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INTRODUCTION

The Nāmacāradīpaka (The Action of Mind)\(^1\) was traditionally attributed to the therī Chapaṭa\(^2\) also later known as Saddharmmajoti-pāla\(^3\) who lived in Arimaddanapura (Pagan) in Burma. This is one of the nine Abhidhamma manuals entitled in Burmese ‘Let-than’ or ‘Little finger summaries’.\(^4\) In the beginning of Parākramabahu’s reign (1165 A.D.) Thera Uttarājīva left Pagan for Mahāvihāra,\(^5\) Anurādhapura, taking with him as a gift to the Sinhalese monks a copy of Saddaniti, a comprehensive Pali grammar\(^6\) written by Aggavamsa in 1154 A.D. He was accompanied by his pupil, Chapaṭa, a young novice (sāmaṇera). After journeyn in Sihaladīpa, Uttarājīva left the Mahāvihāra for Burma; but Chapaṭa remained there from 1170 to 1180 A.D. learning the Tipiṭaka and he received his Upasampādā at the hands of the Sihalaśaṅgha. Chapaṭa wished to confer it on his brethren of Pagan and establish a fraternity in Burma. For this purpose he brought with him four theras of great learning and piety. Five is the minimum required number for ordination according to the Vinaya. They were Rāhula, born in Sri Lanka; Ānanda, born in Kaṅcipuram; Sīvāli, born in the sea-port of Tāmrāśi, India; and Tāmalinda, a Cambodian prince.\(^7\) The nucleus of the Sihalaśaṅgha was formed during the reign of Narapati-Si:Thu (1174-1211).\(^8\)

Chapaṭa was the reputed author of Vinayasamuṭṭhapadīpanti, Pātimokkhavisodhāṇi, Vinayagūhatthadīpanti, Sīmālaṅkarasangahaṭīkā, Māṇikathadīpanti, Paṭhāṇaganaṇānyaya, Abhidharmamattha-

---

\(^1\) Also known in Burma as Nāmacāradīpa or Nāmacāradīpanti; Forchhammer, Essay, p. 35; Piṭakatatthamain, Rangoon, 1906, p. 45.

\(^2\) Sometimes pronounced as Chappata or Chapada, the name of the village where he was born.

\(^3\) Honorific title given by the king Narapati.


\(^5\) This was founded by the king of Sihaladipa, Devānampiya Tissa, for the Arahant Mahinda, Asoka’s son.


\(^8\) Professor Hall, History of South East Asia, Macmillan, 1964, p. 143.
Namacāradīpaka of Chapaṭa

Edited By Hammalawa Saddhatissa

Namo tassa bhagavato arahato sammāsambuddhassa

Ganthārambhakathā

1. Namassivāna Sambuddhāṃ bhūmijātānamaddināṃ vijānāntuttamaṃ dharmāṃ saṅghān2 ca guṇasāgaram.

2. Racayissam samāsena Nāmacārassa dīpaṃkaraṃ Paṭṭhānānayagāhāṃ taṃ3 taṃ suṇātha samāhitā.

I

Catuparamatthā


4. Tesa kāmacittāṃ tāva jātiḥedena catudhā rūpārūpaṃ tīḍhā cittām dvidhā anuttarāṃ matām.

5. Kusalaṃ kusalaṃ 'pākaṃ kiriyaṭi catubbhidham aṭṭhadhā tesu kusalaṃ dvādasakusalaṃ 'pākaṃ.

6. Teviṣati kriyācittam ekādasāti viṇṇeyyaṃ rūpārūpaṃ tīḍhā cittām kusalaṃ 'pākaṇkiriya.

7. Tesa rūpaṃ pannasara arūpaṃ dvādasātiḥāṃ kusala 'pākaṇvasaṃ aṭṭhavidham anuttarām.

8. Catupaññāsadhā kāmaṇ rūpaṃ pannaraśīraye āruppaṃ dvādasā cittāṃ aṭṭhadhā 'nuttaraṃ matām.

9. Apāye sattatiṃseva kāmasugatiyaṃ5 pi hi pañcasatthi ca satthi ca pañcasatthi dvayaṃ rūpaṃ.

10. Kamenārūpabhūṃsu titālisekālīṣam ekunātālīṣam sattaṃṣa ńeyyaṃ bhūmijātāṃ.

Bhūmi-uddeso

1 Be omits
2 saṃghaṃ
3 Paṭṭhānānayagāhāṃ
titālisekālīṣam and so below
11. Jātiyāpabhedena¹ hoti cittā matubhibhām kusalākusalām 'pākaṁ kiriyāti niddesato.

12. Uddese pana tividhām jātibhedena kusalam akusalam² avyākataṁ³ vuttaṁ eva mahesinā.


14. Uddesanye kusalakusalaṁ ca vuttanayam kiriyā 'pākabhedena avyākataṁ dvibhā mataṁ.

15. Kusala 'pākaṁ kāmādi pahbhedena catubbidham kāmabhūmi⁴ va 'kusalam kiriyā hoti tividhā.  

Jāti-uddeso


17. Somanassamatiyuttam asaṅkharām anekam⁵ ca sasāṅkharā manaṁ c' ekaṁ tathā hīnamatidvayaṁ.

18. Tato 'pekkhāmatiyuttam matihinān ti atthadhā kāmāvacaraṇaṁ vihījate vedanādītto.

19. Somanassa-kudittihī yuttam ekam asaṅkharām sasāṅkharāmanaṁ c' ekaṁ hīnadiṭṭhiydvayaṁ tathā.


22. Duvidhā kāmapākāni puññapākādito tathā puññapāka dīṭṭhā athetu⁷ ca⁸ saheṭtā dīṭṭhā ṭhitaṁ.⁹

23. Ahetu-pañca viññānaṁ gahaṇaṁ tiraṇācubho kāyaviññānaṁ¹⁰ sukhi tathā¹¹ somanassadī-ṭiraṇā.

24. Sopekkhāmi¹ cha sesāni sa punānaṁ 'va saheṭtukam.

25. Pāpajam pañcaviññānaṁ gahaṇaṁ tiraṇaṁ ekam kāyaviññānaṁ² dukkhī tatthā sopekkhāva cha ca³ sesakā.


27. Ahetu tividhā kathā sopekkhāvajjanaṁvayaṁ sukhavā-hasitaṁ atthā sa punānaṁ 'va saheṭtukā.

28. Vitakkaviccārapīti-sukhekaggayutāma manāṁ⁵ ādicārādi pītyādī⁶ sukhādhipi paraṁ⁷ tayaṁ.

29. Upekkhekkaggatayuttam rūpaṁ pañce 'va jhānato⁸ pañcādha sa punānaṁ 'va vipākakiriyaẏa matā.


31. Ākāsānācāyanamaṁ Viññāṇācāyanamaṁ ca Ākāsānācāyanamaṁ ca Nevasaṇāṇapaṇāḥ ālayanamaṁ Catudhā saka-puññaṁ 'va vipākakiriyaẏa matā.

32. Maggacittam anuttarita catukiccaṁ yuttā Catudhāpadakajjhāna bhedato puna visati tappakkattā catudhāphalam¹¹ ñeyyaṁ evaṁ sarūpato

33. Duggatiyaṁ sattatiṁsa bhavanti hasitaṁ vinā ahetu sattaraṇa puññāpuññaṁ visati.

34. Kāmasugatiyāsīti sabbāni kāmacittanaṁ 'pākavajjanaṁ mahaggataṁ attha-lokuttarāni ca.

35. Rūpe ekūnasattati kriyācittanī visati ekaviṣati puññāni cakkhusotāni ca tiraṇaṁ.

36. Patīcchanaṁ dasavajjanaṁ¹² phalaṁ 'pākam bhūmikkamaṁ pañcasatthi ca satthi ca pañcasatthi dvibhūmikā.

¹Jātiyāhappabhedanā ²akusalam ³āvyākataṁ and so below ⁴kāmabhūmi ⁵anekakaṁ ⁶sañhitam ⁷dīṭṭhāhetu ⁸Be omiss ⁹dviraṭṭhaka. ¹⁰kāyaviññānaṁ ¹¹tathā ¹²dasa vakayā
38. Sabbabhumikaṃ hetṭhāvajjanaṃ titalıṣekatālīsaṃ ekunatalīsasaattatiṇsa Ṉeyyaṃ bhūmādิน.

Iti Nāmacāradipake Bhūmijātivibhāgo nāma Pathamo paricchedo

II
39. Sekkhāsekkhaputhujjana-bhedena pañcadhā bhave asekkhe niyataṃ cittāṃ hoti ekūnavisati.
40. Sattasekkhesu niyataṃ hoti pānca puthujjane cutuvisati niyataṃ hoti sekkaputhujjane.
41. Catutthimse va cittāni sekkhāsekkhaputhujjane yathārahaṃ uppaṃjanti pañcadhā puggalabhēdā.
42. Kāme dvādasapuggalā sekkhānāṃ catūṭhālasan anāgāmināṭhatālīsam dvisekkhāna ca paññāsaṃ.
43. Muggatthānam ekam ekāṃ cūtunnaṃ cūtpaññāsaṃ dvayaṇ ca ekatālīsam sattatiṃsa ca kamato.
44. Rūpesu nava-puggalā kamato cūtubhumināṃ asekkhānaṃ ekatiṃsa dvatimsekatimśadavayam.
45. Tisekkhānaṃ paṇcatimśaṃ chatimśadavā-paṇcatimśaṃ muggatthānam ekam ekāṃ rāginaṃ cūtubhumināṃ ekunatalīsam tālīsas ekunatalīsasadavayam.
46. Āruppe āṭṭhapuggalā tattha sekkhānaṃ kamato pannarasa cuddasā pi terasa dvādasa pi ca.

47. Bhūmikkamaṃ hi sekkhānaṃ visamēkūna visāṃ ca aṭṭhārasa sattarasa maggaṭṭhānam ekam ekāṃ.
48. Sesānaṃ puthujjanaṃ catuvisā ca tevisam bāvīsam ekavīsa ca hoti cittāṃ bhūmikkamaṃ.

Puggalika-uddeso
49. Saṅkhēpēna mayā vuttaṃ saṅkhepanayakāmināṃ vitthārenā pavakkhēni tāṃ suṇātha samāhitā.
50. Asekkhe niyataṃ cittāṃ hoti ekūnavisati kāmajavanakiriyā mahaggatākīrīyaphalam.
51. Sattasekkhesu niyataṃ cūtumaggaphalattayam puthujjanesu niyataṃ dīṭṭhiyuttam vickiṣćchā.
52. Sekkaputhujjane hoti cutuvisati niyataṃ dīṭṭhiyuttam uddhaṃcāṃ saddosām sāsavām puṇṇāṃ.
53. Catutthimseva cittāni sekkhāsekkhaputhujjane niyāvajjana-dvayaṃ bāṭṭimśasāsavāṃ pākaṃ.
54. Kāme dvādaspuggalā sattasekkhā khiṇāsaṃ tiḥetukādipuggalā cattāro ca puthujjana.
55. Asekkhānaṃ cūtucattālīscittāni uddise kāme tevisa pākāni kiriyā visatiphalam.
56. Pāpam hinnādiṭṭhuddhaccam sattarasā puṇṇāṃ kāmapakaṃ saphalam kiriyādvayaṃ anāgāmināṭhatālīsam.
57. Dvīphalatthānaṃ paññāsaṃ kaṁkhādiṭṭhi yuttaṃ ca vais uṭṭhaṃ niyāvajjanaṃ kānaviṃ pākaṃ saphalam kiriyādvayaṃ.
58. Tiḥetunāṃ cūtpaññāsaṃ bhavati dvādāsāsubhaṃ kāme tevisa pākāni tiḍha puṇṇāṃ kiriyaḍvayaṃ.
59. Duhetukāhetukānaṃ ekatalīsam apuṇṇaṃ nāṇayuttavaṇja pākaṃ kāmapuṇṇāḍvayaṇjanaṃ.
60. Ahetuka-duggatinaṃ sattatiṃsadavyāvajjanaṃ¹ ahetukavipākāni puññāpuññāni visati.

61. Rūpesu nava puggalā sekkhāsekkhā tihetukā tesvā sekkhanādibhūme ekatiṃsa siyuṃ kathāṃ.

62. Dvicaakkhusotaviṇṇānaṃ santiraṇaṃ paṭicchanaṃ kriyāvisati sāpakaṃ aggaphalaṃ² ime siyuṃ.

63. Tisu bhūmisu dvatimśa ekatiṃsa-dvayaṃ kamaṃ saheva³ dvekapākehi tisekkhānaṃ sakaṃ phalaṃ.

64. Diṭṭhiviyuttam uddhaccam dvicaakkhusotaviṇṇānaṃ paṭicchanasantiraṇaṃ tibhumipuññadvajjanaṃ⁴.

65. Savipaka⁵ bhūmikkamanaṃ paṇcaṭiṃṣachattimśa⁶ ca puna paṇcaṭiṃṣadavyaṃ maggaṭṭhānaṃ⁷ ekam ekaṃ.

66. Rāginaṃ catubhuminaṃ lobhamohumulaṃ pāpaṃ dvicaakkhusotaviṇṇānaṃ paṭicchanasantiraṇaṃ.

67. Tibhumipuññadvajjanaṃ⁸ sapakaṃ⁹ evam ekunatālīsāṃ tāḷisēkūnataḷīsanaṃ dvayaṃ kamaṃ.

68. Āruppe atṭhapiṣṭhala te svasekkhānaṃ "saphalaṃ" avajjanaṃ mahākriyā sapakaṃ catukriyā.

69. Bhumikam eva hetṭhimam kriyam hitvā pannarasa cuddasa terasā cā hi Hoti dvādasa cittāni.

70. Tinnanm¹⁰ sekkhānaṃ saphalaṃ diṭṭhiviyuttam uddhaccam avajjanaṃ mahāpuññaṃ sapakāraṇpamalaṃ.

71. Bhumikkamena hetṭhimam puññaḥ hitvā visekūna¹¹ visa-āṭṭhāra¹² sattarasa ekaṃ¹³ maggaṭṭhānaṃ.

72. Rāginaṃ dvidasapāpaṃ¹⁴ avajjanaṃ kāmapuññaṃ sapakāraṇpamalaṃ bhūmikam eva hetṭhimam.

73. Puñnaṃ hitvā catuvisā hoti tevisā bāvīsa ekaviṣati cittāni neyyam evaṃ puggalim.

Iti Nāmacāradipake Puggalavibhāgo nāma
Dutiyo¹ pariccbedo

III

74. Ito paraṃ pavakkhāmi pubbāparaniyāmitā Nāmacāraṃ samāsena taṃ suṇātha samāhītā.

75. Dvayacatumkākusala dve pubbā bhavanti 'paraṭe paṇnāsākevīsā ca tettiṃsa ca ekaviṣaṃ.

76. Lobhamohumula pubbām dvayam paraṃ ekaviṣaṃ dosasahagatāpubbā² dve bhavanti satta 'paraṭa.

77. Kiriya manodhātumha pubbakaṇi pannarasa parāṇi dasacittāni manodvāraṇvajjanaham pubbā ekaviṣaṣ paraṃ paṇca cittālaṃ.

78. Hasitupādado pubbām dvayam parā tu terasa purināsākriyaṭṭhā pubbām dvayam parā paṇca viṇṭocīsa.

79. Duḥet sukhamahā pubbām dvayam parā sattarasa tihetupekkhato pubbām dvayam parā catuvisa duḥetupekkhato pubbām dvayam parā atṭhāraṣa.

80. Paṇca viṇṇānado ekam pubbām paraṃ paṭicchana paṇcā pubbā paraṃ dvaym sukhatāraṇato pubbā.

81. Paṇcavīsā parā hoti dvādasepekkhaṭṭhāna sattatiṃsa pubbā hoti parā dvādasa viṇṇeyāja.

82. Āṇasukhaviṭṭhāki pubbikā satta tu 'pekkhā pubbā dve sattati hoti tehi para ekaviṣa.

83. Duḥetuskhaphāpakhāṃ tāḷisapupbakam matam duhetu 'pekkhapakhāmā ekatāḷīsapupbakam tehi catūhi 'paṭekhi bhavanti dvādasa paraṭa.

84. Sukhopakkhasahagatā rūpaṇapukalam pubbā tayo tayo para dasa bhavanti dvivedaniyā.

¹ Dutiyo and so always ² dosasahagatāpubbā
85. Rūpe kiriyasukhamhā pubbā tayo parā dasa rūpe kiriyukekkhamhā¹ pubbā tayo parā dasa rūppakā pubbe 'kūna saṭṭhi parā 'kūna visām.

86. Āruppakusalā pubbā tayo parā ekādasa dvādasatera cā eva pannarasā pi kamato.

87. Āruppakriyato pubbā tayo parā ekādasa dvādasatera honti pannarasā pi kamato.

88. Āruppa catupākehi pubbā aṭṭha catāliṣam sattaccha pañcataḷisiṣam parā nava 'ṭhā satta cha.

89. Kusalānuttara pubbā cattāro saphalaṃ parām catukkaphalato pubbā kammam² 'va cha satta satta.

90. Saṅkhepena mayā vuttam saṅkhepanayakāminam³ vitthārena pavakkhami tam suṇātha samāhītā.

91. Dvayādikusalā pubbāṃ dvijhānikam voṭṭhapanam⁴ sayaṃ ca pubbakaṃ cittam honti parā tepaṇāsā.

92. Saiṣam cattāri rūpāni aṭṭhavisa lokuttara ekādasa tadālabahaṃ⁵ mahaggata nava 'pākaṃ.

93. Tatiya⁶ catutthā pubbam sayam dukicca voṭṭhapanam⁷ honti parā ekavisa appana dvaṭṭimma vajjita.

94. Pañcamaḷathato pubbam sayam dukicca voṭṭhapanam parā tettimma sayaṃ ca dvādasa pañcam appana ekādasa tadālabahanaṃ⁸ mahaggata nava 'pākaṃ.

95. Sattapāṭhamato pubbam sayam dukicca voṭṭhapanam honti parā ekavisa appana dvādasavajjita.

96. Lobhamohamūla⁹ pubbāṃ sayam dukiccavotthapam parekavisadutiyaṃ bhavange 'kūnavisaṇa¹⁰ ca.

97. Dosasahagatā¹¹ pubbāṃ sayam dukicca voṭṭhapanam honti parā satta sayam upekkhā kāmaḥbhavangam.

98. Kiriyāmanodhiṭumhā pubbakāni pannarasa kāmarūpaḥbhavangāni parān ca dasa viṇāṇaṃ.

99. Manovarāvajjanamhā pubbakā ekavisiṇi ekūnavisaḥbhavangām sayam¹ pubhāṭṭhanaṃ.

100. Parama paṇcā cattāliṣam kāmaḥvaceṣeṣa vam kāmarūpabhaṅgāni sayam² pi ca pacchimakam.

101. Hasitupāḍato pubbam dvvicāvajjanam sayam parā terasa sutiraṃ³ kāmarūpaṭāna 'pākaṃ aṇāṇaṣukhaṇāviṣṭi sayam nāma idam⁴ pi ca.

102. Somanassañayutta-kiriya dvayato pubbam dvvicāvajjanam sayam paṅcavisam parā sayam.

103. Tebhūmakam⁵ matiyuttaṃ bhavaṅgaṃ sukhiṭhānaṃ nāṇayuttaṃ sukhaṇapakāmaṃ sukharūpapakāya mahaggataṃ⁶.

104. Duḥetusukhavayamahā pubbāṃ avajjanam sayam dvijhānikam parā sattarasa sayam sukhiṭhānaṃ⁷ tibhūmiṇāṇabhavangaṃ nāṇahināṣukhapakāmaṃ.

105. Upekkhāṇaṇayuttehi pubbāṃ sadukcāvajjanam honti parā catuvisa nāṇayuttaṇ ca bhavaṅgaṃ.

106. Sopekkhappacchalanam catupekkhatalabahanaṃ⁸ pañcutekkhāṣagata mahaggatakriyā sayam.

107. Duḥetuspekkhavayamahā pubbāṃ sadukcavajjanam honti parā aṭṭhārasa tibhūmiṇāṇabhavangaṃ pacchimaṃca sayam yeṣam catupekkhatalabahanaṃ⁹.

108. Sukhaṇaṇapakāhi¹⁰ pubbākā sattatīvidhā voṭṭhapanam¹¹ dosavajjāni tibhūmiṇaṭṭhacānā ca catupahalaṃ sukhiṭhānaṃ¹² bhavaṅgūnavisiṇi.

¹kiriyapekkhamhā
²kammam
³saṅkhepanayakāminam.
⁴voṭṭhapanam
⁵tadālabham
⁶Lobhamohumūla
⁷kūnavisaṇa
⁸tadālabham
⁹Dosasahagatā
¹¹kiriya and so always
¹²sukhatiram
¹³tadālabham
¹⁴tadālabma
¹⁵Tebhūmikaṃ
¹⁶rahattan
¹⁷sukhatiram
109. Upekkhāṇāṇayutthehi dosamulam pakkhipiyapubba dvesattati hita parah tehi ekavisa āvajjanadvaya ca pi bhavāṅgekukunāvātipi.

110. Duhetusukhapākamhā pubbaṁ tāliśavoththapanam akusalā dosavajjā kämapuññasukhakriyā ekādasa tadālambanaṁ cutikiccam rūpapākaṁ.

111. Duhetupekkhakapākamhā ekatālīśapubbaṁ vōṭthapanam dvādasāpuṇṇaṁ kämapuññopekkhakriyā ekādasa tadālambanaṁ cutikiccam rūpapākaṁ.

112. Tehi catūhipākehi bhavanti dvādasa parā dasakāmabhavaṅga ca āvajjanadvayaṁ pi ca.

113. Pañca viṇṇānakusalapākehi pubbāvajjanam paraṁ paticchanaṁ cittam tāni pubbānimahā.

114. Hitī paraṁ sanīraṇa dvayaṁ ca sukhokekkhā vā tesu sukhātiraṇaṁ pubba pañcavisā honti sayam.

115. Kāmapuñṇasukhakriyā dosavajjām paticchanaṁ para dvādasa vōṭthapanam sayaṁ ca kāma bhavaṅgaṁ.

116. Pubbokekkhā tiraṇaṁ sattatimṣa sanīraṇaṁ vōṭthapanam kāmapuñṇā puṁñopekkhā kriyaḥbhavaṅga paticchanaṁ para dvādasa vajjana dvayaṅ ca kāma bhavaṅgaṁ.

117. Sukhokekkhāsahagataṁ rūpākusalato pubba sukhokekkhamatiyuttam dvayaṁ sayam tato tato.14

118. Parā dasakāma-rūpa-nāṇarupam bhavaṅgaṁ ca sukhokekkhamatiyuttam rūpakiyato pubba.

119. Sukhokekkhamatiyuttam dvayaṁ sayam tato tato para dasakāmarupam tiḥetubhavaṅgaṁ sayam.

120. Rūpapākapubbekkūna-satīṭhivoththapanam lobha-mohamulāpuṇṇāṁ puṁṇākriyā tihhumikā.

121. Catupphalam mahāpāka-nāṇayuttam navapākaṁ parekunivaṁ dvayaṁvajjanaṁ lokiyaṁ navapākaṁ sahetukaṁ.

122. Āruppakusalā pubba tayoekoṁ tayaṁ matiyuttā tayo parā ekādasa dvādasa vērasāpi ca kāmarupanavapākaṁ vipakam heṭṭhimaṁ sayam.

123. Catutt atrocara tatiyaphalasahità āruppakiyato pubba tayo pekkhā matiyuttā.

124. Taya parā ekādasa dvādasa vērasāpi ca kāmarupanavapākaṁ vipakam heṭṭhimaṁ sayam Catuttatro pannarasa catuttaphalasahità.

125. Āruppacatuppaṁ pabbma atṭhacattālīsāṁ satta cha pañcatilāsīṁ uddham pākaviyajītaṁ.

126. Dosavajjasahetukā kāmajavanāmatipakā catupphalāruppajavana sayam pākaṁ ca heṭṭhimaṁ.

127. Parā navattha saṭṭhāṁ manovāravajjanaṁ ca adhovajjārūpapākaṁ mahāpākaṁ matiyuttam.

128. Sukhokekkhāsahagataṁ puññalokuttarā pubba sukhokekkhamatiyuttam dvayaṁ pako sa pako 'va.

129. Sukhokekkhamahagataṁ catukkaphalato pubba kamaṁ 'va chasattasaṛadda vīpuṇāṁ sukhopekkham.

130. Maggasayam catuttārūpaṁ parā bhavanti cuddasa tihetukaṁ rūpārūpakāmaṁ sayam pi ca.

Iti Nāmacāradipakone Pubbāparavibhāgo nāma Tatiyo paricchedo

---

1. vōṭthapanam
2. tadālambanam
3. pubba
4. pubba
5. āvajjanadvayaṁ
6. sukhokekkha
7. sukhitiyā
8. vōṭthabbaṁ
9. tīrā
10. satiravoththabbaṁ
11. Sukhokekkhamahagataṁ
12. rūpākusalato
13. sukhokekkhamatiyuttam
14. tayo, sayam
15. Sukhokekkhamahagataṁ
16. Sukhokekkhamatiyuttam
17. tayo

---

1. Rūpapākapubbekkūna
2. vōṭthabbaṁ
3. kumohamulāpuṇṇāṁ
4. dvayaṁvajjanaṁ
5. tayaṁvajjanaṁ
6. āruppakiyato
7. pekkhā
8. sattaccha
9. Dosavajjasahetuka
10. kāmajavanāmatipakā
11. catupphalāruppajavana
12. navattha saṭṭhāṁ
13. sukhokekkhamahagataṁ
14. catukkaphalato
15. Maggasayam
16. sayam
131. Ito param pavakkhami kiccatthananiyamitam Namaacaram samasena tam sunathaa samahita.

132. Paatisandhibhavanga ca avajjana ca dassanam savanam ghyanam kiccam sayanam phusanam tathaa.

133. Patichchana santriirana vatthapanan ca javana ca tadalambaran2 cutikicca bheda cuddasa vinyeyya.

134. Tena kiccapabhedena cittma cuddasabhedakam bhavati pancavidham pi ekackacabhedato.

135. Sandhibhavaangakicca cuti c ekunavasato dve dve avajjanaadiatham patichchana tukicca.

136. Tiiri tiriirakiccani ekam vatthapanakiccam javanam paanchaanasa ekadasa tadalambarana.

137. Athhasatthi tathaa dve ca navattha dve yathakkaamam ekadvititapatapa panca kicca kilinidh.

138. Paatisandhibhavanga ca avajjana ca vinnana patichchana-santiriirana vatthapanan ca javanam.

139. Tadalambaran cuticittam itithanam dasavidham ekathana paatisandhi bhavanga ca navathihankanam.

140. Avajjanaaviihankanam vinnana ca patichchana tirana c ekathihankanam votthapananaviihankanam.

141. Chatihankanam javanam ca tadalambaran cuticittam itithanakanam cuticittam evam pi paanca visati.

142. Saakhepana maya vuttam saakhpanayakamanam vitharena pavakhami tam sunatha samahita.

143. Sahetusasava 'paka tirana dve c upekkhakaa paatisandhakiccamaniti tinakeunavisati.

144. Dve dve avajjanadini avajjanadikicca ka tiri tiranjikiccana voththapanakiccam manovajjana.

145. Kusalaakusalam sabba kriyavajjanavajjita phalanapancaanasa cittani javanakiccam.

146. Aththa kammadhapakkata tiri santrirani ca iccekadasa cittani tadalambarakiccam.

147. Kusalaakusalam sabba kriyavatthapanavajjita phalam dvipaachaviinnanam manodhatetakicca kiccam.

148. Manovaravajjana ca sukhtirana dviwikiccam mahagatavipakani nava tikic calcium.

149. Aththa kammadhapakkata bhavanti caticcak iccannam tiriirana dve upekkhakaa.

150. Cuthbhavaangakiccanam sandhithanam antaram sandhijavantadalamba voththapanavajjanantaram.

151. Javanatadalambancuti antara ca bhavaangassa bhavaangapaachaviinnana javanantaravajjana.

152. Avajjanapaticchananam viinanaaitthanam antaram paachaviinnatirana patichchathanam antaram.

153. Tiranaththanam patichchana voththapananam antaram tiranajavabhavangana voththapanaththanam antaram.

154. Voithpana tadalamba bhavaangacuti naviyaja tadalambantha bhavaanga cuitna ca javanathanam.

1 voththapanan
2 tadalambar
3 voththabpanakiccam
4 tadalambar
5 voththabana
6 Tadalambar
7 itithanam
8 ekathihankanam
9 voththabana
10 tadalambar
11 evam
12 kamana
131 javantaravajjana.
132 Avajjanapaticchananam.
133 patichchathanam
134 Tiranathanam.
135 voththabana.
136 tirajavabhavanga.
137 voththabhana.
138 javanathanam.
155. Tadālambanāṭhānaṁ tu javanabhavāṅgacutīnasam
   cutiṭṭhānaṁ javanatadālambaṁ bhavāṅga sandhiṁnaṁ.

   Iti Nāmacāradipaka Kiccaṭṭhānaṅvibhāgo nāma
   Catuttho paricchedo

V

156. Tato paraṁ pavakkhaṁ Nāmacāranaṁ samasaṁta
   ārammaṇappabhedenā taṁ suṇātha samāhitā.

157. Chabbidhārammaṇanāṁ nāma-rūpa-saddha-gandha-rasa-
   phoṭṭhambha-dhammaṅvasena vuttam evam mahesinā.

158. Bhavati tividham cittam ekārammaṇiṅkānaṁ
ekārammaṇiṅkānaṁ cittma paṇcātirekatāḷīsaṁ.

159. Paṇcārammaṇaṅcittāṇi tiṇi honti titilīsaṁ
   chāḷārammaṇaṅkānaṁ cittma vuttam evam mahesinā.

160. Paṇcădhikacattāḷīsaṁ ekārammaṇiṅkānaṁ kaḷhaṁ
   amalaṁ paṇcaviṇṇāṇaṁ anabhiṅṇaṁ mahaggataṁ.

161. Paṇcārammaṇaṅkānaṁ kaḷhaṁ manodhātuṭṭayamaṁ
cittma chāḷārammaṇaṅkānaṁ cittma sābhiṅṇaṁ sesakāmaṁ.

162. Parittāṇa ca mahaggataṁ appamāṇaṁ na vattabhaṁ
   catudhārammaṅabbhedāṁ vuttam evam mahesinā.

163. Paṇcaviṁsa parittamhi kāme tevīsa pākāni
   paṇcadvāravajjanaṁ ca bhavanti hasitaṁ cittma.

164. Mahaggata ca āruppeṁ duṭṭhacatutthadavyaṁ
   ekaviṁsi vohāre sesarūpaṁ rūpaṅcittma.

165. Nibbānaṁ amalaṁ aṭṭha phalāmutthamahaṁ visati
   dvādasākusalā aṭṭha kāma jāvanamatthiṁnaṁ.

166. Aggamaggaphalavajje bhavanti gocare paṇca
kāmapuṇṇaṁ maṭiyuttaṁ abhiṅṇānaṁ ca kusalaṁ.

157. Sabbālambe cha cittāṁ voṭṭhapanaṁ tī kriyābhiṁnaṁ
   kāmakriyāmaṭiyuttaṁ sabbaḥāpi bhavanti ca. 2

158. Sattadāha honti gocare chabbidhām 3 pi bhave ati-
   mahantārammaṇaṁdaṁ kathaṁ atimahantādiṁ.

159. Ekāṭītaṁ sulasāyukam timahantam tidhitātmaṁ
   pannarasacuddasāyukam mahantārammaṇaṁ nāma.

160. Ca tādi nava-attitiṁ terasādi atṭhāyukam
tarittāṁ nāma dasādi pannarasāttiṁ tathā.

161. Sattādi dvāyukam ati-parittam nāma ekādi
   paṇcāṭitaṁ sulasādi dvādasāyukam vibhūtaṁ.

162. Chasatta-atitam ekā-dasadasāyukamattaṁ
   avibhūtaṁ nāma gocaraṁ cattāri-paṇcadvārikā 4
   vibhūtāvibhūtaṁ pan manodvārikagocaraṁ.

163. Tadālambapariyantaṁ vibhūtaṁ tīmaṁhantikam
   jāvanantaṁ vīthi-cittaman dibhūtuṁ mahantārammaṇaṁ.

164. Voṭṭhapanaṁ 5 vīthi-cittam parittārammaṇaṁ jāṭanaṁ
   nathādi-paritte vīthi-cittman kicci pi gocare.

165. Tasmām ārammanāpātha 6-gatehi vīthi-cittassā
   hetubhūtaṁ bhavaṅgassa dvikkhattum calanāṁ bhave.

166. Tato paṇcadvāravajjananam 7 bhavati paṇcaviṇṇānaṁ
   tamāḥ sakasakadvārā 8 gocare gaṇaṁnaṁ tato.

167. Santīraṇaṁ tato 9 voṭṭhapanaṁ 10 sakīṁnaṁ tato
   sattakkhattum jāvā kāme chakkattum vī pavattati.

168. Tadālambanam 11 dvikkhattum 12 tamāḥ bhavaṅgātimahantake 13
   mahante 14 tadālambanan 15 parittet nathī jāvanām
   voṭṭhapanaṁ 16 dvikkhattum 'ti parittenetare manamā.

---

1 voṭṭhabhānaṁ
2 Be omits sabbaḥāpi bhavanti ca
3 chabbidhām
4 -paṇcadvārikā
5 Voṭṭhabhānaṁ
6 ārammaṇāpātha
7 paṇcadvāra-vajjanaṁ
8 sakasakadvāra
9 Be adds tamāḥ
10 voṭṭhabhānaṁ
11 tadālambanam
12 dvikām
13 -mahantari.
14 Be adds tu
15 tadālambanam
16 voṭṭhabhānaṁ
179. Manodvāre bhavaṅgamhā manodvāravājjanam¹ tato javanaṁ² tamhā vibhūte tu tadalambaṅanetarā³ mahaggata-amalānaṁ gocaro natthi tabbheda.

180. Sandhibhavaṅgacutinām tividho gocaro bhave kammām kammanimittāṁ ca tathā gatimittakāṁ.

181. Cetanā 'va kammaṁ nāma manodvāre siyātiṇām Chabbhidham kammanimittāṁ chadhāre 'titapaccuppannāṁ.

182. Manodvāre paccuppannāṁ rūpaṁ 'va gatimittāṁ⁴ maranāsannasattānam kapparukkhaṇḍumatiṭhtāṁ.

183. Dve dve paṅca ca paṅcaṭṭha dve bhava sabbabhedato cutiyā tādā honti catuvissati sandhaya.⁵


185. Rūto surū arū paṅca arūpāṭṭhādupto dubo⁶ iccevaṁ Dhammasirinā vuttaṁ tass' athavahanṇanā.

186. Suto du-dve-dupto su-dve-suto paṅca surū arū rūto c' evaṁ⁷ arūpāṭṭha duto dve cataṁvisati iti subhūta bhaddrena vuttaṁ tass' athavahanṇanā.

187. Duto suto sudu dve dve dvekavisudvāru suto ruto c' evaṁ⁹ dve dve dvi arūhi ubho ubho.

188. Attano matiyā eva vuttaṁ tass' athavahanṇanā. saṅkhepen' eva vuttaṭṭham saṅkhepanayakāmekhi viṭṭhārena pavakkhami tam sunātha samāhitā.

189. Duto suto 'tita-paccuppannālambaṇa susandhi dusuto 'va attādilambaṇa dusandhi dve dve.

190. Suto 'titapaccuppanna paṅñattāṭtita paṅñatti surū arū paṅcasandhi tathā paṅcasandhi rūto.

191. Aṭṭalambaṅaruhi svārusandhi duve duve paṅñattalaṁbaṅaruhi svāru sandhi duve duve.

192. Evaṁ sandhi catuvīsa tādā yeva cutiyā bhavālambaṅahedena vijānaṁ¹ tu pahbbheto dvādasadasa satta ca evaṁ² ca paṭisandhaya.³

193. Etā bhavanti tividhā aṭṭhārammanādhī dvālambaṇehi duvidhā cutiḍvādasasatta ca kāmarūpaṁ arūpaṁ⁴ ca cuti-eka dulambaṇā.

