

dhi brāhmaṇassā hantāraṁ
ya ssa vā su na muccati

4 A i
47 Dhp 294, 295  Uv 33:61,62  GDhp 12, 13
mātaram paṭhamaṃ hantā  rājanaṃ do ca khattiye  ||
rāṣṭram sānucaṃ hantā  anigho carati brāhmaṇaḥ  ||
a  R  pa (fn: ‘abbreviation for pitaram’) saṃbhantā  Sh  yah saṃbhantā
b  R  Sh  khatriye  c  R  rāṣṭram  Sh  rāṣṭram

48 Dhp 403  Uv 33:33  GDhp 49
gambhirapramāṇam medhāvinīṃ  māggā Smāggassa kovidam  ||
uttamāṭham anuprāttamaṃ  tam ahaṃ brūmi brāhmaṇaṃ  || 4 A ii
a  Sh  -paññam  d  Sh  brāhmaṇam

49 Dhp 386  Uv 33:32  GDhp 48
jhāyim virajam āśinaṃ  kātakiccamaṃ anāsavaṇaṃ  ||
uttamāṭham anuprāttamaṃ  tam ahaṃ brūmi brāhmaṇaṃ  ||
c  R  uttamāṭham  Sh  anupraṭṭamaṃ
d  Sh  brāhmaṇam

brāhmaṇavarggāḥ

Bhikṣu

50
sabbattha saṃvaro sādhu  sādhu sabbattha saṃvaro  ||  4 A iii
sabbattha saṃvṛto bhikkhu  sabbadukkhā pramuccati  ||

c  R  sabattha

51 Dhp 361  Uv 7:11  Mvu III 423  PrātMā p 37  PrātMū Endstr. 9  GDhp 52
kāyena saṃvaro sādhu  sādhu vācaya saṃvaro  ||
manasā pi saṃvaro sādhu  sādhu sabbattha saṃvaro  ||  4 A iv
sabbattha saṃvṛto bhikkhu  sabbadukkhā pramuccati  ||

b  Sh  vacāya

52 Dhp 362  Uv 32:7  GDhp 53
hastasaṃyyato pādasasāyyato
vācasaṃyyato saṃvṛtendriyo  ||
ajhattarato samāhito
eko saṃtuṣito tam āhu bhikkhunī  ||

a  Sh  hastasaṃyyato pādasāyyato  b  Sh  saṃyato

53 Dhp 378  Uv 32:24
śāntakāyo śāntacitto  śāntavā susamāhito  ||
vāntalokāmiṣo bhikkhu  upaśānto ti vuccati  ||  4 A vi

54 Dhp 363  Uv 8:10  GDhp 54
yo mukhe saṃyyato bhikkhu  mantābhaṣi anuddhato  ||
attham dhammañ ca deṣeti  madhuraṃ tassa bhāṣitaṃ  ||

a  Sh  saṃyato
55 Dhp 365  Uv 13:8  GDhp 61

sāṁ lābhaṁ nātimāṁñeyā  na śīṃñesaṁ prihaẏaṁ care  ||
amāññesaṁ prihaẏaṁ bhikkhū  samādhin nādhigacchati  ||  4 B i

a R nābhimaṁñeyā  Sh nātimāṁñeyā  
b Sh nā 'aññesaṁ  c Sh aññesaṁ

56 Dhp 366  Uv 13:12  GDhp 62

appalābhā pī ce bhikkhū  saṁ lābhaṁ nātimāṁñati  ||
taṁ ve devā praśaṁsanti  sūddhājīvin atandritaṁ  ||

a Sh bhikkhu  
b Sh nātimāñiyati  
c Sh praśaṁsanti  
d R sūddhājīvanī

57 Dhp 369  Uv 26:12  Mvu III 421  GDhp 76

siṁca bhikkhu imāṁ nāvām  sītā te laghu hehiti  ||
hetā rāgaṁ ca doṣāṁ ca  tato nibbānām ehisi  ||  4 B ii

a Sh bhikkhu  
b Sh laghum ehiṁ fn: ‘MS Hehiti’

58 Uv 32:23  Mvu III 422  cf GDhp 71, 72

udāggracitto sumano  adhibhūya priyā śrīyaṁ  ||
tato prāmojjabahulo  sato bhikkhū parivraje  ||

a Sh udāgra-  
d Sh bhikkhu  
c R pramojja-

59 cf Dhp 368  Thi 182  Uv 32:21  Mvu III 421  GDhp 70, 71

mettāvihārī bhikkhū  prasanno buddhāsane  ||  4 B iii
paṭivijjha padaṁ sāntaṁ  saṁkhāropasaṁsam sukhaṁ  ||
ḍrīte va dhame nibbānaṁ  yogacchemaṁ anuttaraṁ  ||

ef = R 60ab  I attach these pādas to 59, as I feel nibbānam is more likely to be a complement to padaṁ sāntaṁ than to suṁñāgāraṁ.

a R mettrā-  Sh vihārī bhikkhu  
b Sh paṭivijjha fn: ‘MS paṭivijjha’  
d R Sh saṁkhāropasaṁsaṁ

60 Dhp 373  Uv 32:9  GDhp 55

suṁñā sāgāraṁ praviśtassa  sāntacittassa bhikkhuṇo  ||  4 B iv
amānuṣā rati hoti  sammāṁ dhammaṁ vippaśsato  ||

= R 60c-f

a R praviśṭasya  Sh suññā, gāraṁ  
b R -cittasya

61 Dhp 374  Uv 32:10  GDhp 56

yathā yathā sammasati  khandhānāṁ udayavvyayaṁ  ||
labhate cittassa prāmojjāṁ  amatā hetaṁ vijānato  ||  4 B v

b Sh udayavvyayaṁ  c R citassa

62 Dhp 372  Uv 32:25  PrātMā p 37  GDhp 58

nāsti jhānaṁ aprāṁṇassa  praṇāṁ nāsti ajhāyato  ||
yamhi jhānaṁ ca praṇāṁ ca  sa ve nibbānasantike  ||
a Sh praṇṇassa
b Sh praṇṇā
c Sh praṇṇā

63 Dhp 375a-d Uv 32:6, 27ab PrātMā p 37 GDhp 59

tatthāyam ādi bhavati
indriyagottī sāntoṣṭī
tośi sukha yā itarī[ ]
sabbassa pāpasa sukham prahānaṃ  l  5 A ii

4 B vi
prātimokkhe ca saṃvaro  ll

a R Sh ādi
b Sh praṇṇassa
c R sāntoṣṭhi
d Sh prātimokkhe

64 Dhp 375ef, 376 (Be, Ce 376a-f) Uv 32:6 PrātMā p 37 GDhp 60

mitte bhajetha kallāne
paṭisandharavaṭṭī ssa
tato prāmojjahabulo

a R mitre
b Sh atandito
c Sh paṭisancara-vattissa
d R pramojja-
e f Sh bhikkhu

bhikṣuvarggaḥ

Attha

65 Dhp 331 Uv 30:34

atthesu jātesu sukha sakhāyā
pumāṇaṃ sukhaṃ jīvitasaṃkhayamhi  l

5 A i

sukha attharasaś vacā
sato bhikkhū parivraje  ll

a R mitre
b Sh atandito
c Sh paṭisancara-vattissa
d R pramojja-
e f Sh bhikkhu

5 A ii

66 Dhp 332 Uv 30:21

sukhā mātreatā loke
tato petteatā sukha  l
šāmanntā sukha loke
tato brāhmmanntā sukha  ll

a R mātreyyatā Sh mātteatā (yatā ?)
b R petreyyatā Sh petteatā (yatā ?)

67 Dhp 333 Uv 30:20

sukhaṃ yāvaj jara śilaṃ
sukha śraddhā pratiṣṭhitā  l
sukha attharasaś vacā
assim mānakhayo sukho  ll  5 A iii

a R mitre
b Sh atandito
c Sh attharata vaca
d R asmiṃ Sh asmiṃ mānajayo

68 Dhp 194 Uv 30:22

sukho buddhāna uppādo
sukha dhammassa desanā  l
sukha saṃghassa sāmaggrī
samaggrāṇaṃ tapo sukho  ll

a R buddhāna Sh buddhāna
tośi sukha yā itarī[ ]

5 A ii and iv.
c R Sh sāmagrī
d Sh samaggrāṇaṃ

69 Dhp 206 Uv 30:25 GDhp 175

sukhaṃ daṃśanam ayirāṇaṃ
saṃvāso pi satāṃ sukho  l  5 A iv
addaṃśanena bālāṇāṁ niccam eva sukhī siyā ā

d Sh sadāṁ

d Sh sukhāṁ sukham is possible, but the parallels support sukhī.

70  Dhp 207  Uv 30:26  GDhp 176

bālāṣaṅgatacārī hi drigham addhāna śocati ā
dukkho bālehi saṃvāso amittehi-r-iva sabbadā ā
dhīrā tū sukhasaṃvāsā nāṭīnaṁ vā samāgamo ā 5 A v ā

b Sh drigham adhvāna

d R amitre hi-r-iva  Sh amitrehir iva

e R dhīrāt tu sukhasaṃvāso

f Sh nāṭīnaṁ  R va

71  Dhp 208  Uv 25:25  GDhp 177

tassā hi dhīrāṁ ca bahuśsutaṁ ca

dhoreyaśila-vratamantam ayiraṁ ā
tam tārisaṁ sappuruṣaṁ sumedhaṁ

sevetha nakkhattapathe va candramā ā 5 A vi ā

a Sh tasmā

d R Sh nakkhatra-

72  Dhp 212  Uv 5:1

priyāto jāyate dukkhaṁ priyā śokā priyā bhayaṁ ā

priyāto vipramuttassa nāsti śokā kato bhayaṁ ā

a Sh priyato ... dukkha ā  b Sh śoko fn: ‘MS śokā’
c R priyātto

d Sh śoko kuto fn: ‘MS śokā’

73  Dhp 210  Uv 5:5

mā priyehi saṃgaṃma apriyehi kadācaṅma ā

priyassa addaṃśaṅma dukkhaṁ apriyassa ca daṃśaṅma ā 5 A vii ā

a R saṃgaṅma

c R adaṃśaṅma  Sh dukkaṅ

d Sh daṃsaṅma

74  Dhp 211  Uv 5:8

tassā priyāṁ na kayirātha priyāvādo hi pāpako ā

ggaṁthā tesaṁ na vijjanti yesaṁ nāsti priyāpriyāṁ ā

a Sh tasmā

c Sh granthā

75  Dhp 213  Uv 26:7  GDhp 163

chudhā paraṁ rogāṇaṁ saṃkhāraparanaṁ dukkhaṁ ā

etaṁ nāttā yathābhūtaṁ nibbāna paranaṁ sukaṁ ā 5 B i ā

b R dukkhaṁ

c Sh nāttā

76  Dhp 204  Uv 26:6  GDhp 162

āroggaparanaṁ lābhā saṁtostiparanaṁ dhanaṁ ā

viśāsaparanaṁ nāti nibbāna paranaṁ sukaṁ ā

c Sh nāttā

77  Dhp 290  Uv 30:30  GDhp 164

mattāsuṣhaharyappahīnā  pāsā ce vipulaṁ sukaṁ ā
cae māttāsukhaṁ dhīro
sampaśsasāṁ vipulaṁ sukhaṁ  ||

ac R Sh mātrā- d R sukhan Sh sukhaṁ

78 S I 81, 82 = Dhp-a III 265 Uv 29:14

manujassā sadā satimato 5 B ii
māttāṁ jāniya laddhibhojane  l
tanukā ṣṣa bhavanti vedanaṁ
śanikāṁ jirati āyu pālayaṁ  ll

b R Sh mātrāṁ Sh laddhito jano
d Sh āyuśā layaṁ

79 Dhp 193 Uv 30:27 Mvu III 109 GDhp 173

dullabho puruṣaṁjaṁno  na so sabbatha jāyatī  l
yattha so jāyate viro  taṁ kūlaṁ sukham edhatī  ll  5 B iii

a Sh -jañño c R jāyati Sh dhīro

80 Dhp 83 Uv 30:52 GDhp 226

sabbatha ve sappuruṣā bhavanti
na kāmakāmā lapayanti santo  l
sukhena puṭṭhā uttavā dukhena
noccāvacanā sappuruṣā karonti  ll

a R sabbatha c R muṭṭhā Sh su(phu?)ṭṭhā

81 Dhp 201 Uv 30:1 GDhp 180

jayaṁ veṛaṁ prasavatī dukkhaṁ śeti parājito  l  5 B iv

upaśānto sukhaṁ śeti  hettā jayaparājayaṁ  ||

82 cf Dhp 333cd Uv 30:24a-c, 30:20d

sukhaḥ najjā sūpatitthā sukho dhammajito jano  l
sukho śraddhaṁśālābho  pāpassa akaraṇāṁ sukhaṁ  ll  5 B v

a Sh sukhaṁ saṅgo sūpatittho
c Sh suddha-

83 Uv 30:23

sukhaṁ draṭṭuṁ śilavanto sukaṁ draṭṭuṁ bahuśśutā  l
arahanto pi sukaṁ draṭṭuṁ vipramutta niropadhī  ll

a Sh draṭṭuṁ
b R bahuśrutā Sh draṭṭa bahuśrutā
c Sh draṭṭuṁ

athavarggaṁ

Śoka

84 Ud 92 (= Nett 67, Peṭ 14) Uv 5:3

ye keci śokā paridevitaṁ vā
dukkhaṁ va lokamhi anekarūpaṁ  l
priyaṁ paṭicca prabhavanti ete
priye asante na bhavanti ete  ll

b R ca c Sh prabhayanti

d Sh priyeṣu santena
85 Ud 92 (= Nett 67) Uv 5:4

tassā hi te sukhi-khi no vitaśokā
yesaṁ priyaṁ nāsti kahiṁci loke ||
tassā aśokaṁ virajaṁ prāthīhayānā
priyaṁ na kayirātha kahiṁci loke ||

b Sh karma

c R sama-
d Sh āmānā

d Sh ātāda

89 Dhp 94 Uv 19:3

yassendriyāṁ samataṁ gatāni
aśā yathā sārathinā sudāntā
prahīṇamāṇassa anāsavassa
deva pi tassa priḥayanti tāyino ||

a R yasemndriyāṁ

90 Dhp 321 Uv 19:6

dāntaṁ nayanti samitiṁ
dāntaṁ rājābhūhati
dānto śreṣṭho manuṣyesu
yo ṭivāde tiṣṭkhiṁ ||

b R -ruhati
d R tiṣṭkhiṁ

d R tākhi

91 Dhp 322 Uv 19:7, /7/ d GDhp 341

varam assatarā dāntā
ejāneya va sendhava
kuṇjaṁ va mahānaṁ
eṭā dānto tato varaṁ

b R ca
c R ca
d Sh attadanta

92 Dhp 323 Uv 19:8-12

na hi tehi jānajātehi
tāṁ bhūmim abhisamabhavayē
yathā Štanaṁ sudāntena
dānto dāntaṁ gacchati

b Sh atisaṁabhavayē
93 Dhp 81  Uv 29:49  GDhp 239
šelo yathā ekagano  vātena na samārati  || 6 A v
evaṃ nindāpraśaṃsāsu  na samāranti paññātā  ||

