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Pali, Pāṇini and “Popular” Sanskrit*
(Miscellanea Palica VI)

Though it has never been doubted that non-standard Sanskrit (or sanskrit approximatif, as Helmer Smith [1954: 3] called it) as evidenced by the Mahābhārata, the Rāmāyaṇa and the Purāṇas is of prime importance for the study of the history of Pali and other Middle Indo-Aryan languages, the Pali grammar of Geiger – and the same holds true for the Prakrit grammar of Pischel – does not make any reference to Epic or Purānic Sanskrit forms. Just as little attention has been paid to the relation of Pali (and Middle Indo-Aryan in general) to late Vedic and Sanskrit as described by Pāṇini. On the other hand, scholars discussing specific forms and constructions of late Vedic, of Epic and Purānic Sanskrit and of Pāṇini’s grammar have rarely taken into account corresponding Middle Indian phenomena. A few selected examples – in the main syntactical and lexical problems – will be discussed to show that the interlinking of the linguistic study of Pali, of Epic and Purānic Sanskrit and of Pāṇini will not only help us to achieve a better understanding of the development of the Indo-Aryan languages, but will also prove fruitful for the better comprehending of what the texts actually tell us.

* The author wishes to express his gratitude to the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft for granting a Heisenberg-Stipendium. This enabled him to write this paper, which is the outcome of an extensive investigation of Epic Sanskrit, the results of which will be published as a “Grammar of Epic Sanskrit” (in Indian Philology and South Asian Studies [ed. by A. Wenzler and M. Witzel]). My thanks are also due to Professor O. von Hinüber, who read an earlier version of this paper and made valuable suggestions. Needless to say, I am responsible for any faults this article may contain.

I use the abbreviations of the titles of Pali texts laid down in the Epilegomena to Volume I of A Critical Pali Dictionary.
1.1. **Instrumental in place of locative**

One syntactical feature shared by Pali, Prakrit and non-standard Sanskrit is the usage of the instrumental\(^1\) in place of the locative\(^2\). It will be seen that the consideration of the same phenomenon in Epic Sanskrit on the one hand, and in Prakrit on the other, will help us to assess one of Lüders' hypotheses relating to the “eastern” proto-canonical Buddhist language. Lüders postulated a locative in "eht" for the “eastern” language, since a couple of Pali stanzas use a form in "eht" where we would expect a locative (1954: § 220-225; cf. von Hinüber § 321)\(^3\). But it is well known that, in the syntax of Epic Sanskrit, the salient feature is the interchangeability of different cases in construction with verb forms. This “confusion” of cases was due to the incipient break-down of the inflexional system, which again led to the employment of a large number of post-positions. The same phenomenon is encountered in Middle Indo-Aryan where – e.g. in the feminine noun inflection (cf. Insler 1994: 70) –

---

\(^1\) I regret that I do not have access to Sukumar Sen, “The use of the instrumental in Middle Indo-Aryan”, PAIOC V (Summaries) 44-48 (according to the PAIOC index it has been published in Indian Linguistics 8 – however, it is not to be found there).

\(^2\) Due to my regrettable ignorance of any Dravidian language I do not know whether (or not) and (if so) to what extent such a phenomenon is due to the influence of Dravidian. To judge from the investigations of De Vreese (1953, 1980), “Dravidism” in Pali only appear rather late.

\(^3\) In the report on his investigations into the Buddhist “Urkanon”, originally published in SBAW 1927, p. 123, and reprinted in Lüders 1954: 8, Lüders explicitly speaks of the “Lok. pl. auf "eht"” (cf. also von Hinüber 1968: § 307). And he considers this form as a peculiarity of the nominal inflexion of the “Ostspareche” and not of the syntax of that language: “Auch in der Flexion zeigen sich manche Unterschiede. Wichtig ist besonders, daß der Akk. Pl. der a-Stämme auf -am ausging, der Lok. pl. auf "eht"” (l.c.). Lüders’ reasoning, in establishing this ending, is as simple as it is in the case of the “ablative” in "um" (cf. de Vreese 1955: 370): some verbs are normally construed with the locative; if we find a form in "eht" in one of these constructions it has to be a locative; and because we do find it we have a locative in "eht."
§ 166e), but on the whole both cases are interchangeable⁷, as the variae lectiones show⁸. Thus the locative and the instrumental can be used in coordination: dvau putrau vinatā vavre kadṛāputrādhi kau bale / ojasā tejasā ca tvā vikramenādhi kau satau “Vinata chose two sons who were to exceed Kadru’s sons in strength and to excel them in brilliance, beauty, and might”, Mbh 1,14.8⁹.

In this respect, the fact that the Epic poets partly used the instrumental and partly the locative to convey what is evidently the same meaning is very instructive. Compare e.g. a) durmantritena vs. durmanrite b) durnayaih vs. durnaye c) prayojanam + instr. vs. + loc.¹⁰:

- sa sete niṣṭanah bhūmau vātaruniga iva drumaḥ / mama durmantritenāsaṃ yathā nāraḥ sa bhārata, Mbh 6,15.15
- bhimo bhima bale rājaṃs / tava durmanrite nāraḥ, Mbh 7,90.24
- samsrmya sarvaduhkhāni / tava durmanritena ca, Mbh 7,162.52
- kṣatriyā nidhanāṃ yānti / karna durmanritena ca, Mbh 6,92.7
- rājan durmanrite tava, Mbh 6,58.19 = 7,80.31 = 122.88 = 127.26 = 157.12 = 8,40.6 = 40.129 = 9,15.37 = 22.41 = 22.71
- vinaṣṭān kauravāvān manye / mama putrasya durnayaih, Mbh 7,108.7
- avyāhatārjuno vyūham / putrasya tava durnaye, Mbh 8,32.3 (cf. [ambike] tava putrasya / durnyāt kilā bhāratāh, Mbh 1,119.9)
- bheṣajaḥ kim prayojanam, Mbh 12,137.52
- papracchāgamane hetum ajan ca prayojanam, Mbh 3,89.3
- na me prayojanam kimcid gamane pannagāsana, Mbh 5,110.15

---

⁷ Usually the locative is used to denote the asterism “at (/ under) which” something takes place, but occasionally the instrumental is, as already stated by Pāṇ. 2.3.45 (cf. Speijer 1886: § 78 rem. 2; Hopkins [1903: 5] remarks that “the instrumental is regularly used with the words puṣya- and tiṣya-”). Thus we come across sentences like mārgaśirṣyām atiśayā puṣyena prayayus tatāh, Mbh 3,91.25, puṣyena samprayāto śmi śravela punar āgātāh, Mbh 9,33.5 or krṣṭihē gī bhavan martyrāḥ kurvā śrāddhaṃ punarvasaḥ / puṣṭikāmo 'tha puṣyena śrāddhaḥ iḥeta mānavaḥ, Mbh 13,89.4.

⁸ Cf. utsanega vyāla ivāhāri 'si “You are like a snake which we took (= into) our lap”, Mbh 2,57.3 (v.l. utsane na / ca), sa tad ajñāya duṣṭāmā pīṭur vacanam apiyam / nirāsaḥ sarvakalyānaiḥ śocan paryapat mahīm “Hearing these unfriendly words of his father the wicked [Āśvatthāma], despairing of obtaining every kind of prosperity, began in grief to wander over the earth”, Mbh 10,12.10 (v.l. kalyēne [cf. critical notes ad loc.]). The word nirāsa- is frequently construed with the locative (nirāśāṃ svagīte, Mbh 4,58.13, nirāśa jīvite 'bhanān, 5,48.47, tau nirāsau madarthe, Rāmāyaṇa 5,35.61), but also with other cases (cf. PW s.v. where, however, no example for the instrumental is given).

⁹ Most probably Pāṇi (1946: 188) is wrong to contend that tasmin is related to paniṣṭa in the sentence tataḥ sā vinatā tasmin paniṣṭa parājitā “Then Vinata was defeated in that bet”, Mbh 1,20.3. It must be construed with paniṣṭa: “... was defeated in the bet on that horse”.

¹⁰ The cases multiply when we go into the manuscripts, as can be seen from Kulkarni’s investigation of the case variations in the critical edition of the Mahābhārata (1946: 83, 96, 103-104, 114-115, 134, 149, 172, 187, 200, 215).
na hi me vidyate sūta jīvite 'dya prayojanam, Mbh 6-73.26
- gārhaspatye kim prayojanam, Mbh 12.261.4
- vācane kim prayojanam, Mbh 12.308.127

(cf. yadā jīvita
prayojanam, Pañcatantra,
162,6, 256,12 [PW s.v.])
- jīvite 'sti prayojanam, R
(Bomb.) 4,1.31
- gamane kim prayojanam, R
(Bomb.) 5,60.6

As far as (d) āgamane is concerned, the sequence o'ane<na>
(preceded by another nasal!) may have led to the loss of the syllable na
by haplology (cf. AiGr. III § 32bος)¹¹. This haplophonic loss may
account for the cases where a locative and an instrumental are
coordinated:

¹¹ The same holds true for anāsane<na> in the sentence deham vānasane tyakvā
sa svargam samupāśnute “Having died by fasting he reaches heaven”, Mbh
13,130.47 – unless we are to translate “having died in fasting”. This feature is to
be found in Pali too: (gāmehi nigamehi vā) ratthe<hi> (janapadehi vā), Ja VI
294,27*, vasanehi anūpame<hi>, Thi 374 (cf. Beichert 1955: 13 n. 25). This
explanation (on which cf. Norman, transl. p. 138) is certainly to be preferred to
sati<ya>, Ja VI 188,2* (rodamānīyā satiyyā, ct.).

In some cases, however, we only find the locative used where
we would expect the instrumental: vāsudevasvānumate “With
the consent of Vāsudeva”, Mbh 1,2.92. And anumate is much too frequent¹² to be
explained by such a “sporadic” phenomenon as syllabic haplology (even
if we take it as a generalized form). It may represent an (abbreviated)
locativus absolutus: anumate (sati) “when there is consent”, which
exactly amounts to “with the consent (of)”. And it is this feature –
(abbreviated) locativus absoluts = instrumental – which may
have contributed to the further merging of both cases. Consequently we not
only encounter the locativus absolutus but also an instrumentalis
absolutus (cf. BHSG § 7.34, Upadhye 1943: 100):

kṛṣṇeṇa samupetena jahre bhāratam puram “When Kṛṣṇa
arrived, the city of the Bhāratas burst out shouting with joy”,
Mbh 2,30.15 (cf. anyaḥ samṛddhah aṣṭ aṣtrah na sutāḥ vid-
yate param “For surely, a son prevails, and nothing prevails

¹² anumate “with the consent of” is attested in the following places of the epics:
Mbh 1,54.11, 77.2, 96.4, 99.17, 108.18, 124.3, 150.3, 196.11, 199.50, 3.7.17,
117.13, 161.14, 267.13, 281.79, 5.31.16, 32.6, 47.2, 171.4, 7.66.2, 102.81,
102.83, 152.11, 9.16.10, 31.29, 12.5.7, 31.41, 274.15, 274.20, 321.13, 13.34.27,
69.14.
over a son", Mbh 3,10.5, punyāhaghośair vimalair vedānāṁ
ninadāis tathā / deveśu caiva vyagresu tasmin yajñavidhau
tadā, Mbh 9,37.6 [v.l. G M ṣgrośe vipule ... ninade (cf. crit.
notes ad loc.)].

Since no one will maintain that any of all these forms in -ena or
-aih / -ebhiḥ is any case other than an instrumental, I do not see why
dantehi in the following sentences should be considered as a locative (as
is done by von Hinüber § 321, and id. 1968: § 307): ajinamhi haṁñate
dīpī nāgo dantehi haṁñati “The leopard is killed for his skin, the elephant
for his tusks”, Ja VI 78,17* (ajinamhi haṁñate dīpī / nāgo dantehi
haṁñati / dhanamhi dhanino hanti aniketam asaṁhavam, Ja VI 61,4*)
14.

Turning to the Prakrits, we meet with the same phenomenon of the
– at least partial – interchangeability of instrumental and locative15:
eehi muni sayanehim samana āsi patelasa vāse “The sage [and] monk
dwelt for thirteen years in those resting-places” (Āyārāṅgasutta 1.9.2.4),
Lāḍhehi tassa uvasagga bahave “He had many difficulties in Lāḍha”
(l. c. 1.9.3.3). It is a characteristic feature of the language of Vimalasūri’s

10 We can single out at least one of Lüders’ in any case rather few examples:
kāmesu ve haṁñore bhajhara ca / kāmesu dukkhakam ca bhayam ca jātam / kāmesu
bhoṭādhipati pamatā / pāpāni kammāni karonti mohā, Ja IV 312,27*-30*
(~ Jāt-m 141,17*-20*). Here Lüders’ explanation of kāmesu is certainly wrong.
The poet started the stanza with kāmesu, a nimitta-saptami – as the Indian
grammarians call it –, and as he obviously wished to repeat kāmesu for the sake
of emphasis, he used in pāda b and c the (shortened) locativus absolutus kāmesu
(santesu) “when (there are) desires”.
14 As is well known (Kielhorn 1898: 18-19 [= Kl. Sch. p. 295-296]) a quite
similar stanza is found in Patañjali’s Mahābhāṣya: carmanī dvipinam hanti
dantayor hanti kutiṣṭhita (I 458,18).
15 Cf. Ghatage 1937 and 1941: § 372, Upadhye 1944: 53; cf. also Paumacariya,

Paumacariya: ambarataleṇa vaccai, 8.4216. But it is here that "the locative is
regularly used for the instrumental" (Ghatage 1937: 56, cf. id. 1953:
116): nānāviha-pāyavesu saṁchānā “covered with trees of various
sorts” (Paumacariya 17.29 [reading of J, the oldest ms. available17]),
karemi mahīlāsa saha nēham “I make love with the women” (ibid.
108.39). This merging of instrumental and locative was completed in
Apabhramśa, as is well known: “Der Verwendungsbereich des loc. ist
[im Apabhramśa] gegenüber dem Pkt. stark erweitert. ... Der loc. tritt
haufig ein für den instr. Die Verwechslung geht nach Jacobi (San. § 14)
vom plur. aus, wo beide Kasus schon friih lauten und begrifflich
zusammengefallen sind. So dient der loc. auch im sing. gleichzeitig als
instr. bei den femininen A- und I-Stämmen. Für die Verwendung des loc.
singt. der masc. und neutr. A-Stämme als instr. bietet Bh[avisatta Kaha]
(S. 34* Anm. 1) 27, San[atkumāracaritam] (§ 14) 3 Belege. Im
Kumārapālapratibhoda finden wir 15 instr. auf ‘i” (Alsdorf 1928: 64;

Taking into account all these facts I see no reason why the Pali
phenomenon should be treated quite differently. Here, too, it is a matter
of syntax and not of morphology. A sentence like ... titthehi ... assam
pāyehi, Ja I 185,3*, has its counterpart in bhūjate rukmapāribhiḥ
“They eat on (/ from) golden plates”, Mbh 2,45.18 (cf. Meenakshi 1983:
72).

1.2. Pali/Prakrit and Epic-Purānic Sanskrit

Popular Sanskrit, as evidenced by both Epics and the Purāṇas,
and Middle Indo-Aryan also share a number of grammatical and lexical
features. Some of them are very frequently attested both in the Epics and

17 See Paumacariya, vol. II, p. XVI.
Purāṇas and in the Theravāda canon: the gen. pl. in (Skt.) viṁśatī and viṁśatī resp. (P.) viṁśatī and viṁśatī (cf. Geiger § 83.8\cite{19}), the same form to denote the nom. and the acc. pl. in the feminine i-declension(s), in the r-declension (of words signifying personal relations) and in the n-declension, the acc. pl. (Skt.) gāvah resp. (P.) gāvo (cf. Geiger § 88.3), the generalization of the weak stem (Skt.) vidus- resp. (P.) vidū- (cf. Geiger § 100.2), the transfer of stems from one declension to another one (leading to the merging of [masc.] i- and in-declensions and of feminine i- and i-declensions and to the emergence of new words like apsarā- / accharā- [etc.]), the genitives (Skt.) mahyaṁ and tubhyam resp. (P.) mayhaṁ and tuyhaṁ (etc.). Some of them, however, are only sporadically encountered, such as:

- certain normalizations within the pronominal inflexion: loc. sg. fem. (Skt.) paścimasyām (cf. R 1,60.3 v.l., 4,36.3, Hariv. 93,15\cite{19}), analogical to other pronouns denoting cardinal points (cf. AiGr. III § 268f); vice versa, (P.) uttarāya[m]\cite{20} (beside uttaraśaṁ disāyaṁ, SN I 148,4*6 [Geiger § 113.8; cf. AiGr. III § 267a(1)].

- viṁśatī instead of viṁśatī- and trimśati-instead of trimśatī-\cite{21}.

- ordinal number instead of cardinal number: (Skt.) ekaviṁśaṁ daśa ca, Mbh 12,308,112, catuvrimśatam putraśatam babhūva,

\footnote{\cite{18} There are more examples: pāṇinām, Th 1258, sivinām, Ja IV 405,24* (C* sīvinām [faulty metre], abandhaṁ, Th 240, Ap 323,22 (cf. CPD s.v. abandhu).}

\footnote{\cite{19} Cf. Brhatkathākośa 71.1, 99.53 (Upadhye 1943: 97).}

\footnote{\cite{20} Cf. CPD s.v. uttara (DN I 153,19, Ap 541,5, Ja V 43,11’ [commenting on uttarayam disaṁyaṁ, 42,21*]). Cf. JM. uttarayam disāyaṁ, Vasudevāniḍi 280,27 (cf. 310,22 and 323,18).}

\footnote{\cite{21} Pali visā(ṁ) (Sn 1019, It 99, Ja V 36,22), Skt. ( devotee-

\footnote{\cite{22} (R.) viṁśatī- (Mbh 1,2199 v.l., 1,180*, R 6,55.7; in compounds: viṁśadbhūja-, R 3,30.8, 3,33.9 v.l., viṁśadbhū-, R 7,32,49, viṁśadojana-, R 5,1,145), Pali (chat)trimśati- (Dhp 339), Skt. trimśati- (Mbh 6,57,12, 12,103,20, R 6,55,7 v.l., 6,96,14 v.l.).}

\footnote{\cite{23} (P.) bhāravādī (Sn 956; Skt.) abhārvādī tī mām bhīṣma vacana pritivardhanam / aham priyatamah putrah, Mbh 1,122,28, praviṣṭo tad veśma mahārathāniṁ ity abhārvādī draupadīm rājaputrīm, Mbh 2,60,19, ity evam ārthā pariṣvaṁ saḥ / rājā kurūnām nakulaṁ babhāse, Mbh 10,10,26, tīrthāyātrā śāmūre vah kāryeti puruṣaṁsabhā, Mbh 16,3,22, sa putram ekam rājāya pālayeti niyujya ca / prthivim kṣatradharmena vanam evānvaspadyata, R 1,54,11 (cf. Speier 1886: § 495), śuṣrāva ca vacas teṣam ... hatāṃ saha khalu ye neha}
the use of the masculine participle in construction with a feminine noun: obhāsayaṁ vanam rammam ... kā va tvam asi kalyāṇī, Ja V 89,24*, ... sā khūjā ... evam dubhāsiṁ bhanam, Ja V 299,2* (cf. Oberlies 1995: 109 s.v. anibbisan); vārṣṇeyan tu tato bhaimi sāntvayaṁ śakṣṇayā girā, Mbh 3,57,11 (cf. ... tato rājā sāntvayaṁ śakṣṇayā girā, 1,92,30, tathā rṣir uvacairanāṁ sāntvayaṁ śakṣṇayā girā, 1,166,5), nirikṣamānaṁ ... munivaco smaran, Mbh 3,280,32, sā drṣṭvā kṛṣṇam āyāntaṁ ... pṛthāpārthān anusmaran, Mbh 5,88,2.

The peculiarieties of the verbal system common to Pali and non-standard Sanskrit are even more striking. Let me cite just one example, namely the “wrong” and “misplaced” addition of the augment: (P.) pacc-a-niyāyi, DN II 22,16, a-paribrūhāyi, Ja V 361,16* (cf. CPD s.v. a, Rem. a/b), (BHS) adhy-a-bhāsati abhy-a-siṣcet, upāsamākrāmat (cf. BHSG § 32,5, 8, 12), (Skt.) pary-a-rundhīta, R 4,1143* (~ pratyaratśit, 4,1144*), (imp.) abhy-a-bhāsa, R 4,3,25, (part.) vy-a-caran, R 3,37,3/4, vy-a-dipayan, R 2,5,24, abhy-a-vahan, R 4,11*, a-sambhramat, Mbh 6,78,38, 7,75,5, praty-a-vyūhan, Mbh 3,269,6, praty-a-samharam, R 5,56,55.

A close comparison of these languages sheds light on linguistic phenomena of Middle Indo-Aryan ill-judged in our grammars (cf. 1.2.1.). And it even may help to solve some of the enigmas of Indo-Aryan philology which have long troubled scholars (cf. 1.2.2.). I shall briefly discuss two examples to illustrate these points.

1.2.1. Syncopation

It is only in the “latest additions” of the pW (p. 315 s.v. astra) that the two “Petersburger Wörterbücher” give for īsvastra- the meaning “the science of arms” (with reference to Mbh 11,123,13,43)25. But also at Mbh 5,178,16 (īsvastraṁ mama bālasya bhavatava catuvidham / upadiṣṭām ...) and 9,5,14 (daśāṅgaṁ yaś catuspādam īsvastraṁ veda tatvatataḥ) this word clearly has this meaning — as it has at Divyāvādāna 528,6. Obviously, Pischel (as also Chatterji 1983: 63) was not aware of this meaning of īsvastra:- when he derived the Prakrit word īsatha- from Skt. īśuśāstra- (§ 148). In order to overcome the phonetic difficulties he had to postulate the loss of the vowel -u:- īsatha- ← *is[t]sattha-. According to Pischel, about ten words show this complete loss of a vowel. But, as with īsatha-, some of them also have to be explained differently: α) uppim26 ← upari x utara[m]; β) kha / kʰ27 ← kho ← kʰd’28; γ) majjanama-29 ← (by dh-h-dissimulation) madhyāhna- (Buck, Kl. Sch. p. 1879-1880; AiGr. I § 108 n.; δ) sunhā- / sonhā-20 ← *nhusā ← snusā- (Jacobi 1886: XXXII n. 3). So we are left only with subbbi- (← surbh-i-) and (the analogically formed) dubbhi- and, interestingly enough, with some kinship terms: dhiyā- ← (*nom. sg. duhitā [already dissyllabic in late Vedic: Lüders, Phil. Ind. p. 506]): piṣyā-, bhāuji-, maussī- (etc.). But we know that kinship terms are, being terms of address, subject to irregular shortening. So there is only one single example for the phenomenon of “vowel loss”. Could subbbi-

paśyāma iti rāghavan, R 2,51,10, ity uṣcā vacaḥ krūram didhakṣan ita tejāsa / kim tavāpakram rājan vane nivasatā mayā, R 2,57,29.

---

2 Neither Monier-Williams nor Apte gives this meaning.
3 Pischel derived this word from *up, *ṛt.
4 For the derivation of this word see below.
5 Such particles often show peculiar phonetics (cf. Jacobi 1886: LXXII).
6 Pischel derived it from madhyām na-. 
7 Pischel derived these words from sun, *hā-, the ‘h-variant’ of sunusā- which is a continuation of snusā-.
and *dubbhi*—be words of the women's language and do they as such have a more popular form?

If we take a closer look at the paragraph of Geiger's grammar dealing with vowel syncopation (§ 20), some of its examples likewise disappear: *jaggati* is not “to be traced from *jāgarati* through *jāgərəti*”, but has developed out of (Epic) Sanskrit (3. sg.) *jāgrəti*31, based on the present stem *jāgra*30 which was extracted from (3. pl.) *jāgrəti*; *kho* does not result from *khəlu* by syncopation of *a*, but is due to the loss of the intervocalic *l* and the subsequent contraction of *a-u* to *o* (cf. Pisani 1952: 281); and *ənhe* (besides *əmhe*) is based on a form *=x : -əma = -ate : -əti = -əse : -əsi = -ante : -anti* into which the *h* of *əhəve* has been introduced (cf. Berger 1957: 112)32.

It is evident that Epic Sanskrit enjoins us to reconsider the whole phenomenon of the syncopation of vowels in Middle Indo-Aryan and to look for the special conditions under which it takes place. Vowels are syncopated, as far as I can see, only in words or word elements that are “phonetically weak”—to borrow Turner's term (Coll. Papers p. 291)—such as (I) second members of compounds, (II) enclitics, (III) suffixes and (IV) terms of address.

32 Geiger's second example, *oka*—from *udakə*—, is very problematic (cf. Tedesco 1947: 176), since there is only one single place where *oka*—certainly means “water”, viz. Vin I 253,14: *okəpunənei cəvərəhi* “with cloaks filled with water” (not recorded by Geiger). So we have to allow for the possibility that it is a mere blunder of the text—more so as it is obscure (pace Geiger's explanation) exactly where the *ə* comes from (should we read *ədəpunənei* with *oda*-wrongly abstracted from compounds like *nəldə*—?).

1.2.2. Preterites in *ə(i)ə*

In a great number of Prakrit texts we come across a petrified preterite form in *ə* used for all numbers (in that respect resembling *əsi* [Pischel § 515]): *acchiə, əsiə, genhiə, vasiə*33. So far no explanation of these *ə(i)ə* pasts has been given. I think Pischel was on the right track when he supposed that this form must be an optative, “as inexplicable as this seems” (Pischel § 466). Now it is a well known fact that in non-standard Sanskrit an optative can be used in place of a past tense34; and we know that optatives were used as preterites in Prakrit, too35. As we have *əita*-optatives—since late Vedic times even in the thematic conjugation (cf. Hoffmann 1976: 371)36—I suggest that the cited Prakrit form is the continuation of an *əita*-optative. At the moment I can cite only one, but very instructive example: *pary-a-rundhita, R 4,1143*; which corresponds to *pratyaarautsit, 4.1144*! Once this *əa* was deemed an ending of the past tense, it was even appended to aorist stems (*kəsιya, kahesiya, θαsia*).

2. Late Vedic, Epic Sanskrit, Pāṇini and Pali

The relationship of Pali to late Vedic on the one hand and to Pāṇini’s Sanskrit (especially to the bhāṣā he described) on the other has

33 These forms are discussed and text references are given by (e.g.) Alsdorf 1935/37: 325 (= Kl. Sch. p. 62), Bhayani / Shah 1987: 44, and Balbir 1989: 510-512 (with literature); cf. Alsdorf 1957: 207 n. 1 (= Kl. Sch. p. 191 n. 1) and Bollée 1995: 144 (s.v. -iya).
36 For the Mahābhārata cf. bhakṣayīta, Mbh 13,107.82, vivarjayīta, Mbh 5,39.35, pratīvāsaśayīta, Mbh 5,37.31, yājayaīta, Mbh 3,197.35. Interestingly enough, the Rāmāyana does not seem to know such forms.
never been systematically investigated (cf. von Hinüber 1983: 308-310). But even a cursory reading of the Jātakas brings a number of further parallels to light.

2.1. iva instead of eva

Since late Vedic times iva is used “in the sense practically of eva” (Keith 1920: 89, cf. id. 1908: 1192-1193): prṣṭhata ivāgniḥdrām kṛtvā “placing the Agnīdh’s altar at his back”, AitB I.30, yadī ha vā api bahava iva yajante “even if many sacrifice”, AitB 2.2, so ‘je jyoktamām ivāramata “[The camel] dwelt for the longest time in the goat”, AitB 2.8.

The same usage is met with in Epic Sanskrit: tato nātīmahān kālah samatīta ivābhavat “Not too long a time had passed since then”, Mbh 1.35.3, prāṇjalim prahvam āśīnam abhīvikṣya smayann iva “smiling as he looked at him ...”, R 2.4.42 (at least according to the explanation of Ck).

This probably accounts for the pleonastic collocation iva ... yathā: viekiṣipur yathā śyenā nabhogatam ivāmiṣam (समन्तः) “As vultures tear apart a piece of raw meat thrown into the air”, Mbh 2.33.6, adhāryamānā svraj ivottamām yathā “Like a beautiful garland that is not being worn”, Mbh 4.13.11 (cf. kim mātur anke śayito yathā śiśuḥ / candram jighryṣur iva manyase hi mām, Mbh 4.13.21). The same phenomenon is met with in Pali (cf. CPD s.v. iva). On the other side, eva is sometimes used where we would expect iva: bhasmany iva huṭāsanah, Mbh 4.36.29 v.l. (crit. ed. bhasmaneva [cf. PW V,1222 s.v. eva]); alāpiṇ ēva, Dhp 149, dhajaggān ēva dissāre, Ja VI 529,33* = 530,24*, rohini h ēva tamb akkhā, Ja VI 576,6* (emended by Alsdorf, KL Sch. p. 312 resp. 325, to dhajaggānīva resp. hīva), macchā vesāliyā

37Thieme pointed out this function of iva which he called “relativierend” (1963: 105 n. 2 [= Kl. Sch. p. 195 n. 2]).
39 The stanza Bhartrhāri 2.45 cited by PW (lobhaś cāsti gunena ...) is Nitisātaka 37 and runs in Kosambi’s edition as follows: lobhaś ced agurenā kim piṣumati ādy ati kim pātakaḥ!
40 For details cf. Gonda 1957: 52-54 (= Selected Studies I,371-373).
42 The first pāda is a bha-vipulā (cf. Alsdorf 1968: 34) whose third syllable has to be a short one.
43 Fausbøll’s manuscript B⁴ reads ce.
216,1⁴⁴, sabbaṅ ca⁴⁵ maccā sadhanā sabhogā / ādipitam dāru tiṇena missam “If people would burn all wood ... ”, Ja VI 206,9*, etaṅ ca saccam vacanaṁ bhaveyya / ... / nākhattiyo jātu labhetha rajjām “If this word were true ... no non-kṣatriya would obtain kingship”, Ja VI 208,1*⁴³/⁴⁶. The poets obviously use ca due to metrical exigencies as a "doublet prosodique" (Smith 1950: 3) of ce. And since ca is used in the sense of ce, ce, vice versa, sometimes stands for ca: tathā maṁ saccam pāletu / pālayissati ce mahaṁ (‘-owment’). “Hence truth should protect me — and surely, it will protect me”, Ja V 95,1⁴⁷, thale yathā +vāri janinda vattam / anaddhaneyyam aciraṭhithikam / evam pi ce hoti asatam saṁāgama “Like water rained down on dry land, not lasting, of no long permanence, so, o king, is the association with bad people”, Ja V 508,1*. Here ce is joined to pi⁴⁸ as often as is ca.

2.3. su as an upasarga

Pāṇini teaches in his rules 1.4.58-59 that pra etc. are called upasargas if they are linked directly to verbs. According to the corresponding gana the word su belongs to this group. That means that su should be used as a verbal prefix! And indeed, we find several examples of this use in Epic Sanskrit: sv-anuyāsantī, Mbh 8,22.59 v.l., su-upatstāhe, Mbh (cited by Whitney § 1121i without reference), su-kurute, Mbh 7,163.30 v.l., sv-ajanayat, Mbh 3,217.6 v.l. (ed. Bomb., not noted by CE [cf. PW s.v. 6. su], su-dhāsyati, Mbh 1,114.31, su-rocaya, Mbh 4.1.8 v.l., su-virājate, Mbh 4,60.4 v.l., su-sākyante, R 2,30.4 v.l. The same holds true for Pali: kim sūvadhitvā na kadāci socati, Ja V 141,10*, corresponding to Mvu III 370,1* kim so-vadhitva na kadāci socati (cf. Smith 1950: 13)*⁹, (mā) su-nandi ... mā su-soci, Ja I 300,20* (sukāro nipātamattam, ct.), su-māpayo, Cariyāp. 9.107, su-māpayi, Cariyāp. 9.108, Mahāvaṃsa, App. A stanza 3 (ed. Geiger p. 326 n. 3), su-boddhām Kaccāyanaappakaranā 200 (ed. Senart [cf. Childers s.v. su at the end]), cf. (with a participle:) su-codyantam, Ja VI 249,1* (sutta codiyantam, ct.)⁵⁰.