Iti Nāmacāradipake Ārammaṇavibhāgo nāma Paṅcamo paricchedo

VI

194. Nāmacāraṁ vinā rūpaṁ yasmā na paṅcavaṇkāre tato 'va tassa nisayaṁ rūpaṁ 'dāni viniddise.

195. Samuddesā vibhāga ca samuṭṭhānā kalāpato pavattikkamato ceti paṇcadhā rūpamaddeso.

196. Sītādiruppanaṁ rūpaṁ aṭṭhavisaṅvīdam bhave paṭhāvāpo⁵ ca vāyo ca tejo cakkhu sotam ghanam.

197. Jīvha kāyo rūpaṁ sado gando raṣojā itthattam pumattam vaṭṭhu jivītām aṭṭhāravissadham tathā.

198. Ākāso⁶ santati jaraḥ bhaṅgo rūpassa lahutā mudukammaṇṇatākāya-vaci⁷-viṇṇatti dassadhā.

Rūpasamuddeso

199. Rūpaṁ⁸ avyākatam⁹ sabbāṁ rūpakkhandho ahetukaṁ anālambanaṁ¹⁰ parittādi ili ekaviḍhamhā naye.

200. Duvidhanyādito pana bahudhā muninā vuttaṁ paṭhavādimaḥābhūta¹¹ upādāya-rūpe 'taram.¹²

¹manodvāravājjanam ²javā ³tadalambaṅitarasmiṁ ⁴gatimittāṁ ⁵sandhiyo.
⁴duhbo ⁷evaṁ ⁸cabhū misprint? ⁹Be adds svāru ⁵Be adds svāru ⁶Ācayo
¹¹vijāna ¹²vaci ¹Rūpa ⁹avyākatam ³paṭisandhiyo. ⁴arūpaṁ ⁵paṭhavāpo ⁶Ācayo ¹byākatam and so below ¹⁰anālambam ¹¹pathavādimaḥābhūta ¹²bharaṁ.
201. Cakkhadijhattam° pasadā bahirā pasade 'taram
cakkhadīdayavatthu vatthu-avatthu itaram°

202. Cakkhadikam viṇñatti ca sattadvaraṁ nāma netaram
cakkhadīhāvajivitam indriyam nāma netaram.

203. Suddhatthakāvinibhogam vaṅgandharasojakaṁ
bhūtam° tato vinibhogam itaran ti vinidisse.

204. Phoṭṭhabbam° āpavajjantu bhūtetaramaphoṭṭhabbam
catuvaṇṇādi phoṭṭhabbam goçaran tu na cetaram.

205. Pasadagocararūpo 'lārikaṁ sukhetaram
āṭhārasādito rūpaṃ nipphannan tu na cetaram.

206. Kham rūpanām parichedo netara kāsasanti
jarā bhanço° ca rūpa tu lakkañama nāma netaram.

207. Lahutādi ca viṇñatti viñāro nāma netaram
kammajākammajam rūpaṃ iccevaṃ duvidha° naye.

208. Pasada kammajā vatthu kammajākammajitaram
vatthu kammajam° pi atti kammajā kammajitaram

209. Indriyam kammajam atthi kammajākammajitaram
pasadan tu oḷārikoljārikaṁ sukhetarama.

210. Kammajākammajājnea kammaṇa kammato tidha
cittāhārutujā tikavasena° ti dhā matā.

211. Kammajākammajajā bhūta° upāda pi tathā bhedā
vatthudvāraṁ advāraṇī ca avatthu pi tathā bhedan.

212. Dvāraṁ vatthu avatthu ca advāraṁ pi tathā bhedan
ghocaraṁ bhūtupāda° ca agocaraṁ tathā bhedan.

213. Indriyāniniindriyenā° pi vatthāvatthussu catuddha
iccevaṃ catubbhidhāni° bhājetabbā vibhavina.

214. Iccevaṃ aṭṭhavīsati vidham pi ca vicakkhaṇa
mahābhūtādibheda vibhajanti yathārahaṁ.

Ayaṁ ettha Rūpavibhāgo

215. Kammacitto tu āhārā rūpassa samuṭṭhāpakā
kāmarūpaṁ pañcavīsa kusalakusalāṁ kammam.

216. Satta-ajjhassantāne rūpaṁ kammasamuṭṭhānam
paṭisandhīṁ upādāya pavatetti khaṇe khaṇe.

217. Pākāruppapañcaviṇṇāṇa 'rahanta cutivajjam
pañcasattavidham° cittaṁ samuṭṭhāpeti jāyantam
rūpaṁ cittasamuṭṭhānam ādibhāvāngupādaaya.

218. Sītuṇhotu samaṇṇātā thitippattā° tejodhātu
janeti ajjhathabhiddhā rūpaṁ utusamuṭṭhānaṁ.

219. Ojā saṅkhāta-āhāro thitippatto° va ajjhate
rūpāhārasamuṭṭhānaṁ samuṭṭhāpeti gilite.

220. Hadayindriyarūpāni kammajāni nava tattha
viṇñatti dvayaṁ cittaṁ saddo citto 'tujo bhave.

221. Lahutādittyam utu-cittāhārehi jāyati
vānño gandho raso ojā bhūtā ākāsadhātu ca.

222. Nava catūhi jāyanti lakkaṇāni na kuto ci
jāyaṇāṇādī rūpānaṁ sabbhavattā hi kevalam.

223. Aṭṭhārasa pannarasa terasa dvādasāpi ca
kamma cittotukāhārajāni honti yathākkamam.

224. Tatthekajāhekaśa° ekam eva duvidhā rūpaṁ
tiṇi tiṇi rūpāni nava catūhi sambahūtā.

Ayaṁ ettha Rūpasamuṭṭhānanayo

225. Ekuppādaniruddhānaṁ ekaniṃsayaavuttiṇaṁ
rūpānaṁ piṇḍavasena bāvisa rūpakalāpā.
226. Cattāro ca mahābhūtā vaññagandharasojakahān
duddhaṁ sajīvitaṁ jīvitaṁ navakam̄matam.

227. Tadeva bhāvatāthi sabbāvadassadakkā
tadhā cakkhusadakādi kalāpā nava kammāja.

228. Suddhaṁ kāyavīññatti navakaṁ saddanavakaṁ
vacīsaddadasakaṁ ca lahuṭadēkādaskaṁ.

229. Taṁ kāyavacīsaddhe dvādasa-terasā pā ca
cittajā satta-kalāpā vaci vinā sādā nava
viññattirahito saddo athī ti pana taṁ matam.

230. Suddhaṁ kāyaṁ saddanavakaṁ lahuṭadēkādaskaṁ
tad eva suddhassaddena dvādasa cato u tujā.

231. Suddhaṁ kāyaṁ lahuṭadēkādaskaṁhārāja dvidhā
kammādiyā nava sattā cattāro dvē yathākkamaṁ.

232. Suddhaṁ kāyavakaṁ dve utuja bahiddhā pā sabbe
pana avasesā ajhajhatma yeva labbhaṁ.

233. Kalāpānanam pariccheda lakkhaṇāta vicakkaṇā
da kalāpānganam iccahu ākāsāṁ lakkhaṇāni ca.

Ayyam ettha Kalāpayojana

234. Catudhā rūpakalāpā kāmalo ke yathārahaṁ
sattanāṁ upalabbhanti anūnāni pavattiyaṁ.

235. Sandhiyaṁ pana sābhāva āsakā kāyavatthukā
gabhaseyyakasatānāṁ pāṭubhavanti kammajā.

236. Abhāvakassa natttheva sattassa bhāvadasakaṁ
tato ṭhitim upādāya upajāyanti utujā.

237. Dutiya cittam upādāya upajāyanti cittajā
direkā dvisattāhe upajāyanti 'hāraṁ.

238. Kamato sattasattāhe dasakā pī cakkhu dāayo
andhabadhira-sattanāṁ na labbhaṁ yathārahaṁ.

---

1Suddhaṁ and so below  2kalāpāngaṁ  3Catujā  4sabhāvaṁ

239. Opapātikasattanāṁ sandhiyaṁ sattadasakaṁ
tesāṁ pana omakānaṁ na labbhaṁ yathārahaṁ

240. Tato pi utujādāni vuttaneyaya jáyanti
iccemaṁ yāvatāyukaṁ abbcocchinā pavatanti.

241. Bhāhīgāsattarasuppāde jáyante kammajā na te
tad uddhaṁ jáyante tasmā takkhayā maraṇāṁ bhave.

242. Āyukkamubhayasaṁ vā khayena maraṇaṁ bhava
upekkamenā vā kesaṁ ' upacchedaka-kammunā.

243. Puretaram uppanāni cutisamaṁ nirujhanti
tato bhijjanti cittajāni sesā 'v utuja.

244. Iccemaṁ matasattanāṁ punad eva bhavantare
paṭisandhim upādāya tathārūpam pavattati.

245. Sandhiyaṁ rūpalo pē cakkhusotavatthudasakaṁ
navakaṁ cāpi labbhi na navakaṁ 'va asaṁnīnaṁ.

246. Tato paraṁ pavatte pi pavattanti cittotujā
utujasaddanavakaṁ asaṁnīnaṁ na cittajāṁ.

247. Aṭṭhavīsati kāmesu honti tevisa rūpisu
sattarase vasaṁnīnaṁ arūpe naththi kiñcī pi.

248. Saddo vikāro jarata maraṇāṁ copapattiyaṁ
na labbhaṁ pavatte tu na kiñcī pi na labbhāti.

Ayyam ettha Rūpapavattikkamo

249. Sattanāṁ āyu jīvitaṁ tasmā tassa paricchedaṁ
vakkhami nayam ādāya tam tām ganthesumāgataṁ.

250. Āpāyikānaṁ sattanāṁ manusṣaṇāna ca jīvitaṁ
pamāṇaṁ niyamaṁ naththi tesanām dukkha-bahūlato.

251. Chakāmāvaca rādīnaṁ pamāṇaṁ jīvitaṁ atthi
sukhumojāhārṭa ca mahāpuṇṇanibbattattā.

---

1tesanām  2upakkamenā  3cittamajāni  4matasattanām  5-dasanā
252.YAñi paññāsavassāni manussānaṃ dino tahim tiṉsaratidivo máso māsā dvādasaṃ¹ vaccharam.

253.Tena samvaccharen ’ayu dibbam pañcasatam mataṃ tato upari devānaṃ dvīgūṇa āyudīghatā divavassassa guṇena² ayu catugunam bhave.

254.Pañca ekam dvi³ ca catu athasolasadāho likhya⁴ ādo dvikaṃ⁵ sese tiha⁶ dibbasankhya pakāsitā.

255.Manussaganaṇaṇa pana no chatri catu catveke so sapaṇ ca catukam⁸ tri dve soceko⁹ ca dve 'nodho¹⁰ ca cha suṇaṃ¹¹ pakāsitaṃ.

256.Cha ete kāmāvacara sabbakāmasangaño¹² sabbesaṃ ekasaṅkhāto āyu bhavati kittako.

257.Nesam¹³ tiṃsa-sahassāni pannarasatati ca ettakā āyuppamāna¹⁴ vassaggena pakāsitā.

258.Dvādasaṅkotisatañ¹⁵ ca aṭṭhavīsa¹⁶ ca koṭiy o paññasasatasahassāni vassaggena pakāsitā.

259.Tato upari brahmānaṃ āyukappena ganaṇam tesam paṭhamabrahmanam asaṅkhheyana ganaṇam.

260.Tato upari brahmānaṃ mahākappena ganaṇam tesam paṭhamabrahmanam tatiyo upadhi eko.

261.Tato upari brahmānaṃ dutiye dve ca tuṭṭhakam tatiye soḷasadakappam battimṣa¹⁷ catusatthi ca.

262.Catutthe ādibrahmānaṃ pañcakappasataṃ mataṃ Tadaññesaṃ sahassekam dve catu aṭṭhasolasa.

263.Arūpināṇ ca brahmānaṃ visatālisa sāṭṭhi ca caturāsīti sahassaṃ kammato ayuppamānaṃ.

264.Manussa ca ca deva ca brahmabhūmi ca terasa bhūmiyo visati ekaṃ kappam uddhaṃ patiṭṭhita.

265.Heṭṭhima brahmalokamāḥ patitā mahati silā ahorattena ekena oggata aṭṭhatāḷīsaṃ.

266.Yojanaṃ sahassāni catumāsehi bhūmiga eva vuttappamāṇena sāyaḥ heṭṭhima-bhūmiga.

267.Ito satasahassāni sattapanīsasa cāparaṃ sāṭṭhi c eva sahassāni ubbedhena pakāsitā.

268.Yojanesu pi vuttesu hitva kāmapamāṇakaṃ sesāni vasavattinema pārisajjānaṃ antaraṃ.

269.Tato hi pañca paññāsa satasahasāni cāparaṃ aṭṭha c eva sahassāni yojanaṃ pavuccare.

270.Ito parāsu sabbāsu brahmabhūmisu yojanaṃ tappamāṇā¹⁵ va daṭṭhabbā nayagāhena¹⁶ dhīmatā.

271.Bhūmito ābhavaggamā sattakoṭi aṭṭhārasa lakkhāpañcañahutāni ca sahassāni sabbadhi.

Iti Nāmacāradipake Rūpaniddeso nāma Chaṭṭho paricchedo

VII

272.Saṅkhāṭaṃ² nāmarūpāni paccayaṇa vinā nattthi tasma paccayavibhāgaṃ pavakkhami samāsato.

273.Hetupaccayārammaṇa-adihipati³-anantarana samantara⁴ sahajātāñaṃmaṇaṇaḥ ca nissayaṃ.

274.Upanissayaṃ pure jātaṃ pacchājātaṃ aśevanam kammvipākatam āhārat indriyam jhānaṃ maggo ca.

275.Sampayuttaṃ vippayuttaṃ atthi nattthi ca vigatāvigate ti catuvīsa vutā⁵ va paccayaṅunanā.

¹dvādasa ²ganaṇa ³dve ⁴aṭṭhasolasadāḥḥita ⁵dvikaṃ ⁶tikaṃ ⁷sappaṇ ⁸catukhaṃ ⁹soca eko ¹⁰chidra ¹¹suṇaṃ ¹²samaṅgino ¹³Netaṃ ¹⁴āyuppamāna ¹⁵satā ¹⁶aṭṭhavīsa ¹⁷battimṣa ¹⁸nayagāhena ²Saṅkhataṃ ³Hetupaccayārammaṇa-adhipati ⁴samanantara ⁵vutta
276. Cha hetu hetupaccayā lobhadosamohādayo
tamsampayutta-khandhānaṃ kammaja-cittaññañ ca.

277. Chabbhidhārammañadhāmā nāmañña yeva paccayo
adhipatti 1 dvidhā bhedo sahajātāṃ ārammaññaṃ
sahajātetha chando ca cittavīrīya 2 vīmaṃsā.

278. Sahajātānaṃ nāmañña cittajānañ ca paccayo
garukattaṃ 3 ārammaññaṃ tathāpavattanāmaññaṃ.

279. Niruddhānantarakhandhānaṃ pacchākhandhāna paccayo
purimā samanantarāṃ nirujjhītvāna paccayo.

280. Sahajāto tidhā bhedo nāmaṃ bhūtā ca hadayaṃ
nāmaṃkhandhā aṇṇam aṇṇam sahajātānañ 4 ca rūpānaṃ.

281. Mahābhūtā aṇṇam aṇṇam upādānañ ca rūpānaṃ
hadayavatthu sandhiyaṃ vipākenaṃ 5 aṇṇam aṇṇam.

282. Aṇṇam aṇṇam tathā tidhā nāmaṃ bhūtā aṇṇam aṇṇam
vatthu saddhiṃ vipākena aṇṇam aṇṇam va paccayo.

283. Nissayo pi tidhā bhedo nāmaṃ bhūtā ca chavatthu
nāmaṃkhandhā aṇṇam aṇṇam sahajānañ ca rūpānaṃ.

284. Mahābhūtā aṇṇam aṇṇam upādānañ ca rūpānaṃ
chavatthu tannissitānaṃ nissayatena paccayo.

285. Anantarāṃ pakato ca ārammaññaṃpanissayo
tividho etha vutta dve pakato tannissitassa.

286. Ārammaññaṃ chavatthu ca pure jāto dvidhā bhedo
jātass 1 ārammaññaṃ rūpāṃ chavatthu tannissitañaṃ.

287. Pacchājātā catukkhandhā purejātassa kāyassa
javanāmalavajjitaṃ pacchimassā āsevanāṃ.

288. Dvidhā kammañ nāmañña nānikhanñikā cetanā
sahajātāsahajāta-nāmarūpaña paccayo.

289. Nānikhanñikā cetanā kaṭattā rūpa-pākanaṃ
pakaṃ sahajarūpaña nāmaṃ rūpaṃ dvidhāhāro.

290. Nāmahāro phassādayo sahajā nāmarūpaña
rūpojā rūpakāyassa paccayāhāra sattiyā.

291. Nāmaṃ rūpindriyaṃ dvidhā nāmaṃ dvinnam sahajānañ.
cakkhādirūpaṃ jivitaṃ viññānaṃ kaṭattānaṃ.

292. Jhānaṅgā sattapaccayo sahajā nāmarūpaña
maggā dvādasa paccayo sahajā nāmarūpaña.

293. Sampayuttā catukkhandhā aṇṇam aṇṇam 'va paccayo
vippayutto dvidhā nāma chavatthu ca tattha nāmaṃ
pure jātaṃ sahajātañ cha vatthu tannissitānaṃ.

294. Atthā vigata-paccayā sahajātāṃ pure jātaṃ
pacchājātañ ca āhāro pañcadvārā rūpa-jivitaṃ.

295. Natthi vigata-paccayā anantarā saadisa
sattimattavisesan 1 ca vutta 2 adicca-bandhūnaṃ.

296. Sappaccayā viññāya kadāci pi na vijjati
jātiyā vitadhammānaṃ ajāti pi saṁviñjati.

297. Ajāti nāma nibbānaṃ khandhaninimita-nissatām
asaṅkhataṃ appaccayā maggaphalaṃ 'lambañan 3.

298. Sabhāveto ekavidhaṃ upādisesabhedina duvidhaṃ hoti suññatāṃ 3 animittadīna tidhā.

299. Padam accutam accentam asaṅkhataṃ anuttaraṃ
nibbānam iti bhāsanti vāmamuttā maheṣayo.

Iti Nāmacāradīpakā Paccayavibhāgo nāma
Sattamo paricchedo

1 visesaṃ 2 vutta 3 suññatāṃ

1 adhipatti 2 cittavīrīya 3 garukattām 4 sahajānañ 5 vipākanaṃ
Nigamana


Saddhāmmanjotipako Nāmacāradipako karontena mayā pattāṃ yaṃ puṇṇaṃ hitadāyakaṃ.

Tena puṇṇena ijjhantu sabbasattamanorathā rājāno pi ca rakkhantu dhammena sāsanaṃ pajāṃ.

Labhāmahāṃ pattabhave araṇīṃ anantaraṃ āyubalāṃ ārogyaṃ dadūtu Metteyya-jino subuddho tilokasantaṃ amataṃ avānaṃ.

Nāmacāradipako niṭṭhitaṃ

---

\(^1\) viriya and so below  
\(^2\) guṇasamaṅgītena  
\(^3\) pācīnadīśābhaṅgatita

ABSTRACT

Suttas in the Pāli Canon fall into distinct categories. The three largest of these, Sermons, Debates and Consultations, are analysed in this paper. These different categories can be clearly defined by means of their introductory and concluding formulas, and their internal structure. The problem of the authenticity of these categories is addressed. The theory is then put forward that the different types of sutta are not equally reliable with regard to the authenticity of the teaching they contain, and especially that the version of the Teaching contained in Sermons and Consultations may be more reliable than that presented in Debates. It is then argued that the ratios of these different types of sutta point to an original difference of purpose between DN and MN: the original purpose of DN being the attraction of converts, that of MN, the presentation of the leader, both as a real person and as an archetype (a Tathāgata), and the integration of new monks into the community and the practice. Some remarks are made about the usefulness of these categories to research into original Buddhism. Finally, a brief comparison is made between the period the Buddha lived in and our own.

---
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CATEGORIES OF SUTTA IN THE PĀLI
NIKĀYAS AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS FOR
OUR APPRECIATION OF THE BUDDHIST
TEACHING AND LITERATURE.¹

The various texts and collections of the Pāli Canon are often
treated as if each of them had the same purpose and function. On a
superficial level this is of course true: at least from the perspective of our
time they are a collection of texts that preserve one school’s version of
the Buddha’s Teaching. But at the very earliest time, in order to ensure
the propagation of the new religion, different sorts of material would
have been necessary. At the very least the new religion would have had to
be made known in a way that would gain both the converts who would
make possible its survival, and the lay-supporters who would make
possible the survival of the converts. After that appropriate material
would be required to integrate the converts into the values and standards
of the new religion, and further material to teach them its principles and
practices and to help them deepen their commitment and their knowledge.
The requirement for different sorts of material for different purposes
would from the beginning have spontaneously given rise to different
types of collections, i.e. sets of suttas all serving the same function and
remembered as a group. At a later time, and under different historical

¹ In this paper translations will be offered in the footnotes to enable comparison
by scholars who are unfamiliar with Pāli and who study other oral literatures and
related topics.

Textual variations such as name changes, changes in pronoun or in the number
of the verbs (singular or plural) and so forth will not be noted as they are not
relevant for the purposes of this paper.

Formulas will be numbered consecutively. They will be referred to thus: “1”,
“2”.

DN 16, the Mahā Parinibbāna Sutta, will not be included in this study.
Frauwallner (1956) has shown that it originally belonged to the Skandhaka of
the Vinaya Piṭaka, and indeed it is too much an amalgam and too different from
the other Dīgha suttas to warrant its inclusion here.

conditions, the original need which caused certain suttas to be grouped
together would have been lost sight of, and other reasons for the
grouping together of suttas invented. The explanation that Majjhima
Nikāya and Dīgha Nikāya are simply the collection of the long suttas and
the collection of the medium length suttas may come from just such a
time, after their original functions had been forgotten.

The Majjhima and Dīgha Nikāyas contain little of the
categorising of the Anguttara and Saṃyutta Nikāyas, few of the rules for
the Order, as in Vinaya, and furthermore, they are rather coherent
material. They offer an opportunity to study certain of the literary forms
in which suttas are presented. A statistical analysis of the proportional
representation of each of the main categories of sutta in these two
collections suggests that originally each of them came about to serve a
separate and distinct purpose. This has implications for our understanding
of Buddhist literature and the Teaching it contains.

Suttas in the Dīgha and Majjhima Nikāyas have been generally
described as “sermons”, “dialogues”, “narratives”, “discourses”,² “prose
dialogues, legends, pithy sayings, and verses”, “speeches”,³ or they may
be studied as part of Indian kāvya literature.⁴ Categories of sutta in the
Dīgha and the Majjhima Nikāyas can, however, be rather more precisely
distinguished. The means for making distinctions among the suttas are
the formulas which provide their structure: their introductory and
concluding formulas, the formulas that occur regularly within certain
categories of sutta only, the use of particular verbs and expressions and
certain stylised literary features.

This article will provide the criteria for the categorisation of three types
of sutta: Sermons, Debates, and Consultations. Most of the suttas in the
Nikāyas can be categorised in one of these three ways. Those that cannot

² Winternitz, 1933, 34.
³ Law, 1933, 79, 80.
⁴ Warder, 1974, Chapter XII.
include gāthās, and some of the stories and myths. These categories will not be treated in detail here.

A Sermon is defined to be a discourse for the purpose of religious instruction containing exhortation and/or instruction. A Consultation is an occasion where someone, bhikkhu or otherwise, has recourse to the Buddha or to a senior monk for instruction or information, or where the Buddha or a senior monk initiates a particular kind of dialogue with a monk or someone belonging to another group or sect. A Debate is a formal intellectual confrontation in which one party challenges another in a contest of religious knowledge.

1. SERMONS.

Sermons can be distinguished by their introductory and concluding formulas and by their internal structure. They may comprise entire suttas, or they may be introduced within a sutta that begins as a Debate or Consultation. Entire suttas which through their opening and concluding formulas can be defined as Sermons are preached only to the monks. Sermons that are preached to persons who are not monks are contained only in Debates and Consultations. In these circumstances monks are always present as well.


There are two formulas, one being an expansion of the other, which occur at the beginning of suttas and which define these suttas to be Sermons. These formulas appear only at the beginning of sermons. They therefore convey immediately to any audience the information that the

---

5 DN 1; 2; 4; 5; 6; 7; 13. MN 30; 36; 41; 94; 135.

6 MN 27; 105. There is one exceptional case, MN 53, where the Buddha instructs Ānanda to preach to the Sakyans.

---

the sutta about to be recited is a sermon. The introductory formulas follow the standard “Evam me suṭṭha” and a brief statement of location.7

i. The simplest introductory formula.

This is:


The theme of the sermon is introduced in the opening sentence which follows the formula.

Instances:

| DN suttas: 22; 26; 30; 33; 34. |
| Total = 5/34 = 14.7%. |
| MN suttas: 3; 5; 6; 7; 9; 10; 11; 15; 16; 19; 20; 25; 28; 33; 34; 39; 40; 45; 49; 64; 65; 70; 101; 102; 103; 106; 111; 112; 115; 116; 129; 130; 141. |
| Total = 33/152 = 21.71%. |

ii. The expanded introductory formula.

This longer introductory formula is made up of three parts. It begins with the simplest introductory formula, “1” above. This is followed by the announcement of the theme in a standardised form, an
injunction to the bhikkhus to listen and the acknowledgement of this injunction. The full expanded introductory formula is:


Instances:

DN suttas: none.
MN suttas: 1; 2; 17; 113; 114; 117; 120; 131; 137; 138; 139; 14010; 148; 149.
Total = 14/152 = 9.21%

1.2. Formulas that introduce Sermons in the middle of suttas.

Part of “2” occurs in the middle of suttas that have begun in some other way. It is the independent formula:

This formula therefore functions as a Sermon-markers, a cue in a sutta which indicates to the audience that what is about to follow will be a Sermon. “3” is preceded by certain standard formulas and expressions. These may be direct questions, or requests for teaching or for the expansion of a Sermon given in brief. “3” may also follow the announcement by the Buddha that he will teach. It may introduce a parable.

i. Direct Questions.

In some Debate Suttas, once the adversary has been reduced to asking the Buddha for an explanation,12 “3” is a frequently used means of introducing the Buddha’s answer.

Instances.

DN suttas: 2 [i 62, § 39]; 4 [i 124, § 22]; 5 [i 134, § 9]; 6 [i 157, § 15]; 7 [i 159, § 1]; 13 [i 249, § 39]; 31 [iii 181 § 2].
MN suttas: 27; 54; 135.

---

9 “And there the Lord addressed the bhikkhus, saying ‘Bhikkhus’, ‘Revered Sir’, those bhikkhus acknowledged him. The Lord spoke thus: ‘I will teach you, bhikkhus, (theme of sermon). Listen to it, apply your minds well. I will speak’. ‘Yes, Revered One’, these bhikkhus acknowledged the Lord. The Lord spoke thus:”

10 The formula is not completely standard here.

11 “Listen to it, apply your minds well. I will speak’. ‘Yes, Revered One’, these bhikkhus acknowledged the Lord. The Lord spoke thus:”

12 See below for an analysis of this category of sutta and especially for the importance of this type of situation.
ii. Requests for teaching or for expansions of Sermons given in brief.

Requests for Sermons or expansions of Sermons in brief seem to have been becoming formulaic, but not to have been distilled by the bhāṇakas (reciters) or by the redactors into one standard formula. This movement towards formula can be seen in the stereotyped use of certain words and phrases. Certain expressions are used when resorting to the Buddha himself (MN 41; 42; 135: “4” below), a different expression is used when resorting to the senior monk Mahā-Kaccāṇa (MN 18; 133: “5” below), and yet another when resorting to the monk Udena (MN 94 [ii 161,17-19]). These expressions are then followed by formula “3”. They are frequently preceded by expressions of flattery directed towards the recipient of the request.  

The formula for addressing the Buddha is:

\[ \text{Na kho mayaṃ imassa bho Gotamaṃ saṅkhittena bhāsitassa viṭṭhārena athām avibhattassa viṭṭhārena athām ājānāma; sādhu no bhavaṃ Gotamo tathā dhammaṃ desetu yathā mayaṃ imassa bho Gotamaṃ saṅkhittena bhāsitassa viṭṭhārena athām avibhattassa viṭṭhārena athām ājāneyyāmā ti.} \] 

Udena is approached with a simple version of this formula, while Mahā-Kaccāṇa is addressed through the related formula:

\[ \text{sadhu me ... desetu} \]

13 These are an interesting category of formula in their own right. They deserve their own study, and will not be discussed or quoted here.

14 “We do not know the meaning in detail of what was said by the Lord Gotama in brief; we do not know the meaning in detail of what was not explained. Please let the Lord Gotama teach us that Teaching so that we may know the meaning in detail of what was spoken in brief by the Lord Gotama; so that we might know the meaning in detail of what was not explained.” MN 41; 42; 135.

15 MN 94 [ii 161,17-19].
Instances:

DN suttas: 5 [i 134]; 13 [i 249].
MN suttas: 73.

There is also the non-standardised form,

Sādhu maṃ, bhante, Bhagavā saṃkhittena ovādena ovadatu ...

... ,¹⁹ MN 145.

The standard phrases in these sermon requests are particularly sādhu no ... desetu “please teach us”

Instances:

DN suttas: 5 [i 134]; 13 [i 249].
MN suttas: 41; 42; 73; 94; 135.

and sādhu paṭibhātu “please let come to your mind”.

Instances:

DN suttas: 4 [i 124].
MN suttas: 3; 9; 46; 47; 68; 76 [i 514,24-28].

Further there is the expression of encouragement from the monks to the Buddha which indicates their readiness to hear a Sermon:

8

“Etassa Bhagavā kālo, etassa Sugata kālo, yaṃ bhagavā ... dharmīṃ katham kareyya, Bhagavato suitvā bhikkhū dhāressantī.”²⁰

iii. Instructions to preach.

Instructions to preach rather self-evidently introduce Sermons. The terminology used in these is similar to that used in requests for sermons. The verb paṭibhāti is standard, and the expression dhammi kathā rather common.

9 Paṭibhātu taṃ ... ²¹

Instances:

DN: 33 [iii 209].
MN: 53 [i 354,21-26]; 123.

In the Nandakovāda Sutta no theme is introduced and the Buddha simply instructs Nandaka to give a sermon to the nuns in these words: Ovāda, Nandaka, bhikkhuniyo. ... karohi tvāṃ, brāhmaṇa, bhikkhunīnaṃ dhammadhan ti (MN 146).²²

iv. Introducing a parable.

The formula “3” may also may be also used to introduce a simile or a parable in the middle of a sutta that is not a sermon.

¹⁹ “Please let the Lord instruct me with brief instructions ... .”
²⁰ “The Lord should teach dhamma. It is the appropriate time for this, Lord. It is the appropriate time for this, Well-come One. When the monks have heard the Lord, they will remember (his words).”
²¹ “Let come to your mind, ... .”
²² “Instruct the nuns, Nandaka. Provide them with a sermon.”
1.3. Expressions that may introduce Sermons.

Certain terms and expressions may introduce Sermons. Because their use is not consistent these cannot be considered invariably to be Sermon markers. Nevertheless they require mention here.

i. The question “What were you talking about?” as a Sermon marker.

A conventional means of introducing the Buddha to the main stage used in these suttas is to have him come up to a group of monks or religious practitioners of other persuasions and to ask them what they are talking about.

10 Kāya nu 'ttha bhikkhave etarahi kathāya sannisinnā, kā ca pana vo antarākathā vippakatā ti (MN 26 [i 161]).

This is a challenging question. The type of sutta it introduces depends on the answer given. When the monks are thus addressed they answer with the subject of their discourse, and the Buddha immediately begins a Sermon. When others who are not monks (and who usually are paribbājakas of whatever kind) are thus addressed they evade the question and instead pose another, and the sutta develops into a Debate.

ii. The expression “dhammi kathā” as a Sermon marker.

The expression dhammi kathā may be used when a sermon is requested (DN 33; MN 76 [i 514]; 146 [iii 270]). There are, however, no regular or formulaic connecting phrases. This expression is used generally for the Buddha’s discourse and occasionally for the discourse of monks too.

iii. The verb “āmanteti” as a Sermon marker.

The verb āmanteti occurs in both the simple and the extended introductory formulas. It is standard too when the Buddha speaks to the monks. The phrase:

11 Atha kho Bhagavā ... bhikkhū/(name of bhikkhu) āmantesī:

which forms part of both introductory formulas may on its own introduce a Sermon.

Instances:

DN suttas: 32 [iii. 206].
MN suttas: 21 [i 124]; 29; 48 [i 322,5]; 53 [i 354,31]; 67 [i 459]; 69;

---

23 “As you were sitting down just now, what was your talk about, monks? What was your talk that was interrupted?”

24 See section on Debate below.

25 “And then the Lord addressed the monk/(name of monk) ... .”
This phrase appears also in the following variant form:

12 *Atha kho Bhagavā tuṇhībhūtaṃ tuṇhībhūtaṃ bhikkhusamgham anuviloketvā bhikkhū āmantesti.*

 Instances:

DN suttas: none.
MN suttas: 110 [iii 21]; 118 [iii 79, 80].

1.4. The internal structure of a Sermon.

Sermons define themselves also by their internal structure, which is simple and unvarying. The subject of the Sermon will be proposed either as a statement or as a question. The Sermon will then be developed methodically either through the expansion of a series of statements or through the expositions to a series of rhetorical questions. Sermons are not usually interrupted. Where there are rhetorical questions within a Sermon it is extremely unusual for these to be answered by the monks. This is a feature that clearly distinguishes Sermons from Consultations: Sermons are mostly monologues, Consultations are mostly dialogues.

Instances of Sermons in which rhetorical questions are answered:

DN Sermons: none.
MN Sermons: 105; 106; 110; 119; 129
Total = 5/57 = 8.77%.

---

26 “And then the Lord, surveying the completely silent community of monks, addressed the monks:”
27 See below for the discussion of this category of sutta.

1.5. Concluding formulas.

i. The standard concluding formula.

The standard concluding formula is completely regular and unvarying except for the names it contains. These vary because sermons are not invariably given by the Buddha and the audience is not invariably, although most usually it is, “bhikkhus” in general.

The standard conclusion to a sermon is an acknowledgement by the monks or by one particular monk in the following form (the words in brackets being those that change):

13 *Idam avoca (Bhagavā). Attamanā (te bhikkhū) Bhagavato bhāsitam abhinandun ti.*

 Instances:

DN suttas: 1; 14; 22; 26; 32; 33 and 34.
MN suttas: 1-3; 6; 9-11; 15-21; 25; 26; 28-30; 33; 39; 40; 45-48; 51; 53; 64; 65; 67; 68; 70; 101-103; 105; 106; 110-115; 117-120; 122; 123; 129; 131; 133; 134; 136-139; 141; 145; 146; 148; 149; 152.

A variation of this concluding formula with compounds of the verbs “bhāsit” and “abhinandat” is also found.

14 *Itīha te ubho mahānāgā aññamaññassa subhāsitam samanumodimsū ti.*

---

28 “Thus spoke the Lord. Delighted these monks rejoiced in what the Lord had said.” (tr. MLS I 8).
29 “In this wise did each of these great beings rejoice together in what was well spoken by the other.” (tr. MLS I 40).
Instances:

DN suttas: none.
MN suttas: 5. (See also under Consultations.)

Occasionally a concluding formula is followed by a statement that a monk or a group of monks has attained a particular stage.

Instances:

DN suttas: none.
MN suttas: 147; 148.

ii. The Concluding formula when suttas end in verses.

When a sutta is concluded with verses, these are introduced by the following concluding formula:

15  **Idam avoca Bhagavā, idam vatvā Sugato athāparaṃ etad avoca Saṭṭhā.**

Instances:

DN suttas: none.
MN suttas: 34; 130; 142.

