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A SURVEY OF THE BURMESE AND SIAMESE PĀLI MANUSCRIPT COLLECTIONS IN THE WELLCOME INSTITUTE*

The purpose of this list is to facilitate access and handling, and to provide a basis for a more detailed scholarly investigation later. It is expected that the manuscripts mentioned here will be fully described at some future date.

The list comprises 106 manuscripts containing 140 identified texts, some of them being rare items, unique in European collections.

**Wms. Burmese-Pali 1**
Kammavācā (CPD 1.2,16)

Gilded decorated metal plates; ff. 9 (kha-khō); 520 × 95 mm; 7 lines, 62 char. in black lac, Burmese medium round script, 480 mm; 2 red lacquered wooden covers, gilded and decorated in red.

**Wms. Burmese-Pali 2**
Kammavācā (CPD 1.2,16)

Gilded decorated stiffened cloth; ff. 16 (ka-khi); 560 × 130 mm; 6 lines, 22 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 525 mm; 2 red lacquered wooden covers, gilded and decorated in red.

* Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine, 183, Euston Road, London.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 3
Kammavācā (CPD 1.2.16)

Gilded decorated palm-leaves; ff. 10 (ka-khā); 532 × 80 mm; 4 lines, 34 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 500 mm.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 4
Kammavācā (CPD 1.2.16)

Gilded decorated metal plates; ff. 13 (ka-khī); 590 × 115 mm; 6 lines, 38 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 550 mm.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 5
Kammavācā (CPD 1.2.16)

Gilded decorated palm-leaves; ff. 15 (ka-khī); 530 × 80 mm; 4 lines, 34 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 495 mm; 2 red lacquered wooden covers, gilded and decorated in red.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 6
Kammavācā (CPD 1.2.16)

Gilded decorated metal plates; ff. 15 (kha-?), 540 × 115 mm; 6 lines, 36 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 505 mm; 2 red lacquered wooden covers, gilded and decorated in red.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 7
Kammavācā (CPD 1.2.16)

Gilded decorated palm-leaves with curved edges; ff. 13 (ka-?); 530 × 95 mm; 5 lines, 32 char. in black lac, unusual tamarind-seed large script, 490 mm, special punctuation marks in shape of a tower; 2 covers, 545 × 95 mm, not belonging to this ms., made of 6 thin wooden chopsticks glued on a white leather piece. + a single gilded decorated metal plate; 535 × 100 mm; 6 lines, 34 char. in black lac, tamarind large script, 510 mm.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 8
Kammavācā (CPD 1.2.16)

Gilded decorated metal plates; ff. 16 (ka-khī); 535 × 98 mm; 6 lines, 32 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 510 mm; 2 red lacquered wooden covers, gilded and decorated in red, not belonging to this ms.: 560 × 112 mm; verso in large ornamental calligraphy, round Burmese script: sut silakkhan pāḷītō pāṭh dutiyathup

Wms. Burmese-Pali 9
Kammavācā (CPD 1.2.16)

Silverplated decorated palm-leaves; ff. 12 (kha-?); 540 × 95 mm; 5 lines, 30 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 500 mm; 1 red lacquered wooden cover, gilded and decorated in red, not belonging to this ms.
Wms. Burmese-Pali 10
Kammavācā (CPD 1.2,16)

Gilded decorated metal plates; ff. 3 (ki, ku, ke); 535 × 100 mm; 6 lines, 30 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 510 mm.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 11
Kammavācā (CPD 1.2,16)

Gilded decorated ivory plates; ff. 11[ka-kaṃ]; 535 × 90 mm; 6 lines, 28 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 485 mm; 2 red lacquered wooden covers, gilded and decorated in red. Slightly damaged. Fly note in English: Kamawasah book a Burmese manuscript containing ordination service of a Buddhist Priest. From the Palace of King Theebaw. + Gilded decorated palm-leaves; ff. 4 (ka ?, ku, kha and ?); 530 × 82 mm; 4 lines; 30 char in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 500 mm.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 12
Kammavācā (CPD 1.2,16)

Gilded decorated metal plates; ff. 7 (ka-ke); 470 × 82 mm; 6 lines, 46 char. in black lac, Burmese medium round script, 440 mm; 2 red lacquered wooden covers, gilded and decorated in red.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 13
Kammavācā (CPD 1.2,16)

Gilded decorated palm-leaves; ff. 17 (ka-khu ?); 540 × 92 mm;

Wms. Burmese-Pali 14
Kammavācā (CPD 1.2,16)

Gilded decorated stiffened cloth; ff. 16 (kha-gi); 515 × 120 mm; 6 lines, 34 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 490 mm; 2 red lacquered wooden covers, gilded and decorated in red.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 15
Kammavācā (CPD 1.2,16)

Gilded decorated stiffened cloth; ff. 16 (kha-gi); 520 × 120 mm; 6 lines, 34 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 495 mm; 2 red lacquered wooden covers, gilded and decorated in red.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 16
Kammavācā (CPD 1.2,16)

Gilded decorated palm-leaves; ff. 17 (no foliation); 530 × 90 mm; 5 lines, 38 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 500 mm; 2 red lacquered wooden covers, 550 × 110 mm, gilded and decorated in red on recto, plain black on verso. Not belonging to this ms.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 17
Kammavācā (CPD 1.2,16)

Gilded decorated metal plates; ff. 16 (kha-gi); 535 × 110 mm; 6
lines, 34 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 505 mm; 2 red lacquered wooden covers, gilded and decorated in red.

**Wms. Burmese-Pali 18**  
Dasaṅguttara fragments (CPD 2.4)

Gilded decorated stiffened cloth; ff. 24 (ki, kam-khā, khu, ŋa-ŋāh, jū-jo, jāh only); 538 × 100 mm; 8 lines, 60 char. in black lac, square medium script, 455 mm; 2 cord holes; 2 hard cardboard covers, covered with a check cotton cloth, grey and off-white.

**Wms. Burmese-Pali 19**  
Kammavācā (CPD 1.2,16)

Gilded decorated metal plates; ff. 16 (ka-khī); 580 × 115 mm; 6 lines, 32 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 540 mm; 2 red lacquered wooden covers, gilded and decorated in red.

**Wms. Burmese-Pali 20**  
Kammavācā (CPD 1.2,16)

Gilded decorated metal plates; ff. 16 (ka-khī); 535 × 110 mm; 6 lines, 32 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 510 mm; 2 red lacquered wooden covers, gilded and decorated in red.

**Wms. Burmese-Pali 21**  
Kammavācā (CPD 1.2,16)

Gilded decorated stiffened cloth; ff. 10 (kha-khō); 560 × 110 mm; 6 lines, 36 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 525 mm; 2 red lacquered wooden covers, gilded and decorated in red.

**Wms. Burmese-Pali 22**  
1. [Jātaka] — Catupañcachanipāt jāt fragments (CPD 2.5.10)

Gilded decorated palm-leaves; ff. 9 (leaves mixed); 542 × 95 mm; 7 lines, 64 char. in black lac, Burmese medium square script, 470 mm. (f. thī, margins in large fine tamarind-seed script giving the colophon in Burmese language)

2. [Vinayapiṭaka] fragments (CPD 1.2)
   A. Pārājikathakathā
   B. Mahāvaggaṭṭhakathā

Gilded decorated stiffened cloth ?; ff. 2 (tha, pū ?); 530 × 98 mm; 8 lines, 65 char. in black lac, Burmese medium square script, 450 mm; 2 dark red lacquered wooden covers, lightly engraved with ornamental motifs, then gilded.

**Wms. Burmese-Pali 23**  
Kammavācā (CPD 1.2,16)

Gilded decorated palm-leaves; ff. 11 (f. ka lacking; kā-kūh); 532 × 95 mm; 5 lines, 32 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 500 mm.
Wms. Burmese-Pali 24
Kammavācā (CPD 1.2,16)

Silverplated decorated palm-leaves; ff. 10 (kha-kho?); 525 × 80 mm; 6 lines, 48 char. in black lac, Burmese round medium script, 490 mm.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 25
Kammavācā (CPD 1.2,16)

1. Gilded decorated metal plates; ff. 3 (kā, kī, ku); 590 × 115 mm; 6 lines, 32 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 550 mm; 2 red lacquered wooden covers, gilded and decorated in red.

2. Gilded decorated metal plates; ff. 4 (kī, ku, gā, gi); 590 × 130 mm; 6 lines, 32 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 560 mm.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 26
Kammavācā (CPD 1.2,16)

Gilded decorated palm-leaves; ff. 13 (ka-kha); 540 × 95 mm; 5 lines, 30 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 490 mm; 2 red lacquered wooden covers, gilded and decorated in red.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 27
Kammavācā (CPD 1.2,16)

Gilded decorated metal plates; ff. 16 (ka-khî); 555 × 110 mm; 6 lines, 35 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 520 mm; 2 red lacquered wooden covers, gilded and decorated in red.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 28
[Majjhimanikāya] fragments (CPD 2.2)

f. ghā a line 1: gaṇakamoggalānasuttantam sattamaṃ | cf. M III 1
f. ghū b line 8: gopakamoggalānasuttantam aṭṭhamāṃ | cf. M III 7
f. ghaḥ a line 8: cūlapuṇṇāmasuttantam dasamaṃ devadhammagga paṭhamo | cf. M III 24
f. chā a line 2: isigiliṣuttantam chaṭṭhamāṃ | cf. M III 68
f. chu b line 8: mahācattārisuttantam sattamaṃ | cf. M III 71
f. tū b line 4: upakkilesasuttantam aṭṭhamāṃ | cf. M III 152
f. taṃ a line 4: channovā[da]suttantam dutiyaṃ | cf. M III 263

Palm-leaves; ff. 48 (mixed); gilded edges with a middle band of vermilion; 2 cord holes; 520 × 55 mm; 8 lines, 82 char., 450 mm; Burmese round medium script; 2 red lacquered wooden covers, gilded and decorated in red.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 29
1. [Vinayaṭṭhakathā — Samantapāsādikā] — Pācit aṭṭhakathā + Bhikkhunī pācit aṭṭhakathā + Aṭṭhakathā bhikkhuviṭṭhānaṃ fragments (CPD 1.2,1)  

Palm-leaves; ff. 134 (ka-ṭhā, many leaves missing); gilded edges, black ornaments and a middle band of vermilion; 2 cord holes; 495 × 62 mm; 8 lines 450 mm; Burmese round medium script.

2. Pārajīkan aṭṭhakathānissya fragment Pāli-Burmese nissaya (CPD 1.2,1)
Palm-leaves; ff. 144 (mixed); gilded edges with a middle band of vermilion; 2 cord holes; 520 × 65 mm; 9 lines, 90 char., 420 mm; Burmese round medium script. + a sa-si-gyo cotton ribbon interwoven with geometrical motifs, without letters.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 30
Rājanīti, Tīkakyō [= Abhidhammatthavibhāvanīti]īkā] (CPD 3.8.1,2). Mātika… Unāḍipāṭh fragments Pāli-Burmese nissaya

Palm-leaves; ff. 295 (mixed); gilded edges; 2 cord holes; 480 × 60 mm; 11 lines, 96 char., 390 mm; Burmese round small script; 2 red lacquered wooden covers, gilded on recto only.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 31
Tika Aṅguttarāpāḷītō fragments (CPD 2.4)

Palm-leaves; ff. 232 (mixed); gilded edges; 2 cord holes; 490 × 65 mm; 10 lines, 88 char., 385 mm; Burmese round medium script; 2 red lacquered wooden covers, gilded on recto only; ff. ii. Blank fly leaves.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 32
1. Visuddhimagga fragments (CPD 2.8.1)

Palm-leaves; ff. 216 (mixed); gilded edges with a middle band of vermilion; 2 cord holes; 505 × 50 mm; 8 lines, 100 char., 450 mm; Burmese round medium script; 2 brown lacquered wooden covers; ff. i. Blank fly leaf.

2. [Abhidhammapiṭakā] — Dhammasaṅgaṇi fragments (CPD 3.1)

Palm-leaves; ff. 113 (mixed); gilded edges with a middle band of vermilion; 2 cord holes; 500 × 52 mm; 8 lines, 82 char., 430 mm; Burmese round medium script.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 33
Vinayapiṭaka — Mahāvagga (CPD I.2)

Palm-leaves; ff. 254 (ka-ba); gilded edges; 2 cord holes; 495 × 62 mm; 9 lines, 68 char., 430 mm; Burmese round medium script; 2 red lacquered wooden covers.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 34
Gambhiyathadesanā/Gambhiratthadesanā Pāli-Burmese nissaya

Palm-leaves; ff. 159 (ka-ḍam, mixed); gilded edges with a middle band of vermilion; 2 cord holes; 520 × 65 mm; 9 lines, 86 char., 410 mm; Burmese round medium script; 2 light brown wooden covers.

Text unknown in other catalogues and histories of Pāli literature. Different from Burmese ed. found in India Office, call no. D 847/1 Gambhiradhamnadesanā kyam, by Paṇḍidhamma U, (sermons) Rangoon, 1919. See also ms. India Office PALI 186, different.

Date: BS 1217 = 1855 AD
Wms. Burmese-Pali 35
Kammavācā (CPD 1.2,16)

Gilded decorated metal plates; ff. 16 (ňa-cí); 520 × 120 mm; 6 lines, 34 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 495 mm; 2 red lacquered wooden covers, gilded and decorated in red.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 36
Kammavācā (CPD 1.2,16)

Gilded decorated stiffened cloth or palm-leaves ?; ff. 10 (ga-gō); 490 × 100 mm; 6 lines, 34 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 470 mm; 2 red lacquered wooden covers, gilded and decorated with relief-moulded lacquer (thayo) and glass-inlay (Hman-zi shwei-cha) + a sa-si-gyo long cotton ribbon interwoven with Burmese letters.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 37
Kammavācā (CPD 1.2,16)

Gilded decorated stiffened cloth; ff. 9 (ka-kō, lacking kī); 532 × 118 mm; 6 lines, 35 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 505 mm; 2 red lacquered wooden covers, gilded and decorated in red.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 38
Kammavācā (CPD 1.2,16)

Gilded decorated stiffened cloth; ff. 16 (ka-kī); 525 × 120 mm; 6 lines, 32 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 500 mm; 2 red lacquered wooden covers, gilded and decorated in red. + a sa-si-gyo long cotton ribbon interwoven with Burmese letters.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 39
Kammavācā (CPD 1.2,16)

Gilded decorated metal plates; ff. 10 (ga-gō); 475 × 88 mm; 6 lines, 28 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 450 mm; 2 red lacquered wooden covers, gilded and decorated with relief-moulded lacquer (thayo) and glass-inlay (Hman-zi shwei-cha).

Wms. Burmese-Pali 40
Kammavācā (CPD 1.2,16)

Gilded decorated palm-leaves; ff. 15 (ka-khī); 540 × 90 mm; 5 lines, 26 char. in black lac, unusual tamarind-seed large script, 490 mm, special punctuation marks in shape of a tower. Special calligraphy.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 41
Kammavācā (CPD 1.2,16)

Gilded decorated metal plates; ff. 16 (ka-khī); 550 × 115 mm; 6 lines, 34 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 520 mm; 2 red lacquered wooden covers, on recto only, verso black lacquered. Wrapped in a cotton cloth printed with flowers motifs in white and blue, red border. + long woollen yellow ribbon.
Wms. Burmese-Pali 42
Kammavācā (CPD 1.2,16)

Gilded decorated palm-leaves; ff. 11 (ka-kō + penultimate f., without foliation); 540 × 95 mm; 5 lines, 26 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 500 mm; 2 very different red lacquered wooden covers, not belonging to this ms.; on the 1st, in ink: “This ancient manuscript is presented to Suffolk Burg (?) Museum by Dr. Probart.” A fly note (printed): “Ancient Burmese Manuscript presented (1857) by Dr. F. G. Probart A. VII., 3.”

Wms. Burmese-Pali 43
Kammavācā (CPD 1.2,16)

Gilded decorated metal plates; ff. 8 (ka-kē); 520 × 110 mm; 8 lines, 60 char. in black lac, Burmese round medium script, 490 mm; 2 red lacquered wooden covers gilded and decorated in red.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 44
Kammavācā (CPD 1.2,16)

Gilded decorated metal plates; ff. 16 (ka-khi); 550 × 105 mm; 6 lines, 32 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 520 mm; 2 red lacquered wooden covers gilded and decorated in red.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 45
Kammavācā (CPD 1.2,16)

Gilded decorated metal plates; ff. 16 (ka-khi); 550 × 110 mm; 6 lines, 30 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 520 mm; 2 red lacquered wooden covers gilded and decorated in red.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 46
1. Chanipāt aṅguttara-pāli fragments (CPD 2.4)

Gilded decorated palm-leaves; ff. 3 (nī, nē, nām only); 542 × 95 mm; 8 lines, 54 char. in black lac, square medium script, 470 mm; 2 cord holes.

2. Mūlayamuik pāli fragments

Gilded decorated palm-leaves; ff. 9 (ṭhi, ṭhe, ṭho, ṭham, ḍa, ḍā, ḍī, ḍū, ḍe only); 542 × 95 mm; 8 lines, 54 char. in black lac, square medium script, 470 mm; 2 cord holes; 2 modern rough wooden covers not belonging to this ms.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 47
Kammavācā (CPD 1.2,16)

Gilded decorated stiffened cloth; ff. 16 (kha-gī); 522 × 122 mm; 6 lines, 34 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 500 mm; 2 red lacquered wooden covers, gilded and decorated in red.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 48
Dhātukathāṭikā fragments (CPD 3.3,18 ?) Pāli-Burmese-nissaya

Palm-leaves; ff. 88 (mixed); gilded edges; 2 cord holes; 530 × 65 mm; 10 lines, 80 char., 430 mm; Burmese round medium script.
Wms. Burmese-Pali 49
[Vinayapīṭaka] — Cūḷavagga fragment (CPD 1.2)

Palm-leaves; ff. 6 (cū-caṃ + 1 blank fly leaf); gilded edges; 2 cord holes; 530 × 65 mm; 10 lines, 80 char., 430 mm; Burmese round medium script. + 1 fly leaf inscribed in English: “Corypha Talipot ... Ceylon”

Wms. Burmese-Pali 50
1. Kammavācā (CPD 1.2,16)

Gilded decorated palm-leaves; ff. 12 (ka-[kāh]); 540 × 95 mm; 5 lines, 34 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 550 mm; 2 red lacquered wooden covers, gilded and decorated in red.

2. Kammavācā (CPD 1.2,16)

Gilded decorated stiffened cloth; ff. 9 (khā-khō, lacking kha and ff. at the end); 570 × 118 mm; 6 lines, 30 char. in black lac covering red lac pattern which is sometimes visible, tamarind-seed large script, 520 mm; 2 red lacquered wooden covers, gilded and decorated in red.

Both mss. wrapped in an orange coloured rough cotton cloth printed with flowers in black.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 51
[Vinayapīṭaka — Suttavibhaṅga] — Pārājika fragments (CPD 1.2)

Palm-leaves; ff. 50 (mixed); gilded edges; 2 cord holes; 510 × 60 mm; 8 lines, 72 char., 420 mm; Burmese round medium script.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 52
Atthasālīni — Dhammaśaṅganiṭṭhakathā Pāli-Burmese nissaya (CPD 3.1,1)

Palm-leaves; ff. 316 (mixed); gilded edges with a middle band of vermilion; 2 cord holes; 500 × 60 mm; 9 lines, 60 char., 420 mm; Burmese round medium script; 2 wooden covers.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 53
[Vinayapīṭaka — Suttavibhaṅga] — Pārājika fragment (CPD 1.2)

Palm-leaves; ff. 25 (ka-khāh); gilded edges; 2 cord holes; 510 × 55 mm; 7 lines, 76 char., 430 mm; Burmese round medium script.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 54
Vinayasāra fragment Pāli-Burmese nissaya (CPD 1.3.3,1 ?)

Palm-leaves; ff. 23 (mixed) gilded edges with a middle band of vermilion; 2 cord holes; 492 × 58 mm; 10 lines, 86 char., 390 mm; Burmese round small script; 2 hard cardboard covers bound with cotton cloth printed in blue and red flowers.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 55
1. Unidentified text fragment

Palm-leaves damaged; ff. 2 (phā, phē) gilded edges with a middle band of vermilion; 2 cord holes; 505 × 55 mm; 8 lines, 55 char., 400 mm; Burmese round medium script.
2. Pālimuttakavinicchayaśaṅgaha (CPD 1.3.5)

Palm-leaves; ff. 19 (mixed); gilded edges with a middle band of vermilion; 2 cord holes; 500 × 55 mm; 8 lines, 74 char., 420 mm; Burmese round medium script; 2 red lacquered wooden covers.

**Wms. Burmese-Pali 56**

[Samyuttaniṇī] — Saḷāyatanasutta (CPD 2.3)

Palm-leaves; ff. 235 (ka-dē); gilded edges with a middle band of vermilion; 2 cord holes; 490 × 50 mm; 7 lines, 75 char., 420 mm; Burmese round medium script; 2 wooden covers.

Date: AD 1784

**Wms. Burmese-Pali 57**

1. Unidentified text fragments

Beg. f. ka a: namo tassa...sile patiṭṭhāya naro sapparīṣā cittām paṇḍaṅca bhāvayaṁ ātā pi nipako bhikkhuṁ imaṁ vijā-byte jaṭanti | iti hidaṁ vuttaṁ | kasmā panetaṁ | bhagavataṁ kira sāvatthiyaṁ viharantam rattiḥhāge āṇataro devaputto upasaṅkamitvā | attāno saṃsaya-samugghātatham |

Palm-leaves; ff. (mixed); gilded edges with a middle band of vermilion; 2 cord holes; 510 × 55 mm; 8 lines, 95 char., 430 mm; Burmese round medium script.

Date: BS 1191 = 1829 AD

2. Dhammasaṅgāṇi fragments (CPD 3.1)

Palm-leaves; ff. 46 (mixed); gilded edges decorated in black, with a middle band of vermilion; 2 cord holes; 500 × 55 mm; 8 lines, 65 char., 425 mm; Burmese round medium script. + a few palm-leaf fragments.

**Wms. Burmese-Pali 58**

[Vinayaṭṭhakathā] — Samantapāśādikā — Mahāvagga — Cullavagga (CPD 1.2,1)

Palm-leaves; ff. 243 (ka-dāḥ); dark red lacquered edges; 2 cord holes; 480 × 52 mm; 8 lines, 65 char., 390 mm; Burmese round medium script; 2 wooden covers.

**Wms. Burmese-Pali 59**

Suttaśaṅgaha Pāli-Burmese nissaya (CPD 2.9.2)

Palm-leaves; ff. 348 (mixed); gilded edges; 2 cord holes; 480 × 55 mm; 10 lines, 85 char., 390 mm; Burmese round small script; 2 red lacquered wooden covers.

Date: BS. 1224 = 1862 A. D.

**Wms. Burmese-Pali 60**

[Vinaya-piṭaka] — Suttavibhaṅga] — Pārājika (CPD 1.2)

Palm-leaves; ff. 186 (mixed) + 14 small fragments of palm-leaves; gilded edges with a middle band of dark red; 2 cord holes; 505 ×
60 mm; 9 lines, 86 char., 400 mm; Burmese round medium script.

Date: BS 1208 = 1846 AD

**Wms. Burmese-Pali 61**
[Abhidhammapiṭaka] — Vibhaṅga (CPD 3.2)

Palm-leaves; ff. 239 (mixed); gilded edges with a middle band of vermilion; 2 cord holes; 510 × 55 mm; 8 lines, 86 char., 440 mm; Burmese round medium script; 2 wooden covers.

Date: BS 1170 = 1808 AD
(Hodgson 12/5/1916)

**Wms. Burmese-Pali 62**
[Pātimokkha-āṭṭhakathā] — Kaṅkhāvitaranī (CPD 1.1,1)

Palm-leaves; ff. 379 (ka-[ō]); gilded edges decorated with red flower motifs with a middle band of dark red; 2 cord holes; 500 × 50 mm; 7 lines, 56 char., 430 mm; Burmese round medium script; 2 wooden covers.

Date: BS 1175 ? = 1813 AD ?

**Wms. Burmese-Pali 63**
Khuddasikkhā Pāli-Burmese nissaya (CPD 1.3.1)

Palm-leaves; ff. 174 (mixed); gilded edges with a middle band of dark red; 2 cord holes; 490 × 58 mm; 9 lines, 75 char., 420 mm;

Burmese round medium script; 2 red lacquered wooden covers, gilded, decorated in red, not belonging to this ms., 1st cover verso: gilded cartouche with a title in Burmese not corresponding to the present text.

Date: BS 1140 = 1778 AD

**Wms. Burmese-Pali 64**
[Vinayapiṭaka — Pātimokkha] — Bhikkhunīpācittiya — Pācittiya (CPD 1.1)

Palm-leaves; ff. 172 (mixed); gilded edges; 2 cord holes; 475 × 60 mm; 11 lines, 95 char., 395 mm; Burmese round small script; 2 lacquered wooden covers in red on recto, black on verso.

Date: BS 1222-23 = 1860–61 AD

**Wms. Burmese-Pali 65**
1. Kammavācā (CPD 1.2,16)

Palm-leaves; ff. 160 (ka-cho); gilded edges with a middle band of vermilion; 2 cord holes; 560 × 75 mm; 7 lines, 45 char., 440 mm; Burmese round large script.

2. Byaṅjanavuddhi Pāli-Burmese nissaya

Palm-leaves; ff. 19 (ka-ko).

3. Kammavāpāṭh Pāli-Burmese nissaya

Palm-leaves; ff. 17 (kō-khu).
4. Sapit ṭhok kan? Pāli-Burmese nissaya

Palm-leaves; ff. 8 (khū-khō).

5. Kammavānisya Pāli-Burmese nissaya

Palm-leaves; ff. 26 (kham-ghū).

6. Kathin arme?: Pāli-Burmese nissaya

Palm-leaves; ff. 30 (ghe-ńu).

7. Kathinadipañī Pāli-Burmese nissaya

Palm-leaves; ff. 36 (ńū-chū); gilded edges with a middle band of vermilion; 2 cord holes; 560 × 75 mm; 12 lines, 45 char., 440 mm; Burmese round medium script; 2 wooden covers. A label on the edge of a wooden cover, inscribed in black ink: “Pounji Bibles Burmese sacred books written on stripes of palm. Sent by B.C.A.F. from Taungduvinji 25/5/87”.

Date: BS 1225 = 1863 AD

Wms. Burmese-Pali 66
1. [Vinayapiṭaka] — Parivāpālīto (CPD 1.2)

Palm-leaves; ff. 226 (ka-dhe); gilded edges with a middle band of vermilion; 2 cord holes; 525 × 58 mm; 8 lines, 70 char., 450 mm; Burmese round medium script.

Date: BS 1068 = 1706 AD

2. Mahāumaggaṭakā Pāli-Burmese nissaya (CPD 2.5.10,1)

Palm-leaves; ff. 44 (mixed); red lacquered edges; 2 cord holes; 490 × 55 mm; 8 lines, 76 char., 420 mm; Burmese round medium script; 2 red lacquered wooden covers.

Date: BS 1198 = 1836 AD

Wms. Burmese-Pali 67
1. Kaccāyanavaṇṇanā (CPD 5.1,3)

Palm-leaves; ff. 216 (ka-thē).

2. Niyaṃ Pāli-Burmese nissaya


3. Kuṭūi achum aprut?: Pāli-Burmese nissaya

Palm-leaves; ff. 26 (dō-ńu).

4. Dhammapadapāḷitō, Dhammapadapāḷitō pāṭh, Dhammapadapāḷitō nisya, Dhammapadanisya Pāli-Burmese nissaya (CPD 2.5.2)

Palm-leaves; ff. 103 (dō-re); red lacquered edges; 2 cord holes; 480 × 65 mm; 12 lines, 78 char., 390 mm; Burmese round small script; 2 red lacquered wooden covers.

Date: BS 123234 = 1870–72 AD
Wms. Burmese-Pali 68
[Vinayapiṭaka — Suttavibhaṅga] — Pārājikam aṭṭhakathānīsa Pāli-Burmese nissaya (CPD 1.1)

Palm-leaves; ff. 345 (ka-lā); gilded edges with a middle band of vermilion; 2 cord holes; 520 × 65 mm; 10 lines, 80 char., 435 mm; Burmese round medium script; 2 dark red lacquered wooden covers on recto, black on verso, rough work.

Date: BS 1135 = 1773 AD

Wms. Burmese-Pali 69
1. Abhidhammaṭṭhavibhāvani — Abhidhammatthasaṅghatīkā — Tikūkyopāṭh (CPD 3.8.1.2)

Palm-leaves; ff. 88 (ka-chō, mixed, the beginning ff. are found at the end of the next text!).

2. Atthasālini — Dhammasaṅgaṇī-aṭṭhakathā (CPD 3.1.1)

Palm-leaves; ff. 107 (caṃ-bā, mixed); red lacquered edges; 2 cord holes; 492 × 58 mm; 10 lines, 80 char., 400 mm; Burmese round medium script; 2 red lacquered wooden covers + long cotton ribbon interwoven with Burmese letters (sa-sī-gyo).

Date: BS 1228 = 1866 AD

Wms. Burmese-Pali 70
[Pātimokkha-aṭṭhakathā] — Kaṅkhāvitarani Pāli-Burmese nissaya (CPD 1.1,1)
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Palm-leaves; ff. 351 (mixed); gilded edges with a middle band of vermilion; 2 cord holes; 480 × 55 mm; 9 lines, 75 char., 385 mm; Burmese round medium script; a single wooden cover with a broken seal in black wax, in ink: “Burmese Bible taken from the Temple at Mandalay during the war”.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 71
[Pātimokkha-aṭṭhakathā] — Kaṅkhāgaṇṭhi Pāli-Burmese nissaya (CPD 1.1,1)

Palm-leaves; ff. 210 (mixed); gilded edges with a middle band of vermilion; 2 cord holes; 510 × 65 mm; 9 lines, 75 char., 420 mm; Burmese round medium script; 2 wooden covers.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 72
Kammavācā (CPD 1.2,16)

Gilded decorated stiffened cloth; ff. 10 (kha-khō); 520 × 150 mm; 6 lines, 28 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 490 mm; 2 red lacquered wooden covers, gilded and decorated in red.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 73
Upasampadākammavācā (CPD 1.2,16) fragments

(ku): ma bhante | nasi rājabhaṭo | āma bhante | anuṅatosi mātāpitūhi | āma bhante | paripuṇṇatavisati vassosi | āma bhante...

cf. ed. Dickson 1873, p. 4 lines 15–16 or ed. Frankfurter 1883, p. 142 lines 6–8
(kū) āyasmato tissassa upasampadāpekhō | yadi samghassa pattakalāṃ | ahaṃ nāgaṃ antarāyike dhamme puccheyyaṃ | suṇasi nāga | ayante saccakālo | bhūtakālo | yaṃ jataṃ | tamaṃ pucchāmi | santiṃ atthiti vattabbaṃ | asantaṃ natthiti vattabbaṃ  | sa

cf. ed. Dickson 1875, p. 4 lines 26–29 or ed. Frankfurter 1883, p. 142 lines 23–27

Ivory plates; ff. 2 (ku-kū); 535 × 90 mm; 4 lines, 21 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 485 mm; 2 margins gilded and decorated in red; unfortunately we cannot read the text on the verso plates as both are covered by the back of the frame; both ff. are framed separately with wood black lacquered and gilded motifs in relief-moulded lacquer (thayo).

**Wms. Burmese-Pali 74**
[Vinayapiṭaka — Suttavibhaṅga] — Pācit pāḷitō fragments (CPD 1.1)

Gilded decorated stiffened cloth; ff. 10 (kī-kū, kī, khū, khe only); 2 cord holes; 545 × 98 mm; 8 lines, 55 char., 465 mm; Burmese square medium script in black lac.

**Wms. Burmese-Pali 75**
Kammavācā (CPD 1.2,16)

Silvery decorated palm-leaves; ff. 6 (ka-ki, ku, kū, kē); 535 × 95 mm; 5 lines, 35 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 500 mm; 2 cardboard covers covered with an Indian (?) printed cotton cloth, blue, red, yellow floral motifs.

**Wms. Burmese-Pali 76**
Kammavācā (CPD 1.2,16)

Gilded decorated palm-leaves; ff. 7 (mixed, belonging to 3 different mss.: [1] ki, ku, kū; [2] kā?, ki, kī; [3] khē); approx. 540 × 95 mm; 5 lines, 35 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 510 mm; 2 cardboard covers covered with a check cotton cloth in red, brown, off-white.

**Wms. Burmese-Pali 77**
Kammavācā (CPD 1.2,16)

Gilded decorated stiffened cloth; ff. 16 (ka-khī); 530 × 105 mm; 6 lines, 33 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 500 mm; 2 red lacquered wooden covers, gilded and decorated in red.

**Wms. Burmese-Pali 78**
Kammavācā (CPD 1.2,16)

Gilded decorated metal plates; ff. 19 (ka-khē, lacking f. kā); 570 × 105 mm; 6 lines, 32 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 525 mm; 2 red lacquered wooden covers, gilded and decorated in red.

**Wms. Burmese-Pali 79**
[Abhidhammamātikā]

Gilded decorated palm-leaves; ff. 10 (ka-kō, f. ka damaged); 540 × 95 mm; 5 lines, 35 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 500 mm; finest decorations of the collection.
Wms. Burmese-Pali 80
1. Kammavācā (CPD 1.2,16)

Gilded decorated palm-leaves; ff. 12 (ka-kaḥ); 540 × 95 mm; 5 lines, 36 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 500 mm; 2 red lacquered wooden covers, gilded and decorated in red.

2. Kammavācā fragment (CPD 1.2,16)

Gilded decorated stiffened cloth; a single f. (kā); 540 × 95 mm; 5 lines, 32 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 500 mm.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 81
Kammavācā (CPD 1.2,16)

Silverplated decorated metal plates; ff. 8 (ga-gē); 520 × 112 mm; 8 lines, 62 char. in black lac, Burmese round medium script, 490 mm; 2 red lacquered wooden covers, silvered and decorated in red.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 82
Kammavācā fragment (CPD 1.2,16)

Gilded decorated stiffened cloth; ff. 13 (khā-gi, lacking the first and last ff. [kha and gi]); 530 × 120 mm; 6 lines, 32 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 500 mm; 2 red lacquered wooden covers, gilded and decorated in red.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 83
Kammavācā (CPD 1.2,16)

Gilded decorated stiffened cloth; ff. 16 (kha-gi); 500 × 110 mm; 6 lines, 38 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 475 mm; 2 red lacquered wooden covers, gilded and decorated in red.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 84
Kammavācā (CPD 1.2,16)

Gilded decorated stiffened cloth; ff. 13 (ka-kha); 540 × 105 mm; 6 lines, 35 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 500 mm; 2 red lacquered wooden covers, gilded and decorated in red, shorter than the ff., not belonging to this ms.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 85
Kammavācā (CPD 1.2,16)

Gilded decorated metal plates; ff. 16 (ka-khi); 520 × 105 mm; 6 lines, 35 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 500 mm; 2 red lacquered wooden covers, gilded and decorated in red.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 86
1. Kammavācā (CPD 1.2,16)

Gilded decorated stiffened cloth; ff. 16 (ṭa-cī); 510 × 110 mm; 6 lines, 30 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 490 mm; 2 red
lacquered wooden covers, gilded and decorated in red.

2. Kammavacca (CPD 1.2,16) fragment

Gilded decorated stiffened cloth; a single f. (ku); 510 × 120 mm; 6 lines, damaged on right hand, char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 500 mm?

Wms. Burmese-Pali 87
Kammavacca (CPD 1.2,16)

Gilded decorated metal plates; ff. 10 (da-du); 480 × 90 mm; 6 lines, 28 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 450 mm; 2 black lacquered wooden covers on recto, decorated and gilded with floral motifs in relief-moulded lacquer (thayo) + glass-inlay (Hman-zi shwei-cha), slightly damaged on border, red lacquered on verso.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 88
Kammavacca (CPD 1.2,16)

Gilded decorated palm-leaves; ff. 15 (ka-khi, lacking f. kā); 540 × 95 mm; 5 lines, 34 char. in black lac, tamarind-seed large script, 500 mm; 2 dark red lacquered wooden covers, gilded and decorated in red; bound with a sa-si-gyo ribbon interwoven with Burmese letters.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 89
[Vinayapiṭaka] — Parivāpālito (CPD 1.2)

Palm-leaves; ff. 8 (mixed); gilded edges with a middle band of vermilion; 2 cord holes; 500 × 60 mm; 9 lines, 72 char., 400 mm; Burmese round medium script.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 90
[Yamaka] fragments

Palm-leaves worn out, many damaged; ff. 136 (mixed) + many fragments; gilded edges with a middle band of dark red; 2 cord holes; 490 × 58 mm; 8 lines, 72 char., 410 mm; Burmese round medium script; a single wooden cover.

Wms. Burmese-Pali 91
[Kaccāyana?] grammar fragments

Palm-leaves; ff. 68 (mixed); gilded edges with a middle band of vermilion; 2 cord holes; 510 × 60 mm; 11 lines, 90 char., 410 mm; Burmese round medium script; 2 red lacquered wooden covers.

Date: BS 1240 = 1878 AD
Stevens 3/9/07

Wms. Burmese-Pali 92
1. [Kaccāyana?] — Nāmanisyaya grammar fragments Pāli-Burmese nissaya

Palm-leaves; ff. 7 (mixed); gilded edges with a middle band of vermilion; 2 cord holes; 490 × 60 mm; 11 lines, 78 char., 400 mm; Burmese round medium script.
2. [Grammar?] fragments Pāli-Burmanese nissaya

Palm-leaves; ff. 44 (ka-gāh); red lacquered and gilded edges; 2 cord holes; 490 × 58 mm; 9 lines, 68 char., 400 mm; Burmese round medium script.