94 Dhp 9 (= Ja II 198)  Uv 29:7  GDhp 192
anikkaśayo kāśyāṃ  yo vastaṃ paridhehi  || 6 A vi
apeto dasāccena  na so kāśyām arihāti  ||

b R Sh vastraṃ  d Sh sa

95 Dhp 10 (= Ja II 198)  Uv 29:8  GDhp 193
yo tu vāntakaśyāyassa  śilehi susamāhito  ||
upeto dasāccena  sa ve kāśyām arihāti  ||

sokavarggaḥ

Kalyāṇī

96 Dhp 116  Uv 28:23
abhittarettha kallaṇe  pāpā cittāṃ nivāraye  ||
dharmāṃ hi karato puṃṇaṃ  pāpamihi ramate mano  || 6 B i

a Sh kalyāṇe  c R kāraye puṃṇaṃ  Sh puṃṇaṃ

97 Dhp 117  Uv 28:21  GDhp 207
kayira ce puruṣo pāpaṃ  na nam kaiyirā punappuno  ||

na tamhi chanda[m] kayirātha  dukkho pāpassa sa[m]cayo  ||
The first line of this leaf is overlapped by leaf 5 B, and the signs for anuvāra and -i- cannot be seen.
a Sh kayiraṃ fn: ‘MS kayira’
c R chandaṃ  Sh chanda
d R Sh saṃcayo

98 Dhp 118  Uv 28:22  GDhp 208
kayira ce puruṣo pu[m]ṇa[m]  kay[i]ra cena[m] puṇappuno  ||
tamh[i] eva chanda[m] kayirātha  sukho puṇṇassa saṃcayo  || 6 B ii

a R puṃṇaṃ  Sh kayiraṃ ... puṇṇaṃ
b R kayira ce naṃ  Sh kayiraṃ ce na
c R tamhi eva chandaṃ  Sh tamhi evaṃ chanda
d Sh puṇṇassa

99 M I 39  Uv 16:15  GDhp 327
śuddhasseva sadā phaggū  śuddasso spoṣadho sadā  ||
śuddhassa śucikammassa  sadā sampajjate vrataṃ  ||
a Sh phaggū

100  Uv 29:41  ab  Dhp 314ab  GDhp 337ab
akataṃ dukkataṃ śreyo  pacchā tapati dukkataṃ  ||
dukkataṃ me katam ti śocati  bhūyo śocati doggamatiṃ gato  || 6 B iii
d R yo gatiṃ
101  Uv 29:42  ab  Dhp 314cd  GDbp 337cd
katañ ca sukatañ sādhu  yam kattā nānutappati  l
sukatañ me katam ti nandati  bhūyo nandati soggatiṁ gato  l
b  R  nānutapyati
c  R  kataṁ hi  Sh  katanti
d  Sh  soggatiṁ

102  Dhp 119  Uv 28:19
pāpo pi paśsate bhadrāṁ  yāva pāpaṁ na paccati  l  6 B iv
yadā tu paccate pāpaṁ  atha pāpo pāpāni paśsati  l

103  Dhp 120  Uv 28:20
bhadro pi paśsate pāpaṁ  yāva bhadrāṁ na paccati  l  6 B v
yadā tu paccate bhadrāṁ  atha bhadro bhadrāni paśsati  l

104
pāpaṁ pi karato bhadrāṁ  yāva pāpaṁ na paccati  l
atha payirāgatē kāle  pāpo pāpāni paśsati  l

105
bhadro pi karato pāpaṁ  yāva bhadrāṁ na paccati  l
atha payirāgatē kāle  bhadro bhadrāni paśsati  l  6 B vi

106  Dhp 124  Uv 28:15
pañimhi ce vrapo nāsasa  dhāreyā pānīna viṣāṁ  l
nāvraṇe viṣāṁ anneti  nästi pāpam akurvatto  l
a  R  na'ssa  Sh  pānīṁhi
d  Sh  akurvato

107  Dhp 71 (= Nett 161, Peṭ 48)  Uv 9:17  (cf Manu 4:172)
na hi pāpakaṁ kataṁ kammaṁ  sajjāṁ chīram va muccati  l  7 A i
dahantaṁ bālam anneti  bhassachano va pāpako  l

108  Uv 9:18
na hi pāpakaṁ kataṁ kammaṁ  sajjāṁ sastam va kantati  l
maranō Ġpēto hi jānāti  yā gati pāpakaṁmuṇo  l

109  Ja IV 166  Uv 16:1  GDbp 335
anāgataṁ paṭikayirātha kiccaṁ  mā vo kiccaṁ kiccaṁ kiccaṁ kiccaṁ vydheyyā  l  7 A ii
taṁ tārisaṁ paṭikata kiccaṁ kiccaṁ kiccaṁ kiccaṁ vydheti  l

110  S I 57  Mil 66  Uv 4:16
paṭikacceva taṁ kaiyā  yam nāyyā hitam āttano  l
na śākaṭikamanti ssa mantanṣ dhīro parākrame ǁ

a Sh yadi kacceva b R nāpyā Sh prāpya
c R -mantrissa Sh -santissa
d R manṭraṃ Sh mandaṃ viro

111 S I 57 Mil 66 Uv 4:17 Utt 5:14

yathā śākaṭiko māggaṃ samaṇḥ hettā mahāpatham ǁ 7 A iii
vīṣamaṇḥ māggam āsāja akkhachinno tha jhāyati ǁ

a Sh yathā gāhati homāggaṃ
b R saṃmaṇḥ Sh sugaṃ There is a slight mark above sa- which
may possibly be meant as an anusvāra. R mahāpatham
d Sh akkha chinnotha jhāyati (royiti?)

112 S I 57 Mil 67 Uv 4:18 Utt 5:15

evaṃ dhammā apakrāṃma adhaṃmam anuvattiya ǁ
bālo maccumukhaṃ pratto akkhachinno va jhāyati ǁ 7 A iv

113 Dhp 307 (= Vin III 90) Uv 11:9

kāśyakamṭha bahavo pāpadaṃmaṃ asaṃyyatā ǁ
pāpā pāpehi kaṃmehi nirayaṃ te upapajjatha ǁ

b Sh asaṃyyatā

114 Dhp 306 (= Ud 45 = It 42-3) Uv 8:1 GDhp 269

abhūtavādī nirayaṃ upeti yo cāpi kattā na karomi ti āha ǁ 7 A v
ubho pi te precsa samā bhavanti

nihūnakaṃma manujā paratra ǁ

115 Dhp 125 Uv 28:9

yo apraḍuśṭassā naro praḍuṣyati
śuddhassa poṣassa anāṃgaṇassā ǁ 7 A vi
tam eva bālama praceti pāpaṃ
sukhumo rajo paṭivātaṃ va khitto ǁ

116 Dhp 123 Uv 28:14

vāniyo va bhayaṃ māggaṃ appasāṭtho mahaddhano ǁ
vīṣaṃ jivitukāmo va pāpāni parivajjaye ǁ

a R vāniyena va bhayaṃ mārggamaṃ
da Sh appasāṭthattho The extra -ttha- I take to be a crossed-out
mistake.

117 Dhp 291 Uv 30:2 GDhp 179

paraḍukkhopadhnāṇena yo icche sukham āttano ǁ 7 B i
verasaṃsaggasāṃṣaṭṭho dukkha na parimuccati ǁ

118

kuṇapassa pi gaṃḍhucchijjati
u śuddhukitassa (-chitassa) pi rāti accayā ǁ 7 B ii
puruṣassa adhammacārīṇo
annāhaṃ gandho na chijjati ǁ

a Sh huṇapassapi gaṃḍhucchi ǀ dṛti
b R uḍduḥ(?)kitas payīrā ti ǀ accayā Sh uttakassapi rāti accayā
c R puruṣasya
119
yathā ggrahapatayo prabhūtaratanā
aḍitte nagaramhi dahyamāne
muttāmaniphaṭikarajataheto
vyāyamantī api niharema kīmci

a Sh grhapatayo
b R āḍittenā śāramhi Sh prābhītte
c Sh -kaṭika-

120
tatha-r-iva śaṁāṇā prabhūtapraṃṇā
ayirā ayirapathesu sicchamānā
jāṭijarāmaranabhayāddittā dukkhāṭā
vyāyamantī api prāpunemā sāntiṁ

a R omits Sh tathāvidha
b Sh ayirapathena
c R -bhavāppittā l dukkhātto Sh -bhavāddittā(ta?) dukkhāttā

tu ca kalyāṇivarggā
Puṣpa

121  Dhp 54  Uv 6:16  GDhp 295

na puṣpagandho paṭivātam eti
na candanaṃ tagaraṃ vāhlikaṃ vā
satān tu gandho paṭivātam eti
sabba diśā sappuruṣo pravātī

b R na candanaṃ vāhṇikāṃ vā

122  Dhp 55  Uv 6:17  cd GDhp 296

candanaṃ tagaraṃ cāpi
uppalāṃ atha vāśṣikīṇa
etesāṇaṃ gandhajātānān
śilagandho anuttaro

a R āḍittenā śāramhi Sh prābhītte
c Sh -kaṭika-

123  Dhp 56  Uv 6:18

appāmatro ayaṃ gandho
yo tu śilavatāṃ gandho
vāti devesu uttamo

a R Sh gandho
c Sh tuu

124  Dhp 57  Uv 6:19  GDhp 297

tesāṃ sampannasālānāṃ
aprāmādavāhārānāṃ
sammadāṃnāvāmottānāṃ
māro māggaṇa na viṇḍati

a Sh vacā
c R -aṇīa-

125  Dhp 51 (= Th 323)  Uv 18:6  GDhp 290

yathā pi ruciraṃ puṣpaṃ
evam subhāṣitā vācā
da Sh akurvato

126  Dhp 52 (= Th 324)  Uv 18:7  GDhp 291

yathā pi ruciraṃ puṣpaṃ
vannavantaṃ sagāṇḍhakāṃ
evāṇaṃ subhāṣītā vācā
saphalā hoti kurvavato

b R Sh sagandhakaṃ
c Sh vacā
d Sh kurvato

127 Dhp 49 Uv 18:8 GDhp 292

yathā pi bhramaro puspā
vannagandham aheḍayaṃ
praḍeti rasam ādāya
evaṃ ggrāme muni care

8 A ii

d Sh grāme

128 Dhp 47 Uv 18:14 GDhp 294 cf MBh 12:169:12

puspāṇi heva pracinantaṃ
vyāsattamanasaṃ naraṃ
suttaṃ ggrāmaṃ mahogho vā
maccu-r-ādāya gacchati

8 A iii

c Sh grāmaṃ
d Sh gacchati

129 Dhp 48 Uv 18:5

puspāṇi heva pracinantaṃ
vyāsattamanasaṃ naraṃ
asamputtaṃnesu kāmesu
antako kurute vaše

8 A iii

b R vyāsatta-amanasaṃ
c Sh asaṃsannesu

130 Dhp 53 Uv 18:10 GDhp 293

yathā pi pusparāśimhā
kayirā mālāguṇe bahū
evaṃ jātena māccena
kātavvaṃ kuśalaṃ bahūṃ

d Sh kātabbaṃ ... bahūṃ

131 Dhp 44 Uv 18:1 GDhp 301

ko imam paṭhavim vijehiti
yamalokaṃ va imam sadevakaṃ
ko dharmapade sudeśite
kuśalo puspam iva prajeḥiti

8 A iv

b R ca (but va in 132b)

132 Dhp 45 Uv 18:2 GDhp 302

śettakho paṭhavim vijehiti
yamalokaṃ va imam sadevakaṃ
so dharmapade sudeśite
kuśalo puspam iva prajeḥiti

8 A v

a Sh saikho
d Sh prajehi

133 Dhp 377 Uv 18:11 GDhp 298

vāśikī-r-iva puspāṇi
maṅcakāni pramuñcati
evaṃ rāgaḥ ca doṣaḥ ca
vipramuñcatha bhikkhavo

8 A iii

a Sh vāśikī viya

134 Dhp 46 Uv 18:18, 20 GDhp 300

phenopamaṇaṃ lokam imam vidittā
mārīcidhammaṃ abhiṣaṃbudhāṇam
chetana mārassa prapaṃpakāni
addaṃśanaṃ maccūra jassa gacche
135  Dhp 58  Uv 18:12  GDhp 303

yathā saṃkārakūṭamhi  ujjhitamhi mahāpathe  
padumāṃ ubbhidaṃ assa  śucigandhāṃ manoramāṃ  

136  Dhp 59  Uv 18:13  GDhp 304

evaṃ saṃkārabhūtesu  andhābhūte pṛthujjane  
atirocanti praṇāya  saṃmasabuddhasāvakā  

137  Dhp 334 (= Th 399)  Uv 3:4  d GDhp 91

manujassa pramattacāriṇo  
tahnā vaddhati mālūtā  
śā prāplavate hurāhuraṃ  
phalameṣi va vanamhi vānnaro  

c  Sh mā prāpnuvate  

138  Dhp 335 (= Th 400)  Uv 3:9

yam  cesā sahate jaṃmi  tahnā loke duraccayā  
śokā tassa pravadhāṃti  ovaṭṭhā beruṇā  
iva  

139  Dhp 336 (= Th 401)  Uv 3:10

yo cetāṃ sahate jaṃmiṃ  tahnāṃ loke duraccayaṃ  
śokā tassa vivaṭṭanti  udabindu va pukkhaře  

140  Uv 3:11  a-d Dhp 337a-d (= Th 402a-d)  ab GDhp 126ab

tam vo vademi bhadrāṃ vo  yāvaṃ-itha samāgata  
tahnāṃ samūlāṃ khaṇatha  uṣṭrāṭṭhī va beruṇiṃ  
tahnāya khatamūlāya  nāsti śokā kato bhayaṃ  

141  Sn 740 (= It 9, A II 10)  Uv 3:12

tahnabitiyo puruṣo  drigham addhāna saṃsari  
etṭhabhāvaṃṭhāṭhābhāvan  tattha tattha punappuno  

a  R  -vitiyo  Sh tahnā vatiyo
140  
Margaret Cone

b R adhvīnaṁ  Sh addhānasamsari

c R -arṇāthi-  Sh ethabhāvaṁ a(?) thābhāvaṁ

142  Sn 741 (= It 9, A II 10)  Uv 3:18

etam ādīnavam nyāttā  tahnā dukkhassa saṁbhavaṁ  l
vītatahno anādāno  sato bhikkhū parivrāje  l  B v

d Sh bhikkhu

143  Dhp 345 (= S I 77, Ja II 140, Peṭ 26)  Uv 2:5  GDhp 169

na taṁ dhṛtaṁ bandhanam āhu dhīra
yad āyasaṁ dārujaṁ babbajāṁ vā  l
sārattarattā maṇikuṇḍalesu
putresu dāresu ca yā apekhā  l

d R putreso dāresu yā apekhā

144  Dhp 346 (= S I 77, Ja II 140, Peṭ 26)  Uv 2:6  GDhp 170

etam dhṛtaṁ bandhanam āhu dhīra
ohārimaṁ sukhumaṁ dupramuṇcam  l
etappi chettāna vrajanīti santo
anapekhnino sabbadukhāṁ prahāya  l

a Sh bandhanam  b R ohārinam (or -maṁ) ...
dupramuṇcam

c Sh etam pi

145  Dhp 186 (= Ja II 313)  Uv 2:17  Divy 224

na kāhāpaṇavāsena  trettī kāmesu vijjati  l

146  Dhp 187 (= Ja II 313)  Uv 2:18  Divy 224

api diivesu kāmesu
ratiṁ so nādhipacchati  l
tahnakkhayarato hoti
saṁmasaṁbuddhasāvako  l

a R Sh dibbesu  d R -sambuddha-

147  Dhp 352

vītatahno anādāno
niruttipadakovido  l
akkhāṁ vā sannipātena
(ñ)ñāyyā pūrvvāparāṇi so  l  A ii
sa ve antimaśāriro
mahapraṇāṁni ti vuccati  l

a R ñāpyā  Sh ñāyyā pūrvv- f Sh mahapraṇñoti

d R ñāpyā  Sh ñāyyā pūrvv-

c R sukhekhino

148  Dhp 341  Uv 3:5

saritāni sinehitaṁ ca
somanassāṁ bhavanti jantuno  l
ye sātasitaṁ sukheṣṭho
ye vā jātiṣṭhaṁ 9 A iii
te vā jātiṣṭhaṁ

149  Dhp 342  Uv 3:6  d GDhp 95

tahnāya purekkhaṭṭa prajā
parissappanti saśo va bādhito  l
parisappanti šaśo va bādhito
te saṃjotanasāṅgasāṅgasattā
gabbhām upenti punappuno cīrāṃ pi

9 A iv

a Sh purakkhatā
b Sh vādhito
c R saṃyojana
Sh saṃyojanasaṅgasattā fn: ‘MS saṅgasanga’
d R garbham Sh cīrāṃ hi

150 Dhp 348 Uv 29:57 GDhp 161

muñca pure muñca pacchato
majjhe muñca bhavassa pāragū
sabbattha vimuttamānaso
na puno jātijārām upehisi

d R -jaram

151 Dhp 344 Uv 27:29 cd GDhp 92

yo nivvanadho vanā tu mutto
vanamutto vanam eva dhāvati
9 A v
tam puggalam etha paśsatha
mutto bandhanam eva dhāvati

a R yo nibbana-dhovanātta mutto
Sh yo nibbanattho vanātta-mutto
c Sh edha (?)