3. Vocabulary

But Pali and Epic Sanskrit can not only be adduced to confirm Pāṇini’s rules as far as syntactical features are concerned, but also to confirm his teaching on how to form words with particular meanings. On the other hand, taking into account Pāṇini and late Vedic texts enables a number of Pali words of obscure meaning to be explained. First an example of the latter kind:

3.1. udāṅgaṇa- (Ja I 109,15*)

For this word the PED gives the meaning “an open space” — whereas the CPD gives no meaning at all — relying on the explanation of the commentary: udāṅgane ti ettha uda iti nipāto, angane ti attho, manussaṇām saṁcaraṇanāthāne anāvate bhūmibhāge ti attho (I 109,20'-21'). This is, of course, impossible, so another explanation is called for. We have in Pali ulūnka- / ulūnka- “ladle, spoon (for fetching water)”

⁴⁴This line corresponds to Mvu III 6,15: sakraś ca (thus the manuscripts which Senart emended to ce) me varaṁ dadyāt.
⁴⁵According to Alsдорf (1977: 42) the Singhalese print (C) reads ce. But the third syllable of the tristubh-pāda has to be a short one.
⁴⁶If bhūjātā can be used as a conditional the following example may be added: idaṁ ca mayham utittenhapiṇḍam / +tam mandavyo bhūjātā appapañño / yakkha ca te nām na vihcetvayeyum / putto ca te hohito so arogo, Ja IV 386,12*-15*.
⁴⁷Cf. Lüders, Märchen 253.
⁴⁹It cannot be ruled out that we have to do with so for sū, the regular outcome of svid (cf. Edgerton s.v. so).
⁵⁰Cf. Aḷāra etā su te +kāmakārā, Ja V 170,29*.
centuries earlier it is found in the Jātaka: Ja I 177,2*, II 348,21(*) v.l. (B4), IV 437,18.

3.3. giveyya- (Ja IV 395,17*, VI 590,9*)

According to the same rule of Pāṇini (4.2.96), the word graiveyaka- is formed to denote a piece of jewellery. Compared with the rather late attested Sanskrit word (Devimāhātmya, Daśakumāracarita, Sāhityadarpana) the Pali word giveyya- occurs in old texts (Ja IV 395,17*, VI 590,9*; eyyaka-, V 297,14 [for further references cf. PED s.v. giveyyaka]).
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The \textit{\textsuperscript{\textasteriskcentered}Paramatthajotikādīpani, a Fragment of the Subcommentary to the Paramatthajotikā II on the Suttanipāta}\textsuperscript{*}

Subcommentaries on texts of the Khuddakanikāya are known to have existed so far only from the evidence found in the Piṭakat samuṁ\textsuperscript{1}. Consequently, it came as a pleasant surprise, when a fragmentary manuscript copied as early as in CS 894 corresponding to 1532 A.D. came to light in the collection of Vat Lai Hin near Lampang in Northern Thailand\textsuperscript{2}. The text of this fragment covers Pj II 513,16 on Sn 770 in the Kāmasutta of the Mahāvagga up to Pj II 548,29 on Sn 848, the first verse of the Purābhedasutta of the Aṭṭhakavagga.

The cover leaves at the beginning and at the end of the single fascicle extant communicate only the title given erroneously as \textit{tikā} (sic!) \textit{suttanipāta aṅguttara} (!)\textsuperscript{3} and the year without containing a complete colophon. Therefore the real title of this subcommentary can be inferred only from the titles given at the end of the single Suttas of the Suttanipāta such as Kāmasuttavanṇanādīpani. Thus “Paramatthajotikādīpani” is nothing more than a likely guess\textsuperscript{4}.

\textsuperscript{*} The abbreviations used follow the system laid down in the Epilegomena to the Critical Pāli Dictionary.


\textsuperscript{2} This collection will be described in: O.v.Hinüber: Die Pāli-Handschriften des Klosters Lai Hin bei Lampang/Thailand (under preparation), where this manuscript is listed as no. 63, see also JPTS 22.1996, p. 35-37.

\textsuperscript{3} In spite of the fact that \textit{su-} is clearly written, the scribe seems to have thought of the Sattakanipāta in the Aṅguttaranikāya.

\textsuperscript{4} It is not impossible that the correct title is Paramatthasūdani rather, if Nāṇamoli: The Illustrator of Ultimate Meaning (Paramatthajotikā) Part I. London 1960, p. V is correct in taking Ādiçcavārma’s Paramatthasūdani mentioned in Piṭ-sm to cover also Pj II, but cf. CPD (Epilegomena) 2.5.1,12 and 2.5.5,12.
The manuscript itself also contains quite a few mistakes, partly corrected by the scribe himself. These corrections have not been marked in the following transcript in detail. Obvious additions or omissions, however, have been indicated by square brackets: ["wrong addition by the scribe"] and pointed brackets: <"omission by the scribe"> respectively. Variants found in the pratiṣṭhas are mentioned after the quotations from Pj II or Sn. The vowels ē/i often confused by the scribe as usual in the South East Asian Pāli tradition. This has not been normalized.

The text published here is the first half of fascicule no. 6 containing the folios marked as ta-tah, This corresponds to about 35 pages of the printed edition of Pj II. Consequently, the preceding five fascicles should have contained the text corresponding to approximately only 350 pages instead of 512. The gap of about 160 pages missing cannot be explained, if the relation between this subcommentary and Pj II is the same all over the text as it is in the present fragment. Even if it varies, the missing text of almost 2½ fascicles is much longer than to be expected.

The anonymous author of the subcommentary used not only Pj II (his basic text), but also Nidd I, which he refers to occasionally. Besides, a remarkable number of technical terms occurs even within in this brief fragment: atthippatti-sankhāta-samuttāna (Sn 772 : 514,5-515,29) cf. on this technical use of samuttāna: Pj I 118,2 : Pj II 300,2 and suttavatthubhūtaāsa attthassa uppatikāle, (521,5); avutta-sampindattha (533,2 “enumeration, which is not quoted in full”); ekasesarpakanayena (536,7, cf. Sadd 6.2.3, CPD s.v. ekasara, and L.Renou, Terminologie grammaticle. Paris 1957, p. 115 s.v. ekaśa); tatvakathā (514,3, meaning uncertain); nipātamatta (516,11; Sn 827b);

desanānusandhi (513,32); pana-saddo pakhantarattho (522,21); pariyāyākathā (514,3, cf. Sadd 6.1.21); pāda (516,19 etc.); piṅdaṭṭha (514,3, cf. Sadd 6.2.1); pucchānasandhi (537,27); purissavippalāsa (545,23, cf. Sadd 2.3.3); yathānusandhi (514,3, cf. Sadd 5.3.2.1; Ja VI 477,21); yojanā (520,24 etc., cf. Sadd 6.2.1); sambandha (522,25 etc.).

Furthermore, the following cases and their respective functions are mentioned: acc.: kammattā upavogavacanam (516,12); abl: nissakke yeva nissakkan (517,11); gen.: niddhārane chatthi (522,29); loc.: niddhārane bhumman (541,10); nimitattā bhumman (541,13); bhāvalakkhaṇe bhumman hetumhi vā (541,17; 548,14, cf. Sadd 5.1.0); sāmiattā bhumman (521,27).

At the beginning of the subcommentary on the Purābheda sutta (Pj II 548,14), a series of six suttas is mentioned, which are grouped together already in Pj II 548, 12-14. The Sammāparibbājaniya sutta is indeed characterized in Pj II as: ... rāgacaritavasena ... devatāgananam ... pannarasā gāthāyo abhāsī, Pj II 362,11-15. The other characteristics, however, such as mohacarita etc. do not seem to be included in the relevant paragraphs of Pj II introducing the sutta of this group.

---

tham saccavaca naṃ, tenaḥa abalattā (E abāla va) baliyanti (Sn 770) ti attho (Pj II 513,16) ti. pākata pari sāyā (Pj II 513,18 "ssayā") ti cakkhūnāṃ āpāthām āgataśeṇa pari sahaṇāti-atthena pākata pari sāyā. niṭṭhipesī (Pj II 513, 32) ti desanānusandhinā niṭṭhipesī kāmasutta vānaṇā (Pj II 514,3) ti ayaṃ yathānusandhivasena piṇḍatthavasena ca, vaṇṭaṇavāthārena pada Kāmasutta (Sn 776-771) vaṇṭaṇā Niddese (Nidd I 1,6-22,7) tatvakathāya (?) pari yāyakathāya ca vasena vaṇṭitā va. samattā (cf. niṭṭhitā, Pj II 514,3) ti pariniṭhitā, sanga hetvā vai attā vutta ti attho.

Kāmasutta vānaṇādipani samattā (Pj II 514,3)
abhulakahā (Pj II 514,26 abahuukatā) ti anādaraṃ katvā. ruddho6 (Pj II 514,26 rutṭhā) ti ativiya kuddho. aṇṇātukāmo (Pj II 515,5) ti jānitukāmo. taṃ anukampamāno (Pj II 515,10) ti tasmi karunām kurumāno. āśādetu (Pj II 515,14) ti gaṭhetum. satto guhāyan (Sn 772) ti guhaṭṭhakasuttama. pa. idam suttam abbhāsi (Pj II 514,5-515,29) ti idam athuppattisankhātasammuṭṭhānahānā. rāgadināṃ vājanāṃ vasanokasato (Pj II 515,30f) ti rāgadosamohādino atiṇā (?7 russattthaṃ vāt(?)migasadisānaṃ visayavasena āranakaranavasena8 vasanatthānabhāvato. ajhattabandhanā9 (Pj II 515,32) ti kāyasankhātān ājitikām bandhanatthānahānā. bahiddhābandhanā (Pj II 516,1) ti rūpādikāmāguṇasankhātām bahiddhābandhanatthānahānā. vivekā (Pj II 516,3) ti vivekato. tathārūpo (Pj II 516,2) ti sato (l) guhāyan (Sn 772) ti ādippakāro. vivekā hi (Sn 772c = Pj II 516,1) ti ettha hi ti nipātīmattam. sattadhammata (Pj II 516,7 sattāmanām dhammatatam) ti sattanām pakatibhāvam. sukhavedanādīmhi (Pj II 516,9) ti ettha ādissadda īthvathvayyobbānā-ārogyajīvitaṭyādo samganhātā. bhavasāte (Pj II 516,9f) ti ettha bhavesu sātasukhavedanādīsa rammanikām. bandhā (Pj II 516,10 badhā) ti laggito (!). bhavasātavatthubhūtā dhammā (Pj II 516,10f) ti bhave sukkhass’ ādīvatthubhūtā dhammā vatthussampadādayo. tathā (Pj II 516,11) ti bhavasātavatthubhūtesu dharmeso. duppamocayā (Pj II 516,11f) ti dukkheṇa pamoctabbā. aṇṇā10, cā (Pj II 516,12 aṇṇē ca) ti kammatthe upayogavacanam. yadi pana muñcceyyun (Pj II 516,14 muñceyyum) ti sac’ eva sabbattā vattadukkhato muñceyyum. bandhiyamānā (Pj II 516,19 patthhayamānā) ti patthhayamānā so yeva vā pātho. dvinnām padānan (Pj II 516,19) ti apekkhamānapadapa(1)-

6 I.e. ruddho?
7 Read ativiya ?
8 Cf. CPD s.v. arana ?
9 The scribe uses regularly -ja- for -jjha-. This is a feature quite common in Northern Thai Pāli manuscripts.
10 Sic: -ā cancelled, no -e written.

jappapadānan11. apekkhamāna (Pj II 516,21) ti icchamāna. itaratha (Pj II 516,21) ti sambandhato aññena asambandhākarena atthe ganhamāne sati. pariyesanā-<ā> din ti (Pj II 516,27 pariyesanādin) ti etha ādisaddena rakkanāsayo samganhāt. avangaṇanatāyā (Pj II 516,28) ti nirayapettivisayatiracchānayonisonkhaṭālāmakaṭṭhānagamanatāyā. macchariyatāyā (Pj II 516,29 macchariyā) ti macchariyadhamsasamannāgatāyā. antakāle (Pj II 516,30) ti maranakāle. maranadukkh<u>u</u>panītā (Pj II 516,30f) ti maranām dukkham pattattā. tisu bhajavissāma (Pj II 516,31 kiṃ su bhavissāma) ti neryikāya pettivisayatiracchānayonisonkhaṭā bhavissāma ti ādina viththaratho veditabbo. ettad eva (Pj II 516,32) ti kämagidhasattassa etam dukkhasambhavanan hoti kämesu do<sa>sambhavām vā. āpajjeyā (Pj II 516,33) ti padhānivasena vuttaṃ jāneyyā ti ādi attho sambahavati. na tassa hetu (Sn 775c) ti pānātipādiṭṭhivisamassa hetu. visamāṃ na careyyā (Sn 775c om. na) ti pubbabhāgabhūtām lobhadhāsāḥdiṭhetuvisamāṃ na careyyā. appan itthi12 (Sn 775d) ti parittattāya sarasaparittattāya parittam. ye na karonti (Pj II 517,3 ye tathā na karonti) ti ye bhagavato vacanā na karonti. ito c’ ito cā (Pj II 517,6) ti taṇhādihi diṭṭhibhavasanaparyosānehi. hinakammantā(l)na (Sn 517,9 kammantā) ti käyakammādipakamkavatā. kāmabhāvādikā (Pj II 517,11 kāmabhāvādisu) ti nissakke yeva nissakkan. okāraṇ (Pj II 517,22) ti lāmaṃ. yam attānām garahī (Pj II 517,31 attānā garahati) ti yena kattātā-akkatatāsanbhāṣātāna kāraṇaṃ hetubhūtena attanā va sattānaṃ garahī nindi. dvinnām leppāna (Pj II 517,33) ti taṇhādiṭṭhippanām. pubbabhāge (Pj II 518,7) ti lokuttaria dhappetito13 pubbabhāge.

Guhaṭṭhakasuttavānanādipani samattā. (Pj II 518,15)

11 Pj II 516,21: jappām.
12 Read appaṇ hi taṃ as Sn.
13 The reading is quite clear in the manuscript: ṛṭhamme (? titho (?)).
Oskar von Hinüber

Pj II 520,2) ti kodhadosavasena na upeti na
hilaṃ etassā ti natthi khilo (Sn 780d = Pj II
80d = Pj II 520,3) ti ajhattabāhiddhādike kasmi
520,15) ti sabbaṭhāṇesu. yāyaṃ diṭṭhi (Pj II
ana-akusalacittupādasanikkhāta diṭṭhi. so (Pj II
vā yassa sassaṭāvādā (Pj II 520,27 yo
tiṇhīyajanassa sassa loko ti ādi diṭṭhivādo. so
ti diṭṭhivādam accayeyā (Sn 781a) ti yojanā.
(Pj II 520,28) ti tena diṭṭhisaṅkhātena chandena.
II 520,28) ti anu punappunam nito. nivittōho (Sn
patiṭṭhito. yathā jāneyyā (Sn 781d = Pj II
dānā nayena diṭṭhivādāna jāneyya. tassā (Pj II
appattiyaṃ (Pj II 521,5) ti suttavathubbhūtasa
tiyadhhammo eso (Pj II 521,11) ti anariyānam
vādo. iti silesū (Pj II 521,14) ti evam silesu.
iti puggalassa. tam akathanaṃ (Pj II 521,16)
521,17) ti eso akiṭṭhanasabhāvattho. rāgādayo
521,19) ti rāgadosamohāhamānā diṭṭhiyakesassā
saṅkhāta satta uussadā. purato kātā (Pj II
katā. attani (Sn 784c = Pj II 521,27) ti ettha
amiatthe ca bhumman ti āha attani tassādiyā (Pj
521,27 = Sn 784c: yad) ti padassa yaṃ yaṃ
mājati. tān cā (Pj II 522,2) ti tassā micchādiṭṭhiyā
ya (Pj II 522,2) ti bhāṅgavasena kuṭṭalppasa-
pannatāya ca (Pj II 522,3) ti attano pacceyehi
vāya. samutisantitiyā (Pj II 522,3 sammu
vohāravasena santisabhāvāya ca. Mahāniddese
nidd-ā 210,26-29): "tasā tān ca ānisansam tān
tantiyā ca kuppapatičca-santisankhātaṃ diṭṭhān
ca nissito hoti" ti pātho dissati 16. evam nissitena cā (Pj II 522,6) ti
dhī ca diṭṭhānisaṃ[da]saṇi ca nissitena puggalena. imassa ca sukhena
avattitABBā (Pj II 522,9) ti iminā sambandho. idam-
saccābhīnivesasankhātāni (Pj II 522,8) ti dvāsaṭṭhidiṭṭhidhammesu
yā kāci attanā abhirucita ādān saccaṃ moghamajhan ti abhinnivesasankhāta
dhī. diṭṭhīnivesanāni (Pj II 522,12 pavattā) ti puggalena pavattāpita. tesu yeva diṭṭhīnivesanesu
gahaṇarocanādīvasena pavattām vijāmanām satthāraṇa ca dhamaṇa ca
nidassati ca ādiyati cā ti yojanā. ajanām sisām pakati ekassā ti ajanāsi-
lo (Pj II 522,15) satta 18 sesapadesu es’ eva nayo. dhama-
kkhānāgananādibheda 19 cā (Pj II 522,17) ti ettha ādisaddena
diṭṭhipadāmagesa sāmghātā. yo panā (Pj II 522,21) ti ettha panasaddo
pakkhatatarattho. dhonadhammasammatā (Pj II 522,24) ti
dosadhunanapāññāya sammataggattā. tassā diṭṭhiyā abhāvā (Pj II
522,25 abhāvena) ti tassa vuttapakāraṇyā diṭṭhīya abhāvāna hetubhūtena.
imassa ca pahāyā (Sn 786c) ti iminā sambandho. tītthīyā (Pj II 522,27)
aṇadīṭṭhīgatika ti. yāya (Pj II 522,28) mayāya katapapatipoccādāna
yena māṇena vā attanā katapāpakammac pāṭiccaśānto (Pj II 522,28)
micchādiṭṭhisankhātaṃ agantabba agatim gacchanti (Pj II 522,28)
pāpuṇḍanti ti yojanā. rāgādidosāna (Pj II 522,29) ti niddhārane chaṭṭhi.
kenā (Sn 782b = Pj II 522,29) ti kena doṣena. tesu tesu dhāmesu
(Pj II 523,4) ti rāgādisu dhāmesu hetubhūtesu.

Duṭṭhakajhasuttavāṇanādipani samattā. (Pj II 523,16)

---

16 The omission of paticcasamuppattaya is confirmed neither by E* nor by B*; both have the same texts as Pj II E*.
17 Ms. "vesantāni".
18 Ms. sattha.
19 Ms. "tanha" corr. to "ganā".
na upeti (Sn 780c = Pj II 520,2) ti kodhadosavasena na upeti na upavadatii. nattii rāgādikhilam etasātā nattii khilo (Sn 780d = Pj II 520,2). kuhīci (Sn 780d = Pj II 520,3) ti ahyattababhidhārike kasmi thāne. sabbato (Pj II 520,15) ti sabbatākhānē. yāyām dīthī (Pj II 520,22) ti lobhappadhāna-akusalacittupādasanikkhātā dīthī. so (Pj II 520,24) ti tittihiyajano. yo vā yassa sassatādivādo (Pj II 520,27 yo vā sassatādiva14) ti yassa titthiyagaranassa sassato loko tī ādi dīthīvādo. so (Pj II 520,24) tittihiyajano ti dīthīvādām accayeyā (Sn 781a) ti yovanā. tena dīthhichandenā (Pj II 520,28) ti tena dīthhisanikkhatena chandena. anunito (Sn 801b = Pj II 520,28) ti anu punnappūnam nito. nivīthho (Sn 781b = Pj II 520,29) ti paṭṭīhito. yathā jāneyyā (Sn 781d = Pj II 520,31) ti sassato loko ti ādina nayena dīthvādāna jāneyyā. tassā (Pj II 521,5) ti sutassa. aththuppattiyan (Pj II 521,5) ti suttavatthubhūtassa aththassa uppatikāle. anariyadhammo eso (Pj II 521,11) ti anariyānaṃ puggalānaṃ sabbhāvo ayam vādo. iti silesū (Pj II 521,14) ti evam silesu. tassā tan (Pj II 521,16) ti puggalassa. tan akaththanan (Pj II 521,16) avikattthanām. eso (Pj II 521,17) ti eso akaththinasaabbhavattho. rāgādayo satta ussaddā (Pj II 521,19) ti rāgadosamohānam dīthikilesassa kammassa d<uccari>−asankhāta15 satta ussaddā. purato katā (Pj II 521,26) ti padhānabhāvatato katā. attani (Sn 784c = Pj II 521,27) ti ettha attasaddo dīthivācako sāmiatthe ca bhumman ti āha attani tassādīyā (Pj II 521,30) ti. yan (Pj II 521,27 = Sn 784c: yadd) ti padassa yasmā yam phalan ti dvidhā attho yuvjati. tañ cā (Pj II 522,2) ti tassā micchādīthiyā ānisansānā ca. kuppataññā (Pj II 522,2) ti bhāngavasena ku<mal>ppasa-bhāvaya. patissacamuppanṇatāya ca (Pj II 522,3) ti attano paccayehi patissacamuppanṇā sahāvāya. samutisantiññā (Pj II 522,3 sammu16 tatāya) ti dīthihiti kānaṃ vohāravasena santisahāvāya ca. Mhānīddese satṭhakathāyaṃ pana (Nidd-a I 201,26-29): “tasmā tañ ca ānisansām tañ ca kuppataññā ca samutisantiññā ca kuppapatipata-santisaṅkhatām dīthhaṃ ca nissito hoti” ti pātho dissaț16. evam nissitena cā (Pj II 522,6) ti dīththi ca dīthhānasā[da]sānī ca nissitena puggalena. imassa ca sukhena ativattatabbā (Pj II 522,9) ti iminā sambandho. idam-saccabhīnisavesanikkhātāni (Pj II 522,8) ti dvāṣaṭhitiṃ dīthihidhammesu ya kāci attāna ahirucittā idam saccaṃ mohhamajhan ti abhinivesanikkhātā dīthī. dīthhīnivesanānī (Pj II 522,716) ti ettha nivisanti ettha ti dīthhīnivesanānī. dīthhiyo evam nivesanānī dīthhīnivesanānī. pavattā (Pj II 522,12 pavattattā) ti puggalena pavattīpītā. tesu yeva dīthhīnivesanēsu gahaṅarocanādivasena pavațṭam vijjanānaṃ satthāraṇī ca dhammaṃ ca nidassati ca ādiyati ca ti yovanā. ājānaṃ sīlaṃ pakati ekkā sa ajanasiolo (Pj II 522,15) satta18 sesapadesu es’ eva nayo. dhamma-kkhanāgādirihibbeda19 cā (Pj II 522,17) ti ettha ādisaddena dīthhipadāmagge sāmaṅghāti. yo panā (Pj II 522,21) ti ettha pana saaddo pakkhatantarthe. dhonadhassamannagāma (Pj II 522,24) ti dosadhunanaṇaṇāya saṃmaṇgagattā. tassā dīthhiyā abhāvā (Pj II 522,25 abbāvena) ti tassa vuttaparakāraṇī dīthhiya abhāvena hetubhūtena. imassa ca pahāyā (Sn 786c) ti iminā sambandho. titthiyā (Pj II 522,27) aṅñādiṭhīgitakā ti. yaya (Pj II 522,28) māyāya katapāpapatīcchādānaṇaya yena māṇena vā attanā katapāpapakkaṃmaṇa paticchādento (Pj II 522,28) micchādīthhisankhātaṃ agantabbaṃ agatim gacchante (Pj II 522,28) pāppuṇantti ti yovanā. rāgādidosanañ (Pj II 522,29) ti niddhāraṇe caṭṭhi. kena (Sn 782b = Pj II 522,29) ti kena dosenā. tesu tesu dhhammesu (Pj II 523,4) ti rāgādisu dhhammesu hetubhūtesu.

Duṭṭhakaṭṭhasuttavānanādipāni samattā. (Pj II 523,16)

---

14 N.b. v.l. in E1
16 The omission of patissacamuppanṇatāya is confirmed neither by E* nor by B*; both have the same texts as Pj II E*.
17 Ms. ivesantānī.
18 Ms. sattha.
19 Ms. tathā corr. to “ganā”.

---
tassā (Pj II 526,9) ti suttassā. adhipamā (Pj II 526,12 avigamā) ti yāti uppa(!)kkamati hetuṭaya dassanassa. tenahā (Pj II 526,19) ti tasmā tam maggaññānaṁ na hoti tasmā bhagavatā diṭṭhena ce suddhi (Sn 789a) ti dutiyagāthāṁ āhā ti sambandho. āpannam (Pj II 526,24) ti dosāpanthānaṁ hoti. tatha vadānaṁ (Sn 789d = Pj II 526,25) ti tathā vadantam. idha (Sn 791d = Pj II 527,8) ti khandhādiko micchāññāna. vā (Sn 791d) ti viparitasabhāvena pavattāya paññāya. pakubbāmāno (Sn 791d = Pj II 527,8) ti abhiññakāhārdīni karonto. assā (Pj II 527,9) ti dutiyatatiya-catutthapādāsankhātāsa padassa. aparān (Sn 791a = Pj II 527,17) ti satthārādi. visenibhūto (Sn 793a = Pj II 527,29) ti ettha vigatā mā<ra>-senā etassā ti viseni, visenibhūtvā bhavati ti visenibhūto. dvinnam purekkhārānam (Pj II 528,10) ti tanhādīttisankhātānaṁ dvinnam purekkhārānaṁ. assā (Pj II 528,18) ti ekapuggalādhiṭṭhāṇaya desanāya (Pj II 528,17). sambandho (Pj II 528,19) ti tidesanāsambandho. kiñca bhiyyo (Pj II 528,18) ti katamam guṇam adhikam vattabham siya ti yojana. catunnaṁ kilesasimānam atittā (Pj II 528,20) ti: “catasso kilesasimāyo sakkāyadīttihicchikcchā silabbata-parāmaso diṭṭhānusayo vicikucchānusayo tadekatthā ca kilesā ayaṁ pathamā simā, olārikaṁ kāmarāgasamānaṁ pātighasamānaṁ olārikā kāmarāgānusaya <pātighānusayo>20) tadekatthā ca kilesā ayaṁ dutiyasimā, anusaḥa gataṁ kāmarāgasamānaṁ pātighasamānaṁ anusaḥagata21) kāmarāgānusaya pātighānusaya tadekatthā ca kilesā ca ayaṁ tatiyasaṁ rūparāgo arūparāgo māno uddhaccam avijjā mānaṁ usayo bhavārāgānusayo avijjānusaya tadekatthā kilesā ca ayaṁ catutthasimā. yato catuhi ariyamaghehi imā catasso simāyo atikkanto hoti samatiikkanto viṭṭivatto22) so vuccati simātigo23) ti evam Niddese (Nidd I 99,24-100,5) vuttānam catunnaṁ kilesasimānam atikkantattā. itthambhūtassā (Pj II 528,21) ti imāṁ guṇapakkāraṁ pattassa. tassā (Sn 795a = Pj II 528,21)

khinnasavabrāhmaṇassā. na virāgaratto (Sn 795c = Pj II 528,25) ti vīseso rāgo virāgo rūparūparāgo. virāgena ratto virāgaratto.

_Suddhaṭṭhakassuttavānaṁṇādişani_ samattā (Pj II 528,28).

yaṁ ānisamsaṁ passati (Sn 797a yad, cf. Pj II 529,28-30) ti yojana. nihinato (Sn 797d = Pj II 530,2) ti nihinabhavato. kidisam (Pj II 530,10) ti kidisam diṭṭhīm na kappayeyya (Sn 799a) ti yojana. yā kappiyati (Pj II 530,12) ti yā diṭṭhī diṭṭhīgatike24) viśkappiyati. etam diṭṭhin (Pj II 530,13 om. etam) ti etam tādisam diṭṭhin. hino na mañña<e>tha visesi vā pī (Sn 799d = Pj II 530,15) ti. hino (Pj II 530,15) ti attānaṁ na maññeyya na avamaññeyya visesi avamaññeyya.

_yaṁ pubbe gahītan (Pj II 530,15) ti yaṁ pubbe gahītan diṭṭhīgatam_.

sa ve viyatthesu (Sn 800c = Pj II 530,19 viyattesu25) ti ettha sasaddassa attho so ti gahetabbo. satthesu (Pj II 530,20 satttesu) ti gatessu nānādiṭṭhīgatessu. phassādibhede (Pj II 530,2526) ti phassa-samudāyādibheda bhaya-kotṭhase. nivesanā (Sn 801c) ti tanhādiṭṭhi-sankhātā nivesanā. dhamsesu (Sn 801d) ti dvāsaṭṭhi diṭṭhidhammesu. nivaccheyā (Sn 801d nivaccheyā) ti nīcchinchī samuggahita-bhinnīviṭṭha nivesanā keci pi yassa na santi (Sn 801c27) ti yojana. tesan (Pj II 531,2) ti tehi khinnasavehi. na paṭ<e>ccita (Pj III 531,3) ti na sampatīcchi.

_Paramattha(sic)suttavānaṁṇādişani_ samattā (Pj II 531,7).

_jātakākathānaṁ (Pj II 531,13 "kathānaṁ") ti ettha ādisaddena samgāhāti. adinī (Pj II 531,13) ti ettha ādisaddena hetṭhā vuttaṁ tatraṭṭhitāni na ussukkasamudānatthanaṁ ti adinī jana-pada-cārikanīmittenā samgāhāti. bhuttavino bhagavato brāhmaṇo bhattam niharāpesi28).

---

20) This has to be inserted following the text of Nidd I.
21) Ms "vatī."  
22) Ms "vīvitānto."  
23) Ms "simātike."
yohanā pubbe va sannivāsenā (Pj II 533,1*) ti ettha vāsaddassa rassatam katan ti veditabbam. pubbe sannivāsenā vā ti vuttam hoti. tattha pubbe (Pj II 533,1*) ti atitajātiyām. sannivāsenā (Pj II 533,1*) ti sahavāsenā sahasaddass’ athte hi ayaṁ sasaddo. paccuppannāhitena vā (Pj II 533,1*) ti pacchuppanne vattamānabhāve hitacaranaṇa vā, evaṁ imehi²⁹ dvihi kāraṇchi tam sinheṣasankhātam pemaṁ jāyati (Pj II 533,2* jāyate) uppañjati. idam vuttam hoti pemaṁ (Pj II 533,2*) nām’ etam dvi<hi> kāraṇchi jāyati purimabhāve māta pi<la> vā dhīta vā putto vā bhūtaro vā bhagini vā pati vā bhariyā vā sahāyō vā mitto vā hutvā yo yena saddhīm ekātthāne vuttapubbe tassa imaṁ pubbe vā sannivāsena bhavantare pi anubandhanto so sīneho na vijahati imasmi attabhāve katera pacchuppannaṇa hitena vā ti evaṁ imehi dvihi kāraṇchi tam pemaṁ jāyati ti. kīṁvīya ti āha: uppalaṃ vā (I) yathā (Pj II 533,2*) ti etthā vāsaddassa rassatam katan ti daṭṭhabbām. avuttasampindattho c‘ ettha vāsaddo tena padumādayo samgāṇhāti. yathāsaddo upamāyām. idam vuttam hoti yathā uppalaṇa ca sēsaṇ ca padumā udake jāyamanā dve kāraṇāṇi nissāya jāyati. udakāṇa c‘eva kalalaṇa ca tathā etehi dvihi kāraṇchi pema jāyati ti. thūtipārita<at>aṇyā (Pj II 533,29) ti thūti<la>kkhaṇasa parittatiyā. sa<ra>-sāparittatāya (Pj II 533,29) ti attano paccaya-bhūtānaṃ kiccānaṃ sampattināṃ ca parittatāya. miyati (Sn 804b = Pj II 533,31.33) ti maraṇaṃ gacchati. idam (Sn 805b = Pj II 534,1) ti mamāyitavatthum. mama upāsako bhikkhu vā ti sākhand gato (Pj II 534,3) ti mama upāsako mama sāvako vā bhikkhu vā māmako (Sn 806d) ti sākhand gato ti yohanā. mamāyamanā (Pj II 534,4) ti piyāyamanō. etam adinavam disvā vidivā pandito (Sn 806c) gahaṭṭho ca pabbajito ca mama sāvako tasma diṭṭhipamattāya mama atā mama santakāni na nametha²⁰ (Sn 806d) na nameyyā ti sambandho. petan (Sn 807d) ti ito paralokagataṃ. kālakatan (Sn 807d) ti mataṃ. petassā (Sn 808d) ti matassa. jāntuno (Sn 808d) ti sattassa. etan (Pj II 534,25) ti attano adassanāṃ. sāmaggiyam āhu tassa tan (Sn 810d = Pj II 534,14) ti ettha ganaṃhaanaabhinibbattiyaṃkkhaṇētu ti sāmaggisyē tassa bhikkhuno anurūpavatthena abhinibbattiyaṃkkhaṇētu anabhi-bbattiyaṃkkhaṇētu. paṇṇe (Sn 811d) ti pokkharapatte³¹ ettha vā (Pj II 534,22) ti diṭṭhasutesu³² vā. tena vattunā (Pj II 534,25) ti taḥhāditthisankhāte<na> vattunā.

