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Preface

Two particularly auspicious events in the history of the Pali Text Society almost coincided in the years 2005/2006, when a pair of memorable events in the Society’s life could be celebrated: The 125th anniversary of the foundation of the Pali Text Society in 2006, and in 2005 the eightieth birthday of its long-serving President, editor of the Journal and doyen of Pali studies, Kenneth Roy Norman. Therefore, the council of the Pali Text Society decided during the meeting on 16 September 2005 to mark these birthdays by the publication of a special number of the Journal as a joint Festschrift for both, K.R. Norman and the Society, which has been a centre of his life for many years. The Pali Text Society gratefully acknowledges the indebtedness to all scholars who without hesitation accepted the invitation to contribute to the present volume.

When the foundation of the PTS was announced by Thomas William Rhys Davids (1843–1922) during his Hibbert Lectures in May 1881 with the original plan to “render accessible to students the rich stores of earliest Buddhist literature” (JPTS 1882, p. vii), printing of major Pali text editions was already going on in England and continued outside the PTS for some time. For, the Játaka edited by Viggo Fausbøll (1821–1908) appeared from 1877 onwards, the Vinaya-pitaka edited by Hermann Oldenberg (1854–1920) from 1879 onwards followed in 1880 by the Milindapañha edited by Villem Trenckner (1824–1891). All three editions were later integrated into the program of the PTS as reprints.2

On the other hand, the PTS was originally, in spite of its name, not closed to other Buddhist traditions. The very first report for the year 1882 lists the plan to publish titles such as the Játakamālā by Hendrik

1JPTS I (1882), p. 1. The first of the yearly Hibbert Lectures under the auspices of the Hibbert Trust (founded in 1847 by Robert Hibbert (1770–1849)) was delivered by Friedrich Max Müller in 1878, “On the religions of India”. Rhys Davids spoke about “Indian Buddhism” in the fourth Hibbert Lecture.


Kern (1833–1917), which later appeared as the first volume of the Harvard Oriental Series in 1891, the Madhyamakavṛtti by Cecil Bendall (1856–1906) and the Bhagavati by Ernst Leumann (1859–1931) — neither of them ever materialised — and, without indication of a prospective editor, also the Lalitavistara (JPTS 1882, p. 10). On the other hand, one of the earliest, if not the very first publication of the Society was the only Jaina text ever published by the PTS: Hermann Jacobi (1850–1937), “The Æyârânga Sutta of the Çvetâmbara Jains” (1882), which evoked some justification in the preface (p. vii) to avoid “that Buddhist subscribers … might take umbrage at the intrusion, as it were, of an heretical guest into the company of their sacred Suttas”. This sin, however, was never repeated, and only translations such as the one of the Mahâvastu (1949, 1952, 1956) by John James Jones (1892–1957) and Ronald Eric Emmerick’s (1937–2001) The Sûtra of Golden Light (1970, 2nd ed. 1990, 3rd ed. 1996) are rare and outrageous steps beyond the path of Theravâda orthodoxy.

From the very beginning, the PTS was run by a truly international board of scholars presided over by T.W. Rhys Davids as longest serving President ever from 1881 until his death in 1922, followed by his wife Caroline Augusta Foley Rhys Davids (1857–1942; first mentioned as a(Oskar von Hinüber)


4The same year 1882 saw also the publication of the Buddhavamsa together with the Cariyāpiṭaka. According to JPTS (1884), p. xiii, the first volume of the Anguttara-nikāya was also published in the same year. However, the date given on the title page is 1883: in fact, following objections from a number of Sinhalese scholars to Richard Morris’s (1833–1894) practice of introducing unwarranted abbreviations into the text (see JPTS (1883), p. xii), this volume was withdrawn and a revised one was published in 1885.

member of the board in *JPTS* 1907/8) from 1923 until 1942. Consequently, the Society was dominated for the first 61 years — almost half of its existence — by the Rhys Davids family.

Besides T.W. Rhys Davids there were four board members in the beginning: Viggo Fausbøll, Richard Morris (1833–1894), Hermann Oldenberg and Émile Senart (1847–1928), who may have been the longest-ever serving officer with forty-seven years of standing from 1881 until his death.

The early development of the PTS can be traced rather easily as long as the Journal appeared more or less regularly until 1927, because annual reports were printed and so were the names of the members of the board irregularly from time to time. This was not continued when the new series of the Journal started to celebrate the hundredth anniversary of the Society.  


6After his death, Fausbøll was succeeded by Dines Andersen (1861–1940).

7In the first series there are issues for the years 1882, 1883, 1884 (Vol. I of the reprint); 1885, 1886, 1887 (Vol. II); 1888, 1889 (Vol. III); 1890, 1891/93, 1894/96 (Vol. IV); 1897/1901, 1902/3, 1904/5, 1906/7 (Vol. V); 1908, 1909, 1910/12 (Vol. VI); 1913/14, 1915/16, 1917/19, 1920/23 (Vol. VII); 1924/27 (Vol. VIII). The reasons for the interruption of the Journal until 1981, when Vol. IX was published, are unknown. — An index to *JPTS* 1882-1927 by P.D. Ratnatunga was published in 1973 and is continued in *JPTS* XXVIII 2006, pp. 177–83.


Looking back at the past twenty-five years the major change in the life of the Society was effected by the unbelievably generous legacy by I.B. Horner, which enabled the Pāli Text Society overnight to promote Pāli studies in a completely new way by financing projects and by giving grants to young Pāli scholars. Biennial I.B. Horner Lectures have been held since 1986 in memory of the donor.9

An important result of this new potential was the immediate plan of a revision of the Pāli–English Dictionary (PED) published by the Pali Text Society in 1925, originally envisaged by K.R. Norman himself, who, however, made only slow progress due to his many other commitments. Therefore, Margaret Cone was employed from 1 October 1984 first as Research Assistant and then (from 1992) as Assistant Director of Research in Pali Lexicography attached to the Faculty of Oriental Studies at the University of Cambridge.10 The original plan of a mere revision of the dictionary was soon abandoned and the first part of a much larger work appeared in 2001 under the title A Dictionary of Pāli covering the entries a – khyāṭi.11

Moreover, the PTS added completely new areas to its activities during the past quarter of a century. In 1994 the first medical text was published, the Bhesajjamañjūsā (Chapters 1–18), followed in 2002 by a

9This was resolved during the council meeting of 18 March 1986. The I.B. Horner lectures are regularly listed in the Society’s Journal, cf. JPTS XXVIII (2006), p. 175.

10According to the minutes of the council meetings on 25 September 1984 and 25 April 1985. — It had been planned earlier during the council meeting on 3 April 1984 “to employ an editorial secretary to assist the President by working half-time on the Dictionary and half-time on copy-editing etc.”

translation, both by Jinadasa Liyanaratne. Very recently in 2005, the PTS ventured into another new field, the translation of Pāli texts into languages other than English by Danièle Masset Stances des Therī and by Nyānaponika Darlegung der Bedeutung (Atthasālīni).

Since 1981 publications of texts and translations from South East Asia have been incorporated into the program beginning with Heinz Bechert (1932–2005) and Heinz Braun, Pāli Nīti Texts of Burma in 1981. In the same year Paññāsājātaka (Zimmè Jātaka), Vols. I and II (1983), edited by Padmanabh Shrivarma Jaini, was published and later accompanied by two volumes of translation in 1985/6. Other texts followed such as the Lokaneyyappakarana (1986) and the Paṭhama-saṃbodhi (2003), edited from a manuscript prepared by George Credès (1886–1969) and rediscovered in the Archives of the École française d’Extrême-Orient by Jacqueline Filliozat. The Jinakālamālā Index (1994) by Hans Penth, indispensable for the study of earlier northern Thai history, was a major step in the publication of ancillary literature for the understanding of Pāli literature as was the huge catalogue on Sinhalese Manuscripts in the Nevill Collection.12

Although very modestly listed under “ancillary works” the monumental Collected Papers13 by K.R. Norman may be considered as one of the outstanding publications of the PTS, as a standard work of reference not only for Pāli studies, linguistic or literary, but, at the same time, also for Jainism. Together with the monograph A Philological Approach to Buddhism (based on a series of lectures delivered at the School of Oriental and African Studies, London, when he was the Bukkyō Dendō Kyōkai Visiting Professor in 1994, and reprinted by the PTS only recently in 2006 in a corrected version), the Collected Papers bear ample witness to the rich fruits of the scholarly life of K.R. Norman devoted to middle Indian studies which was honoured by his election as a Fellow of the British Academy in 1985 and by a felicitation volume at the time of his retirement from the professorship in Indian Studies at the University of Cambridge on 30 September

---

12Published jointly with the British Library, where the collection is kept, in seven volumes between 1987 and 1995.
Almost simultaneously K.R. Norman withdrew from the *Critical Pāli Dictionary*, which he had edited very successfully from 1979 to 1990 thus covering the second half of volume II. It is certainly not easy to find another set of contributions to Pāli in size and importance equal to all these lifelong efforts and achievements.

This induced the Pāli Text Society to mark the eightieth birthday of K.R. Norman by a token of recognition for his work as scholar and as President of the Society, to whose life he contributed in many ways over many decades, in particular after its hundredth anniversary, by voluminous and rich publications, sound advice, and efficient leadership.

Freiburg, Tuesday, 7 August 2007

Oskar von Hinüber

---

*IHJ* 35 (1992), parts 2/3, pp. 81–272 with a bibliography only of books published by K.R. Norman. Therefore, a complete bibliography remains an urgent desideratum.
Stretching the Vinaya Rules and Getting Away with It*
Eleventh I.B. Horner Memorial Lecture, 2005

1. Introduction
One central point of interest in I.B. Horner’s fields of research was Buddhist law. She was the first to translate the Pāli version of the complete Buddhist law code (Vinaya-piṭaka) into a European language.¹ In this eleventh I.B. Horner Memorial Lecture some ideas about the perennial question of how to stretch the Vinaya rules and get away with it are examined. The first part centres on the nature of Buddhist law. It is followed by an overview of the legal literature of the Theravāda tradition (as far as it is relevant to the final part), with special attention to the question of how much authority is attributed to various texts. The final part will deal with two methods for stretching the Vinaya rules.²

*This article is an outcome of my work on “Die in der Vajirabuddhi-ṭikā zitierten Gaṇṭhipadas: ein annotierter Zitatenkatalog zur Geschichte der Rechtssentwicklung bei den Theravādin” (The Gaṇṭhipadas quoted in the Vajirabuddhi-ṭikā: an annotated catalogue of quotations concerning the history of the legal development of the Theravādins) at the Institute for Indology, Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg, promoted by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft. Reinhold Grünendahl read an earlier version of this article and made many suggestions and improvements, Anne Peters supplied a number of references to PTS editions not accessible to me, Peter Jackson in proofreading the text made some further corrections and suggestions, and William Pruitt corrected the remaining mistakes and completed the last missing references. I wish to express my gratitude to them for their help.

¹She only left out passages which seemed to her to be too rude for Westerners. See Kieffer-Pülz 2001.

²I will not deal here with issues not covered by existing law. Such cases have to be handled according to the guidelines (mahāpadesa) handed down in the Khandhaka portion of the Vinaya, according to which new cases have to be decided in analogy to, and avoiding conflict with, existing prescriptions (Vin I 250.31–51.6; BD IV 347). The commentarial tradition of the fourth or fifth century developed this method systematically (Sp I 230.21–33.35 ad Vin III

1.1 The Character of Buddhist Law

A fully ordained Buddhist monk (bhikkhu) or nun (bhikkhuni) has to comply with an abundance of rules governing almost every aspect of daily life. These rules are laid down in the Buddhist law code, the Vinaya-pitaka. Of the various Buddhist schools that developed during the long history of Buddhism, many had a Vinaya of their own. I will confine myself here to the Vinaya of the Theravāda, or, more specifically, of the Mahāvihāra school, handed down in the Middle Indic language Pāli. Before this text was written down in Sri Lanka in the first century B.C., it was transmitted orally. Thus we can say that the Vinaya developed over a period of around four hundred years before it took its final shape. It is divided into three parts: (1) the Suttavibhaṅga with the 227 rules constituting the Pātimokkha, to be recited every fortnight, as the main part, (2) the Khandhakas containing the rules for administrative affairs of the Buddhist community (sangha), and (3) the Parivāra, a later systematization of the rules. This law code is still authoritative for present-day Theravāda monks in South and Southeast Asia.

During the Buddha’s lifetime and, in some respects, right up to the time when the Vinaya-pitaka was fixed in writing, Buddhist law was dynamic. There are various indications of this. To begin with, in some cases the Vinaya provides several formulas for one and the same ceremony, with layer added upon layer and the most recent formula replacing the older ones. Then we have various Pātimokkha prescriptions (paññatti) modified by several supplementary prescriptions (anupaññatti), no less than seven in one case. Furthermore, we have relaxing of restrictions for a number of rules for the borderlands. Finally, the youngest part of the Vinaya, the Parivāra, occasionally

\[23, 37, (BD 142)]. Vjb adds many examples for the different cases (Vjb 88.2–90.7).

\[3\text{See for instance the case of higher ordination, n. 18.}\]

\[4\text{Pāc 32 Mk, Vin IV 71.18–75.23 (BD II 306–14).}\]

\[5\text{Von Hinüber 2000, p. 144.}\]
deals with subjects not spoken of in the rest of the Vinaya.\textsuperscript{6} However, with the \textit{parinibbāna} of the Buddha, and, at last, with the writing down of the Vinaya, the dynamism of Buddhist law gradually came to an end, with hardly any adaptations being made to new circumstances thereafter. Even though the Buddha himself had allowed for doing away with minor rules, uncertainty as to what should be considered a minor rule prevented the monks from changing the rules at all.\textsuperscript{7} Now, once the wording of the law is considered fixed or even sacrosanct, the only way left to adapt it to unforeseen circumstances is to interpret it in a different manner.\textsuperscript{8}

\textbf{1.2 A sketch of the Vinaya commentaries}

The practical relevance of Buddhist law for the Buddhist community led to a multitude of commentaries, not only on the Vinaya, but also on the Pātimokkha which, for practical reasons, was handed down as a separate text alongside the Vinaya. The authority of these texts is also reflected in the constant production of law handbooks and related commentaries. More than twenty complete law commentaries written in Pāli up to the nineteenth century have come down to us. But the number must have been much higher, as is evident from the many lost commentaries quoted in the existing ones. Leaving aside the oldest commentary, the Suttavibhaṅga, the first commentary known to us is the now lost Sīhalatṭhakathā under which designation several commentaries are subsumed, among them the Mahāpaccarī and Kurundi, written down, probably together with the canon, in Sri Lanka as early as the

\textsuperscript{6}The mention of an \textit{atikhuddakā simā} presupposes a definition of the smallest measure of a \textit{simā}, not given explicitly in the Vinaya (Kieffer-Pülz 1992, p. 136, §11.2.1); a \textit{khandamittatā} presupposes a definition of the marks first, which also is not given (Kieffer-Pülz 1992, p. 137, § 11.2.3).


\textsuperscript{8}We find a very early example of this method in an old word-by-word commentary on the rules of the Pātimokkha that has been incorporated in the Suttavibhaṅga.
first century B.C. How far they date back we do not know, and we probably never will. These early commentaries served as sources for the great commentaries, the so-called *atthakathā* literature of the fourth and fifth centuries, i.e., the Kanṭhāvītanī, a commentary on the Pātimokkha, and the Samantapāsādikā, which covers the entire Vinaya. After the fifth century, another category of commentaries developed, the so-called *gāṇḍhipadas*, written in Pāli, Sinhalese, and possibly other languages as well. Some of them still circulate in printed editions, many others are preserved in manuscript form, but most are now lost, apart from the passages quoted from them in other *gāṇḍhipadas* or in the sub-commentaries, that is the *ṭikās*, written mainly in the twelfth to thirteenth centuries. These are followed by Pāli commentaries covering the entire Vinaya or parts of it, and commentaries on Vinaya handbooks.

### 1.3 The authority of legal texts

Now what about the authority of these legal texts from the perspective of the individual Buddhist monk? Every single monk has to make his own decision as to the authority he attributes to a certain text. This equally holds true for the authors of the legal texts just mentioned, who were also monks. My work on the legal literature has led me to the

9*Mhv* 33.100–101: *piṭakattayāpāliṃ ca tassā atthakathāṃ pi ca mukhapāṭhena ānesuṃ pubbe bhikkhū mahāmatiḥ; hāṁśīḥ disvāna sattānaṃ tadā bhikkhū samāgataḥ ciraṭṭhitatthatāṃ dhammassa potthakesu liṅhāpayum. “The text of the three pīṭakas and the atthakathā thereon did the most wise bhikkhus hand down in former times orally, but since they saw that the people were falling away [from religion] the bhikkhus came together, and in order that the true doctrine might endure, they wrote them down in books.” [Translation by W. Geiger, *Mhv* (transl.), p. 237].


11One was written in Northern Thailand in the fifteenth century, and there are two from Burma written in the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries respectively. Furthermore, we have collections of judgements pronounced by various *sāṅgharājas* and associated jurists on a range of legal topics, as well as epistolary correspondence between monks from various countries discussing questions of Buddhist law.
conclusion that the authority of the Vinaya is acknowledged by almost all authors. By contrast, statements of the so-called Sihalaṭṭhakathā were considered open for discussion in all later commentaries, which do not hesitate to reject them or even declare them irrelevant on account of their supposedly defective or missing argumentation. However, there are also attempts to reconcile what are seen as inner contradictions of the Sihalaṭṭhakathā. The teachings of the Vinaya and āṭṭhakathās of the fourth and fifth centuries are generally accepted as authoritative by the gaṭhipada commentaries and the tīkās, whereas the tīkās frequently reject opinions expressed in the gaṭhipadas, usually without even considering it necessary to discuss them.

From more recent times we have some explicit statements of monks regarding the authority they attach to certain law texts. Vajirañāṇa Makuṭa, perhaps better known as King Mongkut, the founder of the Dhammayuttika-Nikāya in nineteenth-century Thailand, explained in a letter written in 1844 to a Sinhalese monk that a thorough investigation of a topic has to start from the canonical writings, i.e., the Vinaya, and that it should be possible to reach a solution on the basis of this material. This refers to the Thai practice of the visuṅgāmasimā, but nevertheless shows the author’s general attitude.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, King Mongkut’s son, the later saṅgharāja, Vajirañāṇavāraṇa, a member of the Dhammayuttika-Nikāya, declared that the Vinaya showed clear signs of accretion over a

---

12 For instance the Anuganṭhipada or the Vajirabuddhi-tīkā on the opinion of keci (Vjb 142.5–10 ad Sp II 376.19–20 ad Vin III 58.22–24 [Pār 2 Mk]).

13 Treatise (S1 XXXIII; S2 IX): āṭṭhakathā hi Pāliṇaṃ saṅgītikālato pacchā katā. dhammasaṅgāhakehi ca pāṭhasaṅgītim niḍṭhapentehi sannīṭṭhānaṃ katan: etakehi pāṭhehi pāṭipannakā sakkhisanti tam tam vinayalakṣaṇaṃ niṭvatā anupatipajjitun ti. “For the āṭṭhakathā was made after the period of the [first] common recitation (i.e., council) of the [canonical] texts. And the compilers of the Dhamma, who carried out that common recitation of the texts, made the decision: With so many texts [those] who have entered upon the Path, knowing this and that definition of the Vinaya, will be able to follow the practice.”
long period of time, and that therefore its words should not be followed blindly.\footnote{In the Vinaya itself which was handed down for a long time both orally and by writing, differences of understanding naturally have crept in at the time when the Ācāryas who understood incorrectly, wrote it down" (Entrance to the Vinaya I, p. xii). “My habit is not to believe all the words which are found in the scriptures, but rather believing the reasonable words; moreover, we have learned the history of the sacred books, as outlined above, so that we should not grasp them as our only source. The basis of my writing is that which is found to be reasonable and this should be taken as credible evidence, while what is defective should be opposed whether coming from the Pāli or from the Aṭṭhakathā” (Entrance to the Vinaya I, p. xiv).}

As these two more recent statements show, a monk’s opinion regarding the authority of a given text is certainly influenced by his adherence to a specific school, sub-school or local branch thereof, but the decisive factor is his own judgement. The influence of the local tradition — transmitted only orally in some cases\footnote{In the case of the Dhammayuttika-Nikāya, we know from Vajirañānavarorasa that the daily practice of this Nikāya, already in continuous use for sixty years at that time, was handed down exclusively by oral transmission from teacher to pupil (Entrance to the Vinaya I, p. x).} — is difficult to determine.

### 1.4 Interpreting the rules

The modern Buddhist monk is confronted with manifold interpretations of Vinaya prescriptions and definitions of terms used therein, laid down in the multitude of commentaries written over a period of more than 2,000 years, which produced an ever finer spun texture of regulations. Hand in hand with the increasing density of regulations, the potential for legal loopholes increased as well because each case or topic which was not explicitly covered by these interpretations and definitions could be seen as falling outside the scope of the respective prescription. This opened up considerable possibilities for stretching the rules, which for the most part resulted in a relaxation of the law. In the commentaries of the fourth and fifth centuries we observe the tendency to loosen the rules by applying them only to those groups that visibly fall under the...
category explicitly defined in the respective prescription. For example, the prohibition to ordain people with certain skin diseases was interpreted in such a way that it applied only to those with increasing and visible symptoms, while as long as the affected parts of the skin were decreasing and hidden under the robe the candidate could be ordained.\footnote{Sp V 993.15f. ad Vin I 71.32–73.20 (BD IV 89ff.).}

In Buddhism there is no ecclesiastical high court whose decisions are binding for the entire Buddhist community. Therefore, nobody can be forced to accept a certain interpretation or doctrine. This leaves ample space for conflicting doctrines developing and existing side by side. What is a transgression of a Vinaya rule in the eyes of one group may be considered legally acceptable by another.

2. Examples of stretching the rule

2.1 Ordination

The first, and most common, method of stretching rules is to interpret a term used in a Vinaya prescription in such a way that its area of application is reduced to certain sections of the former definition — a group of people or things, for example — while other sections are conveniently counted out. The example I have chosen to illustrate this method is the prohibition against ordaining a slave (dāsa) as a novice.