2. DEBATES.

A sutta can be defined as a Sermon on the grounds of its opening and closing formulas and its internal structure. The criteria that permit a sutta to be defined as a Debate include some formulas, but for the most part it is the features of certain suttas that permit their definition as Debates.

---

30 "Thus spoke the Lord; the Well-farer having said this, the Teacher then spoke thus:" (tr. MLS I 279).

---

31 See Witzel, 1987, for some comparisons between the rules of discussion, of challenge and of defeat in Vedic and in Pali literature.

32 for example the formula on brahman virtues in DN 4 [i 113 foll.].

The dramatic debate shows most clearly the sequence of features of the Debate suttas.

I. THE DRAMATIC DEBATE.

i. The description of the Location.

Where the introduction to a Sermon is a brief record of the place in which it was given, the description of the location in a Debate sutta is usually given more importance. It is more elaborate and details are specified. This is because its function is to set the scene and create the atmosphere for a drama. Thus if the Buddha’s opponent is a rich brahman the beauty and wealth of his domain is described, or we may be told that a location just happened to contain at that time a number of brahmans. Where the opponent is another wanderer less importance is given to the location.

ii. The presentation of the opponents and their credentials.

As a Debate is a drama it is important in the presentation of the characters to establish the worth of the adversaries from the outset. Especially, as these Debates are recounted by the Buddhists, the Buddha’s prestige and the importance of the debate that will follow are enhanced by the prestige and importance of his adversary. There are standard ways of introducing and demonstrating the prestige of the different types of adversaries and, equally, there are standard ways of showing that the Buddha’s prestige equals their own. These standard ways are (a) to show the social status of the adversary, (b) to demonstrate his knowledge, (c) to describe the size of his following, (d) to show the respect with which he greets the Buddha.

a. The social status of the adversary.

The social status of the adversary is an important feature especially where the opponent is a brahman or a king (kṣatriya) and it is emphasised by the inclusion of many details. Where the adversary is an important brahman the richness of his domain and the importance of his king-patron is emphasised at the beginning of the account of the Debate, where this feature forms part of the scene-setting (Location). The elaborate procession in which this type of adversary may approach the Buddha is often described.

By promoting the high social status of the adversary the texts prove that the Buddha is held in high esteem by this class of people.

b. The knowledge and attainments of the adversaries.

The news of the Buddha’s arrival in a particular area is announced in a formula that describes both the size of his following (see c. below) and the extent of his knowledge and attainments:


---

34 DN 3; 4; 5. MN 95.
35 DN 6; 13. MN 98.
36 DN 2; 3. MN 84.
parisuddham brahmacariyam pakāseti. Sādhu kho pana tathārupānāṃ arahatāṃ dassanāṃ hoti ti."

This formula occurs wherever the opponent is a brahman, although its use is not limited to these occasions, nor to the Debate situation. The response to this formula by the brahman to whose domain the Buddha has come is either that he decides to visit the Buddha, or that he sends a student (antevāśi).

There are two formulas for describing the highest state of brahman knowledge, a very long one and a short one. I quote only the short one:

17 ... ajjhāyako mantadharo tinnaṃ vedānāṃ pāragī sanighanḍu-keṭubhānaṃ sākkharappahhedānaṃ itihāsa-paścamānaṃ padako veyākaraṇo lokāyata-mahāpurisa-lakkhaṇesu anavayo ...

37 "Now regarding that venerable Gotama, such is the high reputation that has been noise abroad: — That Blessed One is an Arahat, a fully awakened one, abounding in wisdom and goodness, happy, with knowledge of the worlds, unsurpassed as a guide to mortals willing to be led, a teacher for gods and men, a Blessed One a Buddha. He, by himself, thoroughly knows and sees, as it were, face to face this universe, — including the worlds above of the gods, the Brahmas, and the māras, and the world below with its recluses and Brahmas, its princes and peoples, — and having known it, he makes his knowledge known to others. The truth, lovely in its origin, lovely in its progress, lovely in its consummation, doth he proclaim both in the spirit and in the letter, the higher life doth he make known, in all its fullness and in all its purity. And good is it to pay visits to Arahats like that." (tr. DB I 109).
DN 2 [i 49] (abbreviated version); 3 [i 87]; 5 [i 127 foll.]. MN 41; 60; 75; 91; 92; 95.

38 In the Sela Sutta, MN 92, this statement of attributes is communicated to Keniya, the matted-haired ascetic.

39 DN 4 [i 113 foll.]; 5 [i 137]. MN 95.

40 "He was a repeater (of the sacred words) knowing the mystic verses by heart, one who had mastered the Three Vedas, with the indices, the ritual, the phonology, and the exegesis (as a fourth), and the legends as a fifth, learned in

The short formula is most usual when the brahman sends one of his student to see the Buddha on his behalf. When, however, the brahman leader decides to go on his own account, there is a dramatic turn of events. His followers warn him that should he do that his own glory (yasas) will be diminished and that of the Buddha enhanced. They advise him rather to let the Buddha call upon him. They support this advice with the recitation of a long description of all the features that makes this man such a true brahman and such an important religious leader, and which make it, therefore, in every way inappropriate that he should be the one to pay the visit. This gives the brahman the opportunity to defend his proposed action, and to say that indeed the Buddha himself also possesses all of these brahman virtues. This recognition that the Buddha receives from other religious leaders further serves in these texts to demonstrate the esteem in which he is held and his worthiness as an opponent.

c. The audience.

The description of the size of the following around each of the opponents is a frequent feature and its comportment serves to enhance, or otherwise, the importance of each adversary. The nature of audience is also a point. The respectful silence and concentration of large groups of monks is frequently contrasted with noise and gossip among the followings of the various wanderers.

41 DN 4; 5. MN 95.
42 e.g. DN 2; 9. MN 77; 79.
d. The formal greeting between adversaries.

In these dramatic accounts the formal greeting between the adversaries is the final element in the scene-setting before the action of the Debate is begun.

The first encounter between the adversaries is an important moment in an event where the status of each is at stake. There are three degrees of formal greeting in the suttas: simple, elaborate and very elaborate. The simplest greeting is the monks’ way of initiating communication with the Buddha. This simply consists of making a salutation and sitting to one side.

18 bhagavantam abhivādetvā ekamantam nisīdi.43

This does not occur in debates except as part of the ceremonious formal greeting (see below). Rather, in these are found either a formal greeting in which social pleasantries are indulged in, or a ceremonious formal greeting. The formal greeting which includes social pleasantries is expressed:

19 Bhagavatī saddhiṃ sammodi sammodaniyaṃ kathaṃ sārāniyaṃ vītisāretvā ekamantam nisīdi.44

The ceremonious formal greeting occurs when the adversary is an important brahmin. In this case some among his large group of followers will use one or other of the above formal greetings besides which greetings such as bowing with joined palms, announcing name and clan, or simply remaining silent will occur.45

43 “He saluted the Buddha and sat to one side.” e.g. MN 8 [i 40]; etc.
44 “He exchanged with the Blessed One the greetings and compliments of politeness and courtesy, and took his seat on one side.” (DB I, p. 152). e.g. DN 3, § 9; § 16; 4, § 9; § 5, § 8. MN 30; 36; 56; etc.
45 DN 5, § 8. MN 41; 42; 60.
adversary, there is no formal greeting. Instead the Buddha begins with the challenging question, “What were you talking about?”50 In contrast to the monks who always answer this question and then receive a Sermon, the adversary and his group will avoid giving an answer, asking instead their own challenging question.51

iii. The challenge, the refutation and the defeat.

The challenge, the refutation and the defeat in the Buddhist debates conform to the same rules, allowing for the difference in situation, as that in the brahmanical debates.52

a. The challenge.

The challenge comes in the form of a question. It starts the discussion.

The rules for the challenge are that “two or more persons ... challenge each other to answer certain questions of a ritual or spiritual nature; or one man is challenged by a group of others. This may occur in a private or in (a) public situation ... ”.53 In the Buddhist scriptures usually the Buddha is challenged by an adversary but there are also frequent occasions where he issues the challenge himself.

The type of question that may be asked is also defined. “Normally only well-known — though technically complicated — questions are allowed ... ”, and in passages that do not involve a

brāhmodya or ritual discussion, “ ... the questioning concerns the proper procedure or ritual and its secret, esoteric meaning ... ”,54 or there may be questions concerning other “esoteric, secret knowledge, be it ātmān, brahmā or about the dhamma (or simply a secret, as in the case of the origin of the clan of Ambāṭṭha which is known only to him and a few others).”55

It would serve no purpose in this article to list all the challenges in the Buddhist Debate suttas. The example of Ambāṭṭha’s secret has already been given. Here are some others, chosen at random. In the Kūṭadanta Sutta (DN 5), the Buddha is asked how to perform a successful sacrifice. In the Aggi-Vacchagotta Sutta (MN 72), the Buddha’s views are challenged. In the Gaṇaka Moggallāna Sutta (MN 107), the Buddha’s training and its effects are queried. The first (DN 5) is an example of a question of a ritual nature; the others are challenges of a spiritual nature.

b. The refutation.

There are rules too regarding the refutation. It is especially the case that “mere brazen assertion does not suffice; one must be able to prove one’s knowledge”.56

A contestant cannot avoid a challenge, “one must answer at the third time the question is put ... — one must answer completely, not only partially, — if one does not/cannot answer, death is imminent.”57 The contestant must either answer or admit insufficient knowledge. If one of these conditions is not fulfilled the contestant suffers the ominous threat of death through the splitting of his head.58

50 See “10” above.
51 e.g. DN 9; MN 77.
52 The way the Debates are conducted shows that certain “general rules of discussion, rules of challenge and defeat” existed. See Witzel, 1987, 373, 381 foll. In the Buddhist debates there were other specified standards to be kept to as well. See Manné, “The Dīgha Nikāya Debates: Debating practices at the time of the Buddha as demonstrated in the Pāli Canon” (forthcoming in Buddhist Studies Review).
57 Witzel, 1987, 408. See also ibid. p. 371.
58 Witzel, 1987, 375. Witzel provides further conditions under which this threat may arise.
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These conditions point to just how daring the Buddha was to create and justify a category of questions that remained unexplained — *avayakata*.

In terms of literature, the refutations are very lively, containing many strategies, twists and turns which contribute to the drama of the situation.

c. The defeat.

The rule for the Vedic debates is that “in the course of the discussion participants who do not know the whole truth have to state this clearly, they must cease questioning … and thus declare defeat, … or they must become a pupil of the winner”.

This rule is also followed in the Buddhist texts. The participant who is forced in the course of the debate to admit that he does not know the whole truth stops putting challenging questions and instead is reduced to asking the Buddha to explain the matter to him. In this way he acknowledges that he is defeated.

There is a consequence of conceding defeat: “conceding defeat in a discussion has, of course, the social effect of clearly stated and admitted superiority, of gaining and losing ‘face’ among one’s fellow brahmins and in the tribe at large”. This forms part of the drama in the *Sōṇadāṇḍa Sutta* which makes much of Sōṇadāṇḍa’s fears that the Buddha might put to him a challenging question that he would not be able to answer.

---

59 See Warder, 137–50 for a discussion of the philosophical implications of such a category of questions.

60 Witzel, 1987, 371. See also his discussion of the threat that the adversary's head will burst.


62 DN 4 [i 119, §§ 10–11].

63 The situation in this sutta suggests that debates between religious leaders of different persuasions were inevitable when they met each other, and that they could not avoid such a meeting without losing their self-respect and the respect of their following.

Categories of sutta in the Pāli Nikāyas

There are two degrees of defeat in the Buddhist debate suttas. The first may be designated “formal” defeat. In this case the opponent acknowledges the Buddha’s superiority and asks to become a lay disciple. The second degree of defeat is total conversion: the opponent asks to become a bhikkhu. Both degrees of defeat are expressed in formulas. These formulas reflect the degree of commitment with regard to becoming a pupil. The formulas begin:


The formula for “formal” defeat continues:

22 upāsakam mam bhavaṁ Gotamo dhāretu ajjatagge pāṇupetam saraṇaṁ gataṁ.
Instances:

DN suttas: 2; 3; 4; 5; 10; 12; 13; 14; 23; 31.
MN suttas: 27; 41; 58; 60; 72; 73; 74; 80; 84; 85; 91; 92; 93 (brief: see fn. in translation); 94; 95; 96; 97; 99; 100; 102; 135; 150.

The formula that acknowledges total conversion including the request to be accepted as a monk is:

23  Labheyyāhaṃ bhante Bhagavato santike pabbajjaṃ, labheyyaṃ upasampadān ści.66

Instances:

DN suttas: 8; 9; 14.
MN suttas: 7; 75; 79; 92; 124.

These formulas close the Debate.

iv. The reward.

Two types of reward are concomitant upon winning the debate. The first, which is a consistent feature of the Debate suttas, is the acquisition of prestigious converts: the opponent and his following, whether as lay-disciples or as monks. It is expressed through the formulas above.

The second type of reward is a less consistent feature. Admissions of defeat are sometimes followed by an invitation to a meal. This is most usual when the adversary is a brahman, but occurs also when the adversary is a Jain.

---

66 “And may I be permitted to go forth from the world under the Exalted One; may I receive admission into his Order.” (tr. DB I 264).

The importance of each type of reward to a group of religieux who rely on the lay population for their bodily survival is rather evident.

Instances of Dramatic Debates.

DN suttas: 2 - 13; 23; 25; 31.
Total = 15 = 44.12%
MN suttas: 7; 27; 35; 36; 55; 56; 58; 60; 72-77; 79; 80; 82; 84; 90-96; 99; 100; 107; 108; 124; 152.
Total = 31 = 20.4%

II. THE REPORTED DEBATE.

The Reported Debate is an account of a Debate that has taken place in the past. It has the same major features as a Dramatic Debate: two opponents, a challenge, a refutation, and a defeat; but there are differences in their expression in the texts. With regard to the opponents in this type of Debate, one is always the Buddha:67 in the Dramatic Debates the representative of the Buddhist position might be the Buddha himself or a senior monk. The challenges and their refutations in this type of Debate are reported in direct speech as in the Dramatic Debates and conform to the same requirements. The defeat in these Debates is related by the Buddha as part of the account rather than being expressed by the opponent directly through the formulas “21”, “22” and “23”. It is always

67 There are many occasions where monks, having been involved in a debate, report the discussion to the Buddha to find out what they should have said, or whether they answered correctly. On these occasions it is the consultation of the Buddha by the monk that is the defining feature of the sutta, not the Debate. This type of sutta will be dealt with in the following section.
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a defeat in terms of the argument of the refutation, and there is no
conversion to the Buddha’s Teaching.

Many of the minor features are omitted in these Debates. There
is no presentation of the opponents and their credentials, no mention of
their social status, their knowledge and attainments, the size of their
following, or the formal greeting between them and the Buddha. There is
also no mention of any reward.

A Reported Debate may form the basis of a Sermon.

Instances:

DN suttas: 24
MN suttas: 14 (recounted within a Consultation), 49, 101

III. THE DEBATE WITH POTENTIAL OPPONENTS.

A general feature of many suttas is a paragraph in which an idea
or set of ideas of a group with which the Buddha disagrees in general or
who may generally disagree with him, are set forth by him, and then the
correct position, the Buddha’s own, is given. Alternatively, the Buddha
may simply contrast himself with these groups, for example, as in the
Bhayabhārava Sutta, MN 4. A few suttas, however, are entirely devoted
to disputing a particular idea set forth in this way and these satisfy the
criteria for Debate Suttas. In this type of Debate Sutta the Buddha
provides both the opponents, the challenge and the refutation. The
opponents may be regarded as potential adversaries. They comprise either
the rather general group of “wanderers of other sects”, aṅkatiṣṭhyā
paribbājakā, or that of “some samaṇas and brāhmaṇas”, eke
samaṇabrāhmaṇā; or the opponent is the puthujjana, the “Ordinary Man”,
i.e. the general representative of the group who have not undertaken any
training. The challenge consists of the Buddha’s exposition of beliefs
which he attributes to a potential adversary. The refutation comprises the
Buddha’s arguments against the position of the potential adversary as he
has portrayed it.

This type of debate may be placed within Sermon introductory
and concluding formulas, in which case it only contains the minimum of
Debate features:

Instances:

DN sutta: 1.
MN sutta: 102,

or it may be set out as a Dramatic Debate, with several of the minor
formulas, such as that expressing the Buddha’s credentials, the elaborate
greeting ceremony, and the conversion formula which acknowledges
defeat:

Instances:

DN sutta: none.
MN sutta: 60, 150 (samaṇas and brāhmaṇas), 74 (a
debate with a wanderer, but the argument is generally
directed against samaṇas and brāhmaṇas).

IV. THE REFUSED DEBATE.

There are two occasions where a sutta begins as if it were going
to be a Dramatic Debate, and then the Buddha (MN 30) or the monk
concerned (MN 125) refuses to take up the challenge. In these cases the
Buddha offers a Sermon instead. The monk, however, simply refuses to
be questioned with regard to the explanation he has given or will give.

Instances:

DN sutta: 31.
MN sutta: 30; 125.
A challenge issued by the Buddha may also be refused. In the Sigālovāda Sutta, DN 31, the householder Sigāla does not respond to the Buddha’s challenge with an assertion of his own position. Instead he asks for information and is rewarded with a Sermon. Although the question asked is typical of a Consultation the sutta ends with the Debate conversion formula for lay-discipleship. The internal structure of the sutta, however, shows that it is a Sermon as there are no interruptions.

V. SUTTAS THAT TEACH DEBATE AND REFUTATION.

Certain suttas teach strategies of debate and refutation. These suttas do not necessarily simply fall into the category of Debates, as the table of instances below shows. In the Cūlassihanāda Sutta (MN 11) and in the Nagaravindeyya Sutta (MN 150) the Buddha initiates these instructions. In the first case he is instructing his monks, and in the second some brahman householders on how to refute a challenge that wanderers of other sects (āhyaṭṭhikīya paribbājakā) might make. In the Mahā-dukkhakkhandha Sutta (MN 13) monks who had been challenged by other wanderers and who had been unable to answer the challenge go to the Buddha to have the matter explained.

Instances:

DN suttas: none.
MN suttas: 11 (a Sermon); 13 (a Debate); 150 (a Debate).

VI. THE DEBATES BETWEEN THE BUDDHA AND A MONK, OR BETWEEN MONKS.

There are occasions where the Buddha challenges the superlative claims a senior monk has made about the Buddha himself or about his Teaching. In this kind of Debate it is the Buddha who is defeated. He then has to acknowledge that the monk’s superlative claims were justified.

Instances:

DN suttas: 28 (Sāriputta)
MN suttas: none.

There is one occasion, the Rathavinita Sutta (MN 24) where one senior monk, Sāriputta, challenges another, Puṇṇa, on a point of the Buddha’s Teaching to check if the reputation of the other is warranted. This suggests that monks debated with each other to challenge each other’s understanding of the Teaching, and perhaps also to enhance their own prestige.

3. CONSULTATIONS.

A sutta can be categorised as a Consultation when the Buddha or a senior monk is resorted to for information or advice. Most usually the person doing the consulting is a monk but there are also occasions where he is a member of a different sect or group. A sutta is also a Consultation when the Buddha himself, or a senior monk, initiates the conversation.

Consultations have features in common with both Sermons and Debates.

A Consultation may be introduced in the same way as a Sermon, with minimal scene-setting: just a simple statement of the location and the brief introduction by name and social group (monk, brahman, householder, etc.) of the person who is consulting the Buddha, or it may be introduced in the same way as a Debate, with elaborate scene-setting including the description of some event or the recounting of some anecdote.
The formal greeting in a Consultation is almost always the simplest.\textsuperscript{68} It is made both by monks and by others (gahapati, MN 52; Licchavis, MN 105; etc.). The very few exceptions where the more elaborate formal greeting is used occur when the person making the Consultation is a brahman or an ascetic.

Instances:

- DN suttas: none.
- MN suttas: 4; 52; 57; 97; 98.

A Consultation begins with a question. When a monk consults the Buddha or the Buddha initiates some interaction with a monk, there is no problem with regard to categorising the sutta as a Consultation. Where, however, someone who is not a monk approaches the Buddha and asks him a question there are criteria through which this type of question and the question that forms the challenge of a Debate can be distinguished. One is, rather self-evidently, the nature of the question; another is the nature of the questioner’s response to the Buddha’s answer. In a Debate the Buddha’s answer to the challenge is argued against as part of the debating procedure; in a Consultation, the Buddha’s answer is invariably accepted. Further questions may be asked, but a different position is never put forward.

The procedure of a Consultation is that it may take the form of a dialogue, or the Buddha may respond with a Sermon. The Sermon may be introduced by the usual formula for the introduction of a Sermon in the middle of a sutta ("3"), or it may be evident because of the structure of the passage (see Internal Sermon Structure 1.5, above).

A Consultation ends most usually with the same closing formula as a Sermon. There are, however, instances where a Consultation ends with the concluding formula that acknowledges defeat in a Debate ("21" and "22", or "23"). Such occasions can only occur where the person consulting is not a monk, i.e. he is not already a convert. These instances suggest that however innocent the question may seem, one may always suspect some proximity to a Debate when the Buddha is consulted by someone who is not a monk, and when the sutta ends in a defeat formula. In this type of sutta there is often reference to potential adversaries, even when the reference is sudden and intrusive and unconnected with the main theme of the sutta (e.g. the Bhayabherava Sutta, MN 4).

Instances:

- DN suttas: none.
- MN suttas: 4 (upāsaka); 57 (upāsaka, parībījakṣa); 73 (upāsaka); 98 (upāsaka).

Consultations fall into distinct categories. Where the Buddha, or a senior monk, is consulted these include requests for teaching, requests for guidance with the practice, requests for the approval of the Buddha for some other monk’s exposition of his Teaching. Where it is the Buddha, or senior monk, who initiates the interaction, this may be in order to check the progress of the other, to drill the other in the Teaching, or to reprimand the other.

3.1. In the following categories the Buddha is consulted.

i. Requests for clarification regarding the Teaching.

This is the largest category of Consultation.\textsuperscript{69} In this type of Consultation a monk or a non-Buddhist (brahman, householder, etc.) goes

\textsuperscript{68} See Section ii.d. under Dramatic Debates.

\textsuperscript{69} As suttas frequently contain different types of Consultation, I am where necessary giving both page and line numbers in this section.
goes to the Buddha for information regarding the Teaching. This may be a simple request for general information or it may be in order to attain clarity on a particular aspect of the teaching. Clarification might similarly be sought regarding the meaning of a parable, claims made about the Buddha’s capacities and conduct, or the relationship between the Buddha’s qualities and those of other monks. There is also a request for information about the consequences of attainments, and a request for the Buddha’s judgment on the best kind of monk. Further, the Buddha is consulted on the authenticity of some monk’s claims to high attainment.

Various people and beings — monks, non-monks, yakkhas — may ask each other if they remember a particular discourse. They may request from each other expositions in detail of Sermons given in brief by the Buddha. In these cases, the consultation is simply the means to introduce a Sermon.

---

70 E.g the Aṭṭhakatāgāra Sutta, MN 52; the Anuruddha Sutta, MN 127.
71 E.g. the Cūḷatathāsāvakkhaya Sutta, MN 37; the Mahāvedalla Sutta, MN 43; the Cūḷavedalla Sutta, MN 44 [i 304,26]; the Bāhavedaniya Sutta, MN 59; the Anaccaṇḍikkha Sutta, MN 106 [This is a consultation based on a point made in a Sermon. The sutta therefore contains both a Sermon, and the ensuing discussion: a Consultation]; the Mahāpūrṇama Sutta, MN 109; the Bāhudhātuka Sutta, MN 115; the Cūḷasunāhata Sutta, MN 121; the Mahākammavībhanga Sutta, MN 136.
72 E.g. the Vamni Sutta, MN 23.
73 E.g. the Tevijja-Vacchagotta Sutta, MN 71 [i 482]; the Bāhiyika Sutta, MN 88.
74 The Gopakamoggallāna Sutta, MN 108. This consultation becomes a debate.
75 The Tevijja-Vacchagotta Sutta, MN 71 [i 483].
76 The Mahāgosiṅga Sutta, MN 32.
77 The Sunakkhattha Sutta, MN 105.
78 The Mahākkāmarāṇabhaddekarattā Sutta, MN 133 [iii 192]; the Lomasakātanīya-bhaddekarattā Sutta, MN 134 [iii 199].
79 E.g. the Mahāupiṇḍikā Sutta, MN 18; the Mahākaccānasahaddekarattā Sutta, MN 133 [iii 194].

Instances:
DN suttas: none
MN suttas — monk: 18; 23; 32; 37; 43; 44; 59; 63; 81; 83; 104; 109; 115; 121; 133; 134; 136.
— other: 52; 57; 71; 73; 78; 88; 98; 105; 108; 127.

ii. Requests for guidance with the practice.

These rare suttas may perhaps offer authentic information regarding some of the problems encountered by those practising the Buddha’s method. There are requests for guidance on practical problems, such as the problem of getting rid of particular ideas (the Sallekha Sutta, MN 8), or coping with the problem of personal greed (the Cūḷadukkhiṇkhandha Sutta, MN 14).

iii. Requests for confirmation that the Buddha agrees with some other monk’s exposition of his Teaching.

The Buddha may be consulted as to whether or not he agrees with some other monk’s exposition of his Teaching (the Cūḷavedalla Sutta, MN 44 [i 304], or a monk may himself check that he has correctly explained the Teaching (the Bhūmiya Sutta, 46).

iv. A monk consults the Buddha on a challenge.

These are the occasions where a monk has been challenged but has been unable to respond and to enter a debate. The monk then consults the Buddha on the correct answer. In the Mahāśīvanī Sutta, MN 12, the Buddha’s response is the same type of bravura exposition as occurs in a dramatic Debate, including both an assertion of his attainments and a demonstration of his knowledge.
Instances

DN suttas: none.
MN suttas: 12; 13; 80 78.

v. The Buddha’s opinion is sought variously.

The Buddha’s opinion is sought on various subjects: two ascetics ask about their likely fate after death (the Kukkura\textsuperscript{\textit{\texttt{a}}-vati\textit{ka} Sutta, MN 57); the brahmans Vāseṭṭha and Bhāradvāja ask the Buddha to settle their discussion on how one is a brahman (the Vāseṭṭha Sutta, MN 98); Ānanda asks how the order can be protected from breaking into disputes after the Buddha’s death (the Sāmaṇa\textsuperscript{\texttt{a}}-ma Sutta, MN 104).

Instances

DN suttas: none.
MN suttas: 57; 98; 104.

3.2. In the following categories the Buddha initiates the consultation.

vi. Progress is checked.

This type of Consultation in which the Buddha personally checks a monk’s progress presents an interesting aspect of his teaching activities. This sort of checking is not limited to junior monks: in the Piṇḍapātapārisuddhi Sutta (MN 151) the Buddha checks Sāriputta’s progress; nor is it limited to monks: in the Dhānañjāni Sutta (MN 97), Sāriputta checks the practice and progress of the brahman Dhānañjāni.

---

80 This sutta teaches Debate strategy. See Section V under Debates.
ix. The Buddha teaches Râhula.

It seems that the Buddha was particularly assiduous in his concern for Rahula’s progress. In three suttas (the Ambalaṭṭhika-Râhulovâda Sutta, MN 61; the Mahâ-Râhulovâda Sutta, MN 62; the Cîḷàrâhulovâda Sutta, MN 147) he goes to find Râhula especially to teach him. These episodes of teaching take the form of Consultations.

x. The Buddha checks that a particular discourse has been given.

The Buddha is depicted as being particularly concerned that the discourse of the Auspicious (bhaddekaratta) should have been given (MN 132).

xi. Social Consultations.

It seems that visits to sick monks or followers were regularly requested and carried out. In the Anâhapiṇḍikovâda Sutta (MN 143) the householder Anâhapiṇḍika who is ill asks Sâriputta to call on him. In the Channovâda Sutta (MN 144) Sâriputta and Cunda decide to call on the monk Channa who is ill. In both cases there is a discussion with the sick person regarding how he is coping with his illness, and he is offered Teaching on how to sustain himself.

**DISCUSSION**

In this section the following issues will be discussed: (1) the authenticity of these categories; (2) the implications of these categories for our understanding of the Buddhist Teaching; (3) the implications of these categories for our understanding of the different purposes of Digha and Majjhima Nikâyas; (4) the contribution of these categories with regard to distinguishing textual units; and the relationship of the Buddha’s times to our own.

1. The authenticity of these categories.

How far are the categories “Sermon”, “Debate” and “Consultation” authentic? Do these categories represent types of oral literature that go back to the time of the Buddha or must they be considered to be a convenient literary invention of the early monks and the redactors?

Common sense supports the reasonableness of the categories “Sermon” and “Consultation”. It seems hard to doubt that the Buddha, in his role of religious leader, preached Sermons and gave Consultations. This statement makes no claim that the existing material is an historically accurate record of the exact words and themes of the Sermons the Buddha preached or the exact words and themes of the Consultations that he gave. It merely says that it is rather likely that he did both. This also means that it is difficult to suspect the redactors of having invented and created these forms. Whether or not they invented them, it is certain that they exploited them in the service of (their school of) the religion.

The authenticity of the Debate as an old Indian genre of oral literature is not in question, and the Buddhists may have needed some of these types of texts in order to compete with their existence in the Vedic

---

82 I see no way of definitively distinguishing Buddha-style from bhānaka-style. Even a perfect collating back as far as possible using all the existing texts can never achieve this.

83 Warder, who treats the different genres of literature in the Pali Canon according to the criteria of Sanskrit kavya literature, says, “This canon, … (includes) a substantial amount of poetry and some prose stories … Though these are applied to propaganda purposes, they are clearly adaptations or applications of the techniques of the secular poetry and story-telling of their day …” (§ 536). Warder (§ 608) includes in his category “story-telling” suttas that are here categorised as debates, e.g. the Pâyâsi Sutta, DN 23.

texts. They may have needed to present their religious leader the way that
the brahman sages were represented: as a champion of debate in order to
enhance his credibility. Although the redactors of the Buddhist texts
cannot be accredited with the invention of this genre the accounts of
some of these Debates are such wonderful stories that one may suspect
the improving tendencies of a series of good raconteurs.

A further fact that supports the authenticity of the categories
Sermon, Consultation and Debate is their consistency throughout the
Nikayas. This study has been based on DN and MN because these are the
“story-tellers”’ collections. The formulas and literary features are clearest
and most regularly complete in them. They appear consistently too,
however, in the AN and also in the SN where, even though they occur in
increasingly abbreviated form, they are nevertheless retained. Furthermore in this collection (the SN) the same Teaching will frequently be repeated in more than one of these three categories.

The above suggests two things. The first is that the categories
were important and had to be respected and recorded by the early
redactors. Had this not been the case the abbreviated style of the SN
could easily have justified their omission. The second is that Teachings
that appeared in different categories of sutta were differently regarded.
Hence the importance of retaining the mode or modes in which a
particular Teaching was presented.

---

2. The implications of these categories for our understanding
of the Teaching.

There are, in the Pali Canon, suttas that factually and drily
convey the Teaching, suttas which present it by means of drama or
poetry, suttas that present it through discussion, and so forth. In our
own culture we would rightly give different weight to information
packaged in different ways. A factual, dry account contains a different
quality of information: clearer, more precise, more categorical; compared
with that presented as part of a theatrical production or a poetry
recitation. We would accept more readily the impartial arguments of a
good scholar to those put forward by politicians in debate: we would
recognise the politician’s purposes. Different genres of literature,
therefore, arouse different expectations. Sermons may be expected to
convey information most directly and clearly; Consultations show the
problems that arose and how they were dealt with and solved. Both of
these seem rather reliable forms for conveying information (although one
can never exclude later manipulation by the redactors). Debates, however,
are quite a different category. These are the records, slanted no doubt in
the Buddha’s favour, of public events. They are entertainments for
the purpose of propaganda. They serve also to teach the monks how to refute
challenges that were, presumably, regularly being made. It is therefore
only right that we give the correct weighting to these distinct genres of
literature from another culture.

At some point in the history of Buddhism, undoubtedly for good
reasons and probably for historically authentic ones, different aspects of
the Teaching were presented and communicated in different forms of
(oral) literature. It is, however, a frequent custom in research to treat the
contents of the Nikayas and even of the entire Pali canon as homogenous.
In research of this type, occurrences of one particular idea or theme are
collected no matter where they occur in the Canon, and an attempt is
made to understand them as a single group, a coherent whole. This
method treats this enormous body of different types of texts as if it were
all one and the same genre of literature, and therefore that all its various messages, no matter in what genre they be conveyed, have the same weight. This is not even the case in the very largest scale, as the discussions about the concept atta show. 87 Although this kind of work can be coherent, meaningful and very successful 88, more usually it is unclear and leads simply to an exposition of the writer(-believer)’s own interpretation of what Buddhism is. Looking, therefore, beyond this most general view, we can see that the establishment of these different categories of sutta (and the existence of others not treated in this paper) requires that each category be respected and given an appropriate weighting in future research.

3. The implications of these categories for our understanding of the different purposes of the MN and the DN.

The purposes of SN and AN have been described and accounted for thus:

"... the early existence of some kind of Abhidharma would explain the peculiar shape of the Sūtrapitaka, or rather of two sections of it, the Samyukta-gama/P. Samyutta Nikāya and the Ekottaragama/P. Aṅguttara Nikāya. The former arranges traditional utterances ascribed to the Buddha subject-wise; the latter follows a scheme determined by the number of subdivisions in the items discussed." 89

The difference between these texts and the MN and DN is clear and incontrovertible. The question is whether this research into categories of sutta can give insight into the purposes of the DN and the MN, and especially whether it can enable a distinction to be made regarding the purpose of these two works. For instance, it makes sense that a straight sermon to the monks might be expected to contain the Teaching in its most essential form. A Consultation may be expected to show the Teaching spontaneously developing in response to a particular situation and a particular problem. 90 A Debate, however, may be regarded as an exercise in publicity. It is an opportunity for propaganda. Something is always at stake. Not only must the best question be asked, and the best answer be given, but converts must be won and lay support must be gained. Under these circumstances we may expect that, appropriate to the situation, a particular presentation of the Teaching is given. We may expect this to be religiously sound, but exaggerated, because the Debates were public competitive occasions. If the distribution of these different types of suttas between these two collections should show a clear distinction between them we may then be able to propose that each of the first four Nikāyas came about in order to serve a distinct need and purpose in the growing and developing Buddhist community, and we may also then be able to define the function of these two collections.

Statistics usefully show up the different characters of MN and DN.

The Statistics.

The statistics that this analysis supplies are rather surprising in their implications. For this reason I have been particularly stringent regarding which suttas should count for statistical purposes, and which should be omitted. Where I thought there was any room for doubt with regard to categorisation I did not include the sutta. I have indicated my criteria under each heading. Composite suttas, i.e. Debates that become Sermons, Sermons that become Consultations, and so forth, have been

87 See Oetke, 1988. See also Bronkhorst’s review of Oetke (Bronkhorst, 1989a).
88 e.g. Bronkhorst, 1986.
89 Bronkhorst, 1985, 316.
90 On the Buddha’s teaching style see Kloppenborg, 1989.
systematically omitted. This means that the results here are systematically minimised, and therefore all the more convincing.

i. SERMONS.

A Sermon is here defined as a sutta which has both a standard introductory formula ("1" or "2") and a standard concluding formula, and the Sermon internal structure. This is the definition which will include the smallest number of suttas in this category.

DN Sermons: 1; 14; 22; 26; 30; 32; 33; 34.
Total: 8 / 34.
Percentage of suttas in DN: 23.53%.

MN Sermons: 1 - 3 (contains 2 such sermons); 6; 10; 11; 15 - 20; 25; 27; 33; 34; 39; 40; 45 - 47; 51; 53; 64; 67; 68; 102; 103; 105; 106; 110 - 113; 117; 118 - 120; 122; 123; 129; 130; 131 - 134; 136 - 141; 145; 146; 149; 152.
Total: 57 / 152.
Percentage of suttas in MN: 36.8%.

Result:
The percentage of Sermons in the MN is 1½ times greater than that in the DN.

ii. CONSULTATIONS.