152 Dhp 356 Uv 16:16

trinadosaṃi khetrāṇī
tassā hi vitarāgēsā

9 A vi

c R Sh tasmā
d Sh nibbattate

153 Dhp 357 Uv 16:17

trinadosāṇi khetrāṇī
doṣadosā ayaṃ praṇā

9 B i
tassā hi vitarāgēsā

dinnaṃ hoti mahāpphalaṃ

154 Dhp 358 Uv 16:18

trinadosaṃi khetrāṇī
mohadosā ayaṃ praṇā

9 B i
tassā hi vitarāgēsā
dinnaṃ hoti mahāpphalaṃ

155 Dhp 99 (= Th 992) Uv 29:17

ramaṇīyāṃ vaṭa śraṇṇāṃ
vitarāgēttha raṃsanti

9 B ii

yaṃhiṃ na ramate jano

nāṃpe kāmāgavesiṇo

c Sh raṃmanti
d Sh nāṃte kāmāgavesiṇo

156 Dhp 338 Uv 3:16

yathā pi mūle anupadrute dṛḍhe
chinno pi rukkho puna-r-iva jāyati

9 B ii

em eva tahnānuṣaye anūhate
nivvattate dukkham idam punappuno

d Sh nibbattate
d Sh nibbattate
tahnavarggaḥ

Mala

157 Dhp 241
asajjhāyamāla vedā
malo vanṇassa kosajjāṇī
aparahādā gharā l
pramādo rakkhatāṁ malo l
9 B iii

a Sh assajjhāya-

158 Dhp 242
malo istiye duccaritaṁ
malo pāpāni kārmāṇī
maccheraṁ daddatāṁ malo l
assim loke paramhi ca l
9 B iv

a R Sh istriye
b Sh daddatāṁ
d R Sh asmiṁ

159 Dhp 243
tato malataram brūmi
ete male prahattāna
avijjā maraṇam malaṁ l
niṇmala caratha bhikkhavo l
b Sh sarāṇaṁ

160 Dhp 240 (= Nett 129, Peṭ 8, 49) Uv 9:19
ayasā tu malo saṁuṭṭhito
tato uṭṭhāya tam eva khādāti l
9 B v

em eva vīdhūnacāriyaṁ
sakāni kārmāṇī nayanti doggaṭiṁ l

161 Dhp 235
pāṇḍupalāśo ca dāni si
yamapuruṣā pi ca te upaṭṭhitā l
uyyogamukhe ca tiṣṭhaṇi
pāṭheyaṁ pi ca te na vijjati l
9 B vi

162 cf Dhp 236 Uv 16:3
uyyamassa ghatassa āttanā
cārṇmāro rajatamāva niddhamo
niddhāntamalo anangano
bitiyaṁ (vitiyaṁ) ayirabhūmim esī l
10 A i

a Sh uppamassa
d R vitiyaṁ ... emi Sh vibhiyaṁ
... eti

163 Dhp 239 Uv 2:10
anupūrvveṇa medhāvī
thokathokam khaṇe khaṇe l
kammāro rajatasveva
niddhame malaṁ āttano l

a R medhāvī Sh anupūrvveṇa
b Sh thokam thokam c R rajastass'

164 Dhp 244 Uv 27:3 Jm 16:2 GDhp 221
suṇiṣṭa bhīrīkena
saṅkiliṣṭan tu jivati l
prakkhaṇḍinā pragabheṇa
c Sh pakkhaṇḍinā
d R -sūreṇa Sh dhaṃsinā

165  Dhp 245  Uv 27:4  Jm 16:3  GDhp 222

hirimatā tu duṣjīvaṁ
alīnenāpragabheṇa
niccaṁ śucigaveśinā ||
śuddhājīvena paśātā || 10 A ii

a R hirimatātu
b Sh -gaveśinā
c R -pragabheṇa

166  Dhp 252  Uv 27:1  GDhp 272

supaśāṁ vaijāṁ amāñesaṁ
paresāṁ iha vaijāṁi
āttano puna duddaśaṁ
uppunāti yathā busaṁ
kalim va kṛtavāṁ sātho || 10 A iii

supāśāṁ vaijāṁ amāñesaṁ
d Sh bhūsaṁ
f Sh kāliṁ va kitavā

d Sh sudāśaṁ Sh aṁśesaṁ

167  Dhp 163  Uv 28:16  GDhp 264

sukaraṇī asadhūṇī
yaṁ ve hitaṁ ca sādhuṁ ca
taṁ ca paramadukkaraṁ ||
d R dukkharāṁ

168  sukaraṇī asadhūṇī

yāṇi hitāṇi sādhuṇī
tāṇi kurvvanti paṇḍitā || 10 A iv

d Sh kurvanti

169  Dhp 316, 317  Uv 16:4  GDhp 273

alajjitaṁve lajjanti
abhaye bhayaḍaṁśavi
micchādṛṣṭisamādānā
daṁca gacchanti doggaṁi || 10 A v

a R Sh alajjatubbe
b R Sh lajjitabbe

170  Dhp 318

avajje vaijamatino
micchādṛṣṭisamādānā
daṁca gacchanti doggaṁi ||

b Sh -saṁnaṁino
c Sh micchādṛṣṭi-

171  Dhp 11  Uv 29:3  GDhp 213

asāre sāramatino
saṁca saṁsāraṁno
te sāran nādhigacchanti
micchāsaṁkappagocarā || 10 A vi

b Sh -saṁnaṁino

172  Dhp 12  Uv 29:4  GDhp 214

sāraṇ ca sārato nāṭtā
saṁca saṁsāraṁ nāṭtā
te sāram adhigacchanti
saṁsāraṁnāṭtā kimocarā ||

a R nāṭtā

173  Dhp 209  Uv 5:9  GDhp 266

ayoge yuṇjiyāṭṭānamī
yogamhi ca ayuṃjiya ||
177  Dhp 72  Uv 13:2

yā vad eva anathāya ŋattam bālāsa jāyati l 10 B iii
hanti bālāsa śukrāṅγaṃ (?) muddham assa nipātaye l

b  Sh  ŋāttaṃ

c  R  bālāsa śukrās taṃ  Sh  bālāsa śukrāṃśaṃ I cannot read the
syllable following śukrā- with any certainty; R’s mśaṃ is possible, but
Sh’s mśaṃ is not.
d  Sh  vipātaye

178  Dhp 73  Uv 13:3

asatāṃ bhāvanam icchanti  purekkuḥraṇaḥ ca bhikkhusu l
āvāsesu ca essariyaṃ pūjam parakulesu ca l 10 B iv

d  R  pūjam

179  Dhp 74a-d  Uv 13:4

mameva katamannentu  gṛhi pravrajitā ca ye l
na me pratibalā assa  kicca śikcesu kesuci l

b  R  ca yena
c  R  me atibalā

180  Dhp 74ef, 75ab  Uv 13:5

iti bālāsa saṃkappo  icchāmāno ca vaddhati l
aṃṇā hi lābhopaniṣā  aṃṇā nibbānagāmini l 10 B v

c  Sh  aṇṇā hi lābhopaniṣā
d  Sh  aṇṇā

174  Dhp 66  Uv 9:13

c  Sh  priyaggāhi  The MS is very unclear at this point.

malavarggaḥ

Bāla

175  Dhp 67  Uv 9:14

b  R  amittreṇa  Sh  amitreṇa

c  Sh  karento

176  Dhp 68  Uv 9:15

a  R  kaṃṭhaṃ

177  Dhp 72  Uv 13:2

yā vad eva anathāya ŋattam bālāsa jāyati l 10 B iii
hanti bālāsa śukrāṅγaṃ (?) muddham assa nipātaye l

b  Sh  ŋāttaṃ

c  R  bālāsa śukrās taṃ  Sh  bālāsa śukrāṃśaṃ I cannot read the
syllable following śukrā- with any certainty; R’s mśaṃ is possible, but
Sh’s mśaṃ is not.
d  Sh  vipātaye

178  Dhp 73  Uv 13:3

asatāṃ bhāvanam icchanti  purekkuḥraṇaḥ ca bhikkhusu l
āvāsesu ca essariyaṃ pūjam parakulesu ca l 10 B iv

d  R  pūjam

179  Dhp 74a-d  Uv 13:4

mameva katamannentu  gṛhi pravrajitā ca ye l
na me pratibalā assa  kicca śikcesu kesuci l

b  R  ca yena
c  R  me atibalā

180  Dhp 74ef, 75ab  Uv 13:5

iti bālāsa saṃkappo  icchāmāno ca vaddhati l
aṃṇā hi lābhopaniṣā  aṃṇā nibbānagāmini l 10 B v

c  Sh  aṇṇā hi lābhopaniṣā
d  Sh  aṇṇā
Dhp 75c-f  Uv 13:6

evam etam yathabhûtaṃ paśaṃ buddhassa sâvako
sakkàram nabhìnandeyä vivekaṃ anubrûhaye

b R paśaṃ Sh paśyaṃ ... sâvako
d R anubrûhaye

183  S I 222, 223  Uv 20:6

182  S I 163  Uv 20:13

jayaṃ ve manyate bâlo vâcâya paruṣaṃ bhanâma
satâm hesa jayo hoti yä titikkhâ vijñânaṭaṃ

d R yâti bhikkhâ(µ(?)) Sh yâti bhikkhu

c Sh -muttassa

184  Dhp 63  Uv 25:22  Divy 490

yo bâlo bâlamâni paṇḍito câpi tattha so
bâlo tu paṇḍitamâni sa ve bâlo ti vuccati

b R tu (?) thâ so Sh tena so (?)
c Sh ca

185  Dhp 60  Mkv p 46  bc  Uv 1:19

drîghâ assupato râtri drîghaṃ sântassa yojanaṃ

drîgho bâlana saṃsâro saddhâṃmam avijñânaṭaṃ

a R assup(su)ato Sh assa yato
d Sh saddhâṃmam

186  It 68 (= Ja VI 236)  Uv 25:7

pûtimacche kuśâggreṇa yo naro upanahyati
kuśâ pi pûtiṃ väyanti evaṃ bâlo pasevanâ

a Sh pûtigandhe kuśâggeṇa
b Sh upavajjati

c Sh mulâgandhi

187  It 68 (= Ja VI 236)  Uv 25:8

tagaraṇ ca palâsâmhi yo naro upanahyati
pattaṃ pi surabhîr vâti evaṃ dhîropasevanâ

a Sh mulâgandhi
b Sh upavajjati
c R pattraṃ pi Sh mṛduṃ pi

188  It 67  Uv 25:9

189  It 68 (= Ja VI 236)  Uv 25:10

akaṟant pi ce pâpaṃ karonte upâsevati
štâkiyo hoti pâpañhî avaṇṇo câsa rûhâti

a R akâronto pi ce pâpaṃ karonte upâsevati
c Sh gandhiyo hoti yâvamhi
d Sh araṇṇo hoti uhari

c Sh sevamâno sevamâne
sampûṭho samphusaṃ pare alite upalîmpti
upalepabhayā dhīro  neva pāpasakhā siyā  ||

b Sh saṃkṣam  c Sh saro
e Sh upalepatayā
f R naiva  The mark above ne- is the -h- of pāpamhi in 11 A iii.