As is well known, in the beginning the Buddha himself performed the ordination of new members to the Buddhist community. Later on, he delegated the office of ordination to monks. At that time, no distinction between novitiate and monkhood was made.\footnote{The Buddha used the ehi-bhikkhu formula, Vin I 12.22–25, 35–13.1 (BD IV 19f.). With the delegation of the office of ordination to monks, the formula used was modified. From then on, officiating monks had to recite the threefold-refuge formula three times, Vin I 22.8–25 (BD IV 30).} Finally, with the introduction of specific ceremonies for the ordination of novices (pabbajjā), and the ordination of monks (upasampadā), the ordination of a monk was performed in a legal procedure consisting of a motion,
three proclamations and a resolution (ñaticatutthakamma). The
development now was by no means stopped. The Theravāda Vinaya
contains three formulas for the ñaticatuttha procedure. The second one
adds the formal request of the candidate to be given the higher
ordination;\(^{18}\) the third one clears the candidate of all obstacles that
might have prevented his ordination as a monk. The list of possible
impediments contains fifteen obstacles.\(^{19}\) The candidate for ordination
as a monk has to be a human being, male, a free man (bhujissa), free
from debt (anañña), and not in a king’s service (rājabhaṭa); he has to
have his parents’ permission; he has to be at least twenty years old; he
has to own robes and a begging bowl; he should not suffer from leprosy
(kattha), boils (ganda), eczema (kilāsa), consumption (sosa) or epilepsy
(apamāra); and he should know his own name and that of his preceptor
(upajhāya).\(^{20}\)

From the number of formulas handed down in the Theravāda
Vinaya we can infer that the definition of these impediments is a later
development. However, with its compilation the number of obstacles
was by no means fixed. The Vinaya has a long chapter listing eleven
persons unqualified for ordination as a monk.\(^{21}\)

\(^{18}\)Vin I 56.6–9; 57.10–25; 95.16–34 (BD IV 72, 73, 123). Three formulas are
given, with each formula being more elaborate than the preceding one. For
the ordination of novices the threefold-refuge formula previously used for
ordaining monks was adapted.

\(^{19}\)Other schools have much more (the Mūlasarvāstivādins 80; Härtel 1946,
pp. 78ff.), which shows that these lists were constantly changing. For changes
within the Theravāda tradition, the Katikvatas are instructive; see Ratnapāla

\(^{20}\)Vin I 93.24–31 (BD IV 120).

\(^{21}\)These include the so-called eunuch (paṇḍaka), Vin I 85.27–86.9 (BD IV
108f.); one who gained access to the community by theft (theyasaṃvāsaka),
Vin I 86.10–33 (BD IV 109f.); one having gone over to another sect
(tithiyapakkantaka), Vin I 186.33–35 (BD IV 110); an animal (tiracchāṅgata),
Vin I 86.36–88.3 (BD IV 110f.); a matricide (mātughātaka), a patricide
(pitughātaka), a murderer of a perfected one (arabhantaḥgātaka), a seducer
of nuns (bhikkhunidūsaka), one splitting the saṅgha (saṃghabhedaṃaka), one who
In addition to the impediments for higher ordination and to the individuals unqualified for it, the Vinaya also lists impediments for ordination as a novice, i.e., for pabbajjā. Some of these are identical with those for higher ordination, i.e., suffering from one of the five diseases,\(^\text{22}\) being in a king’s service (rājabhaṭṭa),\(^\text{23}\) being a debtor (ināiyika),\(^\text{24}\) and being a slave (dāsa).\(^\text{25}\) Other impediments, however, are exclusively mentioned in the context of lower ordination, such as falling under various categories of publicly known thieves.\(^\text{26}\) Another section of the Vinaya lists thirty-two examples in which lower ordination should not be given. This passage includes persons with mutilations resulting from criminal activities (e.g., severed hands) and persons with impairments due to diseases.\(^\text{27}\)

\(^{22}\) Vin I 73.18–20 (BD IV 91) na bhikkhave paścachi abādhahi phuttho pabbāje-tabbo, yo pabbājeeya, āpatti dukkaṭassā ti. The five illnesses are listed Vin I 71.33–34 (BD IV 89): kuṭṭham gaṇḍo kilāso soso apanāro, Sp V 995.15–18.

\(^{23}\) Vin I 74.24–25 (BD IV 92); Sp V 996.20–97. List of impediments for upasampadā, Vin I 93.24–32 (BD IV 120); Sp does not comment on it.

\(^{24}\) Vin I 76.18–19 (BD IV 95); Sp V 999.9–1000.17.

\(^{25}\) Vin I 76.26–27 (BD IV 95f.); Sp V 1000.16–1002.16.

\(^{26}\) On a thief wearing an emblem (dhajabaddha (\(^\text{b}\) bandhu) cora), Vin I 74.34–35 (BD IV 93); Sp V 997.10ff.; on a thief broken out of jail (kārabhedaka cora), Vin I 75.15–17 (BD IV 94); Sp V 997.26–98.17; on a thief against whom a warrant has been taken out (likhitaka cora), Vin I 75.27–28 (BD IV 94); Sp V 998.17–24; on one having been scourged as punishment (kasāhata katadaṅglakamma), Vin I 75.33–35 (BD IV 95). Sp V 998.24–99.1; and on one having been branded as punishment (lakkhanāhata katadaṅglakamma), Vin I 76.5–7 (BD IV 95); Sp V 999.2–9.

\(^{27}\) Vin I 91.7–11 (BD IV 115f.); Sp V 1026.11–31.24. Persons with severed or mutilated hands, feet, ears, noses, fingers, nails, or tendons, with hands like a snake’s hood (pūṇahattihaka; see BD IV 116, n. 2), a hunchback (khujja), dwarfs (vāmana), persons with a goitre (galaṅgā), again three types of thieves (lakkhanāhata, kasāhata, and likhitaka, see n. 26); persons with elephantiasis (sūpadi), with a serious illness (pāparogi), persons who disgrace an assembly (parisadāsaka, see BD IV 116 by some deformity); those who are one-eyed (kāṇa), crippled (kuṇi), lame (khaṇja), partly paralysed (pakkha-
Of the eight impediments the Vinaya lists for lower as well as higher ordination, I would now like to take a closer look at the case of slaves or, more generally, men whose freedom is confined in one way or another. With regard to higher ordination, it is said that the candidate has to be a free man (bhujissa), which categorically excludes slaves, bondsmen, and others. By contrast, the restrictions imposed on lower ordination are more explicit in that they exclude a slave (dāsa) from pabbajjā, while other types of bondage are not mentioned.

Before I come to the rules themselves, allow me to say a few words about the relationship between the Buddhist community and slaves.

2.1.1 Slaves and the Buddhist community
Although the possession, usage, and donation of slaves by kings, merchants, and others seems to have been widespread in the society in which the Mahāvihāra Vinaya took shape, the Vinaya mentions slaves

\[hata,\] whose movements are destroyed (chinna-iriyāpatha), who are weak of age (jaradubbala), blind (andha), dumb (mūga) or deaf (badhira).

After the introduction of a novice’s ordination, it was obligatory to receive the ordination as a novice before being ordained as a monk, it is therefore to be supposed that the obstacles for novices were also valid for monks.

Interestingly, the question in the Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition is mā asi dāsaś, “You are not a slave?”, and an additional question is mā vikṛtakaś (Tib. btsiṅs-pa ma yin nam), “You have not been sold?”; see Härtel 1956, pp. 78–79.

In addition to the traditional stories, the Vinaya mentions slaves in the Mahāvihāra Vinaya. For instance, the story of the householder Meṇḍaka who, in due succession, shows his own psychic power, that of his wife, son, daughter-in-law, and that of his slave (Vin I 241.33, 34), or the story of Jivaka Komārabhacca, where a merchant’s wife inhaled ghee through her nose, spat it out through her mouth and ordered a slave-woman (dāsi) to take it up with cotton (Vin I 271.35). Later we are told that this ghee was used again for rubbing the feet of slaves or labourers (dāsaṇaṃ vā kammakaraṇaṃ vā pādabhāñjanaṃ) or for pouring into a lamp (Vin I 272.7–8). When the merchant’s wife was cured, Jivaka received money from several persons, but from the husband he received in addition a male and a female slave and a horse chariot (Vin I 272.16). Another merchant promises Jivaka to become his slave himself if he is cured (Vin I 274.9; 275.17, 18). Many references are to be found in the Jātakas, see Ray 1986, pp. 96ff.
only rarely in connection with the Buddhist saṅgha or its ordained members. The term slave is defined as comprising three types: (1) one born as a slave, (2) one bought for money, and (3) a captive turned into a slave. In other parts of the canon, four types are distinguished, the three just mentioned and a person who decided to become a slave himself.

In one prescription the behaviour of nuns is criticized, when they, in obvious imitation of the society around them, caused male and female labourers (kammakara kammakari), and male and female slaves (dāsa dāsī) to wait upon them (upatthāpeti). As a result, this behaviour was prohibited. However, the respective rule does not forbid the acceptance of slaves by the saṅgha, or an individual monk or nun.

30Vin IV 224.25–28 [Sgh 1 N] (BD III 179); Vin IV 224.33; Geiger 1986, § 29, p. 375, divides the third type, karamarāṇita, into two groups, (1) those made prisoners in war (karamara), and those carried off by force (ānīta), but see DOP s.v. karamarāṇita. Four types are listed in Nidd I 11.8–11 (see n. 31). Manusmrti (VIII.145) and Arthaśāstra (III.13) give seven and nine classes of slaves respectively: (1) those captured in war, (2) those who serve for their food, (3) those born in the house, (4) those who are bought, (5) those who are given, (6) those who are inherited from ancestors, and (7) those enslaved by way of punishment. The Arthaśāstra adds two more: those who have either mortgaged or sold themselves.

31Nidd I 11.8–10: dāsa ti cattāro dāsa: antojaṭako dāsa, dhanakkitako dāso, sāmaṃ vā dāsavisayaṃ upeti, akāmako vā dāsavisayaṃ upeti.

32For this meaning of upatthāpeti see CPD s.v. upatthāpeti, 1. Vin II 267.10 (see n. 33) (BD V 370: “they kept slaves, they kept slave women”, etc., is somewhat misleading; see, however, BD V 370, n. 6).

33Vin II 267.5–23 (BD V 370): chabbaggiyā bhikkhuniyo ... dāsaṃ upatthāpetī, dāsīṁ upatthāpetī ... na dāso upatthāpetabbo, na dāsi upatthāpetabbo. “The six [bad] nuns caused a slave to wait upon [them], caused a female slave to wait upon [them] ... a slave may not be made to wait upon [oneself], a female slave may not be made to wait upon [oneself].” Sp VI 1293.28–30: dāsaṃ upatthāpetī ti dāsaṃ gahetvā tena attano veyyāvaccaṃ kārenti. dāsi-ādīsu pi es’ eva nayo. “They caused a slave to wait upon [them] means: Having taken a slave they made him carry out their own housework. Also in the case of female slaves, etc., exactly this [is] the method.”
This is confirmed by the chapter on the rains retreat, which mentions the impending bestowal of a male or female slave and the allowance to interrupt the rains retreat in avoidance of such offers if they were considered incompatible with the religious life of a fully ordained person.\(^34\) An unconsenting monk obviously did not have the possibility to simply reject them.\(^35\)

The Vinaya-pitaka does not contain a prescription which explicitly forbids the acceptance of slaves.\(^36\) However, the Sutta-piṇṭaka states that the Buddha himself did not accept male and female slaves.\(^37\) Based on this regulation, the Vinaya ṭikās (twelfth and thirteenth centuries) finally prohibit the acceptance of slaves. The Sāratthadipani interprets this as a prohibition for monks to accept slaves for their own use,\(^38\) whereas the

---

\(^{34}\)Vin I 150.6–23 (BD IV 198): dāsaṁ vá te demi, dāsaṁ vá te demi.

\(^{35}\)Such a rejection would deprive the donor of the merit which results from his donation, and this presumably could not be an acceptable behaviour for a monk.

\(^{36}\)For further comments on slaves with respect to monasteries, see Geiger 1986, § 187, Gunawardana 1979, pp. 97ff.

\(^{37}\)This attitude is codified in a set of rules called the minor silā (cūlasila), found in the Brahmajāla-sutta and elsewhere, D I 5.14f: dāsidāsapatigghanā paṭivirato samaṇo Gotamo; D I 64.24; M I 180.12; 268.24, etc.: dāsidāsapatigghanā paṭivirato hoti.

\(^{38}\)Sp-ṭ II 330.22–24: dāsaṁ attano atthāya sādiyantassu pi dukkaṭaṁ eva dāsidāsapatigghanā paṭivirato hoti ti (D I 5.14f.) vacanato. “Even for one who accepts a slave for his own use only an [offence] of wrong doing [arises]
Vimativinodani-ṭīkā declares that the āṭṭhakathās reject the acceptance of slaves based on this regulation, thus relating this statement to the designation with which a slave may be accepted (see below). That this still was a question in later times is shown by the Katikāvatas.

The commentaries of the fourth and fifth centuries provide for the acceptance of slaves by the Buddhist community, albeit on certain conditions. For instance, slaves — even if designated as dāsa/dāsi — may be accepted by the saṅgha if they are part of the donation of a palace, in which case they are counted among its inventory stock. Furthermore, the saṅgha is explicitly allowed to accept a dyer-slave (rajakadāsa) and a weaver-slave (pesakāradāsa), provided they are

on account of the [authoritative] statement [of the Sutta texts]: ‘he abstains from the acceptance of male and female slaves’."

The Dambadenikatikāvata (twelfth or thirteenth century) states that in accepting male and female slaves (dāsa-dāsi, v.l. dāsi dāsi) “a well-disciplined, wise and modest bhikkhu should be [first] consulted and those [slaves, etc.] should be accepted in the manner indicated by him” (Ratnapāla 1971, pp. 58, 153, §68). The Kīrtisīrājāsimha-Katikāvata I (eighteenth century) declares that monks should not treat relatives or non-relatives with proper or improper possessions, such as … [among others] male and female slaves (dāsi-dāsa, v.l. dāsi-dāsa; see Ratnapāla 1971, pp. 99, 169, §103). In a similar way it is expressed without the term dāsa being used in the Kīrtisīrājāsimha-katikāvata II (eighteenth century) with respect to people living in villages owned by the Vihāra (Ratnapāla 1971, pp. 109, 175, §11).

Sp VI 1236.30–37.1 [ad Vin II 169.29]: pāsādassa dāsidāsakhetavathuhogomhiṣan dema ti vadanti, pāṭekkan gahanakiccan nutthi. pāsāde patiggañhite patiggañhitam eva hoti. “[If] they say: ‘We give female and male slaves, fields, grounds, cows and bulls for the pāsāda’, there is not an obligation of a separate acceptance. When the pāsāda is accepted, [this] is in fact accepted.” This was noted already by von Hinüber 2000, p. 147.
presented under the designation of ārāmika. In the commentaries on the Sutta-piṭaka and the Vinaya-piṭaka the rule is extended to all slaves (dāsa) labelled as ārāmika, one who belongs to the ārāma, i.e., the monastery, as kappiyakāra, legalizer, or as veyyāvaccakara, steward, attendant. All three terms designate persons who carry out all sorts of

---

42Vin-vn, v. 665; Sp III 683.17–18, see below, n. 43.
43Commentaries on the Sutta-piṭaka (Sv I 78.19; Ps II 209,30ff.; Spk III 304,32ff.):
Mp III 192.1–3; etc.: dāsidāsapṭīgahāṇā ti ettha dāsidāsavasen’ eva tesam paṭīgahāṇaṃ na vaṭṭati. kappiyakāraṃ (v.l. kappiyakārakaṃ) dammi, ārāmikaṃ dammi ti evaṃ vutte pana vaṭṭati. Sp adds a third term, veyyāvaccakara: Sp III 683.6–18: dāsaṃ dammīti vadati, na vaṭṭati. ārāmikaṃ dammi, veyyāvaccakaraṃ dammi, kappiyakāraṃ dammīti vutte vaṭṭati. sace so ārāmiko purebhāttaṃ pi pacchābhāttaṃ pi sanghass’ eva kammaṇa karoti, sāmanerasa viya sabbaṃ bhesaṇjakajugganan pi tassa kātabban. sace purebhāttaṃ eva sanghassa kammaṇa karoti, pacchābhāttaṃ attano kammaṇa karoti, sāyaṃ nivāpo na dātabbo. ye pi pañcādīvasavārana vā pakkhavārana vā sanghassa kammaṇa katvā sesakāle attano kammaṇa karonti, tesam pi karaṇakāle yeva bhattaṇ ca nivāpo ca dātabbo, sace sanghassa kammaṇa nātti, attano yeva kammaṇa katvā jīvanti, te ce hatthakammamūlaṃ ānetvā denti, gahetabban. no ce denti, na kiñci vattabba. yam kiñci rajakādaṇaṃ pi pesakāraṇaṃ pi ārāmikānāmena sampatīcchitaṃ vaṭṭati. “[H] one says: ‘I give a slave’, it is not allowed; if ‘I give an ārāmika, I give a veyyāvaccakara, I give a kappiyakāra’ is said, it is allowed. If an ārāmika carries out work for the sangha before meals as well as after meals, [then] even the whole care for the medicine has to be taken over by him as by a novice. If he carries out work for the sangha only before meals [and] after meals he carries out his own work, no ration is to be given to him in the evening. Also to those who, having carried out work for the sangha every five days or every fortnight, who during the rest of the time carry out their own work, meals and ration are to be given only during the time of [their] working [for the sangha]. If the sangha does not have work [for them], they live carrying out only their own work; if they procure money from their manual labour [and] give it, it is to be taken. If they do not give it, they are not to be spoken to at all. It is allowed to accept with the designation ārāmika whatever slave is a dyer and whatever slave is a weaver.” Khuddas-piṭ 169.25–70.1 (ad Khuddas, v. 284; donation of a dāsa is prohibited) allows accepting slaves given with the terms ārāmika, veyyāvaccakara, and kappiyakāra; Vin-vn-piṭ 1 308.24–16 (ad v. 665) allows accepting slaves given with the terms ārāmika and veyyāvaccakara.
work in Buddhist monasteries, and they all seem to have the social background of a slave. Before we proceed further, we, therefore, have to take a brief look at the usage of these terms.

2.1.1.1 Āramika

The term āramika is only rarely used in the Sutta-piṭaka. Most references are to be found in the Vinaya, where it is used in five contexts (alone and in compounds). First, most references are found in the story of King Bimbisāra’s donation of five hundred āramikas to Venerable Pilindavaccha, which contributed considerably to the general acceptance of monastery attendants (āramika) for the saṅgha. Second, the term appears in the regulations for establishing a monk as a superintendent of monastery attendants (āramikapesaka). Third, the āramika is mentioned as a person to be asked for permission when a monk wants to leave a monastery or when a nun wants to enter a monks’ monastery, in case there is no monk or novice available to be asked. Fourth, we come across the term in passages pondering the

44A II 78.31 (āramikasamanuddexasa); III 109.31, 32 (a prophecy that in future bhikkhus will be mingled with āramikas and samanuddexasa); 275.16 (determination of an āramikapesaka); III 343.2 = IV 343.25; Ap I 39.6; 191.2; 205.7; 205.5; II 409.14; 447.24; BV 56.28 (13.14); Ja I 251.2, 8; M II 5.21f. (see n. 53).

45This story is told twice in the Vinaya, first as an introductory story to Nissaggiya 23 Mk, which prescribes that medicines may be stored seven days at most (Vin III 248.11–50.29; BD II 126–131), and second in the Mahāvagga (Vin I 206.34–209.35; BD IV 281ff.). One difference in wording is to be noted tam atikkāmayato nissaggiyan pācittiyan (Vin III 251.17–18) against Mahāvagga tam atikkāmayato yathādhammo kāretabbo (Vin I 209.34–35); for this see von Hinüber 1999, pp. 54ff. The story has been investigated in detail by Schopen 1994b, pp. 145–173, and more broadly by Yamagiwa 2002, pp. 363–85.

46Vin II 177.20–25 (BD V 248–249); 179.31 (uddāna to the preceding). This is taken up in the Parivāra, Vin V 204.32–33; 205.4 (uddāna to the preceding).

47The rule is to be found in the Cullavagga: Vin II 211.24–25 (BD V 296f.); Vin II 232.8 (BD V 322, uddāna to the preceding). It is hinted at in the word-by-word commentaries to several Pācittiya rules: Vin IV 40.20 [Pāc 14 Mk] (BD
possibility that monks may want to leave monkhood to become åramikas or may ask to be considered as being åramikas. And fifth, the åramika is mentioned in the function of a legalizer (kappiyakāraka), without the word legalizer being used.

Without exception, references to åramika in the Vinaya are in its later layers. A definition of the term is not given anywhere in the text.

II 241); Vin IV 41.34–42.1 [Pāc 15 Mk] (BD II 244); Vin IV 307.29–30 [Pāc 51 N] (BD III 34ff.).

Vin III 24.27; 25.8 [Pār 1.8.2 Mk] (BD I 43ff.), word-by-word commentary, where a monk declares his weakness in making known that he desires the status of an åramika or that he wants to be an åramika; Vin III 27.7 [Pār 1.8.3 Mk] (BD I 45ff.) disavowing the training in asking to be taken as an åramika; Vin III 92.6 [Pār 4.3 Mk], (BD I 160), word-by-word commentary: definition of longing to be purified (visuddhāpekkha) as the wish to become an åramika.

All three references of this type belong to the Nissaggiya section; it is used twice in the word-by-word commentaries: Niss 18 Mk (prohibition of the acceptance of gold and silver; Vin III 238.15, BD II 103) and Niss 19 Mk (engagement in transactions in which gold and silver are involved; Vin III 240.17, BD II 108). Once it is used in a Påtimokkha rule itself [Niss 10 Mk], which, however, on account of its structure seems to be later (see n. 50). There, an åramika or a lay follower (upāsaka) should be indicated as a monk’s personal attendant (veyyāvaccakara) who can function as a legalizer in order to accept goods given by the king or people in the king’s service for a certain monk (Vin III 221.26 [Niss 10.1.3 Mk], BD II 65ff.).

Those in the Suttavibhanga (with one exception) come from the introductory stories and from the word-by-word commentaries. The only reference from a Påtimokkha rule, i.e., from Niss 10 Mk, may be relatively late. According to von Hinüber (1999, p. 77), though the group of Nissaggiya prescriptions may well contain old material, their existence as a separate group probably means their inclusion was the last step in the development of the Påtimokkha with 150 rules. Thus it may well be that Nissaggiya 10, as we have it now, was formulated only relatively late. All references in the Mahāvagga belong to the story which also serves as an introductory story for Niss 23 Mk. According to Schopen (1994B, pp. 151ff.) this story shows strong signs of a local origination in Sri Lanka, which implies that in the shape it has in the Theravāda Vinaya it does not belong to the oldest layers of this text. The references from the Cullavagga as well as those from the Parivāra refer to the superintendent of åramikas, which naturally could have come into being only after the introduction of åramikas.
Stretching the Vinaya Rules and Getting Away with It

which seems to imply that it was commonly known. From its use in the Vinaya we can infer that arāmikas could marry, have children, and were allowed to live together with their families in separate villages (āramikagāma) like slaves who also had their own villages. They could be presented to a single monk by the king. Explicit mention is made of monks who decided to become arāmikas. The hierarchical position of an arāmika is between a novice and a lay follower. He may carry out physical or manual work (clearing caves or rock overhangs). He has some authority with respect to the organization of the monastery (he is asked for permission to leave [in a monk’s case] or enter [in a nun’s case] a monastery if no monk and no novice is present), or he acts as the personal attendant of a monk (veyyāvacekākara) in the function of a legalizer (kappiyakāraka). In the Majjhima-nikāya arāmikas are classed with those following the five rules for lay persons (sikkhāpadas).