Only suttas in which a member of the Order consults the Buddha are included here. This is to avoid the need to justify at length the categorisation as Consultations rather than as Debates of those occasions where someone who is not a monk consults the Buddha.

DN Consultations: 29.
Total: 1 / 34.
Percentage: 2.94%.

MN Consultations: 8; 12; 13; 18; 21; 22; 23; 31; 32; 37; 38; 43; 44; 48; 59; 61; 62; 63; 65; 66; 67; 68; 70; 73; 78; 81; 83; 97; 104; 106; 109; 115; 121; 122; 125; 126; 128; 132; 133; 134; 136; 144; 146; 151.
Total: 44 / 152.
Percentage: 29.94%.

Result:
The percentage of Consultations in the MN is ten times greater than that in the DN.

iii. DEBATES.

The criteria for suttas to be included here as Debates are that there must be a clear challenge, the challenge must be disputed, and there must be an acknowledged defeat, or the Debate must be a reported Debate or a Debate with potential opponents. Debates between monks are excluded, as are those suttas that start as a Debate but finish in some other way, such as refused Debates.

DN Debates: 1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6; 7; 8; 9; 10; 11; 12; 13; 23; 24; 25; 28; 31.
Total: 18 / 34.
Percentage: 52.94%.
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MN Debates: 7; 14; 27; 30; 35; 36; 56; 58; 60; 72; 74; 75; 76; 79; 80; 84; 90; 91; 92; 93; 94; 95; 96; 99; 100; 101; 102; 107; 124.

Total: 29 / 152.
Percentage: 19%.

Result:

The percentage of Debates in the DN is more than $2\frac{1}{2}$ times greater than that in the MN.

These statistics show that the MN contains proportionately a greater number of Sermons and Consultations than the DN and a proportionately fewer number of Debates. How can this be accounted for?

The tradition holds that suttas were assigned to the MN and DN according to their length at the first council. If we accept this then all that these statistics show is that, because there are more Debates in the DN, Debates are usually longer than Sermons and Consultations. This is a possible explanation but it seems also rather superficial and arguments can be brought forward against it.

The legend of the first Council in the Pāli Vināya that holds that Ānanda recited the Sutta Piṭaka, and therefore each of the Nikāyas as we know them today, is generally held to be untenable. On this ground we may dismiss any idea that in an extraordinary feat of mental sorting Ānanda achieved this relationship at that time (or that he was purposefully and intentionally organising the suttas in this way as he memorised them in his position as the Buddha’s chief attendant). In any case the practicalities of such a sorting in the absence of writing are unimaginable. Staal has produced a fantasy about how Pāṇini’s grammar could have been composed orally. It imaginatively involves hordes of pupils who, acting as living note-books, memorise relevant portions of the work in progress. As Bronkhorst has said, it is a charming invention, and an implausible speculation. The monumental task of re-sorting orally-learned texts in the absence of writing makes it extremely unlikely that this legend contains a grain of truth.

The notion that texts were re-sorted orally brings with it further problems, not the least of which is the problem of attachment — so fundamental to human nature and so important in this literature. The Vinaya account of the first Council attests to the attachment of the monk Purāṇa to the version of the Teaching he had heard from the Buddha above that offered to him by the Council. It is unlikely that Purāṇa stood alone. People do not so easily give up features of their religion or system of belief or accept a different version of it or make compromises. The differences between the Dīgha-bhānakas and the Majjhima-bhānakas regarding the constitution of the Khuddaka Nikāya testifies to this.

How, then, did the collections get their earliest form? Norman describes the situation after the second council when the collections had begun to be formed and the schools were still in contact.

“The fact that one and the same sutta is sometimes found in more than one nikāya in the Pāli canon would seem to indicate that the bhānakas of the various nikāyas could not always agree about the allocation of suttas. The fact that the sūtras in each Sanskrit āgama do not coincide with their Pāli equivalents would seem to indicate that each school had its own bhānakas who while all agreeing in general with the other bhānakas of their

---

92 Lamotte, 1958, 141 foll.
93 Staal, 1986, 37 foll.
95 Vin ii 289 foll.
96 Norman, 1983, 31 foll.
own and other sects, nevertheless preferred to differ over the placing of some sūtras. This suggests that there was in early times a large collection of suttas which were remembered by heart, and the task of allocating them to the various nikāyas/bhānakas had not been finished or the allocation completely agreed, by the time the schools began to separate. 97

It is thus more likely that originally suttas came to be remembered in different groups or sets rather spontaneously and naturally in response to the exigencies of particular situations and requirements, and that these groups form the cores of the different Nikāyas as we know them today.

What could those exigencies that brought about the form of the collections have been? The early Buddhists had two important and urgent purposes. One was to gain converts and lay support; the other was to ensure the survival of their religion. Without success in both of these their Teaching would die out. How were they to realise these purposes? Obviously a body of (oral) literature was necessary. To attract converts the early Buddhists first needed an audience. For that their initial communications had at least to be attractive and entertaining. Of the first four Nikāyas by far the most entertaining texts occur in the DN. 98 The most dramatic Debates are there, for example in the Sāmaññaphala Sutta (DN 2), the Ambattha Sutta (DN 3), and the Sāṇḍana Sutta (DN 4); and the most philosophical debates, e.g. in the Kassapa Sīhanāda Sutta (DN 9) and the Poṭṭhāpāda Sutta (DN 9). The most magical and

98 Monks would, of course, not have been excluded from this entertainment. Without radio or TV, society at the time of the Buddha was dependent on locally generated entertainment. The Brahmapāla Sutta (DN 1) gives a rather full catalogue of what was available. But monks were excluded from or at least discouraged from participating in all of these forms. Only one form of entertainment was available to them: the hearing and reciting of suttas. The Brahmapāla Sutta leaves nothing over but this, I think.
Nikāya\(^9\) (MN 19, 26) as well as suttas about the Tathāgata and how to relate to him (how to study the Tathāgata, Vīmānsaka Sutta, MN 47; the nature of the Tathāgata, Naḷakāpāṇa Sutta, MN 68; the Tathāgata’s wonderful qualities: Acchariyabbhutadhamma Sutta, MN 123). There are suttas teaching the monks how to live together peacefully (Kosambiya Sutta, MN 48), how to settle disputes about what the Buddha taught (Kinti Sutta, MN 103), what the right eating habits are to follow (Bhaddāli Sutta, MN 66), and how forest monks should adjust their behaviour when they return to the community (Gulissāni Sutta, MN 69). There is a sutta on the way of the learner (Sekha Sutta, MN 53). There are suttas on the technicalities of the Teaching: how to practise (Satipaṭṭhāna Sutta, MN 10), how to control thoughts (Dvedhāvitakka Sutta, MN 19), how perception works (Madhupiṇḍika Sutta, MN 18), what hindrances are and how to get rid of them (Cūla-Assapura Sutta, MN 40), how to deal with the sense pleasures, (Ānantjasappāya Sutta, MN 106), how to practise the Eightfold Path (Mahācattārisaka Sutta, MN 117), how to train character (Anūmaṇa Sutta, MN 15) and so forth. All of the technicalities of the Teaching appear here in detail, whether taught directly or within an account of a conversation, and especially with regard to what they are and how they are to be dealt with in practice. There are also Sermons on problems connected with the practice and its difficulty: on the problems of meditation in a forest and when to give it up (Vanaṇapatha Sutta, MN 19), on pitfalls along the Path (Mahāsāropama Sutta, MN 29), on how to test whether one has truly attained the goal (Chabbisosdhaṇa Sutta, MN 112).

These facts suggest a general pattern. DN and MN clearly have different and complementary characters. Without denying the inclusion of additional, later suttas over time, and perhaps also under a different system of categorisation, and, similarly, without denying some

\(^9\) The intimate biographical suttas would have had the important function of introducing the monks to the personal side of the founder, so that they could get to know him personally or at least feel that they were doing that.
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movement of texts from one to the other\(^{100}\) and reduplication of each other’s texts, the general trend suggests that indeed the collection now known as the Dīgha Nikāya derived from an original, probably spontaneously created, collection of publicity material for the early Buddhists, while the collection now known as the Majjhima Nikāya was the collection which arose to serve their need to introduce new converts to the character of the Leader, the Buddha, and the important disciples, to integrate new converts into their values and their way of life, and to provide them with the fundamentals of the Teaching and the Practice.\(^{101}\) We thus see that the first four Nikāyas reflect the need of the Early Buddhists to convey, study and systematise their Doctrine at increasingly deeper levels.

4. The contribution of these categories for distinguishing textual units.

The existence of these three distinct categories of sutta, each with own unique structure, needs to be taken into account in any attempt to define the original suttas that the Buddha taught. It has implications with regard to the scientific view of long suttas, of frequently occurring pericopes, and of the integrity of individual suttas.

The view that long suttas are late amalgams of authentic material has been expressed.\(^{102}\) This is in spite of the fact that suttas exist which testify to night-long marathons of Teaching, with Āṇanda taking over when the Buddha had become weary.\(^{103}\) Clearly a great deal of material can be united into a night-long sutta. If one accepts the antiquity of the category of Debate suttas then one must accept that long suttas are not necessarily amalgams of “bits” of the Teaching.

\(^{100}\) Pande, 1974, 78.2
\(^{101}\) See Dutt, 1925, 114 foll. and 1970, 44 foll. for the early custom and practice of specialising in the memorisation of particular types of texts.
\(^{102}\) Pande, 1974; etc.
\(^{103}\) e.g. Sekha Sutta, MN 53.
There is also the tendency to see the “bits” of the Teaching, or pericopes as “original Buddhism”. Once again the category of Debate suttas requires that this view be revised. It is on the contrary likely that the pericopes in these suttas are their original features, necessitated by their structure and function.

Finally, as the strict literary style of these suttas adheres consistently to the use of clearly categorisable formulas and clearly definable internal structures and uses these for demarcation, we may make some factually supported statements about insertions. We may say that, e.g. because the appearance of formula “1” or “2” in the middle of a sutta is so rare, the cases where it does occur may indicate that in the course of time two distinct Sermons have become merged.\(^{104}\) We can, unfortunately, never be entirely certain that the suttas do not represent an occasion when the very two Sermons were given consecutively.

The case is very much clearer with regard to Debates because of their uniformity of structure and the formal exigencies of the debate situation. We may hypothesize with confidence, therefore, that two debates suttas, the Mahālī Sutta (DN 6) and the Jāliya Sutta (DN 7), have lost important parts. The Mahālī Sutta begins in a similar way to other debates with important brahmans. It begins with the information that there were many important brahmans in the area at that time,\(^{105}\) and then continues with a statement of the Buddha’s credentials.\(^{106}\) It then incorporates what could easily be the beginning of a different debate: the introduction of a different adversary, Oṭṭhadha, the Licchavi, with his followers. In the debate that follows, however, the brahmans are forgotten. Their role is never shown. Instead, the debate that is recorded is with Oṭṭhadha, the Licchavi. Then, in the middle of this debate, there is introduced rather suddenly a quite separate debate which is both thematically different and also a debate of a different type, namely a

---

\(^{104}\) E.g. the Dhammādāyada Sutta, MN 3.

\(^{105}\) Cf. the Teviya Sutta, DN 13.

\(^{106}\) Cf. the Soṇḍanda Sutta, DN 4; the Kūṭadanta Sutta, DN 5; etc.

---

Reported Debate. At the end of this debate, in conformity with the style of the Reported Debate, there is no formula acknowledging defeat (cf. formulas “21”, “22”, “23”), but instead the type of acknowledgement formula (“13”) that monks give at the end of a Sermon or Consultation. It appears here that either the Debate with the brahmans that the Mahālī Sutta leads us to expect has been lost in time, or a rector/redactor has introduced this beginning without realising its implications, i.e. at a later time when the literary conventions and their implications had been forgotten. The Jāliya Sutta, DN 7, moreover, comprises just this Reported Debate, only given “live”, so to speak, i.e. not reported, but in the form of a Dramatic Debate. In this account, because it is a Dramatic Debate, one would expect the defeat formulas. The ascetics of DN 7, however, do not become converts. This is at odds with the formulaic and conforming nature of this genre of Debate.

Conclusion.

To study these texts is to be open to their qualities as literature: to their capacity to convey a Teaching convincingly; to their capacity to tell a story, and to their capacity to depict a culture. It is also to be curious, to wonder what sort of a society, what sort of times make the success of a Buddha possible?

In doing this work I could not but be struck by the way the Buddha is depicted to have lived his life and fulfilled his tasks as a religious leader: setting a convincing example, Teaching (in the form of Sermons), being available for Consultations, participating actively also in the society of his time as a Debater, and also taking time to maintain his own meditation and practice. I also found remarkable the depiction of the Buddha as a religious leader among other religious leaders — large numbers of them more or less successfully (the remaining literature shows which were the successful ones\(^{107}\)) — fulfilling this archetypal

---

\(^{107}\) Basham, 1951.
role. And I wondered whether the great contemporary upsurge of interest in Buddhism, both experiential and scientific,\(^{108}\) and in all other forms of personal growth and spiritual development, has not come about because the times we are living in right now and the times of the Buddha have indeed certain similarities. Some people call our times “the New Age”, meaning an age of increasing spiritual awareness emerging from a previous age of materialism and struggle for survival. Buddhism, Jainism, Ājīvikas, Brāhmaṇas, Upaniṣads — don’t these all suggest that Buddhism arose in similar times?

---

\(^{108}\) See the *Journal of Transpersonal Psychology* for many articles on this subject.

---
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ON THE VERY IDEA OF THE PALI CANON

In memory of I.B. Horner

In this paper I address the issue of the formation and role of the Pali Canon in Theravāda history and culture. My perspective is strictly that of an external observer wishing to make a contribution to historical scholarship, or at least to initiate an academic discussion of the issue: I mean to imply no evaluation whatsoever of any way in which the Canon has been or is seen by Theravāda Buddhists. From this perspective and for these purposes, I want to suggest that the role of the Canonical texts in Theravāda tradition has been misunderstood, and that the usual scholarly focus on the early period of Theravāda is misplaced. We must, I will suggest, reject the equation ‘the Pali Canon = Early Buddhism’, and move away from an outmoded and quixotic concern with origins to what I would see as a properly focussed and realistic historical perspective. Rather than pre-existing the Theravāda school, as the textual basis from which it arose and which it sought to preserve, the Pali Canon — by which I mean the closed list of scriptures with a special and specific authority as the avowed historical record of the Buddha’s teaching — should be seen as a product of that school, as part of a strategy of legitimation by the monks of the Mahāvihāra lineage in Ceylon in the early centuries of the first millennium A.D.

It seems to me useful to divide Theravāda Buddhist history into three periods, according to the different kinds of evidence which are available to us. The first or ‘early’ period lasts from the time of the Buddha (whenever that was) to that of Aśoka. We have no evidence of any kind which can be securely dated before Aśoka; to describe, speculatively, pre-Aśokan Buddhism, we must make inferences from his inscriptions, from the texts (whose extant form is due to the later period) and perhaps also from the material remains of later times. From the time of Aśoka onwards, in the second or ‘middle’ period, in addition to an
increasing amount of textual materials we have inscriptions, coins, paintings, sculptures and other material remains to supplement and when necessary correct what the texts tell us. The third or ‘modern’ period refers to those recent centuries in which we have, in addition to material and textual primary sources, reports from western travellers, officials of imperial governments, anthropologists and others, as well as the modern records kept by indigenous rulers and bureaucracies. Much of the evidence for ‘early’, pre-Aśokan Buddhism is to be found in the Pali Canonical texts, or rather some of them; but in assessing the nature of this evidence we must be much more fully aware of their provenance in the ‘traditional’ Theravāda context than has hitherto been the case. In the first part of the paper, I shall outline two senses of the word ‘canon’, and then look for comparable terms in Pali. In the second, I shall sketch in broad brush-strokes what I see as the context in which the Pali Canon emerged; and in conclusion I shall ask briefly what role has in fact been played by this Canon, and — more significantly — by the idea of such a Canon, in those religious cultures we denote by the short-hand term, ‘Theravāda’.

I

The word ‘canon’, in relation to textual materials, can usefully be taken in two ways: first, in a general sense, as an equivalent to ‘scripture’ (oral or written). Used in this way, the term does not specify that the collection of texts so designated constitutes a closed list; it merely assigns a certain authority to them, without excluding the possibility that others could be, or may come to be included in the collection. In the second sense, however, the idea of a ‘canon’ contains precisely such an exclusivist specification that it is this closed list of texts, and no others, which are the ‘foundational documents’. The existence of some sort of scriptural or canonical materials in the non-specific, inclusivist sense is surely a necessary condition for a religion to be or have what anthropologists used to call a ‘Great Tradition’. But the existence of a canon in the second, exclusivist sense is, on the contrary, a non-universal and contingent feature, dependent on the specific history of a given milieu which produces the selection and redaction of such a closed list. When compared with other extant collections of scriptures in Buddhism, I think the Pali Canon is unique in being an exclusive, closed list. Why did such a canon develop in traditional Theravāda Buddhism?

First, what Pali terms might correspond to ‘canon’? There are three main candidates: the word pāli itself, the notion of the tiṇīṭaka, ‘the three baskets’ of tradition, and most importantly, the concept of buddha-vacana, ‘the Buddha’s Word(s).

(i) As is well-known, the word pāli was not originally the name of a language, but a term meaning firstly a line, bridge or causeway, and thence a ‘text’. It is often found in apposition to aṭṭhakathā, which is usually translated ‘commentary’, and so some scholars have taken pāli to mean ‘canon’. I would not want to disagree with this, if the term is used in the general and inclusivist sense of ‘scripture’ outlined above. But the primary use of the distinction between pāli and aṭṭhakathā is not to classify documents into different categories (although it did come to have that function: e.g. Sp 549, Sv 581), and still less to denote explicitly a closed list of texts, as the terms ‘canon’ and ‘commentary’ might imply; rather, it was to distinguish between the precise wording of a text, in the text-critical sense, and the more flexible task of ‘saying what it means’, which is the literal translation of aṭṭhakathā. Pāli and aṭṭha are regularly applied to texts in this way (e.g. Mp IV 187, Th-a II 135-6 et freq.); these terms are often given in commentarial exegesis of the pair dhamma and attha (e.g. Pj II 333, 604, Ja II 351, VI 223; compare the ‘four-fold profundity’ at Sp 22 and Sv 20, the former using pāli, the latter tanti). Pāli can be used synonymously with pātha, ‘text’, in the sense of ‘reading’, often when discussing variants (e.g. Sv 49, Ud-a 105-6, Th-a II 203). Quotations can be introduced by phrases such as tatrāyam pāli, ‘on this matter (there is) this text’, (e.g. Sp 13, 395, Spk I 200, Th-a III 105); the term pāli-vāṇānā, ‘text-commentary’, can be used in the same
way as pada-vanāṇā, ‘word-commentary’ (Sv 771, 982, Mp II 306),
both of which are complementary to vinicchaya-kathā, ‘exegesis’ or
attāha-vanāṇā, ‘explanation of the meaning’ (Vibh-a 291, Vism 16, Pj I
123 foll.). Pāli can refer to the text of a specific individual work, as
Udana-pāli (Ud-a 4) or Apadāna-pāli (Th-a II 201, III 204). The phrases
pāliyam (an)gata (or (an)arūha) are used to mean ‘(not) handed down in
a/the text’, referring to textual passages, topics and names of people (e.g.
Sp 466, 841, 1112, Sv 989, Mp I 272, IV 143, Th-a I 44, III 203); the
term pālimuttaka, ‘not found in a (the) text(s) is used both of sermons by
the Buddha not rehearsed at the Councils and thus not extinct (Sv 539,
Ud-a 419-20, cp. Sv 238, 636, Spk I 201) and of Disciplinary decisions
and rulings in use by the monkhood but not found in the text of the
Vinaya itself (Sp 294 et freq.). In none of these uses, however, does the
term in itself imply that the texts so referred to are a closed list.11

(ii) The term pīṭaka is usually taken to mean ‘basket’.12 If this is in fact
the same word as pīṭaka meaning ‘basket’,13 then it is intriguing to
speculate on what could be the metaphor underlying its use to mean
‘tradition’, given that one cannot literally put oral ‘texts’ in baskets:
Trenckner (1908, pp. 119-121) held that just as in excavations or digging
work in ancient India, baskets of earth were passed along a row of
labourers, so the Buddhist tradition was passed along a line of
transmission, in pīṭakas, from teacher to pupil. Wintemitz (1933, pp. 8-9
note 3) suggested that the idea is of ‘receptacles in which gems, family
treasures, were preserved from generation to generation’. In any case, we
must agree, I think, with Rhys Davids (who accepted Trenckner’s view,
(1894), p. 28) that the term tipitaka refers to ‘three bodies of oral
tradition as handed down from teacher to pupil’. It is, perhaps, not
necessary to see a metaphor underlying the term: just as the term āgama,
in both Sanskrit and Pali, means colourlessly ‘something which has come
down’, ‘a text’, and saṃhitā in Sanskrit means ‘a putting together, a
sequence, a collection (of words, ideas, etc.)’ and hence ‘a text’, so pīṭaka
can simply mean ‘a collection (of words, stories, etc.)’ and hence ‘a (part
of a) tradition’.14 The word is used in canonical texts to mean a ‘tradition’
or ‘customary form’ of religious teaching: but interestingly, in a
pejorative sense, as a poor second-best to personal spiritual experience
and knowledge.15 The earliest extant uses of the word tipitaka date from
inscriptions and texts of the 1st century A.D.16 At this period, I think, it
should be taken to denote not three closed lists of documents, but rather
three different genres within the tradition; and to point to generic
differences in style and content in the Disciplinary Rules (Vinaya-piṭaka),
the Discourses (Sutta-piṭaka) and the ‘Further Teachings’ (Abhidhamma-
piṭaka). This tripartite division continues another, said in the canon to
have existed during the Buddha’s lifetime: the division of labour between
vinaya-, sutta-, and māṭika-dhara-s, ‘those who bear (in memory) the
disciplinary rules, the teachings and the mnemonic lists’.17 Clearly during
the Buddha’s lifetime, there can have been no closed canon18; and I agree
with Lamotte (58, p. 164), when he says that ‘all that the classification
of scripture into three baskets does is to attest to the existence within the
religious community of three different specialisms, having for their
objects the doctrine, the discipline and scholastic matters (la scolastique)
respectively’. Eventually, of course, the term tipitaka did indeed come to
have the sense of a closed and fixed Canon.19

(iii) Originally, then, neither pāli nor tipitaka referred to a closed canon.
This is true also of the third term buddha-vacana, ‘The Word of the
Buddha’; but here we do begin to approach something like our ideas of a
‘canon’ and ‘canonical authority’.20 The term, and other words and
phrases referring to ‘what was said by the Buddha’ can be found in the
Canonical texts.21 One of Aśoka’s inscriptions reads e keci bhāmte
bhagavatā buddhena bhasīte save se subhāsīte vā, ‘everything which was
said by the Blessed One, the Buddha, was well-said’.22 The idea behind
these terms can be, and has been taken in Buddhism in two crucially
different ways. On the one hand it can be used, as it most commonly has
been in the extant Mahāvihārin tradition of Theravāda, to mean the actual
word(s) of the historical Buddha Gotama — despite the fact that it has
always been evident that the collection of texts so designated includes many which cannot have been actually spoken by him (those spoken by other monks before and after his death, for example). For this reason and others, on the other hand, there is also an historically un specific sense of the term, which refers in general to the — eternal and eternally renewable — salvific content of Buddhist Teaching: to use a phrase ubiquitous in the Canon, it refers to the ‘spirit’ (āṭṭha) rather than the mere ‘letter’ (vīśeṣa) of the Buddha’s law (dhamma).

This non-histocrit approach to scriptural authority, although not absent from Theravāda, is much more characteristic of Mahāyāna traditions, where the eternal truth of the Dharma may be revealed in texts of any and every historical provenance. The attitude is nicely captured in the phrase ‘whatever is well-spoken is spoken by the Buddha’.

23 A sutta from the Aṅguttara Nikāya (A IV 162-66), contains this phrase, and is worth looking at in more detail. It describes a conversation between the monk Uttara and the king of the gods, Sakka (Indra). Indra is impressed with a talk he has been told of, given by Uttara to some monks; he descends from heaven and asks Uttara whether what he said was own inspiration (saṅkhyāpatiṣṭhāna) or the word of the Buddha (Bhagavata vacana). Uttara replies with a simile: ‘it is just as if there were a great heap of grain near some village or town, and people were to take grain from it in buckets or baskets (piṭakehi), in their laps or hands. If one were to go up to these people and ask them “where are you bringing this grain from?” how would they properly explain themselves?’ Indra replies that they would do so simply by saying that they got the grain from the heap. Uttara explains ‘in the same way, king of the gods, whatever is well-spoken is all the word of the Blessed One … Whenever I or others preach, what we say is derived from there’ (yam kihi subhāsitaṃ sabhan taṃ tassa Bhagavato vacanaṃ ..., tato upādāy upādāya mayaśi ca ahiṃ ca bhāṣāna). The choice of bhaṣati here is not accidental: bhāṣa and other derivatives are regularly used both for sermons and for the recitation of passages from the canonical texts.) Clearly the point of the remark here is simply that Uttara is saying that what he teaches comes from the Buddha; but grammatically there would be nothing wrong with interpreting his remark in the Mahāyānist sense. (In contrast, the inscription of Aśoka cited above is unambiguously not the Mahāyānist sentiment, since it serves as an introduction to his list of recommended texts (see below, and notes 22, 27): the logic of the edict is that ‘everything said by the Buddha was well-said, but these texts are especially good ….’) Why then did what has become Theravāda ‘orthodoxy’ choose to emphasise an historicist and exclusivist idea of its ‘Canon’, ‘the Buddha’s Word(s)?

II

For the sake of brevity, I will present my argument schematically. Before the 1st century B.C., all Buddhist texts are said to have been preserved orally; there is a large amount of evidence from a wide variety of sources, mutually contradictory for the most part, which suggests that a series of meetings were held, usually called ‘Councils’ in English but more precisely ‘Communal Recitations’ (saṅgiti), one of whose functions was for monks to recite together the scriptures, whatever they were. Apart from Aśoka’s inscription which mentions by name some texts still extant, however, we simply have no idea which texts in fact pre-date Aśoka, and which might have been thus recited. The traditional account has it that Pali texts were transmitted to Ceylon in the 3rd century B.C., along with commentaries, and there again to have been preserved orally (the commentaries being translated into and elaborated in Sinhalese). Both texts and commentaries were then written down during the (second) reign of King Vaṭṭagāmanī, between 29 and 17 B.C. (see below). The following two statements, both written by staunchly orthodox modern Theravādins, make it clear that we cannot know the relation between ‘the canon’ as we now have it and the canon as it was being transmitted at this time; still less can we know that this canon was thought of in the closed, exclusivist sense. Malalasekara writes, in his standard work The Pali Literature of Ceylon (1928, p. 44),
'Although there is evidence to prove the growth of the Pali Scriptures during the early centuries of Buddhism in India and Ceylon, there is no reason to doubt that their growth was arrested and the text was finally fixed in the 5th century A.C. when the Sinhalese Commentaries on the Tipitaka were translated into Pali by Buddhaghosa'.

The Pali Canon, like most other religious Canons, was produced in a context of dispute, here sectarian monastic rivalries. King Vaṭṭagāmiṇi supported the rivals of the Mahāvihārin monks, those of the recently founded Abhayagiri monastery. (In the 4th century there arose a third sub-sect, the Jetavana group, but my focus here will be on the Mahāvihāra-Abhayagiri rivalry.) Both groups existed throughout the first millennium, up until king Parakkamabāhu I suppressed the others in favour of the Mahāvihāra in the 12th century (the extant Mahāvihārin texts call this his ‘unification’ of the monkhood); and at certain periods Abhayagiri was clearly the more numerous and dominant. With some disputed exceptions, no Abhayagiri texts survive, although texts and commentaries are ascribed to them (directly or indirectly) in extant Mahāvihārin works. We can trace, I think, a significant difference between Mahāvihārin texts written before Parakkamabāhu’s ‘reform’ and those written after: that is, in the direction of an increasingly triumphalist re-writing of earlier history.

One area where this change is particularly evident is in accounts of the writing down of the canon: the earliest versions are remarkably brief and restrained, giving little idea of the real reasons for this development, to us so significant. The Dipavaṃsa (XX 20-1) and Mahāvaṃsa (XXXIII 100-1) have exactly the same stanzas:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{piṭakākatayapāḷī ca tassa athakkathāṃ pi ca} \\
\text{mukhapāṭhena ānesuṃ pubbe bhikkhū mahāmaṇī;} \\
\text{hāniṃ disvāna sattānaṃ tadā bhikkhū samāgata} \\
\text{ciraṭṭhitatthām dhammassa pothakesu likhāpayum.}
\end{align*}
\]

‘Previously, intelligent monks (had) preserved the text of the three piṭakas and its commentary orally; but (now) when the monks saw the hāni of beings they came together and had them written in books, in order that the Teaching should endure for a long time.’

The word hāni, which I have left untranslated, means ‘loss’, ‘decay’, ‘diminution’, ‘abandonment’, etc. The issue here is how to take it in context. The Dipavaṃsa account places these stanzas in the midst of what is more or less a list of kings, with minimal narrative embellishment. It mentions Vaṭṭagāmana, but simply gives the bare details of his accessions to the throne (he was king twice), and the length of his reign. Oldenberg’s translation (1879, p. 211) has ‘decay’, Law’s (1959, p. 249) ‘loss’, neither of which attempts to interpret the term. The Mahāvaṃsa places the stanzas immediately after its account of the succession of the monk Mahātissa, and the subsequent split between the two monastic fraternities. Mindful of this perhaps, Geiger (1912, p. 237) translates hāni as ‘falling away (from religion)’. In modern secondary works, there has arisen a tendency to associate the writing of the texts most closely with conditions of war and famine, and so to translate hāni as ‘decrease (in numbers)’, or more generally ‘disastrous state’. This seems first to have been suggested by Adikaram (1946, Chap. 4); Rāhula’s account (1956, pp. 81-2, 157-8) is very frequently cited in other secondary works. These authors recount stories concerning war between Sinhalese
and Tamil kings, and a famine associated with a brahmin turned bandit called Tissa. The Mahāvamsa mentions Tissa briefly earlier in the Chapter (XXXIII, 37-41), but not the famine.

Although it is quite plausible to connect the decision to commit the texts to writing with the troubled conditions of the time, it is worth noticing that this is not given as a reason in any of the primary sources, early or late. Adikaram himself suggests (pp. 115 foll.) that conditions in Rohana, in the south of the island, may not have been as bad as in the north; and as Gunawardana (1982) has shown, it is anachronistic to think of the island at this period as a single state centred at Anurādhapura. I suggest, not necessarily a replacement for their account but perhaps as a complement to it, that we follow the Mahāvamsa and associate the writing of the texts and commentaries with the contemporary rivalry between the Mahāvihāra and Abhayagiri monasteries; and I would argue that at least one of the motives for the decision was the fixation, through writing, of a definitive list of scriptures, at a time when the position of the Mahāvihāra as sole legitimate custodians of Buddhism was under threat. Certainly in the following centuries, one of the major themes in Mahāvihārin writing about its rivals concerns their use of ‘heterodox’ scriptures, in addition to the Pali texts shared by all three groups. It seems that at least from the 3rd century A.D., and perhaps before, the Abhayagiri monks used what we would now call Mahāyāna texts; it is revealing that this is standardly referred to by their Mahāvihārin opponents as their embracing the vetulla-vāda. The term vetulla, Sanskrit vaitulya or vaipulya, meaning ‘extended’ or ‘enlarged’, refers to the great extent of certain Mahāyāna scriptures. Later triumphalist chronicles condemn with increasing vehemence the heresy of these unacceptable texts, and tell of repeated book-burnings by pro-Mahāvihārin kings.

In the 5th century the great Indian monk Buddhaghosa spent some time in Ceylon at the Mahāvihāra, writing what are now the standard Pali commentarial works, on the basis of the earlier Sinhalese texts. This also took place during the reign of a king who supported the Abhayagiri, Mahānāma (409-431). Thus Adikaram (1946, p. 94) aptly remarks:

'It is worthy of notice that the two most important events, namely, the writing down of the Pali texts at Āloka-vihāra and the translation of the Commentaries into Pali, both took place during the reigns of kings who were not favourably disposed towards the Mahāvihāra and who actively helped the opposing camp, the Abhayagiri-vihāra'.

The account in the Cūlavamsa, written after Parakkamabāhu I and in part as a panegyric on him, tells us that when Buddhaghosa had produced his digest of Theravāda scholasticism, the Visuddhimagga, the Mahāvihārin elders exclaimed ‘assuredly, he is Metteyya (the future Buddha) (nissamsayam sa Metteyyo); then when he had rendered their commentaries into Pali, they are said to have received them pālim viya, literally ‘just as (or ‘as if they were’) Canonical texts’, or more loosely ‘as the authoritative version’. The parallelism is obvious: the Buddha Gotama produced the Texts (pāli) as buddha-vacana, ‘the Buddha Metteyya’ produces an authoritative redaction of the commentaries, pālim viya.

Finally, I think we should see the writing and fixing of a closed canon in relation to the creation of historical chronicles in Ceylon: the vamsa tradition. The term vamsa (Sanskrit vaṃśa) was used in India for a variety of forms of historical text, primarily genealogies, from the time of the Brāhmaṇas. Another meaning of the term is ‘bamboo’, and I think we may see some significance in this. Bamboo grows by sending out one, and only one, shoot: unlike our concept of a genealogical tree, therefore, a vaṃśa genealogy allows only one legitimate successor at a time. Thus the term not only describes a line of transmission, but at the same time ascribes to the members of the vaṃśa a specific status and authority as
legitimate heirs of that transmission. In the tradition of purāṇa writing, two of the traditional five characteristics (pañcalakṣaṇa) alleged to be present in any such text are vamsa and vamsānucarita; the former term refers to a genealogy of gods, patriarchs, kings and great families, the latter to the deeds of such a vamsa. (How far these five characteristics actually do apply to the extant purānas is a complex issue.) The texts in question here are not only the great compendia of mythology, theology, etc., concerning various great gods such as Viṣṇu and Śiva; they include also, amongst others, a little-studied genre of regional, caste purāṇas, about which Ludo Rocher says, in his recent book on the subject (1986, p. 72):

Even though this type of texts relate to single castes in limited areas of the subcontinent, they are again not fundamentally different from purānic literature generally ... [then, quoting another writer:] The caste-purāṇas may be considered to be the extension of Vamsānucarita, in the sense that they devote themselves to the history of some Vamsa, in the broad sense'.

I suggest that we see the Pali chronicles in this perspective as a part of the literary genre of the purāṇa in the widest sense, listing the genealogy and deeds of the lineage of the Buddha and his heritage. In addition, both by their very existence and by such details of their content as the stories of visits by the Buddha to the different Theravāda lands, the vamsa texts produced in Ceylon and later in mainland Southeast Asia served the heilsgeschichtliche purpose of connecting these areas with India. More specifically, as Heinz Bechert has argued (1978), the early examples in Ceylon may have served the political purpose of enhancing and encouraging Sinhalese nationalism. It has long been recognised that the ideology of these vamsa texts is that of the dhammadippa, the island which the Buddha prophesied would be the historical vehicle of his saving truth.46

It has often been noted that the dominant Theravāda attitude to its scriptures, unlike other Buddhist groups, is an historicist one; but it has not been noticed, I think, that this development coincides with the production by Theravāda monks of what Bechert calls the only ‘historical literature in the strict sense of the word [in South Asia] prior to the period of the Muslim invasions’.47 The earlier Sinhalese commentarial materials, shared by both Mahāvihāra and Abhayagiri groups, contained vamsa sections, and there may have been at least one specifically Abhayagiri vamsa; but a particular characteristic of the development of the Mahāvihāra tradition is its rich and varied collection of these texts, usually called ‘Chronicles’ in English. There were probably many different reasons for their being produced, and it is true that earlier Sanskrit and Pali works with vamsa sections were preserved orally. Nonetheless I suggest that a revealing perspective on the issue can be gained from the comparative historical and anthropological study of literacy, where it is widely recognised that one of the earliest functions of writing was the making of lists.49 I suggest that both the idea of a fixed and closed Canon and the vamsa genre may be seen together as members of the same class: the ‘list’. The vamsa genre is descended from name-lists (genealogies) and event-lists (annals); the closed ‘canon’ is also descended from name-lists and word-lists, but adds to the simple idea of a list of texts (a librarian’s concern, in itself) the crucial political element of closure: nothing can be added or taken away.