190  It 68-9 (= Ja VI 236)  Uv 25:12
tassā phalapuṭassēva  niśyā samāpākam āttano  ||
asanto nopaseveyyā  santo seveya paṇḍito  || 11 A v

a R tassā (tasmā(?)) Sh tasmā
b R niśyā  Sh niśyāya  d R pandito

191  Dhp 64  Uv 25:13  GDhp 233
yāvaj jivaṁ pi ce bālo  paṇḍite payirupāsati  ||
neva dhammaṁ vijānāti  dravī sūparasān iva  ||

d Sh drabbī

d Sh drabbī
d Sh drabbī

192  Dhp 65  Uv 25:14  GDhp 234  cf MBh 10:5:2, fn 2
muhutam api ce praṇīno  paṇḍite payirupāsati  || 11 A vi
khipraṇaṁ dhammaṁ vijānāti  jihvā sūparasān iva  ||

a Sh praṇīno  d Sh suparasān

193  Dhp 121  Uv 17:5  GDhp 209
nāppam pāppama maṃrīeyā  na me taṁ āgamisyati  ||
udabindunipātana  udakumbho pi pūrati  ||
pūrate bālo pāppama  thokathokaṁ pi acinām  || 11 A vii

ef = R 194ab
a Sh nāssam ... maṅgyeyā
c Sh udavindu-
d Sh udakUMBho

194  Dhp 122  Uv 17:6  GDhp 210
nāppam puṃṇassa manyeyā  na me taṁ āgamisyati  ||
udabindunipātana  udakumbho pi pūrati  ||
pūrate praṇīno puṃṇassas  thokathokaṁ pi acinām  || 11 B i

ab = R 194cd  cf = R 195
a Sh nāssam puṃṇassa  b R na m-etam
c Sh udavindu-
d Sh udakumbho

e Sh praṇīno praṇīnassas  bālavarggāḥ

Daṇḍa

195  Dhp 141  Uv 33:1  Mvu III 412  Divy 339
na nagacariyā na jatā na paṁko
nānaśanam thaṇḍilasaṣyikā vā  ||
rajocelāṁ ukkutukapradhānąṁ
śodhenti māccaṁ avitiṇṇakaṁchaṁ  ||

= R 196
a Sh jatā  b Sh thaṇḍila-
c Sh rakto celaṁ
d Sh śodhanti R -kaṁkaṁ  Sh -kaṁkhaṁ
Dhp 142  Uv 33:2  Mvu III 412  Divy 339  CPS 17:16
GDhp 80

alamkato câpi samaṃ careyā  11 B ii
dânto śânto niyato dhammacāri 1
sabbesu prâñesu nidhâya danḍâṃ
so brâhmaṇo so samaṇo sa bhikkhū 2

= R 197
d  Sh  śramaṇo

Dhp 133  Uv 26:3

mâ vade paruṣâṃ kaṃci  vuttâ paṭivadeyu tâṃ  11 B iii
dukkhâ hi sârambhakathâ  paṭidâṇḍâ phuseyu tâṃ 2

= R 198
b  Sh  pativadeyu
d  Sh  patidaṇḍâ

Uv 26:4

sace iresi âttanaṃ  kaṃso upahato-r-iva 1
ejñimaraṇasaṃsâram  ciraṃ praṭcanubhohis i 2

= R 199
a  Sh  bhâresi
b  R  kaṃso
c  R  jāti-
d  R  pradu(?)nubhohis  Sh  praṭcanutohis

Dhp 134  Uv 26:5

na ce iresi âttanaṃ  kaṃso anupahato-r-iva 1
esa prätto si nibbânaṃ  sârambhâ te na vijjati 2

= R 200
a  Sh  na cen māresi
b  R  kaṃso
 c  Sh  prâto ’dsi

Dhp 135  Uv 1:17  cd  GDhp 148

yathâ danḍena gopâlo  gavo p(r)âjeti gocarâm  1  11 B v
evaṃ jára ca maccû ca  prâñinâm adhivattati 2

= R 201
b  R  Sh  pâjeti  The MS is very unclear here, and I cannot be certain of the reading.

c-f  Dhp 315c-f  Uv 5:17c-f  GDhp 131b-d

yathâ danḍena gopâlo  gavo rakṣati sâminâm 1
evaṃ rakkhatha âttanaṃ  khaṇo vo mâ upaccagû 1
khaṇâṭita hi śocanti  nirayaṃhi samappitâ 2

= R 202
b  Sh  akṣati mâganâm  R  sâminâm
d  R  upaccagga  Sh  upaccagaṃ

Dhp 130  Uv 5:19

sabbe trasanti danḍânâm  sabbesâṃ jivitaṃ priyaṃ 1
âttanaṃ upamaṇi kattâ  neva haṃyyâ na ghâtaye 2

= R 203
a  Sh  bhâresi
b  R  kaṃso
c  Sh  katvâ
 d  R  haṃyye  Sh  hanye
203 Dhp 131 Uv 30:3

sukhkāmānī bhūtānī
yo daṇḍena vihiṃsati
ättano sukham esāno
precca so na labhate sukham

= R 204
c R āttāno

204 Dhp 132 Uv 30:4

sukhkāmānī bhūtānī
yo daṇḍena na vihiṃsati
ättano sukham esāno
precca so labhate sukham

This verse is omitted in R.

205 a-d Dhp 78 Uv 25:3 ef Dhp 76ef Uv 28:7ef GDhp 231ef

na bhajetha pāpake mitre
na bhajetha puruśa śđhame
bhajetha prāmāṇe (prāmāṇa-) medḥāvi
bhajetha puruṣottame
tārīse bhajamānassa
śreyo hoti na pāpiyo

a Sh na taḍayatha
b Sh tajetha
c Sh tajetha prāmāṇa- R prāmāṇa-medḥavi
d Sh tajetha
e Sh tajamānassa

206 Dhp 76 (= Th 993) Uv 28:7 GDhp 231

nidhino pravattāraṃ
nighryavāḍīṃ mhīvīṃ
tārīṣaṃ bhajamānassa

b R -daṃśinaṃ
c Sh medhāvīṃ

207 Dhp 77 Uv 5:26 GDhp 230

ovadeyā anuṣāseyā
satāṁ hetam priyaṃ hoti
satāṁ hoti aprīyaṃ

208 S I 19 Uv 5:27

tassā satāṁ ca asatāṁ ca
asanto nirayaṃ yānti
nānā hoti ito gati
santo saggaparāyaṇā
d Sh yaggaparāyaṇā

209 Dhp 152

appāsūto ayaṃ puruṣo
māṃṣāṇi tassa vaddhanti
śreyā hoti na pāpiyo

a Sh na taḍayatha
b Sh tajetha
c Sh tajetha prāmāṇa- R prāmāṇa-medḥavi
d Sh tajetha
e Sh tajamānassa

210 Dhp 309 Uv 4:14 GDhp 270

cattāri tṭhāṇāni naro pramatto
āpajjate paradāropasevi
apūññalābhāṁ anikāmaśeyam
nindaṃ triṭiyaṃ nirayaṃ catutthaṃ

a R tṭhāṇāni
b Sh āpajjato
c Sh apuñña-
d Sh nidrum
211  Dhp 310  Uv 4:/15/
apurnālābhō ca gati ca pāpiyo bhītassa bhītya rati pi appikā rājā pi danḍam garukam praṇeti kāyassa bhedā nirayaṃ upeti  

a  Sh  apuṇṇa-  d  Sh  kāyassa teṣā

212  GDhp 325  d  Ja IV 172
saṃyyatā sugatiṃ yānti doggatiṃ yānti asaṃyyatā mā ssu viśśasam āpādi iti vindu samaṃ care  
a  R  saṃyattā  c  Sh  māssā viśrāmam  d  R  bindu  Sh  viṇṇu

213  Vin II 195
mā kuṭijara nāgam āsida dukkho kuṭijara nāgamāṃsado na hi nāgahatassa kuṭijara sugati hoti ito paraṃ yato  
a  R  āsid  Sh  nāsamāsita  b  R  nāga-saṃmado  Sh  nāsasaṃmado  c  Sh  nāsahatassa  d  R  sugati  Sh  sumati

214
giriduggavicāraṇaṃ yathā sihaṃ parvatapaṭṭhadgocaraṃ naravirām apetabheravāṃ mā hiṃsitha anomanikramaṃ

215  Dhp 320  Uv 29:21  GDhp 329
ahāṃ nāgo va saṃgrāme cāpītipate šare ativāde titikkhāmi duśśilo hi bahujano  

a  Sh  aham ... samgrāme  c  Sh  titikkhāni  d  Sh  bahujjano
dāṇḍavarggagā  Šaraṇa

216  Dhp 188  Uv 27:31  Divy 164
bahū ve šaraṇaṃ yānti parvate ca vanāni ca vastūni rukkhacittāni manusya bhayatajjita  
a  Sh  bahu  b  Sh  parvate  c  Sh  vanāni  R  -citrāṇi

217  Dhp 189  Uv 27:32  Divy 164
na etam šaraṇam khermam na etam šaraṇam uttamam  
aetam šaraṇam āgaṇma sabbadukkha pramuṣcatti  

d  Sh  pramuṣcatti
218 Dhp 190 Uv 27:33 Divy 164

yo tu buddhaḥ ca dhammañ ca
saghaṁ ca śaraṇaṁ gato

I
cattāri ca ayirasaccāni
yathābhūtāni paśati

II 12 B iii

b R saṃghaṁ Sh saṃghaṁ fn: ‘MS saṃghaṁ’
c R catvāri

219 Dhp 192 Uv 27:35 Divy 164

etaṁ ve śaraṇaṁ kheمام
etaṁ śaraṇaṁ uttamaṁ

I
etma śaraṇaṁ āgama
sabbadukkha pramuuccati

II

b R uttamam

220 Ja V 222 = A II 75

gavāṁ ce taramāṇānāṁ
jihmaṁ gacchati puṁgavo

I

sabbā tā jihmaṁ gacchanti
nette jihmagate sati

II 12 B iv

a R gavāmceta ramāṇānāṁ Sh gadaṁ ce taramāṇānāṁ
b R puṁgavo Sh aṅgada
c Sh gacchanti d R Sh netre

221 Ja V 222 = A II 75

evāṁ eva manuṣyesu
yo hoti śreṣṭhasaṃmato

I

sa ce adhaṛmaṇaṁ carati
prāg eva itarā prajā

II

c R sace vadham saṃcarati

222 Ja V 222 = A II 76

gavāṁ ce taramāṇānāṁ
ujjum gacchati puṁgavo

I

sabbā tā ujjum gacchanti
nette ujjugate sati

II 12 B v

a R gavāmceta ramāṇānāṁ Sh gadāṁ ce taramāṇānāṁ
b Sh ujjum R puṁgavo
c Sh ujjum gacchanti d R Sh netre Sh ujjugate

223 Ja V 222 = A II 76

evāṁ eva manuṣyesu
yo hoti śreṣṭhasaṃmato

I

sa ce va dhaṛmaṇaṁ carati
prāg eva itarā prajā

II

c R sace vadham saṃcarati Sh dhammaṁ

224 Dhp 169 Uv 30:5 GDhp 328

dhaṛmaṇaṁ care sucaritaṁ
da naṁ duccaritaṁ care

I

dhammacāri sukaḥ śeti
assāṁ loke paramhi ca

II 12 B vi

a R Sh dhammaṁ d R Sh asmiṁ

225 dhaṛmaṇaṁ care sucaritaṁ
brahmaṇāri sukaḥ śeti

I

na naṁ duccaritaṁ care
assāṁ loke paramhi ca

II

a R Sh dhammaṁ c Sh brahmaṇāri
d R Sh asmiṁ

226 Dhp 364 Uv 32:8 Mvu III 422 GDhp 64

dhaṛmaṇaṁ dhaṛmaṇaṁ

I

dhaṛmaṇaṁ anuvicintayaṁ

II 12 B vii

dhaṛmaṇaṁ dhaṛmaṇaṁ
dhammaṁ anussaraṁ bhikkhu dhammaṁ na parihāyatī

b R dhammaṁ Sh dhammaṁ
c R anusmaraṁ Sh bhikkhu

227  Th 303  Uv 30:7  Mvu II 80-81

228  Th 304  Uv 30:7  Mvu II 81

dhammo have rakkhati dhammacārī
dhammo sucinno sukhāya dahiṭī 1
esānaśaṁso dhamme sucinne
na doggatiṁ gacchati dhammacārī 1

a R -cārināṁ b Sh sucinno
d Sh daggatiṁ

229  Dhp 155  Uv 17:3  d GDhp 139d

230  Dhp 156  Uv 17:4  cf GDhp 139B

acarittā brahmaċaraṁ aladdhā yovvane dhanaṁ
śenti cāpādhikinno vā porāṇāṁ aṣnutanaṁ 1

b R Sh yobbane c R Sh -koṁcā Sh jhāyanyti
d Sh kṣīnacche

231  Dhp 91  Uv 17:1

ujujjanti satimanto na nikete ramaṁti te
haṁsā va pallaraṁ hettā okam okaṁ jahānti te

a Sh ujjajjanti d Sh jahanti

232  Dhp 175  Uv 17:2

haṁsā va ādīccapathe vehāyasaṁ yānti iddhiṁ
niyāṁti dhīrā lokamhi mārasenaṁ pramaddiya

a Sh niyāṁti ... lokamhiṁ
d Sh pramaddhiya

233  Dhp 146  Uv 1:4  Mvu III 376  GDhp 143

kin nu hāśo kim ānando niccaṁ prajjalite sati
andhakāramhi prakkhittā pradīpaṁ na gavesatha

a R Sh hāśo
234  Dhp 315  Uv 5:16, 17  d-f GDhp 131

praccarnitam na nagaran

vakam santarabhiharam

eva rakkhatha attana

khanitthi hi socanti

13 A vi

d R upacagga  e Sh khanitthi hi socanti

235  Dhp 264  Uv 11:13  GDhp 188

na mundabhav samano

avrato alikam bhanato

icchalobhasamapano

samo ni kini bhaviyati

a R mundabhavo  b R abrato Sh abbato

236  Dhp 265  Uv 11:14  GDhp 189

yo tu sameti papani

anuttulani sabba so

saman eva papanam

samo ni pravacati

13 A vii

237  Dhp 339  Uv 31:29

yassa chattrisati so

manaphassamayabhrisha

vahi vahanti dudrisi

samkappaggrdhanisita

a R chattrisatin

b Sh dudristin

d Sh krodhanisita

238  Dhp 221 (= S I 25)  Uv 20:1  GDhp 274

krodham jahe viprajaje ma nan

samyojana sabam atikrameya

tan namarupamhi asaajamana

13 B i

239  Dhp 184  Uv 26:2  PratM Endstr. 1  PratM Endstr. 1

Khanti

240  Dhp 225  Uv 7:7

ahiinsakay munayo

ticcam kayena samvrit

te yaanti accuta thhana

yattha gant na socati

13 B iii

b Sh samvuta  c R thhana

241  Dhp 300  Uv 15:17  GDhp 104

suprabuddham prabujhanti

yesam diva c ratto ca

ahiinsaya rato mano

13 B i

b R -savgka  c R ratto Sh ratto
suprabuddhaṁ prajīvhaṁ sadā gotamasāvakā 13 B iv
yesāṁ divā ca rātaṁ ca bhāvanāya rato mano 13 B v

c R Sh rātre

suprabuddhaṁ prajīvhaṁ sadā gotamasāvakā 1
yesāṁ divā ca rātaṁ ca niccam kāyagatā satī 13 B v

c R rātre Sh rātre

ye jhānaprasūta dhīrā nekkhaṁmo Śapāme rataṁ 1
devā pi tesaṁ prihayanti samuddhānāṁ satīmatāṁ 1

aranne yadi vā ggrāme

yaṭṭha arahanto viharanṭi taṁ bhoṇaṁ rāmaṇiyakaṁ 13 B vi

a Sh grāme
c Sh viharanti
d R ramaṇiyakaṁ

ekaṁ pi ce prāṇam aduṣṭacitto
mettaṁ kuśāli tena hoti 1
sabbe ca prāṇe manasā śṅukampi
prabhūtāṁ aiyro prakaroti puṁsaṁ 13 B vii

247    A IV 151 (= It 21) GDhp 196-7

ye sattasaṅgāṁ paṭhaviṁ vijetā
rājariśayo yajamāṇaṁ śṅupariyagu 1
āśāmedhaṁ puruṣamedhaṁ saṁmaprasaṁ
vāyupyaṁ nirāggaṁ 1
mettassa cittassa subhāvitassa
kalāṁ pi te nānubhavanti śoḍaṁīṁ 1
candaprabhāṁ tārāganā va sabbe 14 A i

c = R 247a-d, 248a-c
a R paṁviṁ (= paṭhaviṁ) Sh sattasaṅgāṁ
b R -pariyagu (?) Sh -pariyasu (?)
c Sh maṇṣaṁaṁ (?) Sh nirāggaṁ

e R mettrassa Sh prabhāvitassa
g R Sh candra- Sh maddhe

248    Uv 31:42 ab Ja II 61 GDhp 199 cd A IV 151 It 22

 yo Śha mettena cittena sabbe prāne nukampati 1
mettena se sabbabhūtesu veram tassa na kenaci 13 B vii