In the commentaries of the fourth or fifth century arāmika is used as a comprehensive term for workers in a monastery, e.g., as a legalizer (kappiyakāraka); an attendant (veyyāvacekākara); a distributor of rice

---

51Cf. dāsagāmaka (Ap II 538.2 = Th-a [old edition] 151.27; [new edition] 148.8); dāsagāmadvāra ≠ (v.l. dāsakammakaragāmadvāra) dāsagāma vasi (Ap-a 263.1–2 = Mp I 179.26f. = Spk II 195.11f. = Th-a III 133.3–4) and to the statement that the town Anurādhapura had, among others, fourteen villages for slaves (Spk II 194.5f. with Spk-t [CSCD] II 167).

52This becomes evident from the possible order in which one might ask persons for permission (bhikkhu, sāmanera, arāmika, see n. 47), and by the states a bhikkhu might wish to revert to: an upāsaka, arāmika, or sāmapera (see n. 48).

53M II 5.21f.: arāmikabhūtā vā upāsakabhūtā vā pañcasikkhāpade samādāya vattanti.

54In the Milindapañha (Mil 6.25f.) the god Sakka declares himself an arāmika of the sangha. In Ap I 191.2, Ap-a 464.19f., a person declares to have been an arāmika of the Buddha Vessabhū; in Bv-a 39.14 = It-a II 105.12f. = Mp I 116.29f., it is stated that Mahābrahmā may serve as an arāmika or kappiyaka-raka of the Buddha.
gruel, fruits, or hard food; as one who clears an area of grass;\textsuperscript{55} as a mediator between king and monks;\textsuperscript{56} as one who guards the possessions of the saṅgha;\textsuperscript{57} or as one who clears and levels the site at the foot of a tree for the inferior tree ascetic, scattering sand on it, making an enclosure and giving a door;\textsuperscript{58} and as one who has tasks that are similar to those of a novice.\textsuperscript{59} According to the Samantapāsādikā, the monastery provides the \textit{ārāmikas} with food and a ration — presumably of necessaries\textsuperscript{60} — equivalent to their work for the community. For example, if they worked only half a day, the monastery would not provide supper. They could also work every five days or every fortnight only, or if the saṅgha had nothing to do for them, work on their own account without subsidies from the saṅgha. If they earned money by their own manual labour, they could give that money to the monastery but obviously were not obliged to do so since they were not to be spoken to at all in a case where they did not.\textsuperscript{61} This is remarkable

\textsuperscript{55}See the explanation of how one gives up life as a monk with a synonym of \textit{ārāmika}, where the synonyms given are \textit{kappiyakāraka}, \textit{veyyāvaccukara}, \textit{appaharitakāraka}, \textit{yāgubhājaka}, \textit{khaṭjakabhājaka}, \textit{phalabhājaka} (Sp I 253.20–23). Cf. Gunawardana 1979, p. 98, who adds some further functions from more recent sources, for example a chief \textit{ārāmika} being responsible for the decoration in a monastery (Sahassavatthupakaraṇa) and \textit{ārāmikas} in charge of the store of provisions and responsible for the preparation of meals (Sihalavatthupakaraṇa).

\textsuperscript{56}Spk III 23.27; 24.6.

\textsuperscript{57}Vism 120.30–21.4 = Sp-† II 208.14–20, where the \textit{ārāmikas} keep the cattle of the families out of the fields of the monastery and shut off the floodgate so that people do not obtain water for their fields, which causes trouble for the monks, who are responsible for the \textit{ārāmikas’} deeds. This passage is quoted by Gunawardana 1979, p. 98 (from Sp-†) as a proof for \textit{ārāmika} being also used as a designation for those who tilled the land of the monastery.

\textsuperscript{58}Vism 74.14–16.

\textsuperscript{59}Sp V 1121.22; VI 1161.23. In that case \textit{ārāmika} is used in a similar way as \textit{kappiyakāraka}.

\textsuperscript{60}For the explanation of \textit{nivāpa} see Gunawardana 1979, p. 123.

\textsuperscript{61}See n. 43. Further references: Spk III 34.3; 40.3; Sp II 380.10ff.; 474.7–11; III 564.16; 681.19. 21; 692.3.; 733.9; IV 775.8; V 1099.26; Ps I 122.23.
insofar as, according to the Hindu law books, slaves and the profit they produced fell to their own, which also seems to have been the regular case in a worldly Buddhist context. At least in this respect the attitude of Buddhist monasteries towards ārāmikas differs from the attitude of the normal population towards slaves. In the Sāratthapakāsini (fourth or fifth century) ārāmikas are addressed as lay followers (upāsaka) by their interlocutors. Several donations of slaves to Buddhist monasteries and monks are recorded in the Sinhalese chronicles, and the Sinhalese Katikāvatas from the eighteenth century recommend handing

62 See Ja I 402.30 [no. 97], where a slave girl is beaten by her master and mistress because she had not given them her wages (dāsim bhutiṃ adadāmiṇām).
63 Spk III 40.3; in Spk III 218.6 = Sv II 552.32 upāsakas are compared to ārāmikas. In the Vin-vn, v. 1059 ārāmikam upāsakan, could be a lay follower who is an ārāmika, or it could mean ārāmika and upāsaka, describing two different persons. In other cases ārāmika and upāsaka are listed as separate groups (Ps II 152.10f.: bhikkhu vā sāmaṇero vā ārāmiko vā vihārasāmiko vā).
64 King Sirimeghavanna (362–409?) fixed the revenues of the ārāmikas (Mhv 37.63): Aggabodhi I (568–601) granted one hundred ārāmikas to the Kurundavihāra (Mhv 42.15–16); King Silāmeghavanṇa (617–26) distributed the Damiḷas he had overpowered and made slaves (dāsa) to various monasteries (Mhv 44.70–73); King Aggabodhi IV (688–74) placed slaves (dāsaka) as well as female slaves (dāsi) and ārāmikas, which were his own relatives, at the disposal of the Bhikkhu community (Mhv 46.10.14); the Damila Pottakutṭha, in the service of Aggabodhi IV, assigned villages together with slaves to the meditation hall (padhāṇagaha, Mhv 46.19–20); Jetṭhā, the queen of Aggabodhi IV, granted a hundred ārāmikas to the Jeṭṭhārāma (Mhv 46.27–28); Cassapa IV (896–913) granted ārāmikagāmas to the hermitages he built (Mhv 52.26); Parakkambāhu I (1153–1186) assigned a male and a female slave (dāsa, dāsi) to each patient in the hospital (Mhv 73.34–36): Queen Kalyāṇavati (thirteenth century) built a monastery and granted it villages, etc., and slaves (dāsa, Mhv 80.35–36). Her general, Āyasamanta, created a parivena and supplied it with male and female slaves (dāsidāsa, Mhv 80.40). King Kittisirirājasīha (1747–1781) assigned relic villages, etc., with many male and female slaves (dāsidāsa) to the holy Tooth Relic (Mhv 100.11).
over donations to årāmikas or upāsakas, who are equated with kappiyakārakas.65

2.1.1.2 Kappiyakāraka
The second designation enabling a monastery to accept the donation of slaves is kappiyakāraka. In the canonical scriptures, this term is confined to the Vinaya-piṭaka, more precisely to the sixth chapter of the Mahāvagga on medicines, and to the anāpatti formulas of two Pācittiya rules, which are even later than the word-by-word commentaries and the introductory stories in the Suttavibhanga.66 Obviously, the term kappiyakāraka was even less common in the canonical texts than the term årāmika. Likewise, kappiyakāraka is not defined, but used as if its special meaning was commonly known. In contrast to årāmika, there exists no prescription in the Vinaya explicitly allowing kappiyakārakas. The function of a kappiyakāraka was to receive donations of items forbidden for monks, such as fruit or money, and to make them acceptable, or to exchange them with acceptable goods. The Vinaya’s usage renders the impression that kappiyakāraka does not designate a defined office in the monastery, but rather a function that could be executed by any trustworthy person who was not an ordained member of the Buddhist community. Consequently, an årāmika could act as a kappiyakāraka, too, and according to three passages in the Vinaya, this is one of the årāmika’s functions although the term kappiyakāraka is not used there.

The commentarial literature distinguishes ten types of kappiyakārakas, depending on whether they are designated or not (niddīṭṭha/aniddīṭṭha), by whom they are designated, whether in presence or

66Vin I 206.12 (twice), BD IV 280 (same context as Vin IV 90.28 [Pāc 40 Mk], BD II 346, anāpatti formula); Vin I 211.37, BD IV 288 (in a famine kappiyakārakas take a greater part); Vin I 212.7, 20, 23–25, BD IV 289 (kappiyakārakas shall legalize fruits); 215.22, BD IV 293 (similar to the preceding); 245.2–3, BD IV 336 (kappiyakārakas may accept gold); Vin III 242.11 [Niss 20 Mk], BD II 112 (anāpatti formula).
The Katkhāvitanī states that any individual not ordained in the Buddhist community could serve as a legalizer. From the Samantapāsādikā we know that poor people decided to become kappiyakārakas in order to earn their living based on the saṅgha. Therefore, in addition to slaves, free persons in need are expressly mentioned as having become kappiyakārakas. In other cases lay followers (upāsaka) function as kappiyakārakas. Sometimes the functions of a kappiyakāraka have to be similar to the duties of a novice (sāmaṇera) since both are listed alternatively. In another case one who serves someone who is ill (gilānupatthāka) is compared to a kappiyakāra and a sāmaṇera. In the Katikāvatas kappiyakārakas are mentioned as those to whom one should hand over improper things.

2.1.1.3 Veyyāvaccakara

The third designation, veyyāvaccakara, “attendant, steward”, is but rarely used in the canonical scriptures, and except for two references in

---

67 Sp III 675.1ff. [Niss 10 Mk]: Kkh 118.11 [Niss 10 Mk]. Further references Sp III 702.3 (son and/or brother are rendered into kappiyakārakas; V 1070.30; VI 1228.23; 1238.6.10.
68 The Kkh (116.27–28) equates veyyāvaccakara with kappiyakāraka, and declares that anyone, aside from the five co-religionists (bhikkhu, bhikkhunī, sikkhamāna, sāmaṇera, sāmaṇeri), may serve as a kappiyakāraka.
69 Sp V 1001.18–19: duggatamanussā saṅghaṁ nissāya jivissāmā ti vihāre kappiyakārakā honti.
70 Buddhadasā (362–409), for instance, granted kappiyakārakas to monks (Mhv 37.173), which indicates that they were not free men.
71 Mp II 115.2 ≠ Ps I 137.6 ≠ Spk I 136.27 ≠ Sv I 236.12 ≠ Ud-a 288.18; Ja IV 408.16.
72 Dhp-a II 182.20, 21; IV 129.6f.
73 Dhp-a II 60.11.
74 Kātiśirājjasimha-Katikāvata I (eighth century), Ratnapāla 1971, pp. 100, 171, § 110, where kappiyakāraka is equated with āramika and upāsaka; Kātiśirājjasimha-Katikāvata II (eighth century), Ratnapāla 1971, pp. 110, 176, § 15; Rājādhirājjasimha-Katikāvata (eighth century), Ratnapāla 1971, pp. 119f., 181f., §§ 12, 13, 18.
the Játaka and the Apadāna, we only find it in two rules of the Vinaya-pitaka, namely in the Pàtimokkha rule Nissaggiya 10 Mk regulating the appointment of an ārāmika or a lay follower as a monk’s veyyavakkara, and in the anāpatti formula to Pàcittiya 44 N, according to which it is not an offence if a nun cooks for her personal attendant. The fact that an ārāmika or a lay follower may serve as a monk’s veyyavakkara shows that, similar to kappiyakāraka, the term veyyavakkara designates a certain function which may be executed by different persons. It is obvious from the canonical literature that even a monk may act as a veyyavakkara for other monks.

Commentaries on the legal literature explain veyyavakkara with the synonyms kappiyakāraka or kicca kara.

2.1.1.4 Summary
To sum up our findings: all three terms are used mainly in the later parts of the Vinaya and rarely, if at all, in the Sutta-pitaka. This implies that they were alien to the early Buddhist texts. Ārāmika is the technical term for people belonging to, and working for, Buddhist monasteries. Two types of ārāmikas may be distinguished with regard to their social status before they became ārāmikas: (1) dependent persons, i.e., slaves, and (2) free men. Obviously, in order to differentiate these two types of ārāmikas, the Samantapāsādikā introduces the term ārāmikadāsa, a slave who is an ārāmika, to designate the first group. The terms kappiyakāraka and veyyavakkara describe functions that could be executed by ārāmikas, but also by lay followers or other persons.

---

75Ja II 334.8; Ap I 138.8.
76Vin III 221.25–28, 30, 32 (Pàtimokkha rule); 222.23, 25, 27, 29 [Niss 10 Mk], BD II 65f; and in the anāpatti formula to Vin IV 301.4 [Pàc 44 N], BD III 329 (here the meaning is misunderstood by I.B. Horner).
77See the example of Dabba Mallaputta, who did the saṅgha’s work (veyyavakkam karoti; DPPN s.v. Dabba Mallaputta), and the example of a young bhikkhu who did not do the work of other bhikkhus (S II 277.13; E veyyavakkam).
78Kkh 116.23 [Niss 10 Mk]; Sp III 672.22–23 [Niss 10 Mk].
79Sp III 672.22–23 [Niss 10 Mk].
Therefore, an ärāmika could be a kappiyakāraka or a veyyāvaccakara, and vice versa, but a kappiyakāraka and a veyyāvaccakara were not necessarily ärāmikas, at least not of the first type.

2.1.2 The lower ordination of slaves

The Vinaya rules that one should not confer lower ordination (pabbajjā) on slaves. Commenting on that rule, the Samantapāsādikā — in accordance with definitions given in the canonical writings — distinguishes four types of slaves: (1) one born as a slave, (2) one bought for money, (3) a captive turned into a slave, and (4) a person gone into slavery on his own accord. The first two types of slaves may receive lower ordination only after they are freed. The third may not receive lower ordination as long as he is held captive, but may be ordained as a novice if he manages to escape or is released in the course of a general amnesty. The fourth may not be ordained. Even a slave without an owner had to be formally released before he could be ordained. And if a slave who was unaware of his status had been

---

80 Vin I 76.26–27: na bhikkhave dāso pabbajetabbo. yo pabbajeyya, āpatti dukkaṭassā ti. “Monks, a slave should not be let go forth. Whoever should let [one such] go forth, there is an offence of wrong-doing.” (Translation by I.B. Horner, BD IV 957.)

81 Sp V 1000.19–20: na bhikkhave dāso ti ettha cattūro dāsā antojāto dhanaakkito karamarāṇito sāman dāsabyaṃ upagato ti.


83 Sp V 1000.25–1001.3.

84 Sp V 1001.3–6: sāman dāsabyaṃ upagato (Sp 1000.20) nāma jīvithāhetu vā ārakkhahetu vā aham te dāso ti sayam eva dāsabhāvaṃ upagato. rājunaṃ hatthi-assa-gomahisa-gopakādayo viya tādīso dāso na pabbajetabbo. “One gone into slavery of his own accord means one who, for the sake of livelihood or for the sake of protection, went himself into the state of a slave [with the words] ‘I am your slave’. Like watchmen of kings’ elephants, horses, cows, buffaloes, etc., is such a slave; they may not let him go forth.”

85 Sp V 1001.27–28: nissāmikadāso hoti so pi bhujisso kato va pabbajetabbo. “[H] one is an unowned slave, that one too may be ordained as a novice, only having [first] been made a free man.”
ordained as a novice or as a monk and learned about his being a slave only after the event, he had to be released retrospectively.\textsuperscript{86}

As is obvious from Samantapāsādikā, Sāratthadipani, Vimanadin-ṭīkā and Pācītyādiyōjanā, persons who went into slavery held a slave certificate\textsuperscript{87} recording their name, and perhaps their status, their owner, and possibly the place and time of their transfer.\textsuperscript{88} Practices of

\textsuperscript{86}Sp V 1001.28–29: ajānanto pabbājeyvā vā upasampādetvā vā pacchā jānāti, bhujissam kātum eva vajjati. “If not knowing [about his slave status] learns [about it] after they have ordained him as a novice or as a monk, it is allowed in fact to make him a free man.”

\textsuperscript{87}Pāc-y 244.12; Sp-† III 243.12, 14; Vmv II 111.5 (dāsīpaṇṇa); Sp V 1001.9 (panṇa). Pāṇṇa with forms of āropeti (not used in the canon but only in post-canonical literature) for the most part means document (only once is it used for letter, Ja VI 369,13–14), and, depending on the context, stands for a slave letter, a promissory note (also called inapanna; Ja I 227.4; 230.2; Dhp-a II 128.12; 129.19; 133.1; 134.7; 135.1–2; III 12.19f.) , or an attestation of the allotment of goods (Sp 387.24 = Pālim 431.12; with Sp-† II 167.12–13; Vmv I 204.10–11; Pālim-n† II 328.6–8). Āropeti in those cases does not mean “to send”, as indicated by CPD (s.v. āropeti), as an idiomatic use of panṇam āropeti, but “to post (up)” if it is used with the loc., and “to make out” if it is used with the acc. Compare also the younger Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition where in Guṇaprabha’s Vinayasūtra, the recording in a promissory note is expressed by āropya patre (see Schopen 1994A, p. 538). The compound panṇāropana is used in the same meaning in the present context and in two further places, Sv-† I 423.16: sakkhiṇaṃpanṇāropanaṃ vadhīyā saha vīna vā puna gahetukāmassa and, Sv-n†, CSCD, II p. 365: sakkhiṇaṃpanṇāropanānbandhanāṃ vadhīyā.

\textsuperscript{88}Sp-† III 243.12: sace sayam eva panṇam āropenti, na vajjati ti (Sp 1001.9) tā bhujissithiyo mayam pi dāsiyo homā ti sayam eva dāsīpanṇam likhāpenti, na vajjati. “If they themselves make out a certificate, it is not allowed [to ordain their sons: if] these free women themselves cause a slave certificate to be written [with the words], ‘We too are female slaves’, it is not allowed [to ordain their sons].” Vmv II 111.3–5 = Pālim-n† I 233.6–10: sayam eva panṇaṃ āropenti, na vajjati ti (Sp 1001.9) tā bhujissithiyo mayam pi vannadāsiyo homā ti attano rakkanatthiyo sayam eva rājānam dāsīpanne attano nāmaṃ likhāpenti. “If they themselves make out a certificate, it is not allowed [to ordain their sons: if] these free women themselves for their own protection cause their own name to be written in a slave certificate of kings [with the
releasing slaves varied from region to region. One way was to redeem the slave by reimbursing his owner, possibly accompanied by a ritual burning of the slave certificate. Another method was to sprinkle buttermilk on the slave’s head, or to wash (soak?) it with buttermilk. We do not know for certain whether in that case the slaves had to be redeemed first. In any case, the respective references do not mention a payment, which may be taken as an indication that the ablation with buttermilk itself effected the release. The Mahāpaccari, one of the early commentaries from around the first century B.C., already refers to this last method. It is repeatedly mentioned in the commentaries of the fourth or fifth century, and still known at the time of the tikās.

words], ‘We too are courtesans (lit. slaves of beauty)’, it is not allowed [to ordain their sons].’

89 Sv I 216.20 = Ps II 321.5–7: yathā puna (Sv B° pana) dāso kaścid eva mittam upanissāya sāmikānaṁ dhanam datvā attāṇan bhujissan katvā tato pājñhaya yaṁ icchatya, taṁ kareyya; VmV II 110.22–11.1: dāsacārittaṁ āropetvā kīto ti (Sp 1000.23) imānā dāsabhāvaparimocanathāya kitaṅkaṁ niyutteti. śādiso hi dhanakkīto pi adāso eva. tattha tattha cārītavasenā ti (Sp 1000.24) tasmiṁ tasmiṁ janapade dāsapaṁjākhpāniṁ na adāsakaranaṁyāyena. Unowned slaves (nissāmikadāsa) were allowed to free themselves, VjB 424.10–11: nissāmikam dāsan attanāpi bhujissan katuṁ labhata. Sp-t III 243.19–21: nissāmikadāso (Sp V 1001.27) nāma yassa sāmikā saputtadāśadayo (Pāli–pi adds cā) matā honti, na koci tassa pariggahako, so pi pabbajetum na vatthi, taṁ pana attanāpi bhujissan katuṁ vatthi.

90 Sv I 266.24: dhiṭaraṁ adāsita sīsanā dvovīta adāsan bhujissan katvā dhiṭaraṁ adāsi. “He gave [him his] daughter [as a wife]: Having washed his head, [thus] having made [him] a non-slave (= a free man, he gave [his] daughter [to him].” Cf. Ap-a 263.Ś. = Mp I 179.Ś. = Spk II 195.Ś.= Th-a III 133.Ś.: sacce tunhæsu ekekaṁ bhujissan karoma, vassasataṁ pi na ppaṭhi. tumh’ eva tumhãkaṁ sīsanā dvovītva bhujissā hutvā jivathā ti. “If we make each one among you a free man, even a hundred years will not suffice. Having washed your head you head indeed shall live as free men.” See also Vibh-mī (CSCD) 182.

According to the explanations of Dhammasiri’s Gaṇṭhipada and Sāriputta’s Sārathadīpani, this method was practised in Sri Lanka, while the Vimativinodanī-tikā declares that it was a usage in some countries without specifying them.

Among the various groups of slaves mentioned in the Samantapāsādikā, we find the specific group of ārāmikadāsas, slaves who are ārāmikas. They represent the first of the two groups of ārāmikas defined before, i.e., those who are unfree. If these are given to the monastery (vihāra) by a king, they, according to the statement of the Samantapāsādikā, may be ordained as novices only after their release. Whether this is different if the donor was a commoner, we do not know. In any case, it seems to be irrelevant which of the four categories of slaves these ārāmikadāsas belonged to.

[slaves] into non-slaves, make [a slave] into a non-slave by washing his head with buttermilk, so they, because of [their] having been given with the designation ārāmika, [are made] indeed non-slaves. [That is the] intention. ‘The sprinkling of buttermilk, however, is a usage in the Śihala island,’ they say.” Vmn II 111.11–14: takkāṇaṃ sīse āsittakasadīsa va honti ti kesuci janapadesu adāse karonī takkaṃ sīse āsīscanti, tēna kira te adāsā honti, evam idam pi ārāmikavacanena dānāṃ pīti adhippaya. “They in fact resemble [persons] on [whose] head buttermilk is sprinkled: in some regions [those] who make [slaves] into non-slaves sprinkle buttermilk on [their] head; therewith, as is well known, they become non-slaves. In this way also that donation with the statement ārāmika is intended.” Pāc-y 243.20–21: ārāmikaṃ demā ti vacanām dāsānaṃ bhujissavacanan ti vuttaṃ hoti. “It is said that the statement ‘we give an ārāmika’ for slaves is the statement [that one is] a free man.”