**Wms. Burmese-Pali 93**
[Khuddakanikāya] — Mahāniddesa pāṭitō pāṭh dutiyathūp fragments (CPD 2.5.11)

Gilded decorated stiffened cloth; ff. 109 (mixed); 2 cord holes; 535 × 98 mm; 8 lines, 55 char., 450 mm; Burmese square medium script in black lac; 2 red lacquered, gilded and decorated in red wooden covers, on both versos, title in a cartouche in large tamarind seed script. + sa-si-gyo, long very fine exceptional silk (?) ribbon interwoven with Burmese letters + 2 ff. black lacquered, margins red lacquered, not belonging to this ms.

A fly note, worn out: “Mr C.J.S. Thompson. Herewith book of Burmese Sacred Writings, ...Wellcome through Mr Long — the following is a note regarding ... It is the Burmese Sacred Writings made from the silk ... Mindon’s dress, lacquered and gilded by the priests, ... 28 May 1903”.

**Wms Thai-Pali 1**
1. [Abhidhammamātikā]
   A. Dhammasaṅgaṇī
   B. Vibhaṅga
   C. Dhātukathā
   D. Puggalapaññaatti
   E. Kathāvatthu

2. Phra Malai (Siamese)

**F. Yamaka**

G. Mahāpaṭṭhāna

2. Dhammasahassanayya

3. Phra Malai (Siamese)

Folding book, khoi paper, off-white; 50 folds (not numbered); 660 × 125 mm; 5 lines, 45 char. inscribed two-sided in black ink; Mūl script; 16 paired illustrations. (Text and ill. fully described in J. Filliozat Répertoire des textes pâlis dans les manuscrits illustrés de la Péninsule indochinoise, Collections françaises et britanniques, to be issued EFEO, Paris).

No date (Ginsburg 1989, circa 1860–80)

**Wms Thai-Pali 2**
1. [Abhidhammamātikā]
   A. Dhammasaṅgaṇī
   B. Vibhaṅga
   C. Dhātukathā
   D. Puggalapaññaatti
   E. Kathāvatthu
   F. Yamaka
   G. Mahāpaṭṭhāna

2. Phra Malai (Siamese)

Folding book, khoi paper, off-white; 48 folds (not numbered); 630 × 135 mm; 5 lines, 50 char. inscribed two-sided in black ink; Mūl script; 14 paired illustrations. (Text and ill. fully described in J. Filliozat op. cit. above).

No date (Ginsburg 1989, mid-19th century)
Wms Thai-Pali 3
1. [Abhidhammamātikā]
   A. Dhammasāṅgaṇī
   B. Vibhaṅga
   C. Dhātukathā
   D. Puggalapaññatti
   E. Kathāvatthu
   F. Yamaka
   G. Mahāpaṭṭhāna
2. Dhammasahassanayya
3. Phra Malai (Siamese)

Folding book, khoi paper, off-white; 41 folds (not numbered); 665 × 125 mm; 5 lines, 45 char. inscribed two-sided in black ink; Mūl script; 16 paired illustrations. (Text and ill. fully described in J. Filliozat op. cit. above).

No date (Ginsburg 1989, circa 1850–70)

Wms Thai-Pali 4
1. Phra Malai (Siamese)
2. [Dighanikāya — Brahmajālasutta] abridged (CPD 2.1)
3. [Abhidhammamātikā]
   A. Dhammasāṅgaṇī
   B. Vibhaṅga
   C. Dhātukathā
   D. [Puggalapaññatti]
   E. [ Kathāvatthu]
   F. Yamaka
   G. Mahāpaṭṭhāna
4. [Mahābuddhagunā] fragment

Wms Thai-Pali 11
1. Tepitakaganti Sihala

Palm-leaves; 16 bundles (lacking phūk 1); ff. 509 (ga-kyam, lacking ka-khaṭ); gilded edges decorated in black with a middle band of vermilion; 2 cord holes; 580 × 55 mm; 5 lines, 66 char., 480 mm; Mūl script; 2 black lacquered wooden covers finely decorated with golden floral ornaments on recto, red lacquered on verso; wrapped in 2 silk cloths, 1st one, white and blue, embroidered with spangles, 2nd one, red and gold thread. [Very beautiful.] Unknown text?

No date (Ginsburg 1989, end 18th century)

Wms Thai-Pali 15
1. Abhidhammasaṅgīṇīpariccheda fragment Pāli-Siamese nissaya
(CPD 3.1)

Palm-leaves; ff. 14 (ka-ke); gilded edges; 2 cord holes; 545 × 45 mm; 5 lines, 60 char., 470 mm; Mūl and Siamese scripts.

2. Abhidhammaṭṭhakathā fragment Pāli-Siamese nissaya (CPD 3)

Palm-leaves; 6 bundles (lacking phūk 5); ff. 152 (ka-jū, lacking je-ṇah) ta-ni); gilded edges; 2 cord holes; 555 × 52 mm; 5 lines, 80 char., 450 mm; Mūl and Siamese scripts; 2 wooden covers.

Wms. Thai-Pali 16
Aṭṭhakathāpetavatthu (CPD 2.5.7,1)

Palm-leaves; 9 bundles (lacking phūk 1); ff. 303 (mixed); gilded edges with a middle band of vermillion; 2 cord holes; 550 × 50 mm; 5 lines, 82 char., 460 mm; Mūl script; 2 wooden covers.

Wms. Thai-Pali 17
Sārasaṅgaha (CPD 2.9.3)

Palm-leaves; 14 bundles (lacking phūk 1–3); ff. 388 (cha-laḥ-kya-khyä); gilded edges with a middle band of vermillion; 2 cord holes; 540 × 45 mm; 5 lines, 60 char., 460 mm; Mūl script; 2 wooden covers.

Wms. Thai-Pali 18
Dhammapada fragment (CPD 2.5.2)

Palm-leaves; ff. 30 (khra-grah); phūk 14 only; gilded edges with a middle band of vermillion; 2 cord holes; 540 × 55 mm; 5 lines, 76 char., 450 mm; Mūl script.

Wms. Thai-Pali 20
Sutta...Abhidhammaṭṭhakathā, etc. fragments Pāli-Northern Thai-nissaya?

Palm-leaves; ff. 210 (mixed); 7 bundles; gilded edges with a middle band of vermillion; 2 cord holes; 530 × 48 mm; 5 lines, 62 char., 450 mm; Thai-Lao? medium script; 2 wooden covers, wrapped in a cotton cloth.

Wms Thai-Pali 21
[Abhidhammaṭṭhakathā] abridged

Palm-leaves; 7 bundles; ff. 203 (mixed); gilded edges; 2 cord holes; 570 × 50 mm; 5 lines, 65 char., 490 mm; Mūl script; 2 wooden covers, wrapped in a worn out cotton cloth printed with stripes reddish, white and green.

Wms Thai-Pali 22
[Pātimokkha-aṭṭhakathā] — Kaṅkhāvitaranī fragment (CPD 1.1.1)

Kaṅkhāvitaranī mātikaṭṭhakathā tatiya kalāpa | bra kaṅkhāvitaranī phūk 3 | cpa pārājikākanṭha |

Palm-leaves; ff. 31 (ṭa-cah); gilded edges with a middle band of vermillion; 2 cord holes; 560 × 55 mm; 5 lines, 66 char., 470 mm; Mūl
script.

Wms. Yuan-Pali 1
1. Kammavācā (CPD 1.2,16)
2. [Vinayapīṭaka — Pātimokkha] (CPD 1,1)

Folding book, 39 folds, white paper, gilded covers, 540 × 95
mm; large Yuan script, in black ink; 40 char. 470 mm, central text, gilded
margins on boths parts.

Index of Pāli texts in the Burmese and Siamese
Manuscript Collections in the Wellcome Institute

Aṅguttaraniṇīya chanipāta Wms. Burmese-Pali 46(1)
Aṅguttaraniṇīya pañcakanipāta Wms. Thai-Pali 11(2)
Aṅguttarapāḷīṭo Wms. Burmese-Pali 31
Aṭṭhakathāpetavatthu Wms. Thai-Pali 16
Aṭṭhakathābhikkhuviṁbhaṅga Wms. Burmese-Pali 29(1)
Atthasālinī Wms. Burmese-Pali 52; 69(2)
Abhidhammapiṭaka Wms. Burmese-Pali 32(2); 61; Wms. Thai-
Pali 15(2); 20
Abhidhammaṭṭhakathā Wms. Thai-Pali 21
Abhidhammatthavibhāvanīṭikā Wms. Burmese-Pali 30; 69(1)
Abhidhammatthasaṅgahaṭṭikā Wms. Burmese-Pali 69(1)
Abhidhammadāṭikā Wms. Burmese 79; Wms. Thai-Pali 1(1);
2(1); 3(1); 4(3)
Abhidhammasaṅgīṭhāpariccheda Wms. Thai-Pali 15(1)
Uñāḍipāṭh Wms. Burmese-Pali 30
Upasampadākammavācā Wms. Burmese-Pali 73

Kaṅkhāgaṇṭhi Wms. Burmese-Pali 71
Kaṅkhāvītarāṇi Wms. Burmese-Pali 62; 70
Kaṅkhāvītarāṇi mātikaṭṭhakathā Wms Thai-Pali 22
Kaccāyana-Nāmanisya Wms. Burmese-Pali 92(1)
Kaccāyanavaṭṭhānā Wms. Burmese-Pali 30; 67(1); 91
Kathāvatthu Wms. Thai-Pali 1(1); 2(1); 3(1); 4(3)
Kathinaṭṭhāṇi Wms. Burmese-Pali 65(7)
Kammavācā Wms. Burmese-Pali 1–17; 19–21; 23–27; 35–45;
47; 50(1–2); 65(1); 72–73; 75–78; 80–88; Wms. Yuan-
Pali 1(1)
Kammavāṇīsa Wms. Burmese-Pali 65(5)
Kammavāpāṭh Wms. Burmese-Pali 65(3)
Khuddakanikāya Wms. Burmese-Pali 93
Khuddāsikkhā Wms. Burmese-Pali 63
Gambhiyathadesanā/Gambhiratthadesanā Wms. Burmese-Pali 34
Cūḷavagga Wms. Burmese-Pali 49; 58
Jātaka Wms. Burmese-Pali 22(1)
Ṭikakyō Wms. Burmese-Pali 30; 69(1)
Tepiṭakagaṇṭhisihala Wms. Thai-Pali 11(1)
Dasaṅguttara Wms. Burmese-Pali 18
Dīghanikāya Wms. Thai-Pali 4(2)
Dhammapada Wms. Thai-Pali 18
Dhammapadanisya Wms. Burmese-Pali 67(4)
Dhammapadapāḷīṭo Wms. Burmese-Pali 67(4)
Dhammapadapāḷīṭo nisya Wms. Burmese-Pali 67(4)
Dhammapadapāḷīṭo pāṭh Wms. Burmese-Pali 67(4)
Dhammasaṅgāṇī Wms. Burmese-Pali 32(2); 57(2); Wms. Thai-
Pali 1(1); 2(1); 3(1); 4(3)
Dhammasaṅgāṇīṭhākathā Wms. Burmese-Pali 52; 69(2)
Dhammasahassanāyya Wms. Thai-Pali 1(2); 3(2)
Dhātukathā Wms. Thai-Pali 1(1); 2(1); 3(1); 4(3)
Dhātukathāṭhikā Wms. Burmese-Pali 48
Niyaṃ Wms. Burmese-Pali 67(2)
Parivāpālito Wms. Burmese-Pali 66(1); 89
Pācit aṭṭhakathā Wms. Burmese-Pali 29(1)
Pācitittiya Wms. Burmese-Pali 64; 74
Pācit pālītō Wms. Burmese-Pali 74
Pātimokkha Wms. Burmese-Pali 64; Wms. Yuan-Pali 1(2)
Pātimokkhaṭṭhakathā Wms. Burmese-Pali 62; 70; 71; Wms Thai-Pali 22
Pārajjika Wms. Burmese-Pali 51; 53; 60
Pārajjikaṭṭhakathā Wms. Burmese-Pali 22(2)
Pārajikaṇ aṭṭhakathānissya Wms. Burmese-Pali 29(2); 68
Pālimuttakavinicchayaṃsaṅgaha Wms. Burmese-Pali 55(2)
Puggalapaṇṭātti Wms. Thai-Pali 1(1); 2(1); 3(1); 4(3)
Petavathu-aṭṭhakathā Wms Thai-Pali 16
Byaṇjanavuddhi Wms. Burmese-Pali 65(2)
Brahmajālasutta Wms Thai-Pali 4(2)
Bhikkhuvinbhāṅgaṭṭhakathā Wms. Burmese-Pali 29(1)
Bhikkhuṇī pācit aṭṭhakathā Wms. Burmese-Pali 29(1)
Bhikkhuṇī pācitittiya Wms. Burmese-Pali 64
Majjhimanikāya Wms. Burmese-Pali 28
Mahāumaggaṭṭhaka Wms. Burmese-Pali 66(2)
Mahānīḍḍesa pālītō pāṭh Wms. Burmese-Pali 93
Mahāpāṭhāna Wms. Thai-Pali 1(1); 2(1); 3(1); 4(3)
Mahābuddhagūṇa Wms Thai-Pali 4
Mahāvagga Wms. Burmese-Pali 33; 58
Mahāvaggaṭṭhakathā Wms. Burmese-Pali 22(2)
Māṭīkā Wms. Burmese-Pali 30
Mūlayamaṅku Wms. Burmese-Pali 46(2)
Yamaka Wms. Burmese-Pali 90; Wms. Thai-Pali 1(1); 2(1); 3(1); 4(3)
Rājanīti Wms. Burmese-Pali 30
Vinayapitaka Wms. Burmese-Pali 22(2); 33; 49; 51; 53; 60;
THE COMMENTARIES TO THE ANĀGATAVAMSA IN THE PĀLI MANUSCRIPTS OF THE PARIS COLLECTIONS*

In memoriam Ven. Hammalawa Saddhātissa


To establish the text, the author used five manuscripts, all in Sinhalese script, kept at the British Library or in Sri Lanka. He also mentions an edition in Pāli with a rather inaccurate Sinhalese translation (1926), full of mistakes, which had not been of any help to him in his translation. Ven. Saddhātissa also refers to the article by Prof. Minayeff of St Petersburg (“Anāgata-vaṃsa”, *JPTS* 1886, pp. 33–53), which mentions a copy of a manuscript in Burmese script preserved at Prome (Shwe Downg) and another manuscript, in Cambodian script (ka–kho), 3 lines per page, incomplete, which was said to be in the Bibliothèque nationale in Paris (BN). Ven. Saddhātissa greatly regretted not having been able to find a trace of this manuscript. The brief description of it that Minayeff gives (*incipit, explicit*) has not enabled me to identify this ms., which I have therefore not been able to consult. There is at the BN, under the reference number PALI 737, a hand-written catalogue by Minayeff and Feer, *Catalogue des manuscrits pālis de la Bibliothèque Nationale*.

* Translated from the French by B. Chrystall.
which the Paris collections, now easily accessible, hold a dozen mss. I have classified them by title.

1. The manuscripts of the Dasabodhisatta-uddesa

They are four in number. Three are kept in the Pāli collection of the Département des manuscrits orientaux in the BN, Paris, and one in the Pāli collection of the Ecole française d’Extrême-Orient’s library, Paris (EFEO). The mss. BN 629 and 649 were used in Martini’s edition referred to above. Since this edition two new mss. have entered our collections: BN 860 and EFEO 41 (formerly Cambodian collection on olas n° 252, provenance unknown). I have carefully collated them. Both offer only minor orthographic variants which do not change the sense of the text and conform to the critical apparatus given in footnotes by Martini, who edited this text using three mss. of the same recension. These two mss. therefore merely attest the conformity to a well-established tradition. We should note that none of these four mss., which resemble each other in all material points (olas, dimensions, scripts, presumed dates, apparent provenance from Cambodia) begins with the usual formula which prefaces each ms. of Theravāda Buddhism: namo tassa bhagavato arahato sammāsambuddhassa.

BN PALI 629 Dasabodhisatta-uddesa — Anāgatavamsa (CPD 4.4.2)

Ola 1a: bra anāgatavanśaparipūṇā phuk 1 | + khmer; olas 1b to 6a, bl. Beg., ola 6b: saṭṭhā sāvatthiyaṁ upanissaya pubbārme visākhāya kārāpītāya vasanto ajitatheraṁ arabbha anāgata dasabodhisattāṁ uppannaṁ desesi | sāriputto bhante bhagavā ajitathero bhaddhakappe ariyametteyyo buddho ...

End., ola 50b(ghai): ... iti dasuññesāni dasapuddhassa pāramidhammesanassa satthāra désitaṁ samattaṁ siyā | dasabodhisattauddeso niṭṭhito | anāgatavanśo niṭṭhito | nibbanapaccayo
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BN PALI 860 Dasabodhisatta-uddesa — Anāgatadasa-buddhavamsa (CPD 4.4.2)

Ola 1a: bra anāgatavamsaparipuṇṇa phūk 1 | olas 1b to 7a, bl.

Beg., ola 7b(ka): satthā sāvatthiyaṃ upanissāya pubbārāme visākhāya kārāpite vasanto ajitatheraṃ ārabhā anāgata dasabodhisattā uppanāṃ desesī | ...

End., ola 47b(ghu) 1: iti dasaudesāni dasabuddhassa pāramidhammasanassa satthāra desitaṃ samataṃ siyā | dasabodhisatta-uddeko nīṭhito + addition found in BN PALI 649 and EFEO PALI 41 but not in BN PALI 629, from: “sāro maṇḍovaro kappo ... ” to: “ ... ime tayo ti”. Adds line 5: sāro | la | asūṇā pañcavidhā kappo buddhāppadehi maṇḍitā: eko buddho sāro kappo | la | tato naṭṭhādhikājīna | anāgatadasabuddhavaṃsa | olas 48 to 51, bl.

cf. EFEO PALI 41 and BN PALI 629, 649. Not used in F. Martini’s ed. This is not the ms. mentioned by Minayeff.

51 olas, 600 × 60 mm, gilt edges, 2 cord-holes, 5 lines, 70 char. — Script. Mūl — Numb. Mūl letters — Fine writing.

No date — Donation 29591 (Ven. Kosgoda Sobhita 1975)

EFEO PALI 41 Dasabodhisatta-uddesa — Anāgatadasa-buddhavamsa (CPD 4.4.2)

Ola 1a: anāgatavamsa paripuṇṇa phūk 1; on the lefthand side, in black ink: C. 252; in Latin script: anāgatavamsa; olas 1b to 3a, bl.

Beg., ola 3b(ka): satthā sāvatthiyaṃ upanissāya pubbārāme visākhāya kārāpitaṃ vasanto ajitatheraṃ ... olas 27 to 28, bl.

ola 29a: anāgatavamsa paripuṇṇa phūk 2 | olas 29b to 30, bl.

End., ola 52a(gho) 2: iti dasaudesāni dasabuddhassa pāramidhammasanassa satthāra desitaṃ samataṃ siyā | dasabodhisatta-uddeko nīṭhito | sāro maṇḍovaro kappo sāramunḍo ca bhāddhako ete pañcavidhā kappā sambuddhena sudesita | sāre ekabuddho bodhi-manḍakappo ca dutiyu varakappo tayo buddha catuttḥa sāramuṇḍake bhuddakappo pañcabuddhā sambuddhena pakāsitā | anāgatadasa-buddhavamsa | ughaṭitaṇu bodhisatto pañādhiko ti nāma so vipaccitaṇu bodhisatto vutto saddhādhikā nāmaneyyo viriyādhiko nāma bodhisatto ime tayo ti | olas 65 to 69, bl.

cf. BN PALI 629 and 860. Used in F. Martini’s ed. This is not the ms. mentioned by Minayeff.

69 olas between 2 modern wooden boards, 570 × 50 mm, gilt edges, 2 cord-holes, 5 lines, 58 char. — Script. Mūl — Numb. Mūl letters — Fine writing.

No date.
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The mss. are seven in number; four are kept at the BN and three at the EFEO. The table below summarises the order and representation of their different chapters according to the mss. When a chapter is represented I indicate the letter which serves as foliation on the ola, “a” for recto, “b” for verso, then the number of the line where the chapter starts. I have taken the ms. BN 630 as the base because it represents the most complete text, in which I have been able to find the greatest number of chapters. The absence of any indication does not always signify that the chapter does not exist in the ms. concerned, but simply that the title is missing, or that I have not been able to find it, even when it is represented in the chapter. Only systematic collation of these mss. could clarify it completely for us.

None of these has been studied previously.

BN PALI 630 Amatarasadhārīṭikā — Anāgatavāṃsa by Upatissa (CPD 4.4.1,2)

Ola 1a: amatarasadhārīṭikā anāgatavāṃsa phūk 1 | ola 1b to 6a,b. Beg., ola 6b(ka): namo tassa ... jinena yena ānātām lokassa amatām hitam tassa pādambaṭam vande | brahmadevindavanditaṃ | dassitaṃ munirājena vande dhammam divākaram mohandakāram viddhamsi veneyyambujabodhanam | so kitasīlaramsihi vande sammāṃ nisākaram pāsādakamudāṃ niccām | bodhentam janamānase | natvā vatthuttayaṃ evam yam puññam pasuttam mayā | tassa tejana hantvāna antarāyē asesato | sohaṃ anāgatavāṃsaṃ | vannyaissam mahesino | bhāsitaṃ caṅkamantena | nabhīrataancaṅkame | buddhavasaśāsānamhi | brahmaghoṣena tāḍānaṃ dharmasaṇāpattiṭthera | yācitena sayambhūṇā pubbā āṭṭhakathā tassa | ...

ola 22b(khu) 2 | nidānakathā |
" 28b(kham) 5 | gunekadesakathā | ola 30 to 34, bl.
" 35a | amatarasadhārīṭikā anāgathvāṃsa phūk 2 | bra anāgatavanā phūk 2 | ola 35b to 40, bl.
ola 53a(gha) 4 | saṁkhacakkavattipāṭhubhāvakathā |
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abhām vandāmi sabbadā ye ca dhammā pathaviṃ bhinditvāruhi | olas 226b
to 230b.

This ms. is mentioned in CPD 4.4.1.2.

230 olas, 7 phūk between 2 thick wooden boards of 20 mm, 560 × 55
mm, gilt edges with a middle band of vermilion, 2 cord-holes, 5 lines, 65 char. —

No date — Rabardelle Coll.

BN PALI 322 Amatārasadhārātiṣṭikā — Anāgatabhavamsa-
vananā by Upatissa (CPD 4.4.1.2)

Ola 1a: amatārasadhārātiṣṭikā anāgatabhavansa phūk 4 | olas 1b to 4,
bl. Beg., ola 5a(cū): sāvakasannipātakathā | ekam sāvakasannipātam
dassetu ivāhī tassā bhagavato parivrākādayo dassento satthā aha |
koṭisatasahassāni chalabhīhāmahiddhiḥkā ...

ola 10a(cām) 1 | parivrāsasadādikathā | (agrees with BN
PALI 862, ṭhū b line 3 )

ola 11b(cah) 5 | maggalasadādikathā |
" 14b(chi) 1 | rupakāyappumādikathā |
" 18a(che) 1 | pūjavisesakathā |
" 18b(he) 3 | parinibbānakathā |
" 19b(chē) 2 | anicitādāpamānīkaṇḍikathā |
" 20a(chai) 4 | anusāsanikathā |

End., ola 225(chām): | pāsādām | dvārapākāratoranagghika-
bhūṣiṭam | mālacakamapantīhi latānaṃ maṇḍapēhi ca sabbadā
pupphasanājanāṃ pādapehi alakāṭalālayasahassehi suphullakamalehi ca
madhurodakapūnṣehi ... (line 4): aṭṭhadhammasamāhito byākato

Dhammarājena ayaṃ buddho bhavissati | iccevaṃ sabbabuddhānām
uppannānaṃ gato param vuttappakāraṃ sakkarāṃ katvā niccaṃ
manoramā | kaparukkhā vasattānaṃ puretvā sabbapāramāṃ bodhipallakāmārūhyā
buddho huvā anuttaro dharmacakkappavattetvā suvisuddham gamo
nudaṃ tāreyyaṃ pāñino sabbe sohāṃ samsārasātarā kusalena aneneva
abyāpajjha averino sattā asessākhino khemino honto sabbadā gurūhi
dinnānānaṃ buddhaghoso ti vissato kato therena therēnaṃ amatadānaṃ
buddhato carotī | iti upatissattherena thapīṭa amattarasadhārāvananā
nitthīṭa | ye ca buddhā atitā ca ye buddhā anāgata paccappannā ye buddhā

End., ola 225(dūhu): iccevaṃ sabbabuddhānām uppannānaṃ
gato param vuttappakāraṃ sakkarāṃ katvā niccaṃ manoramām
kaparukkho vasattānaṃ puretvā sabbapāramām bodhipallakāmāröhyā
buddho huvā anuttaro dharmacakkappavattetcī suvisuddham gamo
nudaṃ tāreyyaṃ pāñino sabbe sohāṃ samsārasātarā kusalena aneneva
abyāpajjha averino sattā asessākhino khemino honto sabbadā gurūhi
dinnānānaṃ buddhaghoso ti vissato kato therena therēnaṃ amatadānaṃ
buddhato carotī | iti upatissattherena thapīṭa amattarasadhārāvananā
nitthīṭa | ye ca buddhā atitā ca ye buddhā anāgata paccappannā ye buddhā
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28 olas between 2 modern wooden boards, 530 × 45 mm, gilt edges, 2 cord-holes, 5 lines, 70 char. — Script. Mül — Numb. Mül letters.

No date. [XVIIIth century.] — Missions Etrangères de Paris.

BN PALI 862
1. Amatarasadhārāvaṇṇanā — Anāgatavāṃsa by Upatissa (CPD 4.4.1,2)

Ola 1a: amattarassadhārā phūk 1 | ola 1b to 2a, bl.

Beg., ola 2b(ka): namo tassa ... jinena ye ānitaṃ | lokassa amatāma hitam | tassa pādambujaṃ vandhe | brahmaṇdevindavandhitam | dassitam munirajena | vandhe dhammavākaraṃ mohadakāraṃ vindhamsi | veneyyambūjam bomaṃ | sobhītam silarmasihi vandhe samgham disākaram | pasādakamudam niccam | bodhena janamanase | natvā vatthutayaṃ evam yaṃ puṇṇam pasuttaṃ mayā | tassa tejana hantvāna antarāye asesato | sohaṃ anāgatavāṃsāṃ | vaṇṇayissāmahesino ...

ola 18b(chu) 3 | nidānakathā |

" 24b(kham) 5 | guṇekadesakathā | olas 26 to 29, bl.

" 30a | amattarassadhārā phūk 2 | olas 30b to 34, and 59 to 63, bl.

ola 64a 3 | olas 64b to 68, bl.

ola 84b(cf) 1 | ketumatipatthāvakathā | olas 93 to 96, bl.

" 97a | amattarassa° phūk 4 | olas 97b, bl.

" 109a(chaḥ) 4 | ketumatinagaravaṇṇanākathā |

olas 122 and 123, bl.

ola 124a | amattarassa° phūk 5 | ola 124b, bl.

" 137b(νia) 2 | bodhissattupattikatha |

" 141b(νiu) 1 | pāsādasampadādikathā |

" 143b(νe) 2 | mahābhinnikhamanakathā |

" 146b(νo) l | pabbajikathā |

" 147b(νaṃ) 5 | anupabbājikathā | olas 149 to 150, bl.

" 151a: amattarassa° phūk 6 | ola 151b, bl.

BN PALI 323 Amatarasadhārātiṃka — Anāgatavāṃsa by Upatissa (CPD 4.4.1,2) fragment

[Lacking phūk 1]

Ola 1a: | amatrasadārātiṃkā anāgatavanaṃ phūk 2 | ola 1b, bl.

Beg., ola 2a(ga): kañcānaṃ sahassāṃ gahapati kañcānaṃ sahassāṃ sabbasamayanāṭṭhitam sahassānti catāri itthi sahassāni ānesi | tādā savassasahassāni rājakule vasitvā neva puttaṃ nāditaram labhīṃsā ...

ola 6b(gu) 4 | tasmīṃ kāle māngalam niṃṭhitam | (= BN PALI 862, ola chu a line 2)

ola 12b(gaṃ) 2 | cakkvatipatthāvukatthā |

" 13b(gaḥ) 5 | ketumatānaravāṇṇanā Kathā |

" 14b(gha) 5 | jambudīpavāṇṇanā samattā |

" 23a(gho) 4 | pāsādādisampadādikathā |

" 24a(ghaṃ) 3 | mahābhisekkhamakathā |

End., ola 25b(ghaḥ) 5 | tasmīṃ khane mahābrahmādibbhamayaṃ attapariikkhāre gahetvā taṃ thānaṃ sampāpuṇissati | atha mahāsatto ratamayaṃ khaggena samolīkṣeṣakalāpam chinditvā olas 26 to 28, bl.

This ms. originally contained the part of text including 4 phūk. This one is phūk 2, lacking phūk 1 and 3; we find phūk 4 under BN PALI 322.

cf. BN PALI 630 and 862, cam b line 1 to fo b line 1. It begins with the last part of Cakkvatipatthāvakhātha and stops before Pabbajikathā.
EFEO PALI 26 Amatarasadhārāvananā by Upatissa (CPD 4.4.1,2)

Ola 1a, in the middle: | bra amatarassadhārā atthakathā anāgatavamsa phūk 1; + jriën script | ka kha; ola 1b to 4a, bl.

Beg., ola 4b(ka): namo tassa ... jinena yena anītam lokassa aminā hitam tassa dambupājām vande brahmadevindavanditam | dassitaṁ munirājena vande dhammāṁ divākaraṁ mohandakārām viddhamśi vandeyyambujām bodhanām | sobhitasilaramisahi vande samgham disākaraṁ ...

ola 20a(khu) 3 | nidānakathā | ola 24 to 25, bl.

" 26a(khah) 5 | gunekdesakathā | (Here this ms. follows the text of BN PALI 862 that omits 3 stories found in BN PALI 630)

ola 28a | bra amatarassadhārā | phūk 2 | ola 28b to 31, bl. ola 56b to 61, bl.

ola 62a | bra amatarasadhārā phūk 3 | + jriën script; ola 62b to 65, bl.

ola 74a(nāi) 5 | bodhisambhārakathā |
" 8a(cci) 4 | ketumatiṇapubhāvakathā | olas 90 to 93, bl.
" 94a | bra amatarassadhārā atthakathā anāgatavamsa phūk 4 |
olas 94b to 97, bl.

ola 109a(chah) 1 | cakkavattipubhāvakathā |
" 113b(ju) 4 | ketumatinagarvananakathā |
" 120a(jam) 5 | samavagkakhandho | olas 121 to 124, bl.
" 125a | bra amatarassadhārā atthakathā anāgatavamsa niṭṭhitā phūk 5 | jriën script in black ink faded; ola 125b to 128,bl.

ola 141b(na) 2 | bodhisattupattikathā |
" 145b(nu) 1 | pāsādasampadānādikathā |
" 147b(ni) 2 | mahābhinnikhamanakathā |
" 150b(no) 1 | pabbajjakathā |
" 151b(nam) 4 | anupubbajjakathā | olas 153 to 156,bl.
" 157a | bra amatarassadhārā atthakathā anāgatavamsa niṭṭhitā phūk 6 | olas 157b to 161, bl.

ola 164a(ti) 1 | paramābhisaṃdhamikathā |
" 165b(ti) 2 | dhammacakkappavattanakathā |
" 166b(tu) 5 | saṃkharaṇopabbajjakathā |
" 178b(tuth) 3 | parivārasampadādikathā |
" 181b(tū) 5 | mātusampadānikathā | (Here this ms. follows the text of BN PALI 862 that omits 3 stories found in BN PALI 630)
olas 185 to 190, bl.

ola 196b(da) 2 | rupakāyamamānādikathā |
" 202b(de) 1 | pūjāvisesakathā |
" 204a(dai) 2 | parinibbānakathā |

End., ola 210b(duh) 1: ... buddho hutvā anuttaro dhammacakkaṃ pavattetvā suvisuddham tamonuddām tāreyya pāñino sabbe sohaṃ saṃsārasāgara kusalena anekava abyāpajjha averino sattā asesāsuhīno khe pi no hontu sabbādā garuhi dinnāṃ nāmena buddhaghoṣo ti vissuto kato therana amatadānaṃ buddhagocarioti | iti upatissattherathapitā amatarasadhārāvananā niṭṭhitā | ye budā ahaṁ
vandāmi sabbadā | olas 211b to 216, bl.  
216 olas, 7 phūk, 540 × 45 mm, gilt edges, 2 cord-holes, 5 lines, 70 char. — Script. Mūl — Numb. Mūl letters.  
No date.

**EFEO PALI 82 Amatantaradārāṇīma — Anāgatabuddha-
vaṃsavaṇṇanā by Upatissa (CPD 4.4.1,2 ?)**

Ola 1a: | anāgatavaṃsa phūk 1 | olas 1b to 9, bl.  
**Beg.**, ola 10a(ka): jinena yena aditaṃ lokassa amatamhitam tassa pādambyam vande brahmā devinda vanditam ... = BN PALI 630  
ola 25b(khi) 3 | bodhisambhārakathā  
| " 32a(kham) 1 | ketumatiṇa phūk 2 | olas 34 to 38, bl.  
| 39a | anāgatavaṃsa phūk 2 | olas 31b to 35, bl.  
| 54a(ghe) 2 | ketumatinagaranaṇanākathā samattā |  
| 55a(ghē) 5 | jambudīpaṇaṇanākathā | olas 60 to 63, bl.  
| 64a | au centre: | anāgatavaṃsa phūk 3 | olas 64b to 65, bl.  
| 69b(āvī) 2 | bodhisattvapattikathā |  
| 72b(āvī) 3 | pāsādasampadādikathā |  
| 76a(nām) 4 | pabbajjākathā |  
| 80a(ci) 1 | sāvakāsānnapītakathā |  
| 87b(co) 1 | mātusampadādikathā |  
| 90a(cha) 2 | rūpakāyappamānādikathā |  
| 93b(chi) 3 | pūjāvisesakathā |  
| 94b(chu) 1 | parinibbānakathā |  
| 96a(che) 3 | anūsāsanakathā |  

End., ola 98b(chai) 4: dharmacakkam pavaṭṭetvā suvisuddham tamonuddham tāreyya pānino sabbasohāṃ saṃsārasāgarā kusalena kadhā abhyāpajjhā averino satta asesa sukhino khemino honti sabbadāti | iti upatissatheraṇa thapitā amatantaraddhāranāma anāgatabuddhavaṃsavaṇṇana niṭṭhitā | iminā lekkhappuṇṇa buddhapatthā  
olas 99 to 100, bl.  
100 olas, 580 × 48 mm, gilt edges, 2 cord-holes, 5 lines, 60 char. —

No date.

**EFEO PALI 83 Amatarasadhārāṭikā — Anāgatavaṃsa by  
Upatissa (CPD 4.4.1,2)**

Ola 1a: amatarasadhārāṭikā anāgatavaṃsa | phūk 1 | olas 1b to 6a, bl.  
**Beg.**, ola 6b(ka): namo tassa ... jinena yena anītaṃ lokassa amatam hitama tassa pādambyam vande brahmadevinandavanditam | dassitam munirājena vande dharmadivakaram mohandakāram viddhamsi veneyyambajabodhanam | sobhitam sīlaramsīhi vande samghanisākaram pasādakamudāṃ niccaṃ bodhentāṃ janāmānāse | natvā vattheytaṃ evam yaṃ puṇam pasutaṃ mayā ...  
ola 22b(khu) 3 | nidānakathā |  
| 28b(kham) 5 | guṇekadesakathā |  
| 35a | amatarasadārāṭikā anāgatavaṃsa phūk 2 | olas 35b to 39, bl. olas 64 to 68, bl. ola 69a: | amatarasadhārāṭikā anāgatavaṃsa phūk 3 | olas 69b to 72, bl.  

ola 82b(nām) 4 | bodhisambhārakathā |  
| 89a(cū) 3 | ketumatiṇa phūk 2 | olas 97 to 102, bl.  
| 103a | amataraṇa ... phūk 4 | olas 103 to 107, bl.  
| 120a(a) 2 | cakkavattipūtthāvavakathā |  
| 126b(je) 4 | ketumatinagaravāṇanākathā | olas 132 to 135, bl.  

ola 136a | amataraṇa ... phūk 5 | olas 136b to 140, bl.  
| 154b(āvī) 2 | bodhisattvapattikathā |  
| 158b(nū) 3 | pāsādasampadādikathā |  
| 160b(nē) 3 | mahābhīnīkhamanakathā |  
| 163b(nām) 1 | pabbajjākathā |  
| 164b(bāh) 5 | anupabbaįjākathā | olas 165 to 169, bl.  
| 170a | amataraṇa ... phūk 6 | olas 170b to 174, bl.  
| 178a(ṇī) 1 | paramābhīsambodhikathā |  
| 179b(ṭu) 2 | dharmacakkappavattanakathā |
3. The manuscript of Samantabhaddhaṭikā

EFEO PALI 84 Samantabhaddhaṭikā — Anāgatabuddhavaṃsaṇṇanā (CPD 4.4.1,1 ?)

Ola 1a: samantabhaddhaṭikā anāgatabavansa phûk 1 | jriēn script in black ink; ola 1b to 6a, bl. ola 6b, jriēn.