= R 249
a R mettreṇa Sh metreṇa
b R prāne 'nukāmpati Sh prāṇesu kampati
c R mettr’āṃse Sh mettram me sabbabhūtesu

249    yassa sabbe ahorātte

ahiṁsāya rato mano 14 A ii
mettaṃ se sabbabhūtesu 
veraṃ tassa na kenaci  ||

= R 250
a R Sh -rātre
b R mettraṃ se Sh mettraṃ me sabbabhūtesu

d C 250
yassa sabbe ahorātte 
bhāvanāya rato mano  ||
mettraṃ se sabbabhūtesu 
veraṃ tassa na kenaci  ||

= R 251
a R -rātraṃ Sh -rātre
b R mettraṃ se Sh mettraṃ me
c Sh tessa
d Sh 251
yassa sabbe ahorātte 
niccaṃ kāyagatā sati  : 14 A iii
mettraṃ se sabbabhūtesu veraṃ tassa na kenaci  ||

= R 252
a R -rātraṃ Sh -rātre
b R mettraṃ se Sh mettraṃ me

c C 252
yo na hanti na ghāteti 
na jināti na jāpaye  : 14 A iv
mettraṃ se sabbabhūtesu veraṃ tassa na kenaci  ||

= R 253
a R Sh bata
b R jāyaye Sh jñāpaye (?)
c R mettraṃ se Sh mettraṃ me

d C 255
susukhaṃ vata jīvāmo
verinesu averinio  ||
veriṇesu manaṃyesu
viharāma averinio  : 14 A vi

= R 256
a R Sh bata
d Sh averino

d C 256
susukhaṃ vata jīvāmo
ussukesu anussukā  : 14 A vi
ussukesu manaṃyesu
viharāma anussukā  ||

= R 257
a R Sh bata
257  GDhp 168  ab  Dhp 200  Uv 30:44  cf also  Utt 9:14ab

susukham vata jivamo  yesaṁ no nāsti kiṁcanaṁ  l
sakīcane su manuṣyesu  viharāma akiṁcanaṁ  ll  14 A vii

= R 258
a  R  Sh  bata  c  Sh  sakīcane su

258  Dhp 170  Uv 27:15

yathā buddhakāṁ paśse  yathā paśse maricikaṁ  l
evaṁ lokāṁ aveccchānaṁ  maccurajā na paśsati  ll

= R 259
a  Sh  buddhakām  c  Sh  lokom avekkhānaṁ

259  Dhp 148  Uv 1:34  GDhp 142

parijinnam idaṁ rūpaṁ  rogaṇīdaṁ prabhāmpuraṁ  l
bhijjihiti<ti> pūtisamdeho  maraṇāttaṁ hi jivitaṁ  ll  14 B i

= R 260
a  Sh  bhijjihiti  ti  Sh  bhijjihiti  ti has been repeated by mistake in the MS.
c  R  maraṇānttaṁ
d  R  maraṇānttaṁ

260  Th 73  Ja I 139  Uv 1:27

jihmaṁ ca dṛṣṭā dukhitaṁ ca vyādhitam
pretaṁ ca dṛṣṭā na cirassa mānavo  l
saṁvego tippe (?) vipulo (?) ajāyatha
acchechi dhīro gṛhbandhanāni  ll

= R 264

261  Dhp 85  Uv 29:33

appakā te manuṣyesu  ye janā pāragāmino  l
athāyam itarā pra jā  tiram evānu dhāvati  ll

= R 262
a  R  -dahati
d  R  -dhavati

262  Dhp 86  Uv 29:34

ye ca kho sarṣmadākkhāte  dhamme dharamānuvattino  l
te janā pāram ehiṁti  maccudheyaṁ suduttaram  ll  14 B iii

= R 263
a  R  -ākkhyāte  b  R  -vattino
d  R  suduttaraṁ

263  Dhp 87  Uv 16:14a-d

kihe dhamme viprahāya  sukṛre bhāvetha pāṇidita  l
okā anokam āgaṇma  viveko yatthā dūramañ  ll

= R 264
b R šukro Sh šukle d Sh dūragañ

264 Dhp 88 ab Uv 16:14ef
tatthābhārātīṃ esānā hettā kāme akimcanā 14 B iv
payirodamaṃśe āttānaṃ cittaṃ kileśhi sabbasā 11

= R 265
a R esāno
d R citta-kileśhiṃ Sh cittaṃ kileśe hi

265 Dhp 89 Uv 31:39
yassa saṃbodhiṃgaṃhi samaṃ cittaṃ subhāvitaṃ 1
āttānaṃpaṭinissage anupādāya ye ratā 14 B v
khīñasāvā jutimanto te loke parinī(v)ṛtā 11

= R 266
b Sh āttānaṃpaṭhi vimmagge
c R parinīvṛtā Sh parinibbutā The MS is unclear, but appears more like -nīvṛtā than -nīvṛtā.

266 Dhp 292 Uv 4:19a-d GDhp 339a-d
yadhi kiccaṃ tad apaviddham ṭi kiccaṃ puna kirati 1
unaddhānāṃ pramattānāṃ tesam vaddhanīṃ āsavā 14 B vi

= R 267
a R yadhi Sh yaddhi The scribe does not appear to use a virāma. cf 346.
c R unnattā(?)nāṃ Sh unnaḷānāṃ The MS is unclear; we might possibly read unnaḷānāṃ.
d Sh vaddhanīṃ

267 Dhp 293 Uv 4:20 ab,ef GDhp 340
yesaṃ ca susamāraḍdhā niccaṃ kāyaṇagā sati 1
akiccaṃ te na sevanti kicce sātacca-kāriṇo 1
satānāṃ samprajāṇānāṃ tesam khiyaṇti āsavā 11

= R 268
f R khiyaṇti Sh khiyaṇti

268 Dhp 253 Uv 27:2 cd Uv 4:19ef GDhp 339ef
paravajjānaṇupasāṣṭānāṃ niccaṃ ojhyaya samāṇīṇā 14 B vii
āsavā tesam vaddhanīṃārā te āsavākkhayā 11

= R 269
b Sh ujjhāya saṃāṇīṇāṃ

269 Dhp 226 Uv 15:8
jāgarikāṃ anuyuttānāṃ ahaṇattānuṣikkiṇāṃ 1
nibbāṇe adhimuttānāṃ atthaṃ gacchaṃti āsavā 15 A i

= R 270
b R Sh -rātra-
c R adhimuttānāṃ Sh nibbāṇesu vimuttānāṃ

270 Dhp 93 Uv 29:31
yesā āsavā parikkhāāhāhā aḥāre ca anissitā 1
suṃñatā animitto ca vimogho yesa gocaro 1
ākāse va sakuntānaṃ padaṃ tesam durannayaṃ 1

= R 271
f R "duraḥ"
271 Dhp 271 Uv 32:31 Mvu III 422 GDhp 65

na hi śilavrateneva bāhussoccena vā puna \ 15 A ii
atha vā samādhiābhena vivittāsayanena vā \

= R 272

b Sh bahu śocyena

272 Dhp 272 Uv 32:32 Mvu III 422 GDhp 66

phusāma nekkhammasukham aprthujanasevitam \ bhikkhu vi<ssa>sāsamanāpādi aprāpyāsavakhayaṃ \%

= R 273

a Sh nekkhamma- b Sh aprthakjana-
d R aprabbasava- Sh aprāpy āsava-

273 Uv 4:13 GDhp 133

nāyaṃ pramajjitum kālo ṣprāpyāsavakhayaṃ \ 15 A iii
pramatattām dukham anneti sīhaṃ vā mṛgamātikā \%

= R 274

a Sh pramajjitaṃ c R dukkham
d R -mātrikā

274 Dhp 126 cf Mvu II 424

gabbham eke okraṃmanti nirayaṃ pāpakaṃmuṇo \%
Vācā

278  Dhp 281  Uv 7:12  PrātiMū Endstr. 10

vācānurakkhi manasā susaṃvṛto
kāyena yo akuśalaṁ na sevati
ete tt(r)ayo kaṁmapathe viśodhiya
prāppoja so sāntipadaṁ anuttaraṁ

= R 279

c  R  Sh  trayo
d  Sh  prāppoja sāntipadaṁ

279  Dhp 231  Uv 7:1

kāyapradoṣaṁ rakkhaya
kāyena saṃvṛto siyā
kāyaduccaritaṁ hettā
kāyena sācaritaṁ care

= R 280

280  Dhp 232  Uv 7:2

vācāpradoṣaṁ rakkhaya
vācāya saṃvṛto siyā
vācāya sācaritaṁ care

= R 281

a  Sh  pradoṣam
b  R  samvṛto

281  Dhp 233  Uv 7:3

manapradoṣaṁ rakkhaya
manasā saṃvṛto siyā
manoduccaritaṁ hettā
manasā sācaritaṁ care

= R 282

282  Dhp 234  Uv 7:10  GDhp 51

kāyena saṃvṛta dhīrā
vācāya utta cetasā
sabbattha saṃvṛta dhīrā
teva ve suparisaṃvṛtā
teva ve suparisaṃvṛtā

= R 283
a  R  sāmvrta

283  Dhp 227  GDhp 237  c-f  Uv 29:45

porāṇam etaṁ ādhora
nindanti tohiniṁ āśinaṁ
bahubhāṇikaṁ pi nindanti
nāsti loke anindito

= R 284

b  R  āmhu (?) na-r-iva  Sh  agganāriva
d  Sh  nāstl

284  Dhp 228  Uv 29:46  GDhp 240

na cābhuh na ca bhaviṣyati
ekāntanindito poṣa
na cetarahi vijjati
ekāntaṁ vā praśaṁsitō

= R 285

a  Sh  na cābhuh
b  R  samvṛto

= R 286

286  Dhp 229  Uv 29:47  GDhp 241

na bhuṁ na bhuṁ bhaviṣyati
ekaṁkaraṇa dhṛṣṭalokaṁ
ekaṁkaraṇa dhṛṣṭalokaṁ

= R 287

a  Sh  na bhuṁ
285  
yañ ca bālā adhaṃmaṭṭhaṃ  
   pūjeyu garaheye vā  
   avinīñu avibhāvāya  
   na taṃ atthaṭa kāyaṭi  

   = R 286
   a R adhaṃmaṭṭhā  
   b R pūtemu garahe yuvā  Sh pūjyesu garahese vā  
   c R avinīñu Sh avinīñu  d R kāya ti (ci(?))

286  
Dhp 229  GDhp 241  cf  Uv 29:47-8

yanṭ ca viṇṇu praśaṃsantī  anuvicca suve suve  
acchidravattīḥ medhāvīm  praṃñāśīlasamāhitaṁ  

   = R 287
   a R Sh viṇṇu  d Sh praṇīṇā-

287  
Dhp 230  GDhp 242

nikkhasa jāmbuṇadasseva  ko taṃ ninditum arihati  
deva pi naṃ praśaṃsantī  brahmunṇa pi praśaṃsito  

   = R 288
   a Sh jāmbuṇadasseva  b Sh ko ttaṃ ninditum  
   c Sh praśaṃsantī

288  
Dhp 262  Uv 29:10  GDhp 186

na vākkakaraṇamātt(r)eṇa  vannapukkhalatāya vā  
sādhurūpi naro hoti  issukī maccharī sātho  

   = R 289
   a R -mātreṇa Sh vākkakaraṇamātreṇa  

b  Sh -pukkharatāya

289  
Dhp 261, 263  Uv 10:7  GDhp 185, 187

yanhi saccaṃ ca dhammo ca  viraṭi saṃṣyamo damo  
sa vāntadoṣo medhāvī  sādhurūpī ti vuaccti  

   = R 290

290  
Dhp 19  Uv 4:22  GDhp 190

bahuṇi pi ce sahitam bhāṣamāno  
na takkarō hoti naro pramatto  
gopo va gāvo gaṇayaṃ paresaṃ  
na bhāgava śāmaṇṇassa hoti  

   = R 291
   d R śāmaṇṇassa

291  
Dhp 20  a-c, f  Uv 4:23  ab, ef GDhp 191

appaṃ pi ce sahitam bhāṣamāno  
dhammassa hoti anudhammacārī  
rāgaṃ ca doṣaṃ ca prahāya mohaṃ  
vimuttacitto akhilo acaṃcho  
anupādīyāno iha vā hure vā  
sa bhāgava śāmaṇṇassa hoti  

   = R 292
   d R acaṃho fn: ‘Or: acaṃcho’
   f Sh śāmaṇṇassa
292  Dhp 224  Uv 20:16  GDhp 281

saccam bhaṇe na k(r)ujjheya ā
deyā appā pi yācito
ethehi tihi tāñhehi
gacche devāna santike

= R 293

a R kujjheya  Sh krujheyā (omits na)
c R trihi  Sh trihī

293  Dhp 177  Uv 10:2

na ve kadāryya devalokāṃ vrajanti
bālā hi bhe (te) na praśāṃsanti dānam
dhīro tu dānam anumodamāno
teneva so devalokāṃ pareti

= R 294

a R kadāryya  Sh kadāppi  
b R hi bhe  Sh hi te

294  Dhp 217  Uv 5:24  GDhp 322

śilavantaṃ sūciṃ dacchaṃ
dhammaṭṭhaṃ saccavādinam
ättano kārakaṃ ānantum
tam jano kūrute priyaṃ

= R 295

a Sh śilavnataṃ  
c R santam

295  Dhp 308  Uv 9:2  GDhp 331

śreyo ayogudā bhuttā
tattā aggiṣikhopamā
yaṃ ca bhūnjeya duśsilō
raṣṭapiṇḍaṃ asaṃyyato

= R 296

a Sh ayoguta  
d R raṣṭrapīṇḍam  Sh

296  Dhp 311  Uv 11:4  GDhp 215

kuśo yathā duggṛhito
hastam evānukaṃtati
śāmannaṃ dupparāmāṭṭhaṃ
nirayāya upakaṭṭati

= R 297

d R Sh upakaḍḍhati

297  Dhp 176  Uv 9:1

ekadhaṃmam atītassā
muśāvadissa jaṃtuno
vitinnaparalokassā
nāsti pāpam akāriyaṁ

= R 298

d Sh nāsti

298  Ja III 103  Nett 132

na hi śastaṃ suṇītām
viṣaṃ hālāhālam tathā
evam khipraṃ atipāteti
vācā dubhāsita yathā

= R 299

a R sastraṃ  Sh muninītaṃ (?)
b R tam viṣaṃ  
d Sh dubbhāsita

299  Sn 657  Uv 8:2

puruṣassā jāyamānassā
kuṭhāri jāyate mukhe
yāya chindati āttanām
vācaṃ dubbhāṣitam bhaṇanām

= R 300

a Sn puruṣa  
b Sn jāyamān  
c Sn kūṭhārī  
d Sn mukhe  
e Sn viṣā  

299  Sn 657  Uv 8:2

puruṣassā jāyamānassā
kuṭhāri jāyate mukhe
yāya chindati āttanām
vācaṃ dubbhāṣitam bhaṇanām

= R 300

a Sn puruṣa  
b Sn jāyamān  
c Sn kūṭhārī  
d Sn mukhe  
e Sn viṣā  

299  Sn 657  Uv 8:2
yo hi nindiye praśāṣati
uttavā nindati yo praśāṣiye
vicināti mukhena so kāniṁ
kalinā tena sukhaṁ na vindati