92Vjb 424.9: takkāsiḥcanaṃ Śihaladīpe cārittaṃ. Sp-† III 243.17, see n. 91.

93Vmn II 111.11–13, see n. 91.

94Sp V 1001.11–12: vihāresu rājāḥi ārāmikadāsā nāma dinnā honti, te pi pabbhijetaṃ na vaṭṭati. bhujisse katvā pana pabbhijetaṃ vaṭṭati. “Slaves who belong to the ārāma are given to the vihāra by kings; these too may not be ordained as novices. But having made them free men, [they] may be ordained as novices.”

95Probably all four types of slaves were the property of kings.
Furthermore, if a monk receives a slave from his relatives or his servants with the request to ordain him as a novice so that he may do the monk’s work (veyyāvacca), or if the monk’s own slave is considered for such a promotion, the Samantapāsādikā states that he may only be ordained as a novice after he has been released. Thus in both cases — (1) donation of slaves by a king to the saṅgha and (2) donation of a slave by private persons to a monk — the slaves have to be released first.

In this context, however, the Samantapāsādikā hands down a quotation from the Mahāpaccarī (c. first century B.C.). There it is stated that born and bought slaves are given to the community of monks with the words “we give ārāmiṣa”, that the status of these individuals then resembles that of persons whose heads are sprinkled with buttermilk, and that they are entitled to receive the lower ordination.

While the Samantapāsādikā, according to the initial statement, would admit the ordination of the first two types of slaves only after their release, the Mahāpaccarī attaches no further condition to their lower ordination except that they are to be given to the community of monks with the designation ārāmiṣa. The donor is not mentioned in this case. Thus his identity, be it king or commoner, seems to be irrelevant. If one extends that statement to cover born and bought slaves given by a king, the Mahāpaccarī is in obvious disagreement with the Samantapāsādikā. However that may be, from the statement of the Mahāpaccarī

---

96Sp V 1001.21–23: bhikkhusa ānākā vā upaṭṭhākā vā dāsam denti imamu pabbājettha, tumhākam veyyāvaccam karissatiti attano vā (Sp E vā) assa dāiso attthi, bhujissato ‘va pabbājetabbo. “[If] a monk’s relatives or servants donate a slave [to him with the words:] ‘Ordain that one as a novice, he will do your work’, or [if] he himself (i.e., the monk) owns a slave, this one may be ordained as a novice only after he has been made a free man.”

97Sp V 1001.13–15: Mahāpaccarīyamu antojātadhanakkitaṁ ānetvā bhikkhu-sanghasa ‘ārāmiṣe demā’ ti denti, takkam sīse àsītakasadisā ‘va honti, pabbājetuṁ vattaṁ ti vuttaṁ. “In the Mahāpaccarī it is said, ‘They bring persons born [as slaves] and [those] bought for money [and] give [them] to the community of monks [with the words:] ‘We give ārāmiṣa’. [These] become indeed similar to those on whose head buttermilk is sprinkled.’”
it follows that the statement “We give ārāmikas” changes the social status of the slaves and assimilates their status to that of free men.

The position of the Mahāpaccari, in turn, is contested by the Kurundi, another of the early commentaries quoted in the Samantapāsādikā. Without specifying the individuals given to the sangha, the Kurundi agrees with the Mahāpaccari as to the accompanying designation (“We give an ārāmika”), but not with regard to their consequent entitlement to lower ordination. This document presents not only a conflict of views with regard to the social status of ārāmikas given to the sangha, but also a difference of opinion concerning their entitlement to ordination as novices. It shows us as well that this conflict has a very long history, reaching back at least to the first century B.C.

As for the Samantapāsādikā, there are indications that it agrees with the Kurundi: firstly, because it expresses the same opinion with respect to ārāmikas given by a king; and secondly, because it quotes the Kurundi after the Mahāpaccari, which is a sign of acceptance.

The next class of commentaries, the gaṇṭhipadas, contain various statements on ārāmikas. The first, Dhammasiri’s Gaṇṭhipada, is undated and only survived in the passages quoted in the Vajirabuddhi-

---

98Sp V 1001.15–17: Kurundiyaṃ pūna ‘ārāmikam demā’ ti kappiyavohārena denti, yena kenaci vohārena dinn hoṭu, n’eva pabhājetabbo ti vuttam. “But in the Kurundi it is said, ‘They give with the [legally] acceptable designation “we give ārāmikas”; with whatever designation one is given, he is by no means to be ordained as a novice.’”


10Gaṇṭhipadavivarana or -vṇṇanā, Gaṇṭhipadatthanīcchaya, Gaṇṭhipad’-atthavaṇṇanā, etc., or merely gaṇṭhipada is the name of a class of commentaries commenting on words of the canonical texts and their respective atthakathās. The gaṇṭhipadas originated after the atthakathā literature and before the subcommentaries (tīkā). They were written in Pāli, Sinhalese, and maybe other languages. Sometimes we only have the name of the author to identify a certain gaṇṭhipada; sometimes these gaṇṭhipadas have names, for example Mahāgaṇṭhipada. For further information, see Sv-pṭ I xxxii ff.
țikă, which suggests that it must have been written between the fifth and twelfth centuries. Dhammasiri regards āramikas as neither slaves nor free men, but nonetheless supports their ordination as novices. This implies that the slave, with his presentation to the saṅgha as an āramika, achieves a social status between a slave and a free man, which in turn enables his promotion to the status of a novice. Here Dhammasiri clearly sides with the tradition of the Mahāpaccarī against that of the Kurundī and the Samantapaśādikā.

Vajirabuddhi’s Anuṅghanipada, another undated commentary that only survived in quotations by the Vajirabuddhi-țikă, was written after Dhammasiri’s Gaṅṭhipada. Here the ordination of an āramika is made conditional upon the compensation of the community with another āramika. Two interpretations are possible in that case: (1) The Anuṅghanipada considers the status of āramikas as similar to that of free men, and its primary concern is the question of compensation in order to prevent the saṅgha from loss, or (2) if the āramika is regarded as a slave, his status can be transferred to the person presented as a substitute. In the first case, the Anuṅghanipada would side with the Mahāpaccarī, in the second, with the Kurundī.

---

101Vjb 424.8-9: āramiko ca ‘n’ eva dāso na bhujisso’ ti vattabbato na dāso ti likhitam. “And an āramika is not a slave, because it must be said that he is neither a slave nor a free man, [thus] it is written [in Dhammasiri’s Gaṅṭhipada].”

102Vjb 424.10: te ca pabbājetabbā saṅghassārāmikatā. “And these (referring to the Mahāpaccarī quotation in Sp V 1001.14–15, see n. 97) may be ordained as novices, because [they] are āramikas of the community.” This passage is part of a larger quotation from Dhammasiri’s Gaṅṭhipada which refers to several aspects of slaves’ ordination, starting at Vjb 424.9 and ending at Vjb 424.12 with ti likhitam.

103Vjb 424.5–6: āramikam ce pabbājetukāmo, aṁkam ekaṁ datvā pabbājetukāmo ti vuttaṁ. “If one wishes to ordain an āramika as a novice, the [āramika] may be ordained as a novice if another one is given for the one [to be ordained].”

104Different from the Vimativinodani-țikă, which explicitly demands redemption of value plus profit (see below), the Anuṅghanipada only provides for the payment of the value, i.e., replacement of one āramika by another one.
Coming to the tikās, the independent evidence provided by the Vajirabuddhi-tikā (before the twelfth century A.D.) comes down to one sentence that is not part of a quotation from one of the ganthipadas. And here the Vajirabuddhi-tikā explains the position of the Mahāpaccari, without, however, explicitly adopting it. In any case, I find it quite remarkable that neither the Vajirabuddhi-tikā nor one of the ganthipadas quoted in it shows any inclination to consider the contrary position of the Kurundi, although it must have been known to them. This may be taken as an indication that the ganthipadas and the Vajirabuddhi-tikā are in accord with the Mahāpaccari, against the Kurundi and the Samantapāsādikā.

Sāratthadipani and Vimativinodani-tikā confirm the statement of the Kurundi, explaining that ārāmikas may not be ordained as novices because they are ārāmikadāsas of the saṅgha. Nonetheless, the Sāratthadipani also comments on the Mahāpaccari and it seems that it does not take sides with any one of them. The Vimativinodani-tikā, on the other hand, annotates the statement of the Samantapāsādikā that

105Vjb 424.6–8: Mahāpaccarivādassa ayam idha adhippāyo: “bhikkhu-saṅghassa ārāmike demā” ti (Sp 1001.13–14) dinnattā na te tesam dāsā. “This is here the intention of the doctrine of the Mahāpaccari: ‘because [they] are given [with the words,] ‘We give ārāmikas to the community of monks’, they are not their (i.e., the monks’) slaves.’” This sentence probably is a statement of the Vajirabuddhi-tikā; however, it cannot be completely excluded that it may be part of the quotation from Dhammasiri’s Gaṇṭhipada, ending in Vjb 424.9 and starting here (Vjb 424.6) or in 424.7.

106Sp-I III 243.17–18 = Pālim-nt I 233.27–34: n’ eva pabbājetabbo ti vuttan ti (Sp V 1001.17–18) kappiyavacanena dinne pi saṅghassa ārāmikadāsattā evan vuttan. “It is said [in the Kurundi,] that [someone given as an ārāmika] may by no means be ordained as a novice: This is said in that way because one, even if given with the legal statement [that he is given as an ārāmika], is a slave who is an ārāmika of the community.” VmV II 111.14–15 = Pālim-nt I 234.5–7: tathā dinne pi saṅghassa ārāmikadāso evā ti n’ eva pabbājetabbo ti (Sp V 1001.17) vuttan. “Even when given in that way he is only a slave who is an ārāmika of the community; [therefore] it is said [in the Kurundi:] ‘He is by no means to be ordained.’”

107See n. 91.
ärāmikas given to the saṅgha by a king may not be ordained. It explains that the community is entitled to the value, plus profit, of an ärāmika to be redeemed with the aim of ordaining him as a novice.\textsuperscript{108} This makes it perfectly clear that the Vimativinodani-ṭikā regards the ärāmika donated to the Buddhist community by a king as a slave. Furthermore, from the way in which the Vimativinodani-ṭikā comments on the statements of Mahāpaccari and Kurundi, it follows that it shares the opinion of the Kurundi\textsuperscript{109} which is confirmed by its position with respect to the lower ordination of children of ärāmikas (see below 2.1.3). The Pācītyādiyojana from nineteenth-century Burma adopts the view of the Kurundi.\textsuperscript{110}

### 2.1.3 The lower ordination of children of ärāmikas

Another question connected with the ärāmikas is whether children of ärāmikas may be ordained as novices or not.

With regard to children of slaves, the Samantapāśikā points out that they are to be counted among the first of four categories of slaves, namely those born [as slaves], or slaves by birth (antojāṭa, jātidāsa). Furthermore, the Samantapāśikā states that if the mother or both parents are slaves, children do not qualify for ordination as novices. However, if the father is a slave and the mother is free, their children

\textsuperscript{108}\textsuperscript{109}\textsuperscript{110}
are free, too, and therefore qualified.\(^{11}\) This shows that children inherit their status as slaves from the mother, not the father, which is in agreement with Hindu tradition.

The majority of pertinent references is to the masculine form, ārāmika. As for its less common feminine counterparts, the Vinaya has ārāmikini in the story of the donation of five hundred ārāmikas to Venerable Pilindavaccha,\(^{112}\) while ārāmikā is documented in a passage of the Vajirabuddhi-ṭīkā (357,8) introducing us to the niceties of politically correct Buddhist speech. So the phrase “This is our male or female slave” (amhākaṃ eso dāso, dāsi) is prohibited, but it is perfectly acceptable to say, “This is our male or female ārāmikā” (ayaṃ amhākaṃ ārāmiko, ārāmikā).

In the context of feminine terms, mention should also be made of devadāsī and the question of whether their children are qualified to be ordained as novices. Dhammasiri’s Gaṅhipada allows their ordination,\(^{113}\) and the same holds true for the three Sinhalese Gaṅhipadas quoted in the Sāratthadipani.\(^{114}\) Only the Vimativinodani-ṭīkā declares that they are not qualified because even devadāsas are only slaves.\(^{115}\)

Apart from these statements, only three more references for the word devadāsīlā are found in the Pāli texts. In Dhammapāla’s

---

\(^{11}\)Sp V 1001.19–21: yassa mātāpi tāro dāsā, mātā eva vā dāsī, pitā adāso, taṃ pabbājetum na vaṭṭati. See also Sp V 1001, n. 9: Bp inserts yassa pana mātā adāsi pitā dāso, taṃ pabbājetum vaṭṭati.

\(^{112}\)Vin I 208.10, 12, 17, 19 (BD IV 281ff.) = III 249.28, 30, 35, 37 (BD II 128ff.).

\(^{113}\)Vjb 424.5 = Pālim-ṇṭ I 233.15: devadāsīpatte vaṭṭatiti likhitaṃ. “It is allowed [to ordain] the sons of devadāsī [as a novice; this] is written [in Dhammasiri’s Gaṅhipada].”

\(^{114}\)Sp-ṭ III 243.22 = Pālim-ṇṭ I 234.20: devadāsīpatte pabbājetum vaṭṭatiti tiṣu Gaṅhipadesu viuttam. “It is allowed to ordain the son of a devadāsī as a novice; [this] is said in the three Gaṅhipadas.”

\(^{115}\)VmV II 111.20 = Pālim-ṇṭ I 234.15: devadāsāpi dāsā eva. te hi kathaci dese rājadāsa honti, kathaci vihāradāsa, tasnā pabbājetum na vaṭṭatī. “Even devadāsas [are] only slaves. For in one region they are slaves of kings, in another [region] they are slaves of monasteries; therefore, it is not allowed to ordain [them] as novices.”
Sumangalavilasini-poranaṭikā (Sv-pṭ I 477,5), and in the Sumangalavilasini-navāṭikā (Sv-ṛṭ, CSD II, p. 374; eighteenth century) devadāsi is used to explain yakkhadāsi, “slave of a demon”, while the Niruttidipani (CSD, p. 229; twentieth century) mentions devadāsīputta, “son of a female slave of a deva (god, king, temple?)”, and rājadāsīputta, “son of a female slave of a king”, to exemplify a certain type of compound.

The Vimativinodāṇi-ṭikā explains that in some regions the word devadāsa means “slaves of a king”, and in other regions “slaves of a monastery” (vihāra, see n. 115). Devadāsa of Vmv might be a masculine or feminine (?) pl. (though the regular feminine sg. form should end in -ṇa).

Let us briefly return to the usage of the term devadāsa in the gaṇṭhi-padas. Assuming that it here designates female slaves of a king, we may infer that their children had a special status exempting them from the general prohibition against ordaining children of female slaves, which would run against the intention of the Vinaya rule.116

However, if devadāsi designates the female slave of a Buddhist monastery, then these females must be ārāmikās because otherwise the monastery would not have been able to accept them. In that case devadāsi would be synonymous with the term ārāmikini documented in the Vinaya story of the gift of the five hundred ārāmikās by King Bimbisāra. As it happens, the story of their donation is also handed down in the Tibetan version of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya. The Tibetan word used there, however, lha-'baṅs,117 corresponds to Skt devadāsa, rather than to ārāmika.118 Since the context of the story is the same, this may point to the synonymous use of devadāsi and ārāmikini,

---

116 The prohibition to ordain slaves had the aim of not interfering with the rights of the proper owner of the respective slave. Thus it would not make sense to exempt the slaves of kings from this rule.
117 Jäschke s.v. “slaves belonging to a temple”.
118 Schopen 1994b, p. 158 (equates lha-'baṅ with kalpiṇa), 164 (here he refers to devadāsa as the corresponding term).
with preferences probably varying according to region or tradition. All four Gaṇṭhipadas — of which at least three, but probably all four, are of Sri Lankan origin — would then advocate the legitimacy of ordaining children of female ārāmikās. Only one of them, Dhammasiri’s Gaṇṭhipada, explicitly treats both the ordination of ārāmikas and that of their children. We can, however, safely assume that the three Sinhalese Gaṇṭhipadas must have held the same view as Dhammasiri with respect to the ordination of an ārāmika, because otherwise, their attitude towards the ārāmika’s children would be difficult to account for.

Finally, the South Indian Vimativinodani-ṭikā would prohibit the ordination of the children of ārāmikas. From this it would result that the Vimativinodani-ṭikā considers ārāmikas, whether given by a king or by someone else, as slaves. In that way, the Vimativinodani-ṭikā would proceed with the tradition of the Kurundī and the Samantapāsādikā.

In summary, we can say that one branch of the Theravāda tradition, represented at least in Sri Lanka, and stretching at least from the first century B.C. to the time of the gaṇṭhipadas (sometime before the twelfth century A.D.), excepts slaves belonging to a Buddhist monastery (ārāmikadāsa), as well as their children, from the general rule prohibiting the pabbajjā of slaves. For this purpose the rules are stretched in order to exclude ārāmikas from the Vinaya’s definition of slaves. The other branch of the Theravāda tradition, which can be traced from the first century B.C. to the nineteenth century A.D., also represented in Sri Lanka, but in later times adopted by the South Indian Vimativinodani-ṭikā and by the Burmese Pācityādiyojanā, stuck to the Vinaya rule without concessions regarding the status of slaves in Buddhist monasteries.
2.1.4 The higher ordination of ārāmikas

Let us finish this example with one last remark. Among those authorizing the pabbajjā for ārāmikas, Dhammasiri’s Gaṇṭhipada explains that they are neither slaves nor free men. This seems to imply that even Dhammasiri excluded ārāmikas from higher ordination because the candidate for higher ordination has to be a free man. However, we have to reckon with the possibility that, by being ordained as novices, ārāmikas lose their former status and therefore qualify for higher ordination, too.
2.2 The ticīvra

The second method for stretching the rules and getting away with it is not to apply the wording originally provided for the respective case, but to resort to another wording that allows a certain latitude.

As is well known, in the early days of Buddhism, monks had to content themselves with robes made from rags from a dust heap (pamśukāla). Very soon, however, they were also allowed to wear robes donated by householders.¹⁰ The robe (cīvara) every monk is obliged to wear from the time of his higher ordination onward consists of the inner garment (antaravāsaka), the upper garment (uttarāsaṅga) and the outer cloak (saṅghāṭi).¹²⁰ The inner garment covers the navel and the knees and is fixed by a waistband.¹²¹ The upper garment reaches from the neck to the ankles, thus covering the inner garment. The outer cloak had the size of the upper garment and is made of two layers of fabric.¹²² A monk was allowed to own no more than one set of three robes.

¹⁰Vin I 280.35ff. (BD IV 397ff.).
¹²⁰Vin I 289.1–3: anujānāmi bhikkhave ticīvaram digunam saṁghāṭin ekacchiyaṁ uttarāsaṅgam ekacchiyaṁ antaravāsakan ti. “I allow you, monks, three robes: a double outer cloak, a single upper robe, a single inner robe” (BD IV 411). If the clothes were worn thin the antaravāsaka and the uttarāsaṅga were allowed to be double, the saṅghāṭi fourfold, Vin I 290.13–14 (BD IV 413).
¹²¹Following Sp III 643.3–8 = Kkh 94.18–20 saṅghāti and uttarāsaṅga are, according to the smallest size, in length five muṭṭhi (1.8 metres), in breadth three muṭṭhi (1.08 metres); the antaravāsaka is in length the same, in breadth two muṭṭhi (0.72 metres). For muṭṭhi as a measure of length, see Kieffer-Pülz 1993, p. 182, n. 46. The upper limit for all robes is given by the size of a sugata cīvara (nine vidattī in length [1.98 metres] and six vidattī in breadth [1.32 metres]; Vin IV 173.28–29) which they must not exceed.
Six kinds of material were allowed: Vin I 281.34–36 (BD IV 398): anujānāmi bhikkhave cha cīvaraṁ khomaṁ kappāsaṅgam koseyyaṁ kambalam sānaṁ bhaṅgan ti. “Monks, I allow six [kinds of] robe materials: linen, cotton, silk, wool, coarse hempen cloth, canvas.”
Any item in excess was regarded as an extra robe (ati-rekaçivara), and had to be assigned (vikappeti) to someone else after ten days at the latest.

Before a monk could use a cloth, he had to take formal possession of it (adhiitiñhati). This holds true for all nine clothes which serve as requisites of a monk. These are (1–3) the three robes (ticivara), (4) the cloth to sit upon (niserdana), (5) a sheet (paccattharana), (6) a cloth for wiping the face (mukhapuñchanaco±a), (7) a requisite cloth (pari-kkhāra±a), (8) the cloth for the rains (vassikasati±a), and (9) the itch-cloth (kandupaticchādi). Only two of them may be assigned (vikappeti) to others after use, i.e., the cloth for the rains and the itch-cloth. For most items a certain size and number are prescribed.

---

123Vin I 287.31–89.3 (BD IV 409f.). The stories told in the Vinaya about monks who entered a village with one set of three robes, remained in the monastery in another set of three robes, and went down to bathe in another set, amply show that such additional sets of three robes were regarded as extra robes (ati-rekaçivara) which could be kept for ten days at most (see Vin I 289.3–12, BD IV 411).

124Vin I 289.29–30 (BD IV 412); Vin III 196.9–11 [Niss 1 Mk] (BD II 4–5).

125E.g. Vin I 297.2–10 (BD IV 423f.); 308.32–35; 309.2, 3, 12, 13, 16, 19–21 (BD IV 441ff.; vissāsagāhal adhiitiñha, without the exact wording to be used); II 119.6–8 (BD V 163; with the wording); 123.32 (BD V 170f. referring to the namata±a); III 204.36; 246.25 (BD II 28; 121; referring to the patta); V 137.29; 140.18.37 (BD VI 222; 227f.); 173.23, 25, 26; 174.33; 175.18 (BD VI 281; 283f.; paccuddhāra precedes the adhiitiñha; adhiitiñha follows the paccuddhāra); 176.26, 29, 32–33 (BD VI 286; kaññha).

126Vin I 296.39–97.10 (BD IV 423).