In brief, then, I argue that the following four developments in the Theravāda tradition, taking place over the first half of the first millenium A.D., are related, not only conceptually and historically, but also as connected parts of a strategy of self-definition and self-legitimation by the Mahāvihārin monks:

(i) the writing down of the canon and commentaries;
(ii) the production of a closed and historically specific canon of scripture;
(iii) the standardisation of authoritative commentaries, and
(iv) the development of the historiographical tradition of vamsa texts.
(Incidentally, not only might we explain the creation of a fixed Canon by this historicism; it may be that this form of religious legitimation was one reason for the birth, or at least the first real flourishing of historiography in South Asian culture at this place and time.)

There have been, of course, other forms of legitimation in Theravāda, notably the possession and control of relics and images. But one of the most salient characteristics of the Mahāvihāra lineage has always been its conservative and/or reformist, text-oriented self-definition; this was significantly underlined and extended, both in Buddhism and in Buddhist scholarship, by the modern ‘scripturalism’ specific to the 19th and 20th centuries. It is well-known that Buddhism in South and Southeast Asia includes many more things than are described and prescribed in the Pali Canon; these are often seen as ‘later developments’, many of which are standardly but misleadingly referred to as ‘Mahāyāna elements’. Rather than see things in this way, I suggest, we should take this wider Buddhist culture as the contemporary context in which the move to an historicist ‘orthodoxy’ was made. We know that the Mahāvihāra lineage became ultimately dominant in Ceylon; and throughout its spread across mainland Southeast Asia as ‘Sinhala’ Buddhism, it seems to have been perceived precisely as a ‘reform’ movement, and to have been supported by kings with this rhetoric against already-existing forms of Buddhism. Within established Theravāda cultures, again, periodic reform movements have taken place, with the same rhetoric; and this is one important ingredient in Buddhist modernism: ‘back to the Canon!’ (Something like this seems to be happening in the Theravāda revival in contemporary Nepal.)

III

But what role did the actual Canon play in all this? Did these and only these texts function as ‘scripture’, with no others having canonical authority in the first and more general sense I distinguished earlier? No.

We know that throughout Theravāda history, up to and including the modern world, many other texts, both written and in oral-ritual form, have been used. The evidence suggests that both in so-called ‘popular’ practice and in the monastic world, even among virtuosos, only parts of the Canonical collection have ever been in wide currency, and that other texts have been known and used, sometimes very much more widely.

Keyes writes (1983, p. 272):

‘The relevance of texts to religious dogma in the worldview of any people cannot be assumed simply because some set of texts have been recognized as belonging to a particular religious tradition. It is necessary, in every particular case, to identify those texts that can be shown to be the sources of dogmatic formulations that are being communicated to the people through some medium. There is no single integrated textual tradition based on a “canon” to the exclusion of all other texts …. The very size and complexity of a canon leads those who use it to give differential emphasis to its component texts. Moreover, even those for whom a defined set of scriptures exists will employ as sources of religious ideas many texts which do not belong to a canon. For example, the evidence from monastery libraries in Laos and Thailand … reveals that what constitutes the Theravādin dhamma for people in these areas includes only a small portion of the total Tipitaka, some semi-canonical commentaries such as Buddhaghosa’s Visuddhimagga, a large number of pseudo-jātaka and other pseudo-canonical works, histories of shrines and other sacred histories, liturgical works, and popular commentaries. Moreover, for any particular temple-monastery in Thailand or Laos, the collection of texts available to the people in the associated community are not exactly the same as those found in another temple-monastery. In brief, the relevance of textual formulations to religious dogma in popular worldviews is problematic in each specific case.’
It might well be that the content of most smaller monastery libraries is in effect a ‘ritual canon’; that is, it contains the texts, canonical or otherwise, which are in actual use in ritual life in the area concerned. A monastic library with larger holdings may perhaps be compared to a modern academic library: for those few who happen to have access to it, it affords a seemingly obvious and straightforward resource, which provides and defines a cultural ‘world’; but one which gives a wildly misleading picture of the actual experience (literate, cultural, religious and otherwise) of those communities without such access.

If we wish to delineate the actual ‘canon’ or ‘canons’ of scripture (in the wider sense) in use at different times and places of the Theravāda world, we need empirical research into each individual case, not a simple deduction from the existence of the closed tipitaka produced by the Mahāvihāra. We need more research, for example, historical and ethnographic, on the actual possession and use of texts, in monastery libraries and elsewhere, and on the content of sermons and festival presentations to laity, to establish more clearly than we currently can just what role has been played by the works included in the canonical list. The hypothesis I have sketched out here suggests that the actual importance of what we know as the Pali Canon has not lain in the specific texts collected in that list, but rather in the idea of such a collection, the idea that one lineage has the definitive list of buddha-vacana. So the Pali Canon should be seen as just a ‘canon’ (in one sense of that word) in Pali, one amongst others.

Montréal
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NOTES

1 In 1981, when I had the honour to be invited to serve on the Council of the Pali Text Society, my first task was to prepare for publication Miss I.B. Horner’s last work, an unfinished translation of fifty stories originating from Chiang Mai in Thailand in the fifteenth century, and very closely modelled on the canonical Jātaka tales. She was working from the draft of the edition made by P.S. Jaini, which was subsequently published by the PTS as Pannāsā Jātaka (vol. 1, 1981; vol. 2, 1983). Professor Jaini also completed the translation. In choosing a title for the translation volumes, we followed a suggestion found in Miss Horner’s notes for the work, where she referred to it as ‘Apocryphal Birth Stories’; the volumes were published thus in 1985 (vol. 1) and 1986 (vol. 2). At that time Professor Jaini and I discussed, without coming to a clear conclusion, the issue of what is really meant in a Buddhist context by the opposition between ‘canonical’ and ‘apocryphal’ texts; at his instigation, I included in the brief preface to Volume 1 some notes on the background in Christian usage of the term ‘apocryphal’. This paper is a preliminary result of the research inspired by those initial discussions. It was first given, under the present title, as the Second I.B. Horner Memorial Lecture for the PTS in London, September 1987. I am glad to be able to publish it here in memory of Miss Horner, whose contribution both to Pali studies in general and to the PTS in particular has been so great. My title is adapted from the philosophical paper by Donald Davison, ‘On the Very Idea of a Conceptual Scheme’ (reprinted in Davison 1984).

2 References to Pāli texts use the abbreviations of the Critical Pāli Dictionary.

3 The general tenor of the re-evaluation I am recommending here is very much in line with the work being produced by Gregory Schopen, who has shown that for so many things either not found or not emphasised in the Canon, and usually seen as ‘later’ developments, there is in fact extensive evidence in the earliest archaeological and epigraphical remains: see, for example Schopen 1984, 1985 and 1989.

4 I have discussed this further in Collins (1990). The first two of my three periods are similar to those identified by Heinz Bechert (e.g. 1966, 1973, 1979, 1985) as ‘early’ and ‘traditional’; but his criterion for division and designation is the relation of the monastic community to society, and my third, ‘modern’ period does not correspond to his third, ‘modernist’ one. (I am grateful to Prof. Bechert for clarifying this issue, in correspondence.)

5 I agree wholeheartedly with the suggestions made about the value of the commentaries in this regard by Bond (1980). Certain arguments from the content of the Canon do, I think, have force. For example, apart from a few Suttas which deal with the ‘mythical’ figure of the Universal Emperor, the cakkavatti,
the texts do not betray any knowledge of large-scale political units such as that of Aśoka. (I use the word ‘mythical’ here in the same way as Gombrich (1988, p. 82); cf. also pp. 20-21 on this subject.) Anachronism of various sorts is not usually a problem in Buddhist literature; and so it would seem likely that these texts, in general, do indeed come from pre-Aśokan times. But this kind of argumentation is very complex, and of course we cannot know that because something is not in the texts, it did not exist: the history of Hindu literature furnishes many counter-examples. (See further note 25 below.)

In the argument of this paragraph I have profited from articles by Sheppard (1987) and, especially, Olivelle (unpubl. ms.). Sheppard writes that ‘on the one hand, [the term “canon”] can be used to refer to a rule, standard, ideal, norm, or authoritative office or literature, whether oral or written. On the other hand, it can signify a temporary or perpetual fixation, standardization, enumeration, listing, chronology, register, or catalog of exemplary or normative persons, places, or things [and, in our case, texts].’ The former dimension emphasizes internal signs of an elevated status. The latter puts stress on the precise boundary, limits, or measure of what ... belongs within or falls outside of a specific “canon”’.

In proposing a closely related distinction, Olivelle argues that ‘a canon, like an orthodoxy, may be exclusive or inclusive. An exclusive canon both lists the documents included in the scripture and implicitly or explicitly excludes all other documents; the canon is a closed list. An inclusive canon also has a list of documents contained in the scriptures. But it makes no claim to be exhaustive. The list merely has a positive function and it does not intend to exclude documents outside the list. In cases such as the [Indian] Veda, the tradition explicitly admits the possibility that there may exist other documents belonging to the Veda. Other traditions, such as most oral ones, may simply ignore the issue. In all cases of inclusive canons, however, the traditions do not feel the need to precisely demarcate the canonical boundaries’. McDermott (1984, p. 32) remarks aptly that ‘the Mahāyāna Sūtras in India fit into a more Sanskritized concept of scripture and canon (or lack thereof) than does the Theravāda Tipiṭaka’.

The metaphor here, as in other words for texts meaning ‘line’, ‘thread’, etc. (e.g. gantha, tanti, and sutta, if this is indeed equivalent to Sanskrit śūtra), seems rarely if ever to remain alive in the use of the term. One use of the term in parts of the Manoratha-pūraṇa may preserve a sense of ‘line’ or ‘list’. The Anguttara text names a series of monks, nuns, laymen and laywomen, each of whom is said to be ‘pre-eminent’ in some sphere. At the end of each commentarial section, the text states therīpāli-vānānā niṭṭhitā (MⅠ 337), (and similarly) therīpāli- (381), therīpāli- (381), upāsakāpāli- (401), upāsikāpāli- (458). (There are variant readings therāpāliyā, therīpāliyā, and upāsikāpāliyā (sic) vānānā in the first three places.) This may be translated, taking the first example, ‘the commentary on the list of elders is completed’, instead of simply ‘the commentary on the text of (or about) elders ... ’ At the beginning of the commentary on the last three ‘lists’, the text states therīpāliyam pathame (337), upāsakāpāliyam (482 — pathame must have been accidentally omitted here; there is a v.l. upāsakāpāli-vānānāyak pathame), and upāsikāpāliyam pathame (401). Pathame cannot agree with -pāliyam (or -vānānāya); there must be some appropriate masculine noun implied (such as sutta: see A I 23 note 3), so that we may translate ‘in the first suttak list of (or text about) nuns (laymen, laywomen)’. The v.l. at 337, therīpāliyā, which could be genitive, makes this rendering easier, ‘in the first suttak list of the text about nuns’. (Cp. e.g. MⅠ 34 catutthavagga pathame.) At MⅠ 29 there is rūpāpāli, at II 1 aṭṭhānapāliyam (v.l. -pāliyā); at II 18 aṭṭhānapālīvānānā niṭṭhitā and, beginning the next section, ekadhammapāliyam.

Filiozot proposed that in the compounds pāli-bhāṣā and its equivalent tanti-bhāṣā (Sanskrit tautra) both first terms should be understood as referring literally to ‘lines’, i.e. lines of the text in manuscripts (1981, p. 108). This would be extremely important if it could be shown to be true; it would, for example, render problematic the whole tradition which says that both pāli and aṭṭhakathā were transmitted orally before the 1st century B.C. But I know of no evidence to support the hypothesis: Filiozot’s brief discussion, ibid. note 21, is simply an argument from analogy. At one place in the Jātaka, VI 353, the term pāli is used of what is clearly an oral (and non-religious) ‘text’ (cf. von Hinüber (1977, p. 244)).

9 In this connexion, Frauwaller’s speculations on the oral nature of the early tradition are suggestive (1956, pp. 172-177, 189). Although he does not mention this, it seems to me highly probable that the structure he describes, of fixed (though not yet written) ‘memorial sentences’ fleshed out with freely composed ‘oral explanations ... given not in Pāli but in the local language’ was what lay behind the distinction between pāli and aṭṭhakathā. (We have evidence for this structure in the modern period also: see Finot (1917, p. 41); Somadasa (1987, p. ix); Tambiah (1970, p. 166). This might also have helped to bring about the confusion between pāli as a word for ‘text’ and as the name of a language. (As I hope to show elsewhere, however, I remain quite unconvinced by the overall hypotheses of Frauwaller’s work, not least because in the main body of the text he seems quite to forget the oral nature of the early tradition, in
arguing for a single text grandly and precisely conceived and organised by 'the author of the Skandhaka'."
10 von Hinüber, (1978, p. 52), gives an example where alternative readings of a word are cited in different manuscripts of a text, one of which calls the alternative reading a pāṭha, the other a pāli. In two versions of the same commentary exegesis discussing variant readings, one (Th-a III 201) reads pāli, the other pāṭha (Pj II 350).

11 Of course, by the time of Buddhaghosa the list of texts had come to be fixed, though not without disagreements (see Norman (1983, p. 9)), and thence de facto the term pāli was restricted to that list, at least in Ceylon, just as the term aṭṭhakākā ḍā came only to be used of commentaries on pāli texts, others being ṭikā. A number of texts are sometimes said to have been added to the Canon in Burma: The Sutta-saṅgaha, Netti-pakarana, Petakopadesa, Milindapatha (see Oldenberg (1882, p. 61); Bode (1909, p. 5); Duroyelle (1911, p. 121), who disagreed with Bode; Nānāmoli (1962, p. xii); and Bollé (1969, p. 494), who says that King Mindon’s stone edition of the tipiṭaka contains the last three of these texts, as does the modern Čhatthasāṅgayana edition). The word pāli is used of the Sutta-saṅgaha in Burmese manuscripts (Oldenberg (op. cit., p. 80); Faussboll (1896, p. 31)). The Netti-pakarana, which itself claims to have been composed by Mahākaccāna, praised by the Buddha and recited at the first Council (Nett 193), is called by its commentary a pāli (Nett, Intro. p. XI; see also Nānāmoli, op. cit., p. xi); and the commentary is classed as an aṭṭhakākā ḍā by the Gandhavamsa (p. 60). For the use of pāli in relation to the complex of the ‘canonical’ verses of the Jātaka, in opposition to the non-canonical and contemporaneous prosaic passages, see, for example, the references given by Faussboll in Ja VII p. III, and the comments of Bollé (1970) Preface. In the commentary to the Nidāna-kathā, a prose section is referred to as a pāli, and an account of its attha is given (Ja I 7).

12 One philosopher of religion has recently referred to the (‘Eastern’) ‘Religions of the Baskets’, in opposition to the (‘Western’) ‘Religions of the Book’: see Clark (1986), p. 16, etc.

13 Tedesco, (1952, p. 209), suggests that it might not be.

14 At Sp 20-21 Buddhaghosa explains the term as meaning either ‘learning’ (pariyatti) or ‘a container’ (bhājana), and says that the two senses are to be taken together in understanding, e.g. the term Vinaya-piṭaka. For remarks on the use of piṭaka in the title of the (canonical but probably post-Aśokan) Cariyā-piṭaka, see Horner (1975) Cp Preface pp. iii foll.

15 Piṭaka-sampadā and -sampadāna, both meaning ‘expertise in a tradition’ are used in this way of the tradition of learning Vedic mantras (M I 169) and in a

gen general sense, as in the famous Kāḷama Sutta (A I 189 foll.) and elsewhere (e.g. M I 520; A II 191 foll.).

16 For inscriptions, see Lamotte (1958, pp. 163-64, 347-50), where the chronology is not clearly described (see Schopen (1985) pp. 10-11); the word tipiṭaki occurs in the Parivāra (Vin V 3), an ‘appendix’ to the Vinaya included in the canon but usually taken to have been produced in Ceylon in the 1st century A.D. The same date is often given for the occurrence of tepiṭakam buddhavacanan and tepiṭako in the Milinda-patthā (pp. 18, 90), although the dating of this text is far from easy: see Horner (1963, pp. xxi foll.), Norman (1983, pp. 110-11).

17 See Norman (1983, pp. 96-97). Individuals could, of course, become expert in all three branches.

18 This is perhaps an appropriate place to deal with a well-known, but very problematic text, the passage of the Mahāparinibbāna Sutta (D II 123 foll., found also as a separate sutta at A I 167 foll.), dealing with the ‘Four Appeals to Authority’ (cattāro mahāpadesā). Here the Buddha is made to say that if a monk claims to have ‘heard’ (sutaṃ) and ‘received’ (patijjagatiṃ) from himself, the Saṅgha, a group of monks or a single monk, that ‘this is dhamma, this is vinaya, this is the Teacher’s Doctrine’ (saththu sāsanan), then what he says (tāni pada-vyājanāni) is to be compared with the Sutta and Vinaya. It is true that, coming at the end of his life, we might be expected to assume that most of these two bodies of Teaching had by then been given; but it strains credulity to imagine that what is in question here is a straightforward checking of one ‘text’ against a known and fixed body of such texts, collected as the Sutta- and Vinaya-piṭakas. There would be a logical problem here of self-reference: according to its own criterion, this text itself could not be accepted, since at the time of its utterance it could not yet have been included in such fixed piṭakas, as could not all the other texts, including the Mahāparinibbāna itself, said to have been composed after the Buddha’s death. Perhaps more seriously, it is quite unclear, to me at least, exactly what is the force of the terms I have paraphrased as ‘to be compared’: otārettabbāni and sandassetabbbāni. Perhaps the most obvious way to take them is in the sense of a general conceptual and practical agreement (in ‘spirit’ as opposed to ‘letter’). This is the way the Netti-pakarana (pp. 21-22) interprets the Sutta. As the Buddha says elsewhere, ‘those things (‘doctrines’, ‘states of mind’, dharmena) which you know lead to ... nibbāna you may preserve (dhāreyyāsī) as the dhamma, the vinaya, the Teacher’s Doctrine’ (saththu sāsana) (A I 143). (See MacQueen (1981, pp. 314-15) on these texts.) But this leads one immediately to a non-specific, non-historicist interpretation of what dhamma and vinaya are, which would argue very much against either the existence or the
passages from the Vinaya itself, as well as from later Pāli and Sinhalese texts, suggests the strong possibility that in fact it did originally contain such rules. In the case of writing, however, none of the extant Vinayas describes monks as writing the scriptures, and so despite the fact that the argument is one from silence, and although it was originally based on the Pāli Vinaya alone, it has been supported by the discovery of other traditions. Brough (1962, pp. 28-29, 218 foll.) argues for the likelihood of a manuscript tradition of the verses now known as the Dhammapada (Dhammapada) earlier than the redaction of the Pāli version; although individually the examples of textual relationships he cites to prove ‘a very early written transmission’ seem to me less than compelling, common sense would suggest that the transition from oral to written would be gradual and piecemeal, rather than sudden and dramatic as the Chronicles’ accounts tell us.

The most recent brief account is Prebish (1987), with bibliography.

The Bhābrā inscription cited above mentions seven texts, of which some have been identified with sections of the last two vaggas of the Sutta-Nipāta. See Lamotte (1958, pp. 256-59).

Norman (1983, pp. 7-11) is a succinct survey; for a lengthier consideration of the evidence see Norman (1978).

This fact renders futile, in my opinion, the work of those scholars who imagine that anything found in the Canon must be grist for the mill of ‘early Buddhism’, while anything in the commentaries is ‘later’ and therefore to be ignored in our search for the ‘original Buddhism’. The fact is that the same tradition, at the same time and in the same place, has simultaneously preserved for us both the canon as we have it and the commentaries. No doubt, as said earlier (note 5), some judgements of relative chronology can be made on the basis of the internal evidence of these texts; but such judgements are always risky and piecemeal.

See Gunawardana (1979, pp. 7-37).

Three extant texts have been claimed to be Abhayagiri productions: the Upāllipariprcchā-sūtra, which is said to have replaced the Parivāra of the Mahāvihārin Vinaya (see Stache-Rosen (1984), pp. 28 foll., with Bechert’s Introduction pp. 11 fol., and Norman’s review (1985)); and two later texts, the Vinmuttimagga (see Norman (1983, pp. 113-14)) and the Saddhammapāyana (see Sādhātissa (1965, pp. 32-33, 59-64); Bechert (1976, p. 29 note 2); Norman (1983, pp. 159-60)).

With the exception of a reference to an Uttaravihāra-mahāvamsa at Mhv-1 134 (and assuming the Uttara-vihāra and the Abhayagiri-vihāra are identical), no texts are attributed directly to the Abhayagiri group in the commentaries. Other
works, including a *vetulla-pitaka* (variously spelt; see text and note 40 below) are named in commentaries and said to be *abuddha-vacana*: at Sv 566 and Mpi III 160 the *Guhā-vasanta*, *Guhā-ummagga*, *Guhā-vinaya*, and *vedalla-pitaka* are to be rejected since "they do not conform with the Suttas" (*na sutte otaranti*, a phrase in the *Mahāpādāsa Sutta*, here being commented on in both places). Sp 742 and Spk II 201-202 (for the *tikā* on this passage see Cousins (1972, p. 160)) add to these names the *Vanna-pitaka*, *Aṅgulimālā-pitaka*, *Raithapāla-gajīta*, and *Ālava-gajīta*. The *Nikāya-sangraha* (Fernando (1908, pp. 9-10)) lists these texts and others, assigns their composition to various schools in India, and says that only some came to Ceylon; these included the *vaiulya-pitaka* which it later says was adopted by the Abhayagiri-vihāra-vāsins. Adikaram, (1946, pp. 98-100), discusses these texts, and attempts to find versions in Chinese. It may be, as Rāhula suggests (1956, p. 90), that in the later period the term *vaiulya* came to be used in a general way to refer to any 'dissenting views and new interpretations not acceptable to the Mahāvihāra'. The commentary on the *Mahāvamsa* mentions an *Uttaravīhāra-aitthakathā* several times: see Geiger (1908, pp. 47 foll.;) Malalasekera (1935, vol.1 pp. lxv-lxvi). The commentaries often discuss alternative views and interpretations, which may have been those of the Abhayagiri commentators: see De Silva (1970, vol 1 p. lvii foll.); Mori (1988).

The change can be clearly seen by comparing the accounts in the *Dipavamsa* and *Mahāvamsa*, written in the 4th and 5th centuries, with those of the *Nikāya-sangraha* (in Fernando (1908, p. 10-11)) and *Saddhamma-sangaha* (Chapter 6, JPTS (1890) pp. 46-50), written in the 14th.

33 It seems natural to take both *piṭakattaya-pāli* and *aitthakātha* as governed by *līkāpayum* as well as *āṇesum*; and so we have both 'Canon' and Commentary written down for the first time together.

34 Gombrich (1988, p. 152). The commentary to the *Mahāvamsa* (Mhv-1 623) rather surprisingly glosses *hānim* as 'the decline in mindfulness and wisdom of beings whose length of life is diminished in the Kali-age' (or perhaps simply 'that unlucky time') *kalikāte parināṇyukastānām sāti-buddhiparihānim*.

35 The main texts used are Mv XXXIII 37 foll., Mpi I 92-93, Vībh-a 445 foll.; the account at Mpi I 92-93 uses the name *Caṇḍālatissa* but seems to be the same story. (See Malalasekara (1938) s.vv. *Caṇḍālatissa-mahābhaya* and *Brahmanatissa-cora*.)

36 Both Adikaram and Rāhula give as an example of the threat posed 'during this period' by the famine the statement that only one monk was alive who knew the *Mahāniddesa*. The version of this story in the PTS edition of the *Samantapasādikā* (695-96) indicates the time of the tale simply by saying

37 Both Adikaram and Rāhula give as an example of the threat posed 'during this period' by the famine the statement that only one monk was alive who knew the *Mahāniddesa*. The version of this story in the PTS edition of the *Samantapasādikā* (695-96) indicates the time of the tale simply by saying

38 The earlier accounts do not mention the place of the writing down of the texts; from the 13th and 14th centuries onward, in the *Pāḷaviya* and *Nikāya-sangraha* (see Norman (1983, p. 111)) and the *Sāra*- or *Sārātha-sangaha* (see Jayawickrama (1968, pp. 82-83) and Norman (1983, 173)) arises the tradition, so often found in modern secondary works, that this took place far from the capital at Alu- or Áloka-vihāra near modern Matale in central Ceylon. If this was so, Adikaram (1946, p. 79) may be right to suggest that the location, and the fact that it took place under the patronage of a local chief titan rather than the king, afford further evidence that the development is to be seen in the light of *Vattagamini*’s patronage of the Abhayagiri monks. This idea is supported by the fact that the *Saddhamma-sangaha*, which re-writes the tale by giving the king a leading role in the story, has the ‘Council’, as it is there called, take place in a hall which he had built specially for the occasion in the Mahāvihāra itself at Anurādhapura (Saddhamma-s Chapter 6 p. 48).

39 The *Nikāya-sangraha* (Fernando (1908, pp. 12-13)) tells us that in the reign of king Vohārikatissa (269-291) the Abhayagiri monks ‘adopted the Vaiulyan Pitaka’ (on this term see text below), and that the king subsequently ‘suppressed [this] heresy’. Becht (1976, pp. 43 foll. and 1977, p. 364) has argued that Mahāyāna literature was written before this time, the only extant example being the *Buddhāpada*, written in the 1st or 2nd century and now included in the Pāli canonical text called the *Apadāna*; he does not suggest that this was specifically an Abhayagiri text, however. As was mentioned above (note 32), the *Nikāya-sangraha* describes *vaiulya* texts as coming to Ceylon long before the 3rd century.

40 In his *Abhidharmasanmuccaya* Asanga says that the terms vaipulya, vai'dalya and vaiulya refer to the same thing, which he also calls the *Bodhisattva-pitaka* (p. 79, cited in Rāhula (1956, p. 89)). (On this term see also Winternitz (1933, pp. 283, 316)). It is unlikely, and unnecessary, that these terms, a number of variants of which occur in the Pāli sources, should have had any more precise denotation than does the general term ‘Mahāyāna’, which refers not to one or more specific Nikāyas in the Buddhist legal sense, but to a general tendency in Buddhist religion. The classic discussion of ‘Mahāyānism in Ceylon’ is Paravavithana’s article with that title (1928); for recent discussion see Rāhula (1956, pp. 89-90), Norman (1978, pp. 40-41), Becht (1976) and (1977).

41 This is perhaps most evident in the *Nikāya-sangraha*.
The best survey of the evidence for Buddhaghosa and his activity is Nāṇamoli (1975, pp. xv-xxvii).

Chapter 37 verses 215-46. Buddhaghosa's own Visuddhamagga (p. 96) provides a remarkable story expressing the attitudes he encountered at the Mahāvihāra: a monk called Tipitaka-Cūlābhaya, who had not learnt the commentaries (athakatham anugghahēvā) announced that he would give a public discourse on the scriptures (paṭcakeniyamandale tiṇi piṭakāni parivattessāmi; later he says pariyyatim parivattessāmi — it is not clear to me whether this refers simply to a recitation of texts or to commentarial discourses on them, or both). The monks tell him that unless he does so according to the understanding of their own teachers (attano ācariyuggaham) they will not let him speak. He then goes to his Preceptor, who asks for an example: 'how do the teachers say (or 'explain') this passage? (idam padam katham vadanti). Although the monk then gives the passage correctly, his Preceptor simply grunts (hun ti); he then gives it twice more, each time differently (adheṇa adheṇa pariyyēna), but his Preceptor merely grunts again, and then explains: 'your first version follows the way of the Teachers, but because you have not learnt it from them in person, you could not establish that it is their version' (taya pathaṁ kahito yeva ācariyamaggo, ācariyamukhato pana anuggahitatī evām ācariyā vadanti ti santhātum nāsakhi).

This parallelism has already been noted and discussed by McDermott (1984).

Surveys of early historiography in India and Ceylon are found in chapters by Majumdar, Perera, Warder and Godakumbara in Philips (ed.) (1961), Pathak (1966) Chapter 1, Bechert (1969) and Warder (1972, Chapters 3-5).

See Perera (op. cit. in previous note). Malalgoda (1970, pp. 431-32) has usefully compared this attitude to that of ancient Israel; while there are of course many disanalogies, I might add that this attitude has often been connected with the growth of an historical consciousness in Israel.


See Geiger (1908, Chapter 2), Norman (1983, pp. 114-18); and note 32 above.


It is not surprising that there are also a number of vamsa texts devoted wholly or in part to recounting the history of relics and their possession: e.g. the Dāthavamsa, Thīpavamsa, Cha-kesa-dhātu-vamsa, Jina-kāla-mālī.

The term 'scripturalism' was first used in this way by Clifford Geertz (1968), and has been applied to Theravāda by Tambiah (1976) and Bond (1988). I think that this application is very fruitful, but less so when it is generalised to refer to the pre-modern period, as both Tambiah and Bond do. In Theravāda countries, as in the Islam of Indonesia and Morocco described by Geertz, it is most helpful to use the term to refer to a religious attitude arising as a reaction to a wide range of phenomena in the experience of colonialism and modernity: the downgrading of localised supernaturalism, the cultural prestige and practical power of western science, the centralisation and bureaucratisation of power, the establishment of a 'secular' educational system, printing presses, and the resulting value placed on literacy. The search for indigenous resources to combat foreign dominance led, amongst other things, to an emphasis on the noble ideals of the early texts: their teachings are abstract and universal as opposed to localised, 'rational' and 'ethical' as opposed to magical, and fit better with the placing of cultural and political authority in the institutions of bureaucracy and education than do the personalised spiritual interactions of localism. This concatenation of phenomena is, of course, specific to the modern world; and the comparative insight which can be gained from using Geertz's term to describe the Buddhist case seems to me to be lost when it is generalised to become an overall category applicable to all historical periods.

Hence the recurring notion of the need for 'purification' of the Sāmgha by kings. For the influence of Ceylonese Theravāda, in its post-Parakkamabahu 'unified' form, on mainland Southeast Asia see Keyes (1977, pp. 80-81; 1987, pp. 32-33). One example of the relevance, at least at the level of legend and ideological legitimation, of the possession of the Canon can be found in the story of the introduction of Theravāda to his kingdom by the Burmese King Anuruddha (1044-77). (This is, of course, before Parakkamabahu I.) As Luce says (1969, pp. 18-19), although the Chronicles 'at first seem hopelessly confused', 'all are agreed that he was a champion of Buddhism, whose main purpose was to secure copies of the Tipitaka and Relics of the Buddha'. In the various versions of the story recounted by the Sāsana-vamsa (pp. 56-65), for example, the legitimatory knowledge and possession of the Buddha's 'true' teaching, as embodied in the canonical texts, is a central theme, and is opposed to the practices of 'false ascetics'. (This is probably a reference to the practices and influence of the Ari.) Thus the texts, and certain relics, become emblems of orthodoxy, as Bechert's recent summary of the story has it (1984, p. 148): 'The Burmese chronicles report that Anuruddha was converted by a Mon monk called Shin Arahān, but that there were no copies of the holy scriptures and no relics in Pagan. The Mon king refused the Burmese king's request for a copy of the holy
sculptures and some relics. It is unlikely that this was the real reason for war as the texts claim; Anuruddha at any rate conquered Thaton in 1057, took the Mon king captive, and brought him, his family and many monks and skilled workmen to his capital Pagan, together with manuscripts of the sacred scriptures of Theravāda Buddhism. With them Mon culture and Theravāda Buddhism reached the Burmese. The supremacy of the Tantric monks was now broken, and though their doctrine survived for a time, particularly in the border territories of Burma, their influence diminished steadily while orthodox thought soon prevailed in all parts of the country'. The Sāsana-vamsa informs us (p. 63) that the king had the relics installed in a jewelled basket and the texts kept in a jewelled palace. There has, naturally, been much discussion of the historical validity of the Chronicles’ accounts: See Harvey (1925, pp. 23-34), Luce (1969, Chapter 2), Htin Aung (1970, Chapter 6). It is certain, however, that the Theravāda tradition gradually replaced what we now call ‘Mahāyānist’ forms of Buddhism: see, for example, Luce (1969, Chapter 10).


54 Much of this literature is called ‘Mahāyānist’, although again I doubt the usefulness of the term. To the references given in note 40 for the early phase, add also Mudiyanse (1967, Chapter 2) and Schopen (1982). J.S. Strong’s forthcoming work on Upagupta will detail the extensive presence in Southeast Asian ritual and indigenous literature (and at least one text in Pāli: see Denis (1977)) of this figure derived from the Sanskrit Sarvastivāda tradition. F. Bizot’s striking reports from the ‘unreformed’ Mahānākay monasteries of Cambodia show texts and practices which can without much hesitation be called tantric: see Bizot (1976, 1979, 1981).

55 Evidence for this in early 19th century Ceylon can be found in Upham (1833, vol. 3 pp. 167-215, 267), for early 20th century Laos in Finot (1917) (cf. Lafont (1962, p. 395 note 1)), and recently for Thailand by Tambiah (1968). Evidence from catalogues of manuscripts from Ceylon suggests that the contents of the tipitaka have circulated in the same way as, and alongside, a great deal of other literature; both canonical and non-canonical materials, for example, have often been written in the same manuscript. (See de Zoysa (1875, 1885), Wickremasinghe (1900), Gunasena (1901), de Silva (1938), Godakumbura (1980) Somadasa (1987, 1989)).

Evidence for earlier historical periods may be difficult to collect. But as an example of this kind of evidence we need, I cite a list of four kinds of text mentioned in the commentaries (Ps II 264, Mp V 96-97), identical passages commenting on the same sutta. It is said that when young monks do not show special respect for their elders, they do not receive help from them, either materially, by not being provided with robes, bowl, etc., and not being nursed when weak or ill, or in relation to dhamma: the latter is explained as their not being taught pālim vā athakathām vā dhammakathābhandham vā gilhagantham vā. It is not certain what either of the latter two terms refers to. Adikaram (1946, p. 98) remarks of the former that ‘perhaps it included books that formed the basis of the later tikās [sub-commentaries] or [narrative] works like the Rasavāhini’. It might also refer to books containing texts used in preaching, as in the modern Sinhalese bana books. If so, then like the latter, such compilations would have included canonical and non-canonical material (some of the most famous stories in the Buddhist world, such as that of Kīsā-gotami, being found in commentarial literature). Gulhagantha seems to mean ‘secret books’; not surprisingly, perhaps, it is not clear what they were. The lists of ‘heretical’, Vaipulya works cited earlier (note 32) contain titles with gulha- as a prefix; but I think it is unlikely that in the contexts here being discussed, we are dealing with an ‘esoteric’ literature in the Tantric sense. In the later Pali tradition we find works with gulha in the title, and they seem be elucidations of difficult passages in the Vinaya and Abhidhamma (see Malalasekera (1938, vol. 1 p. 781, vol. 2 p. 883); Bode (1909, pp. 18, 56)). The Visuññhamagga (pp. 115-16) contains a very similar passage, but does not mention dhammakathābhandha; the commentary (cited in Nānāmoli (1975, p. 119 note 35)) explains gulhagantha as ‘meditation-subject books dealing with the truths, the dependent origination, etc., which are profound and associated with voidness’. So it would seem that gulhagantha in this case refers to a class of sophisticated and technical literature on specialist topics.

56 Writing of ‘traditional Buddhist culture’ in Thailand, Keyes (1987, p. 179) has said that ‘three texts — or, more properly, several versions of three texts — define for most Thai Buddhists today, as in traditional Siam, the basic parameters of a Theravādin view of the world’: they are the ‘Three Worlds according to Phra Ruang’ (see Reynolds (1982)), the Phra Mali (a 15th century composition based on a Ceylonese story called the Maleyya-Sutta), and the Vessantara-Jātaka. Only the last of these has a canonical version. This generalisation, he says (p. 181), applies to both popular and elite traditions.