**Jārasutavāṇanādīpani** samattā.

tissame<tte>yyā (Pj II 536,7) ti ettha tissatissame<tte>yyā ti vattabbe ekasesasasaāpekanayaena³³ tissameteyyyā ti vuttaṁ. pabbaj(t)āsaṅkhaṇētu (Pj II 536,16) ti pabbaj(t)ākoṭṭhasena vā pabbajo ti samanno ti ganaṃhaanaṇeṇa vā. gaṇava[va]saggagaṭṭhena vā (Pj II 536,17) ti ganaṃhaanaṅiṭṭhāmaṃ vissajjētē vavakaṭṭhena vā. bhāvan (Pj II 536,27) ti pavattanāṃ vadhanaṃ vā. methunan (Pj II 536,31) ti methunaraṃgam. sāṅkappē (Pj II 536,31) ti kāmabyāpādaḍāṭṭhisankhaṇi pasamaṅkhaṇēti. imaṁ kāraṇa[n]ānā (Pj II 537,7) ti gilāno ahaṃ mātaṭWatthē ca mayā bharitabbo ti ādīnā kāraṇaṇa. mosavajjan (Sn 819d = Pj II 537,12) ti musāvādaṃ. pubbāparam (Sn 821b = Pj II 537,15 "pare") ti methunam anuyuttassa. pa. hinam āhu puthujjanam (Sn 815a-816b) ti pubbavuttaādinnavo paramparabhūtām. arahatta-nikāṭena desanāṃ nīṭhapesi (Pj II 537,27) ti idha tissameteyyya-sutte pubbe methunadhammo āgato upari arahattapalaṃ āgato hi hoti yasā, tasmā phalaniṅkūṭena pucchāṇusandhinā ca desanāṃ nīṭhapesi.

**Tissameteyyyasuttavaṇṇanādīpani** samattā. (Pj II 537,30).

jambū (Pj II 538,5) ti jamburukko. paṇāṇānan (Pj II 538,5) ti paṇāṇya naṭṭhena paṭivādam. anāsādento (Pj II 538,7) ti paṭivacananāyakaṃ puggalaṃ āpādetum alabhāmaṇo. kāraṇike (Pj II 538,22) ti yuttaṃ janante. paṇāṇāpaṭṭhānan (Pj II 538,24) ti paṇāṇya vattabbavacanan. te (Pj II 540,4*) ti yāṇi citrāṇi kāmāni te kāmetvā purissassa kāmo ti na

---

* Ms. *imamehi*, cf. on pemaṁ, Pj II 533,2* below.
* Ms. na mapetha.
vadesī (Pj II 540,4) ti yojana. sarirā< kārā> kappesū (Pj II 540,15) ti sasārārāya vesagamanādi kappesu ca. idh evā (Sn 824a = Pj II 540,31) ti imasmi diṭṭhigate. aṇīšu dhannesu (Sn 824b) ti aṇīśu sāsana dhamesu diṭṭhidhammesu ca. pacceka kassu (Sn 824d = Pj II 541,3) ti pacceka diṭṭhisu. te vādakāmā (Sn 825a) ti gāthā (Pj II 541,4) ti e vādakāmā (Sn 825a) ti-ādikā āyam gātha āevaṃ nivīthānaṃ michādi diṭṭhi kāmāṃ visesā kā dassanava sena vutta ti yojana. te (Sn 825a) ti āyam nivīthā diṭṭhigatikā. bālato (Pj II 541,6) ti bālabhāvato. aṇīṇasatthārādin (Pj II 541,7 aṇīnaṃ aṇīnāsa32) ti aṇīnaṃ aṇīnaṃ satthāra din. ubho pi janā āyam saṇīnī hatusa (Pj II 541,9) ti yojana. āyam vadanesu cā (Pj II 541,10) ti kusala vadanesu, niddhārāne ca etam bhummam. pubbe va vāda (Pj II 541,14) ti vādato pubbe vādena yujhanato pubbe ti attho. kathaṃ kathāvinighāti (Pj II 541,14 vinipatti) ti kathaṃ kathaṃ yādakhī hoti. atthāpayagato (Pj II 541,15) ti atthato vigatā. te (Pj II 541,15) ti tayā. pañhavimamsakahe (Pj II 541,15) ti pañhassa yuttayauttahāvam jānantehe. ariparihite34 (Pj II 541,16) chaḍātīte ti attho. vade (Pj II 541,17) ti mathukubhātassa diṭṭhi kāsā vade. āyam apāhatasmi ca vade (Pj II 541,17) ti bhāvalakkhane bhummam hetumhi vā. yam assa vādan (Sn 827a) ti yam tassa diṭṭhi kāsā vāden. yam assa vādan (Sn 827a) ti gāthā (Pj II 541,20) ti āyam gātha bhagavatā yathā vutta gātha dukkhām pāpuṇāti ti yojana. pañhām vimamsākā se (Sn 827b) ti ettha se ti niṇātamaṃ pañhām vimamsakārinā pariṣajjīti ti attho. anāṇīya (Pj II 541,22 aṇīnan mayā I ti ajānīvītā. āvajjita (Pj II 541,22) ti cajjitaṃ. tassa jayo (Pj II 541,23) ti tassa paṭivādapuggalassā jayo. jaya parajāyādi vasenā (Pj II 541,28) ti ettha adissadena labhādābhādayo sammāgati. uggāhato (Pj II 541,28) ti uggatabhāvam. nighātan (Pj II 541,29) ti hetthāgatathāvam. uggāhīti nighāṭimā cā (Pj II 541,29 va35) ti ettha uggāhīti ca nighātī cā ti uggāhātācāsi ātthi uggāhām ettha ti vādesu. sundaro āyan (Pj II 541,34) ti āyam puggalo sundaro ti. tatthā diṭṭhiyā (Sn 829a = Pj II 541,31) ti tassa diṭṭhiyam, nimittattthe ca etam bhummam. dipetvā (Pj II 542,1) ti āyam akkhāyā (Sn 829b) ti imasmi attho. jayatthenā (Pj II 542,2) ti jayasaṅkhātena atthaṃ hetubbhūtena. dantaṃ vidamsabhāvā (Pj II 542,2 dantavīdamsakam) ti dantapakāsakatam. ya uṇnati ti gāthā (Pj II 542,5) ti yā uṇnati (Sn 830a) ti-ādikā gāthā tassa uṇṇamantassa diṭṭhi gatikāsā dosadassanava sena vutta36 ti yojana. vighāṭabhūmi (Sn 830a = Pj II 542,6) ti piḷanabhūmi. ya uṇṇamati37 (Sn 830a uṇṇati) ti yā mānasakāthuṇnmaṇanā. sāsā vighāṭa bhūmi (Sn 830a) ti sā tassa [puggalaviṃghātami (I) ti sā tassa]38 puggalassā vighāṭabhūmipīlanabhūmi. tenā (Pj II 542,13) ti diṭṭhi gāhākādinā. suddhan (Sn 830d) ti nibbānasuddhīṃ. kussalā (Sn 830d) ti khandha ayaṇānādisu chekkā puggalā. taṃ vādāṃ asampatichakato (Pj II 542,8 paticcchanto) ti pi pātho. ettha pi pādihija† na vivādayethā ti tam vādāṃ sampaticchanta puggalassā ti attho. bhatapathenā39 (Pj II 542,10) ti raṇḍā dinnabhātta maṇena. puttho (Pj II 542,10 vutta !) ti posito apādiko vaḍhiko ti attho. etti (Pj II 542,12) ti gacchati. idhā (Sn 832c) ti mahaṃ santāne nesanti khināsavānam. ye (Sn 833a) ti ye attho khināsavāna40. caranti (Sn 833a) ti viharanti. diṭṭhihi (Sn 833b) ti dvāsāṭhi diṭṭhihi. paramam uggahitam (Sn 833d41) ti idam paramam aggagam seṭṭhām ti uggahitam abhinivīthām ajhosaṃ. kotthādāyo (Pj II 542,24) ti sigālādāyo.

Pasūrasuttavanāṇanādipanī samattā (Pj II 542,27).

ukkuṭikan (Pj II 544,1) ti asampuṭṭhamajhāṃ. anukadādhitam (Pj II 544,2) ti pādanikkhepasamaye43 pacchato aṭṭhitam. sahasānupiḷitan

---

34 So ms., read aparipārīte, E's asādātīte, cf. v.l.l.!
35 Cf. v.l. B's ca in E'.
36 Ms. puttā.
37 Ms. uṇṇanātī.
38 Dittography.
39 Ms. "mathena."
40 Read atthā khināsavā?
41 Cf. v.l. B" in E"!
42 Ms. Papura".

(Pj II 544,3*) ti aggāpādāna paññiyā ca sahasā sannirumbhitam. vippakāta (Pj II 544,5) ti aṇiṅṭhitā. abbikāman (Pj II 544,21) ti maṃ icchantam idan (Sn 835c = Pj II 544,23) ti rūpam kā/ma/ nāssā (cf. Pj II 544,28*44) ti kā na assa. saccāni (Pj II 545,9) ti cattāri ariyasaccāni. vadati (?)55 ti māgāṇḍiyān56 brāhmaṇo vadati. purisabyatayan (Pj II 545,23 *tatayam) ti pathamapurisassā uttamaādesavasena purisavipalāsaṃ katvā. dasavatthukam sammādiṭṭhi (Pj II 545,26) ti atthi dinnam atthi yīṭham atthi hutaṃ atthi sukkataṃ dukatam vīpako atthi pitā atthi mātā atthi sattā opapātikā atthi ayam loko atthi paraloko atthi loke saṃanā brāhmaṇaṃ ye imaṃ ca lokam paraṃ ca lokam abhijānītvā pavedenti vā evam dasavatthukasamādiṭṭhi. navaṅgās savanā57 (Pj II 545,27) ti tassā dasavatthukāya sammādiṭṭhiyā savanām. tessū (Pj II 545,30) ti dasavatthukasammādiṭṭhiādisu. atamayatāpajjanena (Pj II 545,34 *mitta) ti nitasahhāvam āpajjanena48. yuttasaṅkha (Pj II 546,16) ti samāpaddhamme paṭṭiladdhasaṅkha. tassā (Sn 842d = Pj II 546,24) ti tassa mayham na hiti. paṭisamyujjeyya (Sn 843d = Pj II 546,345) ti paṭiyujjeyya59. saman (Sn 843c = Pj II 546,32) ti samānan. rūpaḥdhetaviddi (Pj II 547,1 rūpavatthādhi60) ti ettha ādisaddena vedanāsahhāsānsahhāradhātuyo samganhāti. rūpanimittaniketadini (Pj II 547,2) ettha ādisaddena saddgandharasapoṭṭhabhihdammanikete samganhāti. puthubbhuto (Pj II 547,5) ti visum bhūto. mutarūpādhibhāyya (Pj II 547,24) ti ettha mutam rūpanāma59 gandharasapoṭṭhabbahi ādisaddena sarasakhobhādayo samganhāti. kāmādhikaraṇa (Pj II 548,4) ti kāmahetukaṃ. dharmādhipana (Pj II 548,5) ti diṭṭhidhammadhānaṃ.

Māgāṇḍiyasuttavaṇṇanādipani samattā (Pj II 548,9)

uppattiyan (Pj II 548,14) ti sabbāvalakkhaṇe52 bhummam. uttā ti (Pj II 548,15 vutta) vuttā va. devatānaṃ cittam ānātva (Pj II 548,20) ti ruddhicitadevataṇaṃ cittacāraṃ ānātva. Sammāparipābājyanasuttana (Sn 359-375) hi rāgacaritānaṃ devatānaṃ bhagavā kathesi dosacaritānaṃ Kalaha<vi>vādasutta (Sn 862-877) mohacaritānaṃ Mahābhāsuttama (Sn 892-894) sādācārānaṃ Tuvatākapatipāda (Sn 915-934 Tuvakasutta) buddh<ci>caritānaṃ Purabhāsuttama (Sn 848-861) vitakkacaritānaṃ Culabhāsuttama (Sn 878-894) kathesi53. pucchāyā (Pj II 548,24) ti pucchāgāthāya. kathāmdāsi (Pj II 548,24) ti kidisena dassanena samannāgato. kathamsilo (Pj II 548,25) ti kidi[va]sena silena samannāgato upasanto (Pj II 548,29) ti nibbuto.[

The six suttas mentioned above are grouped together in the same way already in the Suanāgalavilāsini: Sv 682,18-23.

Freiburg i. Br. Oskar von Hinüber

---

52 Ms. yabāva6.

---

40 Ms. pādapaticekkhapasamaye, cf. pādanikkhepasamaye kaddhanto viya pādam nikkhipati ten′ assa padam anukaṭṭitaṃ pacchato aññītan hoti, Vism. 105,4*40.
41 E* kā nu assa dīthi. The exact reference to Pj II remains uncertain.
42 Reference in Pj II uncertain.
43 Ms. has consistently -nd-.
44 Ms. na ca taṃ savanām.
45 Corrected from āpajjanassa.
46 Cf. v.l. B° in E°.
47 Ms. pātisamyu°, °sam° cancelled.
48 Thus after correction from nāmarūpa°.
Buddhist Literature of Lăn Nă on the History of Lăn Nă’s Buddhism

General Aspects of Lăn Nă’s Historical Literature

Lăn Nă’s numerous and fact-filled historical works consist of secular and religious writings, are written in Mon, Pəli or Thai Yuan languages with Mon, Thai (Fak Khăm) or Tham letters, and can be short descriptions of one particular event or longer accounts through the ages.

Mon dominated the region from about A.D. 750 to 1300 when the Thai rose to power. The oldest surviving documents are Mon inscriptions on stone with dates shortly after 1200; a few undated inscriptions may be somewhat older. The oldest Thai inscription with a date is from 1371 (Wat Phra Yūn, Lamphùn) though here again some undated inscriptions may be older. The oldest Thai palmleaf manuscript with a date is part of a Jātaka book in Pəli from 1471. Inscriptions are the only true primary sources. Of other texts, which usually were written on palmleaf, we do not have the originals, only

---

1 This article is a revised and enlarged version of the paper Literature on the History of Local Buddhism, presented at the 1st Conference on Buddhist Literature of Lăn Nă, “A Survey of Present Knowledge and Suggestions for Future Activities”, held at Wat Suan Đok, Chiang Mai, 15-16 November 1994.

copies of copies. Thus, there are no original manuscripts of any of the chronicles. Climate and insects necessitated copying to preserve a text.

Lân Nâ’s authors wrote solely on their own history or, at the most, on the old history of Buddhism in India and Ceylon. The accent of their writings is mostly on one locality in Lân Nâ or on one single item such as an image; other regions are mentioned mainly to show that a local item or feature was derived from there, or was moved to there. Lân Nâ’s authors did not write the history of other peoples, nor did they note down the customs of other peoples, whether these populations were living outside their area or within Lân Nâ itself. Thus, for instance, there is no work on the history of the local Lawa, no description of them as a different people, and no old Lawa word list; there is no history, for instance, of China, of a neighbouring Burmese kingdom, nor of Sukhôthai, Ayuthayâ. There is also no comprehensive history of Lân Nâ. There are, it is true, some chronicles that deal with many places in and outside Lân Nâ; but that is not because of wide historical interest on the part of the authors but because their subject, for instance the history of the Wat Suan Dòk monks and their school (MS), or the history of the Wat Pâ Dâng school (JKM), or the history of Chiang Mai (CMA), necessitated dealing with other places. Nonetheless, in particular the last two chronicles are more broad-minded in outlook than others and could be be read as Lân Nâ histories with a strong accent on Chiang Mai. One can therefore state that Lân Nâ’s historical works are basically locality-centered or item-centered. In that, Lân Nâ was not alone, most other regions in Southeast Asia had a similar self-centered way of writing only their own history; but it is clearly different from, for instance, old China or old Rome, where the history, languages and customs of other peoples received much attention.

If the authors of old have not left us an account of the Lawa who lived among them, neither have they left us an account of the life of the ordinary Mon or Thai person. The texts mostly enumerate events, political, military and religious, nearly always in neat chronological order. Causal connections are sometimes explained, are often obvious, occasionally not. Treating important events, the texts deal mostly with higher-ranking individuals, leaders of government, military, and clergy.

With the authors’ interest limited to events in their own country, miäang, their own region, or their own monastery or school, their outlook was limited geographically. Their outlook was also limited intellectually in the sense that they did not compare; certainly they did not critically compare and evaluate in writing, though one imagines occasional lively discussions among learned monks. But in their writings, authors did not, for instance, compare their own people’s history with the history of other populations in order to look for similarities or generalities, did not compare obviously similar accounts of several different famous Buddha statues as a starting point for an investigation into these similarities, did not compare conflicting evidence on one and the same subject for a study into the reason behind the difference. Since there was no comparing, there was no weighing or reasoned choosing between contradictory sources. It seems that there also was a complete absence of historical speculation or historical philosophy, for instance as to the meaning of history, or to its usefulness for present everyday life or for future generations. And they probably never abstracted, summarized a chain of related events. One can therefore further characterize Lân Nâ’s historical works as mostly plain, enumerative and descriptive, and her historians as mainly recorders and compilers.

However, that limited, enumerative event-descriptiveness is the very strongpoint of Lân Nâ’s historical literature. Authors did not
choose between two diverging sources but stated them both; they had
the highest respect for the written word and did not lightly change, add
to, or ‘correct’ what they found noted by their forefathers, an attitude at
present still prevalent among the senior generation. Therefore, in spite
of errors and sometimes accidental ‘jumps’ while copying which
resulted in lacunae in the copied text, today’s historian can with a
good deal of confidence work with the material that has been handed down -
if something appears unintelligible, there is a fair probability that he (or
she) does not understand the matter properly, and not that the text is
corrupt.

With regard to its historical qualities, Lân Nã’s literature can
roughly be divided into two categories: factual history and fictional or
mythical, legendary history. This paper is meant to treat literature
dealing with factual history. However, Lân Nã’s factual history
literature sometimes is not without legendary or mythical elements.

Buddhist Literature of Lân Nã on the History of Lân Nã’s
Buddhism

A major part of Lân Nã’s historical literature was created by
past local Mon and Thai authors who wrote on, or noted contemporary
events of, the factual history of their religion in Lân Nã. These texts
can be classed as Lân Nã’s Buddhist literature dealing with the factual
history of Lân Nã’s Buddhism and can be divided into 6 groups:

1. General religion chronicles
2. Chronicles of Buddha images
3. Chronicles of religious sites
4. Inscriptions
5. Colophons
6. Other

The lists below are meant to be suggestions or examples only;
they are neither complete nor perfect in all details. Some dates are
tentative. Items with Päli text are marked by an asterisk *.

1. General Religion Chronicles

± 1425 Buddhaññâna begins Mûlasânâ (MS).
1516-17 * Ratanapañña writes the first part of Jinakālamâli
(JKM). The second or last part ends with the year 1527.

2. Chronicles of Buddha Images

Ratanapañña in his JKM quite often mentions Buddha images
and usually remarks on their history. Of some of the images, he
reproduces their entire history. These accounts are among the earliest
known versions of image chronicles.

Some images are not mentioned in JKM (for example: Phra
Silã, Wat Chiang Man, Chiang Mai); possible explanations are: the
images then were not yet in Chiang Mai; they were mentioned in
sections lost from JKM;6 their chronicles were written after 1527.

The image Phra Kão Khâo (Phra Setangka Manî, Wat Chiang
Man, Chiang Mai) has a chronicle in Thai but not in Päli.

Phra Kão Môrakot has at least one chronicle version in Laotian
/ Yuan, and three in Päli.

---

6 All known JKM manuscripts have a total gap between 1455 and 1476.
Also, they do not report on JKM’s principal monastery, Wat Pã Dãng near
Chiang Mai, between 1453 and 1516.
3. Chronicles of Religious Sites

These chronicles, of which there are plenty, often consist of a common myth: the Buddha comes and makes predictions, leaves a hair, leaves a footprint, etc. The myth frequently explains the name of the future religious site. Sometimes the myth is followed by genuine historical material which describes events that indeed took place. One could call these histories myth-chronicles. Their date of composition is mostly unknown. They probably did not have a definite author and a definite year of composition because they presumably developed orally during a long time and later were written up. Here are some examples:

1565 Composition of the chronicle of Wat Phra Thät Hariphunchai (HAR).
1606 (or later) The HAR appendix is written.
1631-1812 Composition of the chronicle of Phra Thät Đôi Tùng (DT); but see also: inscription 1.4.3.2 Chiang Sän 1605.

Chronicles of religious sites can contain episodes which are more or less similar to stories contained in Phra jao liap lôk "The Lord (circum-)tours the World", also known as Tammān phra báth phra thät "History (or: The Origins) of the Holy Footprints and Relics", collections of legendary travels of the Buddha through Lăn Nâ and environment among the four Thai peoples, Siamese, Yuan, Khūn and Lū.7

7 There are numerous versions of greatly varying length and contents. A general edition would be most welcome. For a tentative classification of the various versions see: Penth (ed.) 1993 History of Phra Thät Đôi Tùng: 64. It seems that so far only a few isolated mss have been studied and occasionally been distributed in polycopied form ("semi-published"); for

Continues...
4. Inscriptions

Inscriptions mostly deal with one specific event that took place at a certain time, for instance the erection of a building at a monastery or the founding of a Buddha statue.

While chronicles easily belong to the category 'literature', it is often difficult to decide whether a certain inscription is 'literature'. In a broad sense, all inscriptions, whether on stones, on Buddha images, on bells, etc., can be called 'literature' concerning the history of local Buddhism. This is particularly true for longer inscriptions which sometimes are well-phrased and parts of which are written in verse or rhyme. However, very short inscriptions can hardly be regarded as being genuine 'literature'. It will be up to the individual reader to decide where to draw the line. Here are a few examples.

1219
* Inscr. 1.3.1.1 Wat Đôn 1219; stone; Pāli and Mon languages.

1411
Inscr. 1.5.1.1 Phra Suwanna Mahā Wihān 1411; stone; kham ham verse.

1470
* Inscr. 1.2.3.2 Wat Phra Jao Meng Rāi 1470; on a bronze ‘Phra Sing’ Buddha image.⁸

1477
* Inscr. 1.5.3.2 Wat Phayā Ruang 1477; on a bronze Buddha image.

instance: Sommāi 1967 Tamnān Mūang Fāng. (Incidentally, the title of the ms is a misnomer because the ms is a Phra jao liap lōk text and does not deal with Fāng’s history.)

⁸ ‘Phra Sing’ means a certain image but also a type of Buddha image in general. There are several images with inscriptions stating that it is a ‘Phra Sing’. This statue is one of them. The ‘real’ Phra Sing, dealt with in SIN, is claimed to be an image either in Chiang Mai, Bangkok, or Nakhon Si Thammarat; none of these three images is inscribed.

1605
Inscr. 1.4.3.2 Chiang Sān 1605; on a bronze image of a hermit (tūṣā, ṛṣi). Contains the earliest known version of the Đōi Tung chronicle.

See below under ‘INSCRIPTIONS’ for their publication.

5. Colophons

Similar to inscriptions which record, for instance, the founding of an image and are laid down on the pedestal of the image, palmleaf manuscripts (on any subject) may have at the end of the text proper a post-script or colophon that is of general historical interest and that also often bears on the history of local Buddhism because it records details about the writing of the manuscript: author, copyist, sponsor, costs, date, place, circumstances, etc. Some colophons are very short and can hardly be called 'literature'; others are longer, highly informative and also well-written. Colophons are sometimes omitted by copyists, in text editions or translations (and overlooked by their readers).

While instructive colophons are relatively frequent, their opposite, viz. informative prologues, are rare.⁹

See below under ‘COLOPHONS’ for their publication.

6. Other

There are secular chronicles which have a definite religious accent in that they prominently report on religious activities, for

instance on construction work at monasteries. They are not ‘Buddhist historical literature’ in a strict sense but complement other Buddhist writings on the history of local Buddhism. To mention only one example:

± 1410 * Bodhiraṃṣi translates from Thai Cāmadevīvaṃsa (CDV).

Finally must be mentioned certain secular chronicles and other historical writings which technically lie outside the field of ‘Buddhist historical literature’ yet are not unrelated: they can contain versions of old pieces of Buddhist historical writings, they deal occasionally with objects, events and persons connected with Buddhist writings on the past, and they therefore contribute to a better understanding of such writings. To mention only two well-known chronicles:

±1806 Completion of the 7-fascicle (‘bundle’) version of the Chronicle of Chiang Mai (CMA).
±1827 Completion of the 8-fascicle version of the Chronicle of Chiang Mai (CMA).
±1895 Composition of the Chronicle of Nān (NAN).

Texts and their Publications

Note on Abbreviations

In the list below, texts are arranged in alphabetical order while their publications are in chronological order.

Buddhist Literature of Lān Nā

The list avoids titles (prince, etc.) but personal rank-titles attached to such ranks as phra, luang, etc., have been retained and authors are listed under these because they usually are better known.¹⁰

The first letters, before the ‘decimal point’, indicate the name of a text; for instance: KM = the chronicle of Phra Kāo Mūrakot, i.e. the Emerald Buddha image.¹¹

If there are several text versions of the same story, a hyphen indicates the version; for instance: KM-A = history of Phra Kāo Mūrakot according to the therā Ariyavāṃsa.

The letters after the ‘decimal point’ indicate the modern editor of the text, or the translator, by his initials; for instance: KM-A.CN = Translation of KM-A into French by Camille Notton.

It is sometimes useful or even necessary to indicate the language; for instance: SIN.SM/P and SIN.SM/T, meaning that the

¹⁰ Here are some frequently mentioned names and personal titles:
Chām Bunnāk = Phrayā Prachākít-kðrájak แซ่ มานาก, พระยาพระเจ้ากินกรกกำ
Kāo = Phrayā Thammaparōhit แกว, พระยาราชบุรีศรี
Nōi = Phra Wichianprīchā น้อย, พระวีจีรนิท
Phā Tālalaksamon = Luang Prasōt Aksōranít = Phrayā Pariyati-thamthādā พระ ดำลาหลักสมณ์, หลวงปราสาท อักษรานิต, พระยาปิยทิธรรมราช
Sittī Lōjanānōn = Phrayā Yānawījit ศิลป์ โลจานันท, พระยาญาณวิจิตร
¹¹ If in future more texts are to be scrutinized, classified, etc., using the initials of two or three words in the title or name of a text will no longer be enough to clearly distinguish between different texts. One possible solution could be to follow the system of the Critical Pāli Dictionary and to use the first 5 letters of the name of a text instead; for instance: JKM = Jinak (Jinakālamāññī), CDV = Cāmad (Cāmadevīvaṃsa), SIN = Sihīn (Sihīnga(buddharūpa)niddāna). That would work well for Pāli titles; but for the less uniform Yuan titles adaptations will be necessary.
chronicle of the Buddha image Phra Sing (SIN) was edited by Sāng Monwithūn (SM) in Pāli (P) and also translated by him into Thai (T). Other abbreviations: E = English, F = French.

If the same text was repeatedly published, it can be useful to indicate the year of publication; for instance: KM-A.CN’1933.

Note on Text Editions and Transcriptions

In the case of inscriptions that are written in Mon, Pāli or Thai languages and archaic alphabets, also in the case of palmleaf manuscripts written in Pāli, text editions usually are in the form of a transcription that is an exact transliteration, letter by letter, (called คำจารเรียก, อักษรแปล) from the original alphabet into Roman or Thai characters. This gives the modern reader a precise idea of the orthography used in the old text. These transliterations are frequently accompanied by a Modern Thai Reading (called คำอ่านปัจจุบัน) to facilitate understanding; here, modern orthography and explanatory footnotes are used to assist the reader.

But in the case of chronicles written in Yuan dialect and in Tham or Fak Khām letters, text editions practically always are liberal transpositions into modern Thai (called pariwat ปรีวารศี), i.e. a form of Modern Thai Reading. Here, modern and original orthography are mixed to produce a quickly readable modern version with old local flavour, the degree of mixture being individually decided by each editor. These transpositions do not permit reconstruction of the original orthography but only of the wording; they come close to translations.

CDV
Cāmādevīvaṃsa. A Pāli version of the history of Old Lamphūn, History of Nāng Jām Thewē (NJT), translated c.1410 from Thai (Deyyabhāsā) into Pāli (bhāsā Palībyaṅjana akkha) by the mahāthera Bodhiraṃsi. The text has 15 chapters. The end of chapter 4 and the whole of chapters 5 and 6 are missing in all known manuscripts. Probably at an early date one or more bundles of a certain palmleaf manuscript were lost and all our presently known manuscripts go back to that one defective manuscript. Contents: From the visit and prophecy of the Buddha concerning the city until Ādittarāja (c. 1150).

CDV.PK
Translation of CDV into Thai by Phrayā Prachākit-kōrajak (Chăm Bunnāk).
In: Wachirayān, 9, 1898-99.12

CDV.WL
Pāli text edition of CDV in modern Thai characters, probably prepared by officials in the Wachirayān National Library from an unspecified manuscript in that Library.
In: Wachirayān Library 1920 Cāmādevīvaṃsa.

CDV.P+Y
Translation of CDV.WL into Thai by Phrayā Pariyati-thamthādā and Phrayā Yānawijit.
In: Wachirayān Library 1920 Cāmādevīvaṃsa.
Fine Arts Dept 1967 Cāmādevīvaṃsa.

CMA
The Chronicle of Chiang Mai. The known 7-fascicle (‘bundle’) versions end in 1805/06 while the 8-fascicle versions end in 1827. The title

---

12 The journal Wachirayān was published between 1884-1905 by the Royal Wachirayān Library, predecessor of the Wachirayān National Library, itself predecessor of the present National Library.
usually is Tammān Phūn Mūang Chiang Mai คำนำหน้านามเฉียงไม “Historical Account of the Past of Chiang Mai” but for as yet unknown reasons some manuscripts have the title Tammān Sip-hā Rāchawong คำนำใน 15 ราชวงศ์ “Historical Account of the 15 Reigns”.

CMA.CN
Translation of a 7-fascicle version of CMA into French by Camille Notton.
In: Notton 1930 Annales (3).

CMA.TT
Text edition of an 8-fascicle version of CMA in modern Thai by Thon Tonman.
In: Thon 1971 Chronicle of Chiang Mai.

COLOPHONS

Colophons to Cāmadevīvāmsa (Bodhirāmśi, c.1410)
In: Cœdès 1915 Ouvrages palis: 43 n.2.
    CDV.P+Y’1967: at the end of each chapter.

Colophon to Sihinganidāna (Bodhirāmśi, c.1410)
In: Cœdès 1915 Ouvrages palis: 43 n.3.

Colophons to commentaries to aṭṭhakathās of Buddhaghosa (Ṇāṇakitti, c. 1495)
In: Cœdès 1915 Ouvrages palis: 40 n.3; 41 n.1-3.

Colophon to KM (Brahmarājapaṇṭa, c.1500)
In: Cœdès 1915 Ouvrages palis: 46 n.2.

Colophon to Vessantaradīpāṇi (Sirimaṅgala, 1517)
In: Cœdès 1915 Ouvrages palis: 41 n.4.

Buddhist Literature of Lān Nā

Colophon to Saṅkhyaṇapakāśaka-ṭīkā (Sirimaṅgala, 1520)
In: Cœdès 1915 Ouvrages palis: 39 n.2.

Colophon to Maṅgalaṇidīpanī (Sirimaṅgala, 1524)
In: Cœdès 1915 Ouvrages palis: 40 n.1.

Colophon to JKM (1527)
In: JKM.WL/P’1908: 187-188.
    JKM.WL/T’1908: 250-151.
    JKM.GC/P in Cœdès 1925 Documents: 4-5 n.1 (not at the end of the JKM text!).

Various other colophons and related observations are in:
    Hundius 1990 Colophons of Thirty Pāli Manuscripts.