127For the ticivara see above. The niserdana (Vin IV 170.29–31; 171.11–14 [Pàc 89 Mk]; BD III 96) was two vidatthi in length and one-and-a-half in breadth according to the current vidatthi plus a border of one vidatthi breadth, thus altogether 4 × 3.5 vidatthi (c. 1 × 0.87 metres). The vassikasati±a, a cloth for the rains retreat in the four months of the rains allowed for the monks (Vin I 294.24, BD IV 420), was six vidatthi in length and two-and-a-half in breadth according to the current vidatthi (vassikasati±a; Vin IV 172.22–73.3 [Pàc 91 Mk]; BD III 99), ca. 1.5 × 0.62 metres. A kandupaticchādi was allowed in case of certain skin diseases (Vin I 296.4–5, BD IV 421); it spread from below the navel to above the knees and was four vidatthi in length and two in
While the Vinaya describes the procedure of taking formal possession with respect to a strainer only, the Samantapāsādikā is more detailed and rules that a monk has to recite an accompanying formula, for instance: “I take formal possession of this cloak” (imaṃ saṅghāṭiṁ adhiṭṭhātīṁ).129

As already mentioned, a monk is allowed one set of the three robes. If he wishes to accept a new set, he first has to formally abandon (paccuddharatī) the old one. Although the Vinaya is not very explicit with respect to the formal abandonment of the three robes, it must be presumed that it was common practice, at least during the final stage of development of the Pātimokkha, because the Vinaya mentions the breadth according to the current vidatthi (Vin IV 172,11–14 [Pāc 90 Mk]; BD III 97ff.), i.e., ca. 1 × 0.5 metres.

Exceptions are the sheet, allowed in Vin I 295,27–29 (BD IV 421) in the size one wants. Thus there is no limit as to its size. The size of the mukha-puḷāchana-cūla (Vin I 296,19–20, BD IV 422) seems to have not been defined in the Vinaya. However, it could be deduced from its function. In the casuistical layer, according to some, two such garments were allowed, while others declare that may be used (Sp III 645,1–4). The requisite cloth is allowed in Vin I 296,32–33 (BD IV 422). No limit with respect to the number of requisite cloths is given, see Kkh 95.24–25 = Pāli 33,19–20 = Sp III 645,4–5: parikkhāraco gānanā nathī. yattaṃ icchati tattakaṃ adhiṭṭhātibham eva.

128Vin II 119,6–8: sace na hoti parissāvanaṁ vā dhammakarako vā saṅghāṭi-kañño pi adhiṭṭhātibbo iminā parissāvetvā pivissāmi ti. “If there is not a strainer or a regulation water pot, then a corner of the outer cloak should be determined upon with the words, ‘I will drink [water] having strained it with this.’” (BD V 163). This example, though not general, shows that taking formal possession of is an express statement in which the object and the fact that it is taken possession of are mentioned.

129The two ways of making an adhiṭṭhāna are verbal and physical, Vin V 117,37–38 (patta); 117,38–18,1 (civara); Sp III 643,3 ff. (civara); 705,1 ff. (patta).

130See BHSD s.v. pratuyuddharaṁ, “removes”. Horner, BD II 22, n. 3, discusses the term at length, but did not grasp the sense correctly. Here in the casuistry it should mean, “if [the robe] is not formally given up, [but] he is of the opinion that it has been formally given up” (apaccuddhate paccuddhaṭṭasaṅñī, Vin III 202,20).
formal abandonment of a robe in various sections. This indicates that
the knowledge of the practical details is taken for granted.

This said, there is little room left for a monk to own more than one
set of three robes at the same time without getting into conflict with the
law, one would think.

However, we have at least circumstantial evidence that already at
the time of the Vinaya monks had more than one set of three robes at
their disposal. (1) Firstly, there is a stereotype formula laying down the
duties of a pupil, etc., if his preceptor, etc., wishes to leave the
monastery to go to town. Here it becomes apparent that the preceptor
changes at least one of the three robes in preparation for the trip (he
receives a nivāsana and hands back a paṭinivāsana), and that he
changes it again on his return (he hands back the nivāsana and grasps

13) In the Suttavibhanga in the introductory story to Pācittiya 59 Mk and in the
Pātimokkha rule itself: Vin IV 121,17, 20, 23 (introductory story), 121.30–33
(rule); 122,17–18 (word-by-word commentary), 122,19–21 (casuistry; BD II
41ff.); referred to in Vin V 22,7–14 (BD VI 34); furthermore in the casuistry
and in the anāpatti formulas of two Nissaggiya rules: Vin III 202,20
(casuistry), 28 (anāpatti formula) [Niss 2 Mk] (BD II 22–23); Vin III
264,21–22 (casuistry), 32 (anāpatti formula) [Niss 29 Mk] (BD II 159); in the
Parivāra (Vin V 176,24–34) in the frame of the description of the kathina
ceremony, which — as is well known — represents a later stage than the
description of the kathina ceremony in the Mahāvagga. The rule Pāc 59 Mk
has been misunderstood by Horner, BD II 411–13, because she did not
recognize the technical meaning of paccuddhārati. The translation in Pālim,
2001, p. 67: “If any bhikkhu ... should use it without a formal taking back
[i.e., rescinding of the assignment]”, also does not fully grasp the sense, since
here the bhikkhu who uses the robe, and the one who formally takes it back,
i.e., rescinds his own assignment, are one and the same person. In fact the
bhikkhu who uses the [robe] (i.e., the one who had assigned the robe to a
second bhikkhu) is different from the bhikkhu whose robe he uses (i.e.,
whom he had assigned the robe to before), and who did not formally give it up (apaccuddhārakam). For, if someone assigns an object to someone else,
that person has to take formal possession of it in order to be able to use it.
Before that person again may assign the robe to someone else, he first has to
formally give it up (paccuddhārati) again.
the paṭīnivāsana).\textsuperscript{132} This clearly presupposes that the preceptor has more than one set of three robes at his disposal.\textsuperscript{133}

(2) Secondly, we have two instances in the Vinaya where the word vihāracīvāra is used.\textsuperscript{134} The exact meaning of this word in the Vinaya is not known, but it cannot be excluded that it refers to a robe to be used by a monk in a vihāra. However, the Samantapāsādikā indicates that it is a robe deposited as a requisite by the donors of the vihāra.\textsuperscript{135}

(3) Thirdly, the ascetic practice (dhutanga), called the three-robe wearer (tecīvarika), obliges a monk to wear only three robes, with only one yellow shoulder cloth (amsakasāva) allowed in addition. From the fact that this is considered an austerity, we may safely assume that the original confinement to a single set of three robes was no longer the rule, but rather the exception. Since the three-robe wearer is mentioned in the Sutta-piṭaka\textsuperscript{136} and in later layers of the Vinaya, i.e., in the report

\textsuperscript{132}Vin I 46.12–13 = II 223.14f. sace upajjhāyo gāmaṇ paṭivīkāmo hoti, nivāsanaṁ datābaṁ paṭīnivāsanaṁ paṭiggahetabbaṁ (BD IV 60: “If the preceptor wishes to enter a village, his inner clothing should be given [to him], the inner clothing [that he is wearing] should be received [from him] in return.” Vin I 46.25–27: pacciggantvā pattacīvaraṁ paṭiggahetabbaṁ, paṭīnivāsanaṁ datābaṁ, ... nivāsanaṁ paṭiggahetabbaṁ. BD IV 60: “Having gone to meet him, he should receive his bowl and robe, he should give back the inner clothing [given] in return; he should receive his inner clothing.”

\textsuperscript{133}The robe is named nivāsana. Horner supposes that nivāsana is another word for antaravāsaka (BD I 60, n. 1). She (BD 160, n. 2) rejects the interpretation of VinTexts I 155, where nivāsana is rendered as “under garment (i.e., his house-dress?)”, because in that case the monk would not be a tecīvarika. Thus she rejects an interpretation because it does not fit her expectation.

Interestingly, the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins in their Abhisamācārikā in a parallel to our passage, differentiate between a grāma-praveśikacīvaraṁ nivāsana and an ārāmacaraṇaṇakaṁ cīvaraṁ or a vihāra-caraṇaṇakaṁ cīvaraṁ nivāsana. I owe this information to Seishi Karashima.

\textsuperscript{134}Vin III 212.20, 23 (BD II 46, with n. 2). This vihāracīvara clearly is deposited in a vihāra, and belongs to the saṅgha, i.e., it is not taken into formal possession by some monk.

\textsuperscript{135}Defined by the tīkās, Sp-II 403.1 = Pāli-nī II 309.10: vihāracīvaraṁ tī senasanaṁ cīvaraṁ.

\textsuperscript{136}A I 38.13; M I 214.5; see BD IV 351, n. 3.
of the second council and in the Parivāra, this change of practice must have taken effect at least by the end of the first century B.C. But how could the new attitude be put into practice without transgressing the rules? There is a long passage which illuminates this point in the Samantapāsādikā quoting early teachers and texts from at least the first century B.C. The question discussed here is whether or not it is allowed to take formal possession of the set of three robes as requisite cloth (parikkhāracolā). 

The first authority quoted in this context is Thera Mahāpaduma, a Vinaya specialist (vinayadhāra) from Sri Lanka, a pupil of Vinayadhara Thera Upatissa, who lived during the famine in the first century B.C. He declares that a monk may only take formal possession of the set of three robes under precisely this designation (set of three robes). Interestingly enough, this literal interpretation turns

---

137 In the description of the monks of Pāvā (Vin I 253.6; II 299.6.9 [report of the second council]); V 131.16; 193.10.
138 Sp III 643.31–44: ticivaram pana parikkhāracolam adhīṭhātum vāṭati na vāṭati ti? “But is it allowed to take formal possession of the three robes as requisite robes [or] is it not allowed?”
139 Mori 1989, p. 68 (130), no. 93.
140 Sp I 263.24–64.7. Thera Upatissa is mentioned together with Thera Phussadeva as one of those who protected the Vinaya when the great peril arose in Sri Lanka (mahābhaye uppanne, Sp I 263.25–28). This famine is thought to have taken place between 102 and 89 B.C.; see Mori 1989, p. 61.
141 Sp III 644.1–4: Mahāpadumathero kirāha: ticivaram ticivaram eva adhiṭṭhātubbaṁ; sa ce parikkhāracolādhiṭhānāṁ labhēya udosiitikkhāpade parihiṅaṇaṁ niraṭṭhaka bhaveyyā ti. evam vutte kira avasesā bhikkhū āhaṁsu: parikkhāracolā pibhaṅgavatā ve adhiṭṭhātubbaṁ ti vuttaṁ, tasmā vāṭati ti.

“Thera Mahāpaduma, apparently, says that the set of three robes is to be taken formal possession of only as a set of three robes. If the taking formal possession of [the set of three robes] as a requisite cloth were allowed, the protection in the storehouse rule (Niss 2 Mk; i.e., to be allowed to wear fewer than three robes during the kathina period, and after the kathina has been closed, with the agreement of the bhikkhus) would become useless. When he had spoken thus, then the remaining monks said, ‘Even the requisite cloth is taught in fact by the Lord as one which has to be taken formal possession of,
out to be the minority. All the other monks hold that the ticívāra may also be taken into formal possession as a parikkhāracoḷa (Sp III 644.4-6).

Since no limit is given regarding the size and number of requisite cloths (parikkhāracoḷa), there also is no need to formally give up (paccuddharati) old parikkhāracoḷas before accepting new ones. In theory, this leaves room for unlimited accumulation of such requisites in all shapes and sizes.

The view of Thera Mahāpaduma’s opponents receives additional support from the Mahāpaccariyā142 and also from Thera Mahātissa,143 an inhabitant of Puṇṇavālikā and a reciter of both Vibhangas (ubhato-vibhangabhāṇaka),144 who refers to it as an earlier practice of the forest

Therefore it is allowed (i.e., it is allowed to take formal possession of the set of three robes as a requisite cloth).""

142Sp III 644.6-10: Mahāpaccariyām pi vuttaṃ “parikkhāracoḷam nāma pātekkaṃ niḍānāmukkham etan ti ticívārāṃ parikkhāracoḷaṃ ti adhiṭṭhahattā paribhājitaṃ vaṭṭati. udosita-sikkhatāde pana ticívārāṃ adhiṭṭhahattā pariharantassa parihāro viṭṭa” ti. “Even in the Mahāpaccariyā it is said, ‘Requisite cloth means: this [taking formal possession of as requisite cloth is] a distinct one, mainly [serving] the storage, [thus] it is allowed to use the set of three robes, having taken formal possession of them as requisite cloth. In the storehouse rule (Niss 2 Mk), however, the protection is taught for him, who, having taken formal possession of as the set of three robes, preserves [the robes].’”

143Mori 1989, p. 67 (129), no. 90.

144Sp III 644.10-17: ubhato-Vibhangabhāṇako puṇṇavālikavāsī Mahātissa-thero pi kira āha: “mayaṃ pubbe mahātherānaṃ assumha ‘aruhāvāsino bhikkhū rukkhasasirādīsu civaṇaṃ ṣapetvā padhānasu padahanathāya gacchanti, sāmanantihāre dhammasavanathāya gatānāci ca nesaṃ sûriye upāhīte sāmaṇerā vā dahanabhikkhū vā pattacivaṇaṃ gahetvā gacchanti, tasmā sukhaparibhogaṭṭhāṃ ticivaram parikkhāracoḷan ti adhiṭṭhātāṃ vaṭṭati” ti. “Even the reciter of the two Vibhangas, the inhabitant of Puṇṇavālikā, Thera Mahātissa, as is well known, says, ‘We have heard from the mahātheras in earlier times that the monks living in the forest, having deposited a robe in a hollow of a tree, etc., in order to exert [meditation] went to [the place for] exertion, and that, when the sun arose, the novices and young monks of these mahātheras who had gone [there], having taken robe and bowl, went to a neighbouring monastery in order to hear the dhamma.
monks. The Mahāpaccāriārī argues that forest monks had practised the taking formal possession of the ticīvara as a parikkhāracola, because within an undetermined monastic boundary (abaddhasimā), as is the case in a forest, there is no good protection for the set of the three robes. Since the Mahāpaccāriārī dates from around the first century B.C., if not earlier, it provides an impressive testimony to the practice of taking formal possession of the set of three robes as a requisite cloth.

This is corroborated by the Samantapāsādikā, which quotes the Mahāpaccāriārī as the final authority on this issue, as well as by the Kānkhāvitaranī and Vajirabuddhi’s Anuṅṭhīpadā. The Anu-

Therefore, it is allowed for the ease of use to take formal possession of the set of three robes as requisite cloth.”

143Sp III 644.17-20: Mahāpaccariyam pi vuttaṃ “pubbe āraṇīkā bhikkhā abaddhasimāyaṃ dupparihārān ti ticīvaraṃ parikkhāracolaṃ eva adhiṭṭhatāvā pariḥpuṭjīṃsā” ti. “Even in the Mahāpaccāriārī it is said, ‘In earlier times the forest monks used the set of three robes having taken formal possession of [them] only as requisite cloth, [owing to the fact] that in an undetermined [monastic] boundary [there exists] poor protection [regarding the three robes].’”

The monastic boundary consisting in seven abhantara (sattabhantara-simā), which is the type of boundary (simā) valid in a forest, does not in fact have the function of protecting monks from being separated from the three robes (Sp V 1052.11). Since, however, this boundary comes into being only for a legal procedure, for the remaining time the robe rules for the forest are valid. Thus, a monk in the forest may not be more than seven abhantara distant from his robes (cf. Kieffer-Pülz 1992, B 15.2.3).

144See above n. 99.

145Kkh 95.11-12: idaṃ ca pana ticīvaraṃ sukhapariḥgattham parikkhāracolaṃ adhiṭṭhatāṃ pi vuttaṃ. “And this set of three robes may even be taken formal possession of as a requisite cloth for easy usage.” From the point of view of content this statement reproduces parts of the opinion of Thera Mahātissa; see above n. 144.

146Jīv 223.15-17 = Pāli-mṇ 93.27-94.1: paṭhamāṃ ticīvaraṃ ticīvarādiṭṭhānena adhiṭṭhatābbaṃ, puna pariḥharitum asakkoṭena paccuddharitvā parikkhāracolaṃ adhiṭṭhatābbaṃ, na tu eva ādito va idaṃ vuttaṃ ti vuttaṃ. “First, the set of three robes is to be taken formal possession of by [means of] the taking formal possession of as a set of three robes; by one not capable of preserving [them], they, after having been given up formally, should again
ganṭhipada recommends that a monk unable to keep up the robes he has taken formal possession of as three robes should formally give them up (paccuddharai) and then take formal possession of them as parikkhāracola in order to avoid a transgression of Niss 2 Mk, which forbids a monk to part with one of his robes even for one night after the kāṇhina period has been closed, except with the approval of the monks. In case the set of three robes has not been taken formal possession of as such, the rules for the ticīvara do not apply to them.

The evidence of the Anuṅṭhipada also shows that this rule represents a later development, albeit of a considerable age. The Vajirabuddhi-tikā’s lengthy pronouncements on this practice¹⁴⁰ are intended to show that, although it does not belong to the earliest rules, it would have been decided in exactly the same way by the Buddha and that it could very well have been initiated by him. The practice was very common in later times, as we can see from texts on monastic law dating from the twelfth to seventeenth centuries.¹⁵⁰

Thus taking formal possession of a set of three robes as a parikkhāracola was, and probably still is, an acceptable way of circumventing the strict and complex rules applying to the ticīvara.

Even outside the *kaṭhana* period, this practice enables a monk to travel with fewer than three robes, it allows him to own more than just one set of three robes, and it protects him from transgressing the rules applying to the *tiṅvara*. This practice has met with general acceptance, except by the early Thera Mahāpaduma, and it prepared the way for the legal possession of multiple sets of three robes — which nowadays seems to be the regular case in most instances.

These two examples should afford a glimpse of the methods used in Theravāda legal literature for adapting the largely fixed rules of Buddhist law to changing circumstances or wishes. Though there may exist still further forms of adaptation, it can safely be said that the first of the two methods dealt with here is the most common and widespread in the legal texts.

Petra Kieffer-Pülz
Weimar
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Treatise. A Treatise on Monastic Boundaries by King Rāma IV of Siam, ed. by Petra Kieffer-Pülz, (in press)

The Susima-sutta and the Wisdom-Liberated Arahant

The Susima-sutta, a short discourse of the Samyutta-nikāya, uses a dramatic plot to shine a spotlight on a doctrinal topic that must have been of vital interest to the ancient Saṅgha as it classified persons with respect to their meditative expertise and paths of attainment.¹ The topic is the nature of the paññāvimutta arahant, the person who attains liberation through the special efficacy of wisdom without reaching extraordinary distinction in the sphere of samādhi or concentration. The Susima-sutta merits special consideration because the Pāli version has three parallels preserved in Chinese translation, and thus a comparison of the Pāli discourse with its Chinese counterparts permits us to see how, even in an early stage of textual transmission, the Buddhist schools were already in subtle ways contemplating different solutions to the doctrinal problem raised by the sutta. For ease of reference, I will designate the Pāli version S 12:70. Among the Chinese versions, one is found in the Vinaya of the Mahāsāṅghika school, which I will refer to as M-Vin.² Another version is sutta no. 347 in the Saṃyukta-āgama, commonly understood to be the Sarvāstivāda (or perhaps Mūla-sarvāstivāda) counterpart to the Saṃyutta-nikāya.³ I will call this version SĀ 347. The other is an incomplete citation in the Abhidharma-

¹S 12:70; II 119–28.
²T22, 362b25–363b26. In my discussion, when I translate terms used in the Chinese texts into their Indic equivalents, for the sake of consistency I will generally use the Pāli counterparts, even though these texts may have been translated from Sanskrit or Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit originals. For the same reason, I will refer to all versions of the basic text as a sutta rather than use sutta for the Pāli version and sūtra for non-Pāli versions.

vibhāṣa-śāstra.\footnote{There are actually two parallel treatises that cite this version, with slight differences between them. The one I mostly draw upon is Abhidharma-vibhāṣa-śāstra (no. 1546), which cites it at T28, 407c26–408b11. The larger version of this treatise, Abhidharma-mahāvibhāṣa-śāstra (no. 1545), cites it at T27, 572b16–572c27. It is an open question whether this version is actually a *sutta* with canonical or quasi-canonical status; it may be, rather, merely the treatise’s paraphrase of a *sutta*. For the sake of convenience, however, I will refer to it as if it were another version of the *sutta*.} This citation terminates before we reach the end of the *sutta*, but it covers most of the points relevant to our study. This version will be referred to as Vibhāṣā.

In this paper I will use S 12:70 as the primary basis for my discussion and bring in the others later for purposes of comparison. I will first present a summary of the “plot”. Then I will explore the theme of the “arāhant liberated by wisdom” based on the primary text, followed by a discussion of its treatment in the several Chinese versions of the *sutta*. At some later time, I hope to write a sequel to this paper to explore the different versions of the second part of the discourse, which deals with the two knowledges contributing to the status of one liberated by wisdom.

1. The Plot

The *sutta* opens with the Buddha dwelling in the Bamboo Grove at Rājagaha. At the time, he is respected and honored by the laity and amply provided with all the requisites, as is the Bhikkhu Sangha. Because of the Buddha’s rise to fame, the fortunes of the “wanderers of other sects” have steeply declined. The wanderers resident at Rājagaha therefore decide to assign a crucial mission to one of their members named Susima. He is to go forth under “the Ascetic Gotama”, master his doctrine, and then return and teach it to his own community. They assume that the Buddha’s doctrine is the key to his success, and so, they suppose, once they have learned his Dhamma and can teach it to the lay folk, they will regain the support that they have lost to the Sakyen sage.

Susima agrees and heads off towards the Bamboo Grove. At the
entrance he meets the monk Ānanda and tells him he wants to lead the spiritual life under the Buddha. Ānanda brings Susimā to the Buddha, who tells Ānanda to ordain him. Shortly thereafter, in the Buddha’s presence, a number of monks declare final knowledge (ānāna), that is, arahantship, announcing, “We understand: Birth is finished, the holy life has been lived, what had to be done has been done, there is no more coming back to any state of being.”6 Susimā hears about this and approaches the monks to ask whether this report is true. When they confirm it, he asks them whether they have attained the five mundane types of super-knowledge: the modes of spiritual power, the divine ear, the ability to read the minds of others, the recollection of past lives, and the divine eye which sees how beings pass away and take rebirth in accordance with their kammas.7 In each case, the monks deny possessing these super-knowledges. Then Susimā asks them whether they dwell in the “peaceful emancipations, transcending forms, formless, having contacted them with the body”.8 Again, they answer no. Now Susimā is puzzled. He tells the monks that he cannot understand how they could declare arahantship yet deny that they attain these superhuman states. They reply, “We are liberated by wisdom, friend Susimā.”9

This answer does not satisfy Susimā, but when he asks them to elucidate they only repeat the same words, “Whether or not you understand, we are liberated by wisdom.” So Susimā goes to the Buddha in

---

6 In all three Chinese versions, it is not Ānanda that he meets but a group of monks. In Sā 347 and Vibhāṣa, the monks bring him to the Buddha, who tells them to ordain him. In M-Vin, the monks tell Susimā that, as a convert from another sect, he must live on probation for four months, and then, if the Sangha approves, they will give him the ordination.