Beg., ola 7a(ka) | namaththu | jinavaṃsaṃ vidum buddham asamaṃyeya pāraguṃ vanditvā amalaṃ dhammaṃ gāṇaṅca guṇaṅkatam namamāno varam puṇaṃ yam labhim rataṇattam tantejenantvā nānā vīdham upaddavaṃ | bahussuto kaviṇi yo mahābodhināmakā tēro silena sampanno tenāhaṃ abhiyācito | anāgataṅca yam vaṃsaṃ desesi munipuṅgavo aggasāvakabhaddena pucchito pathamaṇa so | athabiesanaramsampannam puṇussāhakārāṃ varam vaṃṣayissāmitaṃ sāram tam nisāmethādhaṇvoti | tattha anāgatavānsoti kenaththena anāgatavānso na agatoti anāgato natāvasampattoti attho | yasmiṃ kāle so metteyyo bhagavā uppajjissati so kālo idāni asampattabhāvena anāgato ti vuccati | vamsī to tanti pavenī paramparā anāgata bhavitabbo vamsī anāgatavamso yathā ājañarathoti | anāgato ca vamsī ca anāgatavamso | athavā | anāgato buddho anāgato yathā rattīti kim vuttaṃ hoti ... ola 25 to 29, bl.

ola 30a | bra samantabhaddhakā atthakathā anāgatavamsa phûk 2 | On the righthand side in black ink jriēn script; ola 30b to 34, bl.

ola 38a( gi) 5 | samattā nāti samāsabyāsasavasenadipankarabuddha vaṃsakathā |

ola 38b( gi) 2 | koṇḍaññabuddhavānṣakathā |

" 39a( gu) 5 | suṃgallā ... |

" 39b | suṃana ... |

" 5 | revata ... |

" 40a( gu) 2 | sothīta ... |

" 5 | anamodassī ... |

" 40b( gu) 2 | paduma ... |

" 4 | nāra ... |

" 41a( ge) 2 | padumuttarasambuddha ... |

" 2 | sujāta ... |

" 5 | piyaddassī ... |

" 42a( ge) 3 | athadassī ... |

" 5 | dhammadassī ... |

" 42b( ge) 2 | siddhaṇtha ... |

" 5 | tissa ... |

" 43a( gai) 2 | pūssā ... |

" 5 | vipassī ... |

" 43b( gai) 5 | vassabhubuddha ... |

" 44a( go) 2 | kukkanandasambuddha ... |

" 5 | konāgamana ... |

" 44b( go) 3 | kassapa ... ola 59 to 62, bl.

" 63a | bra samantabhaddhakā atthakathā anāgatavamsa phûk 3 | ola 63b to 67, bl. ola 92 to 96, bl. ola 97a: samanta ... phûk 4 | in
Strongly encouraged by Ven. Saddhātissa shortly before his death, I propose, with a team of Pāli philologists, to establish the critical edition of these Pāli texts following the Paris mss. here described and adding the mss. in Pāli kept in the British Library, Oriental Collections, London, Or. 12008 (8–9) that I could identify recently as Anāgatavamsa (olas 307b to 312a) and Anāgatavamsavannanā-Samantabhaddiṅka (olas 317b to 401a).

In this event other original documents of the Anāgatavamsa in Elu, Khmer, or Laotian could be sorted and studied in parallel by colleagues specialising in those languages:

1. There is a ms. in Elu at the Ethnographic Section of the Musée Historique in Bern (Switzerland), for which one may consult: C. Regamey, “Manuscrits sur feuilles de palmier”, Jahrbuch des Bernischen Historischen Museums in Bern XXVIII, Jahrgang 1948, p. 20 n° 47: Sārasaddharmapadmākaraya, which seems to be the Sinhalese paraphrase of the Pāli text Dasabodhisatta-uddesa.

2. Some Khmer versions of the texts of the Anāgatavamsa are also attested at the BN in Paris by the mss. KHERER 207, Anāguttavum and KHERER 235, Dassavuits. Their descriptions are to be found in Au Chhieng, Catalogue du fonds khmer, Bibliothèque nationale, Paris 1953, pp. 172–73 and pp. 190–91 which gives the concordance of this ms. with the Pāli text established by F. Martini (BEFEO XXXVI, 1937).

3. There is a Laotian translation kept in its handwritten form in the
Gadelius Collection in the Royal Library of Copenhagen under the reference number LAOS 82 (Dasa)-Anāgata (buddha)vamsa, the detailed notice of which can be found in G. Cœdès, *Catalogue des manuscrits en pâli, laotien et siamois provenant de la Thaïlande*, Copenhagen 1966, pp. 97–98. This ms. dates from 1820.

There is a ms. of the Anāgatavamsa indicated at the Bibliothèque Royale of Luang Prabang by L. Finot in “Recherches sur la Littérature laotienne”, *BEFEO XVII*, Hanoi 1917, p. 177 under the reference number R. 373, 8 bundles, which leads one to think that it contains a long commentary rather than the text itself which is short.

There are three Laotian mss. of the Anāgatavamsa indicated by P.B. Lafont at Luang Prabang (Vat May and Vat Pakhe) in *BEFEO LII*, 2.

London

Jacqueline Filliozat
CORRECTIONS TO
THE BOOK OF THE DISCIPLINE

I should like to suggest the following corrections to Miss I.B. Horner’s translation of the Vinaya-pitaka (= BD). Some are corrections of mistakes which have occurred in the course of translation or printing. Others are changes suggested to give clearer renderings.

Volume 1:

a) p. 218, line 4 should be: “a grave offence together with an offence of wrong-doing.”;

b) p. 218, line 7 should be: “from above the collar bone to below the knee . . .”.

Volume 2:

a) p. 132, lines 23–25 should be: “If he doesn’t think that the seven days have elapsed when they have elapsed, there is an offence of expiation . . .”;

b) p. 133, lines 8–9 should be: “If he thinks that the seven days have elapsed when they have not elapsed, there is an offence of wrongdoing.”;

Mistakes in the footnotes to Volume 2:

A) p. 24, note 6 should read: “Cf. Nissag. I, where . . .”;

B) p. 141, note 1 is wrong — the meaning is that it is an "offence of wrong-doing" to "tear away" a robe from one not ordained, as in lines 18–21 on the same page;

C) p. 222, note 1 is wrong — the meaning is that it is an offence of wrongdoing to tell one not ordained about an offence which is not very bad, as in lines 2–4 from the bottom of the text on the previous page;

D) p. 244, note 3 should read: "... p. 47, n. 1."

E) p. 328, line 8 of note 4 should read: "... food that is not left over because..."

F) p. 328, line 11 of note 4 should read: "not allowable to drink sour milk that is not left over, because..."

G) p. 335, line 5 of note 1 should read: "... of six nuns went, the..."

H) p. 388, note 4 is wrong — the meaning is that it is an offence of wrong-doing to tickle one not ordained, as in lines 18–20;

I) p. 394, note 8 is wrong — it is an offence of wrong-doing to be disrespectful to one not ordained, as in lines 6–11 from bottom of text;

J) p. 397, note 1 is wrong — it is an offence of wrong-doing to frighten one not ordained, as in lines 4–7;

K) p. 416, note 1 is wrong — it is an offence of wrong-doing to hide a requisite of one not ordained, as in the sentence referred to in note 7 on p. 415.

Volume 3:

a) p. 216, lines 7–8 should read: "... is forfeited is not not to be given back...";

Mistakes in the footnotes to Volume 3:

A) p. 26, note 1: the passages mentioned are not "parallel passages" as they involve lay-people (thus resulting in offences of wrong-doing, cf. Volume 3, §§ H–K above), whereas this rule involves only monks;

B) p. 48, note 4 is wrong — it is an offence of wrong-doing to hit a lay-person, as in lines 8–10 in the text;

C) p. 52, note 2 is wrong — it is an offence of wrong-doing to "defame" one not ordained, as in lines 12–14 of the text.

Volume 4:

a) p. 44, line 10 from the bottom of the text: the page number for the Pali edition should be [33];

b) p. 58, the last two lines of the text: the numbers for the footnotes should be "preceptor" and "one who shares his cell";

Mistakes in the footnotes to Volume 4:

A) p. 276, note 1 should read: "... these three materials are disallowed for making needle-cases...";

B) p. 339, notes 9 and 8 should be notes 8 and 9, respectively.
Volume 5:

1) BD.1, p. 210, bottom paragraph: I suggest changing the word “emission” to “to be released”, “to be let go”, “freedom” — as at BD.3, p. 48, line 2 from the bottom of the text;

2) BD.2, p. 345: the word udakadantapana is better translated as “water and teeth-cleaner”;

3) Miss Horner has consistently misinterpreted the number of bhikkhus comprising a gana and a sangha. A gana consists of 2 or 3 bhikkhus, and a sangha comprises 4 bhikkhus or more: ref. BD.2, p. xii, lines 3 and 6; p. 7, notes 5 & 6;

4) In Theravāda countries aruṇa is taken to be “dawn” rather than “sunrise”: ref. BD.2, p. 7, line 8; p. 15, line 4 from bottom; p. 23 line 4 note 1; p. 28, line 15; p. 115, line 15; p. 132, line 12; p. 158, line 10 from the bottom of the text;

Thiradhammo Bhikkhu

Kandersteg

THERAVĀDIN LITERATURE IN TIBETAN TRANSLATION*

Contents

Introduction

1. Theravādin texts in the Kanjur
1.1–13 Thirteen parītta and other texts

The position of the 13 texts in the Kanjur
Translators and date of translation
The 13 texts and modern scholarship
The original language of the 13 texts

1.1 Dharmacakra-pravartana-sūtra
1.2 Jātaka-nidāna
1.3 Āṭānātiya-sūtra
1.4 Mahāsamaya-sūtra
1.5 Maitri-sūtra
1.6 Maitri-bhāvanā-sūtra
1.7 Pañcasīkṣānusāsana-sūtra
1.8 Giri-ānanda-sūtra
1.9 Nandopanananda-garājadamana-sūtra
1.10 Mahākāśyapa-sūtra
1.11 Śūrya-sūtra
1.12 Candra-sūtra
1.13 Mahāmāṅgala-sūtra
1.14 Ārya-maitri-sūtra-nāma
1.1–14 General remarks
1.15 Vimuttimagga, Chapter 3: Dhutagāna-nirdeśa

* I am grateful to Heinz Bechert, Siglinde Dietz, Paul Harrison, Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Donald Lopez, Jampa Samten, Jonathan Silk, and Russell Webb for providing information and materials. Above all, I am indebted to E. Gene Smith, without whose assistance this article would be a much poorer thing, and to David Seyfort Ruegg for his comments.

2. Theravādin texts and tenets in the Tanjur
2.1 Vimuttimagga in the Saṃskṛtāsaṃskṛta-viniścaya
2.2 Miscellaneous citations in the Saṃskṛtāsaṃskṛta-viniścaya
2.3 *Buddhavanaṃsa of the Abhayagiri in the Tarkajvālā
2.4 Parallels to Pāli texts in the Udānavarga-vīvaraṇa
2.5 Sources for Theravādin tenets
2.5.1 The (Ārya) Sthaviras and their branches
2.5.2 Sthaviras, Tāmraśātiyas, Tāmrarāṇīyas, and Tāmrarāṃīyas
   a) Tāmraśātiyas and bhavaṅga-viññāna
   b) Tāmraśātiyas and the constituents of nāma
   c) Tāmraśātiyas in the Tarkajvālā of Bhavya
   d) Tāmraśātiyas in the Madhyamakaratnapradīpa of Bhavya
   e) Tāmraśātiyas in the *Karatalaratna of Bhavya
   f) Tāmraśātiyas, Tāmrarāṇīyas, and the “heart-basis”
   g) Tāmrarāṃīyas and the definition of Akaniṭṭha
   h) Conclusions
2.5.3 Sthaviras and Vibhajyavādins
2.5.4 Sthaviras and Mahiśāsakas
2.5.5 Sthaviras, Kāśyapiyas, and Dharmaguptakas
2.5.6 Sources for Theravādin tenets: conclusions
3. Modern translations of Theravādin texts
3.1 The Dhammapada and Gedun Chomphel
3.2 Abhidhammatthasangaha
4. Tibet and Ceylon

Conclusions

Abbreviations and bibliography

Table 1 Location of the 13 texts after the arrangement of the Tshal pa Kanjur
Table 2 Location of the 13 texts after the arrangement of the Them spangs ma Kanjur
Table 3 “Epithets of insight” in the Dhammacakkappavattanasutta
Table 4 Concordance of Uv, Dhp, GĐhp, PDhp, and alternate nidānas in the Krodhavarga
Table 5 Contents of Abhidhamma and Suttanta according to the Maitreya-sūtra and Gedun Chomphel
Table 6 Occurrence of the term Tāmraśātiya in the Tanjur
Table 7 Affiliation of the Tāmraśātiyas and related schools according to Tibetan sources
1. Theravādin texts in the Kanjur

1.1–13 Thirteen paritta and other texts

The position of the 13 texts in the Kanjur

Thirteen texts, translated by the Sinhalese Ānandaśrī and the Tibetan Thar pa lotsava Ni ma rgyal mtshan dpal bsaṅ po (for whom see below), are the only group of Theravādin texts in the Kanjur. For this study, I have utilized the catalogues of twelve editions of the Kanjur, plus several gSan yigs ("Records of Teachings Received"). The editions fall into two groups, according to the arrangement of the two main lineages of the Kanjur, the Tshal pa and the Them spangs ma.

Bu ston Rin chen grub, in his History of Buddhism (Chos 'byun), completed in 1322 or 1323 — as will be seen below only a decade or two later than the translations — describes the 13 texts as gsar du 'gyur ba, "newly translated". The Lithang xylograph, completed in 1614, the gSan yig of gTer bdag giṅ pa 'Gyur med rdo rje (1646–1714), the Derge xylograph, completed in 1773, and the Urga xylograph, completed in Ulan Bator in 1910, give them the same title. The modern Lhasa xylograph, completed in 1934, does the same, and also calls them

---

1 I apologize to the reader unfamiliar with Tibetan, for the fact that in the following pages I must plunge directly into the thick jungle of Kanjur studies and Tibetan history. It is necessary to do so in order to understand the transmission of the texts, and to clarify the considerable confusion that has arisen concerning them.

2 Lithang Catalogue (Imaeda 1984, p. 26): šes rab kyi pa rol tu phrin pa śes rab sna tshogs dan | mdo gsar 'gyur gyi bskor pu sti gcig; gsar 'gyur gyi mdo la; TD, p. 645 ult; Derge Catalogue (sDe dge bka’ 'gyur dkar chag), folio 118b1 and Urga Catalogue (Bethlenfalvy 1980, p. 11): śes rab sna tshogs dan mdo gsar 'gyur gyi skor pu sta ka gcig la. At least one other text (Urga 361, which is not related to the texts studied here) bears the marginal marking mdo sde gsar 'gyur, ki: Bethlenfalvy, Introduction, p. 12. For this text see Baron A. von Staël-Holstein, “The Emperor Ch’ien-Lung and the Largest Śīraṃgamasūtra”, in HJAS I, 1936, pp. 137–46.
the “Group of Thirteen Sūtras” (mdo tshan bcu gsum po). The catalogue of the Peking and Narhang Kanjurs do not give them any general title; they simply list the titles without further detail.

The first group consists of eight editions which, in terms of their arrangement of the texts in question, are based primarily on the Tshal pa Kanjur, a manuscript compiled in 1347–51 A.C. One of these is a manuscript, that kept at Berlin, while the remaining seven are xylographs. The second group consists of four manuscript editions which agree in general arrangement with the Them spangs ma manuscript Kanjur prepared at rGyal rtse in 1431, supplemented by two Records of Teachings Received (gSan yig) which describe the Them spangs ma tradition. It will be seen that the two groups differ in their classification and arrangement of the 13 texts.

Table 1 gives the location of the 13 texts according to the arrangement of the Tshal pa Kanjur. In all eight editions, the 13 texts occur at the very end of their respective volumes. The table shows that they occur in the same sequence, as numbers 13 to 25, in all editions except the Urga and the Lhasa (modern xylographs completed in 1910 and 1934 respectively). In the Berlin, Derge, Lhasa, Lithang, Peking, and Urga editions the volume in question is the last volume of the Šer phyin division; in the Cone it is the sixth of the eight volumes of Šer phyin.

In the Narhang the 13 texts come at the end of the last volume of the mDo or Sūtra division. Lhasa follows N. In the gSan yig of gTer bDag glin pa, they are appended to volume ah, the last of the Sūtra division; otherwise the contents of volume ah agree with volume ah of the Lithang and Peking Kanjurs, in which it is also the last. (gTer bdag glin pa’s gSan yig agrees with the Lithang and Peking Kanjurs on the order and contents of the Sūtra division; like them, it includes the Parinirvāṇa-sūtra under Sūtra volumes ēa and ta, against the Narhang which treats it as a separate division, following the Sūtra. Like the Narhang, it places the 13 texts at the end of Sūtra; the Tantra [rgyu’d] division of Narhang agrees with the gSan yig against that of either the other Tshal pa or the Them spangs ma Kanjurs.)

1 Catalog of the Lhasa Kanjur, reproduced by Lokesch Chandra from the collection of Prof. Raghuvira (Śata-pitaka series 324), New Delhi, 1983, 438a7 (p. 875): šer phyin sna tshogs dan mdo gsar ’gyur skor; 439a5 (p. 877) mdo tshan bcu gsum po.
Table 2 gives the location of the 13 texts after the arrangement of the Them spangs ma Kanjur. The four manuscripts that follow this order all place the 13 texts in the same position in volume 36 (chi), the second last volume of the Sūtra division. Although the texts are divided into two groups, they otherwise maintain the same internal order as that of the Tshal pa Kanjurs: numbers 1 to 8 occur as numbers 1 to 8 of the volume, while numbers 9 to 13 occur as numbers 15 to 19 of the volume. Two Records of Teachings Received (gSan yig), one by Jayapaṇḍita Blo bzāṅ 'phan rīs (born 1642) and one by 'Jam dbyaṅs bzaṅ pa'i rdo rje (1648–1721), which describe the Them spangs ma Kanjur, give the 13 texts in the same volume (chi) and the same order. The Them spangs ma editors do not class the texts as Mahāyāna or Śrāvakayāna: while the intervening texts (Stog §§ 297–302) belong to the latter, the two texts that follow the second group are described in their titles as Mahāyāna sūtras (Stog §§ 308–9). Since this is the general pattern in the Them spangs ma, which places texts of Mahāyāna and Śrāvakayāna side-by-side throughout the Sūtra division, the question of classification does not arise.

A reason for the different position of the 13 texts in Narthang may now be suggested. In the Tshal pa Kanjurs, apart from Narthang-Lhasa, the 13 texts are placed at the end of the Śes rab sna tshogs or “Miscellaneous Prajñāpāramitā” volume. In terms of contents and order, this volume exists in four different versions:1 Them spangs ma (HLNST, plus the gSan yig of Jayapaṇḍita);2 Tshal pa (BCJQ); Derge (which follows Bu ston’s History of Buddhism); and Phug brag, which is unique. Only the Tshal pa Kanjurs (BCJQ, including here D) place the texts at the end of Śes rab sna tshogs; the Them spangs ma Kanjurs do not. We know that the carving of the blocks of the Narthang Kanjur began at Lhasa in the time of the 6th Dalai Lama, but was interrupted after only 24 or 28 volumes were completed.1 The Kanjur was finally completed by Pho lha nas, who had the remaining blocks carved at Śel dkar on the basis of a descendant of the Them spangs ma kept at Śel dkar chos sde. The Narthang Śes rab sna tshogs volume must belong to the later set; it therefore follows the Them spangs ma tradition, and does not include the 13 texts in that volume.2 As in the gSan yig of gTer bdag glič pa, the Narthang editors placed the 13 texts at the end of the Sūtra division; to complicate matters, they took them from a manuscript tradition belonging to the Them spangs ma rather than the Tshal pa lineage, since the individual colophons agree with those of the former (see below).

One other recension of the Kanjur, the Phug brag manuscript, differs in contents and arrangement from other known Kanjurs. The 13 texts are not found in this edition.3 The recently noted O rgyan glič Kanjur shares certain texts with the Phug brag against the Tshal pa and Them spangs ma Kanjurs;4 this edition, however, includes the 13 texts in the last volume of the Prajñāpāramitā division, “Miscellaneous

---

1 For an earlier note on this volume, see Lalou 1929.
2 The volume is missing in U: see Bethlenfalvy 1982, p. 16. The gSan yig of Kloṅ rdol bla ma, which describes N, agrees with N except that it omits text no. 4: KD II 286.
4 See Jampa Samten, “Notes on the Bka’-gyur of O-Rgyan-Gling, the Family Temple of the Sixth Dalai Lama (1683–1706)”, paper delivered at the Sixth International Conference of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Fagernes, August 1992 (unpublished).
Prajñāpāramitā, and thus agrees in this case with the Tshal pa tradition. The texts do not seem to be included in the extant volumes of the incomplete manuscript Kanjur from Batang kept in the Newark Museum.

In Bu ston’s list of canonical Tibetan translations the 13 texts are catalogue numbers 369 to 380; here too they come at the end of the last section of the Sutra collection properly speaking. This is Section VII, which comprises “Miscellaneous Mahāyāna Sūtras” (theya chen po ‘i mdo sde sna tshogs). After listing the texts, Bu ston expresses doubt about two points: whether or not the texts were duplicates of earlier translations, and whether they belonged to “the Greater or the Lesser Vehicle.”

Doubts about the first point most probably arose from the fact that early translations of (Mula-)Sarvāstivādin counterparts of some of the 13 texts do in fact exist. Here we may turn to the colophons of the 13 texts in the Them spangs ma tradition as represented by the London, Narthang, Stog Palace, and Tokyo Kanjurs. For the Mahāsamaya-sūtra (1.4 in the present study), the colophon notes that “the present text agrees completely with the early translation.” The “early translation” must refer to the (Mula-)Sarvāstivādin recension, the Mahāsāṃjña-sūtra, translated ca. 800 by Jinamitra and others. The colophon to the Maitrī-sūtra (1.5 in the present study) notes that the text deals with the same subject as the early translation [entitled] Maitreya-vyākaranā. The colophon to the

---

1 Ses phyin sna tshogs, 206a–340b: I am grateful to Jampa Samten for providing this information (letter of 23 October, 1992).
2 This Kanjur awaits analysis and cataloguing. The texts are not listed in the tables of contents attached to 12 of the 15 extant Sūtra volumes, and I did not notice them in a cursory examination of the remaining three volumes. They may, of course, have been included in one of the missing Sūtra volumes, or in the “Miscellaneous Prajñāpāramitā volume, which is also missing.
3 Bu ston gives them in an order different from that of the Tshal pa Kanjurs, and omits number 12, the Candrasūtra. That the omission is the result of a scribal error is clear from the fact that Bu ston refers elsewhere to 13 texts (see below).
4 Section VII; this is followed by VIII, a collection of prayers and auspicious verses (bsno ba smon lam bkra śis), which are placed at the end of Kanjurs as benedictions, and section IX, a list of texts “which were definitely translated in the early period but were not included in the Kanjur” at the time of Bu ston’s writing (snar ’gyur nes pa den saṅ gi bka’ ’gyur du ma tshud ci m a mṛṇed pa). The catalogue numbers and sections are from the romanized edition of Nishioka (1980). There is a misprint on p. 76, where the texts in question are given as 367–80, for which read 369–80. This — and the fact that Bu ston lists only 12 titles — has given rise to an error in Szeber 1990, note 19 to p. 106, which lists the texts translated by Nia ma rgyal mtshan (for whom see below) as Nishioka 368–80, thereby including Nishioka 368 = Q 787, a version of the Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra translated from Chinese. His statement “there are no translators indicated in the Peking catalogue except for [Q] 787. Here Nia ma rgyal mtshan is not mentioned” may be disregarded.

---

1 ‘Di rnam snar rgyaṅ ba zlos mi zlos theg pa che chuṅ gaṅ yin dpyad par bya’o. Sumpa mkhan po Ye sde dpal ’byor more or less reproduces Bu ston’s text, listing 12 titles in abbreviated form, and then noting mdo rnam sna ma dag dan zlos mi zlos dan theg pa che chuṅ dpyod: Sarat Chandra Das, Pag Sam Jon Zang, [Calcutta, 1908] Kyoto, 1984, p. 415 (with some misprints). The Derge, Lhasa, and Urga Kanjurs also paraphrase Bu ston’s statement, as cited below in note 1 on page 82.
2 Full bibliographical details are given below under the appropriate titles. In the present context “early translations” (sna ’gyur) refers to those done in the “early period of diffusion of the dharma” (sna dar), from the 8th to the first half of the 9th centuries.
3 For the first three I have consulted the actual texts (Skorupska’s transcription of the Stog colophons [Skorupska 1985] contains a few minor inaccuracies), except for a few cases when I had access only to Skorupska’s catalogue for Stog. I am grateful to Jonathan Silk (Kyoto) for checking the Tokyo Manuscript colophons.
4 Tshig ’dir yod kun snar ’gyur dan mtshis: L XXXVI(4), 115b7; N 350, 564b2; S 292, 124a1; T 289, 114a2.
Candra-sūtra (1.12 in the present study) notes that “there is also an early translation”. That this refers to the anonymous translation of a (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin recension of the same title is clear from the colophon to the latter, which in the Stog Palace and Tokyo editions notes that “it is evident that this is the same sūtra as that translated by Thar pa lo tsa [ba].” The Them spangs ma editors thus realized that the two Candra-sūtras were related. The colophon to the Mahāmaṅgalasūtra (1.13 in the present study) also notes the existence of an early translation; the reference is presumably to the anonymous translation of a Devariprccchā-maṅgalagāthā of unknown school. The Them spangs ma colophons also say that there is an early translation of the Mahākāśyapa-sūtra (1.10 in the present study); I do not know to which text this might refer. The Them spangs ma editors do not note that the Dharmacakra-pravartana- and Āṭanātiya-sūtras — numbers 1.1 and 1.3 of the present study — also have early translation counterparts. The colophon to the Dharmacakra-sūtra — the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin early translation counterpart of 1.1 — does, however, note that “it is apparent that this is the same sūtra as that translated by Thar pa lo tsa ba”. In the case of 1.3, the omission may be due to the fact that the Tibetan titles of the two versions are quite different: I Can lo can gyi pho bstan gi mdo for the Therāvāda Āṭanātiya, and mDo chen po kun tu rgyu ba dan kun tu rgyu ba ma yin pa daṅ mthun pa'i mdo for the Mūlasarvāstivādin Āṭanātiya.

(Oddly enough, the Maitreya-vyākarana is not included in the Them spangs ma Kanjurs (London, Stog, Ulan Bator), nor in Derge, Lithang, or Cone. Nonetheless, it was known and available at rGyal rtse, since the biography of Situ Rab brtan refers to a painting based on the Ḍyams pa lugs bstan pa'i mdo: see Rab brtan kun bzhad 'phags kyi rnam thar, Bod ljongs mi mans dpe skrun khaṅ, 1987, p. 95. The colophon describes it as an early translation by Ḍnāmitra and dPal brtsegs riksṅa; it is listed in Bu ston’s Catalogue (§ 83, under Hnayāna, Theg chun), and included in the Phug brag (F 30, in Vol. ca of Avatamsakal!, Peking (B[82]5, mdo a; Q 1011, mdo byi), Narthang (N 329, mdo sa), and Lhasa (H 350, mdo sa) Kanjurs. It is not clear whether the Phags pa byams pas lugs bstan pa listed in the 1Dan dkar Catalogue as translated from Chinese (Lalou 265) is a version of the text.

1 Shar (LNT: snā S) 'gyur yah yod: L XXXVI(18), 196b2; N 358, 595b7; S 306, 217a5; T 303, 195a1.

2 Skorupski § 63, T 63, 232b3–4, 'di dan thar pa lo tsas (S: tshas T) bskyur ba de mdo gcig (S: cig T) tu snā. The remark most probably occurs in L, which I was unable to consult. It is not found in N 316 (mdo la, 409b), which here follows the Tshal pa lineage. For the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin version, see below, § 1.12; for Thar pa lo tsa ba as a name of Nī ma rgyal mtsan, translator of the 13 texts, see below.

3 Shar (LNT: snā S) 'gyur yah yod: L XXXVI(19), 197b3; N 359, 597a4; S 307, 218b1; T 304, 196a2. For the Devapariprccchā-maṅgalagāthā (IHas žus pa'i bka' sīs kyi tshigs su bcad pa) see below § 1.13. The text does not seem to be included in the Them spangs ma Kanjurs. It is not S 279, since the final line cited by Skorupski (n. 2) is different (I was unable to check L). It is not among the group of svasti-gāthās at the end of the Sūtra division (mdo jī) in the London (ji, 379a1–385a3) or Stog Palace (§§ 328–32, ji 385a5–391a7) Ms Kanjurs, and

Jonathan Silk has informed me that it seems to be missing in the Tokyo Ms. The IHas žus pa'i bka' sīs kyi tshigs bcad listed in Bu ston (§ 400) is presumably the same text.

1 Shar (LNT: sna S) 'gyur yod: L XXXVI(16), 195a1; N 356, 594a4; S 304, 215b3; T 301, 193a8.

2 Skorupski § 208, T 208, 5a7, thar pa lo tsa bas (S: tshas T) bskyur ba dan (T adds ↓) mdo 'i (T adds no [[]]) gcig tu snā. I was unable to consult London. The remark is not in N 322 (mdo la, 434a4) which here follows the Tshal pa lineage. For the Dharmacakra-sūtra see below, § 1.1.

3 'Di bka' dan por gtoš sō, or variants thereof: Skorupski §§ 54, 57, 202, 206, respectively. For the Mahāśānyatā-nāma-mahāsūtra (S 202) — I have been unable to check the others — the remark also occurs in London (za 310a2) and Tokyo (za 309b7), as well as in the as yet unstudied Nes Don collection
no such remark is made for other “first dispensation” texts such as the remaining Mahāsūtras, which belong to the Mūlasarvāstivādin tradition. A study of these brief remarks would contribute to our understanding of the Them spangs ma tradition. The fact that two of the texts referred to in the colophons studied here — the Maitreya-vyākaranā and the Devaparirocchā-maṅgala-gāthā — are not included in the Them spangs ma tradition raises interesting questions.)

Bu ston’s doubts about the second point — whether the 13 texts belong to the Mahāyāna or the Hinayāna — can be laid to rest, since we know that they belong to the Theravādin school, and hence the Hinayāna or Śrāvakayāna. Although most Tshad ma editions place the texts in the Prajñāpāramitā division, the collection of Mahāyāna sūtras of the “Perfection of Wisdom” class, they were not considered to be Prajñāpāramitā texts. This is noted in the catalogue (dkar chag) of the Derge Kanjur; the note is reproduced in the Urga and Lhasa catalogues. “Although the [13] newly translated sūtras do not belong to the Prajñāpāramitā, the translations of the later period were formerly placed together at the end of this volume [that is, the “Miscellaneous Prajñāpāramitā”]. It appears that they were [so] placed without considering whether they belong to the Great or the Lesser Vehicle, or whether or not they are duplicates of early translations. Here we have done the same”.¹ The 13 texts may have been placed there simply due to exigencies of space: the volume in question contains a number of short Prajñāpāramitā texts (180 folios in the Derge edition), not enough to fill a volume. It is also possible that the editors of the Tshad ma Kanjur recognized their status as paritta, and placed them there as an auspicious conclusion to the division, just as they placed various prayers and auspicious verses at the end of other divisions.¹

¹ For this practice, see Skilling 1992, pp. 129–35.

¹ Derge 119a1, Bethlenfalvy 1980, pp. 13–14, Lhasa 439a2 (p. 877) (with a few minor variants): gsar ’gyur gyi mdo rnams ni sles phyin du gtoṅ pa ma yin mod kyi | dus phyis ’gyur ba rnams phyogs gcig tu snar nas glegs bam ’di ’i gsam du bkod ’dug cin | theg pa che chuṅ gah yin dahn | saṅ ’gyur dahn zlos pa yod med sogs kyiṅ ma brtags pa bzhag snaṅ ba bzin | ’dīr yāṅ de litar byas pa. See also the remarks in Ryo’ei Tokuoka, “The Comparison of the Lha-sa Edition with the
Translators and date of translation

Information about the translators of the 13 texts is given in colophons. For this study, I will utilize the colophons of the Derge (D) edition, in comparison with those of the Berlin (B), London (L), Narthang (N), Peking (Q), and Stog Palace (S) editions. The colophons in these editions may be divided into four groups, given here according to the numbers assigned to the 13 texts in the present article.

1) Colophon to 1.1 in DLNS; no colophon in BQ:

The colophon states that the translation was done “at the behest of the Ža lu sKu zad dge sByed, who had unbreakable faith in the Buddha’s teaching, who was accomplished in the two gTug lugs, and who had great prestige and authority, like the waxing moon”.

Grags pa rgyal mtsan was the fourth ruler (dpon) of the Ža lu myriarchy in gTsang province — one of the 13 myriarchies of the period — and a cousin-in-law of the Sa skya pa patriarch bZaṅ po dpal (1262–1232, for whom see below). Sku zad (“respected uncle”) is a title unique to the nobles of Ža lu, signifying that they gave daughters in marriage to the Sa skya pas, then rulers of Tibet. In this case, a sister of Grags pa rgyal mtsan was married to bDag ṇid chen po bZaṅ po dpal, and one of his daughters to Sa skya lama Don yod rgyal mtsan (1310–1344). Du dben ša, which transcribes the Mongol du uen sha from the Chinese tu-yiūan shuai, was a title conferred by the Mongols.

The encomium is not an exaggeration: Grags pa rgyal mtsan was indeed a man of considerable power. Vitali notes that “no other clan in Tibet was in a similar position of strength and authority... than the Ža lu pa”. Furthermore, Grags pa rgyal mtsan, whose power was enhanced through marriage into the powerful Tshal pa clan, was, according to Vitali, “the greatest sku zad of them all”. He was invested with his fief by Oljudu, successor to Qubilai Khan (Ōljaitū = Ch’eng tsung, reigned 1294–1307), from whom he received the title Gu šri (imperial advisor). I have not found a source that gives the dates of Grags pa rgyal mtsan’s life or when he became sku zad or received his other titles (note that the colophon does not describe him as gu šri). Vitali (p. 100) suggests that he became sku zad in 1306; if this is so, then the translations (or at least the colophon) would date to 1306 or later. Sources describe Grags pa rgyal mtsan as “a faithful donor considered to be a manifestation of the

1 For DLNQS, I have consulted the original texts: D in the “Karmapa edition”; S in the facsimile edition, compared with Skorupski’s catalogue (which gives the colophons in full); L and N at the Oriental and India Office Collections of the British Library, London. (For the latter I have used the boxed edition [Tib. E 30]). For B I have used the Beckh’s catalogue, which gives summaries of the colophons only. For the final colophon (4) I have also consulted Cone (C): I am grateful to Susan Meinheit (Washington, D.C.) for providing a copy.
2 This seems to be a stock phrase: see Kun mḥkṣen ’jigs med dbaṅ po, Co ne’i bstan ’gyur dkar chag, Kan su’u mi rigs dpe skrun khaṅ, 1989, p. 441, where it is applied to Kun dga’ don grub.
3 I have been unable to find a definition of the gTug lugs gnis: “two principles”?
4 For Ža lu (also spelt Ža la), see Tucci 1989–91, pp. 70–72; Ferrari 1958, p. 60 and note 426 (p. 143); Vitali 1990, pp. 89–122; for Grags pa rgyal mtsan, see Tucci 1949, Vol. II, Table XVI; Tucci 1989–91, p. 87, and “List of the Princes of Zha-lu”, facing p. 90; Ruegg 1966, pp. 9–10, 17, 31–32.
Great King Vaiśravaṇa. He and his son, Kun dga’ don grub, were the immediate patrons of Bu ston Rinpoche, who spent much of his career as abbot at Ža lu. They sponsored renovations to the gSer khaṅ at Ža lu; these are described in the biography of Bu ston (Ruegg 1966, pp. 89–94, the most important passage on Grags pa rgyal mtshan in the biography).

The colophon goes on to describe the translators as “the Great Paṇḍita Ānandaśri2 — from the isle of Ceylon, a journey of 600 yojanas to the south of Vajrāśana, the Bodhimāḍa (i.e., Bodh Gayā), who had properly entered the religious life (i.e., taken lower ordination) from a brāhmaṇa family, who had taken full ordination and thoroughly mastered the Tripitaka — and the learned (bahuśrutā) translator, the Sākyā bhikṣu3 żi ma rgyal mtshan dPal bzaṅ po”, and states that the translation was done “at the seat of translators, the Great Monastery (mahāvihāra) of the glorious (sri) Thar pa giṅ”.4

---

1 Ruegg 1966, p. 89 and folio 14a6, bstan pa gus pas mchod pa’i sblyn bdag rgyal po chen po rnam thos sras kyi sprul par grags pa.
2 The name is sometimes transliterated as Ānanta- or Ananta-śri. The colophons in DLNQ clearly read Ānanda-. For variants in the editions of Bu ston’s Chos byun, see Szerb 1990, pp. 106 notes 21, 22 and 112 notes 15, 16.
3 The epithet Sākyā bhikṣu is already met with in early Indian inscriptions; according to some it means an adherent of the Mahāyāna.
4 D 183a4; L 7b8; S 6b6 (I was unable to check N 431b because the pages were stuck together; such as I could see seemed the same): sans rgyas kyi bstan pa la mi phyed pa’i dad pa dan ldan žiṅ | gtsug lag gis la thugs legs par byan ba | dpal ’byor dbaṅ phyug dam pa dkar phyogs kyi zla ba bitar ’phel ba’i ża lu ba sku žan (L 8a) grags pa rgyal mtshan du dben sa’i bka’ lung gis byan chub kyi sīṅ po rdo rje (S 7a) gdan las | lhā phyogs su dpag tshad drug bgrya tsam bgrud pa’i gnas | sīṅ gha giṅ pa bram ze’i rigs las legs par rab tu byun żiṅ | bsīṅen par rdzogs pa sde snod gsum la thugs legs par byan pa’i pandita chen po ānanda śri’i žal sna nas | maṅ du thos pa’i lo isha ba śākyā’i dge sloṅ żi ma rgyal mtshan dpal bzaṅ po | skad gis smra ba rnam kyi gdan sa | gtsug lag khaṅ chen po dpal thar pa giṅ du bsgrur cīṅ žus te gتان la phab pa’o. A rather inaccurate attempt at a translation of the whole colophon (from N ?) was made by Feer (1870, pp. 353–55).