DT
The chronicle of the religious site Phra That Đōi Tung, twin stūpas (jedi, cetiya) on a high hill overlooking the Chiang Sān plain, about 50 km north of Chiang Rāi.

DT. HP
Text edition of DT in modern Thai based on the manuscript from Wat Huai Khrai near Đōi Tung and collated with a greater number of other DT manuscripts and one inscription (see also below: Inscriptions).
HAR
The chronicle of Phra That Hariphunchai, Lamphun, written in Yuan characters and dialect. Contents: From the earliest existences of the Buddha to 1565, with an additional episode dated 1606.

HAR.FAD’1942
In: Fine Arts Dept 1942 Prachum Tamnān (1).

HAR.FAD’1962
Text edition of HAR in modern Thai, based on the manuscript ‘Phāyap letters’ อักษรไทยพยัญชนะ no.21 of the National Library, Bangkok.
In: Fine Arts Dept. 1962 Tamnān Phra That Hariphunchai.

HAR.SW
Text edition of HAR in modern Thai by Singkha Wannasai, based on several manuscripts and earlier text editions.
In: Singkha 1973 Tamnān Phra That Hariphunchai.
• Several times reprinted by Wat Phra That Hariphunchai as a part of other publications of the monastery, for instance in 1974 and 1987.

INSCRIPTIONS

1.2.3.2 Wat Phra Jao Meng Rái 1470
In: Griswold 1957 Dated Buddha Images: no.1.

1.3.1.1 Wat Đôn 1219
    Halliday 1930 Inscriptions môn: 87-90 (does not contain the Pāli text).

1.4.3.2 Đôi Tùng 1605
In: Penth et al. 1993 Inscr. 1.4.3.2 Chiang Sān 1605.13

1.5.1.1 Phra Suwanna Mahā Wihān 1411
In: Thöm / Prasān 1980 Silā Jārāk Kasat Lò Phò.9.

1.5.3.2 Wat Phaya Ruang 1477
    Sinchāi / Jintānā 1974 Aksôn nūa: 107 (only the Pāli text).
    Thôm / Bunlōt 1987 Jārāk Yuthisathīra.

JKM
The chronicle Jinakālamālī (or Jinakālamālinī). Written in Pāli, the chronicle traces the history of Buddhism from India and Ceylon to Lān Nā. It deals specifically with a new local school, the Śīlaśīkhkus who installed themselves in 1430 in Wat Pā Dāng near Chiang Mai, then records in detail the activities of the Wat Pā Dāng monks first until 1517, and finally for another 10 years until 1527. The author (at least of the first part, up to 1517) was Ratanapaṇṇa, writing in Wat Pā Dāng.

There is an explanatory index to the Thailand part of the chronicle with comments on places, objects and events: Penth 1994 JKM Index. Cf. ibid. p.335-342 for details of JKM manuscripts and text editions.

13 It has since been established that the inscribed object (a bronze statue of a hermit) originally was kept on Đôi Tùng, hence the change in name of the inscription in the Archive of Lān Nā Inscriptions.
JKM.WL/P
Pāli text edition of JKM in Thai letters arranged by the Royal Wachirayān Library. 
In: Wachirayān Library 1908 Jinakālamāli (1). (‘Prince Damrong Edition’).

JKM.WL/T
Translation of JKM.WL/P into Thai by Phrayā Phojanāphimon and others, made in 1794, omitting certain difficult passages. 
In: Wachirayān Library 1908 Jinakālamāli (2).

JKM.GC/P
Pāli text edition of JKM (only the Thailand part) in Roman letters by George Cœdès. 
In: Cœdès 1925 Documents: 4-5; 36-72.

JKM.GC/F
Translation of JKM.GC/P (only the Thailand part of the chronicle) into French by George Cœdès. 
In: Cœdès 1925 Documents: 5; 73-140.

JKM.SM
Translation of JKM into modern Thai by Sāng Monwithūn. 
In: Sāng 1958 Jinakālamāli; the Thailand part of the chronicle is on p. 81-153. 
Sāng 1967 Jinakālamāli; the Thailand part of the chronicle is on p. 90-171.

JKM.NJ
Translation of JKM into English by N.A. Jayawickrama. 
In: Jayawickrama 1968 The Sheaf of Garlands; the Thailand part of the chronicle is on p. 96-186.

KJ
History of the Buddha image Phra Jao Kān Jan (Sandalwood Buddha Image). There were two of them: one made in Sāvatthī, and one in Chiang Sān (see JKM). KJ deals with the Sāvatthī image and calls the story Varacakandasaranidāna. But no Pāli text of that name seems to exist, the known manuscripts are in Thai Yuan and are usually called Tamnān Phra (Jao) Kān Jan. Ratanapānīya presumably translated a Thai version into Pāli for his Jinakālamāli.

KJ-JKM
An account in Pāli of KJ in the second part (1517-27) of the chronicle Jinakālamāli.

KJ.PY
An account of KJ by Phrayā Prachākīt-korajak in his Phongsāwadān Yōnok, presumably based on several Yuan manuscripts. 

KJ-JKM.GC/P
Pāli text edition of KJ-JKM in roman letters by G. Cœdès. 
In: Cœdès 1925 Documents: 69-70.

KJ-JKM.GC/F
Translation of the Pāli text of KJ-JKM into French by G. Cœdès. 

KJ-JKM.NJ
Translation of KJ-JKM into English by N.A. Jayawickrama. 
KJ-JKM.SM  
Translation of KJ-JKM into Thai by Sāng Monwithūn.  

KJ.SC  
An account of KJ in modern Thai by Sanguan Chōtsisukharat.  

KM  
Chronicle of the Buddha image Phra Kāo Mūrakot (Emerald Buddha). There are 3 Pāli versions by 3 different authors, Ariyavamsa (KM-A), Brahmārāja pāññā (KM-B), and Ratanapaññā in his Jinakālamālī (KM-KJM). They probably did not copy from each other but rather used common Thai sources which Brahmārāja pāññā calls “Siamese language” (syāmabhāsā) in the colophon and which, in the case of Ariyavamsa, presumably in part is taken from a chapter of the Chronicle of Lān Chāng.\(^{14}\)

There are also reports of Laotian versions in Luang Phra Bang, one of which is well-known in Thailand (KM-LP), and I have heard and read of (but not seen) Yuan manuscripts in north Thailand.

KM-A  
History of the Emerald Buddha according to Ariyavamsa: *Amarakaṭabuddharūpāṇidāna*. - Contents: From the creation of the image, initiated in 44 B.C. by the therā Nāgasena of Pātaliputta and sculpted by the god Vissukamma, to the death of King Jaya Jetītha in 1571 when the image is in Wiang Jan. - Date and place of composition are not clear. Two likely dates may be 1643 and 1725; the chronicle perhaps was written at Wiang Jan. The Pāli text may not yet have been published.

KM-A.X  
Translation of KM-A into modern Thai by an unnamed (?) person. - Contents: From Nāgasena to 1565 (correct: 1571 ?), when the image is in Wiang Jan, with a jump to 1778-80 when the image is removed to Bangkok.  
In: Julalongkōn 1920 Phra Rācha Karanyānusōn: 81-105.  

KM-A.CN  
Translation of KM-A from a Pāli - Yuan nissaya into English by Camille Notton. The Yuan text seems to have had enlargements over the Pāli text of the Amarakaṭabuddharūpanidāna.  
In: Notton 1932 Emerald Buddha.  
Notton 1933 Emerald Buddha.

KM.B  
History of the Phra Kāo Mūrakot as told by Brahmārāja pāññā. The author translates old Thai texts into Pāli and calls his work *Ratanaṭimbavamsa*. - Contents: From the creation of the image by Nāgasena until the image is in Lampāng. - Date and place of composition are indicated in the text but have not yet been identified.

KM-B.TP  
Translation of KM-B into modern Thai by Phrayā Thammaparōhit. Finished in 1788, printed in 1937.  
In: ... (No details available to me).

\(^{14}\) See also: Cœdès 1915 Ouvrages palis: 46; Lingat 1932 Rev. Notton 1932 Emerald Buddha; Lingat 1935 Le culte.
KM-B.PA/P
Pāli text edition of KM-B in modern Thai letters probably by Luang Prasōt Aksōranit.
In: Wachirayān Library 1912 Ratanaphimphawong.

KM-B.PA/T
Translation of KM-B into modern Thai by Luang Prasōt Aksōranit.
Probably in: Wachirayān Library 1912 Ratanaphimphawong.

KM-B.SM
Translation of KM.B into modern Thai by Sāng Monwithūn, occasionally with Pāli passages.
In: Sāng 1967 Ratanaphimphawong.

KM-JKM
History of the Phra Kāo Mōrakot according to Ratanapāṇā, 1516-17, in his Jinakālamāli. The story ends in 1481, when the image is installed in the Jāthi Luang, Chiang Mai.

KM-JKM.GC/P
Pāli text edition of KM-JKM in roman letters by G. Coedès.
In: Coedès 1925 Documents: 53-56.

KM-JKM.GC/F
Translation of KM-JKM into French by G. Coedès.
In: Coedès 1925 Documents: 112-115.

KM-JKM.SM
Translation of KM-JKM into Thai by Sāng Monwithūn.

KM-JKM.NJ
Translation of KM-JKM into English by N.A. Jayawickrama.
In: Jayawickrama 1968 The Sheaf of Garlands: 141-145.

KM-LP
Text edition (?) of KM in modern Thai, based on a Laotian version from Luang Phra Bāng.
In: Wichianprīchā 1869 Phongsāwādān Nūa: Appendix.
Prachum Phongsāwādān, 1, 1914, 79-112 (reprint of the 1894 PN and KM texts).
• The KM printings of 1869 and 1894 have the title Tammān Phra Kāo Mōrakot Luang Phra Bāng, but in Prachum Phongsāwādān the title is shortened to Tammān Phra Kāo Mōrakot.

KM.PY
An account of KM by Phrayā Prachākit-kōrajak in his Phongsāwādān Yōnok, presumably based on several Yuan manuscripts.

KM.SC
An account of KM in modern Thai by Sānguan Chōtīsukhārat.

MS
Mūlasāsanā. A chronicle of Buddhism and related secular events in India, Sri Lanka and Thailand, with emphasis on Lān Nā and the araṇñavāsī monks of Wat Suan Dōk near Chiang Mai. Contents: From the beginning of Buddhism in India to its advent in central and north
Thailand, on to the founding of Wat Suan Dök in 1371 and up to about 1510. In a way, MS is a chronicle of Wat Suan Dök as JKM is a
chronicle of Wat Pā Dāng. But MS is much less scholarly and thus
probably mirrors a basic difference between the two araṇāvāsī sects.
All known versions of MS are written in Tham letters and Yuan dialect
and are rather uniform. MS as it is known today is the result of an
original version with later additions: it seems that the abbot of Wat
Suan Dök, Buddhānāṇa, composed the first part in around 1425 and
that later the abbot Buddhabukāma (whose identity is not clear)\textsuperscript{15} and
perhaps others continued it.

MS.S+P
Text edition of MS in modern Thai by Sut Sisomwong and Phrom
Khamālā, based on a manuscript in the Bangkok National Library.
In: Sut/Phrom 1939 Mūlasāsanā.
Sut/Phrom 1970 Mūlasāsanā.

MS.PN
Text edition of MS in modern Thai by Prasōt na Nakhon (Prasert na
Nagara), based on MS.S+P and collated with other MS manuscripts.
In: Prasōt 1975 Mūlasāsanā.

NAN
The Chronicle of Nān.

NAN.RS
Text edition of NAN in modern Thai by Sān Luang Rācha Somphān
แสนหลวงราชสามัญ, based on one or several Yuan manuscripts. - The
prince of Nān, Suriyaphong Phritadet สุริยทรัพย์ผู้ริตเดช, ordered it

\textsuperscript{15} Griswold / Prasōt 1972 King Lōdaiya: 53-54; Prasōt 1975 Mūlasāsanā:
286 n.1.

compiled in 1894 after his accession. The last date mentioned is 1894.
Though there were, and perhaps still exist, older versions written or
copied in the years after 1800, it is this version which is generally used
today.
In: Rācha Somphān 1919 Nān History.

NAN.P+W
An abridged translation of Part 2 and the first two sections of Part 3 of
NAN.RS into English by Prasoet Churatana, checked and edited by
David Wyatt.
In: Prasōt/Wyatt 1966 Nān Chronicle.

NAN.W
Translation of NAN into English by David Wyatt.

NJT
History of Nān Jām Thewī. Contents: The Buddha visits the future
site of Lamphūn (Hariphunchai) and makes prophecies; followed by a
short biography of queen Jām Thewī; followed by a relation of events
in Lamphūn up to the last Mon king of the city, Yībā, when the Thai
Yuan king, Mang Rāi, conquers the city. Dates are few and unreliable.

Mahāthera Bodhiraṃsi translated the original Thai text (which
at least for its earlier part would have been derived from old Mon texts,
oral or written) into Pāli in about 1410 under the name of
Cāmedevaṃsa (CDV). Since then, there are 2 lines of text tradition:
the old Thai line (History of Nān Jām Thewī, NJT) and the new Pāli
line (Cāmedevaṃsa, CDV). The CDV has been re-translated into
modern Thai; it differs somewhat from the known versions of NJT,
perhaps because NJT evolved more during the time than CDV.
NJT.AP
Translation of NJT from a Laotian manuscript in Luang Phra Bâng dated A.D.1646 into French by Auguste Pavie and assistants. There is an appendix with a list of Chiang Mai rulers from Mang Râi to Fâ Sàwâthi.
In: Pavie 1898 Etudes diverses (2): 145 - 166 (‘Histoire de Nang Kiam Tévi’).

NJT.CN-Ams
Translation of NJT from a Yuan palmleaf manuscript which is not described (here called “manuscript A”) into French by Camille Notton.

NJT.CN-Bms
Translation of NJT from a Yuan palmleaf manuscript which is not described (here called “manuscript B”) into French by Camille Notton. The translation covers only the story of Nâng Jâm Thewi in a condensed way.

SET
History of the Buddha image Phra (Kão) Setangka Manî (Setamgamañi; in Wat Chiang Man, Chiang Mai), or Phra Káo Khâo. Only in Yuan dialect, no Pâli version is known. - The history of the image is also mentioned in NJT.CN-Ams: 1-3. There is often confusion in texts between Phra Káo Mîrakot, Phra Káo Khâo, and Phra Setangka Manî.

SET.PY
Summary of SET by Phrayâ Prachâkit-kôrajak in his Phongsawadân Yînok, presumably based on a number of Yuan manuscripts.
In: Prachâkit 1907 Phongsawadân Yînok: 244-245.

SET.EH
Summary of SET by E.W.Hutchinson, based on a transcription from Yuan into Thai made by the monk Phra Mahâ Mûn of Wat Hô Tham, Chiang Mai. That transcription was based on Mahâ Mûn’s palmleaf manuscript which itself had been copied in 1920 at Wat Rampông from another manuscript.
In: Hutchinson 1935 Sacred Images.

SET.CN
Translation of SET from a manuscript in Yuan dialect (and probably in Tham letters) into French by Camille Notton.
In: Notton 1936 Phra Setangka Manî.

SIK
History of the Buddha image Phra Sikhi, one of the five Ayuthayâ Black Stone Images, made from a black rock on which the Buddha once had rested near Ayuthayâ. The image was originally presented to Angkor Thom, then to Pagan, to Lampâng (until 1515) from where it was forcefully removed to Ayuthayâ.

SIK-JKM
Ratanapañña’s version of SIK in the first part (1516-17) of his chronicle Jinakâlamâli.

SIK-JKM.GC/P
Pâli text edition of SIK-JKM by G. Cœdès.
In: Cœdès 1925 Documents: 60-61.

SIK-JKM.GC/F
Translation of SIK-JKM from Pâli into French by G. Cœdès.
In: Cœdès 1925 Documents: 123-125.
SIK-JKM.SM
Translation of SIK-JKM from Pâli into Thai by Sâng Monwithûn.
Sâng 1967 Jinakâlamâîi: 141-144.

SIK-JKM.NJ
Translation of SIK-JKM from Pâli into English by N.A. Jayawickrama.
In: Jayawickrama 1968 The Sheaf of Garlands: 155-158.

SIL
History of the Buddha Image Phra Silâ at Wat Chiang Man, Chiang Mai, perhaps written in 1785 at Pâ Sâng at the request of Ph:â Mahà Phôtha Langkâ; there seem to be Pâli and Yuan versions. - Contents: King Ajâtaśatrû of Magadhâ (today: Bihâr, north India) orders to make the image. It is later removed to Langkâ, Burma, Sawankâlôk, Lampâng, Chiang Mai. - The shape of the letters of the inscription around the head of the image (Ye dhammâ ...) and the style of the image suggest that it was made soon after 900 in Bihâr.  

SIL.EH
A (shortened ?) translation of SIL from Yuan into English by E.W. Hutchinson, based on a Yuan version made by the monk Phra Mahâ Mûn of Wat Hô Thâm, Chiang Mai. Phra Mahâ Mûn had translated the Yuan version himself from a Pâli version and had put both side by side in his own manuscript.
In: Hutchinson 1935 Sacred Images.

SIL.X
An account of SIL in modern Thai by an unnamed person, published by Wat Chiang Man in 1956.
In: Wat Chiang Man 1956 Tamnân Phra Silâ.

SIL.SC
An account of SIL in modern Thai by Sanguan Chôtsûkharat.

SIN
History of the Buddha image Phra Sing (Phra Sihing, Phra Phuttha Sihing). Composed in Pâli or translated from Thai into Pâli c.1410 by the mahâthera Bodhiraṃsi under the title Sihînga(buddharûpa)nidâna. The history of the image is also told by Ratanapañña in the first part (1516-17) of his chronicle Jinakâlamâîi (SIN-JKM). - This history has repeatedly been printed in various forms; below are listed only some examples. More are listed in Sâng 1963 Tamnân Phra Sing: 80.

SIN.PA/P
SIN.PA/T
Pâli text edition together with a translation of SIN into modern Thai by Luang Prasôt Aksûranit. Published under Prince Damrong in 1913 for a private printing made by the Royal Historical Research Society (Porânagatisamosara) or the Wachirayân Library (Hô Phra Samut). In: Wachirayân Library 1913 Tamnân Phra Sing. Wachirayân Library 1918 Tamnân Phra Sing.

SIN.CN
Translation of SIN.PA/T into English by Camille Notton.
In: Notton 1933 Phra Sing.

---

17 Coësès 1915 Ouvrages palis: 43, n.3.
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Sâng 1963 Nîthân Phra Sing
แสง ณุวิช “คำานานุวลีศานา” กรุงเทพฯ กรมศิลปการ 2506.

Sâng 1967 Jinâkâlamâli
แสง ณุวิช “คำานานุวลีศานา” เขียนใหม่ กรมศิลปการ 2501.
- Reprint of Sâng 1958 Jinakâlamâli

Sâng 1967 Ratanaphimphawong
แสง ณุวิช “วัฒนีศัพท์คำานานุวลีศานา” พระภิกษุพระราชาบัญญัติ แต่งเป็นภาษาบาลี” กรุงเทพฯ 2510.
Säng 1980 Buddhism

Sanguan 1972 Prachum Tamnăn
สวาง โซติสุจริต "ประชุมด้านภาษาไทย" กรุงเทพฯ 2515 (2 เล่ม).

Siam Society 1954 Fiftieth Anniversary

Sinchai / Jintana 1974 Aksön nūa
สินชัย กรมบัญชี / จินตนา ศรีสุวรรณ "อักษรไทยภาคเหนือ" กรุงเทพฯ กรมศึกษาครรภ์ 2517.

Singkha 1973 Tamnăn Phra Thát Hariphunchai
สิงขระ วรรณสิงห์ "ด้านคฤหาสน์นครศรีธรรมราช" ลำปาง 2516.
  * Several times reprinted by Wat Phra Thad Hariphunchai as a part of other publications of the monastery, for instance in 1974 and 1987.

Sommai 1976 Tamnăn Mūng Fāng⁹
สมมัย ปรมีจิต "ด้านเนื้อผนัง" คณะสังคมศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยเชียงใหม่ ๒๔๐๓ (ภาคปริร่วมส์ลำปางที่ ๑) / Sommai Premchit: Muang Fang Chronicle, Faculty of Social Sciences, Chiang Mai University, 1976, 42 pp.

Sut / Phrom 1939 Mūlasāsanā
สูต ศรีสังเวช / พระม มราคา "ด้านมูลศาสนาน" กรุงเทพฯ กรมศึกษา 2482.
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Sut / Phrom 1970 Mūlasāsanā
สูต ศรีสังเวช / พระม มราคา "ด้านมูลศาสนาน" กรุงเทพฯ / เขียงใหม่ กรมศึกษา 2513.
  * Reprint of Sut / Phrom 1939 Mūlasāsanā.

Thôm / Prasân 1980 Silâ Jârik Kasat Lô Phô./9

Thôm / Bunlôt 1987 Jârik Yuthisathira
เทนม มีดื่ม / บุญเปิด แสนนาท "ศิลปะจิตรกรรมพระมหาเจ้ายุทธธิการ" ศิลปะ 31.4, 2530, 80-82.

Thon 1971 Chronicle of Chiang Mai
ทอน ระนัน (บริวรรช) "ด้านชั้นเมืองเชียงใหม่" กรุงเทพฯ ลำปาง รัฐมนตรี 2514.

Wachirayān Library 1908 Jinakālamāli
1. (พระสมุหะธารีฐานาน) "หนังสือคืนภาษาปัตตินี พระราชทานิศน์" กรุงเทพฯ ราชบ.127
2. (พระสมุหะธารีฐานาน) "หนังสือคืนภาษาปัตตินี" ภาษาคิน ราชบ.127
  * The book consists of 2 separate volumes. One volume contains a preface by Prince Damrong Rajanubhab and a JKM translation by Phraya Phojanaphimon and others made in 1794 (JKM.WL/T); the other contains a JKM text edition in Pāli, the "Prince Damrong edition" (JKM.WL/P).

Wachirayān Library 1912 Ratanaphimphawong
(?!) พระสมุหะธารีฐานาน "หนังสือขันพิมพ์พระ" กรุงเทพฯ ราชบ.131.

---
⁹ For this misnamed ms, which actually contains another text, see above footnote 3.
Wachirayān Library 1913 Tamnān Phra Sing
(Damrong Rajanubhab, Prince; ed.) "ต้านนะพระพุทธสิทธิ์" กรุงเทพฯ (2456). 20

Wachirayān Library 1918 Tamnān Phra Sing
(Damrong Rajanubhab, Prince; ed.) "ต้านนะพระพุทธสิทธิ์" กรุงเทพฯ (2456). 21
• Reprint of Wachirayān Library 1913 Tamnān Phra Sing.

Wachirayān Library 1920 Cāmadevīvaṃsa
ทะพระสมุทรชาดิยานา "เจมควิวัล พระคัลลิมพ์โองฟรุปุญชราย" กรุงเทพฯ 2463.

Wat Chiang Man 1956 Tamnān Phra Silāłā
(วัดเชียงมั่น) "ต้านนะพระศิลาล้า" เชียงใหม่ 2499 (24 pp.).

Wichianprichā 1869 Phongsāwadān Nūā
• Contains as an appendix: KM-LP.

Wichianprichā 1894 Phongsāwadān Nūā
(พระวิชัยธรรพิรา [น้อย]) "ต้านนะพระราชคุณหว่างเหนือ และต้านนะพระแก้วมรกตเมืองหลวงพระบาง" กรุงเทพฯ ร.ศ. 113.
• Reprint of the 1869 edition incl. KM-LP.

Wichianprichā 1914 Phongsāwadān Nūā
(พระวิชัยธรรพิรา [น้อย]) "พระราชคุณหว่างเหนือ" ประสมพระหาร, 1, 2457, 1-78.
• Appendix p.79-112: ต้านนะพระแก้วมรกต (= KM-LP’1914).

---

20 Hypothetical reconstruction of author, title, place and year. See above: SIN/PA.
21 Same as footnote 16 above.
22 Hypothetical reconstruction on the basis of what is known of the 1894 edition.
On the School-affiliation of the “Patna Dhammapada”

1. The Patna Dhammapada

One of the important Indian manuscripts photographed in Tibet in the 1930’s by Rāhula Sāṅkṛtyāyana is that known as the “Patna Dhammapada” (PDhp), now available in four editions.¹ The first two—those edited by N.S. Shukla and by Gustav Roth—appeared independently of each other in 1979 and 1980. The third and fourth—those edited by Margaret Cone and by Kōgen Mizuno—appeared independently of each other in 1989 and 1990. Both Cone and Mizuno take into account the readings of Shukla and Roth.²

The palm-leaf manuscript of the PDhp gives a complete text comprising 414 (Shukla, Cone, Mizuno) or 415 (Roth) verses in twenty-two chapters (vargga). The contents and arrangement differ from those

¹ The PDhp itself, in its verses, uses dhamma rather than dharma: the Sanskrit title Dhammapada occurs only in the colophon—see Cone (1989) 215; Shukla (1979) 44; Roth (1980) 135. This was noted by von Hinüber (1989:364): “As [in the PDhp] -rm- always develops into -nm- as in Pāli, the text should be called Patna Dhammapada…in spite of the Sanskrit colophon”. I therefore refer to the text as “Patna Dhammapada”, rather than Dharmapada.
² Shukla (1979), Roth (1980), Cone (1989), Mizuno (1990). Cone’s edition is based on a new reading of a copy of the original photographs; unfortunately the editor fails to give chapter numbers or to supply the internal enumeration of verses within chapters. All four editors list parallels to the PDhp verses in related Indie literature; Mizuno adds parallels in Chinese not given by the others. (Since Mizuno’s edition only came to my notice during the final revision of this paper, I refer to it in only a few instances.) von Hinüber & Norman (1994:x) list two indexes by T. Tabata: Index to the Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dharmapada (N.S. Shukla Edition), Kyoto, 1981, and Index to the Patna Dharmapada (Gustav Roth Edition), Kyoto, 1982 (neither seen).

of other known Dharmapadas: the Pāli Dhammapada (Dhp) of the Theravādins, the North-western Prakrit “Gândhārī Dharmapada” (GDhp) attributed to the Dharmaguptakas, two Dharmapadas preserved in Chinese translation, and the Udānavargas (Uv) of the (Mūla)Sarvāstivādins in Sanskrit and in Chinese and Tibetan translation.

The language of the PDhp is quite different from that of the surviving Indic Dharmapadas or Udānavargas. In his “Notes on the Patna Dhammapada”, Norman (1989) discusses some of the linguistic problems posed by the text, and the discrepancies in the readings, the numbering of verses, and the distribution of pādas into verses in the editions of Shukla and Roth. He notes that despite the fact that they are based on a single manuscript, the two editions “show quite remarkable differences”. In his “Origin and Varieties of Buddhist Sanskrit”, von Hinüber (1989:362–66) makes several important observations regarding the language and school of the PDhp.

3 There have been numerous editions and translations: for an extensive bibliography see Russell Webb, “The Dhammapada—East and West”, BSR 6/2 (1989) 166–75. I refer here to von Hinüber & Norman (1994), which lists parallels to the verses in other versions, including the PDhp.

4 Brough (1962).

5 For Sanskrit Udānavargas see Bernhard (1965, 1968, with references to earlier studies and editions) and Nakatani (1987); for the Tibetan Udānavarga see Rockhill (1883) and Dietz & Zongste (1990); for the Tibetan commentary, Prajñāvarman’s Udānavargavivarana, see Balk (1984, 1988). For the Chinese Dharmapadas and Udānavargas see Beal (1878), Lévi (1912), Brough (1962:34–41), Willemen (1973, 1974, 1978), and Nakatani (1984). For a study of the recensions of the Udānavarga see Schmithausen (1970); for comparative studies of the Dhammapada/ Udānavarga literature see Mizuno (1979, 1984).

2. The date of the PDhp manuscript

Shukla (1979:v–vi) describes the script as “eastern proto-Bengali”, and dates it to the 11th century. Roth (1980:82) also describes the script as “proto-Bengali”. He associates the PDhp with a group of manuscripts belonging to the “Sāṅkṛtyāyana collection”, and initially dates the group to the middle of the 12th century, since one of them bears a date equivalent to CE 1149. Later in the same article (p. 84), however, he dates one of these same manuscripts, that of the Bhikṣuṇī-vinaya, to the 11th century. In his edition of the latter, which appeared in 1970, he dates the Bhikṣuṇī-vinaya manuscript to “the 11th (latest 12th) century”.6 Cone (1989:103) concludes that the manuscript “can be dated in the second half of the 12th century”. For the purposes of this article it is sufficient to assume that the manuscript was written in the 11th or 12th century in one of the monasteries of Northern India, that is, ancient Madhyadesa or the present Indian states of Bihar and West Bengal.

3. The language of the PDhp

Shukla describes the language of the PDhp as “Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit” in his title, preface, and introduction, but does not discuss it in detail. Roth (1980:82) describes it as “more Prakritic and more homogeneous [than the language of the Lokottaravādins]” and “closely related to Pāli”. In the first part of his supplement on the PDhp (pp. 93–97) he deals with the peculiarities in some detail, concluding (p. 96) that “the general features of the language…the characteristic marks of a western type of Prakrit, which are very close to those of Pāli”. Mizuno (1984:168) remarks that “the language of this Dharmapada is totally unknown…it is intermediate between Buddhist Sanskrit and Pāli”, and


7 For the range of Madhyadesa see HBI 9.
“is closer to Pāli than to any other Buddhist Prakrit language”. Norman (1989:433) observes that, like the Pāli texts, the PDhp “contains anomalous forms which confirm that earlier material from different Prakrits has been ‘translated’ into one fairly homogeneous whole”. von Hinüber (1989:365) states that “this language is certainly neither Pāli, to which it is near, nor any Buddhist Sanskrit known so far, but a new variety derived independently from Buddhist Middle Indic”.

It is doubtful whether the language, which Roth (p. 93) describes as the result of “a weak attempt...to render a Prakritic text into Sanskrit”, should be described as “Buddhist Hybrid”—or any other—Sanskrit. It would be less confusing to reserve the term “Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit” for Edgerton’s “Group 1”—primarily the texts of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins—and “Group 2”—the language of the verses of a number of Mahāyāna sūtras such as the Saddharmapundarika, and to use the term “Buddhist Sanskrit” for the language of Edgerton’s “Group 3”, which includes both sūtra and śāstra literature in a Sanskrit that is generally correct, but is distinguished by the use of a large number of specifically Buddhist forms derived from Prakrit, and of common Sanskrit terms with specific Buddhist usages. The language of the PDhp might be referred to as a Buddhist Prakrit or a Buddhist Middle Indic.

For present purposes the important point is one raised by von Hinüber: the PDhp is composed in a unique, slightly Sanskritized, Middle Indic, quite different from the languages of the Buddhist schools whose texts have survived in an Indic language. Since the Dhammapada

---

8 For a recent bibliography of this group, see von Hinüber (1989) 342–44 and nn.

is a canonical text, this language must be that of the canon of a specific school. Unfortunately the manuscript does not name the school of the PDhp, and there is no translation of the text into another language, or any other source, that does so. What, then, is the school of the PDhp?

4. The school of the PDhp

Neither Shukla nor Conc discuss the school-affiliation of the text. Nakatani (1984:137) describes it as unknown. Roth (1980:82) states that “the text is not ascribed to a particular school, but was certainly within the reach of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins, as it comes from the same region, indicated by the type of its script”. I do not understand what Roth means by “within the reach of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins”, but he seems to imply that the text was somehow affiliated with that school.

von Hinüber (1989:362) points out the inadequacy of such an affiliation, noting that “even a very superficial glance at the language of the PDhp reveals features alien to the known Mahāsāṃghika tradition”. After eliminating either a (Mūla)Sarvāstivādin or Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin provenance for the text, he goes on to say (p. 365): “Although it is easy to find a negative answer, it cannot be determined in any positive way, to which school the PDhp may belong, as no information seems to survive even on the schools flourishing during the very last phase of Buddhism in Eastern India”. Here I must disagree with the learned scholar, since I feel that we do indeed have information on the schools of the period in question: enough, perhaps, to divine the school of our text. Unfortunately this evidence is scattered, for the most part in

11 In a later publication, Roth (1985:132) indeed includes the PDhp in a list of Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin texts. K.R. Norman has also described the PDhp as Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin (Pāli Literature, Wiesbaden, 1983, p. 60).
Tibetan sources, most of which remain to be explored, and the subject begs for a monograph or even a book.\textsuperscript{12} In the following I will present a preliminary sketch from readily accessible sources such as the works of Tāranātha (1575–1634).\textsuperscript{13} I will first discuss briefly the relation between language and school (§ 5), and then proceed to eliminate those schools which, for historical or geographical reasons, are unsuitable candidates for the transmission of the PDhp (§ 6). I will next present positive evidence for the existence of “Four Main Schools” in Madhyadesa during our period (§ 7). After this anabasis, I will finally venture to suggest a school-affiliation for our text (§ 8).