57 Interestingly, one of the reasons for the frequent appearance of Abhidhamma texts in monasteries in Laos and Cambodia, where the Vinaya- and especially the Sutta-piṭakas are comparatively infrequent, is the fact that these texts are used for funeral recitation: the seven texts of the Abhidhamma collection correspond to the seven days of the week (J.S. Strong, personal communication; cf Bizot (1981, pp. 10 foll.)).
58 Thus I think that what Bizot says of Cambodia is true of the whole Theravāda world: ‘the term [tipiṭaka] refers less to a collection of texts than to an ideological concept’ (1976, p. 21).
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KHANDHAKAVATTA

Loss of text in the Pāli Vinayapiṭaka?

In a recent issue of this journal (*JPTS* XIII, 1989, pp. 83–100) G. Schopen has drawn attention again to the fact that no rules are prescribed in the Khandhaka of the Theravāda Vinaya regulating the veneration of *stūpas*. This has been pointed out earlier, as Schopen recalls, by A. Bareau in 1960 and again by G. Roth in 1980. The explanation given by both these scholars is that the Theravāda Vinaya reflects a very early stage of the development of Buddhist ecclesiastical law, when there was no need felt for the respective regulations, or, alternatively, that it had been the concern of laymen rather than monks to care for *stūpas*. In the end both interpretations may complement each other: for during the early times of Buddhism monks may have left matters of worship to laymen.

Now Schopen has traced two passages, one from the Visuddhimagga, the other from the Mahā-Parākramabāhu-Katikāvata formulated during the 12th century, where rules for the conduct towards *stūpas* are, in fact, mentioned. The word used for “conduct” here is *vatta* < Skt *vṛtta* or < Skt *vṛata* “duty”, as both words, which are semantically near to each other may have been confused in Pāli perhaps, also possibly due to the likely orthographic reform introducing double consonants. At the same time the word *khandhakavatta* occurs in these very rules, which, consequently, seem to have been based on the Vattakhandhaka, the eighth chapter of the Cullavagga, Vin II 207–235. This has been assumed universally by modern Pāli scholars, as Schopen correctly states.

---
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However, Schopen seems to be the first who has cared to compare the relevant text of the Visuddhimagga:

\[ \text{avasesāṇi pi cetiyāṅgaṅavatta-bodhiyāṅgaṅavatta-uposathāgāra-vatta-bhojanasālā-jantāghara-ācarīya-upajīhāya-āgantuka-gamakavattādīni sabbāni khandhakavattāni pūretabbān' eva, Vism HOS VI § 60 = 153,27–31 = PTS 188,5–9.} \]

to the corresponding Vinaya passage, where nothing is said about a cetiyāṅgaṅavatta, on which Schopen concentrates, nor about a bodhiyāṅgaṅavatta, as mentioned in passing by Schopen (JPTS XIII, 1989, p. 88 note 15), nor about uposathāgāra and bhojanasālāvatta, which are not discussed at all. This result makes Schopen argue with all necessary and very much commendable caution that there might be a gap in the Theravāda Vinaya as we read it today, because the rules concerning stūpas, etc., (pp. 94, 98) still known in 12th century Ceylon, could have dropped out in the course of the text tradition as did, of course, if this assumption is correct, those concerning the bodhi tree, the uposatha house, and the refectory (bhojanasālā), if one does not prefer to consider the latter word as simply replacing canonical bhattagga(vatta), cf. Vin II 212,36–215,4.

If all this is correct, we have to reckon with a considerable loss of text at an early date, perhaps even before the composition of the Samantapāsādikā, where no such rules about stūpas are commented on in the Vattakkhandhaka (Sp 1280,35–1286,27), and not, as Schopen seems to be inclined to believe, although with reservations (p. 93), only after the 12th century. The far reaching consequences for the evaluation of the whole Theravāda tradition are so very obvious that a second look at the relevant Vinaya texts does not seem to be totally out of place. For, as far as my knowledge goes, the only gap traced so far in a text of the Theravāda tradition was observed long ago by H. Oldenberg in the cuddasa khandhakavattānī nāma vattakkhandhake vuttānī āgantu-uka-vattām āvāsikā-gamika-anumodana-bhattagga-piṇḍacārika-ārāṇīka-senāsana-jantāghara-vaccakuṭi-upajīhāya-saddhihīrānā-gārīya-anveśi-ka-vattan ti imāni cuddasa vattānī. tato aṅkāna pana kādācā taj-janiyakamakatakādāke yeva caritabbāni dve-asīti mahāvattānī. na sabbāsu avatthāsu caritabbānī. tasmā cuddasa khandhakavattasena aganītānī. tāni pana “pāriyāsikānaṁ bhikkhūnaṁ vattām paññāpessaṁ” ti ārabhitvā “na upasampādetabbaṁ. pa. na chamāyaṁ caṅkamante caṅkame caṅkamitabbaṁ” ti vuttāvasānāṁ chasatthi. tato pana “na bhikkhave pāriyāsikena bhikkhūnaṁ pāriyāsikavuddhaharena bhikkhunā saddhiṁ, mūlaṅgaṭṭikassanāraheṇa, māṇāṭṭihareṇa, māṇaṭṭhikareṇa, abbhānāraheṇa bhikkhunā saddhiṁ ekacchanne avāse vattabbaṁ” ti-

---

2 H. Oldenberg: Studien zum Mahāvastu, 1912 = Kleine Schriften, Wiesbaden 1967, II 1037–68, p. 1045 (131) note 1. The gap traced by Oldenberg in Ee and Se is confirmed today also by Ce (1929) and Be (1956). As the text lost is not commented on (Sv 868,33–869,1), the gap may be older than the final redaction of the Sumanāgalavilāsini.
“Fourteen khandhakavatta (Sp 225,27)”

Duties prescribed in the Vattakkhandha that is the duties concerning incoming monks, resident monks, leaving monks, thanks giving, the refectory, walking for alms food, living in the forest, lodgings, baths, privy, preceptors, companions, teachers, pupils. These are fourteen duties. In addition there are other “82 great duties” (Sp 225,28), which have to be observed occasionally, namely at the time, when a tajjaniyakamma, etc., has been committed. They must not be observed at all stages (of monkhood). Therefore they are not counted among the 14 khandhaka-duties. These, beginning with “I shall prescribe the duties for monks under probation” (Vin II 31,26), and ending with “He should not ordain (Vin II 32,2), etc., he should not pace up and down in a place for pacing up and down if he is pacing up and down on the ground” (Vin II 33,22), are 66; furthermore, “Monks, a monk under probation should not stay in residence under a common roof with a senior monk under probation, deserving to be sent back to the beginning, deserving mānatta, undergoing mānatta, deserving rehabilitation” (Vin II 33,22–27), etc. These duties prescribed (in the Vinaya) are not counted individually, because they are not different from those to be kept in respect to regular monks, (and) they have been combined and abbreviated in respect to different individuals, namely senior monks under probation etc. with whom they must be kept. If each is counted as one, they are five, (and altogether then) 71 (that is: 66 + 5) duties. Among the duties for those, who have committed an offence leading to suspension it is said: “He should not consent to a regular monk’s greeting him, standing up before him, etc., treating his back by massage in a bath” (Vin II 22,20–23). This not consenting to greeting, etc., (is counted as) one. And: “He should not defame a regular monk with falling away from moral habit” (Vin II 20,23 foll.), etc., (are) 10. Thus there are 82 duties. Among these (82) sometimes the duties concerning tajjaniyakamma, etc., sometimes the duties concerning probationers, etc., (are to be followed). By apprehension of what is (implicitly) included there are exactly 82. Elsewhere in the Atṭhakathā it is said: “80 khandhaka-duties” with the intention that not even a little less or too much should be counted.

In spite of the long enumeration and thorough discussion of the khandhakavatta and their relation to the Vinayapiṭaka, cetiyāṅgaṇavatta, etc., are not referred to, and no room seems to be left to include them here in Sāriputta’s reasoning by any means of interpretation.

This negative evidence is fully confirmed by passages from the Atṭhakathā:

ekacco hi vattasampanno hoti: tassa dve-asiti khuddaka (= Ne)vattāni; cuddasa mahāvattāni; cetiyāṅgaṇa-bodhiyāṅgaṇa-

---


4 This may refer to: aggahitaggahanena ganiyamāṇāni asiti khandhakavattāni nāma hoti, Vīj Be 1956, 535,18 on the Vattakkhandha. Here, too, the 14 khandhakavattas are enumerated as in Sp-ı.
Here, cetiyaṅganavatta, etc., are clearly distinguished as a class of their own with no immediate connection to the Vinayapiṭaka. In contrast to Sāriputta’s reckoning quoted above, the 14 duties of the Vattakkhandhaka are called “great duties” here and at Sp 415,28, while elsewhere as at Sp 225,27 there are 84 mahāvatta in accordance with Sāriputta’s opinion. If the duties prescribed in the Vinayapiṭaka are the mahāvatta, then it makes good sense to change khandhaka into khuddaka as in Vih-a and in part of the Mp-tradition.\(^5\)

Further the Vinaya handbooks such as Vin-vn, verses 2914 foll., count 14 khandhakavatta in accordance with the Vinayapiṭaka, which again shows that this is a well defined set of rules. In the Pālīmuttakavinayavinicchayasangaha (Pālīm Be 1956, 233,2–4) only 11 rules are enumerated, and anumodana, saddhivihihārika, and antevasīka are left out. They are, however, duly supplied in the commentary (Pālīm-† Be 1977, II 1,11). All these texts do not mention any duties concerning cetiya, bodhi tree, etc.

On the other hand the cetiyaṅganavatta, etc., are clearly distinguished from those mentioned in the Vinayapiṭaka. For, when commenting on:

\[
\text{cetiyaṅganavattādiasitamahāvattapajjapattipūraṇam, Ps III 30,12,}
\]

which again shows that the canonical and the non-canonical sets of duties are kept well apart. Thus there can be hardly any doubt that from the time of Buddhaghosa and his Visuddhimagga, at the latest, onwards, the Theravāda tradition did not know of a canonical Vinaya text containing duties concerning cetiya or bodhi trees, nor are there any traces of an opinion held by legal experts ascribing those rules to the Vinayapiṭaka. For the 14 khandhakavatta enumerated and defined in the commentaries always fully agree with the extant Vinayapiṭaka.

Still the fact remains that a set of duties going beyond the Vinayapiṭaka is found at the commentarial level. The list found in the Visuddhimagga and quoted by Schopen comprises the following 9 items:
1. cetiyaṅgana, 2. bodhiyāṅgana, 3. uposathāṅgara, 4. bhojanasālā, 5. jantāghara, 6. ācariya, 7. upajjhāya, 8. āgantuka, 9. gamika. Thus this is the most comprehensive list of these vattas met with so far in the commentaries. Elsewhere similar lists occur without any fixed order or number of duties such as the one quoted above from the Manorathapūrāṇi and the Sammohavinodani (Vibh-a) with 6 items, a further list in Dhp-a I 379,15–18, where bodhiyāṅgana is missing, or:

\[
\text{tassa hi cetiyaṅganabodhiyāṅganavattam katam eva hoti, upajjhāyavatta-ācariyavattadīni sabbavattāni pūrethi, Sv 529,31–33.}
\]

These four duties arranged in the same order and followed by jantāghara and uposathāṅgara are named in Sp 415,25–27.

As the duties concerning cetiya and bodhi tree, which usually stand side by side, are not defined in the Vinayapiṭaka, it is necessary to search in the commentaries to find out what they actually are. This is

\(^{5}\) The variant khuddaka is also found in two old Pāli manuscripts from North Thailand kept in the library of the Siam Society, Bangkok (cf. O. von Hinüber, Journal of the Siam Society, 75, 1987, pp. 9–74): No. 55 Manorathapūrāṇi (copied AD 1531/1532) fasc. (phūk) 2, folio gu a 5: dve-asīti kuddakavattāni cuddasa vattāni (sic!): here “bodhiyāṅgana” is omitted as well; No. 59 Sammohavinodani (undated, 16th century) fasc. (phūk) 14, folio lam a 3: dve-asīti kuddakavattāni cetiyā, where cuddasa mahāvattāni is omitted.
stated *ex negativo* in a passage dealing with those who do not pay respect to a Buddha:

> yo buddhe dharmāne upaṭṭhānām na gacchati, parinibbute cetiyatthānām bodhiṣṭhānām na gacchati, cetiyām vā bodhiṁ vā na vandati cetiyāṅgane sacchatto sa-upāhano carati, Sp 1315,8–11.

“Who does not, while a Buddha is living, attend to him, and, when he has entered Nirvāṇa, does not visit a place where there is a cetiya or a bodhi tree (cf. DN II 140,17–30 = AN II 120,24–34), does not venerate a cetiya or a bodhi tree, walks in the courtyard of a cetiya holding an umbrella and wearing shoes.” Further details are found in the commentary on the passage from the Mahāparinibbānasutta (DN II 141,9) just mentioned:

> cetiyacārikaṃ āhiṃḍantā ti tattha tattha cetiyāṅgaṃ sammajjantā āsanāṁ dhovanā bodhiṁ udakaṁ āsiṅcanāt āhiṃḍanti, tesu vattabbam eva n’ atthi. asukavihāre cetiyāṁ vandissāmā ti ..., Sv 582,20–23.

“Wandering about to visit cetiyas means: they walk around everywhere sweeping the courtyard of a cetiya, washing the seats and watering a bodhi tree; with them there is no fault. Thinking: ‘In that monastery we shall venerate a cetiya’ ...”

Sweeping is indeed the usual duty referred to:


“He knows the deed to be done by the body: all sorts of duties such as sweeping the courtyard of a cetiya, sweeping the courtyard of a bodhi tree, or concerning the arrival and departure (from a monastery).” Again sweeping is mentioned at Ps I 259,9 = Pj II 57,16 or:

> yassa pāto vutto yāya cetiyāṅgane vattādinī sabbavattāni katān’ eva, Mp-ṭ Be II 325,3.

“By whom all duties such as the duty concerning the courtyard are done, after he has got up in the morning”, cf. also Ja I 449,21–25, where a more popular view on these duties is expressed. The duty to sweep a courtyard is also required as one of the four duties in respect to an uposathāgāra: *sammajjittum*, Vin I 118,5 “to sweep”, *āsanaṁ paññāpetum*, Vin I 118,16 “to prepare a seat”, *padipam kārum*, Vin I 118,26 “to provide a lamp”, *pāniyo parībhajaniyo upaatthāpetum*, Vin I 119,1 “to supply drinking water”. These, however, are not included in any passage of the Vattakkhandhaka.

Although *bhojanasālāvatta* at a first glance may simply continue and replace the older technical term *bhattachayvatta* — *bhojanasālā* does not seem to occur in canonical Pāli as far as the lexicographical aids available can be trusted — a passage in the Samantapāśadikā shows that this is not necessarily so:

> cetiyāṅgane sammajjanim gahetvā bhojanasālāṅganaṁ vā uposathāgāraṅganaṁ vā parivēnamevāhāna-aggisālāsū vā anāthāram sammajjitvā dhovitvā puna sammajjanīlakhe ṭhapatabbā, Sp 773,14–17.

“Having taken up a broom in the courtyard of a cetiya, having swept and scrubbed the courtyard of a bhojanasālā, an uposathāgāra, or a cell, a day-room or a fire-room, etc., respectively, it must be put back into the broom-cupboard.”6 In the Vinayapitaka itself, sweeping is not

---

6 This passage adds a further *vatta*: *āsanaṅgana sammaṭjantena vattaṁ jānītabbam. tarīrām vattaṁ: majhato paṭṭhāya pādaṭṭhānabhimukhā vālikkā āharetabbā, kacavaram hatthehi gahetvā bahi chaddetabbam*, Sp 773,28–31 “if he sweeps the sitting room, he must know the procedure. This is the procedure...”
included in the bhattaggavatta, which only regulates the correct behaviour when participating in a meal, and it may have found its place within the duties in the bhajanamāla by expansion of those required in the upasahāgāra.

All this, the enlargement and the transformation of the list of vattas, comprising some of those also included in the Vattakhandhaka and at the same time excluding others, clearly shows that the differences between what is said in the Vinayapiṭaka and in the commentaries are not due to a loss of text from the Theravāda Vinaya tradition, but to the development of ecclesiastical law during a period of certainly more than half a millennium. This may be observed very well when comparing the canonical and the post-canonical passages e.g. on gamikānaṃ bhikkhuṇam vattam:

Vin II 211,21–31:

dārubhāṇḍam matikābhāṇḍam paṭisāmetvā dvāravāpāṇām
thaketvā senāsanaṃ āpucchā pakkaṁ itabbaṁ...
sace vihāro ovassati sace ussahati
chādetabbo ussukām vā kātabbaṁ kiṁ ti nu kho vihāro
chādiyethā ti.

Sp 777,21–25:

dārubhāṇḍam matikābhāṇḍam paṭisāmetvā dvāravāpāṇāni
pidahītivā gamiyavattaṁ pūreṇvā
gantabbaṁ.
sace pana senāsanaṃ ovassati
chādanathā ca tinām vā iṭṭhakā vā anītā honti sace ussahati
chādetabboṁ, etc.

Here again words are changed such as pidahītivā in the commentary against thaketvā in the Vinayapiṭaka in the same way as bhajanamāla replaces bhattaggara, or abhikkamana: paṭikkamana stands for canonical āgantuca: gamika in Mp II 146 quoted above. Further the very basic rules

for protecting furniture of a monastery given in the Vinayapiṭaka are expanded and explained in much greater detail meeting the needs of a more developed life style of Buddhist monks. Another example for the development of Vinaya rules are the very detailed āgantuca- and āvāsika-
vattathus relating to dwelling places during the rainy season found only in Sp 1226,1–1235,23, and thus expanding the Vassupāniyakkhandhaka, Vin I 137–156. In spite of this there is again no need at all to postulate any loss of text. For the ecclesiastical law continued to develop until present times, the Vinayapiṭaka being used only as a point of reference also for modern books such as Vajraṭhānavorasara’s “Entrance to the Vinaya (Vinayamukha)”, which originally appeared between 1916 and 1921 in Bangkok, to name only one example.

Already at the time when the Samantapāsādikā was composed, there was, and most probably had been for centuries, a lively discussion on Vinaya rules within the Theravāda tradition with different views being accepted or rejected, e.g.:

Andhakaṭṭhakathāyam pana ... bhāsitam tām dubbhāsitam, Sp 697,17–19,

or:

Andhakaṭṭhakathāyam pana ... ti vuttam tām n’ eva atihaka-
thāyam na pāliyā vuttam tasmā na gahetabbaṁ, Sp 1069,19–22.

Going even beyond the Vinayapiṭaka was not altogether unacceptable as the principle of pālimuttaka-vinicchaya, Sp VIII 1591a, 17 foll., shows.

Therefore there is no reason to doubt the completeness of the text as read in the Theravāda Vinaya, if slightly different opinions or even modified, if not entirely new, rules not traceable in any canonical text surface only in the commentaries. These are problems concerning exclusively the vast and largely unexplored field of the development of
Buddhist law, and not the text tradition. Consequently the astonishing fact pointed out again by Schopen remains that not much is found in the Theravāda Vinaya about duties in respect of cetiyas, in complete contradistinction to the Vinayas of other schools. Whatever the ultimate explanation of this evidence may be, there is certainly no loss of text involved, and the doubts and reservations expressed by Schopen himself against his own views, proffered only tentatively, prove to be fully justified.

Freiburg

O. v. Hinüber

A NOTE ON AMBAPĀLĪ’S WIT

The Thērīgāthā contains a justly famous poem attributed to Ambapālī, verses 252–70. The former courtesan describes the wrack of her beauty in old age; each of the nineteen verses in turn describes the decay of a physical feature, moving down from the hair of her head in the first verse to her feet in the eighteenth.

The last verse (270) reads:

ediso ahu ayaṃ samussayo jaajaro bahudukhānam ālayo
so 'palepapatito jaāgharo saccavādi vacanat anaññathā.

It seems to have escaped the attention of commentators and translators that this contains an excellent pun. Her body, which used to have all the beauties described at the beginning of each of the previous verses, is now compared in its entirety to a house in ruinous condition, “with its plaster fallen off”, as Norman translates. He discusses the phrase and cites the commentary in his note on the verse.¹ There is some doubt about the text of the commentary itself, but it is clear both that the commentary saw two ways of construing the phrase and that it took the metaphor of plaster as referring to abhisāmkhāra, which I understand to mean the store of good kamma: the commentator is saying that Ambapālī’s luck has run out. I may have misunderstood abhisāmkhāra; but certainly the commentator has not seen the pun I am about to point out, and that is probably because he did not understand the pl/v alternation. Norman in his note refers to that alternation and sees that apalepa is a phonetic variant for avalepa, but draws no conclusion from that fact.

Monier-Williams’ Sanskrit-English Dictionary gives for avalepa a meaning “pride, haughtiness” — such as a woman might have in her beauty. So apalepa-patīto means “pride-fallen”. The primary meaning, I suggest, is that her beauty has fallen from its proud condition, but the
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compound leaves open the implication that it has also fallen *because* of pride; the ambiguity is richly poetic. This pun may also explain why in the metaphor the house is said to be *apalepa-patito* rather than *patitāpalepo*, as one might expect in a *bahubhihi*.

"Such was this body. A crumbling home of many sufferings, it is a decayed mansion shedding the pride of its plaster. Unfailing is the word of the Truthful."

Oxford

Richard Gombrich

MAKING MOUNTAINS WITHOUT MOLEHILLS: THE CASE OF THE MISSING STŪPA

Those who share my admiration for the contribution that Professor Gregory Schopen has been making in recent years to the study of early Buddhist history will have shared also my excitement at seeing that he had contributed an article to a recent number of this journal. *The Stūpa cult and the extant Pāli Vinaya* (*JPTS* XIII, 83–100) tells an exciting tale of doctored texts, perhaps monastic censorship. But alas, it turns out to be much ado about nothing.

The article begins: "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*." One of the more curious things about the article (as we have it) is that it goes on to cite several passages in the *Vibhaṅga* section of the Pali *Vinaya* which do refer to stupas, including a reference to their worship (p. 92). What Schopen means, it soon turns out, is that there are no references to the construction and cult of stupas in the other main part of the Pali *Vinaya*, the *Khandhaka*. As Bareau pointed out,¹ all the parallel versions of this part of the *Vinaya* which are preserved in other languages do contain such details.

Schopen bases his exciting hypothesis on the claim that a twelfth-century Sinhala inscription, the *Mahā-Parākramabāhu katikāvata*, says that a monk’s duties towards stupas are mentioned in the *Khandhaka* — but they are not. This is the molehill which he elevates to the mountain of systematic monastic censorship. But there is not even such a molehill: unfortunately his case rests on a simple mis-translation. The inscription describes daily monastic routine and says that each morning monks should perform two sets of duties: "both the duties towards stupa,

---
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towards stupa, great Bo tree and courtyard and the Khandhaka duties such as those towards teachers, elders, the sick and lodgings.” This makes it clear precisely that the first set of duties is not specified in the Khandhaka. The translators Schopen relies on have missed the word du “and” (derived from Sanskrit ca), which occurs twice in the passage: ... ąḍgana-vatu-du ... kandu-vatu-du.

We are thus spared the problem of guessing why all references to the stupa have gone missing from the text of the Khandhaka between the twelfth century and modern times. Schopen says that “any discomfiture with monastic participation in stūpa or relic cult activity is distinctly modern” (p. 96); I have not come across such discomfiture. Similarly, I am not aware that Buddhists have ever understood the Mahāparinibbāṇa Sutta to prohibit monastic participation in the cult of stupas. Schopen refers (p. 95) to a “purported prohibition” but does not say who has purported. Schopen’s claim that some people have attributed an anti-stupa ideology to Theravāda Buddhism seems to be based on an article by Gustav Roth (cited on p. 83); maybe he is also referring to remarks in the cited article by Bareau.

Schopen and I would agree that such an anti-stupa ideology would be extremely odd. Small stupas (closer to molehills than to mountains) cover the ashes of monks in Sri Lanka to this day. I have always assumed that this practice must go back to the very beginnings of Buddhism; that the stupa originates as a tumulus over the ashes of a monk or nun, in direct continuation of Vedic burial practices (samcayana).2

I would therefore more or less agree with Bareau’s suggestion, which Schopen sets out to refute, that the absence from the Pali Khandhaka of some things which are in parallel texts “results from the relatively early date of the ‘closing’ of its compilation” (p. 83). The fact

---

2 This idea is hardly new, but I have been hoping to find the time to explore it a bit further in collaboration with Dr Gillian Evison, whose D.Phil. thesis (Oxford 1989) on Hindu death rituals includes thought-provoking material on Vedic funeral customs and their later development.
PĀLI LEXICOGRAPHICAL STUDIES VIII

SEVEN PĀLI ETYMOLOGIES

Here is another random collection of words which are either omitted from PED, or given an incorrect meaning or etymology there.

1. āharitā “having brought”
2. chandaso “willingly”
3. vāc’-uggata “learnt orally”
4. vyasanna “sunk down”
5. vyamhita “frightened”
6. sihavasā “lion’s oil”
7. SugataTathāgata “Buddha”

1. āharitā “having brought”

At Ja III 399,2* Be and Ee read iminā sakunajātena bijam āharitā hatā “[The trees] are destroyed by birds which have brought a seed”. Ce and Se read āharitvā, which is unmetrical in the cadence of a śloka pāda. The cty states: bijam āharitā ti bijam āharitvā (399,12’), and the reading of Ce and Se is probably the gloss which has been taken over into the text by scribes who did not understand the reading.

---

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: Be = Burmese edition; Ce = Sinhalese edition; Ee = European (i.e. PTS, unless otherwise stated) edition; Se = Siamese edition; PTS = Pali Text Society; PED = PTS’s Pāli-English Dictionary; BD = Book of the Discipline; cty = commentary; Ms. = manuscript.
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CPD (s.v. āharati) suggests reading āhariya, which would represent the absolutive āhariya with lengthening of the final -a to -ā. There is, however, no obvious reason for such a lengthening, since it is not required metri causa. Moreover, CPD’s suggestion seems to be a conjecture with no authority in any of the manuscript traditions. In view of the existence of absolutes in -tā metri causa, it seems very likely that we should accept the reading -tā, and surmise that this represents a simplification of the geminate consonant -tt- in the old pre-Pāli absolutive ending -ttā, to produce a short -t- where the metre requires it.

2. chandaso “willingly”

When dealing with the phrase buddhavacanam cha(ch)daso āropema (Vin II 139.8) elsewhere, I suggested that chandaso did not mean “into verse, into metre, into Vedic” as had been proposed by other scholars, but should rather be connected with the word chanda “will, desire”. I could not quote a canonical usage of the word in this sense, but I quoted the sentence tesam tesam samanabrāhmaṇaṇaṃ chandaso paṭihāyamānaṃ vohārammatam ev’ etam from Thī-a 64.24 (ad Thī 57).

In Bhikkhuṇīpātimokkha (Pārajīkā dharmā I.1) No. 1, which is quoted at Sp 1302,32–34, we find: yā pana bhikkhuṇī chandaso methumāṃ dharmāṇam paṭiṣevenya antamasi tiracchānagatāya pi, pārajīkā hoti asañvāsā. As Miss Horner points out, this is the same as the first pārajīka rule for bhikkhus, except that the bhikkhus’ rule (Vin III 22,33) omits the word chandaso. The word is explained in the cty on the Bhikkhuṇīpātimokkha: tattha chandaso ti methunārāgapatīsamyuttena chandena c’ eva ruciyā ca, chande pana asati balakkārena padhānasiṭṭhā.

3. vāc’-uggata “learnt orally”

This compound occurs in a number of places in the commentarial and later literature: suppavatti ti suṭṭhu pavattām paguṇāṃ

anāpatti, Kkh 157,10–12. It also occurs in the exegesis of this explanation: tilaphalamattam pi padesaṃ chandaso pavesetī, 157,18.

The Sanskrit Bhikṣuṇī-vinaya7 also includes the word. It gives the rule in the form: yā puna bhikṣuṇī chandaso maithunam grāmyaṃ dharman pratiṣeṣvīya antamasato iṣyayoginīgata(ga)ṇaṃ pi sārdhām iyaṃ bhikṣuṇī pārajīka bhavaty asañvāsyāḥ(syā) (§ 114).

As I explained in my earlier article, chandaso would then be an example of the suffix -so < -sas added to the word chanda, and is not to be confused with chandaso = gen. sg. of chanda(s) “metre”, e.g. savittī chandaso mukham, Sn 568 (vede sajñhāyaṃti paṭhaman aṣṭhetabbato savittī chandaso mukham, Pj II 456,21 = Ps III 406,24). For other usages of chanda in the sense of metre, cf. atitakālikānaṃ pi bhadasi vattamanāvacanam akkharacintakā icchanti, Pj II 16,24 (ad Sn 2 “udacchidā”); chandavasena c’ ettha dighāṃ katvā ca-kāram āha, samsuddhacarano ti attho, Pj II 205,25 (ad Sn 162 “-cānaṃ”); chando nidānāṃ gāthānāṃ, S 1,38,21 (glossed: gauṭṭtī-ādiko chando gāthānām nidānāṃ, Spk I 94,21–22); chandavasena rassaṃ katvā, Pj II 402,27 (ad Sn 455 “manta”). At Vv-a 265,14 chandoviciti is used specifically of one of the six vedāṅgas (= Sanskrit chandoviciti); in the corresponding list at Pv-a 97,28 it appears as chanda. If, therefore, we reject the suggestion that chandaso is to be taken from chanda “will”, then it would appear from the Pāli uses of chanda that it means “metre” rather than “Vedic language”.

3. vāc’-uggata “learnt orally”

This compound occurs in a number of places in the commentarial and later literature: suppavatti ti suṭṭhu pavattām paguṇāṃ

5 See R.D. Vadekar, Pātimokkha, Poona 1939, p. 27.
6 See I.B. Horner, BD, VI p. 3 n. 4. 
speech", or his "He who ... comes nearer to one who has mastered a well-intoned speech".\textsuperscript{11}

I suggest that uggata is a form of ṭoggata = ogata (< avagata) with the sense of "learnt, understood", which not usual in Pāli, although avagata sometimes occurs with the meaning "understood".\textsuperscript{12} The compound would therefore mean something like "learnt orally", referring to the recitation procedure.

Although in all these references the word seems to be used of the texts, there are several references in later texts where the word seems to be used of people (sabbe pi te bhikkhū ... sabbe ~ā honi, Gv\textsuperscript{13} 77,12; cf. Gv 77,14,17,18,24,27,30), or even kāla (Duṭṭhapālindaṃ ca kālo ~o dhuvam, Gv 77,18). If these are correct usages, and the fact that they occur only in Ms. M, which is said to be “full of clerical errors”\textsuperscript{14} gives reason for some doubt about this, then they presumably reflect a later semantic development, perhaps taking uggata in an active sense “those who have learnt (texts) orally”. This, however, is hardly applicable to kāla.

4. vyasanna “sunk down”

This word occurs in the Citta-Sambahūṭa-jātaka at Ja IV 399,6\textsuperscript{*} (nāgo yathā paśkamajjhe vyasanna) and 399,8\textsuperscript{*} (evam p’ ahūm kāmapakke vyasanno). In both places Faussbøll lists the v.l. vyasanto (in Ms. C\textsuperscript{k}) and byasanno (in Ms. B\textsuperscript{d}). It is glossed: vyasanno (C\textsuperscript{k} vyasanato, B\textsuperscript{d} byassanno) ti visanno (C\textsuperscript{k} visante, C\textsuperscript{s} visanne, B\textsuperscript{d} visannova), 399,17’–18’. The word also occurs in the Kumbha-jātaka at Ja V 16,15\textsuperscript{*} (sammakkhito vantagato


\textsuperscript{11} B.C. Law, \textit{A manual of Buddhist historical traditions (Saddhama-saṅgha)}, Calcutta 1941, p. 122.

\textsuperscript{12} See CPD, Vol. I, s.v. avagata.

\textsuperscript{13} \textit{JPTS} 1886, pp. 54–80.

\textsuperscript{14} ibid., p. 55.
vyasanno, without v.l. It is glossed: vyasanno (Cks vyaccannā) ti vyasanāpanno, visanno (Bd vipphanno, Ck visatto) ti pi pātho, tasmim vante osanno (Cks osanto) ti atho (19.1-2).

PED explains vyasanna as metric (diaeretic) for visanna, but does not explain how reading vy- instead of vi- affects the metre. Preceded by the final -e of majhhe, vy- cannot make any difference to the scansion of the pāda. The editors of PED make no reference to the Ardha-Māgadhī equivalent of the Citta-Sambhūta-jātaka found in Uttarajhāyaṇa-sutta XIII. There we find: nāgo jahā pankajalāvasanno (XIII.30). This enables us to postulate that an earlier version of the Pāli pāda ended with pākamajjhāvasanno. When this became wrongly divided as pākamajjhā vasanno, perhaps at a time when long vowels were not written, the ending of -majhā was changed to the locative -e, and the initial v- of vasanno was changed to vy- by a scribe who knew that initial v- was often derived from vy-. We might deduce that this change was made before the time of the composition of the cty on Ja, since the explanation vyasanāpanno would seem to reflect a word beginning with vy-. It is, on the other hand, possible that vyasanāpanno is simply intended as a gloss upon the whole compound, in which case we might suspect that the presence of vy- in vyasana led to the insertion of -vy- into pākamajjhāvasanno, with the resultant belief that vyasanno was a word in its own right, followed by the replacement of the unintelligible -majhā by -majhhe. At Ja V 16,15* we might assume that an earlier version of the pāda ended with the words vantiyagoto 'vasanno, and here the reading avasanno is supported by the gloss osanno.

The conclusion that initial vy- has been restored incorrectly in vyasanna suggests that we might look at other words beginning with vy- to see if the ligature can be explained as a non-historic restoration of the same kind. It is possible that the word vyamhita is another example, since here too vy- is explained by PED as being metrical for vi-. The word occurs at Ja V 69,4*: avaca (Ck avañca) vyamhito (Bd by-) rājā. The word is glossed: vyamhito (Bd byamitto) ti bhito vimhaya-puṇṇo (Bd vimhayan āpanno) vā, 69,21-22*. Here vy- could be regarded as metri causa, since the conjunct consonant lengthens the preceding -a and consequently changes the scansion of the opening of the pāda to . This avoids the opening , which is irregular by classical standards, although it can certainly be paralleled elsewhere in Pāli. If, however, a redactor had a feeling for metre and wished to avoid this opening, it would have been simple to gain the same result by lengthening the final vowel of avaca and reading avacā.

In the other occurrences of the word the importance of its form in relation to metre is not obvious. We find: rājā vyamhita-mānaso, Ja VI 243,10* where Be reads byathita-mānaso. It is glossed: vyamhita-mānaso (Be byathita-) ti bhītacitto. Here, after the final -ā of rājā, it makes no difference metrically whether vyamhita- or vimhita- occurs. Nor is it metri causa at the beginning of a pāda at Ja VI 314,26*: vyamhito nābhivādeti, glossed: vyamhito ti bhīto, 314,27*. Nor in the opening of a śloka pāda with the pathyā cadence at 315,1*: na c' amhi vyamhito (Be byamhito) nāga, where bhīto occurs in the exegesis.

Despite the glosses vimhaya-puṇṇo and vimhayan āpanno, the word does not seem to be identical in meaning with vimhita. The occurrence of the gloss bhīto and the Be reading vyathita- suggests that

---

15 See PED, s.v. vyasanna.
18 See PED, s.v. vyamhita.
we may be dealing with the verb *vyādhiti* “to frighten” which, as is well known, takes over the meanings of the root *vyāth- in Pāli*. If this is so, then the correct reading at Ja VI 243,10* could be *vyādhita-mānasā*. There must, however, be some doubt about this, because in an earlier form the verb was probably *vādhita-*, which could equally well be derived from the root *bādh-*. With the development of *vādhita- to *vāhita-*, and the replacement of the long syllable -ā- by a nasalised short vowel -am-, via -am-, we would get *vamhita-*. The restoration of *vy- at the beginning of the word was due to a scribe or redactor who, rightly or wrongly, thought that initial v- was derived from vy-.