1 Paṇḍita (LN 1.5–13 add chen po | [|| in LN 1.5,6,11]: not in LN 1.2–4) ānanda śri’i žal sna nas (LN 1.2 add here daṅ) maṅ du thos pa’i lo tscha ba sākya’i dge sloṅ żi ma rgyal mtshan dpal bzaṅ po | skad gis smra ba rnam kyi (kyis LN for 1.3) gdan sa | gtsug lag khaṅ chen po dpal thar pa giṅ du bsgrur cīṅ žus te gتان la phab pa’o. (I have listed a few selected variants to show the close agreement of L and N, which suggests that N copied the 13 texts from the Žel dkar Ms, even though it placed them in a different volume [see above]. The figures following the variants refer to numbering of the sutras in the present paper.)

2 Beckh’s catalogue of B gives only a brief summary of the colophon; however, since B and Q both belong to the Peking branch of the Tshal pa tradition, I assume here that the colophons are identical. For a translation of the colophon from the Mongolian Kanjur, see Bischoff 1968, pp. 337–40; for further notes see de Jong 1972, pp. 356–37 (§ 791).

3 Phags pa raṅ byun ’jig rten dbaṅ phyug gi gtsug lag khaṅ (*Ārya-svayambhū-lokeśvara-vihāra): for the “self-originated” Lokeśvara at Ža lu, “found by a miraculous white goat with a turquoise beard”, see Vitali 1990, p. 97, Ferrari 1958, loc. cit., and the description in the biography of Bu ston: byan phyogs kha ba can gyi ljon | gans ri dpal daṅ ldan pas bskor ba’i dbus | rje btsun spyan ras gzngs kyi sku mgung sras raṅ byon bṣugs pa’i gnas ... (Ruegg 1966, folio 14a4–5; tr. p. 90). The monastery had three other famed Lokeśvara statues housed in the same chapel (Vitali, 92, 97). For this temple see Ruegg 1966, pp. 17–18 and 34.
Land of Tibet,¹ the Mass of Snow Mountains, [which lies] 100 yojanas to the north-east of Vajrāsana, the Bodhimaṇḍa [Bodh Gayā] in the Āryadeśa at the centre of Jambudvīpa.²

LNS, of which LS, as seen above, divide the 13 texts into two groups, give here only the “abridged colophon” — identical to those of LNS for texts 1.2–12 — in place of the “collective colophon”.

It is now clear that there are only two different colophons: the Them spangs ma colophon, represented by DLNS in (1) above — of which (2) and (3) are an abbreviation — and the Tshal pa colophon, represented by BCDQ in (4). Although they convey much the same information, often in the same words, they are not identical. Without going into too much detail, the reasons for the difference in the assignation of colophons are likely as follows. The Tshal pa Kanjurs kept the 13 texts together; hence B and Q, which follow the

² C 317a3, D 284a4, Q 301b5, de lta mdo bce gsum po ‘di nams ni ‘dzam bu’i glin gi dbyus | ‘phags pa’i yul | byan chub kyi sniṅ po rdo rje’i gdan las dpag tshad brgya tsam byan šar du (CD: Q om. du) bgoṅ pa’i bod yul | gans ri’i khrod | rtṣan Ōañ ro tshoṅ ‘dus ‘gur mo’i sa cha | ‘phags pa raṅ byon ‘jig rten dban phyug gi gtsug lag khan gi bdag po || (Q: D) sans rgyas bcom ldan ‘das kyi bstan pa la lhag par mos sniṅ | dpal ‘byor dan chab srid du ma la dban phyug dam pa’i go ‘phāṅ thob pa’i tal bu (Q: za lu D) pa stu Ōañ grags pa rgyal mthstan du dben sa’i bka’ laṅ gis | (from here on the text agrees with colophon [1]). A similar description of the relation of Tibet, in this case Lhasa, to Bodh Gayā is used by the Fifth Dalai Lama: cf. Macdonald 1963, p. 57 and p. 111, note 24, ‘phags yul rdo rje gdan nas byan phyogs su dpags tshad brgya bdog pa na gdan sa chen po dpal ldan sa skyā dan zun du ‘brel ba lha sa … Vajrāsana is taken as the point of reference because it is traditionally held to be the centre of the universe.

Tshal arrangement, have only the final, collective colophon.¹ The Them spangs ma Kanjurs divide the 13 texts into two groups; therefore L and S, which follow the Them spangs ma arrangement, give colophons for each text.² For the Sūtra division, D follows the Tshal pa arrangement: while the editors of D based themselves primarily on the Lithang recension of the Tshal pa (J), they also consulted a manuscript belonging to the Them spangs ma tradition — as stated in the catalogue (dkar chag) of D itself, and confirmed by text-critical studies. In the present case D adopts the Them spangs ma colophons for 1.1–9; hence its agreement with L(N)S. For some reason, D reverts to the Tshal pa tradition for 1.10–12, and gives no colophons. Finally, since it follows the Tshal pa tradition in treating the 13 texts as a single group, it ends with the collective colophon of that tradition at 1.13. In the present case N follows the Them spangs ma in terms of textual transmission, and thus gives a colophon for each text. In terms of arrangement, however, it agrees with the Tshal pa in keeping the 13 texts together at the end of the (albeit different) volume.

The verse colophon to text 1.14 further describes Ānandaśrī as “virtuous, foremost among the many thousands [of monks] in the samgha of the land of Sinhala; the disciple of Dipaṅkara (?),³ who

¹ It is likely that the Lithang (J) and Cone (C — which follows J) do the same. For Cone I can confirm that it has the final collective colophon, but not whether it omits the earlier colophons.
² It is likely that the Tokyo (T) and Ulan Bator Them spangs ma (U) manuscripts do the same.
³ Mar me mṭṭad = dipaṅkara could be taken as an epithet, followed by slob [dpon] = ācārya, to mean “illuminator, teacher”. However, such a use of dipaṅkara seems unusual. The passage is in verse: slob alone can equal šākṣa, as can slob pa; it can also stand for slob ma = anṭevāsīn, śīṣya. Since it is a common practice to establish one’s teacher’s credentials or prestige by naming his teacher(s), rather than his disciples, I have taken it in the latter sense. The name Dipaṅkara is known in Sri Lanka: a Coliya Dipaṅkara was a disciple of a Vanaratna Ānanda: G.P. Malalasekera, The Pāli Literature of Ceylon, Colombo, [1928] 1958, p. 220.
resides in Vajrāsana; the great pāṇḍita Ānandaśrī, the virtuous; the monk endowed with the vision of the dharma (dharmaçakṣu, “eye of the dharma”), skilled in the two languages; one who seeks the benefit of the [Buddha’s] dispensation (sāsana), the excellent one”.  

The second translator, the Tibetan Ni ma rgyal mtshan dpal bzaṅ po, is well known as one of the teachers of the famous scholar Bu ston Rin chen grub (1290–1364). In his History of Buddhism (Chos 'byun), Bu ston states: “My teacher (guru) Ni ma rgyal mtshan dpal bzaṅ po studied in Nepal for fourteen years; he translated 13 sūtras — the Gīrī-ānanda-sūtra, etc. — with Pāṇḍita Ānandaśrī. Furthermore, he made many other fundamental translations and corrections to translations.”

Bu ston’s biography, composed by his “spiritual son” (thugs sras) Rin chen mam rgyal and completed in 1366, does not state exactly when he studied under Ni ma rgyal mtshan. It is clear, however, that he did so sometime between 1312, when he was ordained at the age of 23, and 1320, when he arrived in Ža lu to become abbot. During this period he stayed mainly at Khro phu, but also undertook several journeys. The biography states that he visited Ni ma rgyal mtshan for fourteen months continuously, and also for periods of two, three, or four months, over a period of four years, and that “for this bla ma he had special regard, holding him to be the Buddha himself”. It describes him as “the great upadhyāya renowned as the ‘Translator from Thar pa [glin]’, famed in the East, West, and Centre of India as Tibet’s chief bhadanta, who had mastery over the profound meaning of spiritual power, a translator (lotsava) who was the eye of the world (lokacakṣu).”

Ni ma rgyal mtshan is credited with the translation of several other Kanjur texts, all in the Tantra (rgyud) division. He translated the Sarvatathāgata-uṣṇīṣavijaya-nāma-dhāranīkalpa single-handedly (raṅ gis bsgyur ba, that is, without the assistance of an Indian pandit), also at Thar pa glin. In the colophon he is again described as the “learned translator” (maṅ du thos pa’i lo tsa ba) and also as “the elder” (gnas brtan = sthavira), Śrī Ni ma rgyal mtshan dpal bzaṅ po. Bu ston, in his Tantra Catalogue, describes him as “the great preceptor” (mkhan chen = mahopadhyāya). In the Stog Palace and Derge Kanjurs, he is credited with the revision of the Śrī-Vajrabhairavakalpa-tantrarāja, “having learned from the great accomplished one (grub thob chen po) Karnaśrī”. In the Phug brag Kanjur only, he is credited with the

---

1 N 328, mdo sa, 477a2, Q 1010, hu 311b3, yon tan dan idan sīh ga glin yul gyi || ston phrag man po’i dge ’daṅ kun gyi gto || mar me dzad slob rdo rje gdan bdug pa || pan chen ā nan dā śrī yon tan can || dge slob chos kyi sphyin can skad gRhis mdkhas || bstan la phan ’dod bzaṅ po (de niid dan ||). The colophon is translated from the Mongolian in Bischoff 1968, pp. 537–38; for further notes see de Jong 1972, pp. 537, 543–45.

2 BA II 793; cf. also p. 800. Ruegg 1966, pp. 80–86, Thar pa lo tsā ba. Gene Smith (oral communication, January, 1993) informs me that according to the Naṅ chun, Ni ma rgyal mtshan belonged to the dpal family, which owned Thar pa glin; and that the monastery was named by the Kashmiri pāṇḍita Śākyasribhadra (1140s–1226). (For the dpal family and the teachings that they transmitted, see BA I 395–97.)

3 The list of texts in Bu ston’s catalogue begins with this sūtra (Nishioka 369).

4 Lhasa xylograph ya 140b2: bdag gi bla ma ni ma rgyal mtshan dpal bzaṅ pos bal po lcu bźr bshyan pa mdzad || ri’i kun dga’i mdo la sogs mdo bcu gsum tsam pāṇḍita a nanta śrī sphyin drens te bsgyur ro || gzan yan gzhis ’gyur daṅ ’gyur bcos man po mdzad do ||. (For variants, see Szerb 1990, pp. 106, 107.) Obermiller (1932, p. 224) translates “fourteen sūtras”; all editions consulted by Szerb give thirteen (bcu gsum tsam); cf. also Nishioka III (1983), p. 70, where Bu ston refers to kho bo’i bla ma skad gRhis smra ba ni ma’i mtshan can (sic).

5 Ruegg 1966, pp. 41, 178.
Theravādin literature in Tibetan translation

Thar pa gлин, “Island of Liberation” (*Mokṣadvipa) is a monastery located in gTsaṅ in Central Tibet, not far south of Ža lu. As seen above, the colophons to the texts studied herein describe it as “the great monastery” (gtsug lag khan chen po = mahāvihāra) and the “seat of translators” (skad gnis smra ba rnam kyi gdan sa). In later literature, such as the two Records of Teachings Received referred to above, the monastery and Ni ma rgyal mtshan were identified with each other: he was called “the translator from Thar [pa gлин]” (Thar lo [tsa ba]), and the monastery was famous as “the residence of the Thar pa lotsava”.3 In early December, 1783, Captain Samuel Turner, emissary of Warren Hastings, visited Thar pa gлин. Chapter IX of his account describes his departure from Teshoo Loombo (Tashiilunpo) and journey to Terpaling (Thar pa gлин) (via Tsondue [= Tshon 'dus] where he and his companion, Mr Saunders, “enjoyed the distinction of having been the first of our nation, that ever signalized themselves by skating in Tibet”). At “Terpaling” he had an audience with the infant “Teshoo Lama” (the 18 month old fourth reincarnation of the Panchen Lama), to whom he delivered the Governor General’s greetings and presents (“a string of pearls and coral”). He notes that the young reincarnation “conducted himself with astonishing dignity and decorum”. At that time there were 300 monks at the monastery, “appointed to perform religious service with the Teshoo Lama”. Chapter X describes Turner’s departure from Thar pa gлин and return to Bengal.4

---

2 The two gSan yigs call him Thar lo ŋi ma rgyal mtshan. See also BA I 104 and II 792.
3 Ferrari 1958, p. 60 and p. 144, notes 436, 437.
4 Captain Samuel Turner, An Account of an Embassy to the Court of the Teshoo Lama, in Tibet; Containing a Narrative of a Journey through Bootan, and Part
Anandaṣrī translated one other text, the Ārya-maitrī-sūtra, § 1.14 in the present study. It will be seen below that this is a different translation of a text similar but not identical to § 1.5, the Maitrī-sūtra. According to the colophon of 1.14, Anandaṣrī collaborated on the translation with Kun dga’ rgyal mtshan Thub bstan dpal bzaṅ po — “monk, lineage-bearer, successor to the great translators, who through good fortune met Anandaṣrī” — at Sa skyā [the seat of the Sa skyā pa school]. The work was completed in “the bright half of the first month of winter of a fire-sheep (me lug) year, 1850 years and 10 months after the passing away of the Teacher [the Buddha], when Dharmarāja Ha shang was on the throne”.¹ The calculation uses the Theravādin Buddhist era, and is equivalent to 1307 A.C.² The use of the Theravādin era most probably comes from Anandaṣrī himself; the era was, however, already known in Tibet, particularly among the Sa skyā pas, from the time of the Kashmiri Śākyānbihadra (Kha che paṅ chen).³ The phrase “when Dharmarāja Ha shang was on the throne” may refer to the fact that the Sa skyā patriarch bDaṅ gūd chen po bZaṅ po dpal (1262–1324) had been installed on the throne of Sa skyā Monastery in 1306 at the age of 45, after 16 years of exile in southern China (from 1282–98) and eight years of confinement in Tibet.¹ The title “Ha shang”, “[Chinese] monk”, suggests that he may have received Chinese ordination at some point, but this presents problems because he had children between 1299 and 1312. He received Tibetan ordination in 1313. According to Tucci, he “was only vested with temporal authority and had no religious authority or rank up to the age of 52”, that is, 1313.²

The colophon gives the name of the patron or sponsor, Kun dga’ sen ge.³ As the elder brother of Jam dbyaṅ Rin chen rgyal mtshan (1258–1306) — in whom power was vested during bZaṅ po dpal’s external and internal exile — Kun dga’ sen ge was the paramount religious noble of the Sa skyā Bla braṅ, one of the main ministerial families of the Sa skyā pas. In 1307 he would have been the de facto power at Sa skyā, and this must be why he is mentioned as patron. The Blue Annals (II 633) states that he was at Sa skyā in 1309.

The colophon closes with non-historical verses and prāṇidhānas.

² I am grateful to Gene Smith (Jakarta) for supplying copies of relevant source materials and for guiding me through the historical maze. In a letter dated 12 July, 1992; he notes that “only a careful study of the numerous sources for this extremely complicated period can solve the puzzle”.
³ Beckh (1914) p. 68, mistakenly describes “Lama Kun-dgah-sen-ge” as the translator. Kun dga’ sen ge is mentioned in the ṛGya bod yig tshan of dPal ’byor bzaṅ po (Chen du, Si khron mi rigs dpe skrun khaṅ, 1985, p. 352).
Some gSan yig and Kanjur catalogues\footnote{1} mistakenly identify Ānandaśrī’s co-translator with the famous Sa skya Pañḍita, fourth patriarch of the Sa skya pas, who lived from 1182 to 1251, and whose full name is Kun dga’ rgyal mtshan dPal bzañ po. This was also done by Sylvain Lévi, who therefore interpreted the me lug year as 1247/8.\footnote{2} The identification and date are clearly wrong. Firstly, it is evident from the common elements of the colophons to 1.1, 1.13, and 1.14 that this is the same Ānandaśrī; I have shown above, on the basis of the contemporary evidence of Bu ston, that Ānandaśrī was active in the early part of the 14th century. (Note also that in the roughly chronological lists of Indian scholars and Tibetan translators given by Bu ston in his History of Buddhism, completed in 1322 or 23, Ānandaśrī [Szerb 1990, p. 112,5] and ĩNi ma rgyal mtshan [ibid., p. 119,2] are fourth last.) Secondly, the name of the co-translator, though partly identical, contains the element Thub bstan, which I have not come across in the name of Sa skya Pañḍita.\footnote{3} Thirdly, even if one wishes to consider the difference in names

\footnote{1}{gsan yig of the Fifth Dalai Lama (Records of Teachings Received: the gsan-yig of the Fifth Dalai Lama Nag-dban-blo-bzan-rgya-mtsho, Delhi, Nechung and Lakhar, 1971, p. 374), Ānandaśrī and Lo tsa ba ‘Jam dbyaṅs Sa paṅ; Lhasa Kanjur Catalogue, p. 916, byams pa’i mdo | ā nan ta ēri dan | ‘jam dbyaṅs sa paṅ gyi ’gyur. Note that the identification with Maṇjūghoṣa (‘Jam dbyaṅs) Sa [skya] paṅ [dita] is made only in catalogues and gsan yigs and never in the colophons themselves. It is presumably based on a hasty reading of the colophons with their mention of Sa skya and the similarity of the names, without looking further into the dates or other historical details.}

\footnote{2}{Lévi 1932, pp. 379–80. Lévi transcribes and translates the greater part of the colophon to 1.14. It is not clear whether he was influenced by the Kanjur catalogues. The mistaken identification and date are perpetuated in de Jong 1972, pp. 537 and 543.}

\footnote{3}{Sa skya Pañḍita himself gives his name as Śākya Bhiksū Kun dga’ rgyal mtshan dPal bzaṅ po: see Jackson 1987, I (text) 298, 299, II (translation) 366, 367. The dPal bzaṅ po = śrībhadra of Sa skya Pañḍita’s name indicates that he was ordained by the Kashmiri master Śākya Śrībhadra (see Ruegg 1966, p. 42 note 1, and Jackson 1987, I 27); in general (as in the case of ĩNi ma rgyal mtshan dpal bzaṅ po) it means ordained within the Vinaya tradition established by Śākyaśrībhadra.}

as a poetic embellishment of the verse colophon, and hold that Ānandaśrī was active in Tibet for nearly 70 years, Sa skya Pañḍita was not at Sa skya in 1247/8: summoned by the Mongols, he had left in 1244, and by 1247 he was at the Mongol court in Liang-chou. He never returned to Sa skya, since he died at Liang-chou in 1251.\footnote{1} Fourthly, neither Sa skya Pañḍita nor his biographers refer to Ānandaśrī. Finally, as shown above, the patron Kun dga’ seng ge was at Sa skya in the early 14th century.

The 13 gsar ‘gyur are some of the latest sūtra translations, and the latest group of sūtras, to enter the Kanjur. When and how did they, along with the Maitrī-sūtra, come to be included? Why do the former occur in two different arrangements, with variant colophons, and why is the latter missing in some Kanjurs? I cannot give a satisfactory answer. I can only note that one of the sūtra collections used in the compilation of the first comprehensive Kanjur, the Old Narthang manuscript collection, was that of īSa Lu, the residence of īNi ma rgyal mtshan’s pupil Bu ston, not far from Thar pa glin.\footnote{2} Contact between Narthang and Thar pa glin itself is shown in the fact that the Tantra Collection of dGe bses ‘dar phyur of Thar pa glin was used in the compilation of the Old Narthang Tantra division,\footnote{3} and that one of the compilers, bCom Idan ral gri, requested īNi ma rgyal mtshan to translate a Tantra (see above).

Nothing else is known of Ānandaśrī. We do not know how or when he came to Tibet, or how long he stayed; all we can say is that he collaborated on the translation of fourteen texts in about the first decade of the 14th century: 13 at Thar pa glin with īNi ma rgyal mtshan, and one at Sa skya with Kun dga’ rgyal mtshan. It is not reported that Bu ston,
who studied at Thar pa glin sometime after 1312, met the *pandita*. The latter’s second co-translator, Kun dga’ rgyal mtsan, is not credited with any other translations in the *Kanjur* or *Tanjur*, and is otherwise unknown.

It is interesting that Bu ston’s biography mentions that at Thar pa glin Bu ston learned “the various systems of writing of India, east and west”, including that of Śiṅhaladvīpa (*Śiṅ ha glin*),¹ and that a Sinhalese manuscript of the *Karmavibhāgaya* was photographed by Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana at Sa skya.² These are probably part of Ānandaśrī’s legacy in the Land of Snows. The colophon to 1.14 suggests that he was prominent in his homeland; since, however, Ānanda was a popular name in Ceylon (particularly from the Polonnaruva period on, and particularly among the Araññāvāsins), I will not attempt to identify the great *pandita* with any of the Sri Lankans of the same name.³

**The 13 texts and modern scholarship**

The first reference to the 13 texts in European scholarship was made by the great pioneer of Tibetan studies, the Hungarian Alexander Csoma de Körös, who listed and summarized them in his “Analysis of the Mdo” (based on the Narthang xylograph), published in 1836–39.⁴ In his French translation of the preceding, Léon Feer, another pioneer of *Kanjur* and Buddhist studies, described them as “textes traduits du Pāli”, and noted their Pāli counterparts.⁵ He published full translations of eight of the texts (1.1, 6–10, 12, 13, plus a part of 1.2) in 1883, comparing them with the Pāli parallels, when available, and also noting other parallels within the *Kanjur*. In 1929 Lalou gave a tabular list of the 13 texts as found in the Narthang and Peking *Kanjurs*, with cross-references to the Berlin manuscript, Pāli parallels, the *pariṇā*, and Feer’s translations in *AMG*.² The texts are discussed briefly in *L’Inde classique*,³ and referred to and listed in the *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism⁶* and in *Crystal Mirror VII*.⁵ Their Sanskrit, Tibetan, and Mongolian titles, as given in the Mongolian *Kanjur*, are listed by Bischoff, who also translates the

---

¹ *AMG* V; Feer also described 1.11, which is virtually identical to 1.12. References are given under the appropriate section. I am unable to do justice to the entirety of Feer’s work, spread through many issues of *Journal asiatique*, not available to me. See for example Feer 1870, and Imaeda 1982 p. 18 (184) note 17 for a reference to *JA* 1871. Imaeda also refers to a study in Japanese by Enga Teramoto, “Chibetto den no agon-kyō ni tsuite”, in *Shūkyō Kenkyū*, New Series 2, 1929, pp. 505–28.
⁴ *EB* III/1, p. 153.
⁵ Dharma Publishing, Berkeley, 1971, pp. 295–97. Gregory Schopen has devoted a long footnote to them (Schopen 1982, p. 231, note 9: note that the description “13 short texts” is wrong: §§ 1.3–4 are long, and 1.2 very long.). Nos. 1.6, 8, 10, and 13 are discussed (in Japanese) by Yamaguchi Tsutomo, “On Pāli Scriptures in the Tibetan Canon — Peking numbers 752, 754, 756, and 759”, in the *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies*, Vol. XXXI, no. 1, Dec. 1982, pp. 95–98 (391–388). Nattier (1991, p. 59) remarks that “only a handful of texts known to the Theravādin tradition can be matched with equivalents in the Tibetan *Kanjur*”; in note 80 she lists most of the 13 *gsar* *gyur*, followed by Peking numbers 955–58, 962–63, 966, 982, 997, and 1003. This statement needs clarification. The 13 *gsar* *gyur* are themselves Theravādin texts, while the other texts listed by Nattier are all (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin texts (which indeed have Pāli parallels). Furthermore, Peking numbers 959–60, 971, 979, 981, 992, 1003, and 1021, as well as a few others, are also (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin texts with Pāli parallels, and nos. 1010 and 972 (= §§ 1.14 and 15 in this article) are Theravādin texts. A concordance of Śrāvaka literature in Tibetan translation is a desideratum.

---

¹ Ruegg p. 81, text folio 11a7.
³ Cf. *DPN* I, Ānanda, nos. 11–14, and *EB* IV, p. 537, Ānanda (14).
⁵ *AMG* II (1881), 288–90.
colophons from Mongolian. Pāli parallels of 1.1–4 and 1.13 were noted in the Tohoku Catalogue, published in 1934; the Pāli parallels of 1.1–4, 1.6 (part A only), and 1.8–13 were given in the Otani and Peking Reprint Catalogues, published in 1930–32 and 1961. The Pāli parallel of 1.5 and 1.14 was noted by Sylvain Lévi in 1932. (As far as I know, the Pāli counterpart of 1.7-A is identified here for the first time.) Thus the 13 gsar ’gyur have caught the attention of modern scholarship from the time of Feer up to the present; brief remarks have been made by Conze, Lévi, Lalou, Pelliot, Imaeda, Ruegg, Schopen, and Nattier (and no doubt others whose work has escaped my attention), as shown in the notes.

The Tohoku and Otani catalogues also give Chinese parallels, when available. According to the concordance of the Derge and Korean Tripitakas given in Lancaster’s Korean Buddhist Canon, only D 39 (no. 1.9 below) has a true Chinese parallel, in that it might be a translation of a Theravādin version. Derge numbers 31, 33, 34, 36, and 42 (below 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 1.6, and 1.12) also have parallels in Chinese, but these are versions of the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādins, Dharmaguptakas, or other schools.

1 Bischoff 1968, §§ 779–91, pp. 333–40; see also § 1105 (pp. 537–39) for § 1.14 with its titles in the same three languages and its colophon translated from Mongolian. Note that all of the texts dealt with in this article — both Kanjur and Tanjur, but excepting the modern translations of § 3 — are also available in Mongolian translation. For a rare notice that Theravādin literature exists in that language, see David Seyfort Ruegg, “Some Observations on the Present and Future of Buddhist Studies”, JIABS 15/1 (1992), pp. 110–11 and note 5, referring to the 13 gsar ’gyur.


4 Lévi 1932.

5 KBC, p. 697.

6 The concordance lists KBC 650 (22.8) for both Derge 41 and 42; this seems to refer to the Sūrya- and Candra-sūtras as parallels of a sole Chinese Candra-

The original language of the 13 texts

The Tibetan titles state that the 13 texts were translated from “the language of India” (rgya gar skad), which generally means Sanskrit. It seems to have been Feer who first averred that they were translated from Pāli. What should have been only a hypothesis took on the force of fact, and the statement has been repeated in later works. The opposite extreme was taken by Edward Conze, pioneer of Prajñāpāramitā studies, who stated that “[the 13 texts] are sometimes said to be translated from the Pāli, but they differ too much from the Pāli text, and on closer investigation they turn out to represent Hinayāna Sūtras from the Canon of the Sarvāstivādins and other Hinayāna sects in contact with Tibet”. It will be seen below that the 13 are without doubt Theravādin texts: perhaps Conze confused them with their (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin counterparts found elsewhere in the Kanjur, although only five texts have such counterparts, and they are not in the Ser phyin section.

In accordance with Kanjur tradition, the titles are transliterated in Sanskrit at the head of each text; they may, however, have been Sanskritized by the translators or by later editors. It is significant that the

sūtra, presumably because the texts are nearly identical. See KBC p. 245, and below 1.11 and 1.12.

1 He describes them as “traduits du pâli” at several places under the references cited below; in AMG II (1881), pp. 288–90, he refers to “un avertissement inseré entre le texte no. 12 et le texte no. 13, au folio 427 [of the Narthang]” as his source. There is no such remark in the edition of Narthang that I consulted, and I have not found any reference to the language of the texts in the colophons (and indeed wonder what the Tibetan equivalent of Pāli would be). It may be that Feer based his statement on the fact that Ānandaśrī is described as a Sinhalese. See also Lévi, “Les saintes écritures du bouddhisme”, in Mémorial Sylvain Lévi, Paris, 1937, p. 78: “treize sūtra … qui se présentent eux-mêmes comme traduits du pāli”, and Schopen’s remarks (1982, p. 231, note 9), which go to the opposite extreme.


titles of the Āṭānātiya- and Mahāsamaya-sūtra (1.3,4) are given in the Pāli forms Āṭānātiya- and Mahāsamaya against the Āṭānāti āṭānātiya and Mahāsamāja of the (Mūla-) Sarvāstivādin versions. The fact that Ānandaśrī was a Sinhalese suggests that the originals were indeed in Pāli; this is supported by the fact that the texts agree with the canonical Pāli versions and that Bu ston learned the Sinhalese script at Thar pa glin. Since even a novice in Ceylon would know the paritta by heart, Ānandaśrī might well have transmitted the paritta texts (at least 1.1, 3–6, 8, 10–13) orally. While it is not impossible that some Theravādī texts were circulated in Sanskrit in India, it is quite unlikely that a senior Sinhalese monk, who knew the paritta by heart, would have transmitted these canonical texts in Sanskrit, although he may well have used Sanskrit when he explained the texts to his Tibetan co-translators. It is possible, however, that some of the longer texts were in Sinhalese.

In the following, I briefly discuss the contents of the 13 texts and their relationship to their Pāli counterparts. For each text I first give the Sanskrit title, as given at the head of the Tibetan text, followed by the Tibetan translation of the title, and an English translation. The next line gives the catalogue number of the Derge edition (D), which I have utilized for this study; the Derge folio numbers; and, in parentheses, the length of the text in “folio pages”, counting one side of a folio as one folio page. The next line gives the catalogue numbers for eleven other editions: Berlin (B), Cone (C), Lhasa (H), Lithang (J), London (L), Urga (M), Narthang (N), Peking (Q), Stog (S), Tokyo (T), and Ulan Bator (U), plus that of Bu ston’s Chos ’byun (Bu ston). The next line gives the

1 References (by page and line) are to the editions of the Pāli Text Society (PTS), unless otherwise noted.
2 Lionel Lokuliyana, Catubhānavarapāli, the Text of the Four Recitals or the Great Book of Protections Sinhala-Maha Pirit Pota, Colombo, n.d. Reference is by text number.
3 Sanskrit equivalents are based on the lexicon composed by a committee of Indian and Tibetan scholars around the year 800, the Mahāvypātī (Mvy). For these I give the Pāli counterpart.
4 The title in the colophon to DLNS is Chos kyi ’khor lo bsdkor ba’i mdo; the title in the final collective colophon in CDQ is ’Phags pa chos kyi ’khor lo bskor [bskor Q] ba’i mdo.
[The *Kanjur* also contains an anonymous translation of a (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin recension, entitled *Dharmakakra-sūtra / Chos kyi ’khor lo ’i mdo*: Q 1003, Vol. 39, *mdo sna tshogs, śu* 283b1–285a7. The text is also incorporated into the *Vinaya* (*’Dul ba*) of the Mūlasarvāstivādinins and into the *Abhiṇiśkrāmana-sūtra*, both in Tibetan translation. These versions were translated jointly by Feer side-by-side with the Theravādin versions as embodied in the present text and the Pāli *Samyuttanikāya* (see references above).]

Tibetan, Pāli: spoken by the Buddha at Bārāṇasi, Isipatana, Migadāya, to the “group of five monks” (*pañcavaggiye bhikkhū*).

The Tibetan agrees closely with the Pāli. At 181a1, equivalent to S V 421,21, the Tibetan omits *soka-parideva-dukkha-domanassupāyāsā pi dukkhā*, given in the PTS edition on the basis of one Burmese manuscript (B¹), but, according to note 2, omitted in two Sinhalese (S¹–³) and one Burmese (B²) manuscripts.¹ It is also not found in the Siamese edition,² the Burmese Chaṭṭhasaṅgīti edition,³ or the Ceylonese *Maha Pirit Pota* (p. 72,2). The third and final insight into each of the four truths — that they are *pariṇāṇatam, pahīnam, sacchikatam*, and *bhāvītam* (S V 422,3–30) — is missing in the Tibetan. The omission must derive from a faulty manuscript or translation: since the insights are an essential part of the sutta, their omission cannot be deliberate or redactional. At the end of the sutta, the progression of the gods who announce that the Buddha has turned the wheel of the dhamma is the same in Tibetan and Pāli; while the Tibetan (182a3–183a1) gives the formula in full for each group of gods, the PTS (p. 423,28), Siamese (p. 532,2), and Burmese (p. 371,13) editions abbreviate the passage, giving only the names of the gods.

¹ See S V, Introduction, pp. vii–viii, for the manuscripts utilized by the editor.
³ *Mahāvaggasamputtappāli*, p. 369,15.

---

In order to demonstrate that the Tibetan represents a Theravādin recension, I will contrast a few passages with the Mūlasarvāstivādin version, as preserved in Sanskrit in their *Sanghabhedavastu* (*Sanghabh*), and with the Mahāsāṃghika Lokottaravādin version, preserved in “Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit” in their *Mahāvastu*.¹

Table 3 shows the “epithets of insight” according to four recensions: the first column gives the Tibetan, the second column a Pāli translation of the Tibetan, the third column the Pāli of the *Samyuttanikāya*, the fourth the Sanskrit of the *Sanghabhedavastu*, and the fifth the Sanskrit of the *Mahāvastu*. The Tibetan and Pāli agree in giving the same five synonyms of insight in the same order. The Mūlasarvāstivādin version gives only four, of which three are common to the Tibetan and Pāli, while the Lokottaravādin version gives seven, comprising all five of the Theravādin version, but in a different order, plus two others, one of which is common to the Mūlasarvāstivādin version.²

The first class of gods to proclaim the turning of the wheel of the dhamma is the “gods of the earth” (*sa’i lha*, 182a4; *bhummā devā*, S V 423,18; *bhūmyā devā*, *Mahāvastu* 443,13) in Tibetan, Pāli, and the *Mahāvastu*, but “yakṣas of the earth” (*bhaumā yakṣāḥ*, *Sanghabh* 136,24) in the Mūlasarvāstivādin version. In the Tibetan and Pāli the naming of Koṇḍañña occurs at the very end of the sutta; in the Mūlasarvāstivādin version it comes before the gods’ announcement of the turning of the wheel (*Sanghabh* 136,15); in the *Mahāvastu* it does not occur at all.

---

² The numbers given in parentheses after the *Sanghabhedavastu* and *Mahāvastu* entries are those of the Tibetan-Pāli entries.
At the end of the Tibetan and Pāli versions, just before the naming of Konḍañña, the sutta states that the earth quaked. The Tibetan (D 183a2) and Pāli (S V 424,4) correspond almost exactly:

“"This ten-thousand world-system (Tib. 'dir yan 'jig rten gyi khams ston phrag bcu = Pāli ayañ ca dasasahassi lokadhatu) quaked (yan dag par g'you so = samkampi), shook (yan dag par rab tu g'you so = sampakampi), [and] trembled (yan dag par rab tu ld eg go = sampavedhi)."1

The Lokottaravādin version (Mahāvastu 443,2) has iyam ca mahāprthivi atiriva saḍvikāraṃ kampe chinnam iva sampravedhe. The Mūlasarvāstivādin version does not contain the passage.

The few examples given here show that the Tibetan version agrees with the Pāli against the Sanskrit versions of the Lokottaravādins and the Mūlasarvāstivādins; many more could be cited.

1.2. Jātaka-nidāna / sKyes pa rabs kyi gleñ gzi2

Introduction to the Jātaka

D 32, 183a7–250a5 (137 1/2 folio pages)
B (40).14, C 1015, H 33, J 27, L XXXVI(2), M 32, N 348, Q 748, S 290, T 287, U 336, Bu ston 379
Partial translation by Feer, compared with the Pāli, AMG V 321–61.

1 The ‘dir yan (“here”, “then” = tatra ?) of the Tibetan does not exactly correspond to the ayañ ca of the Pāli. The Tibetan prefixes yan dag par = sam, rab tu = pa.
2 The colophon — D 250a3, L 99a8, N 543a3, S 140b6 — gives the title as sKyes pa rabs kyi gleñ gzi (LNS: D [altered from gzi i?] reads gzi ri) bṣad pa; the final collective colophon in CDQ reads sKyes pa rabs kyi gleñ gzi i (CD: bzi i Q) bṣad pa.

The Tibetan does not contain the opening verses of the Pāli, which belong to the Jātaka Commentary as a whole rather than just the Jātaka-nidāna. The Tibetan opens with prose:

When the Lord was staying in Anāthapindika’s Pleasance in the Jeta Grove at Sāvatthi, the Great Elder (mahāthera) Atthadassi (gns brian chen po don mthon) went to the Lord, paid homage, circumambulated him, sat to one side, and addressed the Lord: “Sir, I would like to hear the teaching on the lineage of the Lord Buddhas (sans rgyas bcom ldan 'das kyi rgyud kyi chos).” [The Lord] replied, “Pay attention, Atthadassi, and I will speak”.

This introductory passage (nidāna), which accords the following text with the canonical status of a sutta, is not found in the Pāli, which is, of course, a commentary. The Pāli opens with verses in which the commentator explains his reasons for composing the work. In verse 7, he states that he was requested to do so by the Elder (thera) Atthadassi, along with (vv. 8, 9) Buddhmitta and Buddhadeva. Since Atthadassi is not one of the early elders mentioned in the suttas;1 since the Tibetan prose reflects in other ways the opening Pāli verses; and since the text is not a sutta, the prose introduction must be a later concoction or a mistranslation, based on but altering the sense of the Pāli verses.