5. The rise of the Buddhist schools: Vinaya, dialect, and region

Before the beginning of the Common Era, the Buddhist order had divided into a number of schools: eighteen according to a common count. Traditional sources present a number of reasons for the rise of these schools: differences in the interpretation of the Vinaya and in the use of language, combined with the influence of individual teachers and dispersal over a far-flung area. 1-ching noted that “if we observe the differences among the four nikāyas carefully, the conspicuous differences are in the disciplinary practices”.\textsuperscript{14} Bangwei Wang remarks that “1-ching talked a lot about nikāyas, but we have to notice that he talked about them always in connection with Vinaya. When I-ching spoke of ‘practice’, he meant the practice of disciplinary life, i.e. the Vinaya rules”.\textsuperscript{15} Nearly a thousand years later, Tāranātha remarked that “it is necessary to understand that the division into the four schools (nikāya) resulted from distinctions in the practice of Vinaya”.\textsuperscript{16} Vinitadeva states that the eighteen different schools arose from distinctions in region, exegesis, and teachers.\textsuperscript{17}

The Indian scholar Śākyaprabha (8th century) and the Tibetan polymaths Bu ston (1290–1364) and Tāranātha point out that the use of regional dialects affected the transmission of the Buddhavacana from an early date, starting from the 2nd century after the Parinirvāna. Bu ston reports that the Buddhavacana came to be recited in Sanskrit, Prakrit, Apabhramśa, and Pāścācika by that time, and that this led to the birth of the eighteen schools.\textsuperscript{18} Śākyaprabha’s Prabhāvati, representing a Mūlasarvāstivādin tradition, also attributes the rise of the schools to recitation in different languages.\textsuperscript{19} We need not, however, conclude that there were eighteen different languages (although according to the Vimalaprabhā Laghukālacakratantrarāja-tika “even 96 languages are said to be found in Buddhist texts”).\textsuperscript{20} A reasonable summary is given by mKhas grub rje (1385–1438): “According to one system, 160 years after

\textsuperscript{12} Among the problems that cannot be adequately addressed here are the dates of the persons mentioned in Tibetan sources, which are often related to the regnal dates of Indian kings, which are themselves controversial (see e.g. Huntington 1984:29–38 and accompanying tables for the complexities of Pāla chronology). Others include the spelling or correct form of these names, and the reading and dating of relevant inscriptions.

\textsuperscript{13} I do not doubt that important references await discovery in the vast Tibetan historiographical and bibliographical literature. A recent revelation from veteran gter ston Leonard van der Kuijpp is mentioned below.

\textsuperscript{14} Wang (1994) 180, n. 61. The four nikāyas will be listed and discussed below.

\textsuperscript{15} Wang (1994) 180 (see also 174–75, § 1.12.5).

\textsuperscript{16} Tāranātha, History, 209.4/342 sde bzi’i dbye ‘byed kyan ’dul ba’i spyod pa las dbye bar go agos so.

\textsuperscript{17} Vinitadeva, in Tibetan Tripitaka, Peking ed., No. M641, Vol. 127, ’dul ba’i ’grel pa u, 187b7 yol don slob dpon bye brag gis, tha dad rnam pa bco bryeg gcuns.

\textsuperscript{18} Obermiller (1932) 96; Vogel (1985) 105; Yuyama (1980) 177. See also Tāranātha, History, 42.2/81.

\textsuperscript{19} Obermiller (1932) 98; Vogel (1985) 106 (skad tha dad kyis ’don pas).

\textsuperscript{20} von Hinüber (1989) 361.
the Nirvāna of the Teacher, in the city of Me tog gis brgyan, the elders (sthaviras) of four samghas recited the Āgama in four different languages: Sanskrit, Apabhraṃśa, Prakrit, and Paiśāci. As a result the disciples had different views, and separated into the four basic schools. These in turn gave birth to internal subdivisions, giving rise to the division into eighteen schools”. Bu ston and others list the languages employed by each of the four schools:

(Mūla) Sarvāstivādins: Sanskrit
Mahāsāṃghikas: Prakrit
Sāmatīyas: Apabhraṃśa
Sthaviras: Paiśāci.

While all sources agree that the (Mūla) Sarvāstivādins employed Sanskrit, they allot different languages to the other three schools. The important point is that rather than Sanskrit each used a recognizably different variety of Prakrit (taking the latter term in its broader sense).

6. Regional and lesser schools

While some schools spread over a wide area, others arose in particular regions—perhaps around charismatic teachers—and are not known to have gained influence beyond their original areas. These include, for example, the “Mahāgiṟiṇī” schools of the Western Ghats—the Dharmottarīyas, Bhadrayāṇīyas, and Śāṇṇagārikas—and the “Andhakas” of present-day Andhra Pradesh—the Pūrva- or Uttarāśailas, the Aparaśailas, Rājagiriṇīya, and Siddhārthikas. Other schools are obscure: known only from the occasional reference, they probably enjoyed only brief existences. We are concerned here with the Madhyadesa: since these regional and lesser schools are not known to have had any foothold there, and since most or all of them had died out by our period, we may leave them out of consideration.

A fivefold division of schools—Sarvāstivādin, Dharmaguptaka, Mahiśāsaka, Mahāsāṃghika (or Vātsiputriya), Kāśyapa—was known

---

21 Lessing & Wayman (1968) 66–67 yan lungs gcig la ston pa mya nam las ‘das nas lo brya dan drug cu ‘das pa na, gron khyer me tog gis brysan þes bya bar dge ’dun gyi gnas brtan bzi, skad mi mthun pa sam-skra ta dan, zur chag dan, tha mal pa dan, sa za’i skad kyi lu ‘don pas slob ma rnams la ba mi mthun par gyur pas, rtsa ba’i sde pa bzhin gyes so. de dag kyan nañ gyes kyi dbyes ba so sor gyes pas sde pa bco brygad du gyes so. As Roth (1985:131) points out, the four languages are listed at Mvy §§ 4717–20.
24 Bureau (1955) 89 and 99–109. A possible example of the Prakrit employed by the Pūrvaśailas is found in citation by Candrakīrti (late 6th or early 7th century) in his Prasannapadā: see de la Vallée Poussin’s edition p. 548.5, and Paul Harrison, “Sanskrit Fragments of a Lokottaravādin Tradition”, in L.A. Hercus et al. (ed.), Indological and Buddhist Studies (Volume in Honour of Professor J.W. de Jong on his Sixtieth Birthday), Delhi, 1982, pp. 225 foll. This Prakrit, as tentatively restored by Harrison, is quite different from the language of the PDhp (and also from that of the Lokottaravādins). Candrakīrti refers elsewhere to the seven Pītakas of the Pūrva- and Aparaśailas: see Per K. Sorensen, Candrakīrti, Triśārānasaptati, the Septuagint on the Three Refuges, Vienna, 1986, pp. 51–53 (vv. 57–58).
25 The demise of these schools can be determined from archaeological evidence (the abandonment of sites in the Western Ghats and Andhra Pradesh), and from the reports of the Chinese pilgrims and of Tibetan historians. See Bureau (1955) and HBI 600–1 for details.
26 Various lists give one or the other, with a marked preference for the first.
in China during the first half of the first millennium of the Common Era.\textsuperscript{27} This classification describes the situation in the far West, the North-west, and Central Asia, areas which had extensive contacts via the trade routes with the Middle Kingdom during the period. It would have never reflected the situation in the other parts of India, particularly Madhyadeśa, with which we are herein concerned. This was noted by I-ching: “I have never heard, in the West (India), of the division into five principal schools (nikāyas), of which some Chinese make use”.\textsuperscript{28}

I-ching also remarks that “not one of the three schools derived from the Sarvāstivādins—the Dharmaguptakas, the Mahiśāsakas, and the Kāśyapiyas— is practised in India. It is only in Udāliyāna, Kutch, and in Khotan that they have some adherents, mixed with those of other schools.”\textsuperscript{29} The same situation had already been described by Hsüan-tsang at the beginning of the 7th century, when he noted the presence of the three schools in Udāliyāna, but not in India proper.\textsuperscript{30} Tibetan sources do not give any indication that these schools were active in Madhyadeśa during our period.

\textsuperscript{27} Lin Li-kouang (1949) 189–91; Bareau (1955) 22; HBI 593–94; Wang (1994) 173.
\textsuperscript{28} Takakusu (1896) 8; Lin Li-kouang (1949) 191–92.
\textsuperscript{29} Lin Li-kouang (1949) 191–92; Takakusu (1896) 20; Bareau (1955) 39–40, 182. Although the early lists show some confusion regarding the affiliation of these three schools to the other schools, by the time of I-ching they were grouped, rightly or wrongly, with the Sarvāstivādins. There are cogent reasons for accepting the thesis that the “Gāndhāra Dharmapada” belonged to the canon of the (early) Dharmaguptakas, although, like the PDhp, the manuscript does not identify its school.
\textsuperscript{30} Since I-ching did not visit Udāliyāna, his statement may have been based upon that of his illustrious predecessor. He was, however, a scrupulous investigator: at one point (Takakusu 1896:43) he says that “Although I, myself, did not see all these parts of India, I could nevertheless ascertain anything by careful inquiry”. Since his main concern was the Vinaya and its proper and minute observance, we may rely on his testimony.

7. Schools contemporary to the PDhp manuscript

We may now turn to Madhyadeśa. A convenient starting point is the 7th century, for which we may turn to the eye-witness reports of the erudite Chinese pilgrims. Although Hsüan-tsang does not explicitly say so, an analysis of his remarks about the sectarian affiliation of monasteries reveals that only four nikāyas were active in Madhyadeśa in the second quarter of the century. Lamotte writes that “on constate qu’à l’époque de Hsüan-tsang quatre écoles hinayānistes seulement étaient encore représentées”.\textsuperscript{31} I-ching is quite explicit about the situation at the end of the 7th century. He states that “in the five parts of India and in the islands in the South Sea, four nikāyas are spoken of everywhere”.\textsuperscript{32} I-ching lists the four schools:\textsuperscript{33}

1. the Ārya-Mahāśāṅghika, with seven branches, unspecified;
2. the Ārya-Sthavira, with three branches, unspecified;
3. the Ārya-Mūlasarvāstivāda, with three branches;\textsuperscript{34}
4. the Ārya-Saṃmati, with four branches, unspecified.

Similar classifications are given in other sources, from Vinitadeva in the 8th century to the Varsāgraprocchā, translated into Tibetan in the 11th century, most of which list the branches in full.\textsuperscript{35} In his History of

\textsuperscript{31} HBI 596–601; see also Bareau (1955) 38.
\textsuperscript{32} Wang (1994) 180; see also HBI 601.
\textsuperscript{33} Takakusu (1896) 7–8; HBI 601–2; Bareau (1955) 24.
\textsuperscript{34} I-ching lists these further on (Takakusu 1896:20) as (a) Dharmaguptaka, (b) Mahiśāsaka, (c) Kāśyapiya—schools already eliminated for the Madhyadeśa by I-ching himself (above, § 6).
\textsuperscript{35} Bareau (1955) 24–26. The details of the lists (for which see HBI and Bareau 1955), which do not always agree, need not detain us here. (For the branches of the Sarvāstivādins see Skilling 1993, Table 7A; for the three branches of the Sthaviras, see ibid pp. 154–55 and Table 7C.)
Buddhism, Tāranātha refers several times to the basic fourfold division. Our sources thus agree that in Northern and North-eastern India there were four main schools.

A common misconception, long disproven but regretfully not yet put to rest, is that during the Pāla-Sena period only the Mahāyāna, along with the Vajrayāna, survived in India. This assumption ignores the fundamental fact that there was no such thing as a Mahāyāna ordination (upasampadā): a monk, a bhikṣu, no matter what his philosophical preferences, had to ordain according to one of the Śrāvaka Vinaya lineages. The relationship between ordination into the four schools and the Mahāyāna was noted by I-ching (Takakusu 1896:14–15): “both [Śrāvakayāna and Mahāyāna] adopt one and the same Vinaya”. He also remarked that “if one worships bodhisattvas and reads Mahāyāna scriptures, he will be called a Mahāyānist, otherwise a Hinayānist”, and “among these four nikāyas some belong to Mahāyāna and some to Hinayāna”. Similarly, Tāranātha observed that “with the spread of the Mahāyāna, the entire Mahāyāna samgha belonged to these very schools (sde pa, nikāya), although they adhered to the tenets (grub mtha’, siddhānta) of the Mahāyāna”. A connection between the four schools and the Vajrayāna is seen from the fact that they are given a symbolic interpretation in the Hevajra Tantra.

---

36 See especially Chap. 42, sDe pa bZi’i don la cun zad dpyad pa’i skabs (tr. 339–42); some points are obscure, and a new translation is needed.
37 There were, of course, bodhisattvas and Vajrayāna vows, which could be undertaken either by monastics, on top of their Vinaya vows, or by lay-followers.
38 Both citations are from Wang (1994) 181; cp. Takakusu (1896) 14–15, taking into account Wang’s n. 64.
39 Tāranātha, History, 208.21/342.

---
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Since monks and monasteries continued to exist throughout the Pāla-Sena period, Śrāvaka Vinaya lineages must also have survived unbroken. The existence of the four schools (sde pa bZi’, with only the Mahāsāṃghikas specified) at Nālandā in the time of Devapāla (9th century) is mentioned in passing by Abhayadatta (late 11th or early 12th century). The Blue Annals records that in the late 10th century Atiśa “listened to” most of the Three Piṭakas of the four schools (sde pa bZi’i sde snod gsum). Atiśa’s disciple Nag tsho, in his Stotra of Eighty Slokas, says: “At Odantapuri, there were 53 monks. At Vikramaśila, there were about a hundred monks. All the four main schools were found among them”. In his History of Buddhism, Tāranātha records that King Mahāpāla (early 11th century?), son and successor of Mahipāla, reigned for 41 years, and “mainly made offerings to the Śrāvaka samgha (śan thos kyi dge ’dun) at the Odantapuri vihāra, maintaining 500 bhikṣus and 500 dharma-preachers. As a branch he built a vihāra called Uruvāsa, where he maintained 500 Sendhapa śrāvakas.” He also actively supported Vikramaśila, Nālandā, Somapuri, and other vihāras. During the reign of Rāmapāla (late 11th or early 12th century) over 160 panditas and 1000 monks were permanent residents (gtan du bZugs pa’i dge slob) at Vikramaśila; up to 500 pravrajitas (rab byun) gathered from time to time for offerings (mchod = pūjā). At Vajrāsana the King maintained 40 Mahāyānists and 200 Śrāvaka bhikṣus as permanent residents; at times

97–98. Cf. also Tāranātha, History, 207.14/340 de yA rgyud sde du ma las rtsa ba’i sde pa bZi yin par gsu’bs sNi.’
41 Acharya Sempa Dorje, The Biography of Eighty-four Saints, Samath, 1979, Tibetan text p. 144.1 sde pa bZi yod pa’i phal chen sde pa’i mkhan po; Robinson (1979), Tibetan text 171.1 (mistranslated on p. 146).
42 BA I 298.16/1 243.
43 Citation from BA (tr.) I 243, n. 2.
44 For the Sendhapa śrāvakas see below.
45 Tāranātha, History, 175.1/289. This may well be the Mahāpāla under whom, according to the Seven Instruction Lineages (632.4/60), mantra practices were banned for bhikṣus.
up to 10,000 Śrāvaka bhikṣus gathered there. At Odantapuri 1000 monks of both Hinayāna and Mahāyāna resided permanently, and at times 12,000 pravrajitas assembled. In his *Seven Instruction Lineages*, Tāranātha states that Abhayākaragupta "became widely learned in the Vinayas of the four schools (sde pa btsi), in most of the Śrāvaka Pitakas" (apparently at Nālandā). Abhayākaragupta, who flourished during the reign of Rāmapāla, composed works on Vinaya; he was highly regarded by the King, and became abbot of Vajrāsana, and later of Nālandā and Vikramaśilā.

These references establish the existence of the Śrāvaka Vinaya lineages of the four schools in the great monasteries of Madhyadeśa throughout the Pāla-Sena period. Our sources also make specific references to each of the schools.

**The Mahāsāṃghikas**

In his *History* Tāranātha refers to Ānandagarbha of Magadha and Vāgiśvarakirti of Vārānasi, who ordained in the Mahāsāṃghika nikāya in the late Pāla period. During the "period of the four Sena Kings" Buddhaśri of Nepal acted as Sthavira of the Mahāsāṃghikas at Vikramaśilā for a time, before returning to Nepal; Ratnakṣita ordained in that sect, and acted as Mantrācārya at Vikramaśilā. In his *Seven Instruction Lineages* Tāranātha records that, during the reign of Dhrmapāla (second half of the 8th century), Buddhaśrijñāna and his disciple Dipamkarabhadra ordained in the Mahāsāṃghika tradition, the former (and perhaps also the latter) at Nālandā. According to the *Blue Annals*, in the late 10th century Atiśa was ordained at the age of 29 by Śilarakṣita, Sthavira of the Mahāsāṃghika school, belonging to the lineage of Buddhajñānapāda, at the Mativihāra at Vajrāsana. Abhayadatta refers to the Mahāsāṃghikas, probably at Somapura Mahāvihāra.

These references confirm that the Mahāsāṃghika ordination lineage survived in India until the Sena period. This no doubt explains why the Lokottaravādī Mahāvastu was preserved in Nepal, and why several Lokottaravādī Vinaya texts were carried to Tibet, despite the fact that the Mūlasarvāstivādin ordination lineage had held sway there since the 8th century. The fact that the surviving Mahāsāṃghika texts, from both Nepal and Tibet, belong to the Lokottaravādīs suggests that this branch represented the Mahāsāṃghikas in Madhyadeśa and Nepal during our period.

**The (Mūla)Śarvāstivādins**

I-整形 notes that "in Magadha the doctrines of the four nikāyas are generally in practice, yet the Śarvāstivāda nikāya flourishes the most." Tāranātha refers to Sāntipa, who ordained as a Śarvāstivādin at

---

46 Tāranātha, *History*, 189.13/313.
47 Tāranātha, *Seven Instruction Lineages*, 647.2/71.
48 Tāranātha, *Seven Instruction Lineages*, 649.5/72; see also *History*, 189.10/313.
Odantapuri, mastered the entire Śrāvaka Tripiṭaka, and became abbot of Somapuri. He also records that Ratigupta ordained in the Sarvāstivādin lineage. The Blue Annals states that Karopa, disciple of Maitripa (11th century), was ordained by Mitratāra, the great scholar of the Sarvāstivāda at Vikramaśilā, where he studied the Luṅ sde bzh with Vimalakośa, the great Vinayadharā. The Mūlasarvāstivādins are mentioned as one of the four schools at Nālandā by Grags pa rgyal mtshan (1147–1216). Inscriptions of the later period that mention the (Mūla)Sarvāstivādins are few. A bronze pedestal inscription from Nālandā, dated paleographically to the reign of Devapāladeva (9th century), extols a Sarvāstivādin bhikṣu from Nālandā named Mañjuśrīvarman, who appears, from his name and the contents of the inscription, to have adhered to the Mahāyāna. A stone inscription from Patna district, dated to the reign of Mahīpāla (late 10th or early 11th century), records the setting up of a nāga image by a Mūlasarvāstivādin. By our period the Sarvāstivādins had probably been superseded by the Mūlasarvāstivādins, and Tibetan references to the Sarvāstivādins may well be a shorthand for the Mūlasarvāstivādins.

The Sthaviras

We know from Indian inscriptions, from the chronicles of Ceylon, Burma, and Siam, and from Tāranātha that Sthavira or

Theravādin monks regularly visited and resided in the region, particularly at Bodh Gaya. In addition, the “Continental Sthaviras”—the Sthaviras based in India as opposed to those who came as visitors from either Śrī Lankā or South-east Asia—may have been represented in the area. That Sthavira scriptures were preserved in Madhyadesa during our period is shown by the Sanskrit śrāmaṇerī vacana, a text most probably composed there in the 12th or 13th century. The author, Daśabalaśrīmitra, devotes three chapters (Chaps. 13–15) to their tenets, in the form of an abridged citation of the Vīmattimagga. Outside of these chapters, he also cites from other Sthavira texts on ten occasions.

Lokottaravādins, (Mūla)Sarvāstivādins, Sthaviras and the PDhp

The three schools discussed so far may be rejected as candidates for the school of the PDhp on linguistic and textual grounds. The language of the PDhp is not that of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins. Furthermore, the Mahāvastu of that school preserves a Sahasravarga (dharmapadesu sahasravarage): when compared with Chapter 21 of the PDhp, which bears the same title, one sees that the number (22 in PDhp, 24 in Mahāvastu) and sequence of verses is quite different. Other

---

63 For the problem of the “Continental Sthaviras”, see Skilling, op. cit.
66 A similar set of verses, apparently described only as gāthā, occurs in the Chinese Abhiniśkrāmanasūtra summarized by Samuel Beal as The Romantic Legend of Sākya Buddha, [London, 1875] Delhi, 1985, pp. 310–11. This seems to add one more Sahasravarga to those already available: that is, Dhp Chap. 8, Sahassavagga; GDhp Chap. 19 (title not available); PDhp Chap. 21, Sahasravarga; Udānavarga Chap. 24, Piyūlavarga; and Mahāvastu. If the school of this Abhiniśkrāmanasūtra can be determined—Beal claims a Dharmaguptaka provenance, but this is uncertain—and the set of verses can be related to any of the existing Dharmapadas this would further add to our knowledge.
dharmapada verses cited here and there throughout the Mahāvastu belong to a different linguistic transmission. The language of the Sarvāstivādins and Mūlasarvāstivādins was Sanskrit, and their counterparts of the Dharmapada survive as their Udānavargas. The PDhp differs in language, in arrangement of chapters, in inclusion or omission of verses, and within individual verses from the Dharmapada of the Mahāvihāravāsin Sthaviras of Ceylon.

This leaves one more school, the Sāṃmatiyyas, which we will examine in detail in the following section.

8. The Sāṃmatiyyas

At the time of Hsüan-tsang (second quarter of the 7th century), the Sāṃmatiyyas were the most numerous sect: they were predominant in Western India (Sindh and Gujarat), and also represented in Magadha. A half-century later, I-ching remarked that the Sāṃmatiyyas were predominant in Lāṭa and Sindh. Bu ston and Tāranātha agree that the manuscript from Nepal (see below, n. 76) have short a in the first and second syllables. The form with a in the second syllable (and, properly, with vrddhi in the first) is the basis of the two Tibetan translations Maṅ po bskur ba’i sde and Kun gyis bskur ba’i sde: it derives from the name of the school’s founder, Sammata, who presided over the four council (see Skilling 1982:41 and cp. Mvy § 3552, Maṅ po bskur ba = Mahāsāṃmata [here the first, elected King of Buddhist lore]).

But these might be later forms, since earlier records show i in second place. These include an inscription from Mathura (EI XIX, p. 67 acarivāna samitiyāna) and Chinese transliterations (e.g. KBC 972 san mi ti pu lūn and translations (e.g. Takakusu 1896, p. 8, “Noble School of the Right Measure”). The Pāli forms vary: Sammata (Dīpavaṃsa V, 46), Sammatiyā (Kathavatthu-apṭhakathā, Nālandā ed. pp. 4.24, 11.14), and Sāṃmatiyya (Mahāvaṃsa V, 7, from Vamsatthappakāsini, PTS ed., Vol. I, p. 174.8, with the same in the commentary at line 17 and in the Extended Mahāvaṃsa published by Malalasekera in 1937). (See also DPPN VII 1064, which also gives Sammatiya: I do not know if this form is in fact attested in Pāli.) Candrakīrti gives long ā in the first syllable, and i in the second: Sāṃmatīyaḥ (Prasannapadā, ed. Louis de La Vallée Poussin, pp. 148.1, 192.8, 276.2). An inscription from Sarnath is not clear (EI VIII, Pl. 21, i, r, read at p. 172 as a[ca]ryyayanam sa[m]mitiyānam). Although the second syllable of the second word does not show the distinct i of other syllables, it is unclear (altered, or damaged?), and is hard to construe as simply a double ma. For the name see further the remarks at Barea (1955) 121 and Skilling (1982) 45-46.

Literature on the Sāṃmatiyyas is scant: see Louis de La Vallée Poussin, “Sāṃmatiyya”, Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, Vol. 11, 168-69; Barea (1955) 121-26; Venkataramanan (1953); Skilling (1982, 1987); Thich Thien Chau (1987). La Vallée Poussin (Prasannapadā, 148, n. 1) makes the interesting remark that “les Sāṃmatiyas représentent le Petit Véhicule dans la Madhyamakavṛtti”. We eagerly await the promised publication of the theses of Thich Thien Chau (translated from the French by Sarah Boin-Webb) and of Leonard Priestley (Toronto), which should add a great deal to our present meagre knowledge.

HBI 597–601; Barea (1955) 121; Joshi (1977) 40–45.

Takakusu (1896) 9.

Continue...
great logician Dignāga was ordained by a Vātsiputriya (the forerunner of the Sāmmatiyas) preceptor (gna ba bu'i sde pa'i mchan po); the latter adds that this occurred in the South, in the region of Kānci, and that the preceptor was named Nāgadatta. Bu ston notes that Ārya Vīmuktisena, author of a commentary on the Pañcavimśatisahasrikā Prajñāpāramitā according to the system of the Abhisamayālāmkāra, was ordained as a Kaurukulla Sāmmatiya, a statement confirmed by (or perhaps based upon) the colophon to that work, which is preserved in Sanskrit. These two references, though earlier than our period, show that two important figures of Indian Mahāyāna held Vātsiputriya or Sāmmatiya ordination, although their own philosophical standpoints were scarcely compatible with that of the “Pudgalavāda”.

We have seen above that the Sāmmatiyas were one of the four schools represented throughout the Pāla-Sena period in the Madhyadeśa, at the great vihāras of Odantapuri, Vikramaśāli, and Nālandā. For the later period, Tāranātha, in his Seven Instruction Lineages, refers to Ācārya Jñānamitra, a śīdra of Tripura, who was ordained in the East at Jagaddala vihāra; he belonged to the Sāmmatiya school, and was learned in the Vinaya and Abhidharma Pitakas according to their system. A Sanskrit history of the Vajrayogini cult from Nepal notes that the (future siddha) Maitrīputra ordained as a Sāmmatiya at Vikramapura in the first half of the 11th century, and “listened to” the Śūtra, Abhidharma, and Vinaya. In the late 12th century Vihsīhticandra, from Varendra in
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Eastern India, ordained with the Sāmmatiyas. He travelled several times to Tibet, and lived there for many years. But the school continued even beyond that: in an extraordinary Tibetan record recently revealed to the scholarly world by van der Kuijp we find a Sāmmatiya monk from Eastern India named Lokottara, a student of Madhyamaka, Pramāṇa, and Vajrayāna, roaming from Kashmir to Central Tibet in the 1460’s.

No identified text of the Sāmmatiyas has been preserved in an Indian language. Indeed, considering the numerical strength and geographical reach of the school reported by Hsüan-tsang and I-ching, it is remarkable that it seems to have left virtually no traces in India. Hsüan-tsang brought back to China fifteen works from the Tripitaka of the Sāmmatiyas, but unfortunately they were never translated. I-ching notes that “the three Pitakas of the [Sāmmatiyas] contain 200,000 stanzas, the Vinaya texts alone amounting to 30,000 stanzas”. Only two Sāmmatiya works are preserved in Chinese—one dealing with doctrine and one with Vinaya. That the literature of this school was preserved in Northern


78 Leonard W.J. van der Kuijp, “Some Indian and Sri Lankan Peregrinators in Central Tibet and Glo bo Smon thang during the Fifteenth Century”, paper read at the Seventh Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Seggau, Graz, 1995. I am grateful to Dr. van der Kuijp for giving me permission to refer to his paper, which will appear in the forthcoming proceedings.

79 Lin Li-kouang (1949) 206.

80 Takakusu (1896) 8.

India during our period is amply demonstrated by Daśabalaśrimitra in his Samskṛtāsamskraviniścaya: he devotes six full chapters to the tenets of the Sāṃmatīyas in the form of direct citation from their Āgama (ḥā, in this case “tradition” in the sense of śāstra rather than sūtra). In addition, he cites their tenets in a number of other places. Daśabalaśrimitra’s citations and the two Chinese translations supply first-hand information about Sāṃmatīya tenets, for which we also have information from references in non-Sāṃmatīya works. (The London Tun huang collection preserves a short commentary on the ye dharma verse entitled Pratītyasamutpāda-gāthā-vyākhyāna by Ācārya Vinayavarman of the Sāṃmatīya school.) Until the work is studied, we cannot determine whether it propounds any specific doctrines of the school, since Vinayavarman might also be a Mahāyānist belonging to the Sāṃmatīya Vinaya lineage.)

The Sāṃmatīyas and the PDhp

Although no part of the canon of the Sāṃmatīyas has been preserved, we can deduce from citations in their śāstra literature that they transmitted counterparts of sūtras found in the canons of the other schools. The Sāṃmatīyanīkāya-śāstra contains many brief citations, including some described as gāthā, but very few are identified by title, and none attributed to a Dharmapada. Daśabalaśrimitra’s citations include three partial verses which have parallels in the Udānavarga, but again the title of the source is not given. The first (156a6) is equivalent to the first three pādas of the famous anityā bata samskāra verse (Uv I, 3abe); the verse does not occur in other Dharmapadas, but is found elsewhere in sūtra literature. The second (157b1), equivalent to Uv XII, 6a, occurs at Dhp 278a and GDhp 107a, but not in PDhp. Since the source of the Sāṃmatīya citation is not given, it need not be from their Dharmapada; in Pāli, for example, the verse also occurs at Theragāthā 677. The third is given at 163a8:

śes rab med la bsam gtan med // bsam gtan med na śes rab min //

This verse has parallels in all four Indic Dharmapadas and in the concluding verses of the Bhiksū Prātimokṣa of the Lokottaravādins.

PDhp 62ab nāsti jhānam apramāṇa / pramāṇa vā nāsti ajanāyato
Dhp 372ab nathī jhānam apaṇāna / paṇāna nathī ajanāyato
GDhp 58ab nasti jana apraṇāsa / praṇā nasti ajanāya
Uv 32:25ab nāsty aprajñāsyā vai dhyānam / prajñā nādhyāyato

Prātimokṣa nāsti dhyānam aprajñāsyā / prajñā nāsti adhyāyato.

But since this verse is essentially the same in all versions, and since the source is not given, the citation simply proves that the Sāṃmatīya canon also had the same verse.

Wang (p. 173) mentions one other lost translation, a Vinaya text entitled *Sāṃmatīya-sūtra*, known only from catalogues.

* Louis de La Vallée Poussin, Catalogue of the Tibetan Manuscripts from Tun-huang in the India Office Library, Oxford, 1962, § 127.2, p. 50; Zuiho Yamaguchi et al., A Catalogue of the Tibetan Manuscripts collected by Sir Aurel Stein, Part Two, The Toyo Bunko, Tokyo, 1978, pp. 51–52: (La Vallée Poussin’s transcription) rten cing ’brel par ’byun ba’i tshig bchad pa’i rnam par bṣad pa = phrad ti tva’ / sa mud pā da gā tha’ / byag khyav na’; colophon (from Yamaguchi et al.) rten cing ’brel ba’i tshig bchad pa rnam sbsad pa / slob dpon kun gis bkur ba’i sde pa dal ba’i go chas mdzad pa rdzogs sho. Present-day Tadjurs do not include the work, or any others by an author of that name.


* Tatia (1975) 37.3.
Could the PDhp have been transmitted by the Sāmmatiyas? The traditions preserved in Tibetan on the languages of the four schools described above agree that the Sāmmatiyas did not use Sanskrit, and that they used a (Prakritic) language different from that of the Mahāsāṃghikas and the Sthaviras. This fits the language of the PDhp: it is certainly not Sanskrit; it is quite different from the Hybrid Sanskrit of the Lokottaravadins, and related to but different from the Pāli of the Sthaviras.