6. *sihavasā* “lion’s oil”

The translation “lion’s oil” for *sihavasā* depends on the recognition that here the word *vasā* has the sense of “oil”; cf. *vaṣ odiśsam*, Sp 717,27 (“oil as an object of specification or stipulation”).

The compound *sihavasā* has much the same meaning as *sihatela* “lion’s oil” = “a valuable oil or perfume”. Cf. *gahitagahitaṃ ... suvāṇnabhājane pakkhitam iva sihatelam avinassamānam dhārento* (Pj I 198,26) with *gahitagahitaṃ pāsāne khatalekhā viya, suvāṇṇaṅghate pakkhitā-sihaṇsā viya ca gahitākāren’ eva tiṭṭhati* (Ps II 336,34).

It is used in a simile for doing something attentively or carefully (because the oil is valuable and must not be spilled), e.g. ~āya suvāṇṇaññālim pārente viya sakkaccam sotam odahitvā, Ja I 98,4; pāsāne lekhaṃ khaṇanto viya kañcananāliyā~aṃ paṭicchanto viya ohiṣasato,

19 For the confusion between *bādh- *and vādh-, see K.R. Norman, “Middle Indo-Aryan Studies XIV”, JOI(B) XXIX, pp. 37–41 (p. 37). Cf. the gloss *na vyādheti na bādheti*, Ja IV 166,21* (ad 166,4* "na ... vyādheti").
20 For a similar alternation between long and nasalised short vowels (in *udāhi and *udāhi) see O. von Hinüber, Die Sprachgeschichte des Pāli im Spiegel der südostasiatischen Handschriftenüberlieferung, Mainz 1988, p. 26.
21 PED (s.v. *vasā*) gives the meanings “fat, tallow, grease”.

sakkaccam subhāsitāni sunāti, Ja V 149,13*; sakkaccam pāsāne lekhaṃ khaṇante viya, kañcananāliyā~aṃ paṭicchante viya ca ohiṣasoto savaṇṇaṃ karotahā ti atho, Mhv-7,6,24–25.

It is also used as an illustration of something remaining unchanged and not disappearing. The two words *kañcana-pāli and kañcana-nāli* which frequently occur with *sihavasā* both refer to containers (“bowl” and “tube”) in which the valuable oil is kept, so that it is not lost (because it is in a golden container, and not an earthenware one, through the walls of which seepage might take place), e.g. *yassa hi sutam hadayamaḥjūṣyā sannicitaṃ silāyā lekhā viya suvāṣaṅghate pakkhitā—viya ca tiṭṭhati, Mp III 28,15 = Ps II 252,30 (ad “suta-sannicaya”); gahitagahitaṃ pāsāne khatalekhā viya, suvāṇṇaṅghate pakkhitā—viya ca gahitākāren’ eva tiṭṭhati, Ps II 336,34.

Its container is used as an illustration of something which is useful and valuable. We find *tadadhikāram pi suṇṭhāneta va sāsanikajananassa dipañ idam ~āya suvāṇṇabhājanam viya suriyaramsiyā samphullapadumāṃ viya ca disvā, Mhv-7,50,24–26. In contrast to this, at Ja V 489,13 we find *mattikābhājanam viya ~āya abhājanam tvam dhammassa “You are useless as a container for the dhamma, just as a clay container is useless for ...”.

The compound is very appropriate to the work of authors and scribes, who hope that their work will not disappear, just as something inscribed on stone, or valuable oil kept safe in a permanent, leak-proof, container is not lost, but remains unchanged. The compound is found (dissolved into *vasā and sihassa*) in a verse which occurs in the colophons of the Jātaka (Ja VI 595,3–4), Att (34,1–2), and Mhbiv.22

---

22 Cited in the preface to Strong’s edition, p. v.
Tūṇḍīlovāda: An Allegedly Non-Canonical Sutta

"The Sutta of the Advice to Tūṇḍila" is a short Pali text in both prose and verse. Although by title it is a *sutta* and the narrative attributes its contents to the Buddha, it is not included in the Pali Text Society's edition of the Pali Canon. This is not to say that its contents are markedly different from other discourses in the Pali canon. On the contrary, the *Tūṇḍīlovāda Sutta* provides a concise illustration, albeit an inspirational illustration, of the logic and structure of traditional Theravāda Buddhist practice.

The occasion for the discourse is a *dāna* given by the layman Tūṇḍila and his wife. After perceiving Tūṇḍila's spiritual potential, but before delivering the discourse proper, the Buddha sends forth his six bodily rays. This is reminiscent of narratives in medieval Sinhala Buddhist literature where the Buddha is also sometimes said to use two means to convert beings, his manner of preaching and the performance of miracles. The discourse then begins appropriately with an exposition of the benefits (*ānisampāsa*) which accrue to those who practice *dāna*. Significantly, the giving of *dāna* is portrayed here as an integral component of the attainment of *nibbāna*. An account of how *sīla* is always a necessary complement to *dāna* then follows. The exposition of the benefits of practicing *sīla* provides an occasion for an enumeration of first, the five precepts, and then the ten precepts. There is some incongruity in discussing all ten precepts in a discourse addressed to a layman, although this portion of the text may be more narrowly addressed only to the monks in the audience. The benefits of guarding

---

23 See PED, s.v. *Sugata*.
25 See PED, s.v. *tathāgata*.

---

2 The repeated use of the vocative *bhikkhave* in this portion of the text may be taken in more than one way. It can be read as a limitation of the relevance of the
silas extend, of course, to future births, including births in heavens, and
the text then describes the length of life and pleasures found in various
divine states. In a crucial turning point, the Tūndīlovdā Sutta says that
such pleasurable courses of life are to be both desired and renounced. The
text then refers to the inevitable suffering that comes from desire, and
from the life of a householder in general. As is the case with life in a
heavenly state, household life is to be both desired and despised. The
benefits of renunciation are then extolled. The text ends with an extended
simile of the city of nibbāna, in which the city’s gate, for example, is
identified with perfect generosity (dānapārami).

The Tūndīlovdā Sutta as a whole thus illustrates a traditional
Theravādin understanding of “the gradual path,” to use George Bond’s
phrase for “the hierarchy of means and ends necessary to relate the
dhamma to a variety of people and yet to maintain the belief in one
ultimate goal and one ultimate meaning of the dhamma.”

As the above summary suggests, the Tūndīlovdā Sutta is
scarcely noteworthy because of its contents. Rather, it deserves scholarly
attention because it is “an allegedly non-canonical sutta.” Its significance
to the student of the Theravāda was first recognized by Hugh Nevill,
who collected three manuscripts containing the text during his
government service in Sri Lanka at the end of the nineteenth century, and
his own comments are worth extended quotation:

This is a very important work to the student of Buddhism, as it
evidently forms like the Kusala sutta, a portion of the heretical
works of one of the schisms, once so powerful in Ceylon.
There is nothing in the contents which can be pronounced
unorthodox, beyond the fact that the sutta does not occur in the
Nikāyas. The materials are an elegant and masterly compilation
of the doctrine from the Sutta pītaka, composed in a simple and
earnest spirit. Gāthas occur at intervals and those relating to
dānaṃ or alms struck my friend Dr. Neuman, when read to him
by my pundit, as very similar in general style to the Mahādāna
of the Jātaka. Other gāthas remind me of the Nidhikāṇḍa sutta
of the Khuddakapāṭha, in much of which I recognize great
antiquity, though my opinion is really of no value. Dr.
Neuman’s remark however, though made casually, strikes me
on consideration, as very important. There is a primitive
simplicity in such stanzas as ‘Sabbaṃ dhammamā labhha.’

I would set aside Nevill’s speculations about the institutional or
sectarian affiliation of the text, for which there is little independent
evidence. Likewise, I am wary of Nevill’s estimation of the text’s date,
since he sometimes had a predilection to date those texts he judged
important as also early. More important to me is Nevill’s recognition
that there are other texts like Tūndīlovdā, in so far as they are suttas
which are not found in the generally acknowledged Pali Canon. Nevill mentions
the Kusala Sutta, but other examples include the Sāra Sutta, the
Brāhmaṇapāṭha Sutta, the Maranāhāna Sutta, and the Devadīṭa Sutta,
all of which are found in Nevill’s manuscript collection. Another text
with some similarities to these suttas, but also with important
differences, is the Sinhala-language Sumana Sutrāya, described by

1. K.D. Somadasa, Nevill Collection Catalogue, I, pp. 27–28
Malalgoda in his article on Buddhist Millennialism.\(^1\) These texts — and one must wonder if there are more — have received little scholarly attention, and at this point, it is impossible even to say whether they form a single class of texts, much less to generalize about their collective character. It is equally impossible to say at this point whether these texts, all found in Sri Lanka, share anything with the “apocryphal” Buddhist literature of Southeast Asia, such as the Paññasā Jātaka, the Malleyatherasutta, and the Jambupatisutta.\(^2\) All the same, their very existence raises a number of questions, and I hope that this edition will be but a step to the further study they deserve. Whether or not such texts form a distinct body of Pali literature that deserves a name like “deutero-canonical,” they may at least assist us in our continuing inquiries about the nature and role of the Pali Canon in the Theravāda.

The comments of Nevill quoted above suggest that he found the canonical guise of the Tūndilovāda Sutta convincing. It is easy to share this impression. The text begins with evam me sutam, the standard phrase which introduces all canonical discourses, and a conventional account of the circumstances in which the discourse was preached by the Buddha. As Nevill says, “there is nothing in the contents which can be pronounced unorthodox.” I too see nothing that would make it fail the most general test of scriptural authenticity accepted in the Theravāda: “[w]hen anyone claims to have an authentic text, its authenticity is to be judged simply by seeing whether it harmonizes with the texts (sutta and vinaya) already current in the Sangha.”\(^1\) Moreover, the Tūndilovāda Sutta also has some commentarial works attached to it, although significantly not attakathã or tikã. The manuscripts found in London, and utilized in this edition, include Sinhala-language sannayas and Pali-language pada ānumas, both commentarial genres popular during the Buddhist renaissance which began in Sri Lanka during the Kandyan period. It is not possible to say, in any definitive way, whether such commentaries represent attempts to give the Tūndilovāda Sutta more of the appearance of canonical authority, or instead are evidence that the text was indeed received as canonical. K.D. Somadasa’s survey of the holdings of Sri Lankan temple libraries, which lists 44 manuscripts distributed all over that island, at least would suggest that the Tūndilovāda Sutta had some currency as a valued text;\(^2\) I have, however, found nothing that would indicate that it was known outside Sri Lanka.

The full significance of the Tūndilovāda Sutta can only be measured against a historical background that includes a closed Pali Canon, an idea which has long played a complicated role in the heritage of the Theravāda.\(^3\) This closed canon was at least nominally restricted to those works said to be “recited” at the first Buddhist councils, and especially the first sangiti held at Rājagaha. In a way that is reminiscent of commentarial justifications of the canonical status of the Abhidhammapiṭaka, one manuscript in London (given the siglum C below) includes a Sinhala-language nidānapāṭhavistaraya which says that

---


---


the *Tūndilovāda Sutta* was recited at the first council by Ānanda after he had recited the five *nikāyas* of the *Suttapiṭaka*.¹

We may immediately ask why a text like the *Tūndilovāda Sutta* would be written. To answer this we first need to have some idea of the time of its origin, and here we have little concrete evidence. Nevill implied that the text might be early because of perceived similarities between the language and style of the *Tūndilovāda Sutta* and other Buddhist literature, such as the *Jātaka* verses, which are generally accepted as dating to the earliest strata of Buddhist literature. Such similarities, of course, may owe much to “the eye of the beholder,” and one could also note that there are similarities between the *Tūndilovāda Sutta* and the *Kosala-bimba-Vaṅganā*, which Malalasekera dates to medieval Sri Lanka.² Even when such similarities can be extensively established, they may still not be a sure guide for dating a text, as we know from the archaism of the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*.³

My own suspicion is that the *Tūndilovāda Sutta* dates from the Kandyan period. This, however, is little more than an educated guess based on the inference that a text that had canonical status or authority in an earlier period would also have the kinds of commentaries typical of the time, such as *ṭikā*. Informing my suspicion is the *Sumana Sutraya*, which from its contents can definitely be dated to the Kandyan period. Finally, I find it reasonable that a period that was characterized by both a low standard in Pali and indeed Buddhist learning, and a desire to effect a revival of Buddhist thought and practice could provide a fertile context for the acceptance of a work like the *Tūndilovāda Sutta*. As happened with “apocryphal” Buddhist literature in other contexts, “suspicions concerning the authenticity of a text (may have) paled as its value in explicating Buddhist doctrine and practice became recognized.”¹

It is sometimes said that generally Buddhist “apocrypha” were the products of local religious concerns; thus Chinese Buddhist apocrypha “typically reflect their domestic author’s own religious interests and social concerns, which were not directly addressed in translated Indian texts.”² This provides a plausible motivation for contravening the limits of a closed canon, and is helpful for understanding a text like the *Sumana Sutraya*. Similarly, the corpus of Mahāyāna literature, containing distinctive and new teachings, suggests another plausible motivation for extending the limits of a closed canon. Neither of these motivations seems immediately applicable to the composition of the *Tūndilovāda Sutta*. If nothing new was said, why was a new text needed or desired?

Perhaps that question itself is skewed by our common assumption that a closed canon had a rigid and inviolable force in the Theravāda. Steven Collins, in the article cited above, has gone some way to identify the historical background to the ‘fixing’ of the Pali Canon as a closed list of texts. At the same time, he has questioned whether this closed list has always been co-extensive with the body of functionally authoritative literature accepted in the tradition; Collins, to use his own terminology, raises questions whether we should take Canon 2 as simply

---

equivalent to Canon 1. Frequent references to later monastic teachers in Buddhist literature as “masters of the Tipiṭaka” raise similar questions; does such a title imply that they had memorized the whole canon, or, as seems more likely to me, that they were judged to be in command of its contents. In these two instances and in others, we are beginning to discern a spectrum of ideas about the tipiṭaka in the Theravāda tradition, and it may be that when judged against such a spectrum, texts like the Tuṇḍilovāda Sutta will not appear so anomalous.

We can perhaps be more specific about the probable sociology of knowledge necessary for the acceptance of the Tuṇḍilovāda Sutta. In a general sense, the same conditions — especially a widespread use of writing for recording scriptures — which Richard Gombrich suggested were necessary for the rise of the Mahāyāna, were necessary here too. In addition, as one can see with only a glance at K.D. Somadasa’s catalogue of the Nevill manuscript collection, the written Suttapiṭaka was frequently transmitted not as a whole or even in the five nikāyas, but as individual suttas, either separately or as part of ad hoc anthologies. It is easy to see that a new sutta could more readily gain acceptance in a context where the canon circulated and was known more in parts than as a whole. This acceptance may also have been facilitated by the fact that there is a Tuṇḍita Jātaka and the Tuṇḍilovāda Sutta may have been assumed to be a portion of that text.

The text of the Tuṇḍilovāda Sutta contains a number of solecisms, although all are generally intelligible without emendation.

---

1 The work of the anthropologists François Bizot and Charles Keyes is especially relevant in this regard; relevant references may be found in Steven Collins’ paper (pp. 89–126 above).
3 An apparent example of such a perception can be found in G.P. Malalasekera, Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names (London: Pali Text Society, 1960), s.v. Tuṇḍila.

---

Even though the Tuṇḍilovāda Sutta is often written in poor Pali, it is not without literary merit. I agree with Nevill’s judgement that at times it has a “primitive simplicity,” and I confess that I find the simplicity and vigor of its style pleasing.

The Tuṇḍilovāda Sutta frequently uses similes, although this is not simply another part of its literary style. As is well known, analogies, similes, and metaphors are a common feature of Theravādin homiletics. Indeed, analogy and simile were apparently considered very effective teaching tools, appropriate for even the dullest student. In the Naṅgalisā Jātaka, for example, the Bodhisatta uses analogy as a teaching method of last resort with a dullard, thinking that “making comparisons and giving reasons, and the continuous practice of comparing and reasoning on his part will enable me to impart learning to him.” This method is particularly visible in the Tuṇḍilovāda Sutta in a sequence about kāmā; to take one example: “desires are like a boil filled with pus because both have a stinking nature” (duggandhabhāvena pūtiparipūṇgagandupamā kāmā).

The most elaborate simile in the Tuṇḍilovāda Sutta concerns the city of nibbāna. The basic idea of the city of nibbāna is quite common in the Buddhist literature of medieval Sri Lanka, but the term also seems to be a conventional form of reference rather than a live metaphor. The Tuṇḍilovāda Sutta’s long application of the parts of a city, standard in poetic imagination, to nibbāna is thus of some interest. I am not sure, however, that the serial simile is intended as a device for extending understanding through the process of “comparing and reasoning” referred to in the Naṅgalisā Jātaka. I find it hard to comprehend how the watchtower (aṭṭilaka) of the city is similar to samādhi: should we really
try to reason and infer so much that enstaxy is perceived as similar to the place where one expects the guards to keep their eyes open? But the long serial simile of the city of nibbāna is not without precedent in Pāli literature. In the Aṅguttara Nikāya, there is a serial simile about the 'rajaḥ’s citadel', where the gate-keeper is appropriately said to be mindfulness; in the Apadāna, there is a serial simile about the city of Dhamma, where the watchtower (attālaka) is mindfulness; and in the Milindapañha, there is an exceptionally long simile of the city of Dhamma where viriya is the watchtower. Although these three examples seem to have more synthetic coherence than the simile in the Tūṇḍilovāda Sutta, none of them have much immediate force, whether for persuasion or for clarification, even when they are compared with some of the well-worn metaphors used in connection with kāmā. For me, the rhetorical purpose of these serial similes remains unclear. While this is not the place to begin a comparative study of their logic and force, we can at least see that such a comparison will contribute to our understanding of the varied roles of metaphors and images in Buddhist homiletic literature.

The edition presented here is based on seven direct witnesses found in six manuscripts. All of the manuscripts are located in London, and thus the sigla assigned to the witnesses are largely arbitrary, and only group the manuscripts according to the libraries where they are found:


The witnesses naturally fall into three groups, according to whether they represent the text alone, or with either a sannaya or a pada ānuma. One might suspect that a grouping based on what are really different genres would exclude the possibility of contamination, but this has not been the case. Beyond this, the witnesses may be divided into two groups, according to relationships based on similarities of readings. Finally, I suspect that all manuscripts are copies of a single exemplar, which was not the original archetype. All manuscripts share a common, and a surprisingly obvious, error in the last gāthā of the text. It is this error which suggests a common source for all manuscripts, although admittedly it is a rather slim basis for such a judgement. I should note

2 A IV 105–11; Ap 44; Mil 330–45.
3 This manuscript is described in K.D. Somadasa, Nevill Collection Catalogue, I, pp. 27–28.

1 This manuscript is also described in Somadasa, Nevill Collection Catalogue, I, p. 27.
2 Both witnesses found in manuscript C are described in Somadasa, Nevill Collection Catalogue, I, pp. 98–100.
3 The sannayas found with witnesses C2YZ are often substantially different from each other.
this instance is the only place where I have emended the text against the authority of all the manuscripts.

The following chart shows the approximate relationship among the different witnesses, with Q standing for "quelle," hypothetical source; the divisions do not imply a lack of contamination:

![Diagram showing the relationships among manuscripts]

This chart simply represents affinities among manuscripts, not a stemma. Since this distinction was fundamental to the methods employed in making this edition, it deserves some explanation.

The editing of Pali texts is entering a new era. Earlier editions were quite frankly provisional, working tools meant to get the study of Pali literature underway.1 We are now at a point where a re-examination of these provisional editions seems required, but this means, as K.R. Norman has said, “[w]e must then face the question: ‘What is an accurate edition of a Pāli text?’”1 In answering this question, we may have to admit that accurate editions can be produced according to different editing methods, and that various methods may be more appropriate to different kinds of texts.

I have not attempted an edition based on a stemma here. This is not to imply, though, that I have decided that the difficulties inherent in the stemma method cannot be overcome sufficiently for the reconstruction of the originals of early Pali literature,2 or that the stemma method cannot be helpful for reconstructing the history of Indian texts.3 Without addressing such questions, I have only decided that the stemma method is not appropriate for editing the Tūṇḍilovāda Sutta. This decision reflects my suspicion of contamination in the limited number of manuscripts available to me, but more importantly, it is based on a doubt about whether the stemma method is appropriate for any late Pali text from Sri Lanka or Southeast Asia. Success in reconstructing a stemma depends on the recognition of shared errors and variants, by which the historical relationships among witnesses is defined. This recognition, however, is only possible when the editor can establish a relatively uniform standard of language against which mistakes can be

---

2 For a useful survey of criticisms of the stemma method in another field, see Alfred Foulet and Mary Blakely Speer, On Editing Old French Texts (Lawrence: The Regents Press of Kansas, 1979), pp. 1–41.
recognized, and such a clear standard is still lacking for the Pali of the late Theravāda.¹

Thus, to avoid creating a text that is simply a patchwork of readings that no Buddhist reader ever knew, this edition was prepared using a base model method. I hope that this at least gives a reasonably good text, such as could have been available to a reader in nineteenth century Sri Lanka. Z was selected as the basic manuscript for the edition, because I found it consistently to have the best readings in places where other manuscripts had obvious errors. This is not to say that Z is completely free of mistakes, and the other manuscripts thus have served as controllers for the reading of Z, as well as sources of true variants. I have found that A, while having many more mistakes than Z, is often a source for such variants, which is not surprising given the affinities of the manuscripts noted in the chart above. It has thus been singled out as a kind of secondary basic manuscript. Thus both Z and A could, if one were so inclined, be completely reconstructed (except for the routine changes in orthography to be noted below) from the critical apparatus provided in the notes. Rejected readings of these two manuscripts, usually errors in spelling, are contained in brackets [ ] in the notes. XBC₁C₂Y are controllers; their rejected readings are included only out a desire for completeness and are contained in parentheses ( ) in the notes. Except for the single instance noted above, no emendation has been made in the edition against the authority of the manuscripts. I have noted places where emendation does seem necessary and have also suggested some plausible emendations in the critical apparatus.


Tūṇḍilovāda: an allegedly non-canonical Sutta

I have routinely made some corrections in orthography in the edition without any acknowledgement in the critical apparatus. After the sixteenth century, the tradition of orthography in Sinhala, with respect to the letters "n," "m," "l," and "i," became confused, and these letters were used indiscriminately. This affected the transmission of texts both in Sinhala and Pali.¹ This confusion was not completely corrected until the twentieth century, and it is very apparent in all the manuscripts used in the edition. Similarly, the Pali "e" was pronounced as a Sinhala "ē" and the latter mode of representation is sometimes found in the manuscripts. All of these variations could have occurred to different copyists at similar points. Thus, these polygenetic "errors" have no value for constructing an edition, and there seems little reason to add to the number of notes by their scrupulous citation. The copyists of some of the manuscripts had a predilection always to write a long "l," even where an "i" would be expected. The nature of Sinhala script also means that it is sometimes difficult to distinguish "u" and "ū"; I have often been guided by expectations of standard Pali.² In these cases there is some consistency, but still little value in their notation; their occurrence has not been included in the critical apparatus. The spelling of nagara has also been standardized; I have ignored the inconsistent use of the half-nasal, although this has long been noted as a frequent variation.³ It strikes me that this is also a polygenetic variation, with little value for establishing a text.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge that the collation of manuscripts for this edition was done in London while I was on a research leave funded by the American Council of Learned Societies and

² On the confusions of these vowels in Southeast Asian Pali, see Terral, p. 310.
Loyola University of Chicago. The generosity and assistance of Dr. Tadeusz Skorupski, Steven Bunes, and Patti Schor made the final machine-readable production of this edition possible. My friend, Dr. M.W. Wimal Wijeratne, both assisted and encouraged me in the collation; his help was indispensable in more ways than can ever be specified. My teacher, Professor G.D. Wijayarathna, went over a draft of the edition with me, and made many suggestions for improvements, too numerous for individual citation in the notes. As with so much of my work, this edition would not have been possible without his help. To each of these institutions and individuals, I offer my sincere thanks.

NAMO TASSA BHAGAVATO SAMAŚAMBUDDHASSA

Evaṃ me sutam. Ekaṃ samayāṃ Bhagavā Kapilavatthunagaram upanissāya Rohanānadiyā tire Nigrodhārāme viharanto devamanussānaṃ sāṃghañā karaṇatthāya madhurassarena dhamaṃm desento bahudevamanusse saggamokhamagge patīthapento Nigrodhārāme paṭivasati. Tena kho panā samayena tasmiṃ yeva Kapilavatthunagare Tūṇḍilī nāma gahapati paṭivasati. So gahapati mahāvibhavasampanno bahudāsadāsi ca gomahisādayo ca dhanadhañño suvaṇnarajatādīnī bahutārā bahukotthāgaṛāni sampanno ahosi. Bhariyāpissa Irandatī hoti.10

---

1 B ekaṃ divisam; A [ekadivasam]
2 A omits upasaṃkami
3 Y (dhammasabhāyan)
4 A cintetvāsi
5 A punā
6 C₂Y (dātum)
7 Y (saddhiṃ); C₂ omits saddhiṃ
8 C₁ gehagantu
9 BC₁YZ bhaddenī
10 X dātukāmombhāti
11 X (yā)
12 Z, sattavacanaṃ, although the saṃnāya glosses as if reading tassa.
13 C₂ kārīpetvā
14 My word division here is based on an expectation of an accusative plural, with sampiṃdeta, instead of reading an instrumental plural. Admittedly, the hi, attested in all manuscripts, then seems unnecessary in this context.
Atha kho bhavagava bhattakiccavasane Tundilagahapatiyakkha katadanasambharaṃ disv esa gahapaticcar dhavassati, idani pana tassa Tundilagahapatiyakassa pasadetuṃ vaṭṭatiti cintevā accharyarupam pāṭihāriyam akāsi. Buddhānaṃ sarirato nīlapi lotahitavatamajjhetṭhappabhassaraṃvasanaṃ tāni chabbhaññaramsīvavānāni vissajjesi. Tiriyaḥbhāgana anantakathātumṇa pakkhandhiṃsu. 


---

1 C places aha kho after bhavagavaccavasane
2 C2 gahapati
3 A [sambhare]; C2 (sambharam)
4 A then inserts manesu
5 The meaning here is not immediately obvious. I would suggest that the Buddha is thinking that because of the fruit of dāna done previously, Tundila today will be thoroughly happy in three “places,” that is, he will be happy about his past, present, and future.
6 C1 omits tassa
7 A [pasadetun]
8 A omits avadda; AXZ [aṭṭhānaṃ]
9 Y (lokadhātuṃ)
10 Z omits paṭhāviya
11 X (yā)
12 Non-standard sandhi for panaṭṭhānāṃ?
13 B omits yeva
14 Emend to ajjhottharitam?
15 AB gahapaticco; C2 gahapatiko; Y gahapatiputto
16 B (idissa)
17 C2 pāṭihāriyam
18 B accharyabbhuto
19 C2YZ pitipūrītaṃ
Aggassa vatthum dadaṁ aggadhhammasamāhito,\(^1\)
Devabhūto manuso vā aggaṁ sukhāṁ pamoḍati.

Sabbakāmadadaṁ\(^2\) dānaṁ yaṁ\(^3\) icchaṁ paripūrati,
Dānaṁ\(^4\) nidhikumbhūpamaṁ danaṁ kapparukkhopamaṁ.\(^5\)

Yathā vārivāho puro sabbakālam na khiyati,
Evaṁ dānaṁ dadantassa sabbabhogā na khiyati.

Rājāno ca\(^6\) cora ca aggimi udakaṁ eva ca
Appiyā ca ime pañca na ca bhogā\(^7\) haranti taṁ.

Tasmā hi dānaṁ dātabbaṁ dānaṁ daliddabhāriyaṁ,
Dānaṁ tānaṁ\(^8\) manussassa dānaṁ\(^9\) nirayamocanam.\(^10\)

Dānaṁ saggassa sopānaṁ dānaṁ mokkhapatham varaṁ,
Pavesanāya nibbānaṁ dānaṁ\(^11\) dvārasmamaṁ mataṁ.

Dānaṁ pavaḍḍhitā bhogā dānaṁ bhogassa dhārayo,
Dānaṁ bhogāṁ\(^12\) rakkhanti\(^13\) dānaṁ rakkhanti jivitaṁ.

---

\(^1\) ACX aggo dhammo samāhito; C\(_1\) aggdhammo samāhito
\(^2\) C\(_2\)YZ sabbadā kāmadadaṁ
\(^3\) A omits yaṁ
\(^4\) A omits dānaṁ
\(^5\) X kapparukkhopamaṁ
\(^6\) ABC\(_2\) ceva; C\(_1\) omits ca
\(^7\) Bhoga is apparently being declined like a feminine noun, here in the accusative plural.
\(^8\) C\(_1\)C\(_2\)YZ omit dānaṁ tānaṁ
\(^9\) Z adds tānaṁ
\(^10\) A nirayamocanam; C\(_2\) (nirayavacanam)
\(^11\) Z omits dānaṁ
\(^12\) Z bhogā
\(^13\) Here bhoga is apparently taken as a neuter noun. If, as suggested by Z, it is taken as a nominative, in agreement with the plural verb, the line reads “Material goods protect dāna.” While grammatically correct, the more expected meaning would be “Dāna protects material goods.” The second foot of the line illustrates a similar confusion about verbal agreement.
\(^1\) Y omits attani
\(^2\) Z, [issariyam]
\(^3\) XZ [mahādhammaṁ mahābhogā]; C\(_2\) omits mahādhanaṁ; C\(_2\)Z add sadaḥ here
\(^4\) Y omits yaṁ
\(^5\) AC\(_2\)X labhati
\(^6\) YZ omit sadā
\(^7\) C\(_2\) adds vā
\(^8\) AC\(_2\)XYZ ca
\(^9\) Z yatā
\(^10\) BC\(_1\)C\(_2\)X (thito)
\(^11\) AC\(_2\) pānaṁ ca
\(^12\) C\(_1\) annapāṇavatthukā
\(^13\) A dinnaṁ yaṁ dānaṁ
\(^14\) C\(_1\)Z [mahāphalam]
\(^15\) ABC\(_2\)YZ saddhāpubbaṅgamam;'
\(^16\) A sabbam
\(^17\) YZ omit ca
\(^18\) X sabbadāna
\(^19\) A [padesara]ja
\(^20\) Y cakkavattisirīṁ
Tūṇḍilovāda: an allegedly non-canonical Sutta

Devarajāṁ pi saggasu sabbāṁ dānena labbhati.1

Yā manussesu sampatti3 devalokesu yā rati,
Yā ca nibbānasaṃpatti sabbāṁ dānena labbhati.

Yā ca sāvakabodhi ca pacekakumībodhi yā,
Tathāgatassa bodhi yā sabbāṁ dānena4 labbhati.

Ye ca buddhā atītesu samudde vālukopamā,5
Dānaṁ ca adhikāṁ katvā sambodhiṁ ca labhanti6 te.

Evam eva gahapati dānāṁ hi nāmetāṁ mahāguṇaṁ
mahānisamaṁ ti evam Bhagavā Tūṇḍilagahapatikassa dānāṁsaṁsaṁ desesi.7 Dānakathānantaram silānisaṁsaṁ kathetum ārabbi.8

Silāṁ hi nāmetāṁ gahapati9 idhalokassa paralokassa10
sampattimūlaṁ.11 Silasadido avassayo nāma naththī. Silasadiso aṅño patiṭhā12 nāma13 naththī.14 Silasamanth aṅñoṁ ṭhānaṁ15 naththī.16 Silasamaṁ

aṅñoṁ ābharaṇaṁ naththī.1 Silasamo aṅño alarikāro2 naththī. Silasamo3 aṅño
gando nāma naththī. Silasamāṁ aṅñoṁ kilesamarisodhanam4 naththī.
Silasamaṁ aṅñoṁ rūpataram5 naththī. Silasamaṁ aṅñoṁ
saggarohasanopānam naththī. Nibbānanagarappavesanaththāya6 silasamaṁ
aṅñoṁ dvāraṁ nāma naththī.7 Silasamaṁ aṅñoṁ nagaraṁ naththī.8 Atha kho9 Bhagavā Tūṇḍilagahapatikassa silānisaṁsaṁ dassento10 imaṁ
gāthāṁ āha.11

Silāṁ sukhānaṁ paramaṁ nidaṁsaṁ12
silena silīn tivāṁ paṭiṭhi,
Silāṁ hi saṁsāraṁ upāgatassa
tāṇaṁ ca lenaṁ ca parāyaṇaṁ ca.

Yathā nabhaṁ tārāganābhipūritaṁ13
visuddhakaṁ candavinā na sobhathi,14
Tathā naro rūpakulavibhājito
yasassī15 vā silavinā na sobhate.16

---

1 X then inserts: Silāṁ sānam dhānaṁ naththī. Silasamaṁ aṅñoṁ parāyanaṁ
naththī.
2 B adds nāma, Z [alarikāro]
3 C2 (silasamaṁ)
4 Z [kilesamarisodhanam]
5 AX abhirūpataraṁ
6 X nibbānanagarassas pavesanaththāya
7 The preceding two sentences may be compared to Vism 10:
Saggarohasanopānam aṅñoṁ silasamaṁ kuto,
dvāraṁ vā para nibbāna-nagarassa pavesane?
8 AC1 W omit preceding two sentences.
9 Z [khe]: A omits kho
10 C1 desento; Z [dassente]
11 C1C2YZ [gāhaṁ māha]
12 Z nidhānaṁ
13 Z tārāganāhī
data e
14 B sobhaste
15 A yassassā; Z [yasavā]
16 Z sobhate
Suddhamake accharadevata yathā
alaṃkātā tattha vasanti tā sādā,
Purindadeva na vinā na sobhate
saññatikā silavina na sobhate.2

Yathā kumāro manimuttabhūsito3
suvathadhāro4 subhagandhavajjito,5
Tathā naro dānavibhūsitamaṇḍito6
na sobhate silavilepanam vinā.7

Yathā vanaṇ chappadapakhkhaṃguṇaṇa8
vasanakāle9 kusumehi maṇḍitaṃ,
Na sobhate10 kokilavajjitaṃ11 vinā
yathā pi yo silavina na sobhate.12

Yathā gharadārakumāravāsitaṃ
dhanālayaṃ nātigaṇena ākulaṃ.13

---

1 C1 YZ [add tathā] before vinā; C2 (adds yathā)
2 YZ uddena; for the three kinds of elder, see PTSD, s.v. vaddha.
3 AC1 C2 XZ [purita]; B (purita)
4 Apparently from rāja, but it is unclear just what case is intended.
5 A visobhate
6 A nāgo yathā
7 Emend to balavā?
8 C1 C2 YZ omit so nāgo
9 Z omits so
10 X āsāmo
11 AB silam
12 C1 omits the difficult last foot of this verse; to accommodate the requirements
of metre, the last foot might be emended to: tathā hi so surūpino silavinā,
leaving na sobhate implied by syntactical parallels.
13 B taṭākam, from tata?
14 YZ add [tathā pi]; C2 adds (yathā pi)
15 AB [saṃcaritaṃ]
16 YZ omit tathā pi
17 ABC1 C2 X add sā, a feminine demonstrative pronoun used in place of a neuter?
18 BC1 C2 X (padumupphalam)
Na sobhate silavajjito.¹

Dibbehi vanṇehi samānarūpino
Alaṃkato² sabbavibhūsitehi
Annaṃ vinā so na vibhati rūpino,³
Tathā naro dhanadhānābhogino⁴
Na sobhate⁵ silavajjitenā.⁶

Ye keci sīlaṃ rakkhanti sabbadukkhaḥ pamuccare,
Yathā dighāyukā honti yāva nibbānapattiya.⁷

Khaṇena⁸ sīlaṃ rakkheyya⁹ appameyyaphalaṃ¹⁰ siyā,¹¹
Anantagunāsāmyuttaṃ¹² sabbabuddhehi vaṃśitaṃ.

Hīnena brahmaçariyenā¹³ khattiye upapajjati,¹⁴
Majjhimenā ca¹⁵ devatāṃ uttamenā¹⁶ visujjhati.