7 S II 120,30–32: khaṇḍa jāti vusitaṃ brahmacariyaṃ kataṃ karaṇīyaṃ nāparaṃ iṭṭhatāyāti pujānāma.

8 S II 121–23. Briefly, in Pāli: (1) iddhividha, (2) dībbasotadhātu, (3) cetopariyāhāṇa, (4) pūbbenaṅgānusatiyāṇa, (5) yathākammamucchāpāḥāṇa.

9 S II 123,15–16: ye te santā vimokkhā atikkamma rūpe āruppā te kāyena phusitvā viharatha.

9 S II 123,26: paññāvimutthā kho mayaṃ, avuso Susimā.
quest of clarification and reports to him the entire conversation he had with the monks. The Buddha too replies with an enigmatic one-sentence answer, “First, Susima, there is knowledge of the persistence of principles; afterwards, knowledge of nibbāna.”

Susima asks the Buddha to explain this concise statement in detail, but the Buddha first responds simply by repeating his reply, “Whether or not you understand, Susima, first there is knowledge of the persistence of principles; afterwards, knowledge of nibbāna.” However, he then tries to guide Susima to an understanding of his words. He first leads him through the catechism on the three characteristics — impermanence, suffering, and non-self — in relation to the five aggregates, exactly as we find it in the second “argument” of the well-known Anattalakkhaṇa-sutta, the Discourse on the Characteristic of Non-Self (S 22:59). This culminates in the noble disciple becoming disenchanted with the five aggregates; through disenchantment, he becomes dispassionate; and through dispassion, his mind is liberated. With liberation comes the knowledge of liberation and he understands: “Birth is finished … there is no more coming back to any state of being.”

The Buddha next takes Susima through a catechism on dependent origination (paṭicca-samuppāda), first with respect to arising: beginning with “aging-and-death have birth as condition” and ending with “volitional activities have ignorance as condition”; and then with respect to cessation, starting from “aging-and-death cease with the cessation of birth” and ending with “volitional activities cease with the cessation of ignorance”. At this point the Buddha asks Susima whether “knowing and seeing thus” (evan jānanto evan passanto), he exercises the five super-knowledges or attains the peaceful formless emanipations. When Susima says no, the Buddha asks him how he could answer as he did while being unable to attain these states. The Buddha’s use of the word “answer” (veyyākaraṇa) apparently refers back to his agreeing

---

10 S II 124.10-11: pubbe kho Susima dhammaṭṭhitthānaṃ, pacchā nibbāne ḫānaṃ.
11 S III 67.22–68.25.
that he “knows and sees” each of the points the Buddha asked him about in the chain of dependent origination.

Susima does not reply to the Buddha’s question. Instead, he prostrates himself at the Buddha’s feet, confesses that he entered the Buddhist order with thievish intent, and asks the Blessed One to pardon him for this offence. The Buddha then tells him that he was indeed foolish to have contemplated such a dangerous course of action. To underscore the danger he relates a simile about a criminal who is arrested by the king and beheaded to the south of the city. The consequences of “going forth as a thief in the well-expounded Dhamma and Discipline”, the Buddha says, are far graver than the punishment suffered by the criminal; but since Susima sees his transgression for what it is, he pardons him for the sake of his future restraint.

2. The One Liberated by Wisdom

In S 12:70, as we have just seen, when Susima questions the monks about their attainments, he asks about the five mundane super-knowledges and the peaceful formless emancipations, and it is these that the monks deny possessing. It is intriguing that Susima’s questions do not pry into any attainments that the monks might possess below the level of the formless emancipations. I assume that, whatever might have been the historical basis for the origination of this sutta, the actual dialogue, particularly in the first part, is partly the work of the compilers of the texts. Once this assumption is granted, we may infer that the compilers of the sutta had compelling doctrinal reasons for drawing the cut-off point at the formless emancipations. For them to permit Susima to ask the monks whether or not they had attained the jhānas, and then to have the monks give negative answers to these questions, would have been to directly contradict time-hallowed discourses and doctrinal formulae. It seems to me that the compilers of this sutta wish to insinuate that the monks were actually not attainers of the jhānas, that they subtly want to introduce into the canon the idea of the arahant who lacks these distinguished states of concentration. At the same time,
however, they did not want to force an ambiguity that was hovering over the notion of the “wisdom-liberated arahant” to become resolved too starkly in black-and-white terms. Hence they allowed the ambiguity to linger in the canonical text while they resolved the issue in its commentary, which in the earliest period must have been a teacher’s oral explanation accompanying the sutta.

The Nikāyas distinguish among different classes of arahants, using as the basis for the distinctions the attainments they possess ancillary to their attainment of arahantship. In descending order, some arahants possess the six “direct knowledges” (cetanābhāyaññā); some have the three “higher knowledges” (tevijja); some are “liberated in both ways” (ubhatobhāgavimutta); and some are “liberated by wisdom” (paññāvimutta).\textsuperscript{12} The main distinction that the Nikāyas draw is between those arahants “liberated in both ways” and those “liberated by wisdom”. In the Kīṭāgiri-sutta (M 70), the arahant liberated in both ways is defined as one who “contacts with the body and dwells in those peaceful emancipations, transcending forms, that are formless, and whose influxes are exhausted by his seeing with wisdom”.\textsuperscript{13} The arahant liberated by wisdom, in contrast, is one who “does not contact with the body and dwell in those peaceful emancipations, transcending forms, that are formless, but whose influxes are exhausted by his seeing with wisdom”.\textsuperscript{14} Questions can be raised about the exact meaning and extension of these definitions: for example, to what degree must an arahant possess the formless emancipations to qualify as “both-ways-

\textsuperscript{12}See S I 191 (S 8:7). The six direct knowledges are the five mundane super-knowledges enumerated above (see pp. 52–53) plus the knowledge of the exhaustion of the influxes (āsavakkhayahāna). The three higher knowledges are the knowledge of the recollection of past lives, the knowledge of the passing away and rebirth of beings, and the knowledge of the exhaustion of the influxes.

\textsuperscript{13}M I 477,26–28: ekacco puggalo ye te santā vimokkhā atikkammaṁ rūpe āruppā te kāyena phusitvā viharati paññāya c’assā disvā āsavā parikkhīṇa honti.

\textsuperscript{14}M I 477,33–36: ekacco puggalo ye te santā vimokkhā atikkammaṁ rūpe āruppā te na kāyena phusitvā viharati paññāya c’assā disvā āsavā parikkhīṇa honti.
liberated”? The Puggalapaññatti Commentary maintains that those who attain the formless attainments but do not gain the attainment of cessation (nirodhasamāpatti) are called “liberated in both ways” only in a figurative sense (pariyāyena), while those who gain the eight attainments (the four jhānas and the four formless attainments) as well as the attainment of cessation are called “the best of those liberated in both ways in the literal sense”.15 This same commentary, however, then concedes that an arahant who attains just one among the formless-sphere jhānas can still be called “liberated in both ways”.16

The arahant liberated by wisdom, it is clear, has the fourth jhāna as the upper limit of achievement on the scale of concentration; for some reason, not explained in the suttas, an arahant of this type does not proceed further to attain the formless emancipations. The more interesting question, however, concerns the minimal attainment in concentration possessed by an arahant liberated by wisdom. A number of standard texts define the concentration included in several groups among the thirty-seven “aids to enlightenment” (bodhipakkhiyā dharmā) as the four jhānas. In particular, we find the faculty of concentration (sāmadhindriyā) among the five faculties and the right concentration factor (saṁmā samādhi) of the noble eightfold path both defined as the four jhānas.17 The four jhānas also enter into the standard description of the progressive training of the monk, preceding the attainment of the higher knowledges,18 and into the threefold higher training, where they serve as the training in the higher mind (adhicittasikkhā).19 If we rely upon these texts, taking them literally, it would follow that any monk liberated by wisdom must have attained all four jhānas.

15Pp-a 191. nippariyāyena ubhatobhāgavinuttasseṭṭho.
16Pp-a 191. ariyavacarajjhānesu pana ekasmiṁ sati ubhatobhāgavinutto yeva nāma hoṭi.
17SV 196.18–19, 198.24–32; D2 313.12–25; SV 10.5–18.
18E.g., at D1 73–76; MI 181–82, 276–78, etc.
Such a conclusion, however, would be extreme, for other texts equally authoritative recognize the possibility of attaining arahantship on the basis of any jhāna. For example, the Jhāna-sutta (A 9:36) explains that one can gain any one of the four jhānas or lower three formless attainments and then contemplate its constituents in eleven ways: as impermanent, suffering, illness, a boil, an arrow, misery, affliction, alien, disintegrating, empty, and non-self.20 If one is firm in such insight, the text asserts, one will attain the exhaustion of the influxes, that is, arahantship; if one retains a subtle attachment to this experience, one will emerge as a non-returner. Again, in the Aṭṭhakatā-sutta (M 52), Ānanda explains how it is possible to attain the exhaustion of the influxes through any of eleven “doors to the deathless”.21 One enters any of the four jhānas, the four divine abodes, or the lower three formless attainments and contemplates it as conditioned and constructed by volition. One then sees that anything conditioned and constructed by volition is impermanent and subject to cessation. This would imply that the texts that define the faculty of concentration, the right concentration of the noble path, and the training in the higher mind as the four jhānas should not be taken literally as meaning that all four jhānas are needed to reach liberation; rather, they mean that to attain the final goal as a wisdom-liberated arahant, one should be able to gain at least one jhāna as a basis for insight.

We might, however, ask whether even this much is indispensable. In raising this question, we are pushing our line of inquiry further than Susima dared to go in his conversation with the monks. Yet, in view of the direction meditation theory has taken in the mainstream Buddhist traditions, as we shall see, it is precisely this question that should pique our curiosity. Now, if we read certain suttas at their face value it would seem that the first jhāna is a minimum requirement for the attainment of even the third fruition, the stage of non-returner. A text that lends strong

20A IV 422–26. The commentary explains that the fourth formless attainment is too subtle to be contemplated with insight.
21M I 349–52.
support to this claim is the Mahāmālunākyā-sutta (M 64), where the Buddha declares, “There is, Ānanda, a path to the abandoning of the five lower fetters; that anyone, without relying on that path, shall know or see or abandon the five lower fetters, this is impossible.” As the *sutta* unfolds, the “path to the abandoning of the five lower fetters” is then shown to be the same course of practice described just above in the Jhāna-sutta. One enters any of the four jhānas or three lower formless attainments, and then contemplates its constituents from the same eleven angles. If one can remain firm in this contemplation, one exhausts the influxes and reaches arahantship; if there is still a remnant of attachment, one cuts off the five lower fetters and becomes a non-returner.

If the above words — “that anyone, without relying on that path, shall know or see or abandon the five lower fetters, this is impossible” — are taken as categorical, there is indeed no possibility at all that an arahant liberated by wisdom can be destitute of the first jhāna. It will not suffice, either, to appeal to the Abhidhamma distinction between form-sphere (rāpāvacara) and supramundane (lokuttara) jhānas and then hold that while some arahants liberated by wisdom might be destitute of mundane jhānas, they will still possess at least the first supramundane jhāna. This claim could not be accepted in a discussion based solely on the *suttas*, for the distinction between form-sphere and supramundane jhānas is never explicitly drawn in the *suttas* nor is it even discernible in them. If our analysis is to apply to the understanding of meditative attainments characteristic of the *suttas*, it must use concepts intrinsic to the *suttas* themselves and not draw upon modes

---

22M 1434.25–28: yo, Ānanda, maggo yā paṭipada pañcannaṃ orambhāgiyānaṃ saṃyojanānaṃ paḥāṇāya taṃ maggaṃ taṃ paṭipadaṃ anāgama pañcorambhāgiyāni saṃyojanāni hassati vā dakkhaṭi vā pahajissati vā ti n’ etam’ thānaṃ vijjati.

23One possible exception to this is the Mahācattārisaka-sutta (M 117), which, however, in the form it has come down, seems to be the reworking of an archaic version under the influence of later ideas typical of the incipient Abhidhamma.
of analysis derived from a later phase of Theravāda Buddhist thought.

Although the words of the Mahāmālāṇkyasutta quoted above might seem to rule out the possibility that those destitute of jhāna can achieve arahantship, several texts scattered across the Nikāyas hint that this conclusion would be a bit stern. We should remember that, while the suttas are remarkably consistent with each other, they are not rigidly so, and one can often find in some texts exceptions made to principles apparently laid down as categorical in other texts. One discourse relevant to our present discussion, the Asubha-sutta (A 4:163), speaks about four modes of practice: two painful, with sluggish and quick realization, and two pleasant, again with sluggish and quick realization. The mode of practice that is painful, with sluggish realization, is described thus:

Here, a monk dwells contemplating the unattractiveness of the body, perceiving the repulsiveness of food, perceiving non-delight in the entire world, contemplating impermanence in all formations; and he has the perception of death well established internally. He dwells depending upon these five trainee powers: the powers of faith, moral shame, moral dread, energy, and wisdom. These five faculties are manifest in him as weak: the faculties of faith, energy, mindfulness, concentration, and wisdom. Because these five faculties are weak, he sluggishly attains the immediacy condition for the exhaustion of the influxes. This is called practice that is painful with sluggish realization.24

What makes this meditator’s mode of practice “painful” (dukkha-patipadā) is the use of meditation subjects that focus upon the repulsive, fearful aspects of human life, subjects that engender a mood of disenchantment rather than of blissful absorption. It is true that the definition ascribes to this practitioner the five faculties, among them the faculty of concentration, sometimes defined by the jhāna formula. It is likely, however, that this practitioner has merely a facile acquaintance with jhāna or even none at all; for the meditation subjects he uses are taken up, not so much because they are conducive to the jhānas, but

24A II 150.32–51.5.
because they lead to disenchantedment and detachment. In contrast, the practitioner who takes the route described as “pleasant” (sukhapati paddā) is defined precisely as one who acquires the four jhānas. For the contrast to be meaningful, one would have to conclude either that the meditator on the “painful” path has no experience of jhāna or that he assigns jhāna to a subordinate place in his practice. It could even be that an alternative definition of the faculty of concentration found in the Indriya-samyutta is intended precisely for such kinds of practitioners. This alternative definition defines the faculty of concentration, not as the four jhānas, but as “the concentration or one-pointedness of mind that arises having made release the object.”

A similar contrast is drawn at A 4:169 between those persons who attain nibbāna through strenuous practice (sasankhāraparinibbāyi) and those who attain it through non-strenuous practice (asankhāraparini nibbāyi). The strenuous practice is explained by way of the five contemplations that constitute the painful path: the unattractiveness of the body, the repulsiveness of food, perceiving non-delight in the world, contemplating impermanence in all formations, and mindfulness of death. The non-strenuous practice, for those fortunate ones, is nothing other than the four jhānas. Again, a string of suttas in the Āguttara-nikāya says of these five contemplations: (i) that they lead to complete disenchantedment, dispassion, cessation, peace, direct knowledge, enlightenment, and nibbāna; (ii) that they lead to the exhaustion of the influxes; and (iii) that they have liberation of mind and liberation by

---

25 It is true that Vism 265–66 explains how the meditation on bodily foulness can give rise to the first jhāna, but the main emphasis of this meditation is on the removal of sensual lust, not on mental absorption.

26 Sn V 197.14–17, 198.23–24: ariyasāvako vossaggārammaṇaṃ karitvā labhati samādhiṃ labhati cittassa ekaggatam, idam vucahi bhikkhave samādhī’-indriyaṃ.

27 A II 155–56.
The Nikāyas never go so far as to say that those who choose such meditation subjects as their vehicle of practice lack attainment of jhāna; and accordingly, when questioning the monks who claim to be arahants liberated by wisdom, Susima does not pursue his inquiry below the level of “the peaceful formless emancipations” and ask whether or not they attained the jhānas. The issue is left daintily alone, as though it were too sensitive to be touched upon. Perhaps the stock definition of the path factor of right concentration in terms of the four jhānas, and the role of the jhānas in the standard description of the gradual training of the monk, occupied niches too hallowed within the canonical collection for the Theravāda tradition to ever consider altering the received heritage of suttas in a way that might explicitly state such attainments are dispensable. Yet it is among those who use such subjects of meditation as the unattractiveness of the body, mindfulness of death, disenchantment with the world, and the impermanence of all formations as their preferred vehicle that one might expect to find arahants liberated by wisdom; and because practitioners of these meditations are contrasted with those who take the “pleasant” route of the four jhānas, it is among the former that one might expect to find, by implication, those who either attain jhāna with difficulty or opt instead for a mode of practice that draws its primary strength from wisdom built upon the minimum degree of serenity (samaṅga) needed to reach the destruction of the defilements.

3. The Sukkhabhāja Sutta: Arahant and the Susima-sutta

In my reading of the Susima-sutta, the redactors of the text want to suggest that the paññāvimutta arahants are in fact destitute of jhāna attainments, but they dare not say this directly. That is why the questions are not asked. The absence of the questions accomplishes two

---

28A III 83–84 (A 5:69–71). What is referred to here is no doubt the influx-free liberation of mind and liberation by wisdom (anāsavā cetovimutti paññā-vimutti) constituting arahantship.
things. It avoids the need to draw forth answers that would contradict orthodox doctrine, which upheld the secure place of jhāna in the structure of the Buddhist path; and it deftly hints that these monks did not have the jhānas. If the intention of the sutta were otherwise, Susima could have asked about the jhānas, and the monks could have said, “Some of us attain one jhāna, some attain two, some attain three, and some attain all four.” But by passing over this issue in silence, they discreetly imply that they do not attain the jhānas at all.

Where the redactors of suttas fear to tread, commentators step in boldly. It is in the commentaries (including the Visuddhimagga) that we first find explicit mention of the sukkhāvipassaka or “dry-insight” meditator, often in connection with passages that mention the paññāvimutta or “wisdom-liberated” arahant. The dry-insight meditator is defined as “one whose insight is dry, arid, because such insight is unmoistened by the moisture of the jhānas”. Thus upon reaching arahantship, such a practitioner becomes, of necessity, a wisdom-liberated arahant. It must be borne in mind, however, that while the dry-insight arahant is closely linked to the old canonical concept of the wisdom-liberated arahant, a flat identity should not be drawn between the two. Rather, the dry-insight arahant is technically only one subclass within the broad class of wisdom-liberated arahants. The commentaries consistently state, “The arahant liberated by wisdom is fivefold: the dry-insight meditator together with those who attain arahantship after emerging from any one among the four jhānas.” Thus the wisdom-liberated arahants can also be those who attain the four jhānas. The only attainments they do not achieve are the peaceful formless emancipations, experience of which defines an arahant as “one liberated in both ways”.

---

29Vism-mh 11.446 (VRI ed.): so hi jhānasinehena vipassanāya asiniddha-bhāvato sukkhā lākhā vipassanā etassāti sukkhāvipassako ti vuccati.

30Sv III 889: so sukkhāvipassako ca, catūhi jhānehī vaṭṭhāyā arahattaṃ pattā catāro cāti imaṃ vasena pañcavidho va hoti. See too Ps III 188; Mp IV 3; Pp-a I 191.
We might also note that even if the Nikāyas did envisage the possibility of an arahant liberated by wisdom who does not attain the jhānas, this would not mean that such a figure fulfilled the distinctive criteria of the commentarial sukkhavipassaka arahant. For, as the name suggests, the sukkhavipassaka is one who gives special emphasis to vipassanā or insight meditation; the commentaries and subcommentaries in fact often speak of this meditator, prior to attaining arahantship, as the vipassanāyānikā, “one who makes insight the vehicle”, or even as the suddhavipassanāyānikā, “one who makes bare insight the vehicle”. These designations imply that at some point in the evolution of Theravāda meditation theory, the practice of vipassanā came to be regarded virtually as an autonomous means to realization that could be undertaken quite independently of any supporting base of samatha. It is quite conceivable that if the Nikāyas did see, even tacitly, the possibility of wisdom-liberated arahants destitute of jhāna, they still would have assumed these arahants had a minimal foundation of samatha. For such arahants, it would just be the case that their practice of samatha did not reach the level of the first jhāna.

Now while the concept of the dry-insight arahant is first introduced in the commentaries, as often happens the commentators peer back into the suttas to seek substantiation for their hermeneutical innovations. And, sure enough, “seek and ye shall find”. Not to be left empty-handed, the commentators find evidence for the dry-insight arahant in several texts of the Nikāyas, and one of these that is given star billing is the Susima-sutta. The Susima-sutta itself, as we saw, does not specify where the monks liberated by wisdom stood in relation to the jhānas. For all we know, based on the text alone, they could have been adepts in all four jhānas. The commentary, however, apparently drawing upon ancient oral tradition, fills in the gaps in the information we can derive from the sutta itself with additional information apparently transmitted in the lineage of teachers. Thus in the sutta, in reply to Susima’s

---

31See Vism-mht II 351, 438, 474 (VRI ed.).
question, “Without the super-knowledges and formless attainments, how can you claim to be arahants?” the monks reply, “We are liberated by wisdom.” In glossing these words, the commentary tersely says, “Liberated by wisdom: ‘We are without jhāna, dry-insight meditators liberated simply by wisdom only.’” Later, when interpreting the Buddha’s exchange with Susima, the commentary says in regard to a statement of the Buddha, “The purpose is to show the arising of knowledge thus, even without concentration. This is meant: ‘Susima, the path or fruit is not the outcome, benefit, and product of concentration, but the outcome, benefit, and product of insight.’” And the ūkā or subcommentary to this passage, commenting on the words “even without concentration” says, “This is said referring to the meditator who makes insight the vehicle; it means even without previously achieved concentration that has reached the mark of serenity.”

4. The Chinese Parallels to the Susima-sutta

At this point it will be illuminating to turn to the parallels to S 12:70 preserved in Chinese translation. In M-Vin, Susima inquires from the monks, not about all five super-knowledges, but only about the divine eye that sees how beings pass away and take rebirth according to their kamma, and about the recollection of past lives — the last two of these super-knowledges, given here in inverse order from S 12:70 — as well as about the peaceful formless emancipations. As in S 12:70, the monks deny possessing these attainments. When Susima asks them how they could declare final knowledge in the Buddha’s presence, they

32Spk II 127: paññāvinuttā kho mayañ, āvuso ti, āvuso, mayañ nijjhānakā sukkhavipassakā paññāmattā’ eva viduttā ti dasseti.
33Spk II 127: vinā pi samādhin evaṃ hānappattidassanatthaṃ, idaṃ hi vuttaṃ hoti: Susima, mañgo vā phalam vā na samādhinissando, na samādhī-ānisamso, na samādhissa nipphatti; vipassanāya pan’ eso nissando, vipassanāya ānisamso, vipassanāya nipphatti.
34Spk-pit II 107 (VR1 ed.): vinā pi samādhin ti samathalakkhavappataṃ purinasiddhaṃ vinā pi samādhin ti vipassanāyāniṣakaḥ sandhāya vuttaṃ.
reply, “We are wisdom-liberated ones.” Thus M-Vin is fairly close to S 12:70. It is virtually impossible to judge which is likely to be more original, the five super-knowledges of S 12:70 or the two mentioned in M-Vin. The twofold scheme has the advantage of economy, and greater detail usually suggests lateness; but if the *sutta* originates from a real historical incident, it could well have been that the wanderers suspected the Buddhist monks to be adepts in the spiritual powers and mind-reading, the first and third super-knowledges, which ostentatious ascetics would be most likely to use to impress gullible lay devotees (particularly in a royal capital like Rājagaha). This would then better explain Susīma’s skepticism that there could be wisdom-liberated arahants who lack such powers.