I have noted above that Roth describes the language of the PDhp as related to a western Prakrit and close to Pāli. von Hinüber (1989:365) comes to a similar conclusion, writing that “on the whole [the language of the PDhp] may be a western variety”, although he also suggests North-western and Eastern influence. The close relationship of the language of the PDhp to Pāli, and, along with it, Western India, suits a Sāmmatiya affiliation. The Vatsiputriyas, the “mother school” of the latter, were one of the earliest schools. Bhavya states that they were called Avantakas because they held a council at Avanti. The evidence Hsüan-tsang and I-ching shows that in the 7th century the Sāmmatiyas were predominant in Sindh, and well represented at Mālava and Valabhi. Bareau interprets the names of two branches, the Avantakas and Kurukulas, as referring to Avanti and Kurukṣetra.6

The problem of the “Sendhapa Śrāvakas”

The predominance of the Sāmmatiyas in Western India raises the problem of the enigmatic “Sendhapa Śrāvakas”. Bu ston refers to a method of calculation of the years elapsed since the Parinirvāṇa according to the system of the Sendhapa Śrāvakas.7 Tāranātha makes frequent reference to these Śrāvakas, often in connection with Vajrāsana8 and Odantapuri; they were evidently quite active and numerous in North-eastern India during the Pāla-Sena period. If we derive Sendhapa from Saindhava, “belonging to Sindh”, the term could refer to the Sāmmatiyas, who might have taken refuge in Magadha when Sindh fell to the Arabs, or simply have been described by the name of their “home country”90 (as, from the 13th or 14th century, bhikkhus ordained in the reformed Theravāda in South-east Asia were said to belong to the Sihala-vamsa). Some references imply that the name refers to a specific nikāya: Tāranātha mentions a Jñānaśrīmitra (late 10th century) who started out as a pandita of the Sendhapa Śrāvakas, and became proficient in the Tripiṭaka according to their system, before gaining faith in the

---

6 Bareau (1955) 121–22.
7 Tāranātha, History, 168.13/279; 208.15/342; Seven Instruction Lineages, 609.1.2/42, 680.3/95; Tārā Tantra 523.5 = Templeman (1981) 18, Willson (1986) 182.
9 Tāranātha, History, 175.5/289; Seven Instruction Lineages, 631.1/59.
10 A stone pedestal inscription from the area of Bihar Sharif in Patna District, from the reign of Mahendrapāla (the Pratihāra ruler, late 9th century), records a dedication to the Saindhavas (saindhavānām dānājñāthe, taking saindhavānām to be dative): Saxtī (1942) 105–6; Huntington (1984) § 61, p. 240, and Fig. 39. Two inscriptions from Bodh Gaya record the setting up of Buddha images (pratimā muneḥ) by Śrī Dharmabhūma of Sindh (sindhudhavavo) during the time of Gopāladeva II (CE 940–960): Ramaranjan Mukherji and Sachindra Kumar Maity, Corpus of Bengal Inscriptions bearing on History and Civilization of Bengal, Calcutta, 1967, nos. 23 and 25; Huntington (1984) § 27 (pp. 218–20). I do not know whether the presence, with connections with Bodh Gaya, of ruling families claiming a SIndhu origin has any bearing on the presence of Saindhava monks (see D.C. Sircar in El XXXV 82, n. 1). For a different interpretation of Sendhapa, based on the variant Penda ba, see D. Seyfort Ruegg, “Notes on some Indian and Tibetan Reconneings of the Buddha’s Nirvāṇa and the Duration of his Teaching”, in Heinz Bechert (ed.), The Dating of the Historical Buddha, Part 2, Göttingen, 1992, pp. 267–68 and nn.
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District Monghyr (Munger), Bihar—three from Uren* and one each from Ghoshikundii (near Kiul), Kajra, Badhaulii, and Guridih. There is also a dedication in the same script, from Maldah in West Bengal, that gives the same recension of the ye dhammā verse.

Sircar dates the Uren inscriptions to "between the ninth and the twelfth century, preferably to the latter half of this period"; Bendall dates his inscriptions to between the 7th and 10th centuries, but given the similarity of the script to that of the other Bhākṣukī records a later date is likely. The language of the records—described by Bendall as "differing

Uddandapura...the discovery of the Kara inscription in the Allahabad District of the U.P. and that of...one in the Maldah District of West Bengal appear to suggest a wider distribution". See EI XXVIII 222, 225.

* D.C. Sircar, "Four Bhakshuki Inscriptions", EI XXVIII 220–24. Inscription No. 1, dedicated by Śrī Pratinava Śrāda(vi)tapāla, is from "the base of a mutilated Buddhist image lying half buried by the side of the main road running through the village". Sircar edited Inscriptions Nos. 2 and 3—which were on unspecified (stone?) "images", the present whereabouts of which are unknown—from photographs published by L.A. Waddell in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, LXI (1892), Part i, Plate IV, Nos. 1 and 2 (not seen). For Uren see Sircar's remarks and Patil (1963) 583–86.

† Edited from impressions by D.C. Sircar, "Bhakshuki Inscription in Indian Museum", EI XXXV 79–84; on the pedestal of an image of Jambhala dedicated by bhadanta Jayasena. For Kiul see Patil (1963) 209–10.

†† EI XXXV, p. 84, Postscript, described as "on the lower part of a sculptured stone slab under a pipal tree near the Kajra railway station".

‡ Bendall (1895) 153. The accompanying plate shows that the text is inscribed along the top of a sculptured stone base. Oddly enough, although Sircar (EI XXVIII 222, n. 1) refers to Bendall's article, he does not mention that this and the following inscription give the same text as his inscriptions.

‡‡ Bendall (1895) 154, edited from "an eye-copy of a longer inscription". The nature of the inscribed object is not mentioned.

‡‡‡ EI XXVIII 224–26: on the pedestal of an Avalokiteśvara image, dedicated by bhadanta Buddhapāliita.

§ EI XXVIII:223; Bendall (1895) 155. Sircar suggests a mid-13th century date for the Jambhala inscription (EI XXXV:81). Although his reasoning—a
in only a few details from the literary Pāli" and by Sircar as “Pāli which is, however, greatly influenced by Sanskrit”—is consistent, and indeed similar to that of the PDhp, as von Hinüber has noted. The ye dhammā verse differs from that of the Therāvādins, Mahāsāṃghikas, and Sarvāstivādins. We may note the following correspondences between the inscriptions and the Patna Dhammapada (Cone ed.):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{dhammā} & = \text{PDhp dhamma, passim} \\
\text{deśeti} & = \text{PDhp 68b deśanā; 36b, 363d deśitām} \\
\text{prabhavā} & = \text{PDhp 1c pradduṣṭa, 2c prasanna, etc., and von Hinüber (1989) 362–63} \\
\text{tesām} & = \text{PDhp 87d, 124a tesām; cp. 5d, 6d, 74c, 244c, 266d tesām} \\
\text{ṣamano} & = \text{PDhp 196d, 235a, d, 236d, 239d ṣamano.}
\end{align*}
\]

The same reasoning that has been applied above to the PDhp may be applied to the inscriptions: since they present a canonical passage in a unique and consistent form of Middle Indic, they must come from the canon of one of the Buddhist schools. The similarity of the language to that of the PDhp suggests that they belong to the same school as that text, the Sāṃmatiyas, and in this case we have corroborating evidence. Hsüan-tsang visited a country between Nālandā and Champa called I-lan-na-po-fa-to, bordered by the Ganges River in the north and mountains in the south. It possessed ten samghārāmas with about 4000 monks, most of whom belonged to the Sāṃmatiya school. There were a number of sacred sites in the region, which Cunningham and Waddell identified

---

88 It would be interesting to see whether there are any other ye dhammā inscriptions in the same language. The verse appearing on ten terracotta plaques from Nālandā seems the same: see Simon D. Lawson, A Catalogue of Indian Buddhist Clay Sealings in British Museums (thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the University of Oxford, 1982), pp. 429–39. I suspect there are others (see Lawson, pp. 153–54, for a tablet from Bodh Gaya in a language closer to Pāli). It is unfortunate that few scholars take the trouble to transcribe the verse; they regularly dismiss it as “the usual Buddhist creed”, thereby depriving us of a body of examples that would allow us to classify its forms. Sircar (El XXVIII 221), for example, remarks that he “took impressions of altogether fourteen image inscriptions at Uren, many of which, however, contained nothing but the Buddhist formula ye dhammā, etc.” At Kül Cunningham uncovered several thousands of lac seals with the figure of the Buddha, mostly inscribed with “the usual Buddhist creed formula in 10th or 11th century characters” (Patil 1963:209–10). (There is one other very brief “canonical” Bhāikṣuṇi inscription: a dedication “in correct Sanskrit” on a metal plate meant to fit into the base of an image, from Kara in Allahabad District, which opens with the phrase nāmarūpam anityam: El XXII 37–39).

90 Julian's restoration of the name as Hiranyaparvata (Golden Mountain) was rejected by Watters (1904–5, II 179), who suggested Ḡeṇaparvata.

91 Beal (1884) II 186–91; Watters (1904–5) II 178–81; Bagchi (1959) 102–3. Not long before Hsüan-tsang’s visit, a “king of a border country” had seized power, and “built in the city two samghārāmas, each holding something less than 1000 priests. Both of them are attached to the Sarvāstivādin school”. Since the language of the inscriptions is not that of the Sarvāstivādins, the existence of these monasteries does not affect our argument. The report is interesting in that it suggests that different schools may have vied for the favour of rulers.
with the ruins in the area of Uren.\footnote{See Siricar (EI XXVIII) and Patil (1963) 278–79; 583–86.} On the evidence of our peripatetic pilgrim, I-lan-na-po-fa-to seems to have been the main Sāmmatiya centre south of the Ganges, and to have boasted the largest concentration of monks of that school in Madhyadeśa after Vārāṇasi (which had 4500 monks, including those in Sarnath).\footnote{See HIBI 599 (Vārāṇasi 3000 + Sarnath 1500) (= Beal 1884 II 44–45; Watters 1904–5 II 46–48; Bagchi 1959:71–72); Bareau (1955) 36.} If one examines the pilgrim’s itinerary, there can be little doubt that the identification of the extensive Uren sites—which are all close together, within a radius of ten miles\footnote{Sircar (EI XXVIII:220–21) states that Uren is about seven miles from Kuli and 2 1/2 miles from Kajra. Bendall (1895:153–54) places Badauli about five miles south-west of Uren, and Gurdih about ten miles south-west of Uren and opposite Husainpur on the Kuli River. Unfortunately Uren was blasted for railway materials and otherwise plundered by the end of the 19th century. Sircar (EI XXVIII) relates the sad tale of its fate.}—with I-lan-na-po-fa-to is correct. We may therefore conclude that the Sāmmatiyas were responsible for the inscriptions, and that the language is that of their canon: that is, that Monghyr District was indeed the major Sāmmatiya centre (and as a corollary Maldah in West Bengal might have had at least one Sāmmatiya vihāra).\footnote{Maldah would seem to have been in Pundravardhana, which possessed about twenty samghārāmas with some 3000 monks who studied both the Hinayāna and Mahāyāna: Beal (1884) II 194–95; Watters (1904–5) II 184–85; Bagchi (1959) 104. It was also near Karnasuvampa, which had ten samghārāmas with about 2000 monks of the Sāmmatiya school: Beal (1884) II 201–4; Watters (1904–5) II 191–93; Bagchi (1959) 106. For Pundravardhana, see Dilip K. Chakrabarti, Ancient Bangladesh: A Study of the Archaeological Sources, Delhi, 1992, pp. 22–23.} Religious activity continued at Uren up to at least the reign of Rāmapāla (late 11th or early 12th century).\footnote{See for example the dedications at Huntington (1984) §§ 46, 48, pp. 231–33. These should be the inscriptions referred to by Sircar (EI XXVIII:221), especially the second, which agrees in dating from year 14 of Rāmapāla’s reign.} One can only agree with Patil when he says, “The place does not seem to

have been examined by any archaeologist afterwards [since the end of the 19th century] and considering the large number of inscriptions and inscribed images, as reported by Waddell, further…exploration is certainly necessary”.\footnote{Patil (1963) 586.}

Another canonical inscription that may be mentioned here is the pratītyasamutpāda inscription from Devnimori in Gujarat.\footnote{See von Hinüber (1985).} Although the relationship to the language of the PDhp is not as close as that of the Monghyr inscriptions, it does bear some resemblance. Furthermore, as it probably dates from the late 4th or early 5th century, it is centuries older than either of the former. Once again, we meet with a “new” canonical Middle Indic that must be that of a particular school. Since Gujarat was one of the strongholds of the Sāmmatiyas, the inscription may represent an earlier phase of their canon, or that of their predecessors, the Vātsiputiyas. The Sāmmatiya Agama cited by Daśabelaśrimita relates that the school held several councils (sanghī). At these councils, the language of the canon might well have been revised: the Devnimori inscription might be drawn from an earlier recension of their canon, the PDhp and the Monghyr inscriptions from a later recension.\footnote{von Hinüber (1985:193 foll.) deals with a second pratītyasamutpāda inscription from the 5th century from Ratnagiri in Orissa, The language is much closer to Pāli, and does not show any of the unique features of our inscriptions or the PDhp. The school affiliation of this inscription warrants further study.}

9. Conclusions

The PDhp, transmitted in a distinct dialect of Buddhist Prakrit (or, less felicitously, Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit), must have belonged to the canon of a Buddhist school. There is sufficient linguistic and textual evidence to
eliminate as candidates three of the four main schools of the Madhyadesa of the period of the manuscript (11th to 12th century): the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins, the (Mūla)Sārvāstivādins, and the Sthaviras. The remaining “lesser” schools and sub-schools may also be eliminated: either they had a limited geographical reach, or they did not survive into our period (in most cases both). By this process of elimination, the most likely candidate becomes the fourth of the four main schools, the Śāmmatiyas. The description of the canonical language of the Śāmmatiyas in Indo-Tibetan tradition as other than Sanskrit and different from that of the other schools suits the language of the PĐhp. The Śāmmatiya ordination lineage was still active during the period of the PĐhp manuscript (and indeed beyond), and Śāmmatiya texts were available in the library used by Daśabalaśrimitra. The inscriptions from Uren, a major Śāmmatiya centre at the time of Hsūn-tsang, are in a similar language, and should also belong to the Śāmmatiyas.\(^{19}\)

The information presented in this article gives rise to a number of general reflections about the Śāmmatiyas, beyond the question of the affiliation of the PĐhp. Many of the Buddhist monuments of India, particularly of Gujarat and Sindh, but also of Madhyadesa, were undoubtedly Śāmmatiya centres. We must therefore recognize that that school played a significant role in the development of Buddhist art and architecture, and keep our eyes open for inscriptions, including the je

dhāmmā verse, that may be related to the Śāmmatiyas. From the time of Ārya Vimuktisena, monks ordained in the Śāmmatiya lineage practised Mahāyāna, and from the Pāla-Sena period up to the 15th century, monks ordained in the Śāmmatiya lineage practised Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna. That is—and this is already quite clear from the statements of the Chinese pilgrims and from Tibetan sources—the Mahāyāna was not restricted to any single nikāya, and all four nikāyas participated in the development of Mahāyāna thought and practice.

The original draft of this article, written some years ago, ended here. I was not aware that Kōgen Mizuno had already independently concluded that the PĐhp belonged to the Śāmmatiyas, for entirely different reasons. He writes: “The nikāya (school) which transmitted this Dharmapada is entirely unknown, but judging from the linguistic features, the language of the words and phrases of this Dharmapada seems to correspond to the transliteration of various technical terms concerning Vinaya which appear in the Vinaya-dvāvīṃśatiprasannārtha-śāstra (Nanjio 1139, Taishō Vol. 24, pp. 665–73) translated by Paramārtha in CE 568. Since this Vinaya text is regarded as a sacred book of the Śāmmitiya-vāda, it seems to me that this Dharmapada was transmitted by the same school.”\(^{120}\) If Mizuno’s

\(^{19}\) Although Tārāṇātha’s History states that the Vatsiputriyas survived beyond our period, this is probably an anachronism: in their own Āgama, the Śāmmatiyas describe themselves as successors to that school. Tārāṇātha mentions the existence of another branch, the Kaurukulas, whose existence is confirmed by the colophon of Ārya Vimuktisena’s Abhisamayālaṁkāra-vṛtti, in Sanskrit and Tibetan. Since the colophon refers to the Kaurukulla-ārya-sāmmatiyas, the Kaurukulas were certainly Śāmmatiyas. There is no evidence that this branch, or perhaps, as Barea suggests, geographical division, existed at the time of the PĐhp manuscript.

\(^{120}\) Mizuno (1984) 168 (I have corrected the misprinted -prasannārtha- to -prasannārtha-, after Nanjio’s Sanskrit form of the title of the work referred to above as the *Vinayadvāvīṃśatiprasāntī-sāstrā*. Mizuno remarks that in the other Śāmmatiya text preserved in Chinese, the *Śāmmatiyānākāya-sāstrā*, “no linguistic distinction is shown”, and refers to his “Study of the SDHP” [= PĐhp] in Buddhist Studies XI, Hamamatsu City, 1982, pp. 1–48 (not seen). Lin Li-kouang (1949:206) reached a similar conclusion regarding the Śāmmatiyānākāya-sāstrā, noting that it contains over fifty transcriptions, which do not offer any conclusive information about the original language, except that “l’original...comprenait des mots dénotent une tendance au moyen-indien, comme on en trouve dans tant d’autres textes”.
findings can be confirmed, the Sāṃmatiya affiliation of the PDhp becomes more than a hypothesis.
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New Pāli Inscriptions from South-east Asia

I. A RECENTLY DISCOVERED PĀLI INSCRIPTION FROM NAKHON PATHOM*

In October 1991 the Institute of Western Thai Culture, Silpakorn University, held an exhibition on “The Archaeological Sites in Western Thailand” at the Sanamchandra Palace, Nakhon Pathom. The exhibition catalogue included a brief note, in Thai and English, accompanied by photographs, on a “New inscription found from Dvāravati site in Western Thailand”. A reading of the inscription, with a Thai translation, was published in the same year by Naiyana Prongthura et al., with larger and clearer plates. According to the latter, the inscription was presented to Silpakorn University, Sanamchandra Palace Campus, by the abbot of Wat Taku (Amphoe Muang, Nakhon Pathom) in BE 2532 (CE 1989). The abbot received it from a villager from district Nakhon Chaisi (Nakhon Pathom province); no further details regarding the nature of the find-spot or the date of discovery are available.

* An earlier version of this article was published under the title “Preliminary Report on a Recently Discovered Pāli Inscription” in the Journal of the Office of the Supreme Patriarch’s Secretary (Warasanchotmaikhao Samnaklekhmanusomdetpurasangharat), Vol. I, No. 1, (2535 [1992]), pp. 83–86. The earlier version was based only on the “exhibition catalogue” (see n. 1); the present revision takes into account the work of Naiyana et al. (see n. 2), and gives an improved reading of the inscription and some additional references.


2 Naiyana Prongthura et al., “An inscription on a rectangular bar in the Pallava script in the Cultural Project Centre, Silpakorn University, Sanamchandra Palace Campus, Nakhon Pathom” (in Thai), in Phasa-Charuk, Part 3, published in celebration of the sixth cycle of Prof. Dr. Prasert Ná Nagara, Silpakorn University, Bangkok, 2534 [1991], pp. 40–44.
The text is neatly engraved in ornate Pallava characters on a rectangular stone bar measuring 30.7 by 5.2 cm., with two lines on each of the four long sides. The exhibition catalogue dates the inscription to the 12th century BE [circa 550–650 CE], and notes that it bears “the essence of the Buddha’s Teaching: Ariyasacca (The Four Noble Truths) and Paṭiccasamuppāda (The Law of Causation)”. Naiyana dates the inscription to the 12–13th century BE [circa 550–750 CE].

1. Transcription

The transcription given here follows the order in which the photographs occur in the exhibition catalogue and that given by Naiyana et al., with the four sides of the bar numbered from A to D.

A.1. śrī // dukkha samudaya nirodha magga avijjā samkhāra viññāna nāmarūpa

A.2. salāyatana phassa vedanā tanhā upādāna bhava jāti jarā marana //

B.1. cattāro satipaṭṭhāna cattāro sammappadhāna cattāro iddhipādā pañcindriyāni

B.2. pañcabalāni satta bojhāṅgā ariyā atṭhāngiko maggo sattatiṁsa bodhipakkhiyadhamma

C.1. abhiññeyyaṁ abhiññātaṁ bhāvetavvaṇca bhāvitaṁ

C.2. pahātavvam pahinam me tasmaḥ buddho ‘smi brāhmaṇa //

D.1. dukkham dukkhasamuppādam dukkassa ca atikkamaṁ ariyaṁ caṭṭhaṅgikam maggam dukkhpasamagāmīna[m] //

D.2. iti buddho abhiññāya dhammam akkhāsi bhikkhūnaṁ dukkhass’ antakaro satthā cakkhumā parinibbuto //

2. Discussion

A) Side A may be divided into two parts. The first lists the four Truths of the Noble Ones (ariya-sacca), from dukkha, suffering, to magga, the path; the second lists the twelve links of dependent arising (paṭiccasamuppāda), from avijjā, ignorance, to jarā-marana, ageing-and-death.

The four Truths of the Noble Ones are given in an inscription from Sārnāth in India⁴ and in a number of inscriptions from Siam.⁵ From an early but as yet undetermined date, it was a practice to place the inscribed text of dependent arising within or upon thūpas or cetiyas, as shown by numerous inscriptions in Pāli, Prakrit, Sanskrit, and Chinese, from India, Siam, Burma, Malaya, Java, and Central Asia.⁶

B) Side B lists the “37 factors conducive to enlightenment” (bodhipakkhiya-dhamma) in seven groups in ascending numerical order:

- the 4 foundations of mindfulness (cattāro satipaṭṭhānā);
- the 4 right efforts (cattāro sammappadhānā);
- the 4 bases of success (cattāro iddhipādā);

---

⁴ See Sten Konow, “Two Buddhist Inscriptions from Sārnāth”, Epigraphia Indica IX (1907–08), § 43.
⁵ See Peter Skilling, “A Buddhist Verse Inscription from Andhra Pradesh”, Indo-Iranian Journal 34 (1991), pp. 239–46, especially p. 244 and notes thereto, and Part II of the present article.
the 5 faculties (pañcindriyāni);
the 5 powers (pañcabalāṇī);
the 7 factors of awakening (satta bojjaṅgā);
the noble eightfold path (ariyo aṭṭhaṅkiko maggo).

The same list is given in the Pyu script of Śrīketra on one of the gold plates from “Khin Ba’s Mound” at Hmawza in Prome District, Burma. The only difference is that the present inscription concludes with the general title “37 factors conducive to enlightenment” (sattatinśa bodhipakkhiyadharmā), not given in the Pyu version.

C) Side C gives a single verse:

I have realized what is to be realized;
I have cultivated what is to be cultivated;
I have abandoned what is to be abandoned:
therefore, O brāhmaṇa, I am a Buddha.

The verse, spoken by the Buddha to the brāhmaṇa Sela, occurs in the Sela-sutta of the Mahāvagga of the Sutta-nipāta (v. 558) and in the verses of the Elder Sela in the Visati-nipāta of the Theragāthā (v. 828). It also occurs in the Brahmāya-sutta in the Brāhmaṇa-vagga of the Majjhima-nikāya (sutta 91, Vol. II 143.29), spoken by the Buddha to the brāhmaṇa Brahmayu. Buddhaghosa (5th century) cites the verse for the definition of sambuddha in his Visuddhimagga. A partial Lokottaravādin counterpart occurs (in a corrupt state?) in the Mahāvastu, spoken to the Ājivaka Upaka by the Buddha shortly after his enlightenment. Mūlasarvāstivādin parallels occur in the Verses of Kaineyā in the Bhāsaśiyavastu of the Vinaya of that school, as preserved in Sanskrit and in Tibetan translation, and in a short sūtra preserved in Tibetan translation in Śamathadeva’s precious commentary on the Abhidharmakośa. The latter has close parallels in the Tsa a han ching (the “longer” Chinese Samyuktagama, translated by Guṇabhadra between 435–43) and in the Pieh i tsa a han ching (the “shorter” Chinese Samyuktagama, an anonymous translation done during the Three Ch’in dynasties, 352–431). Bhavya (6th century) refers to the verse in his Madhyamakahārya-kārikās for the first of three definitions of the word “Buddha”, and cites it in his commentary thereon, the Tarkajvālā, as

---

9 Mahāvastu III 327,2 n. 9.
11 Upāyikā Ṭikā on the Abhidharmakośa, Peking Tibetan Tripiṭaka § 5595, Vol. 118, mnon pa tu, 266.
12 Taishō 99, no. 100 (Vol. 2, 28a); see Lewis R. Lancaster in collaboration with Sung-bae Park, The Korean Buddhist Canon: A Descriptive Catalogue, Berkeley, 1979, § 650, Ch. (4) 13.
13 Taishō 100, no. 266 (Vol. 2, 467a); Korean Buddhist Canon § 651, No. 13.17. I am grateful to J.-U. Hartmann (Berlin) for checking the Chinese sources.
15 Translated in Eckel, loc. cit.
well as in his Prajñāpradīpa\textsuperscript{16} and Madhyamakaratnapradīpa.\textsuperscript{17} Kamalasila (circa 740–95) also cites the verse, with variants, in his Pañjikā on Śāntarakṣita’s Tattvasamgraha.\textsuperscript{18}

The verse is known from another inscription from Ban Phrom Din, Tambon Lum Khao, Amphoc Khok Samrong, Lop Buri, published with photographs in Ancient Inscriptions from the Early Period Found in Lop Buri and Vicinity and in Inscriptions of Thailand, Vol. I.\textsuperscript{19} The inscription, found by a farmer while ploughing his fields, is in a somewhat cursive and less ornate Pallava, but otherwise the form of the characters is close to that of the present inscription. The editors of the former work date it to the 14th century BE, those of the latter to the 13th to 14th centuries: that is, from about 650 to 850 CE. In both inscriptions the \textit{-vv-} in place of the \textit{-bb-} of “standard” Pāli is quite clear: in bhāvetavvam and pahātavvam in the Nakhon Chaisri inscription, and in pahātavvam in the Phrom Din inscription, which is fragmentary. That \textit{va} and \textit{ba} were distinguished in “Dvāravati Pallava” may be easily seen by comparing the shape of the \textit{va} with that of the \textit{ba} in buddha in both inscriptions, and in several other places in the present inscription. Oskar von Hinüber has already noted the same peculiarity in a dhammacakka inscription from Nakhon Pathom—which carries the readings pahātavvam, sacchikātavvam, and bhāvetavvam—as well as in a later inscription from Lamphun.\textsuperscript{20} The form also occurs in veditavo in the “Maunggun plates” from near Hmawza in Burma.\textsuperscript{21} These texts offer further evidence for von Hinüber’s suggestion that “it does not seem to be altogether impossible that the Pāli of Dvāravati differed in this respect [that is, using \textit{-vv-} for \textit{-bb-}] at least from standard Ceylonese Pāli”.

D) Side D contains two verses, one to each line. The first summarizes the four truths:

\begin{quote}
Suffering, the arising of suffering,
the transcendence of suffering,
and the noble eightfold path
that leads to the cessation of suffering.
\end{quote}

The verse occurs frequently in Pāli: in the Dhammapada (v. 191), Sānnyutta-nikāya (II 185.23), Itivuttaka (17.22–18.2), Theragāthā


\textsuperscript{17} Translated by Lindtner, op. cit., p. 188. While Bhavya’s authorship of the Prajñāpradīpa is not questioned, it is for the other two works. For this problem, see David Seyfort Ruegg, “On the Authorship of Some Works Ascribed to Bhāvaviveka/Bhavya”, in David Seyfort Ruegg and Lambert Schmithausen (ed.), Earliest Buddhism and Madhyamaka, Leiden, 1990, pp. 59–71, and also Eeck, p. 197, n. 1.
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The verse occurs once in the Mahāparinibbāna-sutta (Digha-nikāya II 123.9) and twice in the Anguttara-nikāya (II 2.3, IV 106.5). In all three cases it is spoken by the Buddha, following the verse:

Virtue, concentration, wisdom,
and the unsurpassed liberation,
these dhammas have been realized
by Gotama, the illustrious.²⁶

This is the first time that the verse has been noted in an inscription. The iti (“thus”) with which it commences should refer to the preceding verse on the four Truths; thus the two verses of Side D seem to have been connected in the Dvāravatī tradition.

3. Conclusions

The present inscription is one of the most complete of the Dvāravatī corpus, which is made up of mostly fragmentary texts. It is a significant addition to our knowledge of the Buddhism of the Dvāravatī period. The language of the texts (with the exception of the opening Sanskrit śri) is Pāli. The orthography (with the exception of the -v/-b- discrepancy) agrees with that of the Pāli texts transmitted in Ceylon: indeed the verses of the inscription could have been taken from a modern printed edition of the canon, with scarcely a single variant.

The inscription confirms the preoccupation of the Dvāravatī Buddhists with what the exhibition catalogue has called “the essence of the Buddha’s teaching”. The four truths are given twice, in the bare list of A and in the verse of D. Dependent arising is given in A; it is also given

²⁶ silām samādhi paññā ca vimutti ca anuttarā, anubuddhā ime dhammā gotamena yassassī.
in fuller form on at least one dharmacakka, and is represented by the numerous ye dharmā inscriptions from various sites. The Pyu of Śrikiṣṭra also inscribed canonical texts on various materials, sometimes the same ones inscribed in Dvāravatī: dependent arising, the ye dharmā verse, and the 37 factors. While such a practice is well attested in Burma and Siam, no contemporary canonical Pāli inscriptions have been found in Ceylon, where extensive excavations have taken place for over a century. It is astonishing that an article published in 1971 could list only three Pāli inscriptions for the whole of Ceylon, all later than those of Dvāravatī or Śrikiṣṭra. Examples of canonical inscriptions from South India are rare: I know of only the interesting trove of distinctive sealings in Pallava script from the Śaṅkaram Hills in Andhra Pradesh, and the verse from Andhra mentioned above. Throughout Northern India the practice of inscribing the ye dharmā verse and the Discourse on Dependent Arising, whether in Sanskrit or Prakrit, was widespread from at least the early Gupta period. This suggests that the early Buddhism of Burma and Siam had links with Northern India—the heartland of Magadha—which is only natural since such links may be seen throughout the historical period up to the present. On the basis of available evidence, the predominant school at both Dvāravatī and Śrikiṣṭra seems to have been a form of Theravāda affiliated to that of India—whether of the North, of Andhra Pradesh, or several regions together—as well as to that of Ceylon. The early Buddhism of South-east Asia should not, however, be seen as a simple import. By the time of the inscriptions it had already adapted to local social and cultural conditions, and evolved its own characteristics.

II. PĀLI INSCRIPTIONS ON A STONE DHAMMACAKKA AND AN OCTAGONAL PILLAR FROM CHAI NAT

Among the interesting inscriptions unearthed in Siam in recent years are some fragments in Pāli, inscribed in the South-east Asian Pallava script on a stone dharmacakka or “wheel of the law” and on an octagonal stone pillar, which originally supported the wheel. The fragments were discovered at Tambon Hang Nam Sakhon, Amphoe Manorom, Chai Nat (Jayanāḍa) Province, on 5th October, 2531 [1988]. The inscription has been published in a Fine Arts Department report entitled The Archaeology of U Taphao. Its paleography has been discussed by Christian Bauer in his “Notes on Mon Epigraphy” (accompanied by four plates, without transcription). The Fine Arts Department dates the inscription to the 12th century BE (circa 550–650

---


20 References to Pāli texts are to roman script editions of the Pali Text Society (PTS); to Thai-script editions of the Syāmacchārīya Tegiṣāya (SvR) or those published by the Mahāmuktārājavidyālaya (Mm); to Burmese script Chaṭṭhāsaṅgīti editions (ChS); or to Nāgari script Nālandā editions (Nāl), as available.


CE), while Bauer concludes that it is possible “to date this dharmacakra with certainty to the 6th century AD”.