After the prose introduction, the Tibetan corresponds to the Jātaka-nidāna text. As in Pāli, the career of the bodhisatta is divided into three phases (183b2). These are defined as in Pāli, and lend their structure to the text:

1 cf. DPPNI 55–56.
riṃ po’i gleṅ gzi = dūrenidāna  
bar pa’i gleṅ gzi = avidūrenidāna¹  
ñe ba’i gleṅ gzi = santikenidāna  
D 183b5 foll., Jātaka 2,12 foll.  
D 216a1 foll., Jātaka 47,20 foll.  
D 237a1 foll., Jātaka 77,3 foll.

The Tibetan ends, as does the Pāli, with the donation of the Jetavana, verses on the advantages of donating monasteries, and a description of how the past Buddhas also had monasteries on the same spot. The two versions show some differences on the size of the monasteries.

I have not been able to make a complete comparison of the two versions. Such comparison as I have made convinces me that they represent fundamentally the same text: the Tibetan follows the progression of the Pāli throughout, and the passages that I have checked, including many of the verses, agree word for word with the Pāli. This is only natural since the Jātakāniḍāna is a uniquely Theravādin text.

1.3. Āṭānāṭiya-sūtra / Ican lo can gyi pho braṅ gi mdo
Āṭānāṭiya Sūtra²  
D 33, 250a5–259b4 (19 folio pages)  
B (40).15, C 1016, H 34, J 28, L XXXVI(3), M 33, N 349,  
Q 749, S 291, T 288, U 337, Bu ston 380  
Āṭānāṭiya-sutta, D 32, Vol. III 194–206; Maha Pirit Pota 29

¹ Tibetan bar pa translates Sanskrit madhyama = Pāli majjhima. At 237a1, the phrase is rendered as gleṅ gzi bar ma; bar ma can translate antara as well as madhyama. If the translation is not a gloss, antara-nidāna seems more likely than majjhima-nidāna.
² Āṭānāṭiya, according to the Pāli commentary, derives from Āṭānāṭa, a city mentioned in the sutta (D III 200,24). The Tibetan interprets the title in the same way: lcan lo can = atakavati / alakavati Mvy 4137 (lcac lo, “curl, lock” to Sanskrit alaka) + pho braṅ “residence, town” (dhāni, Mvy 5510, pura Mvy 5511). But there are further complications, for which see Hoffmann (bibliographical information in text) pp. 22–24.

[A (probably) Mūlasarvāstivādin parallel, translated ca. 800 by Jinamitra, Prajñāvarman, and Ye šes sde, occurs twice in the Kanjur: Āṭānāṭiya-sūtra-nāma-mahāsūtra / mDo chen po kun tu rgyu ba daṅ kun tu rgyu ba ma yin pa daṅ mthun pa’i mdo, Q 333 (rgyud ba), Q 687 (rgyud ya). Extensive Sanskrit fragments of a (probably) Sarvāstivādin recension from Central Asia were published by Helmut Hoffmann, and compared with the Tibetan, Chinese and Pāli versions, in Bruchstücke des Āṭānāṭikasūtra aus dem Zentralasiatischen Sanskritikanon der Buddhisten (Kleinere Sanskrit-texte Heft V), Leipzig, 1939, reprinted Stuttgart, 1987, in Lore Sander (ed.), Nachträge zu “Kleinere Sanskrit-texte, Hefte III–V”, along with further Sanskrit fragments (pp. 193–207). Page references are to the reprint edition.]

Tibetan, Pāli: at Rājagaha, Gijjhākūṭa Mountain; the first part is spoken by Vessavaṇa to the Buddha, the second part by the Buddha to the monks in general.

Like the Pāli, the Tibetan is divided into two parts. The first part ends at D 254b7, lcan lo can gyi pho braṅ gi mdo las skabs rab mchog daṅ po, in Pāli at D III 206,4, paṭhama-bhānavāra; the second part at D 259b2, skabs rab mchog gnis, in Pāli dutiya-bhānavāra.¹ Skabs rab mchog, a compound otherwise unknown to me in Tibetan, must somehow correspond to the Pāli bhānavāra, “recitation”. Skabs translates a number of Sanskrit terms, such as avakāśa, sthāna, kāṇḍa, and pariccheda, and is probably a gloss. Both rab and mchog are used in Tibetan to translate vara; thus rab mchog may represent either a misreading (twice) of vāra as vara, or a correct translation of a manuscript that read (twice) vara for vāra.

In the Tibetan version, both parts are given in full, without abbreviation; the PTS version abbreviates the second part to six lines (D III 206,7–14), the Siamese edition to two and a half pages (219,5–221,11), while the Burmese Chaṭṭhasaṅgīti edition gives it in full. The correspondence is very close. The Tibetan and Pāli include sections not found in the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin versions: the verses of homage to the seven Buddhas (D 251a3 foll. = D III 195,27–196,17); the prose passage on the spirits (amanussa) who do not heed the Four Great Kings, with the simile of the daicots who do not heed the King of Magadha (253b3 foll. = D III 203,24–204,20); and the prose passage which describes the various ways in which the yakkhas take leave of the Buddha (254b4 foll. = D III 205,21–206,4). Conversely, the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin versions contain passages not found in the Theravādin version, Tibetan or Pāli: the opening verse of homage (Hoffmann 48–49), the verse lists of gandharvas (72–73), kumbhāṇḍas (78–79), nāgas (66–67), and so on.

1.4. Mahāsāmaya-sūtra / 'Dus pa chen po'i mdo
Sūtra of the Great Assembly
D 34, 259b4–263a4 (7 folio pages)
B (40) 16, C 1017, H 35, J 29, L XXXVI(4), M 34, N 350, Q 750, S 292, T 289, U 338, Bu ston 374
Mahāsāmaya-sutta, D 20, Vol. II 253–62; Maha Pirit Pota 23

[A (probably) Mūlasarvāstivādin parallel, translated ca. 800 by Jinamitra, Prajñāvarman, and Ye shes sde, occurs twice in the Kanjur: Mahāsāmājīsūtra-nāma-mahāsūtra / mDo chen po 'dus pa chen po'i mdo, Q 332 (rgyud ba), Q 687 (rgyud ya). Comparative studies of some of the lists of deities were undertaken by J. Przyluski and M. Lalou in their “Notes de mythologie bouddhique”: (1) “Yakṣa et gandharva dans le Mahāsamaya-sūttanta”, HJAS 3 (1938), pp. 40–46, and (3) “Les fils de Brahma”, HJAS 4 (1939), pp. 69–76. Extensive Sanskrit fragments of a

(probably) Sarvāstivādin recension from Central Asia were published by Ernst Waldschmidt, and compared with two Chinese versions, the Pāli, and the Tibetan, in Bruchstücke Buddhistischer Sūtras aus dem Zentralasiatischen Sanskritkanon (Kleinere Sanskrit-texte, Heft IV), Leipzig, 1932, pp. 149–206 (repr. Wiesbaden, 1979). A revised edition of the Sanskrit, based on further manuscript fragments, was published by the same author with English translation in his “Central Asian Sūtra Fragments and their Relation to the Chinese Āgamas”, in Bechert 1980, pp. 148–62. The latter was reprinted in Lore Sander (ed.), Nachträge zu “Kleinere Sanskrit-texte, Hefte III–V”, along with further Sanskrit fragments (pp. 159–79).

Tibetan, Pāli: spoken by the Buddha among the Sakkas at Kapilavatthu, Mahāvana, to the monks in general.

A romanized edition of the Tibetan Mahāsāmaya-sūtra has been published, side-by-side with the Pāli, by Y. Miyasaka, with introduction and comments in Japanese. The Tibetan and Pāli are very close. The Tibetan omits six lines of verse (Miyasaka, p. 117), and adds a single line of verse in a refrain: miñ ni gceg tu thos pa ste (Miyasaka 118,1, 12, 23, 34). The line is not found in the Pāli Mahāsāmaya-sutta, but occurs in the corresponding verse refrain in the Pāli Āṭānātiya-sutta2: ekanāmī ti me sutam.

1.5. Maitri-sūtra / Byams pa'i mdo
Sūtra on [the Next Buddha], Maitreya3

---

2 D III 197,10, etc.
3 The Sanskrit title in Tibetan transcription for both this and 1.14, maitrī, is not the proper name but the abstract noun for “friendliness”. The usual Sanskrit form of the name is Maitreya (cf. BHSD, p. 440 for variant forms). The Tibetan equivalent for both the name and abstract noun is byams pa. The Sanskrit title should properly be Maitreya-sūtra. In modern Newari, Maitreya is pronounced
Peter Skilling

D 35, 263a4–270a1 (13 1/2 folio pages)
B (40).17, C 1018, H 36, J 30, L XXXVI(5), M 35, N 351,
Q 751, S 293, T 290, U 339, Bu ston 375

*Metteyya-sutta

Tibetan, Pāli: spoken at Kapilavatthu, Nigrodhārāma, on the
bank of the Rohini River.¹

In this section I will also discuss 1.14, which bears the same
title prefixed by Ārya. This is a different translation of a similar but not
identical text.² The basis of the two Tibetan versions is a text
depending at least in part to the non-canonical Pāli Metteyya-sutta, a
prose text mixed with the verses of the Anāgatavamsa. In 1886, Prof. J.
Minayeff published an edition of the Anāgatavamsa, a verse text in 142
verses on the future Buddha, Metteyya.³ In 1919, a new edition was
published by E. Leumann.⁴ A Burmese manuscript utilized by Minayeff
and labelled by him manuscript B is in mixed prose and verse; according
to the colophon it is entitled Metteyyasutta Anāgatavamsa. Minayeff cites

Maitrī, whether it is written Maitreya or Maitri; since Ni ma rgyal mtshan spent
14 years in Nepal, the spelling in at least the present title may derive from
the Newari pronunciation. This does not explain the title of 1.14, unless the co-
translator Kun dga’ rgyal mtshan Thub bstan dpal bzaṅ po also had studied in
Nepal. Note that other Kanjur titles containing the name Maitreya, such as the
Maitreya-vyākaraṇa discussed above, use the standard form Maitreya.

¹ cf. DPPN II 762 for the location.
² The two texts are briefly discussed in Levi 1932, pp. 377–80; cf. also Nattier
³ JPTS II (1886), pp. 33–53.
⁴ E. Leumann, Maitreya-Samiti, das Zukunftsideal der Buddhismen, Strassburg,
1919, pp. 184–226. This work was not available to me for this study; the
reference is from Saya U Chit Tin, assisted by W. Pruitt, The Coming Buddha
Ariya Metteyya, Heddington near Calne, 1988, which reproduces Leumann’s text
(p. 33, note).

several portions and summarizes the sutta(690,76),(997,249), which I will refer to in the
following as Metteyya-sutta.

(A text [or texts?] of this title is referred to by Louis Finot,
“Recherches sur la littérature laotienne”, BÉEFO XVII/5, [1917], pp. 64–
65; in G. Coedès, Catalogue des manuscrits en pâli, laotien et siamois
provenant de la thaïlande, Copenhagen, 1966, p. 28; and in Charles F.
Keyes, “New Evidence on Northern Thai Frontier History”, in Tej
Bunnag and M. Smithies (edd.), In Memoriam Phya Anuman Rajadhon,
Bangkok, 1970, p. 247, item 24. As far as I know, the Metteyya-sutta is
known only in South-east Asia and not in Ceylon; it is therefore
interesting that it was taken to Tibet by a Sinhalese monk. The Metteyya-
sutta — along with the present text[s] — is related to the Metteyya
chapter [Ch. 1] of the Dasabodhisatta-uddesa, for which see François
Martini, “Dasa-bodhisatta-uddesa”, BÉEFO XXXVI, [1936], pp. 287–
413, and Supaphan 1990, pp. 190–204. Note that the Maitreya-
vyākaraṇa referred to above [p. 79 and note 5 thereto] is a different, non-
Theravādin [probably (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin] Maitreya text.)

For comparison, I will give the opening (nidāna) of the two
Tibetan versions and of the Pāli Metteyya-sutta.

1.5, Maitrī-sūtra (D 35, 263a5)
ston pa dus gcig na ser skya’i gzi daṅ / nga gro dha’i kun dga’
ra ba daṅ / chu kluṅ ro hi ni’i ‘gram na bţugs so // de nas tshe
daṅ idan pa sā ri’i bus ma ’oṅs pa’i rgyal ba de’i phyir bcom
Idan ’das la ḳuṣ pa /

At one time the Teacher (saṭṭhā) was staying at Kapilavatthu, at
the Nigrodha Pleasance (ārāma), on the banks of the Rohini
river. Then Venerable Sāriputta, for the sake of the Conqueror
(jīna) of the future, asked the Lord ….
The Maitrī-sūtra (D 263a5) then gives two verses, the first spoken by Sāriputta, the second by the Buddha, corresponding to Anāgatavamsa verses 2cd–5. Minayeff’s Metteyya-sutta gives a “history of the previous existences of Metteyya”, not found in the Tibetan versions. The latter (D 263b1 foll., Q 304b1 foll.) open with the five periods (bar gyi dus) of the decline of the Buddha’s teaching, parallel to the five “disappearances” (antarādhāna)\(^1\) of the Metteyya-sutta (Minayeff p. 34):

1) **bras bu’i bar gyi dus** *phala-antara-kāla* = adhigama-antarādhāna  
2) **bsgrub pa’i bar gyi dus** *paśipatti-antara-kāla* = paśipatti-antarādhāna  
3) **lun gi bar gyi dus** *āgama-antara-kāla* = pariṇāti-antarādhāna  
4) **riags tsam gyi bar gyi dus** *lingamatta-antara-kāla* = linga-antarādhāna  
5) **sku gdu’i bar gyi dus** *dhātu-antara-kāla* = dhātu-antarādhāna

These are then defined. Under (3), lun gi bar gyi dus, it is said that the Tipiṭaka will disappear, starting with the Abhidhamma. “When the Abhidhamma Piṭaka has disappeared, the Suttanta Piṭaka will disappear…” Then only the Jātaka (skYes rabs) along with the Vinaya (’Dul ba) will remain…First the Vessantara-jātaka (Thams cad sgrol gyi skyes pa’i rabs\(^2\)) will disappear; finally the Apanṇaka-jātaka (D Lo ma med pa, “without leaf” (panna); Q Pa ra ka: note the Sanskritic form) will disappear.” The seven books of the Theravādin Abhidhamma and the four of the Suttanta are listed, with several severe mistranslations and an unconventional order. These are given in Table 5.\(^3\)

---

\(^1\) While **bar gyi** = **antara, dus** (time, period) = kāla, samaya, etc., and is hard to reconcile with -dhāna. I have given *antara-kāla* as a tentative equivalent.

\(^2\) Thams cad sgrol = Viśvāntara, Mvy 32.

\(^3\) The list of the books of the **Abhidhamma** in the original was probably one long compound; both D and Q confuse the titles by merging them or breaking them up with the addition of dan = ca, “and”, given in parentheses in the table. In the table I have given for comparison the titles as translated by the 20th century scholar Gedun Chopel (for whom see below, § 3.1), which are correct.
(This description of the decline of the Buddha’s dispensation seems to be unique to the Theravādin. The closest parallels that I know of are those given by Daśabalaśrimitra, without naming his source, in his Samskrīta-samskrīta-viniścaya and by Bu ston from a Tikā on the Śatasahasrika Prājnāpāramitā, which speak of 500 years divided into ten somewhat similar periods.¹ Nattier [1991, p. 59] suggests that the “standard figure” of 5000 years accepted in Tibet for the duration of Śākyamuni’s dispensation is derived from the Maitrī-sūtra. This is incorrect: the source is the Śatasahasriks-ṭikā ['Bum tik], as seen from Bu ston’s citation and from other citations in Tibetan literature, which never refer to the Maitrī-sūtra with its unfamiliar list of Theravādin texts.² The listing of the five periods was very popular in late Theravādin literature, particularly in Siam, where it is given for example in the Paṭhamasambodhi, the Sārasaṅgaha, and the Saṅgītiyavamsa.³)

Minayeff (p. 31) then states, “Immediately after this there follows an account of the destruction of the Kappa”. This seems to agree with the Tibetan versions, which give here a description of the three antarakappa (bskal pa bar ma: D 264b7 foll., Q 306a5 foll.).

The stage now being set, the two Tibetan versions go on to describe the aon that ushers in Metteyya, the main theme of the work, as does the Pāli version. Both D and Q close with variations of the stock sutta ending: “When the Lord had spoken thus, the monks applauded the Lord’s teaching” (D 269b6); “Thus spoke the Lord; the entire assembly together with Venerable Sāriputta was uplifted, and applauded the Lord’s teaching” (Q 311b2).

Like the Metteyya-sutta, the two Tibetan versions are in prose and verse. Most of the verses that I have traced have counterparts in the Anāgatavamsa. Some examples from 1.5, the Maitrī-sūtra are:

265b7–267a2 = Anāgatavamsa vv. 15–42
267b5–7 = Anāgatavamsa vv. 100–102
268a1 = Anāgatavamsa v. 57
268a5–6 = Anāgatavamsa vv. 110–111
269b5 = Anāgatavamsa vv. 141cd, 142

1.6. Maitrībhāvanā-sūtra / Byams pa bsgom pa’i mdo
Sūtra on the Cultivation of Friendliness
D 36, 270a1–b7 (2 folio pages)
B (40).18, C 1019, H 37, J 31, L XXXVI(6), M 36, N 352,
Q 752, S 294, T 291, U 340, Bu ston 376
Translated by Feer, AMG V 221–23; translated by W. Rockhill,
Indian Antiquary 12, 1883.¹

The Tibetan combines two Pāli texts, both of them parittas, under one title and one nidāna. These will be discussed here as 1.6.A and 1.6.B.

1.6.A. D 270a2–7
Metta-sutta, A V 342,1–14; Maha Pirit Pota 11, Mettanisamsa-
sutta


² See e.g. Ruegg 1992, pp. 268, 284–89, and accompanying notes.
³ Cf. Supaphan 1990, pp. 165, 269. For further references, and for the theory of decline in general, see Nattier 1991.
Tibetan, Pāli: spoken by the Buddha at Sāvatthi, Jetavana, Anāthapiṇḍika's Pleasance, to the monks in general.

The *sutta* lists eleven benefits derived from the practice of friendliness (*metta*); these are the same and occur in the same order in Tibetan and Pāli.

1.6.B. D 270a7–b6
*Mūgapakkhataka, Jātaka 538, Ja VI 14,5*–25* (vv. 12–21)
*Mittānīsāmsa, Maha Pirit Pota 12

The Tibetan counterpart of the *Mittānīsāmsa* follows directly upon the preceding, as it does in the *Catubhānavāra*, where, however, it is a separate text. The Tibetan versions are linked by a statement made by the Buddha: “Furthermore, monks, I will expound the benefits of friendliness” (*byams pa’i phan yon = mittānīsāmsa*). The ten verses of the Tibetan correspond closely to the ten of the Pāli. The latter, however, deal with friendship (*mitta*). The Pāli verses end with the single-line refrain *yo mittānam na dūbhāti*, “he who does not deceive friends”; the corresponding refrain in Tibetan is *gāṅ gis byams pa ma spāṁs na’o*, “he who does not forsake friendliness”. “Forsake” (*spāṁs*) could correspond to Pāli *cajati*, *jahati*, *pajahati*, *vajjeti*, and so on.

The Tibetan (270b6) ends with the stock formula, “Thus spoke the Lord; the monks applauded his teaching”, not found in either the *Jātaka* or the *Maha Pirit Pota*.

---

1.7. *Pañcaśikṣānuśamsa-sūtra / bSlab pa lha’i phan yon gyi mdo*
*Sūtra on the Benefits of the Five Trainings*
D 37, 271a1–276a5 (10 folio pages +)
B (40).19, C 1020, H 38, J 32, L XXXVI(7), M 37, N 353, Q 753, S 295, T 292, U 341, Bu ston 377
*Pañcaśikkhā-ānisāmsa-sutta*
Translated by Feer, *AMG* V 230–43.
This text consists of two parts, labelled here 1.7.A and 1.7.B.

1.7.A. D 271a1–b3
*Samajīvin, A II 61,15–62,11*

The Tibetan opens with *’di skad bdag gis thos pa dus gcig na / bcom ldan’ das garga ra daṅ / chu srin byis pa gsod kyi ri daṅ / sman gyi nags ri dags rgyu ba’i gnas na bzung so*. In order to understand this, we must first compare the Pāli: *ekam samayaṁ bhagavā bhaggesu viharati suṁsūmāragire bhesakalāvane migadāye*: “At one time the Lord was staying among the Bhaggas, at Mt. Suṁsūmāra, in the Bhesakalā Grove, in the Deer Park”. The Tibetan terms correspond to the Pāli as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pāli</th>
<th>(transliteration)</th>
<th>Tibetan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gargara</td>
<td>(transliteration)</td>
<td>bhagga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chu srin byis</td>
<td>suṁsūmāragaragiri</td>
<td>suṁsūmāragari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pa gsod kyi</td>
<td>bhesajva-vana</td>
<td>bhesakalavana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ri sman gyi</td>
<td>suṁsūmāragaragiri</td>
<td>suṁsūmāragari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nags</td>
<td>bhesakalāvane</td>
<td>migadāva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ri dags rgyu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ba’i gnas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 The colophons to D (276a4), L (132a1), N (584b3), and S (143a3) and the final collective colophon to CDQ give the title as *Tshul khrims lha’i phan yon bstan pa’i mdo = *Pañcaśikṣānuśamsa-sūtra*. See also Beckh p. 12, note 1. This might be the correct title.
2 The title is from the *uddāṇa*, A II 65,23, dve ... samajīvino.
3 For these toponyms, see *DPPN* II 1172–73.
There is a fair correspondence for all but the first, the transcription gargara equivalent to the Pāli bhagga. The text itself corresponds to the Pāli closely, giving a prose introduction followed by verses:

D 271a1–b1 (prose) = A II 61,15–62,5 (prose)
D 271b1–3 (verse) = A II 62,6*–11* (verse)

In the prose of both versions, the Buddha, donning his outer robe (chos gos = cīvara) and carrying his alms-bowl (lhaṅ bzed = patta) goes in the morning to the home of the householder “Father Nakula” (Pha na ku la'i khyim bdag = Nakulapitā gahapati). There he is addressed first by Nakulapitā, and then by the latter’s wife, “Mother Nakula” (Ma na ku la'i khyim bdag mo = Nakulamātā gahapatāni). The gist of their statements is the same in the two versions (there are clearly problems with the Tibetan translation): they have been faithful ever since they were brought together, and they wish to see each other in future lives just as they do at present. The Tibetan then gives the phrase, de nas bcom ldan ’das kyi s ba’ stsal pa, “Then the Lord spoke”, not found in the Pāli. The Buddha’s reply (271a7) is that such is possible, if a couple is “equal in faith, equal in virtue, equal in giving, and equal in wisdom”. Here the terms correspond directly:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{dad pa mñam pa} & \quad = \text{samasaddhā} \\
\text{tskul khrims mñam pa} & \quad = \text{samasīla} \\
\text{gtoṅ ba mñam pa} & \quad = \text{samacāga} \\
\text{šes rab mñam pa} & \quad = \text{samapaññā}
\end{align*}
\]

1 For this couple, renowned for their mutual devotion, see DPPN II 3–4. Nakula(-pirit) figures in the Chinese Ekottarāgama: see BSR 7/1–2 (1990), pp. 86–89 (parallel to S III 1–5).

The Buddha then addresses the couple in verse. Here the Tibetan (271b1) introduces the verse with the phrase, yan tshigs su bcad pa ’di bka’ stsal te, “then [the Buddha] uttered these verses”, not found in the Pāli. The verses are similar.

1.7.B. D 271b3–276a5
No Pāli parallel traced.

The Pāli sutta ends with the verses. The Tibetan continues, with the Buddha speaking in prose:

“Therefore, you should guard the five types of training (bslab pa = sikkhā):
1) refraining from killing living beings;
2) refraining from theft;
3) refraining from sexual misconduct;
4) refraining from false speech;
5) refraining from drinking intoxicating beverages.”

These are of course the five precepts, which give their title to the Tibetan version. The monks, who have not been previously mentioned, ask the Buddha about the benefits (phan yon = anisamsa) of the five virtues (tskul khrims = sīla) (271b4). The Buddha addresses the monks (271b6): “The killing of living beings should be regarded as like a poisonous snake: bound up with many sufferings, leading to rebirth among petas, animals, and hell-beings”. He then describes the sufferings of the Sañjiva Hell (yan sros). If the person is reborn as a human being, he will be short-lived, unattractive, and unintelligent. The section contains a verse of four lines on the faults (šes pa = dosa) of killing (272a4), and verses on the twenty benefits (yon tan = guṇa) of refraining from killing (272a4–7).

1 cf. DPPN II 1001.
The second section (272b1 foll.), on theft, describes rebirth in the Roruva Hell (ṇu 'bod), which is of two types: Jālaroruva ('bar ba'i ṇu 'bod) and Dhūmaroruva (du ba'i ṇu 'bod).\(^1\) If the person is reborn as a human, as a result of his previous theft he will lose his possessions, and have difficulty in obtaining the necessities of existence. “Thief is like a poisonous serpent . . . .” The section contains a verse of four lines on the faults of theft (272b7), and verses on the twenty benefits of refraining from theft (273a1–4).

The third section (273a4 foll.) deals with sexual misconduct, which leads to rebirth in the Mahārova Hell (ṇu 'bod chen po),\(^2\) of which the torments are described in prose and verse (273b2). “Sexual misconduct, monks, is like a poisonous serpent . . . .” The section contains a verse of four lines on the faults of sexual misconduct (273b4), and verses on the twenty benefits of refraining from sexual misconduct (273b7–274a3).

The fourth section (274b1 foll.) deals with lying, which leads to the Kālasutta Hell (thig nag),\(^3\) of which the torments are described. “Lying, monks, is like a poisonous serpent . . . .” The results if the sinner is reborn as a human are described (274b4). A verse of four lines describes the faults of lying (274b6), while thirty-three benefits of refraining from lying are given in verse (274b6–275a2).

The fifth and last section (275a6 foll.) deals with intoxication, which leads to the Tapana Hell (isha ba'i dmyal ba).\(^4\) The results if the person is reborn as a human are described (275b3). The section contains a four-line verse on the faults of drink (275b4), and verses on the thirty-six benefits of refraining from drink (275b5–276a1).

In conclusion (276a2), the Buddha states, “These five virtues (tshul khrims = sila) should be guarded: a man or a woman who does not guard or develop virtue will, at the breaking up of the body, after death, be reborn in the evil destinies, the evil realms, the downfall; those who guard and cultivate virtue will, at the breaking up of the body, after death, be reborn in the happy realms, the heavens, the worlds of the gods”. The sutta closes with the stock ending, “Thus spoke the Lord; the monks applauded the Lord’s teaching”. No mention is made of the devoted Nakulas.

The second part of the sutta, which gives the text its title, has no counterpart in the Pāli canon. The five sections on the five transgressions and their opposites have a similar structure: description of the allotted hell; description of the results if the sinner is reborn as a human; comparison of the transgression to a poisonous snake; a verse of four lines on the faults of the transgression; and verses on the many benefits of its opposite. The style of both prose and verse is late, and may be compared with that of cosmological texts such as the Lokapaññatti.

1.8. Giri-ānanda-sūtra / Ri'i kun dga' bo'i mdo\(^1\)
Sūtra for Giri Ānanda
D 38, 276a5–279a2 (5 folio pages +)
B (40).20, C 1021, H 39, J 33, L XXXVI(8), M 38, N 354, Q 754, S 296, T 293, U 342, Bu ston 369

\(^1\) The title given in the colophons at D 279a1, L 135b4, N 588b6, and S 147a6, and in the final collective colophon in CDQ is Tshe dan ldan pa (DQ: pa' i C) ri'i kun dga' bo'i mdo = Pāli *Āyasmā-giri-ānanda-sutta.*
Giri, A V 108,18–112,18, Girimānanda-sutta, Maha Pirit Pota 20
Translated by Feer, *AMG* V 145–50.

Tibetan, Pāli: spoken by the Buddha at Śāvatthī in the Jetavana, Anāthapiṇḍika’s Pleasance, to Ānanda.

The Tibetan lists and then deals in detail with the same ten notions (‘du šes bcu, dasa saňñā) as does the Pāli. The sixth notion, ‘dod chags daň bral ba’i ‘du šes = virāgasaññā, is incomplete in the Derge, London, Narthang, Peking, and Stog versions, and merges with the seventh, ‘gog pa’i ‘du šes = nirodhasaññā.² At D 276b1, the Tibetan adds de nas bcom Idan ‘das kyis ishe daň Idan pa kun dga’ bo la bka’ stsal pa = “Then the Lord said to venerable Ānanda”, not found in the Pāli. In the description of “notion of the unpleasant” (mi gtsan ba’i ‘du šes = asubhasaññā), reference is made to “the thirty-two impure items” (277a3, mi gtsan ba’i rdzas sum cu rtsa gñis = *dvattimṣa-asubha- vatthu*); this is not found in the Pāli.

1.9. Nandopandanāgarājadamana-sūtra / Klui’i rgyal po dga’ bo ṅer dga’ ‘dul ba’i mdo³

Sūtra on the Vanquishing of the Serpent King Nandopananda
D 39, 279a2–281b1 (5 folio pages)
B (40).21, C 1022, H 40, J 34, L XXXVI(15), M 39, N 355, Q 755, S 303, T 300, U 349, Bu ston 370

---

¹ The A title is from the udāna, 112,22.
² D 277b4–5; L 134a1–3; N 586b7–587a2; Q 294b1–3; S 145b1–3. Since the lacuna occurs in representatives of both Them spañ ma (LNS) and Tshal pa (DQ), it almost certainly occurs in other known editions.
³ The final collective colophon in CDQ reads ... dga’ bo dan ṅer (DQ: Ŧe C) dga’ ... ; LNS read as above (but ṅer LN, Ŧe S).

---
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*Nandopandanāgarājadamana-sutta, Visuddhimagga XII § 106–16; Theragāthā Atţhakathā (PTS edition) III 177,4–179,20

Translated by Feer, *AMG* V 414–19.

Occurs at Śāvatthī, Jetavana, Anāthapiṇḍika’s Pleasance.

The account of Mahāmoggallāna’s taming (damana) of the powerful Nāga Nandopandana by means of a dramatic magical contest is not found in the Theravādin Tipiţaka. It is related in almost identical terms in the *Visuddhimagga* and in the *Theragāthā Atţhakathā*; in both cases it is given as a citation, without naming the exact source, although the event is described in both texts as *Nandopanandadamana*.¹ A Sinhalese version, also very similar, is found in the fourteenth chapter of the *Amāvatura*, a life of the Buddha composed by Guruñugomī at about the end of the 12th century.² There is also a Chinese parallel, styled stūtra (ching) in the title, in an early (pre-Buddhaghosa) translation: the *Lung wang hsiung ti ching*, translated between 223 and 253 A.C.³
The Tibetan is described as a sūtra in the title, and indeed opens with the traditional formula, “Thus I once heard: the Lord was staying at Sāvatthī”, and closes with the traditional formula, “Thus spoke the Lord; those monks applauded the Lord’s teaching”. The latter, however, is hardly apt, since the text contains no sermon as such, and since the last words are spoken by Anāthapiṇḍika, who offers to provide the Buddha and the monks with food for seven days. Otherwise, the Tibetan, which in this case is quite clearly rendered and relatively free of error, corresponds almost exactly to the Visuddhimagga and Theragāthā Ātiṭṭhakathā accounts.

Reference is made to the vanquishing of Nandopananda in the Jayamaṅgalagāthā, a popular non-canonical paritta that invokes protection through eight victories. The Tikābāhum, a commentary on the verses, therefore includes the account of the vanquishing of the Nāga king.1 I have not come across any references to the Nandopanandadamana as an independent sūta in the various catalogues of Pāli manuscripts that I have consulted.2 The tale is popular in Burma, where it is represented pictorially by Nandopananda and Mahāmoggallāna in the form of nāgas coiled around Mt. Sumeru.

2 Supaphan (1990) describes the text as sutta, a Thai translation by Nāgapradīpa, Tikā-jaayamangala-ātiṭṭhaka-desanā (Bāhum), Bangkok, 2470 [1927], repr. 2520 [1977], pp. 160–81, as -sūtra. Godakumbura, op. cit., p. 43, refers to Nandopanandanāgarājasutta in his list of contents of the Tikā-bāhūni, but transcribes the title as Nandopanandanāggarāja (sic) only on p. 45.

10. Mahākāśyapa-sūtra / 'Od srūn chen po'i mdo
Sūtra on Mahākāśyapa
D 40, 281b1–282a6 (–2 folios)
B (40).22, C 1023, H 41, J 35, L XXXVI(16), M 40, N 356, Q 756, S 394, T 301, U 350, Bu ston 371
S V 79,18–80,18, Gilāna;2 Maha Pirit Pota 17, Mahākassapatherabojjhangam
Translated by Feer, AMG V 150–52.

Tibetan, Pāli: spoken at Rājagaha, Veḻuvana, Kandalakaniṇīpa.

The Tibetan gives the text in full, without abbreviation; the Pāli of the PTS and Maha Pirit Pota editions is abbreviated. The two versions are very close. The Tibetan (281b4) adds one phrase not found in Pāli (cf. S V 80,1): de nas tshe dan ldan pa 'od srūn chen pos gsal pa, “Venerable Mahākassapa then said”.

11. Sūrya-sūtra / Ňi ma'i mdo
Sūtra on the Sun
D 41, 282a6–b6 (1 folio page)
B (40).23, C 1024, H 42, J 36, L XXXVI(17), M 41, N 357, Q 757, S 305, T 302, U 351, Bu ston 372
S I 51, 1–24, Suriya-sutta; Maha Pirit Pota 15, Suriyaparitta

Tibetan, Pāli: spoken at Sāvatthī in the Jetavana, Anāthapiṇḍika’s Pleasance.

The Tibetan and the Maha Pirit Pota give the Sāvatthī nidāna in full; in the Saṁyutta Nikāya (PTS) there is no nidāna. Where the Pāli, in

1 The colophons to DLNS and the final collective colophon in CDQ give the title as gNas brtan 'od srūn chen po'i mdo = Pāli *Mahākassapathera-sutta.
2 The title is from the uddāna, p. 83,4, gilāna apare tayo.
both this and the following sutta, has bhagavantam anussaramāṇo only, the Tibetan of this and the following text (Ni ma 282b1; Zla ba 283a1) have bcom ldan 'das rjes su dran pa yid la byas te, which seems to translate bhagavantam anussaramāṇo manasikaronto. The Tibetan introduces the last verse with des smras pa, “he [Rāhu] said”. An equivalent phrase is not found in Pāli. Otherwise the prose and verse of the two versions is similar.

1.12. Candra-sūtra / Zla ba'i mdo
Sūtra on the Moon
D 42, 282b6–283a5 (1 folio page)
B (40),24, C 1025, H 43, J 37, L XXXVII(18), M 42, N 358,
Q 758, S 306, T 303, U 352, Bu ston deest
S 1 50,15–35, Candima-sutta; Maha Pirit Pota 14, Candaparitita
Translated by Feer, AMG V 410–13, conjointly with the Pāli, side-by-side with a translation of the (Mūla)-Sarvāstivādin version.


The Tibetan and the Maha Pirit Pota give the Sāvatthī nidāna in full; the Samyutta Nikāya (PTS) abbreviates it as Sāvatthiyām viharatī. The Tibetan (283a5) introduces the last verse with sgra can 'dzin gysics

smras pa, *rāhu āha. An equivalent phrase is not found in the Pāli. Otherwise the Tibetan and Pāli are similar.

In Pāli, the Suriya- and Candima-suttas are identical, but for the substitution of su tiya / candima where appropriate and the addition of one extra verse in the Suriya-sutta; similarly, in Tibetan the Sūrya- and Candra-sūtras are identical, but for the substitution of ni ma = su tiya / zla ba = canda, and the addition of the extra verse. Chizan Akanuma, The Comparative Catalogue of Chinese Āgamas & Pāli Nikāyas (Nagoya, 1929, p. 178), lists Chinese parallels for the Pāli Candima-sutta but not for the Suriya-sutta. Thus while the former is well represented in the versions of at least two schools (the Theravādins and the [Mūla]-Sarvāstivādins), the latter is not, and may be unique to the Theravādins.

1.13. Mahāmaṅgala-sūtra / bkra šis chen po'i mdo
Sūtra on the Great Blessing
D 43, 283a5–284a1 (1 folio page +)
B (40),25, C 1026, H 44, J 38, L XXXVI(19), M 43, M 360,¹
N 359, Q 759, S 307, T 304, U 353, Bu ston 373
Khuddakapāṭha V, pp. 2,25–3,26, Maṅgala-sutta; Sn
pp. 46,10–47,22, Mahāmaṅgala-sutta; Maha Pirit Pota 7,
Mahāmaṅgala-sutta
Translated by Feer, AMG V 224–27.

[The Kanjur contains an anonymous translation of a recension of another, unknown school: Lhas ūs pa'i bkra šis kyi tshigs su bcad pa / Devaparipṛcfchā Maṅgalagāthā, Q 442 (rgyud tsha), Q 721 (rgyud ya),

¹ In the Urga edition only, the text (as M 360) closes the Sūtra Division of the Kanjur (cf. Bethlenfalvy 1980, Introduction, p. 12). The colophon is the same as for M 31–43, with the addition of bu ston phab pa'o, “edited by Bu ston”. This remark is not found in any of the other editions.
Q 1053 (’dul ba phe). This was translated by Feer side-by-side with the present text, under the rubric “Version du Nord”.

Tibetan, Pāli: located at Sāvatthi, Jetavana, Anāthapiṇḍika’s Pleasance.