It is with SĀ 347 and the Vibhāṣā version that the divergences from S 12:70 become significant, for these versions straight away transform the monks into Sarvāstivādin counterparts of the Pāli commentarial dry-insight arahants. Though these versions do not have a neat appellation for this figure, it is evident that the text here wants the expression “wisdom-liberated one” (慧解脱) to convey very much the same idea that the expression *paññāvimutta* as used in the Susīma-sutta conveys for the Samyutta Commentary: one liberated without *jhāna* (*ni-jjhānaka*), entirely through wisdom. As in S 12:70 and M-Vin, so here Susīma enters the Saṅgha for the purpose of “stealing” the Dhamma. He is ordained at the Enlightened One’s behest, but here it is stated that the Buddha already knew his intention in going forth. A fortnight after his ordination, one monk, at the head of a group of monks, tells him he should be aware that they have all won the goal. Susīma then asks him whether he has attained the first, second, third, or fourth *jhānas*, or the peaceful formless emancipations; and, he adds to each question, “by the

\[35\text{T22, 36}3\text{a14: 我是慧解脱人。}

\[36\text{See the Buddha’s explanation of the dangers in “the miracle of spiritual}
\text{powers” (ādhipāṭhārīya) and “the miracle of thought-reading” (ādesanā-
pāṭihārīya) at D I 212–14.}
non-arising of any influxes is your mind well liberated?" In each case, the monk answers no, the purport being that they have exhausted the influxes and gained full liberation of mind without relying on any jhānas or formless attainments. Finally Susima exclaims, "How could this be? What you have said is inconsistent; your later [words] contradict your earlier [words]. How is it that you don’t attain jhāna, yet you make a declaration [of arahantship]?" The monk then says, "I am liberated by wisdom."

Thereupon the whole group of monks depart. Realizing that he now needs clarification, Susima decides to seek help from the Buddha.

The Vibhāṣa version of the sutta is evidently later than the others, at least in its final redaction, for it speaks of Susima, after taking full ordination, as "having read and recited the Tripitaka", a phrase that refers anachronistically to the classification of the sacred scriptures into the "three baskets", perhaps even in written form. In this version, Susima asks the monks, "Was it on the basis of the first jhāna that you attained the exhaustion of the influxes?" They answer no. Then: "Was it on the basis of the second, third, or fourth jhānas, or the peaceful formless emancipations that you attained the exhaustion of the influxes?" They answer no. Susima then says, "Then without depending on any jhāna you attained the exhaustion of the influxes! Who can believe that?" The monks then say, "We are liberated by wisdom."
Then, as in the other versions, Susīma turns to the Buddha for help. The Buddha explains, “Those monks first exhausted the influxes based on the access to the jhāna, and afterwards aroused the basic jhāna.”

Though SĀ 347 and Vibhāṣā differ in details, they are both regarded as affiliated in some way with the Sarvāstivāda, which must have been, not one unified entity, but an umbrella term for a range of schools with collections of texts that showed considerable variation, perhaps stemming from wide geographical distribution and long duration through time. Since the Sarvāstivāda and the Theravāda are widely recognized to be two branches of the old Sthaviravāda, and the first major schism in the archaic Saṅgha resulted in its bifurcation into the Sthaviravāda and the Mahāsāṅghika, when the readings in one Sthaviravāda version and a Mahāsāṅghika version of a text agree and the reading in another Sthaviravāda version diverges, it is likely that the latter results from a later alteration or transmutation in the text. Of course, we cannot always be absolutely certain that this is so, but the above stipulation is generally a safe guideline to follow, and in the case of SĀ 347 and Vibhāṣā, quite apart from the passages with doctrinal ramifications, a number of other “fingerprints” suggest that these versions are less archaic than S 12:70 and M-Vin. One example is a certain flair for detail in SĀ 347; another is the reference to the Tripiṭaka in Vibhāṣā.

\[T27, 572c16–17,\] Susīma asks the monks: “Was it on the basis of the first jhāna up to the base of nothingness that the venerable ones attained realization?” (仁等所 證依何定耶。為初靜慮為乃至 無所有 處耶) And to this they answer no.

\[41T 28, 408b9-10;\] 彼諸比丘。先依未至靜慮。後起根本靜。The “access to the jhāna” (未至靜, lit. “not-yet reaching jhāna”) is presumably a state similar to upacāra-samādhi, the access concentration of the Pāli commentaries. This Vibhāṣā passage does not altogether deny that these arahants can possess jhāna, but the jhāna it allows them seems to correspond to the minimal first lokuttara-jhāna that the Pāli commentaries ascribe to the sukkhavipassaka arahants.
5. Assessment

SĀ 347 and Vibhāṣa thus present us with an interesting case where the Sarvāstivāda recensions of a sutta give utterance to an idea that is not found in the Theravāda version but was not unknown to the Theravāda tradition, namely, the idea of an arahant who has reached final liberation without attainment of the jhānas. In the Theravāda tradition, however, this idea came to open expression only in the commentaries, with the concept of the sukkhavipassaka or dry-insight arahant. This idea must have gained such prestige that it presented itself, either to the ancient anonymous authors of the lost Sinhala commentaries, or to Ācārya Buddhaghosa, the compiler of the present Pāli commentaries, as the key to understanding the paññāvimutta arahants of the Susima-sutta. In this way, the sukkhavipassaka arahant, though hidden behind the text of the Susima-sutta itself, found a secure lodging in its commentary.

Several canonical texts, however, suggest that even prior to the commentarial period the archaic concept of the paññāvimutta was already being reinterpreted in the direction of the dry-insight arahant. We saw above that, according to the Kitāgiri-sutta, the “arahant liberated by wisdom” was distinguished from the “arahant liberated in both ways” with respect to their relationship to the peaceful formless emancipations. The latter can attain them; the former cannot. In the Puggalapaññatti, the fourth book of the Abhidhamma-piṭaka, these definitions are subtly rephrased. The arahant liberated in both ways is now “a person who dwells having contacted the eight emancipations with the body, and having seen with wisdom, his influxes are exhausted”. And, corresponding to this, the arahant liberated by

---

42See above, p. 55.
43Pp14: idhi’ ekacco puggalo atha vimokkhe kāyena phusitvā viharati; paññāya e’ assa āsavā parikkhāhā honti. The eight emancipations are not identical with the four jhānas and the four formless attainments. The first three emancipations are equivalent to the four jhānas, but they deal with the state of jhāna in terms of its objects rather than in terms of its subjective
wisdom is “a person who does not dwell having contacted the eight emancipations with the body, but having seen with wisdom, his influxes are exhausted”. The subtle change in wording between this definition and that in the Kiṭāgiri-sutta, an almost inconspicuous change from “peaceful emancipations, transcending form, that are formless “ (santā vimokkhā atikkamma rūpe āruppā) to “eight emancipations” (attha vimokkhā), makes a world of difference with regard to meaning. The new definition gracefully suggests that the arahant liberated by wisdom need not possess any of the eight emancipations, including the lower three, which comprise the four jhānas. Although the Puggalapāṇñatti Commentary glosses these two definitions in the same way that it does the older definitions, the new definition opens the door just a crack — but does indeed open it — for admitting the dry-insight arahant into the chamber of figures duly ordained by canonical authority.

Since the Puggalapāṇñatti is an Abhidhamma tract and thus of later provenance than the Nikāyas, it may not be altogether surprising to find a revised definition of the two types of arahants there. But it is a bit astonishing to find the above definitions actually incorporated into a sutta. A discourse in the Aṅguttara-nikāya called the Putta-sutta (A 4:87) distinguishes four types of ascetics, among them one known as a red-lotus ascetic and another known as a white-lotus ascetic. The red-lotus ascetic (samaṇapaduma) is defined as a monk who has realized by direct knowledge the taintless liberation of mind, liberation by wisdom, and dwells in it; and who also dwells having contacted with the body the eight emancipations. The white-lotus ascetic (samaṇapundarika) is “a monk who, with the destruction of the taints, has realized for himself with direct knowledge, in this very life, the taintless liberation of mind,

experience. Thus all four jhānas can be based on each of the first three emancipations, since all four jhānas can experience their object in the way defined by each of these emancipations. Emancipations 4–7 are the four formless attainments, and the eighth emancipation is the cessation of perception and feeling (saṁññāvedāyitanirodha).

\[44\] Pp 14: idh’ ekaccu puggalo na h’ eva kho attha vimukkhē kāyena phusitvā viharati paññāya c’ assa divā āsavā parikkhīṇā honti.
liberation by wisdom; and having entered upon it, dwells in it; yet he does not dwell having contacted with the body the eight emancipations”.\(^45\) The commentary identifies the red-lotus ascetic with the *ubhatobhāgavimutta*, the *arahant* liberated in both ways, since the *sutta* definition here matches the Puggalapaññatti’s definition of this type; but it does *not* simply identify the white-lotus ascetic point-blank with the *paññāvimutta*, the *arahant* liberated by wisdom. It says, rather, “By this he shows the dry-insight *arahant*.\(^46\)

It seems to me that there are two ways to account for the definitions of the two types of lotus-ascetics in the Putta-sutta. Either the *sutta* itself is a later composition that was inserted into the Aṅguttara-nikāya, incorporating the new definitions of the *ubhatobhāgavimutta arahant* and the *paññāvimutta arahant* that were being framed during the period of scholastic elaboration that brought the Puggalapaññatti into being. Or, alternatively, the *sutta* itself is archaic, but an original version employing definitions of the two types of *arahants* matching those in the Kitāgiri-sutta had been “updated” to accommodate the new definitions that were canonized by the Puggalapaññatti. I would suggest, too, that “behind the scenes” the *mode of thought* that influenced the definitions of the two lotus-ascetics of the Putta-sutta was also exerting its influence on the interpretation of the Susima-sutta. So, while the wording of the Pāli version of the Susima-sutta was not altered and it could thus still be interpreted as simply denying that the monks declaring arahantship possessed the super-knowledges and the formless emancipations, among an influential body of early Pāli exegetes it was already being seen as a paradigmatic text for the figure of the dry-insight *arahant*.

Within the Theravāda school, this interpretation of the *sutta* first came to literary expression in its commentary. In contrast, among those

\(^{45}\) A II 87.3-11: *iddha, bhikkhave, bhikkhu āsavānaṁ khyāyā anāsavam ceto-vimutih paññāvimutih dīth’ eva dhamme sayaṁ abhiññā sacchikatvā upasampajjā viharati, no ca kho attha vimokkhē kāyena phusirvā viharati.*

\(^{46}\) Mp III 113: *iminā sukhāvāpi sakkākhānāsavatth dasseti.*
in the broad Sarvāstivāda camp, a parallel commentarial stance towards the *sutta* had already become strong enough to “burst the bonds” of sacerdotal hesitancy and force its way into the primary text itself. In this camp, the *sutta* must have become altered in such a way as to grant canonical legitimacy to the figure of the *arahaṇṭ* wholly bereft of the *jñāna*. Not only do the wisdom-liberated monks of SĀ 347 and the Vibhāṣā version deny that they possess the four *jñānas*, but the Sarvāstivāda commentaries even redefine the concept of the *pāññāvimutta* in such a way that any possession of a *jñāna* by a *pāññāvimutta arahaṇṭ* “compromises” and “corrupts” the purity of his possession of *pāññāvimutta* arahantship. We thus find that the Abhidharma-mahāvibhāṣā-śāstra, the great commentary of the Kashmiri Sarvāstivādins, distinguishes two kinds of *pāññāvimutta arahaṇṭ*, making specific reference to the Susīma-sutta:

*Question:* It is said here several times that one liberated by wisdom [can] arouse the knowledge of others’ minds. This necessarily depends on the basic *jñāna*. But if the wisdom-liberated one can arouse the basic *jñāna*, does this not contradict the Susīma-sutta? In that *sutta* it is said, “The wisdom-liberated one cannot arouse the basic *jñāna*."

*Reply:* There are two kinds of wisdom-liberated ones, the partial and the complete. The one partially liberated by wisdom (少分慧解) is able to arouse one, two, or three among the four *jñānas*. The one completely liberated by wisdom (全分慧解脱) cannot arouse any of the four *jñānas*… The Susīma-sutta speaks about the one completely liberated by wisdom, who cannot arouse any of the four *jñānas*.\(^{37}\)

The earliest version of the Susīma-sutta received by the archaic Sarvāstivāda school, we might suppose, was probably quite similar to S 12:70 and M-Vin regarding the qualities denied of the *pāññāvimutta arahaṇṭs*. During the historical evolution of the *sutta*, however, these came to be altered, transformed into a complete denial that they possess the *jñānas*. While it is possible that such alterations could have occurred by unconscious habit in the course of oral transmission, given that the

---

\(^{37}\) T 27, 564b5–13.
Sarvāstivāda came to place such a strong emphasis upon the absence of jhānas in the ideal type of paññāvimutta arahant, we may suspect that the alteration was deliberate, done under pressure from the evolving Sarvāstivādin doctrinal system.

Unlike the Sarvāstivādin commentators, the Theravadins never went so far as to distinguish degrees among the paññāvimutta arahants. According to the Pāli commentaries, all five types — those arahants who attain any of the four jhānas and the dry-insight arahant — are equally entitled to be called “liberated by wisdom,” as long as they do not attain the peaceful formless emancipations. But despite this “official” breadth recognized in the term paññāvimutta, one can detect in certain texts a subtle shift taking place in its “weight” towards the dry-insight arahant. This is manifest in the definition of the white-lotus ascetic of the Putta-sutta as one without the eight emancipations, defined by the Anguttara Commentary as the dry-insight arahant; again, it appears in a similar definition of the “one liberated by wisdom” in the Puggalapaññatti; and it crops up still again in the commentarial gloss on the expression “liberated by wisdom” in the Susīma-sutta as “without jhāna, dry-insight meditators liberated simply by wisdom only”. Still another example is seen in the commentarial gloss on the word paññāvimutto occurring at A I 74. Here, the commentary succinctly says, “Liberated by wisdom: the dry-insight influx-destroyer [i.e., arahant].” 48 The ākāśa to this passage does not state that this is said merely to exemplify the family of wisdom-liberated arahants, but reinforces the idea that the wisdom-liberated arahant lacks attainments in samatha: “Liberated by wisdom: liberated by the wisdom of the supreme path [of arahantship] without a support of serenity.” 49

We thus see that at the commentarial level, the Theravāda wound up with an interpretative concept that closely matched an idea that the Sarvāstivādins had already inserted into texts they regarded as sūtras.

48Mp II 147: paññāvimutto ti paññāya vimutto sukhavipassakakhīnasavo.
49Mpt II 38 (VR1 ed.): paññāya vimutto ti samathasannissayena vinā aggamaggapaññāya vimutto.
coming directly from the Buddha’s own mouth, namely, the idea of an arahant liberated without attainment of the jhānas. To what extent this idea is already intended by the Pāli suttas that speak about monks who attain arahantship via the “painful” or “strenuous” path of meditation on the unattractive nature of the body, the repulsiveness of food, the inevitability of death, and other topics “tending to disenchantment” is difficult to determine. What is certain, however, is that the Pāli suttas never explicitly admit the existence of arahants who altogether dispense with the jhānas. It might also be important to note that the Sarvāstivādins did not adopt the term sukhavipassaka or any other term that quite matches it. While this may be just a matter of circumstance, simply because the term sukhavipassaka arose in an exegetical camp geographically far removed from their own centers of activity, another more fundamental reason may also be involved. It is possible that the Sarvāstivādins did not speak of a “dry-insight arahant” because they never introduced the scission between samatha and vipassanā as sharply as the Theravādin commentarial tradition did but saw the path of any paññāvimutta arahant to involve an interplay of these two meditative factors. To qualify as a “full paññāvimutta” arahant, as one who is utterly bereft of jhāna, this practitioner must end the development of samatha at a level called sāmankādiyāna, “threshold meditation”, corresponding to access concentration (upacārasamādhi) of the Theravāda commentaries. But, it seems, they never conceived the idea of a meditator “who makes [bare] insight the vehicle” (vipassanāyānikā, suddhavipassanāyānikā), the distinctly Theravādin notion of the meditator who eventually reaches final fruition as a dry-insight arahant.

Nevertheless, despite these differences, both these major Śāva-vādā traditions, as well as the Mahāsāṅghikas, have preserved versions of the same story telling how an ascetic named Susima infiltrated the Buddha’s Saṅgha and entered into dialogue with the paññāvimutta monks and with the Tathāgata himself. In the two traditions that we know most about, the encounter became an important
canonical pillar for the belief that arahantship was possible without the jhānas. In one tradition this idea was stated explicitly in the sutta itself; in the other it rested upon the explication of the text by the commentary. But as I read it, even the older version of the sutta, S 12:70 and perhaps too M-Vin, originally intended to establish the possibility of arahantship without the jhānas. That is, I suspect that the questions Susīma posed to the paññāvimutta monks in this version, which confirm their lack of the super-knowledges and the formless attainments but stop short at the jhānas, were also intended to hint, by their very silence, that similar questions could have been asked about the jhānas, and that the same answer would have been given. If such is the case — and I must emphasize that this is largely intuition on my part — we could then understand that the compilers of the versions I have called SĀ 3.47 and Vibhāṣā did not so much add anything new as simply state explicitly what the redactors of the older version had wanted the sutta to convey from the start.

Though I say “this is largely intuition on my part”, I do have reasons for this intuition. Apart from those I have brought forth above, there is also the ensuing dialogue between Susīma and the Buddha, on the grounds for the possibility of paññāvimutta arahantship. This, however, is a major topic in itself, which I intend to treat in the sequel to the present paper.

Bhikkhu Bodhi
A Note on the Heterodox Calendar and a Disputed Reading in the Kālakācāryakathā

K.R. Norman is no doubt best known among Indologists for his penetrating publications on the Pāli Canon and the Theravāda Buddhist textual tradition. It should, however, be emphasised that the particular authority of his extensive philological work, whether editorial or etymological in orientation, derives from its firm grounding upon a detailed knowledge of a wide range of Middle Indo-Aryan dialects whereby Pāli is not to be studied in exclusively Buddhological terms but rather as representing a component of a wider linguistic matrix in which the insights gained from the phonology, grammar, and lexicon of Ardhamāgadhi and other Prākrits play a vital elucidatory role. Furthermore, the editions and metrical analyses of short Jain canonical texts and discussions of various linguistic and doctrinal parallels between early Buddhism and Jainism to be found throughout the eight volumes of his Collected Papers make amply clear that Mr Norman’s career-long preoccupation with Pāli philology has not led to Jain studies’ loss being Buddhist studies’ gain. In this light I trust that my former teacher will not think it inappropriate if in a congratulatory volume which contains contributions dealing almost exclusively with Buddhist matters I proceed to discuss a topic relating to Jainism which abuts on Buddhism only tangentially but nonetheless represents a matter of no little concern to the two heterodox, that is non-brahmanical, traditions, namely the configuration of the ritual calendar.

As is well known, adherents of the early śramaṇa orders assembled at various times of the month to preach their respective doctrines and

My thanks to John Cort for reading a draft of this paper.

1 See Norman 1990–2001. As a postgraduate Mr Norman had originally contemplated an edition of the Jain canonical text, the Sthānāṅga Sūtra, a project aborted because of lack of accessible early manuscripts at the time (personal communication).

perform communal rituals of purification and solidarity. This is clearly witnessed by early Buddhist and Jain sources. Thus the Mahāvagga of the Theravāda Vinaya describes this custom as taking place on the fourteenth, fifteenth, and eighth days of the half-month\(^2\) and goes on to portray the Buddha as sanctioning the recitation of the Pātimokkha on the fifteenth day as an uposathakamma,\(^3\) while the Jain Sūtrakṛtāngasūtra refers to the posaha being correctly observed on the fourteenth and eighth days, on designated dates and on full-moon days.\(^4\)

Notwithstanding the brahmanical origins\(^5\) of the term used for this important day of observance,\(^6\) the Vedic ritual calendar proved unacceptable to renunciatory groups such as the Jains and Buddhists who wished to distance themselves from brahman customs and initially a lunar calendar seems to have been adopted by them by way of differentiation. However, the latter was in turn to be challenged by a lunisolar calendar, of Greek origin and in use by around 380 C.E., which gained ground at the expense of the former mode of reckoning through its attempt to reconcile the 354 days of the lunar calendar with the \(365\frac{1}{4}\)

---

\(^2\)Vin I 101.4-6: tena kho pana samayena aññatīṭṭhiyā paribbājakā catuddase pannarase ataṭṭhamiyā ca pañkhussa sannipatitvā dhammaṁ bhāsanti.

\(^3\)Vin I 102.22–24.

\(^4\)Sūtrakṛtāngasūtra 2.2, pp. 188–89: cauddasaṭṭhamuddithapunnamāśiniṇisu paṭipuṇṇam posahāṃ sammaṃ anupālemāna. Cf. 2.7, p. 250, where Jambūvijaya reads posadhaṃ.

\(^5\)The common source of the term variously rendered by the Buddhists and Jains as uposatha, posadhā, and posaha (signifying both the day and the observance connected with it) is upavasatha, used in Vedic texts of a particular form of overnight fast associated with the full-moon sacrifice. Tieken (2000, pp. 11–13) argues for the Buddhist uposatha as the counterpart of the secular aṣṭapālata ceremony at which the king and his functionaries rendered account of activities conducted during the previous eight months.