The surviving fragments of the wheel, which is carved in the round, are inscribed on both rim and spokes. Associated finds include fragments of an ear and the nose and mouth of a stone deer. Pairs of recumbent deer, symbolizing the Deer Park where the Buddha delivered the First Sermon, have been found in association with dhammacakkas elsewhere in Central Siam. The motif of a wheel flanked by a pair of deer is known from sculpture and monastic sealings from Northern India, and frequently adorns the roof-tops of Tibetan temples up to the present day.

I give here a romanized version of Cha-ame Kaewglai’s Thai script transcription. The sequence is that of Cha-ame’s restored text; the numbers in square brackets are those assigned to fragments or groups of fragments by the Fine Arts Department. In No. 1a, text in square brackets is supplied from the Dhammacakkappavattana-sutta; in Nos. 1b and 2, the symbol “×××” indicates missing text.

1. Dhammacakka inscriptions
1.a. Rim of the wheel: Dhammacakkappavattana-sutta

[6] [pu]bbe anussutesu dhammesu cakkhum udapādi

1.b. Spokes: Commentary on the Four Truths?

[8]

(1) na
(2) tti
(3) pilana
(4) samudayasa
(5) dhipateyya
(6) sa ××× /
(7) ×××
(8) ×××

---

6 dudapādi, Cha-ame.
7 dudapādi, Cha-ame.
8 The numbers in parentheses are those assigned to individual spokes.
9 See the upper spoke in Bauer, Pl. 3.
10 See the lower spoke in Bauer, Pl. 3.
2. Inscription on octagonal pillar: Verses

(1) dhi
(2) samudayasa

Discussion

1.a) Fragments 1 to 6 belong to the Dhammacakkappavattana-sutta, the first sermon spoken by the Buddha to the Group of Five Monks at the Deer Park (Migadāya) at Isipatana in Vārānasi. The surviving portions all belong to the section on the Buddha’s realization of the three insights (sacca-, kicca-, kata-ñānam) into the first three Truths of the Noble Ones (ariya-sacca). Since the fourth Truth must have been included, we may conclude that the rim of the wheel gave at least the complete text of the realization of the three insights into each of the Four Truths.

As transcribed, the text presents two orthographical peculiarities:

ariyya in Frags. [5], [1], and [3];
pamīṇā in Frags. [1], [3], [2], and [4] (but paṇīṇā in Frag. [5]).

We may also note that the text has dukkhasamudayo in Frag. [1] and dukkhanirodho in Frag. [3], which agree with the readings of SyR (both SN and Vinaya), against the dukkhasamudayaṃ and dukkhanirodham of PTS (both SN and Vinaya).18

1.b) The fragmentary condition of the inscriptions prevents a precise identification. The presence (twice) of the word samudayasa on a dhammacakka inscribed with the Dhammacakkappavattana-sutta leaves little doubt that the subject is again the Four Truths. The two other preserved words, pilana and [ā]dhipateyya, do not occur in connection with the Four Truths in the early sutta literature. The citation might therefore belong to the later commentarial literature, which assigns four meanings to each of the Four Truths, and includes the two terms:19

---

11 Most of the pillar text can be read from the plate at Boranakhadi Muang U Taphao, p. 33, and Bauer, Pl. 4. The numbers in parentheses are those of the lines, after Bauer.
12 From Bauer’s plate it appears that Cha-ame’s reading may be corrected to (i)da(m) matam, as in the texts (the “texts” will be described and cited below).
13 tobā cannot be right: the texts have here tam vinā.
14 Cha-ame reads sā, but the reading is clearly so, as in the texts.
15 The last word might be samato: only a single ma is visible, followed by what might be the left-hand curve of an o.
16 Samyuttanikāya, Mahāvagga, Saccasamuttta, Dhammacakkappavattana-vagga, 1.
17 SN (PTS) V 422.2–22; (SyR) Vol. 19, 529.11–530.10. The same text occurs in the Mahāvagga of the Vinaya: (PTS) I 11.1–14; (SyR) Vol. 4, 19.10–20.16. Almost the same text occurs as an independent sutta, Tathāgataṃ vuttam, at SN V (PTS) 424–25, (SyR) 532–34, with the substitution of tathāgatānam for me.
19 Here and in the following citations I underline the terms that occur in the Chai Nat inscription.
A. dukkha: (1) pilana, (2) samkhata, (3) santāpa, (4) viparināma;
B. samudaya: (5) āyuhana, (6) nidāna, (7) saññoga, (8) palibodha;
C. nirodhā: (9) nissarana, (10) viveka, (11) asamkhata, (12) amata;
D. magga: (13) niyyāna, (14) hetu, (15) dassana, (16) ādhipateyya.

A concise statement of this theory is found near the end of the Buddhaṇussatikāthā of the Visuddhimagga: 20

pilana-samkhata-santāpa-viparināmaññha vā dukkham ariya-saccam; āyuhana-nidāna-samyo-ga-palibodhathiṇna samudayaṁ; nissarana-vivekasamkhata-amataññha nirodham; niyyānikhetu-dassanādhipateyyaññha maggam.

The Truth of the Noble Ones regarding suffering has the senses of (1) oppressing, (2) being compounded, (3) burning, and (4) change. Origin has the senses of (5) accumulating, (6) source, (7) bond, and (8) obstructing. Cessation has the senses of (9) final release, (10) solitude, (11) being uncompound, and (12) being free from death. The path has the senses of (13) outlet, (14) cause, (15) seeing, and (16) predominance.

The four senses of the Truth of the Path (maggasacca) are preserved in another inscription, on a dhammacakka from Nakhon Pathom dated to the 6th or 7th century: niyyānikhetudassanādhipateyyabhāvema maggasacce. 21 The phrasing is close but not identical to that of the Visuddhimagga.

20 Chap. VII.62; (Mm) 1271.2–5.
21 Bauer, op. cit., Fig. F, no. Kd.24 (for which read Kd.29; for Coedès 1956 read Coedès 1966) gives 6th century; Charuk nai prathet thai (hereafter referred to as Charuk), Vol. I, National Library-Fine Arts Department, Bangkok, 2529 [1986], p. 59 gives 12th century BE = circa 550–650 CE. See also Supaphan na
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The 16 meanings (āthā) are different from the 16 aspects (ākāra) of the Four Truths, well-known in the Vaibhāṣika tradition, and are apparently unique to Theravādin exegesis. 22 The earliest evidence of the Theravādin theory is in the Patisambhidāmagga, where the terms occur several times. 23 The first occurrence is early in the text, in the "Discussion of Insight" of the Mahāvagga: 24


23 Although the Patisambhidāmagga is included in the Khuddaka-nikāya of the Pāli Canon, it is stylistically related to the Abhidhamma and Commentarial literature: see A.K. Warden, Indian Buddhism, Delhi, 1970, pp. 312–16; A.K. Warden, Introduction to Bhikkhu Nāyamolī (tr.), The Path of Discrimination, London, 1982; K.R. Norman, Pāli Literature (Jan Gonda [ed.], A History of Indian Literature, Vol. VII, Fasc. 2), Wiesbaden, 1983, pp. 87–89. Tradition ascribes the work to Sāriputta. Warden’s assertion (Introduction to Bhikkhu Nāyamolī, p. xlvi, repeated almost verbatim in Norman, Pāli Literature, p. 132) that “Mahānāma begins [his commentary, the Saddhāmmapakāśīni] by saying that Sāriputta explained the Dhammacakkappavattanā Suttaṇa by
A. dukkhaṭṭho abhiññeyyo dukkhassa pīlanathṭho abhiññeyyo dukkhassa samkhataṭṭho abhiññeyyo dukkhassa viparīnāmaṭṭho abhiññeyyo.

B. samudayaṭṭho abhiññeyyo samudayassa āyuhanattho abhiññeyyo samudayassa nidānaththo abhiññeyyo samudayassa saṅkhataththo abhiññeyyo samudayassa palibodhaṭṭho abhiññeyyo.

C. nirodhaṭṭho abhiññeyyo nirodhaṣṭha nissaranattho abhiññeyyo nirodhaṣṭha vivekaṭṭha abhiññeyyo nirodhaṣṭha asamkhataṭṭho abhiññeyyo nirodhaṣṭha amataṭṭho abhiññeyyo.

D. maggaṭṭho abhiññeyyo maggassa niyyānāttho abhiññeyyo maggassa hetuṭṭho abhiññeyyo maggassa dassanattho abhiññeyyo maggassa ādhipateyyatho abhiññeyyo.

A longer passage occurs in the “Discussion of the Truths” in the “Chapter on Pairs”.

The next evidence for the theory is from the Vimuttimagga, a manual transmitted by the Abhayagiri school in Ceylon and abroad. The work was composed by Upatissa, in perhaps the 1st century CE, and

27 Patīsambhidiṭṭamagga, Yugenaddhavagga, Saccakathā, (PTS) II 104.14–105.10; (Sr) Vol. 31, 449.5–20; translation p. 297. The passage is cited in abbreviation under vibhāga in the Saccanidīsā of the Visuddhimagga (Chap. XVI.15, Mm III 76.18–77.4) and in the Saccavibhanga of the Sammohavinodani nāma vibhanga-aṭṭhakathā, (ChS 78.14–19; Nāl 84.12–17).
certainly before the time of Buddhaghosa (first half of the 5th century). 28
The original Pāli is lost, but the complete text survives in Chinese
translation, done by *Samghabhara, a bhikkhu of Funan (an early state in
the region of southern mainland South-east Asia), at the beginning of the
6th century. 29 The section in question is also preserved in Tibetan
translation, as cited by the North Indian scholar Daśabalaśrimitra in his
Samskritasamskṛta-viniścaya, composed in the 12th or 13th century. 30 It
deals with the Four Truths under the heading "natures" or
"characteristics" (mtshan niñ = lakkhaṇa).

(Tibetan text) 31

mtshan niñ žes pa ni (a) sdbug bsñal ni ņes pa'i mtshan niñ dan/
(b) kun 'byun ni rgyu'i mtshan niñ dan/ (c) 'gog pa ni mi sgye
ba'i mtshan niñ dan/ (d) lam ni 32 thabs kyi mtshan niñ do/
yan na 33 sdbug bsñal ni (1) gzir ba'i mtshan niñ dan/ (2) kun
da bā gdon ba'i mtshan niñ dan/ (3) 'dus byas kyi mtshan niñ dan/
(4) ņoḥs su 'gyur ba'i mtshan niñ do/ kun 'byun ni (5)
'phen par byed pa'i mtshan niñ dan/ (6) gzi 35 mtshan niñ dan/

(Translation from the Tibetan) 38

"Natures" (lakkhaṇa): (a) suffering (dukkha) has the nature of fault (dosa). (b) Origin (samudaya) has the nature of cause (hetu). (c) Cessation (nīrodha) has the nature of non-birth (anuppatti?). (d) Path (magga) has the nature of method (upāya). 39

Furthermore, suffering has (1) the nature of oppressing (piḷana), (2) the nature of burning (santāpa), (3) the nature of being compounded (sāmkhata), and (4) the nature of change (vipariṇāma). Origin has (5) the nature of projecting, 41 (6) the

---

28 Norman, op. cit., p. 113.
29 For the affiliation of the Viṃuttimagga and the name and date of the translator, see P. Skilling, "Viṃuttimagga and Abhayagiri: The Form-aggregate according to the Samskrta-samskṛta-viniścaya", JPTS XX (1994) 171–210.
31 Daśabalaśrimitra (stObs bcu dpal bṣes gden), 'dus byas daN 'dus ma byas rnam par ņes pa, Derge Tanjur (D) No. 3897, dbu ma ha, 192b4–7; Peking Tanjur (Q) No. 5865, Vol. 146, no mtshar ŋo, 109a6–b2.
32 ni N : Q omits.
33 /D : Q omits.
34 kun du D : kun tu Q.
35 gzi i Q : bēt'i D.
36 kun du tshogs D : kun tu 'tshogs Q.
37 Dan D : do Q.
38 The Pāli terms given in parentheses are equivalents of standard Sanskrit equivalents of the Tibetan; references are to Lokesh Chandra, Tibetan-Sanskrit Dictionary, Compact edition, Kyoto, 1990 (TSD). Nos. 1–4, 6, 9–13, and 15–16 agree with the Pāli. The order of nos. 2 and 3 is opposite to that of the Pāli. The remaining items are discussed in the notes.
39 I have not traced an exact Pāli parallel to (a)–(d), which agrees with the Chinese.
40 gzir ba = PĪD: piśita, paripidita, prapidita, also arditā, āṭa, āṭa: TSD pp. 2083–84.
41 'phen pa is regularly used for the root KṢIP; byed pa = karana. Cf. TSD pp. 1592–93: 'phen pa = ākṣepa, ākṣepana, āvedha, preraka. The term may be interpreted to mean that tānḍā projects further existence and rebirth. I cannot

Continues...
nature of source (nīdāna), (7) the nature of accumulating,\(^4\) and (8) the nature of defiling.\(^4\) Cessation has (9) the nature of final release (nissarana), (10) the nature of solitude (viveka), (11) the nature of being uncompound (asadhamkata), and (12) the nature of freedom from death (amata). The path has (13) the nature of outlet (niyyāna), (14) the nature of achieving,\(^4\) (15) the nature of seeing (dassana), and (16) the nature of predominance (ādhipateyya).\(^4\)

suggest a Pāli equivalent.

\(^4\) The Pāli has here sam-yoga. The Tibetan kun tu = sam; it is possible that here tshogs (= accumulation, collection, group) = yoga, although such a translation is not attested. kun tu tshogs pa = samāgata (TSD p. 24). Cf. Akira Hirakawa et al., Index to the Abhidharmakoshabhāṣya, Part 1, Tokyo, 1973, p. 362, samyoga = mshunis par ldan pa, phrad pa, ’brel ba, reg pa. The term may be interpreted to mean that tanhā accumulates suffering; in fact, in the present context, this seems a more suitable interpretation of samyoga than the sense of “bond” = saññojana, though both are possible.

\(^4\) The Pāli has here palibodha = “obstruction, hindrance, obstacle, impediment, drawback” (PED), a term which does not seem to be known in Buddhist Sanskrit. The Tibetan yois su = pari. sbags, a rather rare term in translation literature, does not carry the sense “obstruct”, but rather to saturate, dampen, besmear, stain, pollute: cf. TSD p. 1742, khrag gis sbags = ruddhira-mraksita; khrag sbags sin = ruddhira-litta; Lokesha Chandra, Tibetan-Sanskrit Dictionary, Supplementary Volume 5 (New Delhi, 1993, p. 1349) sbags (pa) = akta, ādīgtha, ādṛta, sikta; Hirakawa et al., p. 300, mraks = sbags. Derge appears to read spags, but I believe that sbags is the correct reading. I cannot suggest a possible Pāli equivalent.

\(^4\) Here the Tibetan is certainly different from the Pāli, which has hetu (a term regularly rendered in Tibetan as rgyu). The Tibetan yan dag par = sam; thob pa = PRĀP; byed pa = karana. Equivalents listed in TSD (p. 2128) include samprāpana and samudāgama. The Tibetan seems to be confirmed by the Chinese, rendered as “arriving”. The term may be interpreted to mean that magga leads to the realization of the levels of the ariyas: satāpanna up to arahat.

\(^4\) Pa bzhag po = adhi; bdag po = adhipati (TSD p. 1198). Sanskrit ādhipatīya is usually rendered as dban byed (pa), dban (po), but there is little doubt that here the text read ādhipateyya.

(Translation from the Chinese)\(^4\)

How, through characteristics? (a) Ill is the characteristic of suffering. (b) Origin is the characteristic of cause. (c) Cessation is the characteristic of non-birth. (d) The path is the characteristic of the means of success.\(^4\)

And again, ill is the characteristic of (1) grief, (2) despair, (3) the put together, (4) the limited.\(^4\) Origin is the characteristic of (5) accumulation, (6) cause, condition,\(^4\) (7) fetters, (8) clinging. Cessation is the characteristic of (9) renunciation, (10) solitude, (11) the non-conditioned and (12) the choice. The path is the characteristic of (13) vehicle, (14) arriving, (15) seeing, (16) reliance. Thus should these be known through characteristics.

On the whole the Vīmūrtimagga version of the 16 natures or characteristics agrees with that of the Patisambhīdāmagga, and confirms that the exegesis was early and “pan-Theravādin”. The next evidence of the theory is found in the Visuddhimagga (see above), a manual of the 5th-century Mahāvīhāravāsins. It is also given in still later texts such as the Sāratthasamuccaya, a commentary on the Cattabhānāvāra composed probably in Ceylon in the second half of the 12th century, and in the Paṭhamaśambodhi, a South-east Asian life of the Buddha (date uncertain).\(^5\)

---

\(^4\) Translation from N.R.M. Ehara, Soma Thera, and Kheminda Thera, The Path of Freedom (Vīmūrtimagga), [Colombo, 1961] Kandy, 1977, pp. 274,ult–275.7. The translation shows a number of infelicities, and Nos. 4, 12, and 16 are obscure (the numbering is my own).

\(^4\) “means of success” might equal the thbs = upāya of the Tibetan.

\(^4\) Could the Chinese translate viparītāna in place of viparītāna?

\(^4\) I take “cause, condition” to represent one characteristic.

\(^5\) Sāratthasamuccaya, Atthakathā-bhānāvāra, Vol. 4, repr. Bangkok, BE 2532

Continues...
While the text inscribed on the spokes may be related in part to the 16 senses of the Four Truths, it is impossible to match all of the fragments. [8](3) and (5), pīlana and āṭhipatīyaya, certainly belong to the group. The sa of [8](1) might belong to āyuhana, nidāna, or niyāna. The samudayaśa of [8](4) and [9](2) might be samudayaśa, or possibly samudaya-sacca. The sa of [8](6) might be samudaya, sacca, or saññoja. But there are no counterparts to the tti of [8](2) or the dhi of [9](1) (unless for some reason āṭhipatīyaya was given twice). 51

2) The complete text of the octagonal pillar fragments may be restored from a set of five verses cited without attribution in two of Buddhaghosa’s works, the Visuddhimagga and Sammohavinodani, in the Saddhammapakāsimi of Mahānāma, which probably dates to the early 6th century, and in a Vinaya-ṭīkā, the Sāratthadipani, composed in Ceylon during the reign of Parakkamabahu (12th century). 52 The citation gives one verse for each of the Four Truths in succession, followed by a concluding verse:

[CE 1989], Chap. 21, commentary on the Dhammacakkappavattana-sutta, p. 53.9 foll.; Pathamasambodi (Phasabali), Bangkok, 2537 [1993], Dhammacakra-parivatta, p. 126.8 foll. These references were first noted in G. Coedès, “Une roue de la loi...”, p. 226.

51 For tti, we may also consider as candidates pavatti (for dikkha) or nivatti (for nirodha): see Visuddhimagga, Chap. XVI.23, pavatti-pavattana-nivatti-nivattana-lakkanhāni. Another possibility is the *anupatti of the Vinuttimagga.

52 Visuddhimagga Chap. XVI.25, (Mm) III 79.13–80.3; Sammohavinodani nāma vibhangatthakathā, (ChS) 80.12–22, (Nāl) 86.18–87.2; Saddhammapakāsimi nāma patisambhidāmaggatthakathā, (Mm, BE 2465 [= CE 1922]) I 74.1–11 (for Mahānāma see Warder, “Introduction”, p. xlv and Norman, Pāli Literature, pp. 132–33); Sāratthadipani nāma vinayafikā (Mm) IV 75, ult.–76.10. Phrases preserved in the inscription are underlined. For a commentary on the verses see Paramathamaṇjusāya nāma visuddhamaggasamivāṇaṇāya mahāṭikāsammattāya tatiyo bhāgo, (Mm) 176.6–177.6.
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apica

nābādhakam yato dikkhaṁ dikkhaṁ aṇṇaṁ na bādhakam
bādhakattaniyāmena tato saccam idam matam
tam vinā nāṇnato dikkhaṁ na hoti na ca tam tato 53
dukkhaheṭuniyāmena iti saccam visissitakāṁ.

54 santān na ca na tam yato bhūtabbhāvanā ṭīkā so
nāṇnā nihbānato santi aniyyāno na cāpi so
maggā aṇṇaṁ na niyānaṁ iti so saccasammatā.
tacchaniyānabhāvattā bhūtabbhāvan caṭūsāvāpi
iti tacchāvippallāsa- 55
dukkhādīsu vīsesena 56
saccaṭham, 58 āhu pandūtāti.

There is no pain but is affliction,
And naught that is not pain afflicts:
This certainty that it afflicts
Is what is reckoned here as truth.

No other source of pain than craving,
Nor naught that source provides but pain:

53 Visuddhimagga (Mm) only has tam tato.
54 The word visissitakāṁ occurs (usually in connection with tanhā and as object of forms of the verb TR) at Dhammapada 180a, 335b; Suttanipāta 333c, 768c, 857d; the Sanskrit visissitakāṁ occurs at Udānavarga 3:14c, 15a; 15:4f; 16:6c, 8c, 10c; 29:53a, 55a; 30:17d. It is not clear to me how Nāṇamoli arrived at his rendering of the term as “considered” (see below).
55 Saddhammapakāsimi only has here -bhāvena.
56 caṭūsāvapi Visuddhimagga (HOS, Mm), Saddhammapakāsimi (Mm), Sāratthadipani (Mm); catusu pi Sammohavinodani (ChS), caṭūsāvapi Sammohavinodani (Nāl).
57 So Visuddhimagga Mm, Sāratthadipani Mm: v.l. dikkhādīsāvāsesa (Saddhammapakāsimi Mm), dikkhādīsāvāsesa (Visuddhimagga HOS; Sammohavinodani ChS [-ādi-], Nāl).
58 Saddhammapakāsimi (Mm) only reads saccatathā.
This certainty in causing pain
Is why it is considered truth.

There is no peace except nibbāna,
Nibbāna cannot be but peace:
This certainty that it is peace
Is what is reckoned here as truth.

No outlet other than the path,
Nor fails the path to be the outlet:
Its status as the very outlet
Has made it recognised as truth.

This real infallibility,
Which is their true essential core,
Is what the wise declare to be
Truth’s meaning common to all four.\(^8\)

Enough of the text is preserved to show that the pillar gave at least the first four verses. The *Visuddhamagga* of Buddhaghosa (first half of the 5th century), the *Sammohavinodani* and Mahānāma’s *Saddhama-pakāsini* (early 6th century) are earlier than the inscription, but since the verse is a citation, it is not certain that any of these is the source of the inscription, which remains unknown.

Texts dealing with the Four Truths are found on other *dhammacakka* inscriptions from the same period (BE 12th–14th

cenuries).\(^6\) A wheel from Wat Phra Śri Ratanamahādhātu, Amphoe Muang, Lop Buri was inscribed with the *Dhammacakkappavattana-sutta*, as shown by the fragment *udapādi vijjā udapādi*, part of the “refrain” that describes the arising of insight into the Four Truths.\(^6\) The following non-canonical verse was popular:

\[
\text{sacca kicca kata ṇānam catudhā catudhā katam}
\text{tivatatham dvādasākāram dhammacakkaṃ mahesino.}
\]

Insight into truth, task, and accomplishment
each performed four times
make up the three turnings and twelve aspects
that are the wheel of the dhamma of the Great Sage [the Buddha].

The complete verse is preserved on the base of a *dhammacakka*
from Amphoe Kamphaeng Saen, Nakhon Pathom Province\(^6\) and on the hub of a wheel from the same province. Individual spokes of the latter name the “twelve aspects” of the Four Truths.\(^6\) Fragments of the verse are known from octagonal pillar fragments from Sap Champa, Amphoe Chai Badan, Lop Buri; the verse follows the ye *dhammā gāthā* and is followed by several canonical verses.\(^6\)

---

\(^{60}\) For a list of *dhammacakkas* see Bauer, Fig. F (p. 50); for a bibliography see Bauer, n. 44 (p. 70). Unless otherwise noted, Bauer dates the inscriptions to the 6th century CE.

\(^{61}\) Supaphan p. 39; *Charuk* I 123–25; *Charuk boran run raek phop ti lop buri lae klai khiang* (hereafter referred to as *Lop Buri*), Fine Arts Department, Bangkok, 2524 [1981], pp. 5–6.

\(^{62}\) Supaphan p. 37; *Charuk* I 98–99.


\(^{64}\) Supaphan pp. 21–27; *Lop Buri* 28–29, 74–81. Bauer (Fig. F) dates the inscription to the 7th century CE.

---

the four truths, apparently in Sanskrit. At least one wheel from Siam was inscribed with the text of the twelve links of conditioned arising (pañicca-samuppāda), found on the spoke of a wheel from Amphoe Muang, Lop Buri.

The Chai Nat inscriptions add to our knowledge of the textual basis of Dvāravatī Buddhism. The evidence of the canonical extracts in Pāli (including those known from other inscriptions of the period), which agree closely with the Pāli canon as we know it, in conjunction with exegetical terms or phrases found in the Pañisambhidāmagga and with verses found in the works of Buddhaghosa and in later texts, prove with certainty that a form of Theravādin Buddhism was current, perhaps predominant, in the Chao Phraya basin during the 6th and 7th centuries.

---

65 The twelve aspects are imbedded in an unidentified text of homage to the Buddha found on a stone Buddhāpāda kept at Wat Chomphuwek, Amphoe Muang, Nonthaburi. The inscription, in the Khom or Khmer script and from a later period (circa BE 1800 = CE 1250), ends with the ye dhammā verse. See Supaphan pp. 29–33.
67 Available to me (as also Coedès) only in the Thai translation, which cites the first three lines of the verse in Pāli: Sāratthasamuccaya, Aṭṭhakathā-bhānavaṇṇa, Vol. 4, repr. Bangkok, BE 2532 [CE 1989], Chap. 21, commentary on the Dhammapakkappavattana-sutta, p. 239.12.
68 See Part I of the present article.
III. A PARITTA INSCRIPTION FROM ŚRIKŠETRA IN BURMA

In his *Historical Sites in Burma*, U Aung Thaw, then Director of Archaeology, referred to “a very recent discovery of a stone slab, unfortunately badly flaked and weathered…made near the Shwedaga Gate [at Śriḵsetra near Prome]. From the fragmentary lines could be read extracts from three popular Pāli recitations in verse, namely, the *Maṅgala Sutta*, the *Ratana Sutta*, and the *Mora Sutta*. It is datable to [the] 6th or 7th century.”¹ The same author had already published the text of the inscriptions in an article written in Burmese in 1968.² As far as I know, a reproduction has not been published.

According to Aung Thaw’s earlier article, the three texts are in fact from two different stones from two different sites.³ The *Mora-paritta* and *Maṅgala-sutta* are from the stone slab found near the Shwedaga gate. The slab carried about 28 lines of text; the centre is entirely effaced, and the seven fragmentary lines read by Aung Thaw are from the right side. The *Ratana-sutta* is from a stone from Kon Yoe village, north-west of Śriḵsetra. The broken stone carried four lines of

date. Here I present a romanized version of Aung Thaw’s Burmese character transcription, following the author’s orthography and division of words and lines, without any changes.⁴

[I. *Mora-paritta*]
1.1.…pathavippabhāso tamtaṃ na
1.2.…apetayam cakkhumena eka
1.3.…vimuttiyā imamso

[II. *Maṅgala-sutta*]
2.1.…anāthapi
2.2.…sādevatā bhagavantaṃ gāthāya a
2.3.…attasammapa ni dhica etammaṅgala mutaman
2.4.…jānikammāni etammāṅgalamu

[III. *Ratana-sutta*]
3.1. siddhāmyānkhāṃ (khi) dhavāhuramīsaggesuvā
    yamratanampanitaṃ na...
3.2. attitathāgatenā idampibuddheratanam
    panitaṃ etena saccena su…tu
3.3. yānidha bhūtāni…nibhummaṇīvā
    yānivā antalikkhe tathāgataṃ
3.4. devamansapūjitaṃ…
    …saṅghaṃ namassāmi

³ I am grateful to the U.S. Library of Congress office in New Delhi for providing a summary of the relevant paragraphs, through the kind offices of E. Gene Smith.
⁴ The author does not number the lines. His presentation of the seven lines of the Shwedaga gate slab is clear, but I am uncertain whether my resolution of his text of the Kon Yoe inscription into four lines is correct.
I. Mora-paritta

The first fragment is from the Mora-jātaka, the ninth text of the Dalha-vagga of the Duka-nipāta (Jātaka II 33–38). The verses of this jātaka were transmitted independently as the popular Mora-paritta.\(^5\) Line 1.1 of the inscription is from verse 1bc; line 1.2 is from verse 3a; line 1.3 is from verse 4de. The restored text is as follows:\(^6\)

1a. [udet’ ayaṁ cakkhumā ekarājā]
1b. [harissavanno] (1.1) pathavippabhāso
1c. tam tam na[massāmi harissavaṇṇam pathavippabhāsām]
1d. [tay’ ajja guttā viharemu divasamaḥ]

3a. (1.2) apet’ ayaṁ cakkhum[a] eka[rājā]
3b. [harissavanno pathavippabhāso]
3c. [tam tam namassāmi harissavaṇṇam pathavippabhāsām]
3d. [tay’ ajja guttā viharemu rattim]

4a. [ye brāhmaṇaḥ vedagga sabbadhamme]
4b. [te me namo te ca mam pālayantu]
4c. [nam’ atthu buddhānam nam’ atthu bodhiyā]
4d. [namo vimuttānam namo] (1.3) vimuttīyā
4e. imam so [parittam katvā]
4f. [moro vāsam akappayi]

\(^5\) There are some differences in the numbering of the verses in different editions of the paritta, depending on whether or not the two introductory verses (not given in the jātaka version) are counted. I follow here the numbering in Lionel Lokuliyana, Catubhānāvārapāli, The Text of the Four Recitals, or The Great Book of Protections, Sinhala Maha Pirit Pota, Colombo, n.d., pp. 34–37.\(^6\)

II. Maṅgala-sutta

The second fragment is from the Maṅgala-sutta, the fourth sutta of the Cūla-vagga of the Sutta-nipāta (Sn pp. 46–47).\(^7\) Lines 2.1 and 2.2 are from the prose introduction (nidāna); line 2.3 gives the complete text of verse 3cd, and line 2.4 gives most of verse 6cd. The missing portions may be restored as follows:

Nidāna: [ekam samayam bhagavaḥ satvathiyam viharati jetavane] (2.1) anāthapi[ṇḍikassa ārāme...ekam antaṃ thitā kho] (2.2) sā devatā bhagavantam gāthāya a[jihabhāsi]...

3ab. [patirūpadavesāso ca pubbe ca katapūṇatā]
3cd. (2.3) attasammāpanidhi ca etam maṅgalam utamam(!)

6ab. [dānaḥ ca dharmacariyā ca ṅātakānaḥ ca saṅgho]
6cd. [anavaj]- (2.4)-jāni kammāni etam maṅgalam u[ttamam]

III. Ratana-sutta

The third fragment is from the Ratana-sutta, the first sutta of the Cūlavagga of the Sutta-nipāta (Sn pp. 39–42). Lines 3.1–2 give most of verse 3; lines 3.3–4 give most of verse 15abc (or 16abc)\(^8\) and a fragment of line 17d, the last verse. The text may be restored as follows:

---

\(^7\) I refer here to the numbering of verses in the PTS edition of the Suttanipāta.

\(^8\) Since the first three lines of vv. 15 and 16 are the same, the lines might come from either verse. The first three lines of v. 17 are also the same, but I assume from the dotted line in Aung Thaw’s text that there is a break with missing text, which rules out v. 17.
(3.1) siddham
3a. yanik[ci vittam īdhā vā huraṃ vā
3b. saqgesu vā yaṃ ratanāṃ panītam
3c. na [no samaṃ] (3.2) att[hi]i⁹ tathāgatena
3d. idāṃ pi buddhe ratanāṃ panītam
3e. etena saccena su[vatthi ho]tu

15a. (3.3) yānidha bhūtāni [samāgatā]ni
15b. bhummāni vā yāni vā antalikkhe
15c. tathāgatam (3.4) devamanussapūjitam
15d. [buddham] namassāma suvatthi hotu

17a. [yānidha bhūtāni samāgatāni]
17b. [bhummāni vā yāni vā antalikkhe]
17c. [tathāgatam devamanussapūjitam]
17d. (3.4) saṅgham namassāmi (!) [suvatthi hotu]

The inscription seems to give an excerpt from the Ratana-sutta, rather than a complete text. The siddham at the beginning suggests that the text opened with verse 3 of the sutta. From verse 3 the extant text jumps to the end of the sutta. In the absence of any plates, or a more scientific description of the stone, it is impossible to say how much of the sutta was included in the inscription.