= R 301
a Sh nindiye d Sh sukham

appāmātto ayāṁ kāli
yo akkhehi dhanaṁ parājaye
sabbassam pi sahāpi āttanā
ayam eva mahat(t)aro kāli
yo sugatesu manaṁ pradūṣaye

= R 302, 303a; = Sh 301, 302a
a R -mātro Sh kalīyo b R shanaṁ Sh begins akkhe hi
c R saddhammaṁ pi sa hāyi (?) āttanā Sh sabhassam pi mahāpi āttanā
d R Sh mahattaro

śaṁ sahasrāṇi nirabbudāṇaṁ
chattrisatiṁ paṇča ca abbudāni
yāṁ ayiragarahi nirayāṁ upeti
vācaṁ manaṁ ca praṇidhāya pāpikāṁ

= R 306
b R Sh pāpikāṁ d R Sh viṣabhī

vācaṁ bhāṣeya kallāṇiṁ
jātāṁ krodhaṁ nivāreya
so biṣabhī nirujhathi

= R 305
a Sh I 44 c Uv 20:2
b R Sh pāpikāṁ
d R Sh viṣabhī

= R 304

kallāṇiṁ eva seveya
mokkho kallāṇiye śreyo
muttā tapati pāpikāṁ

= R 303
b Sh chattisatiṁ R arbbudāni
c R nirayam

= R 303b-e; = Sh 302b-e

kallāṇiṁ eva bhāṣeyā
nā ṣṣa mucceya pāpikā
mokkho kallāṇiye śreyo
muttā tapati pāpikāṁ

= R 300
a R puruṣasya
áttanā ye avicecheya
katāni akatāni ca

310
na paresaṁ vilomāni
áttanā ye avicecheya
samāni vișamāni ca

311 SI 72 Uv 5:13
áttanām ce priyaṁ ānāyā
erakkheya naṁ surakkhatam
na etam sulabham hoti
sukham dukkatakārīnāṁ

312 Dhp 157 Uv 5:15
áttanām ce priyaṁ ānāyā
erakkheya naṁ surakkhatam
tīṇaṁ añiṭaraṁ yāmānaṁ
patijāggeyam paṇḍito

313 Dhp 305 Uv 23:2 GDhp 259
ekāsanaṁ ekāsayaṁ
ekacariyāṁ atandrito
ekorayam attanaṁ
vanānte ramīta siyā ||

= R 314

c Sh damayam

314
yo sasanaṁ arahatāṁ
ayirāṇāṁ dhammadvināṁ
paṭikroṣati dummedho
dṛṣṭiṁ niśśāya pāpikāṁ
karoṣi so tathāttānaṁ
yathā naṁ biṣam icchatī || 17 A iii

= R 315
a R śasanaṁ
c R paṭikroṣati
d R dṛṣṭiṁ Sh niśśāya fn: ‘MS niśśiya’
f R viṣam Sh visam

315 Dhp 164 Uv 8:7 GDhp 258

yo sasanaṁ arahatāṁ
ayirāṇāṁ dhammadvināṁ
paṭikroṣati dummedho
dṛṣṭiṁ niśśāya pāpikāṁ
phalāni kaṇṭakasseva
āttaghannāya phallati || 17 A iv

= R 316
a R śasanaṁ
b Sh ayirāṇāṁ
d R niśśāya Sh niśśāya

316 cf Uv 23:6

āttanāṁ eva paṭhamanāṁ
atthe dhamme niveśaye
athāṁñāṁ anuśāseyā
evaṁ hohi yathā ahaṁ ||

= R 317
a Sh hi te

320 Dhp 105 Uv 23:5

neva devā na gandhabbā
titaṁ apajitaṁ kayīrā
tattharūpassa jantuno || 17 A vii
321  Dhp 160  Uv 23:11
ättā hi ātano nātho  ko hi nātho paro siyā  I
ättanā hi sucinnena  nāthaṁ labhati dullabhāṁ  II

= R 322

322  Dhp 380  Uv 19:14
ättā hi ātano nātho  āttā hi āttano gati  I  17 B i
tassā samyamayā nyātanaṁ  aśsaṁ bhadram va vānijo  II

= R 323
b  R  satī  c  Sh  tasmā

323  ab  Uv 19:13ab
ättānam eva damaye  aśśasugatiyā sadā  I
daṅma śaṁma ujjum hoḥ(hotī) tato akuṭilo bhava  II
tato dānto sukhi hoḥ(hotī)  anupādāya nivṛto  I  17 B ii

= R 324, 325ab
c  R  hoti  Sh  ujjāṁ hoti

324  Dhp 379
ättanā codayā śītanaṁ  parīmaśāttanam āttanā  I
so āttagutto satimā  sukhāṁ bhikkhū vihāhisi  I

= R 325cd, 326ab

325  Dhp 166  Uv 23:10  GDhp 265
ättadāṭṭham paraṁ paśchā ṭena  bahunā pi na hāpaye  I
ättadāṭṭham paraṁ ūśāṁ  sadāthaparamo siyā  II  17 B iii

= R 326c-f
a  Sh  attadāṭṭham  c  Sh  ūśāṁ

326  Dhp 84  GDhp 324
nevāttaheto na parassa heto
na saggam icche na dhanāṁ na rāṣṭraṁ  I
 necche adhammema samṛddhiṁ āttano
so śilvā praṃṇavā dhāṃmiko siyā  II  17 B iv

= R 327
b  R  saggam ... rāṣṭraṁ
c  R  neccha  d  Sh  praṇṇa vā

= R 327

327  Dhp 249  Uv 10:12
dadanti ve yathāśraddhaṁ  yathāprasadaṇṇaṁ janā  I
tattha yo duṇṭhamano hoti  pāreṇaṁ pānabhojane  I
na so divā ca rāṭṭo ca  samādhiṁ adhiγacetati  II  17 B v

= R 328
e  R  Sh  rātro
328 Dhp 250 Uv 10:13

yassa cetaṃ samucchinnaṃ mūlo ṣgghaccaṃ samūhataṃ  I
sa ve diva ca rātto ca samādhim adhigacchati  II

= R 329
b Sh mūlo gar[ghajccaṃ  c R Sh rātro

329 a-d Dhp 143, 144ab Uv 19:1,2 ef Sn 330cd Uv 22:19cd

aśīśa va bhadro kāṣya puṭṭho 17 B vi
ātāpiṃo saviṃgaṇo ca ānīṣo  
śraddhāya śilenā ca viriṃya ca
samādhinā dhammaviṃpaśanāya ca  
te khāntisoracchasamādhiṃsaṃhītā
sutussa praṃṇāya ca sāram ajhagū  II

= R 330
b R ātāpi yo sa viṃgaṇo  Sh ātāpiyo saviṃgaṇo ca bāno
 c R śilenā ca viriṃya ca  Sh śraddāya
d Sh dhammaviṃpaśanāya
e R -sāraccha- Sh khāntim āraddha samādhiṃsaṃhītā
f Sh śubhassa praṃṇāya

330 Uv 10:9 cd GDhp 260

yo driṣṭe dhaṃme labhati śraddhāṃ praṃṇāṃ anuttarāṃ  I
sa ve mahaddhano loke mōham arṇīṃam bāhum dhanam  II

= R 331
a R yo tha (?) driṣṭe Sh yoṭha driṣṭa-dharmme tha is almost certainly a mistake, ie something crossed out.

331 Dhp 303 Uv 10:8 GDhp 323

śraddho śilena sampanno yaśabhogasamāhito 1 18 A i
yam yaṃ so bhajate desāṃ tattha tattheva pūjiyo  II

= R 332
a Sh śilana

332 S I 25

śraddhabitiyaṃ puruṣaṃ carantaṃ  na naṃ labheyā aśraddho va cāro  I
yaśo ca kitti ca tato nam eti  
saggarṇ ca gacche sārīraṃ prahāya  II 18 A ii

= R 333
a R Sh śraddhavitiyaṃ  c R nameti Sh rameti

333 Dhp 97 Uv 29:23

aśraddha akataṃṇī ca saṃdhiccheda ca yo naro  I
hatāvakaśo vāntāso sa ve uttima porte  II

= R 334
a Sh akataṇṇī

334 Dhp 182 GDhp 263

kiccho buddhāna uppādo kicchā dhammassa deṣanā  I
kiccho śraddhāpatilābho
cicchaṁ mācchāna jīvaṁ || 18 A iii

= R 335
a R uppa
c R -patilābho Sh śuddhāpatilābho

335 Dhp 38 Uv 31:28

anavaṭṭhitacittassā
dharmam avijāṇato ||
pariplavaprasādassā
praññā na paripūrati ||

= R 336
b R saddhammam Sh -avijānto
d Sh praññā
d Sh praññā

336 Uv 31:25

nāprasannacittena
duṣṭena kupitena vā ||
śakkaṁ ājñitum dhammo
sāraṁbhahabulena vā || 18 A iv

= R 337
d Sh sārambhaha-

337 Uv 31:26

yo tu viniya sāraṁbhaṁ
aprasādaṁ ca cetaso ||
prasannacitto sumano
sa ve nyāyāya subhāṣitaṁ ||

= R 338
b Sh apramādaṁ cf Uv; aprasādaṁ refers back to aprasanna- of 336.
Citta

342 Dhp 33 Uv 31:8 GDhp 136

phandanaṃ capalaṃ cittaṃ
uijau karoti medhāvi
uṣukāro va tejanā  18 B i

= R 343
a Sh capalam
c Sh ujaṣā

343 Dhp 34 Uv 31:2 GDhp 137B

vārijo va thale khitto
okamokātu ubbhatu  1
pariphandatimaṃ cittaṃ
māradheyaṃ prahātaye  1

= R 344
b R Sh okamokāta

344 Dhp 37 [Uv 31:8A] a GDhp 137A

dūraṇgamaṇaṃ ekacaraṇaṃ
aśariraṃ guhāsayaṇaṃ  1
ye cittaṃ saṃyayamehinti
mokkhaṇṭe mārabaṇḍhanā  1

= R 345
d R Sh -bandhanā

345 Dhp 35 Uv 31:1

dunniggrahassa laghuno
yatthakāmanipātino  1  18 B ii

346 Dhp 36

sudddaṇḍaṃ sunipunam
yatthakāmaninipātinaṃ  1
cittaṃ rakkheya medhāvi
tad>a>hi guṭṭhaṃ sukhavaham  1

= R 347
a R sunipunam
d R tad ahi Sh tadā hi cf 266.

347 Dhp 39 Uv 28:6 a GDhp 137D

anapāṣrayamāṇaṃ
anāpanāhatacetas  1  18 B iii
hettā kallāṇapāpāni
nāsti jāgarato bhayaṃ  1

= R 348
a R anayāṣraya-
b Sh anānāhata-

348 Dhp 79 Uv 30:13 GDhp 224

dhammapritirasam pātta
viprasannena cetasā  1
ayirapravedite dhamme
sadā ramati paṇḍito  1  18 B iv

= R 349
a R dhammapritir asaṃyāttā

349 Dhp 41 Uv 1:35 GDhp 153

acirā vata ayaṇā kāyo
pāṭhaviṃ abhiśehiti  1
chūḍo apetaviṃśayāṇo nirātthāṁ vā kaṭṭaṅgaraṇi

= R 350

c R chūḍho apetaviṃśayāṇo Sh chudho apeta viñyāṇo The reading is uncertain, but the second aksara is not like th or dh. It seems closest to d, perhaps written in mistake for dh, cf 392: ḍṛdhaṃ.

350 Dhp 40 Uv 31:35

kumbhopamāṇ kāyām imaṁ viditā 18 B v
nagaropamāṇaṁ cittam adhiṣṭhīhitā 1
yodheya māraṁ praṃśāyudhena
jitaṁ ca rakkhe aniveśano siyā 11

= R 351
a R kumbho- c Sh praṃśā-

351 Dhp 13 Uv 31:11 GDhp 219

yathā agāraṁ ducchannam vaṭṭhi samitivijjhati l 18 B vi
evaṁ abhāvitaṁ cittam rāgo samitivijjhati 11

= R 352

352 Dhp 14 Uv 31:17 GDhp 220

yathā agāraṁ succhannam vaṭṭhi na samitivijjhati 1
evaṁ subhāvitaṁ cittam rāgo na samitivijjhati 11

= R 353

353 Uv 31:12

yathā agāraṁ ducchannam vaṭṭhi samitivijjhati l 18 B vi
evaṁ abhāvitaṁ cittam doṣo samitivijjhati 11

= R 354
d Sh samitivijjhati

354 Uv 31:18

yathā agāraṁ succhannam vaṭṭhi na samitivijjhati 1
evaṁ subhāvitaṁ cittam doṣo na samitivijjhati 11

= R 355

355 Uv 31:13

yathā agāraṁ ducchannam vaṭṭhi samitivijjhati 1 19 A i
evaṁ abhāvitaṁ cittam moho samitivijjhati 11

= R 356
b Sh samitijjhati

356 Uv 31:19

yathā agāraṁ succhannam vaṭṭhi na samitivijjhati 1
evaṁ subhāvitaṁ cittam moho na samitivijjhati 11

= R 357

357 Dhp 183 Uv 28:1 Mvu III 420 PrätMū Endstr. 8 PrätMā Endstr. 4 PrätSa Endstr. 13 Bhi Vin §§ 69, 99
sabbāpāpasa akaraṇaṃ 
kuśalassa apasaṃpadā । 19 A ii
sacittapayirodamanaṃ 
etāṃ buddhāna sāsanaṃ ॥

= R 358
b Sh upasampadā fn: ‘MS apasampadā’ The end of the line is unclear in the MS. It is possible that it reads kuśalassu.
c R omits sa-
cittavarggaḥ

Māgga

358  Dhp 273  Uv 12:4  GDhp 109
māggānaṣṭaṃgiko śreṣṭho 
saccānaṃ catturo padā ।
virāgo śreṣṭho dhammānaṃ 
dupadānaṃ ca cakkhumā ॥ 19 A iii

= R 359
b Sh saccānaṃ catturo c R dhammānaṃ

359  Dhp 275cd, 276 a-d Uv 12:9  f Uv 12:11d
ākkhato vo mayā māggo 
amṇāye sallasaṃsano ।
tubbhehi kiccam atappaṃ 
akkhātāro tathāgataḥ ।
paṭipannaṃ pramokkhanti 
jhāyino mārabāṇḍhanā ॥ 19 A iv

= R 360
b R -sramśano Sh aṇṇāye sallauṃsano
c Sh tuṭṭhehi

eseva māggā nāstamśno 
tāṃ māggam paṭipajjhavo 
etāhi tubbbe paṭipannā 
dukkhassa antaṃ kariṣyatha ॥ 19 A v

= R 361
a Sh nāstamśno b Sh viśuddhiye
c Sh paṭipajjamho e Sh tuṭṭhe

361  Dhp 283  Uv 18:3 d GDhp 93d
vanaṃ chindathā mā rukkhe 
chetṭā vanaṇa ca vanadhaṇa ca
vanāto jāyate bhayaṃ ।
nibbanena gamissiṣṭha ॥

= R 362
a Sh rukko b Sh vanato
d Sh nibbanena

362  Dhp 284  Uv 18:4 d GDhp 94d
yāvata vanadho na cchijjati 
apumātto pi narassa nātisu ।
paṭibaddhamano hi tattha so
vaccho cchiravako va mātari ॥