¹ C₁ silavajjito; AB then add naro; Y adds na sobhate; C₁ C₂ add naro na sobhate; all of these additions may be attempts to restore some semblance of a metre to this either poorly written or poorly transmitted verse.
² ABX [alaṃkata]
³ Z [rūpino silavajjitenā na sobhate]; X (rūpinā)
⁴ B dhanadhānābhogino; C₁ C₂ Y omit tathā naro dhanadhānābhogino
⁵ C₂ Y omit na sobhate
⁶ Y then adds na sobhate
⁷ C₁ C₂ nibbānasampattiya
⁸ A [khaṇne]
⁹ Z [rakkheyyaṃ]; C₂ (rakkhayya)
¹⁰ AB [omit phalaṃ]
¹¹ AB [add sīlaṃ]
¹² C₁ C₂ (anantagunāsāmyuttaṃ)
¹³ Y (brahmaçariyehi)
¹⁴ C₁ (uppaññiti)
¹⁵ X omits ca
¹⁶ X (uttame)

Pāṇātipātā veramanīyā sabbāṅgehi pūritā,¹
Rūpāvā sukhasampanno dighāyuko arogino.

Adinnādānā veramanīyā pahūtadhanadhaññavā,²
Rājāno ceva corā ca aggiṃ udakam eva ca
Appiyā vā ime paṅca asādhārānabhogavā.

Kāmesu micchācārā veramanīyā itthibhāvā pamuccitā,⁴
Sabbaṅgehi sampanno abhyāvā sukhavihārino.⁵

Musāvādā veramanīyā puthupaññā visāradā,⁶
Mukho⁷ ca gandhasampanno amusāmadhurabhāsītā.

Surāpānā veramanīyā na ummatā⁸ amohada,
Hiri ottappasampanno saccavādasurūpītā.⁹

Evam eva gahapati sīlaṃ hi nāme taṃ mahāguṇaṃ mahānissāmjan ti evam eva gahapati Bhagavā Tuṇḍilagapati kassissa sīlānissāmjan kathesi. Puna Bhagavā etad avoca: Yo hi koci purisapuggalo itthi vā puriso vā khattiyo vā khattiyā vā brāhmaṇo vā brāhmaṇi vā


1 AC2 [gahapatinī]
2 C1 omits daliddo vā
3 Y omits from gahapatika to daliddi vā
4 BC1C2 Y Bhikkhave ekam; X ekam silam bhikkhave
5 A [pativirato]
6 A plural form used for the singular ?; similar solectisms are found below.
7 C1C2 Y Bhikkhave dutiyaṁ pi silam
8 X omits dutiyaṁ silam rakkhitabbam
9 C2X hoti
10 YZ Bhikkhave tatiyaṁ silam; C1C2 Bhikkhave tatiyaṁ pi silam
11 ABZ add silam here
12 AC1C2 hoti
13 A Catutham pi silam bhikkhave silam; X Catutham pi silam bhikkhave
14 B (Musāvādaṁ)
15 AX omits musāvādam pahāya
16 Y (paṭiviraso); there is an obvious confusion in the clause as it stands, since it says the opposite of what must be intended.
17 BY hoti
18 AY Paṭcammam pi bhikkhave; X (paṭcamm pi bhikkhave); C2C1 (Bhikkhave paṭcamm pi)
19 A [pamādattha]
pahāya uccāsayamanahāsayanā paṭivirato hoti, Nimmānaratīnaṃ1
devānaṃ rājāno2 honti mahiddhiko mahānubhāvo hoti. Bhikkhave
dasamaṃ3 sīlaṃ4 rakkhitaṃ5. Bhikkhave katamaṃ6 dasasīlaṃ7
rakdhitaṃ8? Jātarūparajatapātīgāhānaṃ8 pahāya9 jātarūparajatapātīgāhānaṃ paṭivirato hoti, Paranimmittavasaṭṭhaṃ devānaṃ rājāno
honti mahiddhiko mahānubhāvo hoti. Bhikkhave imāni dasasīlaṃ10
rakkhitaṃbhām, iti imāna Simūthā11 gāthāṃ āha:12

Sataṃ hatttha sataṃ assa sataṃ assasirathā13
Sataṃ kaññā sahassāni14 āmutamaṇṭikunḍālā
Ekassa padavīthārassa kalaṃ nāgghanti solasīnaṃ.

Dverne kule uppanjanti khattiyi caipi15 brāhmaṇe
Hīne kule16 na17 jāyanti sīlaṃ rakkhayaṃ phalaṃ.

1 A Nimmānaṃ ratīnaṃ; X Nimmākaratīnaṃ; Y Nibbānaratīnaṃ
2 A rājā
3 A Dasasīlaṃ bhikkhave
4 C2 dasasīlaṃ
5 Y sīlaraṅkhitabbām
6 ABXY Katamaṃ bhikkhave
7 Emend to dasaṃ sīlaṃ ?
8 B Jātarūparajatapātīgāhānaṃ; C1 C2 paaṭiggāhānaṃ
9 X omits Jātarūparajatapātīgāhānaṃ pahāya
10 ABC2 C2X imāni dasasīlaṃ bhikkhave
11 Y (Simūthā)
12 Z evam āha; perhaps this variant is an instance of contamination from a pada ānuma, since it agrees with a gloss found in C2.
13 BC2 Z (assasirathā); emend to assasirathā ?
14 Y omits sahassāni
15 Z vāpi; Y ca
16 C1 Hinakule
17 AY omit na

Tuṇḍilovāda: an allegedly non-canonical Sutta

Anantabhogasampannaṃ anantabalavāhānaṃ
Nārivaragaṇākīnaṃ sīlaṃ rakkhayaṃ phalaṃ.2
Hathhi assārathā patti senā hi3 caturaṅgini
Samantā parivārenti sīlaṃ rakkhayaṃ phalaṃ.5
Kaye candanagandho ca mukhe vāyanti uppalaṃ
Sattayojaṃ4 vāyanti sīlaṃ rakkhayaṃ phalaṃ.7

Mahāpuṇṇā mahātejā mahāpaṇṇā mahāyasā8
Mahābalā mahāthāmaṃ sīlaṃ rakkhayaṃ phalaṃ.9

Sīlaṃ ābharaṇaṃ setthaṃ sīlabharaṇaṃ uttamaṃ
Sīlaṃ apāyabhāyajanaṇaṃ10 sīlaṃ rakkhayaṃ phalaṃ.11
Candanāṁ tagaraṁ cāpiṁ uppalaṁ attha vassikāṁ
Etesāṁ gandhajātānaṁ silagandho anuttaro.

Dasīlaṁisamsaṁ3 silakathānantaraṁ saggakathā kathetum4 ārabhi. Sakko hi nāmetaṁ ghahapiṁ indo manāpo ekantasukho niccaṁ Sinerumathake5 Tāvatiṁsabhavane dibbhayaṁ anubhavanti. Niccaṁ dibbasampatṭiṁ6 abhiramitvā7 dibbehi rūpehi8 samannāgato dibbehi vathālāmkārehi samannāgato9 patimaṇḍitā dibbamālāgandhavilepanēhi vibhusitā10 dibbehi paṇcaṅgikurīyēhi sāda pappoṭhītā11 dibbehi naccagītavāditehi nandātā niccaṁ dibbasampatṭiṁ12 abhiramantī.

Cātummahārājikānaṁ13 devānaṁ ayuppamānaṁ navutivassatassahassāni ettakaṁ pana kālam dibbasampatṭisukkhāṁ anubhavanti. Tāvatiṁse14 devānaṁ pana ayuppamānaṁ pana tissī15 ca vassakoṭiya saddhiṁ ca vassassatassahassāni honti. Ettakāni16 ayuppamānaṁ dibbasampatṭiṁ17 anubhavitā abhiramimśu.18 Yāmānaṁ devānaṁ ayuppamānaṁ

1 ACx [chuddasa-]
2 X Tuhiṁnam; an example of the influence of Sinhala phonology on Pali orthography?
3 X Ēttakāni
4 X omits kālam
5 C1C2 dibbam sampattī; Z dibbasampatti
6 A then adds abhiramitvā
7 X abhiramimśu
8 A then adds pana
9 Z Ēttakān
10 X omits preceding two sentences.
11 A navavassakoṭisatānā
12 A then adds [saṭṭaya]; C2 add satānītim
13 BC2 (digharattim)
14 Y then adds hoti
15 E mend to parikkhito?
16 A sāvīthi
17 Z [sāpokkharaniṁ]; mend sā throughout sentence to sa?
18 ABY (sākapparukkhā); C2 (sākapparukkhā)
Tuṇḍilovāda: *an allegedly non-canonical Sutta*

Evāṃ Bhagavā saggagunapaṭisamyuttam dhammadesaṇam Tuṇḍilassa gahapatiputtassa desesi.

Puna ayam saggio anico addhuvo. Sabbe3 pi devā tathā yāvata sukhaṃ thatvā puna puṇṇakkhyā ramanīyasyasaggo cavītvā pana puṇṇajātiyaṃ uppaṇjanti. Tasmā gaḥapati ayam saggio nāma anico addhuvo sabbasamkhāresu jigučchikātum yuttam4 na heṭṭhāchandarāgo kātabbo. Alaṃ piyāyitum alaṃ tussitum alaṃ vivajjitum vimuḍhitum.5

Evāṃ Bhagavā saggakathānantaraṃ kāmēsa dosaṃ dassetum6 ārabhi. Bho gahapati kāme7 hi nāmetaṃ mahantaṃ ghorataraṃ dukkhaṃ paṭivadeti. Kāmaṃ nissāya bahusoko bahūpāyaso bahūpaddavo dukkhaṃ sayati dukkhaṇa na parimuccati. Niccaṃ upekkhaggacitto hoti,8 niccaṃ dummukho hoti, niccaṃ soko hoti, niccaṃ ḍasito hoti,9 niccaṃ aññehi piḷito hoti, niccaṃ bahudukkho hoti. Kāmeta iccā nāma na ciraṃ tiṭṭhanti.10 Padumoppattano11 galita udakam viya hoti khaṇe neva muccati vinassati yevati, assačabhāvena12 supinakkupamā kāmā,13 attano issarīyabhāvena araṇītaṃ dahananti tiṇakkuṃ pama kāmā,14 aticcaphala-

---

1 X (tasmin)
2 Y (pokkaranıyiye); emend to pokkaranıyā
3 BC2 (upphalam)
4 XY (upphalapundarikarpa)
5 C1C2Z teleṭṭhitam
6 Vādenti, a causative, is apparently being used as a passive, or perhaps devehi should be taken as deve hi, with an accusative plural used as a nominative. Some emendation would thus seem appropriate here.
7 A gīyantī; in both cases a denominative verb form is used instead of the more standard gīyaṃ.
8 B naccam
9 X puṇhaṃ kammam
10 X karmakara
11 Emend to karontā?
12 YZ pūjaneyyanam
13 X vandanīyānam vandanatā
14 Emend to appanatā?
15 BC2 (digharattam)

---

1 C1C2 saggagunam; X saggagunā; C1C2YZ [paṭisamyuktam]
2 B Tuṇḍilagahapatiputtassa
3 AX then add samkhāresu jigučchikātum
4 BC1C2Z [yuttam]; emend to yutto?
5 C2 vimučhitum
6 C1 dhesetum
7 ABC2Y kāmesu
8 The meaning here is not immediately obvious. I take this clause to mean that upekkhā is the best mental state possible in this world, that is, happiness — , true happiness — is not possible.
9 A omits niccaṃ ḍasito hoti.
10 BX tiṭṭhāti
11 A padumoppatakonā
12 A [accabāvesu]
13 A then adds tāpana
14 A omits kāmā
bhāvena¹ sappisirupamā² kāmā, pājjalitabhāvena tiṇakkupamā kāmā, tāpanabhāvena³ āṅgārakāsupamā⁴ kāmā, jīvitaharanaṭṭhena halāhālavasupamā⁵ kāmā, viññabhāvena⁶ naccalohipamā⁷ kāmā, pājjalitabhāvena ayoṇupamā⁸ kāmā, atekicchabhāvena makkhanā parivāritavanupamā⁹ kāmā, tathā dukkham eva kevalam.

Duggandhabhāvena¹⁰ pūtiparipuṇṇagaṇḍupamā kāmā, gūtharāsimhi nimuggapuriso viya kāmā, pūtikunapesu hathhapavesanapuriso¹¹ viya kāmā, āṅgārakapallesu¹² āṅgulipakkhittapuriso¹³ viya¹⁴ kāmā, evaṁ kāmanissāya¹⁵ imasmim loke¹⁶ yeva ativiyaghorataram¹⁷ dukkhāni¹⁸ ca mahantaṁ ca vināsaṁ paṭiṁśvedenti.¹⁹ Puna tato²⁰ idhalokadukkhan²¹ ca paṭivedetvā¹ puna paraloke mahānirayesa upajjanti. Tasmaṁ yeva mahānirayeta tippakharā kaṭukā vedanā paṭivedenti.


Evaṁ Bhagavā gharavāsesu¹² dosañ ca nikkhhamme ānisāmṣaṁ ca dassettvā niṁbānassānisāmsaṁ pakāsento: Bho gahapati nibbāyati etam¹³ tasmā niṁbānan ti vuccati. Jātiyarāvyadhimaranaṇadukkham etsaṁ catunnaṁ dukkhaṁ niṁbāpetti¹⁴ niṁbānaṁ nāma, rāgadosamohānaṁ,

---

¹ Z omits aticca phalabhāvena; XY anicca phalabhāvena
² Z omits sappisirupamā; the compound can be read as “like a lump (Pali: sira) of ghee” or perhaps as “like a stream (borrowing Sanskrit sīra) of ghee.”
³ Y omits tinakkupamā kāmā, tāpanabhāvena
⁴ B omits āṅgārakāsupamā
⁵ C₁C₂ halāhālavasupamā
⁶ B vinālabhāvena
⁷ C₂X tambalohasupamā. The exact significance of the simile is obscure to me, largely because of the difficulty of nacca. Perhaps it should be understood as “like quivering — that is, molten (as is suggested by the variant in C₂X) — metal.”

⁸ AZ [ayoṇuttamamā]
⁹ B parivāricanupamā; Y parivāriyā; Z parivāriyaṁ
¹⁰ A [duggandho bhavena]
¹¹ X hatham pavesanapuriso
¹² ABC,XYZ [āṅgāraka paphalasus]
¹³ Z [āṅguliparikkhinnā]; perhaps parikkhīna was intended?
¹⁴ Y then adds puna
¹⁵ BX kāmam nissāya; A [kāmānissāyā]
¹⁶ X omits loke
¹⁷ Y ativiyaghoram
¹⁸ C₁ dukkham ca
¹⁹ XY paṭivedenti; C₂ paṭisamjanti
²⁰ A tatho
²¹ C₂ idhaloke dukkhan ca

---

¹ A [paṭivedeti vā ca]
² C₁ desetvā
³ A [bahukicca]
⁴ Emend to imesu? or perhaps understand as imasmim loke?
⁵ Emend to upaneti?
⁶ X jegucchikātum; BC;C₂Z [jecchiyāṁ]; emend to jegucchi?
⁷ C₁C₂ [yuktaṁ]; emend to yutto?
⁸ X (vīraṁ situm)
⁹ B then adds chandam
¹⁰ A [paṭisīvā]
¹¹ Z nibbānasukhā
¹² B gharavāse
¹³ BX (etam nibbānaṁ)
¹⁴ B nibbānaṁ peti; C₂ nibbānapeti; C₁ (nibbāpenti)
natthi¹ athi etesaṃ pañcannya² dosānaṃ nibbānapetiti nibbānaṃ nāma³ ti uccati.⁴ Tasmiṃ⁵ nibbāne ajātiṃ ajarāṃ abyadhim⁶ amaraṃ⁷ nibbhayaṃ⁸ na upaddavaṃ.⁹

Sattappavaram¹⁰ ramaniyyataṇaṃ¹¹ ca nibbānamahānagarāṃ sapākāram sadvāram sattālakām saparikkhitam savīthi saantarāpanām sakappāṃ sapāsādaṃ¹² satambhāṃ sasayanāṃ sapallāṅkāṃ¹³ sadippa-jāliyatam¹⁴ samālāgandhavilepanaṃ sapokkharāṇiyaṃ sajalapiṇṇaṃ savālukāṃ¹⁵ tasmiṃ yeva¹⁶ pokkharāniye¹⁷ sapādumppalakumudapunḍarīkaṃ¹⁸ sabhamārāṃ sauyvānaṃ¹⁹ sahamsacakkavākaṃ²⁰ satalākaṃ

---

¹ C₂ rāgadosamohānapāñca; emend natthi to diṭṭhi? or take natthi as referring to the view of nihilism, which is generally rejected as a wrong view.
² Emend to pañcaṇāṃ?
³ X adds sokadukkhaparidevadomanassa upōyāsādi hi athi etesā (emend to etesā?) dukkhānaṃ nibbānaṃ peti nibbānaṃ nāma
⁴ A vuccati
⁵ B adds yeva
⁶ BYZ [ovyādhiṃ]; C₁ [ayyyādhiṃ]
⁷ C₂ amarānaṃ; A [amanam]
⁸ ABC₁Z [nibbhaya]  
⁹ B omits na upaddavaṃ; emend to anupaddavaṃ? 
¹⁰ B (sattappaddavaṃ)  
¹¹ Perhaps ramaniyyatāṇā ca is intended ?; AC₁C₂XY ramaniyavan
¹² C₁C₂Z [sapāsādaḥ]
¹³ A [sapallakāṃ]
¹⁴ AXY sadippa-jāliyatāṃ
¹⁵ BC₂Z savāthukāṃ
¹⁶ C₂ ye; X (ye so)
¹⁷ X (pokkharāni)
¹⁸ BC₁C₂ (*upphala-); AB [⁸kumudu-]
¹⁹ A [uuyyānaṃ]; C₂ (uyānaṃ)
²⁰ B hamsacakkavākaṃ

---

jivamjivakasamghā naccāhakokilasuvapotaṅka¹ madhurakoṇicādi sakunagaṇehi² sevitaṃ, evaṃ³ nibbānamahānagarassā sampattiyohanti.⁵


---

¹ BC₁ naccākokilasuvapotaṅka  
² A [sakunagahane vinaṃ hi]  
³ C₂ (ekam)  
⁴ C₁C₂ nibbānassā mahānagarassā  
⁵ Y (hoṭi)  
⁶ B nibbānamahānagare  
⁷ AXYCI₂XY dānapārami dvāram sadisaṃ  
⁸ C₂ mettāyā pārami; I suspect that this variant is an instance of contamination by a pada añuma.  
⁹ Z parikkhitaṃ pākārasadisaṃ; BC₁C₂XY parikkhitaṃ sadisaṃ  
¹⁰ B antarāpanam sadisaṃ  
¹¹ BZ omit sa  
¹² Emend to Abhidhammasattappakaranam tambhasadisaṃ?  
¹³ C₂ vimuttiṃṇānam pallaṅkaṃ sadisaṃ; emend to Vimuttiṃṇānam pallāṅkasadisaṃ?  
¹⁴ B sampadipa-jāliyam  
¹⁵ Emend to Nānanā dyāpajjalitastadisaṃ?  
¹⁶ AC₂ [pokkharāniyā]  
¹⁷ AB kāruṇāsitalajalapiṇṇasadisaṃ

Saccam ekantasukkhām eva hoti. Tādisaṃ saggasukkhām10 akatapunīnehi na laddhaṃ. Kim aṅga pana tathā nibbānanagarāṃ gantuṃ vā pūpuni tūṃ vā pavisitaṃ na sakkā11 laddhum. Yena kena c jāna dāne na pi yadā puṇṇakammesu pi ratā, te pi jāna niyataṃ eva nibbāna- mahānagarāṃ gantuṃ vā pūpuni tūṃ vā pavisitaṃ vā passituṃ vā labhis asanti. Atha Sattā nibbān a mahānagarāṃ vaṇṇento āha:

Santāṃ pānītaṃ amalāṃ sīvaṃ abhayaṃ maccutaṃ12
Ajamāṃ amatāṃ khe ṁaṃ13 nibbānaṃ nāma i disan ti

1 B padumappukumudapundarīkaṃ
2 BC2 omits sīlaṃ; A then adds [padumappukumudupund sadisaṃ], obviously a copyist's error, but one which suggests that the usual pattern in the simile was expected here too.
3 A agge sāvakāṃ; B aggasāvakā
4 A then adds sa
5 AC2 viriya
6 B (hamsacakka kāvākaṃ)
7 BC1 omits arahantām hamsacakka kāvā kādīja ganasadasānaṃ
8 Emend to nibbānam tālākasadasānaṃ?
9 Read as samvithārāṃ vā?; or emend to samvithārāva?
10 X saggasukkhāṃ
11 A [sakko]
12 Emend to maccutaṃ?; or, to keep metre, to madhuraṃ?
13 All manuscripts then add [evaṃ Bhagavā]

Tuṇḍilovāda: an allegedly non-canonical Sutta

Evaṃ Bhagavā anekagunāsamyyuttāṃ1 dhammadesa naṃ Tuṇḍilagahapati kassa desesi. Gahapati ko ime acchariyabbutaṃ2 dhammadesanām sutvā Irandaī nāma bharīyāa3 saddhiṃ dhammarasaṃ pivītvā pitivegena ubho pi jayampi ko arahattaṃ pāpuniṃsu. Aññe pi janā bahusotāpatti phalādālini pāpuniṃsu.

Tuṇḍilovādasuttaṃ.4

Chicago

Charles Hallisey
APROPOS THE PĀLI VINAYA AS A HISTORICAL DOCUMENT: A REPLY TO GREGORY SCHOPEN

In an article on “The Stūpa Cult and the Extant Pāli Vinaya,”¹ Gregory Schopen argues that Theravādins once knew a Vinaya text different from that now available to us. The difference suggested by Schopen is not minor: his hypothesis is that the Pāli Vinaya once had rules regarding stūpas, just as the Vinayas of other Buddhist schools do. Obviously, if this provocative hypothesis is correct, it would have wide ramifications for our understanding of the Theravāda as a historical tradition. It could be the keystone for a new vision of the the social structure and practice of ancient Buddhist communities.

I have a great deal of sympathy with the promise of that new vision, and like Gregory Schopen, I feel that it has been too long in coming. However, I also find Schopen’s specific suggestion about the Pāli Vinaya to be untenable. Before giving reasons for this judgement, I would first like to acknowledge the continuing value of this paper for a student of Buddhism. Schopen’s article on the Pāli Vinaya, like so much of his work, combines a scepticism towards received ideas in scholarship and a keen ability to see new connections between scattered details. This is an exemplary combination that more often than not leads to a better understanding of the history of the Buddhist traditions. Moreover, this article offers, in the course of supporting the main suggestion about the “extant Pāli Vinaya,” many particular insights and recommendations for future research; these on their own make the article a valuable contribution to Buddhist historiography.


Journal of the Pali Text Society, XV, 197-208
Schopen’s argument that the Pāli Vinaya once contained rules regarding stūpas rests ultimately on the interpretation of a few passages in Buddhaghosa’s Visuddhimagga and the twelfth century monastic code (katikāvata) of Parākramabāhu I. Other important information documenting monastic participation in the stūpa cult as a matter of some ordinariness is offered as corroboration for the key textual interpretations, and indeed much of the article is devoted to this supporting material. All of this supporting material is relatively well-established, in large part because of Gregory Schopen’s own research, published elsewhere, and there is nothing about it that I would wish to gainsay. Valuable as this material is, it is still “circumstantial evidence” and alone it cannot confirm Schopen’s hypothesis about the history of the Vinaya text.

In a curious way, however, some of Schopen’s supporting material seems to turn on the main hypothesis itself, so much so that, in my view, the determinant interpretation of the different passages in the Visuddhimagga and the katikāvata consequently appears less credible. This subversion of the argument begins when Schopen notes that “if — as the Mahā-Parākramabāhu Katikāvata, the Visuddhimagga, and the Sutta-Vibhaṅga seem to suggest — the Pāli Vinaya originally contained such rules [regarding stūpas], then the fact that they are no longer found in the Vinaya known to us could, apparently, only be explained by


2 Schopen, “Extant Pāli Vinaya,” p. 93.

criticism" would correct whatever gaps had occurred, thus restoring at least a semblance of the original.

Schopen's alternative assumption — that the rules regarding stūpas were systematically removed — seems no more likely. Schopen himself provides abundant evidence that there could not have been any serious prohibition of monastic participation in the stūpa cult in the Buddhist communities of India and Sri Lanka before Buddhaghosa. There is also no evidence to indicate that this monastic participation was proscribed in the medieval period. Finally, we can add the fact of the numbers of Vinaya manuscripts and also manuscripts of the extensive commentarial literature associated with the Vinaya. To suggest that references to the rules regarding stūpas were systematically removed from so many duplicate manuscripts is to posit a preposterous conspiracy theory.¹ Conspiracies are notoriously difficult to establish, in courts of law and in scholarship; all too frequently the charge owes more to the preconceptions of the accuser than to the facts themselves.

Thus both "explanations" of the hypothetical loss of rules regarding stūpas "raise many more questions than answers."² For me, then, Schopen's own support for his argument about the Pāli Vinaya provides sufficient reason to reconsider whether his interpretation of the passages from the Visuddhimagga and Parākramabāhu's katikāvata is indeed correct.

II

If Schopen's argument about the Pāli Vinaya depends in the end on his interpretation of a limited number of passages, his interpretation of these passages depends on his understanding of a single term, khandakavatta. These passages associate, by juxtaposition at the very least, duties (vattāni) pertaining to stūpas and bodhi trees with other specific observances called collectively khandakavattāni. On the crucial point of this term's reference, Schopen is somewhat tentative, admitting that his interpretation depends on the correctness of other scholars' work.

Following the lead of standard dictionaries and translations, Schopen glosses khandakavattāni as "duties specified in the Khandaka," with the further possibility that they refer to the observances enumerated in the Vattakkhandaka portion of the Vinaya.¹ Impressively, this gloss is said to agree with that of the great tīkācāriya Sāriputta, although Sāriputta's own interpretation comes at second-hand from a footnote in Ratnapala's translation of the Mahā-Parākramabāhu Katikāvata.

While this translation of khandakavatta is obviously plausible for lexical purposes, it is still too general to bear the weight it must, if it is to be the sine qua non of Schopen's hypothesis.

Some further specificity is provided by Sāriputta himself, in a discussion of khandakavattāni found in his Vinaya tīkā, the Sāratthadipani. The textual occasion for this discussion is Buddhaghosa's

¹ Schopen, "Extant Pāli Vinaya," p. 85.

---

¹ Schopen seems to think that a careful examination of the Samantapāsādikā might confirm his hypothesis about an original Pāli Vinaya. I gather that he has in mind the possibility that the commentarial literature might display gaps in the Vinaya itself by preserving glosses and discussions of material now missing; see Schopen, "Extant Pāli Vinaya," p. 86, n. 9. My own cursory use of this commentarial literature makes me doubt that a discrepancy between text and commentary will be found to any degree more marked than with other commentaries. If such gaps were preserved in the Vinaya commentaries, I would expect Theravādī literature to address their source, in a manner analogous to Jaina acknowledgement of the loss of their original scriptures; the lack of such an acknowledgement is of course not conclusive, but merely contrasting "circumstantial evidence."

² Schopen, "Extant Pāli Vinaya," p. 95.
reference to fourteen khandakavattiśi and eighty-two mahāvattāni in the Samantapāsādikā; significantly Buddhaghosa is not commenting on any monastic practices at this point, but is elaborating the means by which the saddhamma may be preserved; it may be that in such a context Sāriputta would have been guided more by scriptural precedent than by the patterns of practice of his day and this discussion may then be a good reflection of the Vinaya he knew. The Sāratthadipani passage reads:

cuddasa khandakavatti śi nāma vattakhandake vuttāni āgantuva-vattāni dvāsika-gamika-anumodana-bhattaggapinḍa-cārika-ārahaṇaka-senāsana-jañāghara-vaccakuti-upajjhāya-saddhīvihārika-ācariya-antevāsikavattan ti imāni cuddasa vattāni. Tato aṭṭhīni pana kadāci tajjātikammatikādikāle yeva caritabbāni dve-asīti mahāvattāni. na sabbāsu avatthāsu caritabbāni. tasmā cuddasakkhandakavattesu agaṇitāni.1

This may be translated:

“The fourteen khandakavattiśi are those fourteen observances described in the Vattakkhandaka such as the observance pertaining to guest monks, to resident monks, and to monks going away, pertaining to giving thanks, to the refectory, to the collecting of alms, to the forest-dwellers, and to the lodging place, to the bathroom and to the latrine, to the preceptor, the co-resident, the teacher, and the pupil. Then the other eighty-two mahāvattāni are those which are to be practiced only at the appropriate time, as, for example, the act of censure was done, and are not to be practiced in all stages of life. Therefore they are not counted in the fourteen khandakavattāni.”

1 Vin II 231. A glance at the Devanāgarī edition of the Cullavagga indicates that on this point there are no variants among the Roman, Burmese, and Sinhalese editions; see Cullavagga, edited by Bhikkhu J. Kashyap (Nalanda: Devanagari Pali Series, 1956), p. 362.
2 See Sp 225, 874, 1378; Vbh-a 297.
3 Ja I 449.
4 Compare Sp 225 with Sp 415.
5 Vbh-a 297.
We have evidence that the observances for cetiyas and bodhi trees were counted among those to be done daily,¹ which might also explain why they were juxtaposed with the fourteen vattāni. It hardly seems plausible that they would be grouped with the other eighty-two vattāni, since they do not fit within the definition of those observances, even though the larger number would make their inclusion easier. It thus seems more than likely that Buddhaghosa, Sāriputta, and the other tiṭācariyas did not include the observances concerning stūpas and bodhi trees among the observances specified in the Vinaya itself.

The individual passages discussed by Schopen require some further comment. It may be that Ratnapala’s translation of a key line in the Mahā-Parākramabāhu Katikāvata, while in general correct, is misleading in a crucial respect. Schopen gives emphasis to the line in question when he quotes the passage: “the duties specified in the Khandaka such as the duties pertaining to Stūpas, . . . the teachers . . . ,” etc. Ratnapala, however, omitted in his translation a du, “also” which, if included would give: “the duties specified in the Khandaka, such as the duties pertaining to teachers, etc., as well as the duties pertaining to stūpas and the shrines of the bodhi tree.”² This would seem to be a clear example of juxtaposition, rather than inclusion in a fixed list.

---

¹ For example, the Heranāsikavinisa, a twelfth century commentary to a handbook of Vinaya rules for novices referred to in the Mahā-Parākramabāhu Katikāvata (see Ratnapala, pp. 130, and 192, n. 8.1) explicitly says that these observances are to be done every day; an edition of this work is found in Sikkavallanda hā Sikkavallanda Vinisa, edited by Māda uyanoḍa Vimalakirti (Colombo: Gunasena, 1970), p. 157.

² Ratnapala apparently also misconstrued dhaṇagab māṇbo atgana-vatu-du as three observances, rather than two, as is suggested by the Visuddhimagga passages discussed by Schopen. I know of no other reference where observances specially focused on “temple terraces” are specified.
The *Visuddhimagga* passages are more difficult to explain. My only suggestion is that *Khandakavattāni*, which we have already seen is not strictly a technical term, may have had an even broader field of reference. Perhaps it grouped a range of practices according to their family resemblances, rather than by their common origin in specific parts of the *Vinaya*.

III

At the end of his article, Schopen seems to anticipate alternative interpretations of *khandakavattāni*, and he offers another implication of his research and discussion:

“If this interpretation is not correct, and if the Pāli *Vinaya* did not contain 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.”

These comments raise questions of a completely different order about the Pāli *Vinaya* as a historical document and I would like to conclude this reply with a response to them.

We are all well aware that there is a vast and intimidating literature associated with the *Vinaya*. This literature does, however, make it clear that Theravādins found the *Vinaya* both too little and too much. They found it too little in so far as the canonical text required elucidation and clarification, and as a result, massive commentaries and glossaries were written on it; we have been using some of these in the course of this discussion. They found it too much in so far as the size of the canonical *Vinaya* made it unwieldy and they consequently wrote diverse summaries and compendiums, including Buddhagatta’s *Vinaya-viniccaya* and Sāriputta’s *Muttaka-Vinaya-viniccaya*. Such works were written to present the *Vinaya*’s practical message in a more manageable fashion. In a similar vein, handbooks like the *Khuddasikha*, *Mulasikha*, *Herāṇasikha*, and indeed the *katikāvatas* themselves were written to provide even more practical guidance. This associated literature makes relating the canonical *Vinaya* to actual practice in diverse contexts more complex than has generally been admitted by students of Buddhism.

The supporting evidence concerning the routine participation of monks in the *stūpa* cult, which Schopen considers in the course of developing his main hypothesis, clearly indicates that the *Vinaya* does not address every aspect of Buddhist monastic life.¹ This does not mean, however, that it consequently has little historical value.

Schopen may be right, I think, to suggest that the canonical *Vinaya* text is not as useful as once thought as a ready source for extracting usable historical data. For this, archeological evidence and the evidence found in the different monastic handbooks may give more accurate answers to our questions. Even so, reconstructing the general historical context of early Buddhist monasticism may ultimately depend on the extent to which we can penetrate the thought-world of the larger texts, and especially the canonical *Vinaya*.

¹ Schopen (“Extant Pāli Vinaya,” p. 98) holds T.W. Rhys Davids up for criticism for saying that the Pāli *Vinaya* “enters so great length in all (Schopen’s emphasis) the details of the daily life of the recluse.” Perhaps we may excuse Rhys Davids’ hyperbole; he was, after all, describing a text which contains rules against building a fire to smoke out those who take too long in the latrine.
An important historical value of the canonical Vinaya lies in its being a coherent expression of a particular Buddhist mentalité. It will only be after we have learned how to combine our interest in "what really happened" with a sensitivity to the changing thought-worlds of the Theravada that we will begin to discern the historical reality behind the literary and archaeological traces of ancient Buddhist monasticism.
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A NOTE ON DHAMMAPĀLA(S)

Of the works ascribed by tradition to Dhammapāla, the Paramathamaṁjaśa (Visuddhimagga-mahā-tikā, abbr. Vism-mhṭ) and the tikās on the first three nikāyas (that on the Anguttara having presumably disappeared by the time of Sāriputta in the twelfth century) are usually assumed to be by the same author, referred to as Dhammapāla II: e.g., Mr Norman writes:

"In the absence of any evidence to the contrary, it seems reasonable to assume that the Gandhavamsa is correct in stating that the tikās to the Visuddhimagga and the four nikāyas are by the same person."

Some authors follow tradition in identifying this author with the author of the Paramatthadīpani, referred to by others as Dhammapāla I.

Near the beginning of Vism-mhṭ occurs the following passage:

etth’ āha "kasmā panāyaṁ Visuddhimagga-kathā vatthu-pubbikā āraddhā, na Satthu-thomanāpubbikā?" ti. vuccate "visum asaṁvaṇṇanādibhāvato"; Sumāṅgalavilāsini-ādayo viya hi Dighanikāy’-ādinaṁ nāyāṁ visum saṁvaṇṇanā, na pakaraṇantaraṁ vā Abhidhammāvatāra-Sumatāvatār’-ādi viya;

1 E.g. Gandhavamsa, ed. J. Minayeff, JPTS 1886.
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therefore has to think up explanations for their absence in the Visuddhimagga. I find it hard to believe that he could have written the nikāya ṭīkās, which have no such opening (the same is true of the Netti ṭīkā and the anuṭīkā).

Where do we go from here? Do we now have yet another Dhammapāla? The colophons and the close similarity of the opening and closing verses, and according to Father Pieris matters of thought and style as well, suggest Vism-miṭṭa written by Dhammapāla I, but objections have been raised on chronological grounds; the matter clearly requires further research.6

Cambridge

---

4 Majjhe Visuddhimaggo esa catunnaṁ pi āgamānaṁ hi Tharī pākāsayissati tattha yathā bhāsitaṁ atthaṁ (Sv 2,6–7, etc.).

5 Hamlet III ii.
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