⁹ The atti of the printed text might be a misprint for athi, the ta and the tha being similar in Burmese script.

Sāriputta and his works

Sāriputta was one of the most prominent monks of the Polonnaruva Period:¹ he composed several texts in Pāli, Sanskrit and Sinhala. He was a disciple of Dimbulagala Mahākassapa, the first known saṅgharāja of Ceylon,² and one of the most important members of Parakkamabahu’s great council of theras, the date of which is


I would like to thank Prof. R.F. Gombrich, Prof. Oskar von Hinüber and Mr. Royce Wiles, who carefully read this article, for their helpful suggestions and corrections.


tentatively fixed at 1165 A.D.\footnote{V. Panditha, “Buddhism During the Polonnaruwa Period” in The Polonnaruwa Period (Dehiwala: Tisara Prakasakayo, 1973), p. 137; see also W. Geiger, “Introduction” in Mhv Trsl., pp. xxviii-xxix; Geiger, §31, n. 4.} Diñbuligala Mahākassapa, who was in charge of the reformation of the Buddhist order under the patronage of king Parakkamabahu I (1153-86),\footnote{Saddhamma-s 58, 13-14; Sās Ne 1961 25, 4-5; Mhv LXXVIII 6. On the reform of the Buddhist order during the reign of Parakkamabahu I see also Saddhamma-s 58-59; Mhv LXXIII 11-22; LXXVIII 1-30; Sās Ne 1961 25, 1-12; PLC, pp. 176-77; W. Geiger, Culture of Ceylon in Mediaeval Times (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1960), p. 209, §202; W. Geiger, Mhv Trsl. (Cilavamsa), vol. 2, p. 102, n. 2; V. Panditha, “Buddhism During the Polonnaruwa Period” in The Polonnaruwa Period (Dehiwala: Tisara Prakasakayo, 1973), pp. 136-138; H. Bechert, “The Nikāyas of Medieval Śri Lanka and the Unification of the Sangha by Parākramabāhu I” in Studies on Buddhism in Honour of A.K. Warder, Toronto 1993, pp. 11-21.} was appointed by the king himself to organize and preside over the great council of theras to reform the Buddhist order and establish the Vinaya rules. After the council held under the presidency of Mahākassapa therā many tikās were written,\footnote{Saddhamma-s 58, 27-60, 24; PLC, pp. 192-194.} and one of the most important authors was Sāriputta, “perhaps brightest among the constellations that adorned Ceylon’s literary firmament during Parākrama-Bāhu’s reign.”\footnote{PLC, p. 190.} On account of his erudition he was called Sāgaramati,\footnote{Saddhamma-s 63, 15.} “like the ocean in wisdom”, and was “like all the other learned men of his period, a clever Sanskrit scholar as well.”\footnote{PLC, p. 190.} Perhaps he was the immediate successor of Mahākassapa as sangharāja of Ceylon\footnote{H. Bechert, Buddhismus, Staat und Gesellschaft (Frankfurt: Alfred Metzner Verlag, 1966), vol. 1, p. 265.} and was very influential with a large circle of disciples such as Vācissara, Sumangala and Dhammakitti, who were famous Pāli authors and religious leaders.\footnote{For a detailed discussion on Sāriputta’s disciples and their works see PLC, pp. 198–219 (Sāriputta’s Circle); Geiger, §§32-34.} Sāriputta resided in the Jetavana Vihāra\footnote{Mp-t Be 1961 III 370, 24 = Sp-p-t Be 1960 III 496, 11 = Pāli Be 1960 468, 12; sītalūdakasampanne vasam Jetavane imam. See also Abhidh-mha mht 212, 14; Abhidharmārhasangrahaya Sanna, ed. by Paññāmo Tissa, 3rd ed. (Ambalangoda: W.E. de Silva, H.S. de Silva and R.C.P.W. Vaidyaratna, Vijaya Printing Press, 1926, B.E. 2469), p. 257, v. 1; Somadasa, Cat, vol. 1, p. 235.} at Polonnaruva in a “vast and glorious pāsāda with rooms, terraces and chambers”\footnote{W. Geiger, Mhv Trsl. (Cilavamsa), vol. 2, p. 105; Mhv LXXVIII 34: thirasilassa therassa Sāriputtavihayassa pi, hammiyatthalagabbihe mahā-pāsādam ujalam.} which the king had specially built for him.

The writing of the tikās on the canonical texts most probably started very soon after the convocation, because according to Saddhamma-s, it was completed in one year.\footnote{Saddhamma-s 60, 26-28: ayaṃ piṭakaṭṭhakathāya atthavanaṇṇa ekasamvaccharen’ eva niṭṭhitā.} “The tikās were sub-commentaries, that is to say, works containing expositions of points in the Atthakathā or commentaries which needed further elucidation for correct interpretation; or sometimes they merely gave additional information regarding the discussions in the commentaries, e.g. more illustrative stories.”\footnote{PLC, p. 192.} In the chapter where the writing of the tikās is described Saddhamma-s\footnote{PLC, p. 192.} does not name the authors of the tikās: “Sāriputta’s name is not mentioned, and no special works are assigned to

\footnote{See also K.R. Norman, Pāli Literature (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1983), pp. 148-51.}
him.” In the next chapter Saddhamma-s gives a list of many authors, among them Sāriputta is mentioned, under the name Sāgaramati, as the author of Vinayasangaha (Pālim). According to G.P. Malalasekera “the ūkās may be regarded as the work of a school, rather than of single individuals” and Sāriputta “may possibly have been appointed to supervise certain sections of the work - the Vinaya, Aṅguttara and Majjhima portions.” Whatever the truth may be, Sāriputta is mentioned in the bibliographical texts and in the colophons of the works of his disciples as the author of the following works:

1. Sāratthadipani Vinayaṭikā (Sp-t)
2. Aṅguttaranikāyaṭikā, Catuttā Sāratthamaṇjūsā (Mp-t)
3. Pālimuttakavinayavinicchayaśaṅgaha (Pālim)
4. Pālimuttakavinayavinicchayaśaṅgahaṭikā (Pālim-vn-t)
5. Paṅcikālankāra
6. Abhidharmārthasaṅghaṭahaya Sanna (Abhidh-s-sn)

---

6PCL, p. 193.
7Saddhamma-s 63, 15-16: Sāgaramatināmena therena ractam idam, Vinayasangahaṁ nāma vinayathappakāsanam.
8PCL, p. 194; cf. also Geiger § 31. Majjhimanikāyapurāṇatikā, Dutiya Linatthapakāsinī (Ps-pt) is ascribed to Dhammapāla; for further discussion on the authorship of Ps-pt see S. Na Bangchang, “Introduction” in A Critical Edition of the Mūlaparivāyavagga of Majjhimanikāya-aththakathāṭikā (unpublished Ph.D. diss., Univ. of Peradeniya, 1981), pp. xxiv-xxxix, see also H. Saddhatissa, “Introduction” in Upās, p. 47, n. 154. In CPD, Epilegomena to vol. I, p. 40*, 2.2.12, Majjhimanikāyaṭikā, Dutiya Sāratthamaṇjūsā (Ps-t) is ascribed to Sāriputta of Poḷonnaruva, but no further evidence is given. According to Saddhamma-s 59, 23-35, the four ūkās with a common name Sāratthamaṇjūsā (Sv-t, Ps-t, Spk-t, Mp-t) were written by the “elders” (thera bhikkhu) during the reign of Parakkamabahu I (1153-86). As far as I am aware no research has been done yet on the authorship of Majjhimanikāyaṭikā, Dutiya Sāratthamaṇjūsā (Ps-t).
having been supported by the compassion of Sāriputta thera, who possesses many virtues most excellent and firm, and whose commentaries on Vinayatthakathā and so on – the foremost among which is Sāratthadipani – show here the greatness of his knowledge and gladden good people with explanations of the essence of sweet meaning...

A Pagan inscription dated 1442 A.D. (B.E. 804) mentions two Vinayaṭikās: (1) ḍīga pārājikan, identified by G.H. Luce and Tin Htway as “Pārājika[kanda] sub-commentary Sāratthadipani”, and (2) ḍīga terasakan which is identified as “[Samghādisesakanda] Rules sub-commentary” which seems also to be a part of Sāratthadipani.


In this ḍīka six verses of the prologue are nearly identical with six verses

---


23Abhidh-s-mht 212, 9-14: ṇānānubhāvam iha yassa ca sūcayan’ti samvannanā ca vinayaṭhakathādikānaṃ Sāratthadipaninukkā Madhurathasārasandipanena sujananaṃ parītosayan’ti, tass’ ānukampam avalambiya Sāriputtatharassa thāmagataśāraṇān̄karaṇassā... (R.F. Gombrich suggests Sāratthadipani- m.c.; Madhurathasāra- or madhurathasāra- ?). Cf. the colophon of Abhidharmāṭhasangrahayā Sanna at the end of this article, where the most complete list of Sāriputta’s works is given. See also Somadasa, Cat, vol. 1, p. 235.

24G.H. Luce and Tin Htway, “A 15th Century Inscription and Library at Pagan, Burma” in Malalasekera Commemoration Volume (Colombo: The Malalasekera Commemoration Volume Editorial Committee, 1976), p. 218, Ms. 9; cf. PLB, p. 102, where the title of the Ms. 9 is mentioned as Pārājikakanda-ṭīkā.

25G.H. Luce and Tin Htway, as preceding note, p. 219, Ms. 10; cf. PLB, p. 102 where the title of the Ms. 10 is mentioned as Terasakanda-ṭīkā. Pit-sm 240 lists terasakan ḍīka, and the preceding ḍīka - which corresponds to ḍīga pārājikan in the inscription - is mentioned as Sāratthadipani (Pit-sm 239).

26Cf. the Ms. in the India Office Library with the title Terasakanda ṭīkā pāṭh which ends with: ettāvatā ca, Vinaye pāṭhavattāya ... Vinayatthakathāya sā, Sāratthadipani nāma sabbaso parinīthita... Terasakandavannanā nīthita (see V. Fausboll, “Catalogue of the Mandalay MSS. in the India Office Library” (Formerly part of the King’s Library at Mandalay), JPTS (1894-96), pp. 12-13, Ms. 16).


Besides the Chaṭhasaṅgaṅayana edition (Mp-t Be 1961 I-III) there exist the following three earlier editions of Mp-t: Be 1910 I-II (see CD, Epilegomena to vol. I, p. 41*, 2,4,12); Ce 1907 (see W.A. de Silva, “A List of Pali Books Printed in Ceylon in Sinhalese Characters”, JPTS (1910-12), p. 150; not listed in CD, Epilegomena to vol. I, p. 41*, 2,4,12); Ce 1930 (see EncBuddh, vol. 1, fasc. 4, p. 629, s.v. Anguttara-nava-ṭīkā; not listed in CD, Epilegomena to vol. I, p. 41*, 2,4,12). Mp-t Ce 1907 contains most of Ekanipāṭṭāṭikā (cf. Mp-t Be 1961 I,1,1 - 254,17) and Ce 1930 contains the entire Ekanipāṭṭāṭikā. The Ms. of Mp-t are listed in: LPP, vol. 1, p. 2 (5 Mss. in Sinhala script), vol. 2, p. 1 (7 Mss. in Sinhala script), vol. 3, p. 164 (1 Ms. in Burmese script from the British Museum, Or 2089); W. A. de Silva, Catalogue of Palm Leaf Manuscripts in the Library of the Colombo Museum (Colombo: Ceylon Government Press, 1938), vol. I, p. 37 (1 Ms. in Sinhala script); Pit-sm 202-212 (1 Ms. in Burmese script). For a detailed description of the editions and some of the above mentioned Mss. of

Continues...
in the prologue of the Sārathadipani,
the colophons are also very similar and the first few pages of both texts likewise show very few differences. These similarities could be evidence of common authorship.

It is also interesting to note that although the first few pages of 
and 
are quite different from the introductory pages of the 
written Dhammapāla, all the four nikāyaṅkās (Sv-pt, Ps-pt, Spk-pt, Mp-t) have many parallel passages.


Pit-sm 199-201 also lists an incomplete manuscript of the “old” (hoṅ) tika on Aṅguttaraṅkāya (Mp-pt, see CPD, Epilegomena to vol. I, p. 41*, 2,4,11), which is, according to Pit-sm (1989 edition), at present held in the National Library, Rangoon (note on Pit-sm 1 informs us that all the entries which are marked by an asterisk - and Pit-sm 199-201 are marked by an asterisk - are held in the National Library, previously Bernard Free Library; see also H. Bechert et al., Burmese Manuscripts (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1979), Part 1, p. XXXIV. The manuscript contains only Eka-, Duka- and Tikanguttarikā. In a letter dated 10 October 1995 Prof. U Ko Lay informs me that “the old Aṅguttarikās appear to be out of use in Myanmar monasteries for a long time”. Cf. also Oskar von Hinüber, Op. cit., pp. 167 (§ 357), 173 (§ 376).

Sv-pt = Sumangalavāsinapurāṇatikā; Ps-pt = Papiṅcasūdanipurāṇatikā; Spk-pt = Sāratthapakāsinipurāṇatikā.

The introductory portions in these four tikaṅs are similar because they comment on the introductory verses in Sv 1, l - 2; 9; Ps I 1, 1 - 2, 13; Spk I 1, 1 - 2, 21 and Mp I 1, 1 - 3, 3, which are identical in most cases. Mp-t is nevertheless quite different from the other three tikaṅs because: 1) it has the introductory verses which the other three tikaṅs do not have (six verses are the same as in Sp-ṇ, see

above note 28); 2) the prose passage following the verses is much more similar to Sp-ṇ (and Sv-ṇ) than to the other three tikaṅs; 3) the Netī method applied to the first sutta in each of the four nikāyarikās (Sv-pt, Ps-pt, Spk-pt, Mp-t) is much longer in Mp-t. See also “Table of Parallel Passages” in P. Pecenko, Aṅguttaranikāyaṅkā, Catuttahā Sāratthamaṇjuṣsā: Gathārāmbhakathā, Gathārāmbhakathāvān̄nā, Rāpādivaggavān̄nā (unpublished Ph.D. diss., The Australian National University, 1994), pp. 330-343.


PLC, pp. 194-195.
very similar to the colophons of Sp-t and Mp-t; all three works were written at the request of king Parakkamabahu I in the Jetavana Vihara in Polonnaruva. The work has been known under several different titles: Pālimuttakavinayavinicchayasangaha, Vinayasangahathakathā, Vinayasangaha, Vinayasangahapakaranā.36 In Lankavī puskola pot nāmāvaliya (LPP) several names for Pālim are also given: Pālimuttakavinayavinicchayasangaha, Pālimuttaka, Pālimuttakavinaya, Pālimuttakavinayavinicchaya, Mahāvinayasangaha, Vinayasangaha.37 Piṅkatsamuṇi3 (Piṅ-sm) 260 gives it under the name Vinayasangahathakathā, which seems to be the correct title, since it was “a summary of the Vinaya Piṅaka, divided into various sections, giving the explanations of Vinaya rules.”38 On the title page of Pālim Be 1960 the following title is given: “Pālimuttakavinayavinicchayasangaha” ti pi voharītā Vinayasangahatthakathā. In the Pagan inscription two Mss. are mentioned:39 viṇeñ sangruyā kri, which is identified as Vinayamahāsangaha, and viṇeñ sangruyā nay, identified as Vinayasangaha. Similarly Piṅ-sm lists first Vinayasangahathakathā, written by Sāriputta,40 which obviously corresponds to the “greater” (kri) Vinayamahāsangaha mentioned in the inscription as viṇeñ sangruyā kri.

Then it mentions two Mss. of Vinayasangahayathakathā,41 which correspond to the “lesser” (nay) Vinayasangaha mentioned in the inscription as viṇeñ sangruyā nay. Also among the titles of Pālim given in LPP42 are Mahāvinayasangaha and Vinayasangaha, which seem to correspond to the “greater” (kri) and the “lesser” (nay) Vinayasangaha listed in the Pagan inscription and in Piṅ-sm. Are these two different texts or just two names for the same text? In the Burmese sources they are mentioned as different but in LPP they are just two names of Pālim. Malalasekera explains this “variety of the titles” as follows:

It has been suggested in view of the variety of the titles under which the book is known that Vinayasangaha, or, to give its full name, Pālimuttaka-Vinayavinicchayasangaha, was only part of a much larger Mahā-Vinayasangahapakaraṇa, but I see no reason to accept this suggestion. It is only too well known that the work of ancient authors often bore more than one title - sometimes confusedly so - and it is quite likely that Sāriputta’s work was no exception to this custom and that whatever its full and original name was, it was generally called the Vinayasangaha.43

4. Pālimuttakavinayavinicchayasangahatiṭkā (Pālim-vn-t), also Vinayasangahapuranaṭkā, aṭkā on Vinayasangaha (Pālim), which some sources also ascribe to Sāriputta.44 According to Malalasekera

---

3Cf. Pālim Be 1960 468, 8-21; Mp-t Be 1961 III 370, 15 - 371, 8; Sp-t Be 1960 III 496, 2-23.
3Pīḷc, p. 191. In Somadasa, Cat (vol. 1, p. 233) it is also mentioned as Vinayavinicchaya (Vin-vn) which is a mistake because Vin-vn was written by Buddhaddatta; see Vin-vn (Ee 1927), ed. by A.P. Buddhaddatta. On the term pālimutta see Steven Collins, “On the very idea of the Pali canon”, JPTS 15 (1990), p. 92.
3PLC, p. 190.
3G.H. Lace and Tin Htway, as above note 24, p. 219, Mss. 11, 12. Cf. PLB, p. 102 where these two texts are called “Vinayasangaha-ṭṭhakathā (the greater)” (Ms. 11) and “Vinayasangaha-ṭṭhakathā (the less)” (Ms. 12).
3Piṅ-sm 260.
work seems to be lost.46 Ratnamati’s Cāndravyākaraṇatīkā is also mentioned in the Pagan inscription as Candrapaṇiṭikā: “Word-for-word commentary on Candrā’s grammar”.49 Dhammakitti, one of Sāriputta’s immediate disciples,50 mentions in the colophon of his Dāṭhāvāṃsa (Dāṭh), a poem composed in the beginning of 13th century,51 four of the above mentioned works of Sāriputta:

he who wrote the praised tīkā on the paññikā to the excellent grammar composed by Candragomin, and a tīkā on the Vinaya commentary Samantapāsādikā, which produces the power of

4Gv 61, 33 (where the Pañcikā is mentioned as one of the five works of Sāriputta); 71, 15-16 (sakaṭasaddasatthassā Pañcikā nāma tīkāgandho attano matiyā Sāriputtaṭāciyena kato); Śās-dip Ce 1880, v. 1203 (Pañcikāya tu tīkāpi dhimātā kaviketunā, therena Sāriputtena katā paraḥitaṭhinaḥ); Piṭ-sm 1124 (mentions Candriṇikāpaniṭikā written by Sāriputa, the author of Sāratthadipaniṭikā; cf. also Piṭ-sm 239); de Zilva Wiikremasinghe, as note 19, pp. xiii, xv; PLC, p. 190 (mentions Ratnamatipaniṭikā or Paññikālaṇkārā); A.P. Buddhaddatta, Theravādī Bauddhācāryayā (Ambalagoda: S.K. Candratilaka, 1960), p. 78, Pāḷisāhityaya (Ambalagoda: Ananda Potsamāgama, 1956), vol. 1, p. 251; Somadasa, Cat, vol. 1, p. 233; H. Bechert, “Sanskrit-Gramatik in singhalesischer Überlieferung”, StI 13/14 (1887) [Festschrift W. Rau], pp. 8-10 (mentions Ratnasrijitha or Ratnamatipāda, also known as Ratnasrijīpā, as the author of Cāndrapiṇḍikā, also Ratnamatipaniṭikā).


4Text at the end of this article, vv. 2-3: ...Sārīṣuteṇa yātimā gurunā gunena yoginam upakaṭaṇāya kato Vinayasangaha ten’ eva racita c’ asa līniṇhāpadavannanā. According to Somadasa, Cat, vol. 1, p. 233, the colophon was written by Sāriputta himself; līniṇhāpadavannanā in the colophon is read Līniṇhāpadavannanā (ibid, p. 235) and taken as “Līniṇhāpadavannanā (on Paṇḍaṇasūdani)” (ibid, p. 233) which is not correct (see above note 18). Cf. Dāṭh VI 2 quoted below.
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5. Pañcikālaṇkāra. This is a Sanskrit work, a tīkā on Ratnamati’s Cāndravyākaraṇatīkā, also called Cāndrapaṇiṭikā.47 This...
wisdom, wrote a ēkā on the excellent commentary on Anguttaraniyāya, which destroys the restlessness of delusion, and a book called Vinayasangaha for the multitude of those who are self-controlled and are exerting themselves in meditation.52

6. Abhidhammārthasangrahaya Sanne (Abhidh-s-sn). This is a paraphrase of Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha in Sinhala which is ascribed to Sāriputta,53 who according to Hugh Nevill54 “calls his own work the Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha Sīhalatthavānṇanā”. There exist several manuscripts55 and at least four printed editions56 of this work.

52Dāthi 1-2: yo Candragominacite varasaddasatthe tiṁam pasattham akarittha ca Paṇcikāya buddhipabhāvajāvanī ca akā Samantapaṇḍikāya vinayāthakathāya tiṁam Anguttarāgamavaraṭṭhakathāya tiṁam sammohavibbhamavighātaśi karini akāsi aṭṭhāya sanyamanānaṃ padhānakassa ganthām akā tiṁam Vinayasangahanāmadheyyam.


55W.A. de Silva, as above note 19, p. 266, Ms. 1743 (Abhidhammārtha Sangrahaya Sanne); Somadasa, Cat, vol. 1, pp. 233-36, Ms. 6601(1), 6601(2) (Abhidhammaṭṭhasangrahahapurāṇasānanya); LPP, vol. 1, p. 6, s.v. Abhidhammaṭṭhasangaha Sannaya (many Ms.), vol. 2, p. 5, s.v. Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha Sannaya, Abhidhammārthasangrahaya Sannaya (many Ms.).


Śāriputta and his works

In the colophon of Abhidh-s-sn57 Sāriputta is also mentioned as the author of the following four works:58

7. Visuddhipathasaṅgaha.59

8. Kammattanāsaṅgaha.60 Pit-sm lists Kammattanānadipani as the work of Sāriputta, and according to Pit-sm61 a manuscript of this work is held in the National Library, Rangoon. It is not clear if this is the same work as Kammattanāsaṅgaha which is listed in the colophon of Abhidh-s-sn.

9. Maṅgalasuttaṭṭika.62 Hoerning63 lists a Burmese Pāli manuscript of Maṅgalasuttaṭṭika held in the library of the British
Museum. If the colophon of Abhidh-s-sn is correct this could be a work of Sāriputta.

10. Sampasadani. Perhaps this work is related to Sampasadaniya Suttanta of DN. Among the works of unknown authors Gv lists also Pasada and Pasadajanani. LPP lists the following Sinhalese works which could be related to Sampasadani: Sampasadaniyasuttapada-anuma, Sampasadaniyasuttavyakyava, Sampasadaniyasuttasannaya. From the colophon of Abhidh-s-sn it is not clear in which language the Sampasadani was written.

The above four works are mentioned in the colophon of Abhidh-s-sn as follows:

Visuddhipathasangaha [was written] for the forest-dwelling bhikkhus, a collection of the objects of meditation [Kammatthanasangaha] for the bhikkhus, who contemplate the objects of meditation ... the precious Sampasadani was composed to produce joy for the hearers and for the benefit of the wise ... and a delight-increasing ñka, which is a thorough exposition of the commentary on Mangalasutta, was written for wise bhikkhus.67

11. Padavatara. This is the only work which is in many secondary sources ascribed to Sāriputta, but it is not mentioned in the colophon of Abhidh-s-sn. This work seems to be lost. In the Pagan inscription a work called (padavasara) mahacat is mentioned and it is identified by G.H. Luce and Tin Htway as: “Padavaha mahacakka? Query Padavatara, a Sanskrit work on grammar by Sāriputta (PLC 190), or Sadavatara (cf. [Ms. no.] 165 above?)”.70 Bode also mentions the same work but reads it differently: “Padavahamahacakka [Padavatara?]”.71 Sās-dip ascribes the authorship of Padavatara to Coliyācariya Sāriputtatthera, who according to H. Dhammaratana “lived

---

67See text at the end of this article and cf. Somadasa, Cat, vol. 1, p. 235: Mangalassa [ca] suttassa vananaya suvananana, vinnanam likhitā ñka bhikkhanam rati vaddhati.
69PLC, p. 190; H. Bechert, as note 68, p. 10;
70G.H. Luce and Tin Htway, as above note 24, p. 236, Ms. no. 169.
71PLB, p. 106, Ms. 169.
at Bodhimangai in Chola country".73 This is most probably true, since Padāvatāra is the only work which is not mentioned in the colophon of Abhidh-s-sn, where the most detailed list of Sāriputta’s works is given.74

According to Hugh Nevill75 and Somadasa76 the colophon of Abhidh-s-sn was written by Sāriputta himself. Since the list of works given in the colophon is very detailed this suggestion could be correct. In the colophon of Dāth, written in the beginning of the 13th century by Dhammakitti, who was one of Sāriputta’s immediate disciples, only four works in the above list are given: Sp-t, Mp-t, Pālim and Pañcikālankāra.77 The colophon of Abhidh-s-mhṭ written by Sumanagala, who was also one of Sāriputta’s disciples, mentions only Sārathadipani (Sp-t) as the first work of Sāriputta’s “exposition on Vinayathakathā and so on”.78 It seems that Sp-t, which is mentioned in all three colophons, was considered Sāriputta’s “first and foremost work”.79 All three colophons were most probably written not later than the 13th century.

Saddhammasaṅgaha (Saddhama-s), which was written about AD 1400 in Siam,80 ascribes to Sāriputta only one work, i.e. Pālim.81 All the tikkas, including Sp-t and Mp-t, which are clearly mentioned in the colophons of earlier works (Abhidh-s-sn, Abhidh-s-mhṭ, Dāth) as the works of Sāriputta, are in Saddhama-s ascribed to the “elders” (therā bhikkhū) or the “great elders” (mahātherā),82 who are also mentioned as “the teachers of the tikkas” (tikacarīya).83 Although “it is significant that Sāriputta’s name is not mentioned in this connection, and that no special works are assigned to him by the author of Saddhammasaṅgaha”, there is, according to Malalasekera, “no doubt that the account of the tika compilation, as given here [i.e. in Saddhama-s], contains more than a germ of truth”.84 The main aim of the council held during the reign of Parakkamabāhu I and presided over by Diṃbulāgala Mahākassapa was to reconcile different communities of saṅgha which “had been torn by various schisms”.85 Although “they accepted the authority of the common canon and of Buddhaghosa’s commentaries” they “interpreted various points of teaching in their own way” and “these interpretations were written and handed down in [different] tikkas”.86 The council presided over by Mahākassapa realised the need “[to bring] these various

---

74See text at the end of this article and also Somadasa, Cat, vol. 1, p. 235.
75Somadasa, Cat, vol. 1, pp. 233.
76Ibid., p. 235.
77See the discussion on Pañcikālankāra above.
78Abhidh-s-mhṭ 212, 13-14: samvāhmanā ca vinayathakathādikānām Sārathadipanimukhā.
81Saddhama-s 63, 15-16: Sāgaramatināmena therena racitam idam, Vinayasamaghamā nāma vinayathappakāsānam.
82Saddhama-s 59, 14 - 61, 30.
83Saddhama-s 62, 13.
85PLC, p. 193.
86PLC, pp. 193-194. Cf. Saddhama-s 58, 31 - 59, 2: kattha ci anekusu gaṅhipadesu Śhalaabhāsāya niruttiyā likhitān ca kattha ci mūlabhāsāya Māgadhikāya bhāsanam samissam akulaṃ ca katva likhitān ca; also 61, 10-18. Similarly also Sp-t Be 1960 I 2, 5-16. According to Lily de Silva (“General Introduction” in Sv-pt, p. xxxvi) gaṅhipadas “formed a sort of basis for the compilation of the tikkas during the Polonnaruva period, and the tikā authors openly acclaim their indebtedness to these gaṅhipadas [see Sp-t Be 1960 I 2, 7-8]".
Therefore according to Malalasekera “these tikās may be regarded as the work of a school, rather than of single individuals”, as also the parallel passages found in many other tikās seem to indicate.

To conclude, I reproduce below the colophon of Abhidh-s-sn, where all the works of Sāriputta except Padāvatāra are mentioned:

ramme Pulatthinagare nagarādhiraje
raññā Parakkamabhujena mahābhujena
kārāpīte vasati Jetavane vihare
yo rammahammavariyupavanābhirāme [1]
sabbattha pattathayaseya visaraadena
suddhāsayaena parisuddhakulodayena
takkāgamādikusaleṇa yatissareṇa
Sārisutena yatinā gurunā guṇena [2]
yogīnam upakārya kato Vinayasangaho
ten’ eva racitā c’ assa linathapadaavanānanā [3]
bhikkhūnaṃ ’raññāvāsinaṃ Visuddhiphasangaho
kammaṭṭhānikabhikkhūnām kammaṭṭhānasa saṅghaho [4]
Candagomābhidhānena racitā sādhusammatā
pañcikā ramanīyenā ‘lankārena ca bhūsiṣṭā [5]
pasādajanatanathāya sotūnaṇ ca mahāraha

viññānañ ca hitaththaya racitā Sampasādāni [6]
Vinayathathakathāyāpi suvisuddhapadakkāmā
tikā viracitā rammā vinayāṅṇupasamāsī [7]
Anguttaranikāyathathakathāya ca anākulā
bhikkhūnam paṭubbhāvyā tikā pi ca susankhatā [8]
Mangalassa ca suttassa vannanāya suvanānanā
viññānaṃ likhitā tikā bhikkhūnam rativaddhāni [9]
kankhāvīnyanathāya Abhidhammatthasangāhe
bhikkhūnam likhitam gantam Sāhāya niruttīyā [10]
Parakkamanarindassā narindakulaketuno [11]
nāmena tilakaṃ vuttaṃ nakkhattapathanissitam
yaṁ candey [2] Candabhūtān niśitataramatīm Pāṇinīṃ pāṇinīye
sabbasmiṃ takkasatthi paṭutaramatayo kattubhūtam va tan
tam
maññante Kālidāsaṃ kaviyahanadayañandahanetum kavitte
sāyam lokatthasiddhiḥ vitaratu racanā tassa Sārīsuttaa.

[12] [13]

Canberra

Primož Pecenka

---

*PLC, p. 194. According to H. Saddhatissa (“Introduction” in Upās, p. 47, n. 154) “the Linathapakāśini on Buddhagosa’s commentaries to the four Nikāyas written earlier by Dhammapāla might surely have been consulted in this recompilation of tikās”.

*Somadasa, Cat, vol. 1, p. 235 reads rati vaṭṭhatī.

*Ibíd., reads -ketunā.

*Ibíd., reads cānde.

*According to A.P. Buddhodatta this verse was written by one of Sāriputta’s disciples, see Therāvādī Baudhācāraya (Ambalamgođa: S.K. Candratilaka, 1960), p. 79.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Volume and Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangchang, Supaphan na: A Pāli letter sent by the</td>
<td>XII.185-212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggamahāsenāpati of Siam to the royal court at Kandy in 1756</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bareau, André: The Theravādins and East India</td>
<td>IX.1-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>according to the canonical texts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bechert, Heinz: The Bauddhayāna of Indonesia: A syncretistic</td>
<td>IX.10-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>form of Theravāda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhaddatta, Aggamahāpanḍita Polvatte:</td>
<td>XI.155-226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramatthavinicchaya by Anuruddha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins, Steven: <em>Kalyāṇamitta</em> and <em>Kalyāṇamittatā</em></td>
<td>XI.51-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins, Steven: On the very idea of the Pāli canon</td>
<td>XV.89-126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins, Steven: The story of the Elder Māleyyadeva</td>
<td>XVIII.65-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins, Steven: see Denis, Eugène</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cone, Mary: Patna <em>Dharmapada. Part I: Text</em></td>
<td>XIII.101-217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cone, Mary: The I.B.Horner Lecture 1995:</td>
<td>XXII.1-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexicography, Pāli and Pāli lexicography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cousins, Lance S.: The <em>Paṭṭhāna</em> and the development of</td>
<td>IX.22-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Theravādin Abhidhamma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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