The prose opening is the same, except that for the Pāli aññatara devatā, “a certain deity”, singular, the Tibetan has lha du ma rnam s, “many deities”, plural. Both versions open with a verse question spoken by the god(s), asking about blessings (māṇgala). Before the first verse of the Buddha’s reply (Suttanīpāta 259), the Tibetan gives an extra verse (283b1), not found in the Pāli:

lha'i yan lha yis bka' stsal pa ||
sdig pa thams cad rnam par ’joms ||
’jig rten kun la phan pa'i don ||
bkra šis de rnam khyed la bṣad ||

The god of gods (devatideva) [the Buddha] replied:
“l will teach you those blessings (māṇgala)
which overcome all evil (sabbapāpa)
and bring benefit (hitā) to all the world (loka)”.

Otherwise the eleven verses spoken by the Buddha are the same and occur in the same order, with, as usual, many problems of translation. The Tibetan (283b7) ends with, “Thus spoke the Lord; those gods applauded the Lord’s teaching”. The ending is not given in the Pāli. The other Tibetan version, the Devapariprcchā Maṅgalagāthā, is a recension of another school, and hence differs in order and number of verses.

1.14. Ārya-maitri-sūtra-nāma / ’Phags pa byams pa'i mdo žes bya ba
Sūtra on Holy Maitreya (or) Holy Sūtra on Maitreya
Q 1010, mdo, hu 304a5–311b3 (15 folio pages, excluding colophon)

The Ārya-maitri-sūtra was translated by Ānandaśrī and Kun dga’ rgyal mtshan Thub bstan dpal bzaṅ po at Sa skya in the year 1307 (see above). As far as I have been able to determine, it is available in only four of the Kanjurs used for this study:¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lhasa</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narthang</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peking</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The text is not listed in Bu ston’s catalogue. As seen above, it is closely related to 1.5, and has at least a partial parallel in the Pāli Metteyya-sutta. The first modern note of the sūtra was made by Csoma de Körös in his “Analysis of the Mdo”, published in Asiatick Researches (Calcutta, 1836–39) in the form of a generally accurate summary. The text was referred to by Sylvain Lévi along with 1.5.² There is also a Mongolian translation.³

Numbers 1.1. to 1.14: General remarks

Nos. 1.1–13 all open with ’phags pa dkon mchod gsum la gus pas phyag ’tsal lo, 1.14 with dkon mchod gsum la gus par phyag ’tsal lo, “I respectfully pay homage to the (Holy) Three Gems (ariya-

³ Ligeti § 1105 = Vol. 90 = mdo (elde) XXXI, no. 4.
They seem to be the only texts in the Kanjur to do so, the usual formula of homage for sūtras being dkon mchog gsum la phyag 'tshal lo = namo ratnārāja. Numbers 1.1–1.7 in the Derge edition and numbers 1.2–7 and 1.9–13 in the London, Narthang, and Stog Palace editions end with a short pranidhāna, not found at all in the Peking edition, sa'i steṅ du ṅi (ma dañ) zla (ba) ltar gyur cig, “May the surface of the earth be like the sun and moon”, also not met with elsewhere in the Kanjur.

I hope in the foregoing to have established that all fourteen texts belong to the Theravādin school. For those texts which have no known counterpart in the canons of other schools, I have tried to show the similarity between the Tibetan and Pāli versions. For those texts that have such a counterpart, I have mentioned the differences between the versions by way of contrast.

Nine out of the 13 texts (nos. 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13) are included in paritta collections such as the Maha Pirit Pota. Since number 6 comprises two parittas, ten Pāli parittas are in fact represented. (Feer was presumably the first to recognize their relationship to paritta, which is also noted in the Otani catalogue, p. 94, note) Three texts — the Jātakanyādāna and the two versions of the *Metteyyasutta — deal extensively with the past lives and final life of the Buddha of the present age, Sakyaṃuni, and with the future Buddha, Metteyya, respectively; together they constitute a complete Theravādin Buddhism. It is unlikely that either of these, or the Pañcaśikṣānusāmsa-sūtra, were classed as paritta; the first part of the latter, the Samajīvin (1.7.A) is not classed as such by the Theravādins. The Jātakanyādāna is precluded by its length, while the other two do not have the characteristics of paritta (note, however, that the “Buddhadāna-sutta” was chanted to bring rain in the Shan state of Jengtung in the 14th and 15th centuries1). They may have been selected for translation on the basis of popularity, since the life of the Buddha was perennially popular, and the Metteyya cult and cosmological (the latter and main part of the Pañcaśikṣānusāmsa) texts were popular at the time in question. The Nandopanandadamanas, though composed in rather unwieldy prose, might have had paritta status, since Mahāmoggallāna’s taming of the Nāga King is one of the “eight victories” of the Jayamangalagāthā.

Only two of the fourteen texts are popular among Tibetans today. These are the Sūrya-sūtra (1.11) and the Candra-sūtra (1.12), which are included in popular collections of mantras and rakṣas such as the mDo maṅ.3 Here the Theravādin version of the Candra-sūtra is chosen over the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin version, also found in Tibetan translation. The same two are popular in Theravādin countries, being included in the Maha Pirit Pota (nos. 15 and 14) of Ceylon and in the Catubhānavāra collections.4

A considerable portion of one text, the Pañcaśikṣānusāmsa, has not been traced in Pāli; all the others are available in Pāli (assuming that the *Metteyya-sutta [1.5, 1.14] does correspond to a Pāli text of the same name).

---

2 Maha Pirit Pota, p. xlii, verse 7.
3 Marcelle Lalou, Catalogue du fonds tibétain de la Bibliothèque Nationale, quatrième partie, I.—Les Mdo Maṅ, Paris, 1931, nos. 117, 118 (pp. 46–47); R.O. Meisezah, “Über Zwei Mdo Maṅ Redaktionen und Ihre Editionen in Tibet und China”, Zentralasiatische Studien 2, Wiesbaden, 1968, p. 36 (LXIV.tu 111, 112); p. 96 (LXIV.tu 139, 140); p. 107 (LXIV.tu 138, 139); p. 121 (LXIV.tu 110, 111); Concordance, 7a, nos. 176, 177.
4 For the latter, see Skilling 1992, pp. 118–20.
Under the individual sūtras I have noted a few discrepancies between the Tibetan and Pāli versions. Some, such as the supplying of a complete opening (nidāna) in the Tibetan against an abbreviated or omitted opening in the Pāli sutta versions are only to be expected: in the sutta versions the opening occurs earlier on in the collection; as independent texts, the Tibetan versions give the complete nidānas, as do the Pāli paritta versions. Other discrepancies such as the introduction of a phrase “so and so said” are relatively minor redactional variants.

All of the fourteen texts show many problems of translation, some of which have been mentioned above. A few further examples:

1.1. (D 183a2) bag yod par gyun, *appamādo, “heedful” = S V 424,5 appamāno, “limitless”;

1.3. (D 250b1) sīṇḥ po daṅ sīṇḥ po med pa’i gtim, *katham sārāśāniyam (?) = D III 194,14 katham sārāṇiyan;

1.3. (D 253a3, etc.) draṅ sroṅ chen po, Skt. mahārṣi, Pāli mahesi = D III 203,1, etc. mārṣa, “sir”;

1.8. (D 277b2) mi bsgom par ’gro ba, *anabhāvanam gacchati, “is not cultivated” = A V 110,16 anabhāvan gameti, “disappears”;

1.8. (D 277a1 etc.) dge sloop kun dga’ bo ‘di ni “Bhikkhu Ánanda, this…” = A V 109,19, etc. idh’ ānanda bhikkhu, “Here, Ánanda, a monk …”;

1.11. (D 282b1), 1.12,(D 283a1): thams cad myur du grol bar gvis = S I 50,20–51,5 vippanmutto si sabbadhi; since myur du corresponds to Sanskrit kṣipra, Pāli khippa, the Tibetan seems to translate *khippamutto.

Many more examples could be cited. At a few places, transliterated letters suggest Sanskrit forms:

1.3. (D 252b2) lcan lo can daṅ ku sa’i groṅ || pha rol ku sa’i groṅ daṅ ni || nāṭa’i groṅ daṅ pha rol gvyi || ku ši ta’i groṅ yin no || = D III 200,24, āṭāṇāṭa, kusināṭa, parakusināṭa, nāṭapuriyā, parakusatanāṭa.

1.8. (D 277a6) bitsartsika, (Q 294a4) bi tsar rtsi ka = Sanskrit vicarcika; A V 110,6 vitacchikā.

Mistranslations can arise from a correct translation of a faulty Indic original, or a wrong translation of a correct Indic original. In the present case, let us suppose that the manuscripts were in Pāli in Sinhalese script, and that Ánandaśrī did not know Tibetan nor Ni ma rgyal mtshan Pāli or the Sinhalese script. Since the latter had spent fourteen years in Nepal, and since the former is said to have resided in Bodh Gayā (and at any rate would have travelled through Northern India and perhaps Nepal to reach Tibet), they may well have communicated in a mixture of Sanskrit and the North Indian lingua franca of the day. This could have given rise to both the mistranslations and the Sanskrit forms. A thorough analysis of the Tibetan versions in comparison with the Pāli might reveal whether the mistranslations arose from a Sanskrit or a Pāli text, or even whether the original was in the Sinhalese script, if it can be shown that the mistranslation was caused by a misreading of that script.

1.15. Vimuttimagga, Chapter 3: Dhutagunanirdeśa

Vimuttimagga-dhutagunanirdeśa-nāma i rNam par grol ba’i lam las sbyaṅs ba’i yon tan bstan pa’i ʿes bya ba

A. Included in the Kanjur
A.1. Following the arrangement of the Tshal pa Kanjur:

Berlin (80).6 Vol. 80 mdo sa (28), no. 6
Cone 945 Vol. 52 mdo sa (28), no. 6
Derge 306 Vol. 72 mdo sa (28), no. 6
Lhasa 309 Vol. 72 mdo la (26), no. 6
A.2. Following the arrangement of the Them spangs ma Kanjur:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Vol.</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>mdo ra (25), no. 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stog</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>mdo ra (25), no. 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>mdo ra (25), no. 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulan Bator</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>mdo ra (25), no. 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JB</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>mdo ra (25), no. 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>mdo ra (25), no. 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.3. Phug brag Kanjur:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Vol.</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phug brag</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>mdo sa (29), no. 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phug brag</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>mdo khu (36), no. 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.4. Newark Kanjur:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>mdo ra (25), no. 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.5. According to Bu ston’s *History of Buddhism*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bu ston</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. Sa is Vol. 29 because two volumes are labelled ra. Although the text is sa no. 6 in most of the Tshal pa Kanjurs as well, this is a coincidence: apart from the first text (the Abhinirskramana-sūtra), the contents of volumes sa in the Tshal pa and Phug brag Kanjurs are otherwise different.

2. The last text in the volume: information from the table of contents at the end of Vol. ra, which should be Vol. 25 of the Sūtra section, if there were no irregularities in numbering of volumes.


5. Genjun H. Sasaki, *Vimuttimarga Dhutanganirdesa*, Kyoto, 1958, based on HNQ, and several other editions not clear to me.
This text, a chapter of the *Vimuttimagga* dealing with the 13 purifying practices (*dhutagaṇa* or *dhutāṅga*), was translated into Tibetan by the Indian preceptor (*upadhyāya*) Vidyākaraprabha and the Tibetan translator dPal brtsegs, well-known scholars active around 800 A.C. The colophon states:

```
rnam par grol ba'i lam las sbyaṅs pa'i yon tan bstan pa žes bya ba ste kun nas btus pa gsum pa rdzogs so ||
```

“The Exposition of Purifying Virtues” (*Dhutagunanirdeśa*) from the *Path of Liberation* (*Vimuktimārga*), Chapter 3, is completed.

Here (as in the translation of the title) the compound Sanskrit title *Vimuktimārga-dhutagunanirdeśa*, which shows no case endings, has been rendered as “Exposition of Purifying Virtues from (las) the

---


2 For these see *BHSD* 285b, *dhuta, dhutagaṇa, dhutadhārma; PTSD* 342a, *dhuta; EB* IV/4 580–85 (“*Dhutāṅga*”).

3 S 244, Skorupski, p. 139; Q 972, *mdo, śu*, 149a2; Newark, *mdo, ra*, 249b6. The Newark *Kanjur* lacks the translators’ colophon. A cursory examination of the last folio (ra 249b) suggests that it is the same translation.

4 *Kun nas btus pa*, which I have taken here in the sense of chapter, is equivalent to the Sanskrit *samuccaya*. Since the *Vimuttimagga* is not available in the original, whether Pāli or Sanskrit, I cannot say whether this term was used in the original text.

---
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*Path of Liberation*. This shows that the translators knew they were dealing with an excerpt from a work entitled *Vimuktimārga* and not an independent text. Otherwise they would probably have rendered the title as “Exposition of Purifying Virtues of” (*gyi*) or perhaps “in” or “in relation to (la)” the *Path of Liberation*, taking the last as a common noun. The chapter in question is indeed the third of the Chinese translation of the *Vimuttimagga*.

Since the text is in fact a treatise (*śāstra*) and not the word of the Buddha (*Buddhavacana*), its proper place is the *Tanjur* rather than the *Kanjur*. Bu ston (§ 40) classifies the text in Section II (*Hinayāna*) of the Word of the Buddha (*bka’*); he notes that “in the great catalogues this is classified as a sūtra, but some hold that it is a *śāstra* (*‘di dkar chag chen mo dag tu mdo byas la kha cig bstan bcos su ’dod*). A similar statement is made in the catalogues of the Derge and Urga *Kanjurs*. Bu ston (§ 98) also lists a [*Dhutagunanirdeśa-sūtra* (*sByaṅs pa’i yon tan bṣad pa’i mdo*) in Word of the Buddha, Section III, “Texts unavailable at present but definitely translated in the early period” (*snar ’gyur nes pa da lia ma rṇed pa*). Under *śāstra* (§ 793) he refers to a [*Dhutaguna-anuṣamsa* (*sByaṅs pa’i yon tan gyi phan yon*) in 100 ślokas composed by Ācārya Nāgārjuna (*Slob don Klu sgrub*) which “should be sought” (*btsal bar bya’o*). I doubt whether the last-named is related to our text.

Why the text was selected for translation is not clear. Since the Indian translator, Vidyākaraprabha, worked on Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya texts such as the *Vinayavastu, Kṣudrakavastu,* and *Bhikṣuni-

---

1 Some of the Tibetan transcriptions of the Sanskrit title read *-mārge*.
4 The Lithang and Lhasa *Catalogues* and the Urga colophon in fact add *mdo = sūtra* to the title.
Vinayavibhanga, it is unlikely that he was a Sthavira. Perhaps such an exposition of the 13 dhutanga was lacking in the Mulasarvastivadin or other traditions, causing the Vimuttimagga chapter to be adopted by other schools.

2. Theravadin texts and tenets in the Tanjur

The Theravadin literature in the Tanjur occurs in the form of citations within larger works; with the exception of the duplicated Vimuttimagga, no independent Theravadin texts are found.

2.1. Vimuttimagga in the Sanskrit-Sanskrita-viniścaya

The most extensive and significant Tanjur source for Theravadin tenets is the Sanskrit-Sanskrita-viniścaya of Daśabalaśrimitra, lost in the original Sanskrit and preserved in Tibetan translation only.1 In an earlier article I have attempted to show that the author most probably lived in North-eastern India in the 12th or 13th century A.C., and have pointed out that the text is accurately and clearly translated, and that the author's sources, when traceable, are accurately cited.2

Daśabalaśrimitra devotes three full chapters, numbers 13 to 15, to the tenets of the Theravādins; although in each case he names his source as "the tradition (Āgama) of the Ārya Sthavira school (Sthaviranikāya)",3 in all three cases the chapters are direct citations from the Vimuttimagga. Two other passages from the same work are also cited by Daśabalaśrimitra. The concordance of the citations and the Chinese Vimuttimagga (in English translation) is as follows:

1) Daśabalaśrimitra, ch. 13, gNas brtan pa'i sde pa'i tshul lugs phun po skye mched khams rnam par nes pa, 90b3–98b7, *Sthaviranikāya-naya-skandhāyatanañcādu-viniścaya:
   "An analysis of the aggregates, bases, and elements according to the Sthavira school", equivalent to Vimuttimagga, ch. 11, section 1, pp. 237–59;

2) Daśabalaśrimitra, ch. 14, gNas brtan pa'i sde pa'i tshul gyi rten ci 'brel bar 'byun ba rnam par nes pa, 98b7–106a4, *Sthaviranikāya-naya-pratītyasamutpāda-viniścaya:
   "An analysis of dependent arising according to the Sthavira school", equivalent to Vimuttimagga, ch. 11, section 1, pp. 259–68;

3) Daśabalaśrimitra, ch. 15, 'Phags pa gnas brtan pa'i sde pa'i tshul lugs las 'phags pa'i bden pa la mkhas pa rnam par nes pa, 106a4–127a3, *Ārya-sthaviranikāya-naya-āryasatyaśānta-viniścaya:
   "An analysis of mastery of the Four Truths of the Noble according to the Exalted Sthavira school", equivalent to Vimuttimagga, ch. 11, section 2, pp. 269–82 (ch. 12, section 1 omitted), and ch. 12, section 2, pp. 301–26;

4) Daśabalaśrimitra, 177b2–178b4, equivalent to Vimuttimagga, p. 6; cf. also p. 10;

5) Daśabalaśrimitra, 179a4–183a1, equivalent to Vimuttimagga, ch. 10, pp. 229–36, complete citation.

2.2. Miscellaneous citations in the Sanskrit-Sanskrita-viniścaya

Daśabalaśrimitra cites the views or interpretations of the Sthaviras in ten other cases:

---

1 Stobs bcu dpal bṣes gben, 'Dus byas dan 'dus ma byas rnam par nes pa, Peking Tanjur 5865, Vol. 146. References in this section are to this edition.
3 90b3, 'phags pa gnas brtan pa'i sde pa'i luñ las 'di ltar rnam par bzag ste.
1) the length of the dhanu, kosa, gavuti, and yojana (in verse), 18a3–4;
   2) the sixty-four destructions (samvattani) of the universe by fire, water, and wind, 24a1–5;
   3) the maximum life-span is unlimited, 25b6–7;
   4) the “lesser” and “greater” incalculable aeons (asamkheyyakappa), 37a7–b1;
   5) the Buddhas revered by Sakyamuni as a bodhisattva during twenty great incalculable aeons plus 100,000 [lesser] aeons; the future Buddha Ajita Metteyya; the three types of individual (puggala): predominant in faith, in energy, or wisdom (saddhādhika, viriyādhika, paññādhika), 38a4–40b6;
   6) the seven precious things (sattaratana) of a universal emperor (cakkavatti); the ten species of elephant (hatthikula); the four species of horse (assakula); the six types of universal emperor who go to the heavens (*devalokagāmin), 41b5–42a5;
   7) five Buddhas arise in a bhaddakappa, 42b5;
   8) five types of aeon in which Buddhas arise (sāra, mana, vara, sāramanda, bhadda), 43a2–5;
   9) the five levels of meditation (jhāna), 188b8–189a3;
  10) where Sakyamuni spent the eighty years and vassas, 266a8–b7.

2.3. *Buddhavamsa of the Abhayagiri in the Tarkajvālā

Bhavya (c. 500–570 ?), in Chapter 4 of his Tarkajvālā, Śrāvakatattvāvatāra, gives brief citations from various scriptures of 17 schools, in order to demonstrate that in the Śrāvakayāna

as in the Mahāyāna homage is to be paid to bodhisattvas.1 The seventh citation is of four verses from the “Twelve-thousand Lineage of the Buddhas of the Ārya Sthāvira Abhayagirivāsinīs” (Phags pa gnas brtan pa 'jigs med ri la gnas pa nnams kyi sans rgyas kyi rigs khri ņis ston). The title may be tentatively rendered into Pāli as *Dvādas-sahassabuddhavamsa; it is not clear whether “12000” refers to the number of Buddhas or the number of ślokas.2 The 16 lines of verse, which I have been unable to trace in Pāli, state that a bodhisatta “should be honoured by all the world.”3 The work was translated by Dipamkaraśrīnāṇa (Atiśa) and Tshul khrims rgyal ba at Lhasa in the first half of the 11th century.

2.4. Parallels to Pāli texts in the Udānavarga-vivaraṇa

The Udānavarga-vivaraṇa, composed by Prajñāvarman at an uncertain date and preserved in Tibetan translation only (done in the 11th century bypañjita Janārada and Śākya Blo gros), is a commentary on the Udānavarga, the (Mūla)-Sarvāstivādin counterpart of the Pāli Dhammapada. Like the Dhammapada, the Udānavarga contains only verses, in his commentary, Prajñāvarman states the occasion (nīdāna) upon which each verse, or set of verses, was spoken. First he gives the “official” nīdāna of the (Mūla)-Sarvāstivādin tradition; in some cases, he

---

1 Q 5256, Vol. 96, dbu ma'i sīṃ po'i 'grel pa rtog ge 'bar ba, dbu ma, dza: fhan thos kyi de kho na ŋi ld la 'jug pa, 192b2–6; D 3856, dbu ma, dza, 177a7–b2.
2 I do not know of any texts which describe a group of 12000 Buddhas. The Sambuddhe verses, popular in South-east Asia, refer to the late Theravādin figure of 512,028 Buddhas as 28 + 12,000 + 500,000 (sambuddhe attavisaṅca dvādasanam ca sahasasak a pañcasaṭa sahasānī ...), but I suspect that the figures are so given for reasons of metre, since related prose texts group the numbers differently. See Peter Skilling, “A Note on the Sambuddhe Verses and Later Theravādin Buddhology”, Journal of the Secretarial Office of His Holiness the Supreme Patriarch, 1/2 (Jan.–Mar. 1993), pp. 73–85.
3 For an edition and translation of the verses, see P. Skilling, “A Citation from the *Buddhavamsa of the Abhayagiri School”, JPTS XVIII (1993), pp. 165–75.
also briefly cites alternate *nidānas*, which he ascribes simply to “others” (gzaṅ dag). Some of these alternate *nidānas* are identical or similar to the brief *nidānas* that open the lengthy stories for each verse or set of verses in the *Dhammapada Commentary*. Here I will give four examples from UvViv Chapter XX, *Krodhavarga* (“On Anger”), equivalent to Dhp Chapter XVII, *Krodhavagga*.1

1) UvViv II 584–85, commenting on Uv XX,1:

The “official” (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin *nidāna* states that “a naked ascetic (nirgrantha), who rejoiced in non-attachment (asangarata), asked the Lord … ”. Prajñāvarman also gives an alternate *nidāna* (584,23):

\[
gzaṅ dag ni nya gro dha’i kun dga’ ra ba na rgyal rigs kyi bu mo snar ma žes bya ba las brtams pa ’o žes zer ro ||
\]

Others say that this was spoken at the Nigrodha Pleasance (*ārāma*), with reference to (*ārabha*) a *khattiya* girl named Rohini.

This agrees almost perfectly with Dhp-a III 295,3–5 on Dhp XVII,1:

\[
imam dhammadesanam satthā nigrodhārāme viharanto rohini-nāma-khattiya-kaññam ārabha kathesi.
\]

The Teacher gave this instruction in the dhamma when he was staying at the Nigrodha Pleasance (*ārāma*), with reference to (*ārabha*) a *khattiya* girl named Rohini.

3) UvViv II 600–01, commenting on Uv XX,19:

Official *nidāna*: “A brāhmaṇa named *Asurāyana*1 abused the Lord with offensive language (asabhya vācā). Therefore [the Lord] said … ”. Alternate *nidāna* (600,8):

\[
gzaṅ dag ni u da ri žes bya ba’i dge bsñen ma’i khyim du bcom ldan ’das ņan thos kyi tshogs dañ bcas pa bsos gsol pa byas na dge bsñen ma u da ri las brtams te ’di gsuṅs so žes zer ro ||
\]

---

1 Ched du brjod pa’i tshoms kyi nram par ’grel pa = UvViv. For ease of comparison I have given Pāli equivalents for Tibetan names or terms in the alternate *nidānas*. The material is drawn from my perpetually unfinished paper, “The Nidānas of the Udānavargavivaraṇa: the Krodhavarga”.

1 The name is transliterated in Tibetan as A-su-ra-ya-na.
Others say: when the Lord, together with a group of disciples (sāvaka-gana), had been offered a meal at the home (geha) of the lay-woman (upāsikā) *Udari, he spoke this with reference to the lay woman *Udari.¹

Dhp-a III 302,5–7 on Dhp XVII,3:

imaṃ dhammadesananat satthā veluvane viharanto uttarāya gehe katabhattakico uttaram upāsikaman ārabbha kathesi.

The Teacher gave this instruction in the dhamma when he was staying in the Bamboo Grove, on having eaten at the home (geha) of Uttarā, with reference to the lay woman (upāsikā) Uttarā.

4) UvViv II 604,20, commenting on Uv XX,22:

a gra ta ba ka žes bya ba’i yul na dge sloy žig kho ro ba byan yan tshig rtsub po mi brjod pa de las bṛṣams so žes gtan dag zer ro ||

Other say this was spoken in the land of *Agratavaka,² with reference to a certain monk who became angry, yet refrained from harsh words (pāruṣya).

Dhp-a III 299,13 on Dhp XVII,2 reads as follows:

imaṃ dhammadesananat satthā aggālave cetiye viharanto aññataram bhikkhum ārabbha kathesi.

The Teacher gave this instruction in the dhamma when he was staying at the Aggālava Shrine, in connection with a certain monk.

The two nidānas bear some resemblance if one takes *Agratavaka to equal Aggālava, which is by no means certain. The full Dhp-a story involves a tree-spirit who controls her anger, which initially arises towards a monk who has chopped down the tree in which she lives and accidentally wounded her child. The story does not agree with the UvViv nidāna, in which it is the monk himself who controls his anger.

It is noteworthy that formulas similar to the imaṃ dhammadesananat satthā … (place) viharanto … (name) ārabbha kathesi, which comes at the head of the stories in the Dhammapada-aṭṭhakathā, are also used in the Jātaka-aṭṭhakathā.¹ It may be that these brief nidānas are older than the following commentary: that they could have been shared by several schools of the Sthavira fold, but that the full stories would have differed in style, length, and detail. (Note that the stories of the Dhp-a are non-canonical. They are themselves a condensed Pāli translation of the old Sinhalese version, and a new Sinhalese version, much expanded, was produced by Dharmasena Thera in the 13th century.² The form and detail of narrative literature of this type, which was told and retold over the centuries, should not be taken too seriously as an indication of sectarian affiliation.)

The Udānavarga-vivarana contains other material relevant to Pāli studies. Commenting on the second verse of the same chapter (UvViv II 585–86 on Uv XX,2), Prajñāvarman opens his “official nidāna” with a verse question spoken by a god (Iha žig gis gsol

¹ Some random examples are Ja I 123,11–12, 126,14–15, 136,10–11, 276,2–3, 364,2–3; II 248,5–6, 321,8–10.
pa); the Buddha answers with Udānavarga XX,2. The only parallel to this verse noted by Bernhard is found in the Nettipakarana, which also opens with the verse question; neither question nor answer is found elsewhere in the Pāli canon or in Buddhist literature.

UvViv 586,1
skyes ma thag tu ci 'ig span
kiṃ su hane uppaṭītaṁ
kim śū hane uppaṭītaṁ
kiṃ su jātāṁ vinodaye
kīṇ c'assu pajahe dhīro
kissābhīṣamayo sukho
Nettipakarana 145,25
Nettipakarana 146,1
krodham jahed uttpattiṁ
kodham hane uppatitaṁ
rägaṁ jātāṁ nivārayet
rägāṁ jātāṁ vinodaye
avidyāṁ prajahed dhīraḥ
avijām pajahe dhīro
saccābhīṣamayo sukho
saccābhīṣamayo sukho

Uv XX,2
krodham jahed uppattiṁ
rágaṁ jātāṁ nivārayet
avidyāṁ prajahed dhīraḥ
saccābhīṣamayo sukham

UvT XX,2
skyes ma thag tu khro ba spoṁs
skyes nas 'dod chags span bar gyis
brtan pas ma rig rab tu spān
bden pa mthon na bde bar 'gyur
brtan pas ma rig rab tu spān
bden pa mthon na bde bar 'gyur

The agreement is very close. The only major variant occurs in line d of the answer: the Nettipakarana and the Sanskrit Udānavarga agree on saccābhīṣamaya = satyābhīṣamaya;² the Tibetan Udānavarga has instead bden pa mthon = satyadarśana. Prajñāvarman (UvViv 586,20) gives sdug bsnal mthon ba = duḥkhadarśana as the preferred reading, but notes an alternate reading (586,26) bden pa rtogs na = satyābhīṣamaya. Bernhard notes a Sanskrit variant, duḥkhābhīṣamaya.

For Uv XX,1 (= Dhp XVII,1) Prajñāvarman (UvViv 584,18) gives as official nidāna a verse question in canonical style that is not found in the Pāli or other parallel. Other nidānas have Pāli counterparts. For Uv XX,3 (UvViv 587,1) he gives as official nidāna a question spoken by Śakra, and then the Uv verse as answer. Both question and answer are found in the Sakka-samyutta (S I 237,9–13) with Sakka as interlocutor, as well as in the Devatā (S I 41,15–20), Devaputta (S I 47,8–12), and Brāhmaṇa (S I 161,3–8) Samyuttas, with various interlocutors, in the Nettipakarana (Nett 145,19), and in the Gāndhāri Dharmapada (XVII,15–16). The official nidāna to Uv XX,4–14 (UvViv 588–96) gives a parallel to the Vepacitti-sutta of the Sakka-samyutta (S I 220,33–222,19), including the prose introduction. The official alternate nidāna to Uv XX,13 (UvViv 596,5)¹ may be related to the Asurindaka-sutta (S I 163–64), and the official nidāna to Uv XX,20–22 (UvViv 601,13) is similar to the Akkosaka-sutta (S I 161–63), both of the Brāhmaṇa-samyutta.² The commentary also cites sūtras (cf. UvViv 587,20 with A I 200,4) and refers to jātakas (UvViv 592,15 [also 1021,27], Ma he'i skyes pa'i rabs = Mahisa-jātaka [Ja 278]; UvViv 593,10, Thams cad sbyin pa'i skyes pa'i rabs = Sarvamāda-jātaka [Ja 499, Siv]). Balk’s Tibetan

¹ I describe this as an “official alternate” because Prajñāvarman does not ascribe it to “some” or “others”, but simply states dir yan gle gzi gzhan du bjod de, “here another nidāna is also given”. It seems possible that he is referring to a different nidāna occurring in another place in the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin scriptures (just as in Pāli the same verse occurs in different places with different nidānas) rather than the nidāna of another school.

² The Akkosaka-sutta has parallels in the two Chinese Samyuktāgamas (Chizen Akanuma, The Comparative Catalogue of Chinese Āgamas and Pāli Nikāyas, Nagoya, 1929, p. 185), and in the The Sūtra in 42 Sections, traditionally held to be the first Buddhist text to have been translated into Chinese (see John Blofeld, The Sutra of 42 Sections and Two Other Scriptures of the Mahayana, rev. ed., London, 1977, §§ 7, 8).

¹ Balk reads brstan; this should be corrected to brtan on the basis of UvT, UvViv 586,17, and the dhīra of Nett and Uv.
and Sanskrit indexes of proper names (II 1056–81) are a useful tool for the study of some of the parallels.

My selection of the Krodhavarga for this study was quite arbitrary, but such research as I have done in other vargas of the UvViv has led me to conclude that Prajñāvarman’s presentation of nidānas for this varga may safely be taken as representative of the UvViv as a whole. In the Krodhavarga he gives no more than two nidānas — one official and one alternate — for a single verse. In other vargas he sometimes gives three nidānas. Commenting on Uv XIX,5 (UvViv II 577,13 foll.) he gives an official nidāna, followed by an alternate attributed to “others” (gžan dag = anye), followed in turn by an alternate attributed to “some” (kha cig = eke) which has a parallel at Dhp-a III 84,6 on Dhp X,10. At UvViv I 212,5 foll. on Uv III,9, Prajñāvarman gives a nidāna attributed to “some” (kha cig), which has a parallel at Dhp-a IV 36,3 on Dhp XXIV,1, followed by a nidāna attributed to “others” (gžan dag).

The alternate nidānas with parallels in the Dhp-a agree so closely with the Pāli that they must go back to a common source. They are direct quotations, and they follow the same “spoken (at ...) with reference to (brstams pa = ārabhya, ārabbha) ... ” pattern. Prajñāvarman, living in North India at an uncertain date, drew on a tradition strikingly similar to that of the Theravādins. Regrettably he does not name his source but simply attributes the alternates to “others” (gžan dag = anye).

Who were these “others” ? I cannot say: perhaps a branch of the “continental” Sthaviras rather than of the “insular” schools. But a Sthavira origin for the nidānas need not be taken for granted. While Prajñāvarman does give alternate nidānas for the four verses of the Pāli Kodhavagga common to the Uv Krodhavarga, only three of them agree with the corresponding Dhp-a nidānas. The remaining 10 verses of the

Pāli Kodhavagga have parallels not in the Krodhavarga but in the Sucarita-, Smṛti-, and Yuga-vargas of the Uv. An examination of Prajñāvarman’s commentary on these vargas reveals that he does not give any alternate nidānas whatsoever for the verses in question. If Prajñāvarman was indeed relying on a Dharmapada closely related to the Pāli Dhp and on a commentarial tradition closely related to that of the Dhp-a and belonging to the broader Sthavira tradition, he was selective in his citation of alternate nidānas.

Another possibility is that the alternate nidānas are from a tradition related to the Gāndhāri Dharmapada. (The manuscript of the GDhp is incomplete; it does, however, contain a complete, untitled chapter, mostly dealing with krodha, which Brough has tentatively named Krodhavarga, and identified as the 17th chapter.\(^1\) The school of the text is unknown, although Brough has suggested the Dharmaguptakas or the Kāśyapiyas, both of which are held by some traditions to belong to the broader Sthavira fold.) Six out of the 16 verses of the “Krodhavarga” of the GDhp are common to the Uv; five (GDhp XVII,1,2,7,8,16) to the Krodhavarga of the Uv and one to the Prakīrṇakavarga (GDhp XVII,11 = Uv XVI,23). Out of the five verses common to the Uv Krodhavarga, four (GDhp XVII,1,2,7,8) are those for which Prajñāvarman supplies alternate nidānas in the “spoken in connection with” (de las brstams so, ārabbha) form. While no such nidāna is given for the fifth (GDhp XVII,16), in this case the GDhp itself contains the verse question (XVII,15) that constitutes the official nidāna of the UvViv (587,1). Prajñāvarman comments on the sixth verse (GDhp XVIII,11) at Uv XVI,23 (UvViv I 530–32); here he gives two alternate nidānas. The first, in the “ārabbha” form, is related but not identical to Dhp-a III 113,3 on Dhp XI,5 (but the differences may arise

\(^1\) The Pāli Kodhavagga is the 17th chapter of that work; out of the 5 verses of the GDhp “Krodhavarga” common to the Uv Krodhavarga four are also common to the Pāli Kodhavagga, the first two in the same order in GDhp and Dhp.
from the Tibetan translation rather than the original Indic); I have not traced a parallel to the second. Thus all six of the GDhp Krodhavarga verses common to the Uv are covered by the UvViv, under five alternate "ārabbha" and one official nidānas.

There does not seem to be any clear relationship between the alternate nidānas of the Uv Krodhavarga and the Patna Dhammapada. This work, which is apparently complete, does not have a Krodhavarga; the four verses that it has in common with the Uv Krodhavarga are found in three different chapters, nos. XI, XIII, and XVI. As may be seen in Table 4, only two of the "ārabbha" nidānas have corresponding verses in the PDhp (XIII,22, XVI,15); two have no counterparts. Prajñāvarman introduces the third alternate nidāna (Uv XX,6, UvViv 590,33; PDhp XI,10) with 'dir glen gzi ni gian dag 'di skad zer to, "here others give this nidāna". Since the verse in question does not occur at all

---

1 The PDhp may well belong to the Sāṃmatīya school. Of the four main North Indian Buddhist schools recorded by Hsūn-tsang and others — Sthaviras, (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādins, (Lokottaravādin) Mahāsāṃghikas and Sāṃmatīyas — the PDhp cannot belong to the first three, whose recensions are known in full or in part (Dhammapada, Udānavarga, citations in Mahāvastu, etc., respectively). The sole manuscript of the PDhp is in proto-Bengali characters. The presence of the Sāṃmatīyas in the North-east up to the Pāla-Sena period is attested in a number of sources. The existence of the four schools or orders (sde pa bzi, with only the Mahāsāṃghikas specified) at Nālandā in the time of Devapāla is mentioned in passing by Abhayaadhattāśrī (Acharya Sempa Dorje, The Biography of Eighty-four Saints, Sarnath, 1979, p. 144,1–4); a Sanskrit document from Nepal notes that the (future siddha) Maitriyuta ordained as a Sāṃmatīya at Vikramapura (Sylvain Lévi, "Un nouveau document sur le bouddhisme de basse époque dans l’Inde", Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies VI (1931), p. 423 penult) in the first half of the 11th century (for the date, see Mark Tatz, "The Life of the Siddha-Philosopher Maitriyuta", Journal of the American Oriental Society 107/4 [Oct.–Dec. 1987], pp. 695–711). Daśabalaśrīmitra cited copiously from their scriptures in the 12th or 13th centuries, and Tārānātha refers to their active existence. The Prakrit language of the PDhp fits that ascribed to the Sāṃmatīyas by Tibetan tradition (see Bu ston as discussed by Yuyama: reference in foll. note).

in either the Dhp or the GDhp, it is possible that the nidāna belongs to the tradition of the PDhp. The fourth (Uv XX,13 = PDhp XI,9) is that which I have described above as an "alternate official nidāna"; if, however, it may be shown to be the nidāna of another school, it may also be related to the PDhp, since the verse does not occur in the Dhp or GDhp.