= R 363
a R cchijjati Sh cchijjati b R Sh -mātro Sh narrassa
d Sh cchirapākā va fn: ‘MS pa in the margin’

cucchina sineham āttano
kumudāṃ sāradikāṃ va pāṇinā
śāntimāggam eva byūhaya
nibbāṇam sugatena desitaṃ  19 A vii

= R 364
c  Sh  brūhaya

364  Dhp 286  Uv 1:38  ab  GDhp 333ab
idaṃ vaśā kariyāmi
iti bālo vicinteti

= R 365
a  Sh  vaśā kariyāmi
b  R  Sh  hemanta-  The MS has *hemamgrhamasu*, with *na* below the line.
c  Sh  vicinteti

365  Dhp 287  Uv 1:39  a  GDhp 334a
taṃ puttapasussammatam
vyāsattamanasaṃ naraṃ
suttaṃ ghrāmaṃ mahogho vā
maccu-rādāya gacchati  19 B i

= R 366
a  R  putra- ... sammatam  Sh  putra-
c  Sh  ghrāmaṃ

366  Dhp 288  Uv 1:40  GDhp 261
na santi puttā ttāṇāya
antakenā śdhibhūtassa

= R 367

367
krandatāṃ eva ṇātinaṃ
janā antarahīyaṃti

= R 368
a  Sh  ṇātinaṃ
b  R  c'evāṃ
c  Sh  antarahīyaṃti
d  Sh  jahanti

368  Dhp 289  Uv 6:15
etaṃ vidiya medhāvi
praṇāvā vitamacchari

= R 369
b  Sh  praṇāvā vā
c  Sh  taṃ maggadhāmanam

369
tassā hi paṇḍito poṣo
sampaṭṭaṃ attam attano

= R 370
a  Sh  tasma
b  R  yaṃ paṭṭaṃ  fn:  ‘looks in MS like *sam*’
c  R  saggā-ga[m]naṃ  Sh  taṃ magga[sa]naṃ

= R 371
370  A IV 271
śraddho śīlana saṃpanno prāññavā susamāhito l
niccaṁ māggam viśodheti sacchayanaṁ sāmparāyikaṁ ṭ
d  R 371
b  Sh  praññā vā
c  Sh  māggam

371  śraddho śīlana saṃpanno prāññavā susamāhito l
ramate māggam āsevaṁ aṭṭhaṭṭhapasame rato ṭ
19 B iv

= R 372
b  Sh  praññā vā
d  Sh  aṭṭhaṭṭhapasame

372  cd  Dhp 31 cd  Uv 4:29 cd
śraddho śīlana saṃpanno prāññavāgarato sadā l
samyojanaṁ anūthūlaṁ daham aggī va gacchati ṭ
mānaṁ makkhe va pāpake ṭ
19 B v

= R 373
a  R  saṃpanno
b  R  prāññavā sārato  Sh  praññā
c  R  samyojanaṁ
e  Sh  mānaṁ makkheva

373  Dhp 277  Uv 12:5  GDhp 106
aniccā sabbaśaṅkhāraṁ yato prāññāya paśati ṭ
atha nivvāṇāte dukkhaṁ esa māggo viśuddhiye ṭ

= R 374
b  Sh  praññāya
c  R  nibbīṇḍate fn: ‘MS nibbāṇḍate’  Sh  nibbīṇṇate

d  R  viśuddhiya

374  Dhp 279  Uv 12:8  GDhp 108
sabbadharmā anāttaṁ ti yato prāññāya paśati ṭ
atha nivvāṇāte dukkhaṁ esa māggo viśuddhiye ṭ

= R 375
a  R  -dhammā anāttaṁ  b  Sh  praññāya
c  R  nibbīṇḍate  Sh  nibbīṇṇate

375  Dhp 282  Uv 29:40
yogā hi bhūri saṃbhavati ayaogā bhūrisaṃkhayo ṭ
etam jethāpatham niṭṭṭaṁ bhavāya vibhavāya ca ṭ
tathā śiccheyya medhāvi yathā bhūri pravaddhati ṭ
19 B vī

= R 376
a  R  ti bhūri
c  Sh  jethāyatham ūṇāttaṁ
e  R  tathā-m-iccheyya  Sh  śiccheyya medhāvi
f  R  bhūri

māggavarggaṁ

Sahasra

376  Dhp 100  Mvu III 434  GDhp 306
sahasram api ce vācā anatthapasāhitā ṭ
ekaṁ atthapadaṁ śreyaṁ yaṁ sottu upasāṁmati ṭ
20 A i

= R 377
c R ekam

377 Dhp 102 Uv 24:1, 2 GDhp 309

yo ca gätāśataṁ bhāse anatthagāsadāhitam
ekaṁ dhāmappaṁ dreyo yaṁ sottā upāśāṁmati

= R 378

c R dha[m]ma- Sh dhāma- The scribe has probably omitted an anusvāra.

378 Dhp 103 Uv 23:3 Mvu III 434 GDhp 305 Utt 9:34

yo sahasraṁ sahasrāṁ saṁgrāme maṁuṣe jine
ekaṁ ca paṁṇām āättānaṁ sa ve saṁgrāmamuttamaṇa

= R 379

c Sh paṁṇaṁ d Sh saṁgrāmaṁ

379 Dhp 106 c-f Uv 24:16-c-f Mvu III 435 GDhp 320

māse māse sahasreṇa yo yajeya šatat samā
ekaṁ ca bhāvi<tt>tāttānaṁ muhaftam api pūjaye
sā eva pūjanā śreyo yac cha vaśāśataṁ hutaṁ

= R 380

b R šaṁta

c R bhāvitāttānaṁ fn: ‘MS bhāvītāttānaṁ’ Sh bhāvitāttānaṁ
d Sh vaśāśataṁ

380 Dhp 107 Uv 24:16 Mvu III 435 GDhp 319, 320

yo ca vaśāśataṁ jantū aggniḥ paricare vane
ekaṁ ca bhāvītāttānaṁ muhaftam api pūjaye
sā eva pūjanā śreyo yac cha vaśāśataṁ hutaṁ

= R 381

a Sh jantu

381 Dhp 108 Mvu III 435-6 GDhp 321

yaṁ kimci yaśtaṁ va hutaṁ va loka saṁvatsaraṁ yajate puṁña pekapkhī
sabbaṁ pi taṁ na catubbhagam eti abhivādanā ujjugatesu śreyo

= R 382

b Sh puṁña-

382 Uv 24:21 Mvu III 434 GDhp 310 ab Dhp 106ab

māse māse sahasreṇa yo yajeya šataṁ samā
da taṁ buddhe prasādassë kalāṁ agghiḥ śoḍaṃśīṁ

= R 383

b R Sh yaccheva Sh sataṁ
d Sh aṣyaṭi

383 Uv 24:22 Mvu III 435 GDhp 311 ab Dhp 106ab

māse māse sahasreṇa yo yajeya šataṁ samā
da taṁ dhamme prasādassë kalāṁ agghiḥ śoḍaṃśīṁ
384  Uv 24:23  Mv III 435  GDhp 312  ab  Dhp 106ab
māse māse sahasreṇa  yo yajeya satam samā  l  20 A vi
na taṁ saṁgha prasādassa  kalām agghati ṣoḍaśaṁ  ll

= R 385
d Sh aṣyati

385  Mv III 435  GDhp 313  ab  Dhp 106ab  Uv 24:21-23ab
  cd  Dhp 70cd  Utt 9:44cd
māse māse sahasreṇa  yo yajeya satam samā  l
na taṁ sākhātadhaṁmaṁāṁ  kalām agghati ṣoḍaśaṁ  ll

= R 386
a Sh sahasraṇa  d Sh aṣyati

386  Uv 24:17  Mv III 435  ab  Dhp 70ab  Utt 9:44ab
  cd  GDhp 310cd
māse māse kuṣāṅgareṇa  bālo bhuṣṇeṣa bhojanam  l  20 A vii
na taṁ buddha prasādassa  kalām agghati ṣoḍaśaṁ  ll

= R 387
d Sh aṣyati

387  Uv 24:18  Mv III 435  ab  Dhp 70ab  Utt 9:44ab
māse māse kuṣāṅgareṇa  bālo bhuṣṇeṣa bhojanam  l
na taṁ dhamme prasādassa  kalām agghati ṣoḍaśaṁ  ll  20 B i

= R 388
d Sh aṣyati

388  Uv 24:19  Mv III 435  ab  Dhp 70ab  Utt 9:44ab
  cd  GDhp 312cd
māse māse kuṣāṅgareṇa  bālo bhuṣṇeṣa bhojanam  l
na taṁ saṁgha prasādassa  kalām agghati ṣoḍaśaṁ  ll

= R 389
d Sh aṣyati

389  Dhp 70  Mv III 435  Utt 9:44  ab  Uv 24:17-19ab
  cd  GDhp 313cd
māse māse kuṣāṅgareṇa  bālo bhuṣṇeṣa bhojanam  l
na taṁ sākkhātadhaṁmaṁāṁ  kalām agghati ṣoḍaśaṁ  ll  20 B ii

= R 390
d Sh aṣyati

390  Dhp 110  Uv 24:3  Mv III 436
yoc ca vaṣṣaṇeṣaṁ jive  duṣṣilo asamāhito  l
ekāhāṁ jivitaṁ śreya  śīlavantassa jhāyato  ll

= R 391
c R jīvaṁ taṁ śreya  Sh jīvitaṁ

391  Dhp 111  Uv 24:4
yoc ca vaṣṣaṇeṣaṁ jive  dupraṁño asamāhito  l  20 B iii
ekāhaṁ jivitaṁ śreyo
pramāṇavantassa jhāyato

= R 392
b Sh dupramāṇo
d Sh pramāṇa-

392  Dhp 112  Uv 24:5  Mvu III 436  GDhp 316

yo ca vaśśaṣataṁ jive
kusīdo hīnavirīyo
ekāhaṁ jivitaṁ śreyo
viryyam ārabhato drḍhaṁ

= R 393
d Sh viryam  R Sh drḍhaṁ  cf 349

393  Dhp 113  Uv 24:6  Mvu III 436  GDhp 317

yo ca vaśśaṣataṁ jive
apaśṣaṁ udavyayayaṁ
ekāhaṁ jivitaṁ śreyo
paśasato udavyayayaṁ

= R 394

394  Dhp 115  Mvu III 436  GDhp 318

yo ca vaśśaṣataṁ jive
apaśṣaṁ dhammad uttamaṁ
ekā Śaṭṭha jivitaṁ śreyo
paśasato dhammad uttamaṁ

= R 395

395  Dhp 114  Uv 24:15  Mvu III 436

yo ca vaśśaṣataṁ jive
apaśṣaṁ amataṁ padaṁ
ekā Śaṭṭha jivitaṁ śreyo
paśasato amataṁ padaṁ

= R 396

396  yo ca vaśśaṣataṁ jive
saddhāṃme apratiṣṭhito
ekā Śaṭṭha jivitaṁ śreyo
sadhaṃmaṁ iha vijānato

= R 397
a  R vaśa-
c  R jivitaṁ

397  Uv 24:8

yo ca vaśśaṣataṁ jive
aprāya āsavakkhaṇaṁ
ekā Śaṭṭha jivitaṁ śreyo
prāpyato āsavakkhaṇaṁ

= R 398
c  R śreyo

sahasravarggaḥ

[Uraga]

398  Sn 5  Uv 18:21  GDhp 81

yo nā Ṣīḥagamī bhavesu sāraṁ
vicinaṁ puṣpaṁ iva udumbaresu
so bhikkhu jahāti orapāmaṁ
urago jinnam iva ttacāṁ purāṇiṁ

= R 399
c Sh bhikkhū
d R tućāṁ  It is impossible to distinguish tta- from tu-, but a reading of tta- makes the preceding syllable long, as is required.
399
yo uppatitaṁ vineti rāgam
visātaṁ sappaviṣaṁ va oṣadhihi
so bhikkhu jahāti orapāraṁ
urago jinnam iva ttacāṁ purāṇiṁ

= R 400
a Sh rāgam  b Sh sappaviṣaṁ
c Sh bhikkhū  d R tucāṁ

400
yo uppatitaṁ vineti dosaṁ
visātaṁ sappaviṣaṁ va oṣadhihi
so bhikkhu jahāti orapāraṁ
urago jinnam iva ttacāṁ purāṇiṁ

= R 401
a R uppatitam  c R bhikkhū
c Sh bhikkhū  d R tucāṁ

401
yo uppatitaṁ vineti mohaṁ
visātaṁ sappaviṣaṁ va oṣadhihi
so bhikkhu jahāti orapāraṁ
urago jinnam iva ttacāṁ purāṇiṁ

= R 402
a R uppatitam  c Sh bhikkhū
c Sh bhikkhū  d R tucāṁ

402  Sn 1  GDhp 82
yo uppatitaṁ vineti krodhaṁ
visātaṁ sappaviṣaṁ va oṣadhihi
so bhikkhu jahāti orapāraṁ
urago jinnam iva ttacāṁ purāṇiṁ

= R 403
c Sh bhikkhū  d R tucāṁ

403  Uv 32:65
yo uppatitaṁ vineti mānaṁ
visātaṁ sappaviṣaṁ va oṣadhihi
so bhikkhu jahāti orapāraṁ
urago jinnam iva ttacāṁ purāṇiṁ

= R 404
c Sh bhikkhū  d R tucāṁ

404  Sn 2  Uv 18:21A = 32:56  cf. GDhp 83
yo rāgam udicchiyā aśeṣaṁ
bisapuṣpaṁ va sareruhaṁ vigāhya
so bhikkhu jahāti orapāraṁ
urago jinnam iva ttacāṁ purāṇiṁ

= R 405
b Sh vis-
c Sh bhikkhū  d R tucāṁ

405  Uv 18:21B = 32:57
yo dosaṁ udicchiyā aśeṣaṁ
bisapuṣpaṁ va sareruhaṁ vigāhya
so bhikkhu jahāti orapāraṁ
urago jinnam iva ttacāṁ purāṇiṁ

= R 412

c Sh bhikkhū
d R tucāṁ

412 Sn 9 Uv 32:55 GDhp 87

yo nā  śccasāri na precchasāri
sabbam idāṁ vitadhāṁ ti moṣadhaṅ̄maṁ
so bhikkhu jahāti orapāraṁ
urago jinnam iva ttacāṁ purāṇiṁ

= R 413

c Sh bhikkhū
d R tucāṁ

413 Sn 16 Uv 32:78 GDhp 89

yassa vanathā na santi keci
vinibandhāya bhavāya hetukappā
so bhikkhu jahāti orapāraṁ
urago jinnam iva ttacāṁ purāṇiṁ

= R 414

c Sh bhikkhū
d R tucāṁ

414 Sn 15, 14 Uv 32:79

yassa jarathā na santi keci
mulā akkuśalā samuḥatāḥsssa
so bhikkhu jahāti orapāraṁ
urago jinnam iva ttacāṁ purāṇiṁ

= R 415

Patna Dharmapada

b R akusāla fn: ‘MS akkusāla’ Sh sulabhā kuśalā
c Sh bhikkhū
d R tucāṁ

No title is given for this varga, and I have adopted R’s suggestion of uraga.