These relationships are very tentative, since they are based on the study of only one of the 33 chapters of the Uv. Are they purely coincidental to the Krodhavarga, or do they pertain to the UvViv as a whole? It is important here that Prajñāvarman’s methodology be determined. Under what circumstances does he cite alternate nidānas? Would he cite an alternate nidāna of another school if he was aware that that school also had a canonical nidāna similar to his own official, Sarvāstivādin nidāna? Why, if he was relying on a tradition related to that of the Dhp-a, does he sometimes cite an alternate nidāna with a parallel in that text, and sometimes not? Whether Prajñāvarman’s methodology can be discerned and whether these questions can be satisfactorily answered will only emerge when a complete concordance of the alternate nidānas of the UvViv with all existing Dhamma-/Dharma-pada texts, including all Chinese versions, has been made.

While Prajñāvarman’s alternate nidānas cannot be classified as Theravādin, they are an important source for the study of the Dhammapada-āṭṭhakathā. The examples presented here bring to light the fact that Prajñāvarman utilized several different sources for his nidānas, and suggest that he had access to three or more commentarial traditions: the tradition of the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādins (the "official" nidānas); a tradition strikingly similar to that embodied in the Dhp-a of the Mahāvihāravāsin Theravādins; and a tradition (or traditions) as yet unidentified shown when Prajñāvarman cites three nidānas.
2.5. Sources for Theravādin tenets

One further source for Theravādin or Sthavira tenets is the vast corpus of śāstra and commentarial literature preserved in the Tibetan Tanjur. Both treatises and commentaries — on the Abhidharma or the Vinaya, or on Mahāyāna śāstras — make occasional brief references to the Sthaviras or related schools. Outside of the Tanjur, there are references to the Sthaviras in the works of Tibetan authors such as Buṣton and Tāranātha, and no doubt elsewhere in Tibetan literature. Here there is the problem — interesting in itself — of the name by which the Sthaviras or Theravādins are designated. In the following I will refer to a number of possible candidates.

2.5.1 The (Ārya) Sthaviras and their branches

The term gNas brtan = Sthavira is found in both early (Asaṅga in the 4th century) and late (Daśabalaśrīmitra in the 12th: above §2.1, 2) sources. In the 6th century, Bhavya cites the Ārya Sthavira Abhayagirivāsins (above §2.3). From the 8th century on, Vinītadeva, the Mahāvyutpatti, Subhūtighoṣa, and the anonymous Śrāmaṇera-

1 See, for example, Akira Yuyama, “Buṣton on the Languages Used by Indian Buddhists at the Schismatic Period”, in Bechert 1980, pp. 175–81. There are numbers of references in Tāranātha’s history (Antonius Schiefner, Tāranāthāe de Doctrinae Buddhicae in India Propagatione, St. Petersburg, 1868; Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya (ed.), Tāranātha’s History of Buddhism in India, [1970] Calcutta, 1980) and other works not yet properly studied.

2 The earliness of Asaṅga’s reference may be open to question, since it is not found in the Chinese translations, but only in the Tibetan of ca. 800 (see below). Note that “Sthaviravāda”, a term employed by some scholars, is a modern translation from Pāli to Sanskrit: as far as I know it is not attested in any traditional works, which use simply (Ārya) Sthavira(-nikāya). The forms Ārya-sthāvira and Āryaśākhāvīrā are known in Sanskrit (BHSID 1056).

3 Samayabhedoparacanacakra-nikāyabhedopadārṇā-nāma-samgraha, Q 5641, Vol. 127, ‘dul ba’i ’grel pa, u, 187b6, 190a3.

4 Mvy 9095–98.

5 Sarvayānāllokakara-vaibhāṣya-nāma, Q 5303, Vol. 102, dbu ma, ha, 417a2.

and Bhikṣu-vārsāgra-prachāsā accurately list the three branches of the Theravādins of Ceylon — Jetavanīyas, Abhayagirivāsins, Mahāvīhravāsins — as the three divisions of the Sthaviras (see Table 7.C).2 I-ching also refers to three divisions of the Sthaviras, without naming them.3

2.5.2 Sthaviras, Tāmraśātiyas, Tāmrarāṇiyanas, and Tāmraravarniyas

a) Tāmraśātiyas and bhavaṅga-vijñāna

The Sthaviras, or a branch thereof, were known as Gos dmar sde pa = Tāmraśātiya. In his Karmasiddhi-prakaraṇa, Vasubandhu notes that the Bhadanta Tāmraśātiya propound a bhavaṅga-vijñāna;4 in his commentary thereon Sumatiśila equates the Tāmraśātiyas with the Ārya Sthaviras.5 Asaṅga’s Mahāvīnasamgraha, in the Tibetan version translated ca. 800 A.C. by Jinamitra, Śilendrabodhi, and Ye šes sde, cites

---

6 Q 5634, Vol. 127, ‘dul ba’i ’grel pa, u, 79a8; C, ‘dul ba, su, 65a1.
7 Q 5649, Vol. 127, ‘dul ba’i ’grel pa, u, 318a8. Although later Tibetan sources attribute this and the preceding to Padmasambhava (e.g. B 41 I 30–31), this is not stated in the colophons.
8 The order given here is that of all sources except Mvy, which moves the Mahāvīrāra from last to first. For a study of these (except Subhūtighoṣa) and related sources, Chinese as well as Tibetan, see Bareu 1955. The present study concentrates on sources not utilized by Bareu.
5 Q 5572, Vol. 114, sems tsam, ku, 105a6, btsun pa gos dmar sde pa rnam ’shes bya ba ni ’phags pa gnas brtan pa rnam te. For this and the preceding see also Ryoshun Kajihama (ed.), Karmasiddhi-prakaraṇa by Vasubandhu, Karmasiddhi Tikā by Sumatiśila, Samarth, 1988, pp. 150–51.
a verse of four lines on bhavāṅga from the “Āgama of the Ārya Sthaviras” (the earlier Chinese translations do not give the citation):¹

srīd pa’i yan lag lta ba dān || šes pa dān ni gto d pa dān ||
g’yo ba dān ni rtogs pa dān || bdun pa ‘jug par byed pa yi ||

The verse seems to be a garbled version of one found in the Samyutta-āṭṭhakathā:²

bhavāṅgaṃ āvajjanā c’ eva, dassanāṃ sampāṭicchanāṃ
santiranāṃ voṭhhabbanam jāvanāṃ bhavati sattamam.

The verse and the accompanying commentary in the Upanibandhana (here both Tibetan and Chinese, both difficult to decipher) are important because they prove that the bhavāṅga referred to functions in a process similar to the citta-vīthi of the Mahāvihāravāsins and is not simply a link in pratītyasamutpāda, a usage known to the Therāvāda as well as to other schools.³ The Upanibandhana notes that


2 Spk III (PTS) 191, Mahāmuktiṣārājavidiyālaya 286,2-3. Since na / da and ba / pa are frequently indistinguishable in Tibetan, I have amended the gton ba (ut-SRI, TTAJ, HĀ) of Lamotte’s text to gto d pa, equivalent to BUHJ and also to āvārjana (see Akira Hirakawa et al., Index to the Abhidharmakośabhāṣya (Peking Edition), Part III, Tokyo, 1978, p. 90b. This gives a sequence “bhavāṅga (srīd pa’i yan lag), vision (lta ba = dassana), knowledge (šes pa = sampāṭicchana ?), advertising (gto d pa = āvajjana), disturbance (g’yo ba = jāvana ?)”. The verse merits further study.


³ Don gsan ba rnam par phyre ba bsdu te bsad pa, Q 5553, Vol. 113, sens tsam, li, 390b7, gnas brtan pa rnam de kho na bzin du bstan nas srīd pa’i yan lag gi rnam par šes pa rnam pa lta bu ste. The work is incomplete; since a similar title appears in the Ldan dkar ma Catalogue (Lalou 1953, § 629, don gsan ba bsdu pa), the translation probably dates from about 800 A.C.

⁴ Q 5496, Vol. 104, mdo tshogs ’grel pa, chi, 24b5. (The sections containing this and the following passage are not among the preserved Sanskrit fragments published by Giuseppe Tucci, “A Fragment of the Pratītya-samutpāda-vyākhyā of Vasubandhu”, Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, London, 1930, pp. 61–23. I use here the title given in the colophons to the Sanskrit manuscript rather than that given at the head of the Tibetan translation: see Tucci p. 612, note 1.) Commenting on this, Guṇamati (end of bampo 5, chi, 152b7) refers to the “Abhidharma of one particular [sect]” (ni tse ba gzan gyi chos mdo pa las srīd pa’i gnas byed par rab tu grags pa ston to). Ni tse ba (“phyoogs re ba, thor ba, phran tshogs [Bod rgya tshig mdo chen mo 1949b], in Sanskrit prādēśika, pratyeva, avāntara) gzan (antra, anya, anayatra, aparā, etc.), means “one particular [sect]” in the sense that it is not a doctrine common to all schools. The term ni tse ba also occurs at Guṇamati 153b6–154a1 in an interesting explanation of how the Word of the Buddha has become scattered (phros) (commenting on Vasubandhu 25a3); at Guṇamati 154b6, and at Vasubandhu 32b6, 64b4. Guṇamati also refers to the Dharmaparāyāya of the Bhadanta Mahīśāsakas (btsun pa sa ston pa’i chos kyi rnam grags) at156b5. In the light of Guṇamati’s references, Lambert Schmithansen’s identification (in Ālayavijñana: On the Origin and the Early Development of a Central Concept of Yogācāra Philosophy, Tokyo, 1987, Part II, note 69) of the Abhidharma-dharmaparāyāya
We may therefore conclude that the concept of bhavāṅga-vīññāna was held by the Tāmraśāṭiyas, Vibhajyavādins, Mahiśāsakas (in their *Abhidharma-dharmaparyāya*), and by unspecified Sthaviras, and that it is equivalent to the bhavāṅga-vīññāna well known in the literature of the Mahāvihāravāsins.

b) Tāmraśāṭiyas and the constituents of nāma

In his Pratītyasamutpāda-vyākhya, Vasubandhu mentions the Tāmraśāṭiyas in connection with a sūtra citation on the constituents of nāma. In his commentary thereon, Gunamati repeats the name without comment. The constituents (tshor ba, 'du šes, sems pa, reg pa, yid la byed pa) agree with those listed in Pāli parallels (S II 3,34, M I 53,11, vedanā, saññā, cetanā, phassa, manasikāra); the definition in the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādins parallels is different.

c) Tāmraśāṭiyas in the Tarkajvālā of Bhavya

In his Tarkajvālā Bhavya refers to the Tāmraśāṭiyas in at least three different places. In Chapter 3 he cites the Sautrāntikas and Tāmraśāṭiyas (against the Vaibhāṣikas) on the nature of nirvāṇa. This
do not suggest that the two schools were affiliated, but only that they agreed in this case. In Chapter 4 — in a section on the origins and affiliation of the “18 schools” that occurs also as an independent treatise — he ascribes to the Tāmraśāṭiyas a single tenet: “the person (pudgala) does not exist”.

As noted by Béreau (1955, p. 204), “celci est aussi peu original que possible dans le Bouddhisme”. Elsewhere in the same chapter Bhavya cites a verse of four lines spoken by Venerable Revata from the “Word of the Buddha of the Ārya Tāmraśāṭiyas”. I have not been able to trace the verse in Pāli.

d) Tāmraśāṭiyas in the Madhyamakaratna-pradīpa of Bhavya

In the Madhyamakaratna-pradīpa there is a passage virtually identical to that of the Tarkajvālā on the nature of nirvāṇa, with the same mention of the Tāmraśāṭiyas. The authorship of the work — translated according to the colophon by Dipamkaraśījñāna (Atiśa), brTson ’grus sen gc, and Tshul khrims rgyal mtshan at Somapuri Monastery [in Bengal] — is a subject of debate.

---

1 Q 5496, 25b5.
2 Q 5496, (bam po 3) 36a5.
3 Q 5497, Vol. 104, mdo tshogs 'gro pa, chi, 190b8.
4 Candrabhāgī Tripāṭhi, Fürunftwanzig Sūtras des Nidānasamyuktas, Berlin, 1962, § 16.7; Šamathdeva, Upāyikā Tikā, Q 5595, Vol. 118, mdo 'gro tu, 160b8; gold plate version in J.G. de Casparis, Selected Inscriptions from the 7th to the 9th Century A.D. (Prasasti Indonesia II), Bandung, 1956, pp. 109–10; Nālandā brick versions in EJ XXI (1931–32), p. 198,11; and Chinese version of Hsūn-tsang in the latter, p. 203. These five define the constituents of nāma as “the four formless skandhas”, which are then listed.
5 Iida 1980, p. 196, mdo sde pa dan ’gos dmar sde pa dag ni phun po med pa tsam ste | mar me ši bar gyur pa litar || de ’i sems ni rnam par thar || ces brjod do. The two lines of verse are found in the Mahāparinibbāna-sutta of both the Theravādins (D II 157,15, pajjotass’ eva nibbānam vimokho cetaso ahā) and (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādins (Ernst Waldschmidt, Das Mahāparinirvānasutta, [Berlin, 1950–51] Kyoto, 1986, § 44.11, pradyotasyeva nirvāṇam vimokṣas tasya cetasah), and are cited by Vasubandhu in his Koṣabhāṣya (I 327.3) on kārikā II,55d Here it is a question of interpretation rather than difference in the canonical text.
6 Tarkajvālā 165b2, ’gos dmar ba rnam kyi dam ishig ni gān zag ni med do žes bya ba’o = Q 5640, Vol. 127, ’dul ba’i ’gro pa, ut, 182b5; tr. in Béreau 1956, p. 182.
7 Tarkajvālā 193b7, ’phags pa go sdmar ba’i sans rgyas kyi gsums pa las ’don par byed do.
e) Tāmraśāṭiyas in the *Karatalaratna* of Bhavya

Bhavya’s *Karatalaratna* is extant only in the Chinese translation of Hsūn-tsang of 649 A.C.; because of its importance I include it here.¹ In this text he quotes the Tāmraśāṭiyas as maintaining that space (ākāśa) is chidra-rūpa, and hence conditioned (samskṛta), against such schools as the Vaibhāṣikas, who hold space to be unconditioned.² The Theravādin rejection of space as unconditioned goes back to the Kathāvatthu (Kv 328–30, ākāsakathā).

f) Tāmraśāṭiyas, Tāmraparṇiyas, and the “heart-basis”

In the Sanskrit Abhidharmakośa-vyākhya, Yaśomitra refers to the Tāmra-parṇiyas twice: once in connection with the “heart-basis” (hrdaya-vastu, Pāli hadaya-vattu) and once in reference to the phrase “all schools” (sarvanikāyāntara).³ The Tibetan translation, however, reads Gos dmar ba’i sde pa = Tāmra-sāṭiya in both cases.⁴ With regard to the first point, Yaśomitra states:

---

² Louis de La Vallée Poussin, “Le joyau dans la main”, Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques 2 (1932–33), p. 111; N. Aiyaswami Sastri, “Karatalaratna”, Visva-Bharatī Annals II, Santiniketan, 1949, p. 73.1; see also English summary, p. 24. Both translators give Tāmraśāṭiya. I am grateful to Paul Harrison (letter of 29 December, 1992) for informing me that the reference is at Taishō 1578, 274b24: t'ung-hsieh-pu-shih, “the masters of the t'ung-hsieh school”, with t'ung meaning copper or bronze, hsieh ore or ring. There is at least one complication, and the final interpretation of the term, in comparison with the two Chinese translations of the Karmasiddhi-prakaraṇa, must be left to those competent in the field.
⁴ Chos mnyen pa'i mdo kyi 'grel gśad, Q 5593, Vol. 116, mdo 'grel, cu, 41b4; Vol. 117, chu, 388a6. Hrdaya-vastu is rendered as sṅhi gi dḥos po. I have been unable to find the first reference in either Sthiramati’s (Q 5875) or Pūrṇavardhana’s commentaries. The latter, in his Laksanānusārini Tikā, Q 5594, Vol. 118, rū, 374a1 cites the Sa ston pa’i sde pa = Mahiśāsakas as an example in the latter case. Note that here Tāmraśāṭiyas and Mahiśāsakas are simply examples of nikāyas, not equivalents.
¹ La Vallée Poussin I 281; Wei Tat p. 327.
labbhanti, rūpaloke pana ghāṇādittayaṁ n ’atthi, arūpaloke pana sabbāni pi na samvijjanti.

There are six types of vatthu: the eye, ear, nose, tongue, body, and the heart-basis. All of them are found in the Sensual World; in the Form World the three starting with the nose do not occur, while in the Formless World none of them occur.

This, then, is the theory of the Mahāvihāra. Yaśomitra is correct in referring the concept of hrdaya-vaṣṭu to a school affiliated with the Sthaviras, whether the Tāmrarāṇiṣyas of the Sanskrit = residents of Ceylon = Theravādins or the Tāmrarāṇiṣyas of the Tibetan. That he has made a mistake in stating that they hold it to exist in the Formless Realm is possible, but seems unlikely because his opponent’s defence in terms of āpiṅgala is given as a direct citation. Yaśomitra may be referring to the Abhayagirivāsins, to the Jetavanīyas, or to a branch of the Sthaviras settled in Āndhradeśa, the “Andhakas” of the Kathāvatthu-āṭṭhakathā. For the present, we must leave the question open; further research, for example in the Pāli Tikās, may throw more light on the matter.

g) Tāmrarāṇiṣyas and the definition of Akaniṣṭha

In his Abhisamayālākāra-vṛtti, Ārya Viṃuktisena (who himself was ordained as a Kaurukulla Ārya Sāṃmatiya) gives a definition of the Akaniṣṭha Heaven according to the Bhadanta Tāmrarāṇiṣya-viśvamitra. The reading is confirmed by the Tibetan, translated in the second half of the 11th century by Amaragomin and Blo Ildan ṣes rab: btsun pa zans mdo (zans = tāmra, “copper”; mdo =

1 Q 5185, Vol. 88, šer phyin, ka, 31a2. For the translators see Pensā p. 3 and Naudou 1968, pp. 165, 171 foll.

2 Mahāmukaṭṭhavijñālaya, Bangkok, 2516 [1973], 159,11.


4 Lalou 1953, § 510, sde pa bco brgyad kyi min dan rim pa slob dpon ‘dul ba’i las mzdaz pa; § 503, ñge slon ma’i so sor thar pa’i ‘gre l pa.

of 6 and 7; in the Later Period Atiṣa, brtson 'grus seṅ ge, and Tshul khrims rgyal ba (8, 9, 10); Subhūtighoṣa and Tiṅ ṇe 'dzin bzaṅ po (10);¹ and Narayadeva (Nārāyaṇadeva ?) and rGyal ba'i šes rab (11).²

The known translation teams were all made up of skilled and experienced members, both Indian and Tibetan. It begs belief that they all misread Tāmraparṇīya (no doubt in several different Indic scripts) as Tāmraśāṭīya; that they all read Tāmraparṇīya but deliberately translated it as Tāmraśāṭīya; or that later editors systematically changed the (unattested) Tibetan *Lo ma dmar ba'i sde to Gos dmar ba'i sde. In one case, that of Subhūtighoṣa, the author translated his own work into Tibetan. In the case of the Śrāmanera-varsāgra-prcchā, we know that the translator, rGyal ba'i šes rab, consulted two manuscripts: one which he himself had brought from Nepal, and one brought to Tibet by Dharmapāla, a monk from Eastern India who came to Western Tibet at the invitation of King Ye šes 'od.³ rGyal ba'i šes rab studied under two Vinayadharas, Dharmapāla in Tibet and Pretākara in Nepal; he translated the Śrāmanera-varsāgra-prcchā at Tho lin in Gu ge with the guidance of Narayadeva in the time of Byaṅ chub 'od. His translation of another text, the Śrāmaneraṇakārika, compared Sanskrit manuscripts from India, Kashmir, and Nepal.⁴ The skill and care of the translators leads to the conclusion that Tāmraśāṭīya must be accepted as the primary form of the great majority of available texts.

The term Tāmraśāṭīya was current from the time of Vasubandhu (4th or 5th century) to that of Bhavya (6th century) to that of Vinitadeva (8th century), with Vasubandhu's commentators Sumatiśīla, Guṇamati, and Yaśomitra falling somewhere in between. The dates of the anonymous Śrāmanera- and Bhikṣu-varsāgra-prcchā are not known. The latest author, the 11th century Subhūtighoṣa, may well have simply reproduced earlier sources, although Tāranātha refers to the Tāmraśāṭīyas as existing at least through the Pāla period.¹ The form Tāmravarṇiya occurs only once in a work by Ārya Vimuktiṣena (6th century);² the Nepalese manuscript in which it occurs dates to about 1100.³ The same Sanskrit form is indirectly attested by the manuscript (presumably from Kashmir) of Vimuktiṣena's Vṛtti employed by the Tibetan translators, since it must have also read Tāmravarṇiya in order to give rise to the translation Zaṅs mdog. That manuscript would date from the latter half of the 12th century; thus the form Tāmravarṇiya is attested by two manuscripts of about the same period. It need not necessarily be taken as a scribal error for Tāmraparṇīya, since the latter form is attested only in late Sanskrit manuscripts of the Kośavyākyā from Nepal; as noted above, the Tibetan translation reads Gos dmar ba'i sde pa = Tāmraśāṭīya. No Tibetan equivalent of Tāmraparṇīya (*Lo ma dmar ba'i sde ?) is attested, and the Chinese equivalent in the Karmasiddhi-prakarana poses difficulties.⁴ The sole Chinese reference to the Tāmraśāṭīyas that I know of is that in Bhavya's *Karatalaratna, rendered as such by both La Vallée Poussin and N. Aiyawami Sastri. Perhaps further research into Chinese sources will clarify the question.

¹ Schiefner 208,13–18; Chattopadhyaya 341–42.
² Date from Ruegg 1981, p. 87.
⁴ See above, note 4 on p. 155.
What is the significance of Tāmrāṣāṭiya? The name means literally “Copper-clothed”; the standard Tibetan form of the Mahāvyutpatti interprets “copper” (tāmra) as “red” (dmar). Tāranātha includes the Tāmrāṣāṭiyas among the schools named after their founding Sthaviras, and also gives the name Tāmrāṣāṭa (Gos dmar ba) in a verse list of the “great bhaṭṭārakas.” His interpretation is supported by the fact that Vinitadeva’s first verse list of schools refers to Gos dmar slob ma, “the disciples of Tāmrāṣāṭa.” It follows that Tāmrāṣāṭiya should be taken as “the followers of Tāmrāṣāṭa”; since the latter seems a queer ordination name, it may have been a nickname. It appears that he was a teacher belonging to the Sthavira ordination lineage, who had sufficient

---

1 Schiefner 208,2, sa ston pa dan | chos bsrub ba dahn | gos dmar ba rnam ni de dahn de ‘i mthshan ’chan ba’i gnas brian rnam kyi rjes ’bran yin; Chattodpya 341.
2 Schiefner 3,4, Chattodpya 14 and note 82 thereto.
3 Q 5641, ‘dul ba’i ’grel pa, u, 187b6.
4 A rather queer nickname as well, at least to be adopted as the name of a sect: it seems, after all, to have been the accepted protocol in Buddhist śāstra literature to refer to a school under its own name — Vaibhāṣika, Mahāājīmbhika, Mahāāāsaka, etc. (The Vātsiprūṇiyas were in debate sometimes described as Pudgalavādins — a term they themselves did not accept — but when their opponents cited their views or texts they would generally refer to them as Vātsiprūṇiyas or Sāmmatiṣyas.) It is therefore natural to conclude that the Tāmrāṣāṭiyas described themselves as “Copper-robed”, which is not altogether likely. Could the name derive from a later misunderstanding or corruption of a toponym? Tāmrādvipa usually meant Śīmaladvipa, although (at a date later than most of our references) Tāmrādvipa was also a name of a Pagan in Burma. Tāmrāpunji usually meant the same, but is also the name of a river in Tirunelveli District; Anuruddha is said to have lived in Tāmāraṭha in South India: cf. BHSD 251b, “Tāmrādvipa”, “Tāmrādvipaka”; DPPN I 995, “Tambapani”; D.C. Sircar, Studies in the Geography of Ancient and Medieval India, 2nd ed., Delhi, 1971, pp. 315–17. There are other toponyms employing Tāmra: Tāmralipi at the mouth of the Ganges, Tāmraṭiṇi in Arakan, Tāmrāliṅga in the central Malay peninsula, and so on: see R.C. Majumdar, Hindu Colonies in the Far East, 2nd ed., Calcutta, [1963] 1973, pp. 234, 237. But it is unlikely that any of these are related to the name of our school, and hard to imagine them giving rise to Tāmrāṣāṭiya.

—

Neither Tāmrāṣāṭiya, Tāmrāpani, nor Tāmrvānpi are mentioned in the earliest lists of the “18 schools”, such as that of Vasumitra; nor was a sect of any of these names noted by the 7th century pilgrims Hsüan-tsang and I-ching (but note that the former mentions numbers of Sthaviras). No equivalents of Tāmrāṣāṭiya or Tāmrāvpāni as names of the Therāvāda or any other sect are known in Pāli or in inscriptions from India or elsewhere. Tabapanak occurs in a rail

---

inscription from Bodh Gayā, but probably not in the sense of adherent of a sect; the toponym Tāmbapamiṇī occurs in the rock edicts of Ashoka. A 3rd century Prakrit inscription from Nāgārjunakoṇḍa describes the meritorious deeds of a munificent lay woman (uvāsikā = upāsikā) named Bodhisiri. The main dedication is to the Tāmbapamiṇika Theras (theriyānam tambapam[ṇ]nakānam suparigahe), "converters" (pasādaka) of a number of countries, listed from Kasmira to Tāmbapamiṇi-dīpa. Bodhisiri also erected a shrine for a bodhi tree in the "Sinhalese monastery" (sihālavihāre bodhirukha-pāsāda), presumably in the same vicinity (EI XX, 22.25). Another Prakrit inscription from Nāgārjunakoṇḍa, dated to the middle of the 3rd century, records the installation of a stone slab bearing the image of the Buddha's footprints in the monastery (vihāra) of "the teachers, the Theras, the Vibhajavādins (āchariyānam theriyānam vibhajavādānam) 'converters' (pasādaka) of Kasmira, Gāmdhāra, Yavana, Vanavāsa, and Tāmbapamiṇidīpa, the dwellers in the Great Monastery (mahāvihāravāsinām)." That Theriya here means Theras or Sthaviras in the sense of a sect rather than simply "elders" is suggested by the fact that contemporary Nāgārjunakoṇḍa
dedications to other schools do not employ the term, but rather the phrase "masters of such-and-such a school": a-[or ā]-cāriyānam aparāmahāvinaśeliyānam, bahusutiyānam, and maha[s]ā sakānam. If we take the two inscriptions — from two different sites — to refer to the same sect, we get the equation Tāmbapamiṇaka Theras = Vibhajavādin Theras = Mahāvihāravāsins. Since the epithet Mahāvihāra was applied to numerous monasteries in India and abroad, and occurs in other Nāgārjunakoṇḍa inscriptions including Bodhisiri's inscription, it is not certain whether "Great Monastery" refers here to one at Nāgārjunakoṇḍa or that at Anurādhapura in Ceylon.

2.5.3. Sthaviras and Vibhajavādins

We have seen above that the Upanibandhana on the Mahāyānasamgraha and the Vijñaptimātratā-siddhi ascribe the concept of bhavāṅga to the Sthaviras and Vibhajavādins, and that the latter are described as Sthaviras in a Nāgārjunakoṇḍa inscription. In the Abhidharmakośa, the Tarkajvālā, and the Abhidharmadīpa the Vibhajavādins are said to reject the fundamental tenet of the Sarvāstivāda, the existence of the dharmas of past, future, and present, and to hold that past karma which has borne fruit and the future do not exist while past karma that has not yet borne fruit and the present do exist. According to the Kośa and the Tarkajvālā, this is the origin of their name. In the Kathāvatthu-attahakathā (I 8) the theory that a part of both past and future exist is attributed to the Kassapikas. In his Tarkajvālā Bhavya cites a verse of four lines, spoken by Venerable

---

1 EI X, 1909–10, Appendix, § 946.
3 EI XX, 1929–30, p. 22,13–15. Note that the term pasādaka in this and the following inscription has parallels, used in an identical context, in the pasādayi of the Dipavamsa (Ch. VIII), pasādayum of the Mahāvamsa (XII, 43), and the abhiprasādita of the Mahākarmavibhanga: Sylvain Lévi, Mahākarmavibhanga (La Grande Classification des Actes et Karmavibhangapadesa (Discussion sur le Mahā Karmavibhanga), Paris, 1932, p. 61,11,12, etc). Similar lists of countries occur in the Mahākarmavibhanga, the Dipavamsa (Ch. VIII), the Mahāvamsa (Ch. XII, vv. 1–8 and foil.), and the Thūpavamsa (Ch. 6).
Kāludāyin (tshe dan idan pa nag po 'char ka) to the Buddha, from the
“Word of the Buddha” of the Ārya Vibhajyavādins.1 Bareau (1955,
p. 167) has noted that “la question des Vibhajyavādins est l’une des plus
difficiles du problème général des sectes”: I agree, and refer the reader
to his study. The only point I wish to make is that in the sources studied
here they are related to the Tāmraśāṭīyas and the Sthaviras through the
bhavāṅga-vijñāna.

2.5.4. Sthaviras and Mahiśāsakas

A Mahiśāsaka theory of the “skandhas that endure throughout
Samsāra” is cited in Yogācāra literature as a Śrāvakayāna parallel to the
concept of ālayavijñāna.2 The Vivṛṣṭagūḍhārtha also refers to this
theory.3 It is therefore related to the bhavāṅgavijñāna, and indeed, as
seen above, Vasubandhu also ascribes the use of that term to this school,
referring to their *Abhidharma-dharmaparāya. In his Vyākhyaūktya,
the same author notes that the Mahiśāsakas and others do not accept sūtras
dealing with the “intermediate state” (antārā-bhava) as canonical;4 in his
commentary thereon, Guṇamatī states that “others” refers to
“Dharmaguptakas, Kāśyapīyas, etc.”5 The intermediate state is also
rejected by the author of the Vimuttimarga and by the Mahāvihāravīsans;
the Mahiśāsaka standpoint is confirmed by Vasumitra, Bhavya, and
Vinātadeva (Bareau 1955, p. 184). In his Pratītyasamutpāda-vyākhya,6
Vasubandhu cites the Bhadanta Mahiśāsaka on the relationship between the
aṅga of pratītyasamutpāda and the three times;7 their interpretation

should be compared with that of the Theravādins. Bhavya cites 12 lines
of verse, spoken by Venerable Subhūti (tshe dan idan pa rab 'byor),
from the “*Aṣṭavargiya of the Ārya Mahiśāsakas”.1 The sect is referred
to in an inscription from Nāgarjunakonda (see above), and its presence
is attested in Ceylon.2 It thus seems to have lived side-by-side with the
Sthaviras in at least Andhra and Lanka.

2.5.5. Sthaviras, Kāśyapīyas, and Dharmaguptakas

As seen above, Guṇamatī states that the Kāśyapīyas reject the
theory of the “intermediate state”. Vasubandhu gives brief citations from
a sūtra of the school in his Abhidharmakosa,3 and from a sūtra and a “text
(grantha) of the Bhadanta Kāśyapīyas” in his Vyākhyaūktya.4 Bhavya
cites 16 lines of verse spoken by Ārya Śāriputra (‘phags pa šāri i bu) to
the Buddha from the “*Pāramitā-mārga of the Ārya Kāśyapīyas”.5 The
sect is referred to as Kaśāviana in Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions from North-
western India.6

According to Guṇamatī, the Dharmaguptakas rejected the theory of
the “intermediate state”. According to Yaśomitra and Pūṇavardhana
they asserted “insight [into the four truths] in a single moment”
(ekābhisaṃaya),7 as did the author of the Vimuttimarga, the
Mahāvihāravīsans, the Mahiśāsakas, the Kāśyapīyas, and also the

1 Tarkajāvālā 194a6–7, ‘phags pa rnam par phyre stey smra ba rnam kyi sans
gyas kyi gsuns pa.
2 cf. La Vallée Poussin, La Siddha de Hiwan-tsang 1 180, and Lamotte, La
3 Q 5553, Vol. 113, sens tsam, li, 383a3, b2.
4 Q 5562, Vol. 113, sens tsam, si, 124a8, sa ston pa’i sde la sog pa.
5 Q 5570, Vol. 114, sens tsam, i, 153a2, [sa] ston pa’i sde dan, chos srün gi (!)
sde dan, ‘od srüns gi sde la sog pa’o.
7 Tarkajāvālā 193b3–7, ‘phags pa ‘od srüns pa’i pha rol tu phyin pa’i lam.
8 Sten Konow, Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions, Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum,
pp. 33 foll.
Mahāsāṃghika schools, all against the Sarvāstivādins, who asserted “insight in stages”, anupūrṇābhisamaya). Bhavya cites 16 lines of verse, spoken by the Buddha on his prediction by Dipamkara, from the “*Dharmapada* of the Ārya Dharmaguptakas”. The verses are not found in the Theravādin *Dhammapada* or, as far as I know, in any other *Dharmapada*.

2.5.6. Sources for Theravādin tenets: conclusions

The conclusions for this section are rather inconclusive: much more work remains to be done. That there was a close relationship between the Tāmraśāṭiyas and the Sthaviras is certain. The equation is given by Sumatiśīla, and confirmed by the ascription of the bhavāṅga-vijñāna to the Sthaviras in the Mahāyānasamgraha, its Upanibandhana, and the Siddhi of Hsūan-tsang and by the ascription of the *hrdayavastu* to the Tāmraśāṭiyas in the (Tibetan) Kośavyākhya and of a similar tenet to the Sthaviras in the Siddhi. These two tenets preclude a connection with the Sarvāstivādins, as suggested by Vinitadeva and others, or with the Sāmmatiyas as given in the Śrāmaṇera- and Bhikṣu-varṣāgarpṛcchā (see Table 7 and below). The other theories or tenets attributed to the Tāmraśāṭiyas also seem compatible with those of the Theravādins of Ceylon.

The Mahīśāsakas and Vibhajyavādins are also cited in connection with the bhavāṅga, and the Tāmraśāṭiyas and Sthaviras in connection with the heart-basis. Barea and others have shown that the *Vinayas* of the Mahīśāsakas and Dharmaguptakas are affiliated with the *Vinaya* of the Theravādins. It is likely that doctrines such as *hrdayavastu* and bhavāṅga developed in embryo among the monks of the early Sthavira lineage in India, and that they were refined over the centuries in the branches of that school such as the Theravādins of Ceylon and the Tāmraśāṭiyas and Mahīśāsakas of India, leading to differences of interpretation. It is clear, and only natural, that each branch underwent its own separate development: the texts of the individual schools cited by Bhavya in his *Tarkajvāla* seem to have no parallels in Theravādin literature, and the Mahīśāsakas and Dharmaguptakas held views that were rejected by the Theravādins, as, for example, on the nature of the unconditioned (asamśkṛta).

But periodic contact between the various schools could have brought with it “contamination”. The conservatism of the Thera tradition of Ceylon is often overrated. The *hadaya-vatthu* (not listed in the *Dhammasaṅgani*) and the developed bhavāṅga theory (along with the Theravādin *khanikavāda*) appear only with Buddhaghosa. The great Ācariya was an Indian monk who almost certainly selectively introduced new material from the tenets of the Indian Sthavira schools: he was not only a codifier but also an innovator, but the latter aspect of his career is too frequently ignored.

The Tāmraśāṭiyas, Mahīśāsakas, and Dharmaguptakas may be taken as branches of the Sthavira school. But what Sthaviras? We cannot, on the basis of the evidence, identify them with the Sthaviras of Ceylon. “Sthavira” as used by Sumatiśīla, Asaṅga, and Hsūan-tsang may well refer to the broader Vinaya lineage of the Tāmraśāṭiyas: that is, they evidence to suggest that either the Tāmraśāṭiyas or Vibhajyavādins were Vinaya schools.

1 Tarkajvāla 194a7–b2, phags pa chos sbas pa rmams kyi chos kyi rkaṅ pa. See 198a3–7 for another citation.
2 For the language of the *Vinaya* of the Mahīśāsakas, see J.W. de Jong, “Fa-hsien and Buddhist Texts in Ceylon”, *JPTS IX*, 1981, pp. 105–15. Note that there is no

2 I do not think the Mahīśāsakas alone can be taken as “the continental counterpart” of the Theravādins (Barea 1955, p. 183): it is simplistic to expect the Sthaviras, spread out over a wide area in different countries and conditions, to have sprung only a single branch.
were not the Sthaviras but rather one of several schools of the Sthavira fold in India, along with at least the Mahāsāsakas and the Viṃhajayavādins. (Note that the Theravādins of Ceylon do not portray themselves as part of a "Greater Sthavira School" of Jambudvīpa, about which they are silent, but rather as the sole repositories of the pristine Sthavira lineage.)

The affiliation of the Sthaviras, Tāmraśāṭiyas, Viṃhajayavādins, Mahāsāsakas, Kāśyapiyas, and Dharmaguptakas suggested by the sources cited above does not, however, agree with that given in the later treatises on the "18 schools". The closest parallel is given by Bhavya, who reports a tradition that places the Tāmraśāṭiyas, Mahāsāsakas, Kāśyapiyas, and Dharmaguptakas under the Viṃhajayavādins (Table 7.B).1 According to this tradition the Viṃhajayavādins are distinct from the Sthaviras. Vinitadeva, Subhūtīghoṣa, and the anonymous Ārya-saṃvastivādi-mūla-bhikṣuṇī-prātimokṣa-sūtra-vṛtti count the Tāmraśāṭiyas as number 6 of the seven branches of the Sarvāstivādins (along with, let us note, the Mahāsāsakas, Kāśyapiyas, Dharmaguptakas, and Viṃhajayavādins of Bhavya’s list).2 This list must originate with the Sarvāstivādins, to whom it gives prominence. A Sarvāstivādin affiliation for these schools can be rejected since it is contradicted by both other, earlier, sources on the “18 schools” and by the doctrines ascribed to them; the point of interest is that the group is kept together. In the

---

1 Q 5640, u, 179a4; Tarkajvalā 162b5; Bureau 1956, 171–72.
2 "Phags pa thams cad yod par smra ba'i rtsa ba'i dge sloṅ ma'i so sor thar pa'i mdo'i 'grel pa, Q 5614, Vol. 122, mdo 'grel, tshu, 3b8 foll. The Sanskrit title is so presented in the Peking edition. The commentary might be based on a Sarvāstivādin version of the Bhikṣuṇī-prātimokṣa since it describes the Sarvāstivādins as the “root” (rtsa ba = mūla) but the Mūlasarvāstivādins as the first of the “seven branches” (yan lag = sākhā)(3b8); the author must, however, have been a Mahāyānist since he or she cites sūtras of that “school” in the form of excerpts from the Sutra-samuccaya. An interesting feature of the work is that it mentions 22 schools (3b7), referring the reader to the sāstras of Ācāryas Vasumitra (dByig gi bṣes gšen) and Vinitadeva (Dul ba'i lha) for details (4a5). The latter reference dates the work to the 8th century.

---

3 Q 5640, 177b8; Tarkajvalā 161b6, de rdi la gams kyi ri pa žes kyan zer te | gams kyi ri la brten nas gnas pa'i phyir ro. For this school, see Bureau 1955, pp. 111–13.
4 Q 5640, u, 189b8, ’pho ba smra ba de dag ni gos dmar gyi sde pa rdi do; Bureau 1956, pp. 192, 196–99. For this school, see Bureau 1955, Ch. XXII.
5 For a different interpretation of Sendhapa, based on the variant Pendapa, see Ruegg 1992, pp. 267–68, and accompanying notes.
In some cases the school may not be named at all, but simply described as “some” or “others”. In his Vṛyākhyāyukti, for example, Vasubandhu, analyses the phrase sa-artham su-vyañjanam, the standard form met with in Sanskrit texts. He notes also that “some read *sa-artham sa-vyañjanam” (kha cig ni don dan ldan pa dan | tshig ’bru dan ldan pa žes ’don te); this agrees with the standard Pāli form sa-artham sa-vyañjanam (M I 179,7, etc.). Unfortunately neither Vasubandhu nor his commentator Gunnāmati says who these “some” are; they may be Theravādins, but they may also be members of one of the several Buddhist schools whose scriptures have not come down to us. At any rate, the reference shows that the reading preferred by the Theravādins was known to Vasubandhu.

3. Modern translations of Theravādin texts

3.1. The Dhammapada and Gedun Chomphel

The Dhammapada was translated from Pāli into Tibetan by the modern scholar Gedun Chomphel (dGe ’dun Chos ’phel, 1905–51) under the title Chos kyi tshigs su bcad pa (= Dhamma-gāthā, gāthā being one of the meanings of pada). The first edition has a 3-page preface by George Roerich dated Kulu, 1944. Roerich notes that “the translator is not only a Tibetan scholar of eminence, but a distinguished poet as well, and his translation combines scholarly exactitude with a high literary value”. The translation gives brief nidānas extracted from the Dhp-a (of the type discussed in § 2.4 above) at the head of the verses. It has been reprinted several times, and has firmly established itself in the

1 VyY, Q 5562, sels tsam, si, 33a1.

2 ‘Phags pa gnas brtan pa rnam kyi mdo sde sde snod du bsad pa las | phran tshogs kyi mdo phran gūs pa chos kyi tshigs su bcad pa zhes bya bar dzogs so || 'dren pa chen po gnas brtan dha rmā nāna’ i žabs drun du žus te | singa la dpal ral gri’i ri bo’i dgon par dge ’dun chos ’phel gvyis bsgyu bar dzogs so || ||.
3 A brief account of Gedun Chomphel’s stay in Ceylon is given (in Tibetan) in the biography Šes rab rgya mtshos bris pa ’i dge ’dun chos ’phel gyi rnam thar, in Dge ’dun chos ’phel gyi gsun rtsom, Vol. II, p. 369.
4 Va ra nā si ma hā bo dzi ’dun dge sloi san gha rnam ’i bka’ mngags bzin du | sog po chos rje bla mas lcags ’phrul tu par bsbrun pa’o. This is followed by a brief note on the Mahābodhi Society in India and at Sarnath (pp. 157–58).
The Dhammapada translation was by no means Gedun Chomphel’s sole contribution to the study of the Theravāda in Tibetan. His great work on Madhyamaka, Ornament of the Significance of Nāgārjuna’s Thought, mentions Bhadanta Buddhagossa side-by-side with Asaṅga and other Buddhist masters; this may well be the first reference to Buddhaghosa in the philosophical literature of Tibet.  

His lengthy “History of Sinhala” — recently made available in printed form — gives a long account of Ceylonese history from the beginning up to modern times. The author describes Ceylonese monasteries and monastic regulations; he gives a breakdown of the Pāli canon, and discusses the commentaries, the works of Buddhaghosa such as the Visuddhimagga (rNam par dag pa’i lam), and so on. (Note that the names of the seven books of the Abhidhamma, for which see Table 5, are correctly rendered.) In what must be the first mention of Pāli (the word is transcribed, not translated) in Tibetan, he discusses that language and the Theravādin belief that it is the language of the Buddha. He discusses the duration of the dhamma and the Theravādin calculation of the nirvāṇa era, comparing it with that introduced to Tibet by Kha che pan chen.  

Stoddard (p. 182) mentions that during his stay [in Ceylon] he translated the Vinaya into Tibetan and sent it to a friend in Tibet, explaining the difference between [the Theravādin and Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinayas]. As far as I know this work has not come to light; if he did indeed translate the entire Vinaya, this would be an extraordinary feat — but Gedun Chomphel was an extraordinary man.

1 Dbu ma’i zab gnad sīn por dril ba’i legs bṣad klu sgrub dgongs rgyan (Kalimpong blockprint, 1951) (modern page) 12.4, btsun pa sans rgyas dbyangs: I am grateful to Donald Lopez (Ann Arbor) for this reference and for a copy of the relevant passage.

2 Dge’i  ’dun chos ’phel gyi gsun rtsom, Vol. I, Ch. 14, singa’i lo rgyus skor, pp. 427–500.

3 Stoddard, p. 182: “Pendant son séjour, Gedun Ch’omp’el fit une traduction tibétaine du vinaya cinghalais et l’envoya à un ami au Tibet, lui explicant la différence entre les deux systèmes”.

3.2. Abhidhammatthasaṅgahā of Aniruddha

The Abhidhammatthasaṅgahā of Aniruddha, a popular manual of the Abhidhamma, has recently been translated into Tibetan by Acharya Sempa Dorjee (Sems dpa’ rdo rje), accompanied by his own commentary entitled Abhidhammakaumudini. Volume I, containing the first five chapters in 705 pages, with Hindi translation, has already been published as Vol. VIII of the Dalai Lama Tibeto-Indological Series by the Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies (Sarnath, 1988); Volume II, containing chapters six to ten, is forthcoming from the same publisher. The introduction describes the seven books of the Theravādin Abhidhamma, and the commentary explains the Theravādin system in detail, with frequent references to Pāli sources. Sempa Dorjee’s scholarly work is the first extensive description of the Pāli Abhidhamma in the Tibetan language.

4. Tibet and Ceylon

Other material relevant to the history and Buddhism of Ceylon is available in Tibetan sources. Ānandaśri was not the only Ceylonese to have played a role in the literary and religious history of the Land of Snows (though he may have been the only one to introduce Theravādin texts). The Tanjur preserves translations of a commentary on the Cakrasamvara-tantra and three related ritual texts composed by a Ceylonese monk named Jayabhadrā. In the 11th century, a Yogini from Sinhaladvipa named Candramālā collaborated on the translation of several
Tantras with bhikṣu Śākya Ye ṣes (‘Brog mi’). Tse’s biography of the first Sa skya Lama Sa chen Kun dga’ sḥiṅ po (1092–1158), was a key figure in the early Sa skya pa lineage; perhaps more information about Candramālā may be found in the texts of that school. An elusive “Arhat of Siṃhahalavīpa” figures in the biography of the Kashmiri paṇḍita Śākyasribhadra (1140s–1226). In the second half of the 15th century, a Ceylonese named Chos kyi őn byed (Dharmadi ṇākara?) travelled to Tibet, where he travelled and taught extensively. He is held to be a predecessor in the incarnation lineage of the first Jetsundampa of Mongolia. In his homeland he had a vision at “the mountain with the footprint of the Buddha” (Śripāda), foretelling his visit to the Mountain of Five Peaks (Wu tai shan) in China. He travelled to Magadha and Vajrāsana, then on to China, where he met some merchants who invited him to Tibet. After a year at sTag lun he travelled to Lhasa and to Western Tibet and Nepal, where he disrobed to become a Tantric yogi. He died on his way back to Ceylon.

The travelogues of peripatetic yogis contain information about Ceylon (and also India and South-East Asia). Tse’s biography of the Chittagoni monk Vanaratna (born 1384) describes his visit to Ceylon — where he spent six years (from about 1404–10) — and to Śripāda. Tāranātha’s biography of Buddhagupta of South India contains an account of that yogi’s visit to Ceylon, where he spent five years in the late 16th century, and his pilgrimage to Śripāda. Further references to Ceylon may be found in such works as Tāranātha’s History of the Tārā Tantra or his Seven Instruction Lineages, in the biography of Dharmasvāmin, the biographies of the Eighty-four Siddhas, or in other works not yet examined. A brief but somewhat more modern account of the island was offered by Jigs med gliṅ pa in 1788.

Conclusions

The Theravādin texts in Tibetan translation are the work of four known translation teams: Vidyākaraprabha and d Pal brtsegs near Lhasa, ca. 800 (1.15); Dipamkaraśriṇāṇa (Atiśa) and Tshul khrims rgyal ba at Lhasa in the first half of the 11th century (2.3); Ānandaśri and Ī mrgyal mtskan dPal bsaṅ po at Thar pa gliṅ (1.1–13), and Ānandaśri and Kun dga’ rgyal mtskan Thub bstan dPal bsaṅ po at Sa skya, both in the first decade of the 14th century. The translators of 2.1–2 are not known.

Our knowledge of the development of Buddhism in India suffers heavily from a (Mūla-)Sarvastivādin-Vaibhāṣika bias, since most of the surviving sources for the subject — whether of the Śrāvakayāna or the Mahāyāna, whether in Sanskrit, Chinese, Tibetan, or Central Asian
translation — belong to or were influenced by that tradition. The information supplied here from Tibetan sources helps in a small measure to fill that lacuna in our knowledge. The brief citation of a *Buddhavamsa of the Abhayagarirvāsins (2.3) gives us the name of a lost and hitherto unknown text of that school, and shows that it was available in the India of about the 6th century. Tradition holds that Bhavya was born in and spent the greater part of his life in the South, but from where he obtained the text is not certain — and the possibility that he borrowed the citation from another work cannot be ruled out. The translations of portions of the Vimuttimagga (1.15, 2.1) show that that text was extant and studied in Northern India from ca. 800 to the early 13th century. The citations from other, unidentified texts given by Daśabalaśrimitra (2.2) show that other Theravādin texts were circulated in Northern India in 12th or 13th century. The alternate nidānas cited by Prajñāvarman (2.4) show that he had access to a commentarial tradition on the Udānavarga verses that must have derived from a source common to that of the Pāli Dhammapada-aṭṭhakathā. Some of his “official” nidānas give us (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin parallels to canonical Pāli suttas; they also cast a beam of light on the sources of the Nettipakarana, one of the riddles of Pāli studies. The references in various Tanjur texts (2.5) to tenets of the Sthaviras, Tāmraśātikyas, and affiliated schools throw at least a little light on some of the key concepts of the Theravāda, such as the bhavanga-viññāna and hadaya-vatthu, and show that such doctrines were known to Indian scholars. The modern translations (3.1, 2) show that the Tibetans still take an interest in the texts and tenets of all Buddhist schools, whether Mahāyāna or Śrāvakayāna, and are still indefatigable in the art of translation.

While a critical edition of the 14 texts translated by Ānandaśrī might be of some value, and would clarify the extent of redactional differences from the Pāli, its preparation would not be an enviable task, considering the many problems of translation in the Tibetan. Four of them, however, certainly deserve further study. The Maitrī-sūtra (1.5, along with 1.14, the Ārya-maitrī-sūtra) could be edited in conjunction with the hitherto unedited Pāli Metteyya-sutta in Burmese and Siamese manuscripts. The Pañcaśikṣāṇusāmsa (1.7) merits study since the second part (1.7B) seems to have no Pāli parallel, and is otherwise unknown. The Mahāmaṅgala-sūtra (1.13) could fruitfully be edited along with the Tibetan Devapariprcchā Maṅgalagāthā of unknown school, in comparison with the Pāli. A comparison of the Nandopanandadāmanā (1.9) in its Tibetan and Pāli versions with the Chinese sūtra of the same title should prove very interesting, since the Chinese version predates Buddhaghosa’s citation by about two centuries. An edition and translation of Daśabalaśrimitra’s citations from the Vimuttimagga (2.1), in comparison with the Chinese version, and of the same author’s citations of other Theravādin texts (2.2), is a desideratum, as is a thorough comparison of both the official and alternate nidānas of Prajñāvarman (2.4) with Pāli sources. Finally, a concordance of references in Tibetan literature to Theravādin tenets and to Ceylon would be most useful.

Bangkok

Peter Skilling
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### Table 1: Location of the 13 texts after the arrangement of the Tshal pa Kanjur

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>13–25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cone</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1014–26</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>13–25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derge</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31–43</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>13–25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lhasa</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32–44</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>32–44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithang</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>26–38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13–25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narthang</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>347–59</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>13–25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peking</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>747–59</td>
<td>tsi</td>
<td>13–25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urga</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31–43</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>19–31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 The catalogue does not assign a letter (ka, etc.) to the volume.

### Table 2: Location of the 13 texts after the arrangement of the Them spangs ma Kanjur

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Vol.</th>
<th>Nos.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>XXXVI</td>
<td>1–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XXXVI</td>
<td>15–19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stog</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>15–19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>15–19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulan Bator</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>15–19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JB</td>
<td></td>
<td>1–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15–19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JP</td>
<td></td>
<td>1–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15–19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3: “Epithets of insight” in the Dhammacakkappavattana-sutta

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Derge 31, 181a6</th>
<th>Tib. tr. into Pali</th>
<th>S V 422,3</th>
<th>Sanghabh I 135,4</th>
<th>Mahāvastu III 441,1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. mig bskyed pa dan</td>
<td>cakkhum udapādi</td>
<td>1. cakkhum udapādi</td>
<td>cakṣur udapādi (1)</td>
<td>jñānam udapāsi (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ye ses bskyed pa dan</td>
<td>ūnānam udapādi</td>
<td>2. ūnānam udapādi</td>
<td>jñānam udapādi (2)</td>
<td>cakṣur udapāsi (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ses rab bskyed pa dan</td>
<td>paññā udapādi</td>
<td>3. paññā udapādi</td>
<td>vidyā udapādi (4)</td>
<td>vidyā udapāsi (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. rig pa bskyed pa dan</td>
<td>vijjā udapādi</td>
<td>4. vijjā udapādi</td>
<td>buddhir udapādi (—)</td>
<td>buddhi udapāsi (—)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. snañ ba bskyed pa’o</td>
<td></td>
<td>ałoko udapādi</td>
<td>5. ałoko udapādi</td>
<td>bhūri udapāsi (—)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

prajñā udapāsi (3)  
ālokam prādurbhūṣi (5)

---

### Table 4: Concordance of Uv, Dhp, Gdhp, Pdhp, and alternate nidānas in the Krodhavarga

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>alternate nidānas in the Krodhavarga</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gdhp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pdhp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I give the name of the chief figure as keyword.

2) Bhikku  
3) Udwari  
1) Rohini  
2) Mogallana  
19  
16  
22  
2  
4  
3  
4  
7  
8  
2  
2  
1  
1  
1  
1  
XIII.22  
XIV.15
Table 5: Contents of Abhidhamma and Suttanta according to the Maitreya-sūtra (1.5, 14) and Gedun Chopphel (3.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Abhidhamma</th>
<th>B. Suttanta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Rab tu byed pa chen po</td>
<td>Am go tta ra ni ka yam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Yamakam (gi)</td>
<td>Aṅguttara-nikāya(^8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tshigs su becad pa (dañ) gzi (dañ)</td>
<td>Yan dag par ldan pa'i sde pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Gan zag (dañ) gdags pa (dañ)</td>
<td>Yāmaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. sKu gdun gi gtram (dañ)</td>
<td>Kathā-vatthu(^3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. rNam 'byed (dañ)</td>
<td>gT'am gyi gzi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Chos bsdus pa</td>
<td>Chos kyi tshogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chos yāṅ dag par sāṇḍ pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dharmasaṅgāni(^7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Chomphel also gives transcriptions of the Abhidhamma titles; these are corrupt in the printed edition. The numbers before the titles refer to the order followed by Chopphel.
2. Rab tu byed pa = pakarana; chen po = mahā. Mahāpakarana is an alternate title of the Paṭṭhāna.
3. Both D and Q translate “gāhā (tshigs su becad pa) and vatthu (gzi)”. In D this is connected to the preceding by the genitive postposition gi, making one title of nos. 2 and 3: “the gāhā and vatthu of the Yāmaka”.
4. D translates, “gan zag (= puggala) and gdags pa (= paññatti)”; Q transcribes and translates, “pañcagala and gtsug”. I cannot explain the use of gtsug = cīda.
5. D translates dhamma in the sense of “relic” (sku gdun), Q in the sense of “element” (kham). D translates kathā correctly as gtañ; the tshogs of Q might be a misreading of kāya for kathā.
6. The translation is correct: rnam (par) 'byed (pa) is the standard rendering of vibhanga.
7. Chos = dhamma; the bsdus pa of D = sangaha; Q has yāṅ dag par = sāṇ + sāṇḍ pa = sangaha.

| 8. D transcribes anga, and translates uttara as phyi ma; Q transcribes all. D translates nikāya as sde pa throughout; here Q transcribes nikāya, but in the next three translates it as lun = āgama. The translations of 2 to 4 are correct; Q uses the standard Tibetan renderings of the four Āgamas of the (Mūla-)Sārvāstivādin tradition.

<p>| 1.5 (D 264a1 foll.) | 1.14 (Q 305a4 foll.) | Pāli | gSuñ frsom I 453–54|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author, translators</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Ldan kar ma no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Vasubandhu</td>
<td><em>Karmasiddhi-prakarana</em></td>
<td>bhavānga</td>
<td>651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr. Viśuddhasīṃha, Devendrarakṣita; rev. dPal brtsegs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Sumatiśila</td>
<td><em>Ṭīkā on preceding</em></td>
<td>ctry on prec.</td>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr. Viśuddhasīṃha, Devendrarakṣita; rev. dPal brtsegs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Vasubandhu</td>
<td><em>Pratītyasamutpādavyākhyā</em></td>
<td>citation</td>
<td>653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr. Surendrākaraṇrabha, Nam Mkha’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Guṇamati</td>
<td><em>Ṭīkā on preceding</em></td>
<td>ctry on prec.</td>
<td>654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr. Surendrākaraṇrabha, Nam Mkha’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Yaśomitra</td>
<td><em>Kośa-vyākhyā</em></td>
<td>a) hṛdayavastu</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr. Viśuddhasīṃha, dPal brtsegs</td>
<td></td>
<td>b) example of sect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Vinītadeva</td>
<td><em>Samayabheda-samgraha</em></td>
<td>list of sects</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr. unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Author unknown</td>
<td><em>Bhikṣunīprātimokṣa-vṛtti</em></td>
<td>list of sects</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr. unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Bhavya</td>
<td><em>Tarkajvalā</em></td>
<td>a) list of sects</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr. Atiśa, Tshul khrims rgyal ba</td>
<td></td>
<td>b) citation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Bhavya</td>
<td><em>Madhyamakar anticspadipa</em></td>
<td>citation</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr. Atiśa, Tshul khrims rgyal ba, brTson 'grus sen ge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Author unknown</td>
<td><em>Bhikṣuvarṣāgraprcchā</em></td>
<td>list of sects</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr. Atiśa, Tshul khrims rgyal ba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Subhūtigṛhoṣa</td>
<td><em>Sarvayānālāka</em></td>
<td>list of sects</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr. Rab 'byor dbyaṅs, Tīn 'ne 'dzin bzaṅ po</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) Author unknown</td>
<td><em>Śrāmaṇeravārṣāgraprcchā</em></td>
<td>list of sects</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr. Narayadeva, rGyal ba'i sles rab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### A. Branches of the Sarvāstivādins

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vinitadeva 187b5, 189a2</th>
<th>Bhikṣunīprātimokṣa-vṛtti 3b8</th>
<th>Subhūtīghoṣa 417a1</th>
<th>Bhikṣuvarṣāgra 318a4</th>
<th>Śrāmaneravarsāgra 79a5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kāśyapiya</td>
<td>Mūlasarvāstivādin</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahāśāsaka</td>
<td>Kāśyapiya</td>
<td>1 Kāśyapiya</td>
<td>Mahāśāsaka</td>
<td>Mahāśāsaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dharmaguptaka</td>
<td>Mahāśāsaka</td>
<td>2 Dharmaguptaka</td>
<td>Dharmaguptaka</td>
<td>Dharmaguptaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahuṣrutiya</td>
<td>Avantaka (sruñ ba pa)</td>
<td>Bahuṣrutiya</td>
<td>Bahuṣrutiya</td>
<td>Bahuṣrutiya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāmraśāṭiṇya</td>
<td>Tāmraśāṭiṇya</td>
<td>Tāmraśāṭiṇya</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibhajyavādin</td>
<td>Vibhajyavādin</td>
<td>Vibhajyavādin</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Subhūtīghoṣa states that there are 7 branches, but omits the first.
2 Maṅ po ston pa'i sde, rather than the usual Sa ston pa'i sde.
3 Sa ston, Śrāmanera, sa sruñ, Bhikṣu.
4 = Samkrāntivādin (Vinitadeva).
5 Gos dmar can gyi sde, rather than the usual God dmar ba'i sde.

### B. Branches of the Vibhajyavādins (Bhavya) and Sāmmatiṇyas (Śrāmaneravarsāgra, Bhikṣuvarṣāgra)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tarkajvālā 162b5</td>
<td>Mahāśāsaka (sa ston pa)</td>
<td>Mahāśāsaka (mañ ston pa)</td>
<td>Tāmraśāṭiṇya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kāśyapiya</td>
<td>Dharmaguptaka</td>
<td>Avantaka (sruñ ba pa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dharmaguptaka</td>
<td>Tāmraśāṭiṇya</td>
<td>Kurukulla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tāmraśāṭiṇya</td>
<td>Kāśyapiya</td>
<td>Bahuṣrutiya</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C. Branches of the Sthāvira

Vinitadeva 187b6, 190a3, Śrāmaneravarsāgraprācchā 79a8, Bhikṣuvarṣāgraprācchā 318a8, Subhūtīghoṣa 417a2

**Sthāvira (3):**

Jetavanīya
Abhāyagiriṇīśinī
Mahāvihāravāsīn

---

6 Jigs med rigs (correct to ri) gnas sde, Subhūtīghoṣa; 'jigs byed ri la gnas pa, Śrāmaneravarsāgra.
EXTERNAL SANDHI IN PĀLI
(WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE
SUTTANIPĀTA)

Since words in Pāli can, as a general rule, end only in a vowel or anusvāra, external sandhi in Pāli consists of a series of contractions of final vowels with the initial vowels of following words, or the loss of the nasalisation and the contraction of the vowel remaining.

As Geiger points out,¹ external sandhi in Pāli differs fundamentally from that in Sanskrit. It is always arbitrary and applies only to words which are syntactically closely connected. It permits hiatus, elides and combines vowels including nasalised vowels, and in particular depends upon the crasis or elision of -i and -u before vowels rather than the development to -y and -v found in Sanskrit. Windisch pointed out that such a sandhi system appears to be older and more natural than the system found in Sanskrit.²

When the final vowel is -il-e or -ul-o we do sometimes find -y or -v appearing. Since, in the case of -e and -o, this is not historically correct, I regard these as hyperforms, with -y and -v inserted incorrectly by someone who had some knowledge of Sanskrit. I similarly regard the appearance of -y and -v in place of -i and -u as insertions in imitation of Sanskrit.

On occasion, the long vowel which results from combination remains before a doubled consonant or consonant group (indicated by CC in the following examples), in defiance of the Law of Two Morae, by which a long vowel should be shortened in those circumstances. There seems to

¹ W. Geiger, Pāli Literatur und Sprache, 1916, § 68.
² Quoted by Geiger, ibid.

be no example in the Suttanipāta of this happening before a nasal + consonant (indicated by NC).

The great variety of sandhi forms which occur probably supports Windisch's belief. External sandhi in Pāli is, however, by its very variety more complex and confusing to readers, since it is not always obvious what vowels are being combined. In the belief that readers of Pāli, especially beginners, might find an analysis of sandhi forms helpful, I have collected here a number of examples of external sandhi which occur in the Suttanipāta, although I have very occasionally given examples from other texts of sandhi forms which do not occur in the Suttanipāta. I make no claims for completeness, but I believe that the list contains most of the sandhi forms which readers of Pāli are likely to encounter. For the most part I give only one example of each sandhi development, usually but not always the first occurrence of the form in the Suttanipāta. Numbers without any other indication refer to the verses of the Suttanipāta, and references prefixed with p. refer to the prose portions of that text. I sometimes give additional examples in the footnotes, including references to texts other than the Suttanipāta, where the sandhi is rare, or for some reason particularly interesting.

Since editors sometimes differ in the way in which they show contractions and elisions, I have omitted inverted commas, etc., and simply show the result of sandhi between hyphens. Since we cannot always be certain what vowels have been elided, I have drawn attention to possible ambiguities. As a result of the same uncertainty, some of my reconstructions may be wrong. I hope that the number of incorrect forms has been kept to a minimum.

---

1 Some of whom, I know, find the detailed accounts of sandhi in Geiger, §§ 68 foll. and A.K. Warder, *Introduction to Pali*, pp. 213 foll., rather daunting.

---

The developments of the particles api and iti sometimes show a secondary development from the historical Sanskrit sandhi. I have discussed these in a separate excursus.

In an Appendix at the end I list the sandhi developments in reverse order, so that beginners, faced with a sandhi form which they do not recognise, may have guidance in recognising which vowels may have combined to produce the form in question.

\[-a + a > \text{-}a\-\]
\[-a + aCC > \text{-}aCC\-\]
\[-a + aCC > \text{-}aCC\-\]
\[-a + aNC > \text{-}aNC\-\]
\[-a + i > \text{-}i\-\]
\[-a + i > \text{-}i\-\]
\[-a + i > \text{-}e\-\]
\[-a + iC > \text{-}iC\-\]
\[-a + iNC > \text{-}iNC\-\]
\[-a + u > \text{-}u\-\]
\[-a + u > \text{-}u\-\]
\[-a + uC > \text{-}uC\-\]
\[-a + e > \text{-}e\-\]

---

1 cf. 8 foll. na + accasāri > nāccasāri; 291 na + assu > nāssu.
2 This is probably not the result of -a + i-, but is an analogical form based upon -i + iti. See the note on -i + i- below.
3 cf. 768 sappassa + iwa > sappassewa.
4 cf. 801 yassa ubhayante > yassābhayante; 849 na + upasamkheyyo > nūpa-;
1077 jīvītena + upapannam > jīvītenūpa-; 1106 ca + ubhayam > cābhayam.
5 cf. 779 na + upalitto > nopalitto; 812 na + upalippati > nopalippati.
-a + o- > -o-
270 iva + ossajanti > ivossajanti

-am) -am + a- > -ā-
p. 16.1 labheyyāma + aham > labheyyāham
-am + a- > -ā-
538 -taman + agā > -tamāgā
-am + aCC- > -āCC-
225 samām + athi > samathī
-am + aCC- > -āCC-
769 gavām + assam > gavāssam
-am + aNC- > -āNC-
1148 pañhānam antakaro > pañhānamantakaro
-am + ā- > -ā-
285 brāhmaṇānam + asum > brāhmaṇānāsum
-am + i- > -i-
833 yesam + idha > yesidha
-am + u- > -u-
700 anagāriyam + upetassa > anagāriyupetassa
-am + u- > -ū-
901 tapam upanissāya > apūpanissāya
-am + uCC- > -ūCC-
248 niccām + uyyutā > niccāyyutā

-ā) -a + a- > -ā-
53 yathā + abhirantam > yathabhī-
-a + aCC- > -āCC-
146 pāñabhūtā (perhaps) + aththi > -bhūtathī

1 Is this iva + ossajanti (with gemination of -s-) or iva + ussajanti, i.e. is it -a + o- > -o- or -a + u- > -o-?
2 cf. 353 1061 vācam abhikankhāmī > vācābhikankhāmī; 365 nibbānapadām + abhipatthayāno > -padabhikapthayāno; 788 etam + abhijānam > etabhijānam; 896 khema + abhipassam > khemābhipassam; 1033 jappam + abhilepanam > jappabhilepanam; 1057 1083 etam abhinnāmī > etabhinnāmī.
3 cf. 693 viṭṭhārikam + asa > viṭṭhārikassa; 970 kuvam + ajja > kuvajja [NB kuvam in 970a].
4 Is this internal or external sandhi, i.e. is it a compound or two separate words? Is it -a + aCC- > -āCC- or -am + aCC- > -āCC-?
5 cf. 972 kukkuciyām + upacinde > kukkuciyāpa-.
6 cf. 151 yāvatā + assa > yāvatassa; 508 Brahmā + ajja > Brahmajja; 595 padakā + asmā > padakasmā; 875-76 ettavatā + aggam > ettavattagam; 1022 uṇṇā + assa > uṇṇassa.

1 cf. 830 sā + assa > sāssa; 1100 āsavā + assa > āsavāssa.
2 cf. 1030 manasā + icchatha > manasicchatha.
3 cf. 231 catūhi + apāyehi > catāhpāyehi.
4 cf. 693 phusissati + aya > phusissatayam; 693 vattessati + aya > vattessatayam; and Thī 206 tehi + aruncañnam > tehūncañnam.
6 cf. p. 13,15 bhuṃjāmī + iti > bhūṃjāmiti. The development of vowels before (iti) follows a consistent pattern, and I have listed them in their appropriate places (e.g. -a + i- > -ā-; -i + i- > -i-; -u + i- > -ū-; -e + i- > -e-; -o + i- > -o-, but since the development of -am > -an in comparable situations (e.g. 9 idam + ti > idanti) seems to suggest that we are dealing with iti, not iti, I would rather suggest that, on the analogy of historical Skt -i + i- > -i-, e.g. bhavati + iti > bhavatiti which was analysed as bhavati ti, short vowels before (iti) were lengthened, and -e and -o remained unchanged. A similar analogical development has taken place in
-i + e- -> -e-
52 pi + eta ni > petani
-ti + eke > tyek

-im + a- -> -a-
Vin IV 162,1 kim + aham > kaham
-im + aCC- > -aCC-
Ja V 362,25* ajanalim + asa > ajanalissa
-im + i- > i-
1078 munim + idha > munida

-u) -u + a- -> -a-
482 sadhu + ahama > sadhaham
-u + a- -> va-
Ap 516,14 bhavesu + aham >
-bhavesvaham
-u + a- -> -a-
p. 31,18 sadhu + avuso > sadhavuso
-u + a- -> -va-
424 kamesu + adinavam >
kamesvadinavam
-u + i- > -a-
173 su + idha > sidha
-u + i- > -i-
1082-83 su + idha > sidha
-u + e- -> -ve-
-p. 104,13 adhivasevata eva >
-adhivasesveva

Artha-Magadhi, where the historical bhavatiti was replaced by the alternative bhavatiti, analysed as bhavati tti, which led to the analogical -a tti and -u tti. Before the double consonant a long vowel is shortened, e.g. samiti tti (Uttaradhyayanasutra 8.9), for samiti tti, logu tti (Utt. 8.20) for logu tti, and pati tti (Utt. 12.47) for pati tti.

1 cf. p. 124,5 hi + eva m > hevam, where, however, hevam may be a word in its own right (see K.R. Norman, "Pali lexicographical studies IX", JPTS Vol. XVI, 1992, pp. 77-85 [p. 85]); p. 218,18 M III 133,29 ti + eva > teva.
2 For 1032 kisabhiplapanam see GD II, note ad 1032.
3 I suspect that this is a Sanskritism for bhaves aham. 4 p. 13,13 bhujasuti is probably not the result of -u + i-, but is an analogical form based upon -i + ti. See the note on -i + i- above.
5 I suspect that this is a Sanskritism for adhivases tta eva; cf. 611 manussese + etam + manussesvetam (= manussese etam ?); p. 126,12 tu + eva > teva; and Thi 499 pipitiptus + eva > pipitipusveva, which is probably a Sanskritism for pipitipus tta. See GD II, note ad 144.

1 See Sv 389,10.
2 cf. 1046 kame abhiyappanti > kambhiyappanti; 1116 dve + ahama > dvaham; and Ja V 154,18* ye + ahama > vaaham.
3 cf. p. 21,16 dhamme + itti > dhammeiti. This is, however, probably not the result of -e + i-, but is an analogical form based upon the development of -i + iti. See the note on -i + i- above.
4 cf. 461 rato + ahma > rataha; 690 anuttaro + ayam > anuttaraya; 692 orako + ayam > orakaya; and S 1238,22 kuddha + ahama > kudhabha; Dhp 56 yo + ayam > yaya; S II 178,8 anamataggo + ayam > anamataggaya.
5 cf. Vin II 181,6 ko + ayam > kvaya.
6 cf. 94 asanto + asa > asantassa; 324 sammavittito + asa > nivittassa; 584 bhyyo + asa > bhyyasa; 920 anego + asa > anejasa; 922 lolo + asa > lalosa; 923 phuto + asa > phuttassa; 925 padalolo + asa > padalolassa; 994 soko + asa > sokassa; and Dhp 389 yo + asa > yasa.
7 cf. S III 93,9* otno + amhi > othiyamhi.
Excursus on the sandhi of api and (i)ti

In 460 api + eva > apy eva > app eva, i.e. the Pāli sandhi is a development of the Skt sandhi, showing the assimilation of py > pp.

In 241 iti + eva > ity eva > icceva; 251 iti etam > icctam; 355 iti + abravi > iccabravi, i.e. the Pāli sandhi is a development of the Skt sandhi, showing the palatalisation of ty > cc.

We also find some contexts where what must originally have been (i)ti occurs as tv, as though from tu:

kālakato tv eva saṅkhaṁ gacchati, M III 137,8 foll.
Ekadhammasavānīyo tv eva saṃaññā ahosi, Th-a I 162,12.

As the first of these comes only a few pages after ti + eva > t′ eva, it seems suspicious. Trenckner notes⁴ that “in canonical writings there is sufficient authority to distinguish between t′ eva = ti eva and tveva = tu eva. In comments the latter is never used, but the scribes often substitute

---

1 cf. 142 brāhmaṇo + ti > brāhmaṇoti. This is, however, probably not the result of -o + i-, but is an analogical form based upon the development of -i + iti. See the note on -i + i- above.
2 If genuine, this is presumably a secondary development from kv with a svarabhakti vowel. Perhaps we should read kvidha with Be.
3 See GD II, note ad 214.
4 At Mil 423 (ad Mil 114,11).

---

1 See CPD s.vv. itveva and itvevam, where it is derived from ity eva(m), and the equivalence is icceva. See also Sadd 617,14-17.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( -a- )</th>
<th>( -am + a- )</th>
<th>( -äCC- )</th>
<th>( -a + aCC- )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( -i + a- )</td>
<td>( -am + aCC- )</td>
<td>( -ä + aCC- )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( -aCC- )</th>
<th>( -a + aCC- )</th>
<th>( -a + i- )</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( -am + aCC- )</td>
<td>( -i + i- )</td>
<td>( -o + i- )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( -aNC- )</th>
<th>( -a + aNC- )</th>
<th>( -a + aCC- )</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( -am + aNC- )</td>
<td>( -i + aNN- )</td>
<td>( -a + NC- )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( -ä + aNC- )</td>
<td>( -i + aNN- )</td>
<td>( -e + aNC- )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( -o + aNC- )</td>
<td>( -iNC- )</td>
<td>( -a + iNC- )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( -ä - )</th>
<th>( -a + a- )</th>
<th>( -a + ä- )</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( -am + a- )</td>
<td>( -a + i- )</td>
<td>( -am + å- )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( -am + æ- )</td>
<td>( -ä + i- )</td>
<td>( -ä + å- )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( -ä + a- )</td>
<td>( -i + i- )</td>
<td>( -ä + å- )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( -ä + å- )</td>
<td>( -i + i- )</td>
<td>( -i + å- )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( -i + a- )</td>
<td>( -u + å- )</td>
<td>( -i + å- )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( -i + å- )</td>
<td>( -u + å- )</td>
<td>( -i + å- )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( -im + a- )</td>
<td>( -u- )</td>
<td>( -a + u- )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( -u + a- )</td>
<td>( -am + u- )</td>
<td>( -u + å- )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( -u + å- )</td>
<td>( -uCC- )</td>
<td>( -a + uCC- )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( -um + a- )</td>
<td>( -uCC- )</td>
<td>( -a + uCC- )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( -e + a- )</td>
<td>( -am + uCC- )</td>
<td>( -e + aCC- )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( -o + a- )</td>
<td>( -o + aCC- )</td>
<td>( -e + aCC- )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( -o + å- )</td>
<td>( -uvi- )</td>
<td>( -o + i- )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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