samāptā dhammapadā1 amṛtapadānī2 gāthāsatāni paṇca dve 21 B vii
c a gāthe yathā drṣṭaṁ tatha lihitam iti pariḥāroyam asmadiyaḥ
subham astu sarvvasatvānānaṁ3 21 B v

1 Sh dhammapadā
2 R amṛtapadāt Sh amṛtapadā  I cannot read with any certainty the
aksara following -dā.
3 R sarvvasatvānānī Sh sarvastvānānī
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PĀLI LEXICOGRAPHICAL STUDIES VI

SIX PĀLI ETYMOLOGIES

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

1. āsīta “cursed”
2. ghaccā “killing”
3. ghañña “killing”
4. ninuttipatha “(having) a way of speaking”
5. mattigha “mother-killer, matricide”
6. gedhalrodha “thicket”

1. āsīta “cursed”

We find at Ja V 87,23* the compound āsīta-satto. The cty explains this as āsīta-visena satto (V 87,26*), where satto is presumably to be derived fron Skt šapta “cursed”. CPD takes the compound āsīta-visa as a noun, and we should therefore translate “cursed by the poison (which has been) dripped”, although I see no reason for rejecting the view that it is a bahuvrīhi adjective, in which case we could translate “cursed by the one who is dripping poison”. CPD quotes Ja-gp 398,31 foll., which reads āsīta-sapatto, and explains sapatto as sapatha, i.e. Skt

---

1 See K.R. Norman, “Pāli Lexicographical Studies V”, in JPTS, XII, pp. 49-63.
2 Abbreviations of the titles of Pāli texts are as in the Epilegomena to V. Trenckner: A Critical Pāli Dictionary, Vol. I, Copenhagen 1924-48 (= CPD). In addition: BHS = Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit; PTS = Pali Text Society; PED = PTS’s Pali-English Dictionary; PTC = Pali Tipitakam Concordance; MIA = Middle Indo-Aryan; AMg = Ardha-Māgadhi; Pkt = Prakrit; Skt = Sanskrit; Gdh = Gāndhārī Dharma-pada; Utt = Uttarajjhayana-sutta; Ss = Sattasa; BD = Book of the Discipline; KS = Kindred Sayings; D of B = Dialogues of the Buddha; EV = Elders’ Verses; cty = commentary.
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śapatha “curse”. I think that the etymology is correct in seeing the need for a word meaning “cursed” here, but I think the wrong word has been chosen to bear this meaning. I believe that āsitta is to be derived < āsatta < *āsaptā. This compound of the root šap- seems not to occur in Skt, but there seems to be no reason why it should not have existed. This, then, would be another example of palatalisation of -a after ś. If we retain the reading āsitta-satto it would mean “the cursed person”, but CPD prefers the reading āsittamatto, showing the m/s alternation, which would then mean “as soon as cursed”.

2. ghaccā “killing”

This word occurs in the compounds mūla-ghaccā (D III 67,12 foll.); sabbhasunakhaghaccā (Ja I 176,27); and saṃghaccā (Ja I 177,4*). There is no doubt about its meaning “killing”, nor about its connection with the root han- “to strike”, but PED does not explain its precise form. It is to be derived from ghāya, the future passive participle of the root han-, meaning “to be killed”, and is an example of the future passive participle being used as an action noun. This usage has been noticed for Skt by Renou: “Les kṛtya fournissent assez librement des abstraits neutres”. He quotes rakṣitavya, kārya, rantavya, patitavya, geyya, śayaniya, tāpya, steyya. He also quotes the feminine kṛtā “action, act, deed”.

Although the use of the past participle as an action noun in MIA is well-known, the use of the future passive participle in this way is less common. We can, however, quote other examples from Pāli and Pkt:

(a) in Pāli: chejjā “cutting”; mūla-chejjā Sp 213,22 (cf. Skt chedya)
bhejjā “breaking, splitting” Vin III 47,2
khampaṇīya “healing, getting better” D II 99,22
anumodaññya “thanks, expression of gratitude” (= anumodana) A III 50,16; Ap 394,18
theyya “stealing” (cf. Skt steya)
palobhiya “seduction”; isi-palobhiya Ja V 161,13*

(b) in Pkt: jujha “fighting” Utt 9.35 (< yudhya)
pujja “honouring” Utt 11 [title] (< pūjya)
hassa “laughing” (in a-hass-ira) Utt 11.4 (cf. Skt hāṣya)
mohaniya “deluding, delusion” Utt 9.1 (= mohana)
āvaraniya “obstructing, obstruction” Utt 33.2 (= āvarana)
simjīva Ss 392 “jingling” (*siṅjīvavya)
pampiṣṭva Ss 450 “chattering” (*pajalpiṭvavya)
ramiṣṭva Ss 461 “pleasure, enjoyment, play” (*ramiṭvavya; cf. Skt rantavya)
cumṣṭivva Ss 465 “kissing” (*cumbitvavya)
rūṣiṣṭva Ss 466 “being angry” (*rūṣṭvavya)
rūja Ss 843 “wailing” (*rodya = rodaniya)

3. ghānā “killing”

PED gives the correct etymology for this word, but is hesitant about it, and undecided whether it is a noun or an adjective. It is to be derived from the vṛddhi formation noun ghānā from ghana in its early
sense of “striker, killer, destroyer”. The word exists in Skt, but is used only in the later sense of ghana “thick”, and is found in the Skt Dhātupāṭha in the sense of “compactness”. It is therefore a noun, and the tanṭurūṣa compound with atta found at Dhp 164 (ataṭghaññāya phallati) is also a noun.

4. niruttīpatha “(having) a way of speaking”

The compound niruttīpatha occurs in the Pāli Canon at Vin III 57:22-23; D II 63:29 (Sv 503,34 foll.: niruttipato ti sarati ti sato, sampajāṇāti ti sampajāno ti, ādikassa kārayāpadesasavasena pavattassa vohārassa patho); 68,19; S III 71-73 (Spk II 279,5: niruttīyo va niruttihathā; aha vā niruttīyo ca tā niruttivasena viññātabbānaṃ attānaṃ pathattā pathā cā ti niruttīpathā) quoted at Kv 140-41; Nīd 124:26 (§ 563); Dhs 7,12. The PTC translates it as “path, process of language”; BD translates as “way of speaking”; D of B as “process of explanation”; KS as “mode of reckoning”; Points of Controversy as “mode in word”; Dhs-Trsl “processes of explanation”. Professor N.A. Jayawickrama (in a private note which he made in my copy of PED) suggests “linguistic convention”.

In the Vinaya the compound occurs in a set of five stories which are told in the section on pārājika, illustrating the fact that an offence is committed only if there is the intention to do wrong. The first story concerns a monk who spread out his robe in the open air: tena kho pana samayena aṭṭhataro bhikkhu ajjhokāse cīvaram patharītvā vihārāṁ pāvissi. aṭṭhataro bhikkhu mā-y-idam cīvaram nassi ti paṭisāmesi. so nikkaṁitvā bhikkhī pucchi: āvuso mayhaṁ cīvaram kena avahaṇaṁ ti. so evaṁ aha: mayaḥ avahaṇaṁ ti. so taṁ ādiyī asamaṇo si tvaṁ ti. tassa kukkancaṁ

7 The uddāna states: niruttīyā paṭca akkhādā, Vin III 55,27.

Miss Horner translates this story9: “At one time a certain monk having spread out his robe in the open air, entered the vihāra. A certain monk, saying: “Do not let this robe be lost,” put it aside. Having come out (of the vihāra), he asked the monks: “Your reverences, who has stolen my robe?” He said: “I have stolen it.” He seized him and said: “You are not a true recluse.” Thereupon he was remorseful. He told this matter to the lord. He said: “Of what were you thinking, monk?” “I, lord? It was a way of speaking,” he said. (The lord) said: “There is no offence, monk, in the way of speaking.”

Comparable stories are told (in an abbreviated way, in some cases) about a monk who deposits his robe on a chair, his mat on a chair, his bowl under a chair, and also about a nun who deposits her robe on a fence. In each case the monk who had intended to do a service to the other monk stated that he had stolen the object, but the Buddha announced that there was no offence niruttīpathe. Although there is some possibility of ambiguity as regards the speaker on each occasion, so that it is not entirely clear who feels remorse, Miss Horner solves the problem by a set of footnotes identifying the speaker on each occasion. She does not explain why the second monk says he has stolen the robe, or what “the way of speaking” means.

In his commentary Buddhaghosa explains: niruttīpathe-vatthusmiṁ ādiyī ti gaṇi, coro si tvaṁ ti parāmasti, itaro pana kena avahaṇaṁ ti vutte mayañāvahaṇaṁ ti pucchāsabhāgana paṭiṁnaṁ adāsi. yadi hi itareṇa kena gahitāṁ kena apanitaṁ kena ṭhapitaṁ ti vuttoṁ abhavissa, addhā ayam pi mayañā gahitāṁ apanitaṁ ṭhapitaṁ ti vā vadeyya. mukhaṁ

8 Vin III 57,16-23.
nāma bhūjanathāyā ca kathanathāyā ca katan, theyyacittam pana vinā avahāro n’ athi. tena bhagavā anāpatti bhikkhu niruttipathi ti. vohāravacanammeta anāpatti ti atho.\(^{10}\) “Without the intention to steal there is no theft. For this reason the Bhagavat said: ‘There is no offence, bhikkhu, in the way of speaking’. This means that there is no offence in the mere conventional use of language”.

From the story in the following section, where there is an intention to steal, and therefore there is an offence,\(^{11}\) it is clear that it was the bhikkhu who was called asamaṇa who felt remorse. He felt remorse at being called asamaṇa because he was only trying to be helpful, and had not actually taken the robe, in the sense of having stolen it, despite the answer which he had given to the questioner. The word niruttipathi is used with reference to the answer he gave. The robe-owner said, “Who has taken, i.e. stolen, my robe?”. The other replied, “I have taken [but not stolen] it.” Since by his words he had, in the robe-owner’s view, confessed his guilt, he called him asamaṇa, which caused the would-be do-gooder to feel remorse. When questioned by the Buddha, the robe-remover in effect said, “It was just my way of speaking. He asked who had taken it, and I said I had. He was using the word avahāta in the sense of ‘stolen’, whereas I was using it in the sense of ‘taken away (for safe keeping)’.”

As Buddhaghosa explains, the second monk was merely repeating the form of words used by the first monk. The latter had said avahātam, and the second monk had repeated his word. If the questioner had said gahitam “seized”, apanitam “removed” or ōhapatam “placed”, the second monk would have used the same word in his reply. The point of the story is that avahāta (and the verb avaharat from which it is derived)

has two meanings: (1) to take away; (2) to take away with the intention of not returning, i.e. to steal. The first monk was using the word in the second sense “who has stolen my robe?”. The second monk, understanding the questioner to have used it in the first sense and to have said “who has taken my robe away?”, correctly answered “I have taken it away”, but his answer was understood to mean “I have stolen it”. When questioned by the Buddha as to his intention (“kincitto?”), the second monk explained that he had used the word in a conventional way of speaking. The Buddha ruled that, even if someone seemed to confess to stealing, offence only arose if there was intention (to steal). There was no offence in the use of the conventional way of speaking, whereby the person who was questioned repeated the form of the words employed by his questioner. If a person, making use of a conventional way of speaking, i.e. repeating the word used by a questioner in conversation, seems to say that he has stolen something, but has not in fact stolen it, then there is no offence.

Miss Horner was clearly uncertain about the way in which to analyse the form of the compound. She took it as a tatpurusa compound on both occasions, but to do this she has to take aham as a monosyllabic sentence “I?”. Although this is not impossible in itself, it seems very unlikely that it could be possible in this context where it appears as the second word. She puts it as first word in her translation. Unless we are to see aham as an early replacement for ayam, it would seem to be essential to take the compound in two different ways. First as a bahuvrihi adjective, in agreement with aham: “I have a way of speaking”, i.e. “I was (merely) using words”, and then as a tatpurusa compound: “[There is no fault] in a way of speaking, i.e. in the mere use of words”.

\(^{10}\) Sp 374,10-19. The PTS edition reads niruttipatheti, breaking up the compound incorrectly.

\(^{11}\) Vin III 58,5-10.
5. mattigha “mother-killer, matricide”

PED does not list this word, which occurs at Ja V 269,2*. It is glossed at 274,16’ as mātughātika, and we may compare Skt mātr-ghātaka and mātr-gha “a matricide”. The word is of interest because, if we follow the obvious division and take it to be matti + gha (<Skt gha), this is another example of mātr becoming matti– in compounds, and we can compare it with matti-sambhava (Sn 620 = Dhp 396). The easiest way to explain matti-sambhava, however, is to assume that matti is a locative in a tatpurṣa compound, i.e. *mātri = mātari, by analogy with mātrā and mātre, cf. Skt mātari-bhvari. It does not, however, seem possible to take matti as a locative in mattigha, and here we should have to assume that mātr- > *māti- > matti-. The compound occurs at GDhp 17 in the form yoneka-matra-sabhama, although it is not clear whether yoneka should be included in the compound. Brough\footnote{GDhp, p. 183.} stated that the interpretation of matti– as mātr- was difficult and thought that the expression mātr-sambhava seemed forced. The GDhp form led him to suggest that mātra- is the original sense, although on the basis of the Tibetan version of the Udānavarga (the Skt version was not available to him) he conjectured that the Skr version had mātr. Now that Bernhard’s edition is available we can see that Udānavarga 33.15 does, in fact, read mātr-sambhavam. The existence of Pāli matti-gha suggests that the problem of matti-sambhava needs to be reconsidered.

6. gedha/rodha “thicket”

The word gedha occurs in a passage which occurs twice in the Pāli canon: kathā ca bhikkhave mahācūro gahanissitto hoti? idha bhikkhave mahācūro tinagahanāṃ vā nissitto hoti rukhāgahanāṃ vā gedhaṃ vā mahāvānasāsandam vā (A I 154,1 = III 128,23 [although the PTS edition reads roḍhaṃ in the latter reference]). Since the reference is to gahana-, one would expect some sort of vegetation to be involved, and in the absence of any other indication, I should prefer the translation “thicket”, which is given in PTC, rather than “cave” which is given in PED.

The cty explains: gedhan ti ghanaṃ arahānaṃ (v.l. arāhamaṃ) saṃsattasākhaṃ ekādādhahā mahāvānasāndam (Mp II 254,6). This too is interpreting the passage as referring to vegetation, rather than a cave. PTC quotes only the word ghanaṃ from Mp, which implies that the editor of PTC assumed that ghanaṃ was the gloss upon gedhan. It would look as though gedhan is being taken as an adjective in PTC, with mahāvānasāndam, although the translation “thicket” which is given contradicts this. Taking it as an adjective does pose the question of why there should be the word vā following it, unless we are to understand gedhan as standing for gedha-gahanāṃ.

Clearly the tradition found difficulties with the word because, as noted above, we find roḍhaṃ as a reading or as a v.l. in some editions, and the Burmese Chāṭṭhasaṅgāyana edition actually reads roḍhaṃ in both the canonical passages and the aṭṭhakathā. Although PED translates roḍha- as “bank, dam”, taking it from 2\textit{vṛdh}-, I assume that it is actually from 1\textit{vṛdh}-, and means “the growing thing”.

There would then seem to be great doubt as to whether gedha– actually exists but, if it does, then I suggest that it does not mean “cave”.

\footnote{GDhp, p. 183.}
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