\(^6\)In medieval Jainism, posadhā came to mean the day of the moon’s periodic change and the fast carried out thereon, while today it designates a contemplative exercise structured over a half or whole day which is most generally observed at the time of Paryuṣan (see below). See Cort 2001, p. 123, and Williams 1963, p. 142. This note does not deal with the Jain posadha ritual as such.
days of its solar equivalent. Adoption of one or the other of these calendars was eventually to be among the strategies involved in the formulation of sectarian identity amongst the Buddhists and so the Mulasarvastivadin sources describe how that particular Buddhist nikaya customarily performed the half-monthly posadh ceremony involving the recitation of the code of monastic law on the fifteenth day of the fortnight, or, as a result of calendrical circumstances which necessitated the omission of one day, exceptionally on the fourteenth day also, thus ensuring that the observance always fell on a full-moon or new-moon day. Although the Posadhavastu of the Mulasarvastivadin Vinaya allows for special procedures to be permitted for monks observing posadh on the fourteenth day if they were visting a monastery where the ceremony was normally held on the fifteenth day, the Pravrajyavastu asserts firmly that customary observance of posadh on the fourteenth day only was a practice of heretical sectarians (tirthya).

It is most likely that the Mulasarvastivadins regarded these heretics as being the members of other Buddhist nikayas, but we can assume that the Jain community in the early common era was also caught up in the

---

8 “[A lunar] year is made up of twelve synodic months of about 29½ days each, this being the interval between two successive full (or new) moons styled a lunation. If the Poṣadhā ceremony had been celebrated on the fifteenth throughout, after two months already it would have taken place one day later than [the] full moon, which would surely have been noticed by the monks. It is for this reason that one day was dropped, and the function was held on the fourteenth instead of the fifteenth every other month. Hence Poṣadhā always fell on [the] full-moon or new-moon day” (Vogel 1997, p. 678). For a Jain awareness of this situation, cf. the fourteenth-century Gurutattvapradipā (see note 36) 4.17. At an early date a rule was formulated by the Buddhist community to allow for three posadh days for the laity every fortnight, namely the eighth, fourteenth, and fifteenth. See Dietz 1997, p. 63, and cf. Hu-von Hinüber 1994, p. 21, and Hureau 2006, p. 102.
9 Vogel 1997, p. 678.
difficulties contingent upon calendrical innovation, even if detailed contemporary evidence equivalent to that provided by the Buddhists is lacking from this source. It is against this background that we can proceed to discuss the main change in the dating system of the Jains, introduced according to tradition by the teacher Kālaka in 466 C.E. whose career is described in the cycle of hagiographies which can be collectively and individually entitled the Kālakācāryakathā, and the possible implications of this for disciplinary observance held on the fourteenth day of the month.10

The earliest account of Kālaka’s redating of Saṃvatsāri, the day communally devoted to pratikramaṇa, the general repentance of transgressions (in this case, those committed in the previous year) which is the culmination of the festival of Paryuśan, occurs during the tenth uddeśaka of the Niśṭha Cūrṇi by Jīnadāsa (c. seventh century).11 Kālaka is portrayed there as authorising while in Pratiṣṭhāna the shift of the date of Saṃvatsāri from its traditional location on the fifth day of the month of Bhādrapada to the fourth day at the behest of King Śātavāhana in order to avoid a clash with a Hindu festival. The portion of the Niśṭha Cūrṇi version of the story most relevant to the present discussion can be rendered as follows: “So Paryuśan (i.e. the Saṃvatsāri pratikramaṇa ceremony) must be performed on the fourth

10See Brown 1933. This Kālaka is no doubt not identical to the teacher of the same name who according to the Kālakācāryakathā invited the Śakas into western India to revenge an insult to his sister. However, this is not relevant to the present paper. The story of Kālaka became associated with the Kalpa Sūtra, the central text of the Śvetāmbara Jain festival of Paryuśan. The Gurutattvapradīpa 4.22 auto commentary states that there existed no early (ādya) manuscript of the Kalpa Sūtra which did not contain the story of Kālaka and that the latter must have been included when the former was first written down as an individual text (prthaglikhita). Both the Kalpa Sūtra and the Kālakācāryakathā thus have equal antiquity and authority. The Gurutattvapradīpa also suggests (4.24 auto commentary) that the story of Kālaka originated about two and a half centuries after its hero’s life.

11Niśṭha Cūrṇi on bhāṣya verse 3153, p. 131. For pratikramaṇa in general, see Cort 2001, pp. 123–24.
A Note on the Heterodox Calendar

In this way the mighty teacher of this epoch (Kålaka) caused the fourth day to be introduced [as the day for the observance of Samvatsari] since there was an appropriate motive for this. That same date was approved by all the monks.\footnote{12} Later writers (see below) also refer to the Paryuṣanākalpa Cūṇi, possibly approximately contemporary with the Niśītha Cūṇi, which gives as the equivalent of its version, “[The Samvatsari day of] Paryuṣan was performed on the fourth day of the month; in this way the fourth day became [a festival] inspired by an [appropriate] motive.”\footnote{13} In other words, the Niśītha Cūṇi and Paryuṣanākalpa Cūṇi record the fact that a significant modification in the ritual calendar entered the realm of Śvetāmbara Jain customary practice for a practical reason and with general approval.

Versions of the story of Kålaka found in Śvetāmbara Jain narrative collections in the later centuries of the first millennium C.E. such as Jayasimhasūri’s Dharmaḍeśamālāvivarana do not appear to concern themselves with the finer issues of the account of the redating of Samvatsari. However, versions of the story produced at the beginning of the second millennium introduce a statement describing the possible implications of Kålaka’s redating which was to prove highly controversial.\footnote{14} An early example occurs in the Kālakācāryakathānaka found in the commentary of 1089–90 C.E. by Devacandrasūri (the teacher of the celebrated Hemacandra) on Pradyumnasūri’s Mūla-śuddhiprakaraṇa.\footnote{15} After providing an approximate reproduction of the
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\footnote{12}{\textit{tāhe cauthhe pajjosaviyaṃ. evaṃ jūgaprahāṇeḥi cauththī kāraṇe pavattitā. sa cevāṇumata āsavasāhīnum}}

\footnote{13}{\textit{cauththī katā pajjosavaṇaḥ, evaṃ cauththī vi jāyā kāraṇiyā. See Kulamaṇḍana-śūri (1353–99), Vicārāmṛtasaṃgraha, p. 34, and Guruttvapradipa, p. 66. I have not had access to a published version of the Paryuṣanākalpa Cūṇi and am not confident that one exists.}}

\footnote{14}{Brown (1933, p. 2) suggests that the Kālakācāryakathā cycle may have emerged in the twelfth century.}}
statement in the Niśītha Cūrṇī given above and an epitomising verse delineating the overall context of the redating as being prompted by King Śātavāhana. Devacandraśūri continues: “And because of that (tavvaseṇa) (i.e. the redating), the [regular] fortnightly observances [of pratikramaṇa] (pakkhiyāṇī) were performed on the fourteenth day of the month, which had otherwise been described in scriptural tradition [as to be performed] on the full-moon day (i.e. the fifteenth day).” That is to say, Kālaka’s redating of Saṃvatsari is held to be responsible for the relocation of another important observance, the fortnightly act of repentance, which had previously (that is, back to the time of Mahāvīra) been practised on the full-moon day, to the fourteenth day of the month. The tavvaseṇa statement also occurs in the first serious

16 *evām ca kāraṇeṇa Kālagāyarehiṃ cauttakie paśiasavaṇaṃ pavattiyam saṃmathasaṃghena va añumanniyaṃ.*

17 kāraṇiyā va cauttakī ciyajaisāhuvasaṃpanimitamuddisiya Śātavāhaṇa pāyaṭṭiyā Kālyya "jena.

18 tavasseṇa va pakkhiyāṇī vi cauddasie āyariyāni, aṇṇahā āgatottāṇi pūnimā. This will be designated hereafter as the “tavvaseṇa statement”. The spelling pūnimā / pūninā alternates in the various sources.

19 See Renou and Filliozat 1953, p. 734, for the bright half (ṣuklapaṇa) of the fifteenth day also being called pūnimā (or some derivative of it).

20 In his defence of the impossibility of any scriptural warranty for the fortnightly pratikramaṇa being observed on the full-moon day, the fourteenth-century Kulamaṇḍanāsūri, Vicārāṃtasārasamgraha, p. 24, specifically connects the tavvaseṇa statement with Devacandraśūri, albeit locating it in his commentary on the Sthānāṅga Śūtra, a work which seems to have been lost, rather than his commentary on the Mūlasuddhipraṇarana. However, Kulamaṇḍanāsūri further points out that in that same work there also occurs confirmation of the general authority for the fortnightly observance taking place on the fourteenth day, that is without any reference to a supposedly scripturally sanctioned full-moon day observance, and he ascribes these two differing judgements apparently made by Devacandraśūri to the influence of the current time of decline (janānāṃ kāladosaviśeṣena). For a reference to the Sthānāṅga Śūtra commentary in conjunction with a version of the Kālakācāryakathā which possibly relates to the topic under discussion in this study, see Catalogue 2006: No. 668 (entry for Nānāvicāra-ratna-samgraha), p. 472: iti śrī-Devacandraśūri-kṛtyāṃ Tḥānā-vṛttau, tathā kasyāntcit Kālakācārya-
modern edition of the Kālaka story, that of Jacobi, which was based on a manuscript dating from 1428\textsuperscript{21} and was to be drawn on by Brown in his study of 1933 for an edition of what has come to represent the best-known telling of the story, the so-called “Long Anonymous Version”.\textsuperscript{22}

On the face of it, the assertion of the tavvaseṇa statement that the fortnightly pratikramaṇa must be performed on the fourteenth day of the month, when in fact scripture had originally stipulated that it should take place on the full-moon day, might seem to represent a simple acknowledgement of the necessity for a further adjustment of the ritual calendar as a knock-on effect in the wake of the redating of Saṃvatsaṛī to one day earlier than had been the ancient practice. However, the authoritative ninth-century commentator Śilāṅka, elucidating Śūtrakṛṭaṅga Sūtra 2.7.3 (~2.2.76) which describes the various days on which poṣadha could be celebrated (see above), connects only the three four-monthly (caturmāsaka) pratikramaṇa observances, in which repentance is offered for transgressions in the previous four months, with full-moon days, not the fortnightly pratikramaṇa,\textsuperscript{23} and by the eleventh century (that is, at the approximate time when developed versions of the Kālakācāryakathā were starting to appear) there can be found increasing evidence that a connection of the fortnightly pratikramaṇa with the supposedly scripturally sanctioned full-moon day was difficult, or indeed impossible, for elements of the Śvetāmbara Jain community to accept. This situation is signalled by Bhojak, the editor of Deva-

\textsuperscript{21}Jacobi 1880, p.271.
\textsuperscript{22}Brown 1933, pp. 36–52; for the tavvaseṇa statement, see p. 47.
\textsuperscript{23}Śilāṅka, commentary on Śūtrakṛṭaṅga Sūtra, p. 272c: tathā caturdaśay-aṣṭoniyādiṣṭau tithiśāpadīṣṭasu mahākalyāṇakasambandhitayā puṇyatithiśvēna prakhyātāsu tathā pauṇamādiṣṭau ca tāsya api caturmāsakatithiśvity arthah, evambhāteṣv dharmanavaseṣu. This passage is referred to by the sixteenth-century Dharmasāgara (see below), Pravacanaparikṣā 3.59.
candrasūria’s Mulaśuddhiprakaraṇa, who notes that the *tavvasena* statement is not found in two of the six manuscripts utilised by him.\(^24\) Another version of the Kalakṣaṇa story approximately contemporary with that of Devacandrasūri, that found in the Kahāvali of Bhaḍreśvara,\(^25\) does not contain the *tavvasena* statement at all, although the fourteenth century Kulamaṇḍanāsūri does in fact associate this version of the story, albeit without quoting it directly, with the claim that the fortnightly *pratikramaṇa* was held on the full-moon day.\(^26\) Furthermore, two of the manuscripts utilised by Brown for his edition of the Long Anonymous Version of the Kalakṣaṇa, dated respectively 1279 and 1287, read *ya caumāsānī caumāsayāṇī* for *pakkhiyāṇī* (the equivalent of *pakkhiyām* in other versions), that is to say enjoining that the four-monthly *pratikramaṇa* observance be performed on the fourteenth day of the month rather than the fortnightly observance.\(^27\) A version of the

\(^{24}\) Bhojak also notes that the epitomising verse referred to above is only found in two manuscripts.

\(^{25}\) Although this significant Prākrit narrative collective has unfortunately remained in manuscript form to this day, Brown (1933, pp. 102–106) provided an edition and summary of its version of the Kalakṣaṇa story. Malvania (1983, p. 81) argues that Bhaḍreśvara most likely flourished in the twelfth century. For Kulamaṇḍanaśūri, Vicārāmśarasamgraha, p. 26, the author of the Kahāvali was already of uncertain date (*anirṇitaśaṁbhavakāla*).

\(^{26}\) Vicārāmśarasamgraha, p. 26. The Kahāvali describes King Śātavāhana’s wives being instructed by their lord to fast on *amāvāsyā* (the dark half of the fifteenth day) for the sake of *pratikramaṇa* and then to feed monks on the *pratipad*, the first day of the fortnight. See Brown 1933, p. 104. The phrase *parikhyā-padikkamān’attham* of Brown’s edition, while possibly meaning something like “for the sake of repentance of faults which have been examined”, is nonetheless odd, and we may conjecture that Kulamaṇḍanaśūri was referring to a manuscript of the Kahāvali which had a reading corresponding to *pakkhiya/pakkhiyām*. This is indeed the reading found in the quotation of this passage at Gurutattvapradīpa 4.36 autocommentary p. 80.

\(^{27}\) Kulamaṇḍanaśūri, Vicārāmśarasamgraha, pp. 29–30, quotes the Niśthā Cūṇhi and other sources for the original observance of the four-monthly *pratikramaṇa* on the full-moon day, pointing out that the fact that it had come to be prescribed for the fourteenth day had been brought about by practice initiated in ancient times (yac *ca caturdaśiyam vidhiyate tatra pūrvaprayātācaraṇā*
tavvasena statement contained in a Kālakācāryakathā edited by Leumann in 1883 also contains the reading caumāsiyam, although the verse in which it occurs appears to have been added as a supplementary amplification to the manuscript utilised by the Swiss scholar.²⁸

There was a perfectly understandable calendrical rationale for the redating of the four-monthly pratikramaṇa to the fourteenth day. It derived from the fact that the Kalpa Śūtra, which in the form it exists today most likely dates from around the fifth century C.E., states (p. 296) that Mahāvīra had commenced the Paryuṣaṇ festival in which Saṃvatsari occurs after a month and twenty days of the rainy season retreat had elapsed. As the rainy reason for the Jains customarily started on a full-moon day which was also an obvious date for one of the three purificatory four-monthly pratikramaṇas, a forward adjustment of Saṃvatsari necessarily entailed a commensurate forward adjustment to the fourteenth day for that particular caturmāsika observance and by extension for the other two also.²⁹ However, it seems clear that the story of Kālaka’s redating of Saṃvatsari and the possible consequences of it, involving as they did matters of authority and consensus as well as the relocation of an ancient festival, was to become a highly charged issue in the Śvetāmbara Jain community by around 1000—1100 C.E. and we

---
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may regard the increasing production of extended versions of the Kālakacāryakathā as partly indicative of this. Furthermore, the emergence of one particular disciplinary order, the Paurṇamiyaka Gaccha, at the beginning of the twelfth century, reveals how this issue exposed what must have appeared to some possible inconsistencies in Śvetāmbara Jain customary practice.

The Paurṇamiyakas, or “Adherents of the Full-Moon Day”, are credited with inspecting the logic of Kālaka’s redating and consequently interpreting an ancient, that is to say pre-Kālaka, Saṃvatsarā observed on the fifth day of Bhādrapada as necessarily requiring the restoration of the observance of the fortnightly pratikramaṇa on the full-moon day (the fifteenth) rather than the fourteenth, and they accordingly defended the validity of this dating in what was among the first of many attempts in Śvetāmbara tradition in the second millennium C.E. to reactivate the context of the ancient scriptures, the word of the Jinas. Unfortunately, no significant Paurṇamiyaka writings defending this position seem to have survived, and their arguments have to be reconstructed from the accounts of their opponents. So the twelfth-century Pākṣikasaptati, “Seventy Verses on the Fortnightly Pratikramaṇa” (also known as the Āvaśyakasaptati, “Seventy Verses on the Obligatory Practices”) of Municandrasūri of the Bṛhad Gaccha, with its commentary by Maheśvara, prepares the ground for later polemicists in presenting the Paurṇamiyakas as attempting to overthrow the consensual basis of Kālaka’s redating. In this work Municandrasūri affirms the impossibility of the fortnightly pratikramaṇa taking place on the full-moon day on the grounds of general usage, textual authority, albeit

30 The Paurṇamiyaka Gaccha seems to have ceased to exist as a significant institutional component of Śvetāmbara Jainism in the eighteenth century. However, vestigial traces of its continuity into more recent times can be found. See Cort 2001, p. 45.

31 See Municandrasūri, Pākṣikasaptati, v. 40, for the terms caturdaśi, “fourteenth day”, and pākṣika, “fortnightly”, being identical in significance, a point reiterated by all later anti-Paurṇamiyaka writers against the supposed claim
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deriving from works apparently not predating the sixth century, and customary behaviour since Kālaka’s time.

The status of the readings pakkhiyanī and cāumāsīyāṇi (or some close approximation to them) in the tavvaseṇa statement was a topic not dealt with in detail by Municandrasūri, but their implications became increasingly discussed from the thirteenth century by anti-Paurṇamīyaka polemicists belonging to the Taṭā Gaccha disciplinary order who refused to accept that the fourteenth-day pratikramaṇa observance was originally observed on the full-moon day and subsequently conditioned by Kālaka’s redating of Saṃvatsarī. So Kulamaṇḍanasūri claims in his Vicārāmātasārasaṅgraha that there can be no reason to associate a change to the fourteenth day with Kālaka, since no authoritative text refers to this. He also asserts that there can be found no reference to any teacher such as Kālaka performing the fortnightly observance on the fourteenth day for the very first time, thereby confirming its that the fortnightly observance could in fact overlap with the first part of the fifteenth day of the month and thus coincide with the new moon.

32 Municandrasūri, Pāṃśikasaptati, v. 12, with commentary (pp. 13–17) which refers to cūrṇis, the Mahānīśītha Sūtra and the Samarāccakahā.

33 Maheśvara, commenting on Pāṃśikasaptati, v. 67, p. 53, reiterates the reading of the Niśītha Cūrṇī, adding to it Kālāgaṇijēhaṁ. Municandrasūri, Pāṃśika-saptatī, v. 59, addresses the argument that there can be found authoritative textual evidence for lay people fasting on the fifteenth day. The example cited occurs in the Kālākācāryakathā when King Śaṭāvahana informs his wives that they must fast on the amāvāsyā, that is to say the fifteenth day when the new moon rises. See Niśītha Cūrṇī, uddeśaka 10, p. 131, and note 26. This is interpreted as a special case by reference to a permissible act of worship on this particular day of depictions of the temple on the uninhabited continent of Nandīśvara. Cf. Pāṃśikasaptati, vv. 60–62, which discusses the mention of occasional cases of lay observance on the fifteenth day, stating that they do not undermine the general authority of practice on the fourteenth day, and Pāṃśikasaptati, v. 65, which rejects endorsement of any popular leaning towards the fifteenth day.

34 Kulamaṇḍanasūri is here opposing the Paurṇamīyaka claim that the fourteenth day pratikramaṇa observance is purely conventional.
antiquity. On this basis and also on the authority of a central canonical text like the Śūtrakṛtāṅga Śūtra, the fourteenth-day observance must be regarded as having been promulgated by none other than the Jinas at the beginning of each successive tīrtha. It is therefore the Jain teacher lineage as represented in Kulamāṇḍanasūri’s time by the leaders of the Tapā Gaccha and those who have preceded them as far back as Mahāvīra who guarantee the genuineness of this dating and the fact that a challenge to its validity was not articulated in the Jain community prior to the emergence of the Paurnamiyaka Gaccha.

The Gurutattvapradīpa, a polemical text written by a monk of the Bṛhatposālika sublineage of the Tapā Gaccha some time in the fourteenth century and approximately contemporary with Kulamāṇḍanasūri, discusses the matter equally explicitly in its fourth chapter which is directed against the Paurnamiyaka Gaccha. It confirms that no compelling textual connection can be established between Kālaka and the institution of the fourteenth-day pratikrama observance. Detailed mention in the Paryuṣanākalpa Čūrṇi and what the Gurutattvapradīpa styles the “short” (laghu) version of the Kālakācāryakathā of a matter not immediately relevant to the celebration of Paryuṣan and the dating of Saṃvatsari would, it is claimed, be improbable because of the brevity of these texts. Injunctions relating to both the fourth and fourteenth days of the month are no doubt found in the “long” version of the story, but even there no description is given of what observance is to be

Kulamāṇḍanasūri, Vicārāṃśārasaṃgraha, p. 28, points out that even the Śatapadi, the foundational text describing the customary practice of the Aścalā Gaccha, an order which emerged from the Paurnamiyaka Gaccha and still observes Saṃvatsari on the fifth day of Bhādrapada (see Balbir 2003, p. 59), admits that Kālaka was not responsible for initiating the observance of the fortnightly pratikrama on the fourteenth day.

Kulamāṇḍanasūri, Vicārāṃśārasaṃgraha, pp. 26–28.

For the background to this text, see Catalogue 2006, p. 463 (entry no. 662), and Dundas 2007, chapter four.

Gurutattvapradīpa 4.20–21 with autocommentary.
carried out (caritānuvāda). In other words, the fourteenth-day prati-
kramaṇa observation has its own authority without reference to the
Kālakārtyakāthā. The Gurutattvapradīpa further states that in the old
manuscripts of the Kālakārtyakāthā the reading in the tavvasena
statement is regularly tavvasena ya caummāsiāni vi cauddāśī āyariyāni
and it attributes the existence of erroneous references to the fortnightly
observation found in other versions of the statement to an interpolation
by an ill-informed member of another sect (siddhāntānābhijña
matāntariya), who can no doubt be judged to be Candraprabhāsūri, the
founder of the Paurṇamisya Gaccha, or one of his followers.

The question of the correct reading in the tavvasena statement
remained an issue as late as the second half of the sixteenth century.
The Tapā Gaccha polemicist Dharmasāgara claims that it was a member
of the Paurṇamisya Gaccha (rākārka) who had altered the old and
genuine reading (jīrṇapāṭha) caummāsiāni to pakkhiyāmi in the portion
of Devacandraśūri’s commentary on the Sthānāṅga Sūtra referred to by
Kulamaṇḍanaśūri, supposedly thus giving a meaning making as much
sense as the phrase “water it with fire”. Dharmasāgara refers to the
reading cāummāsiāṃ being found in many of the old palm-leaf
manuscripts in the famous libraries in Pāṇaṇ and also to the absence of
the reading pakkhiyāṃ in old manuscripts in general, suggesting that
the presence of the phrase annaha āgamuttāni puṇṇimāe is itself
indicative of this change of reading, since it could only convey meaning

---

39 Gurutattvapradīpa 4.22 auto-commentary, p. 70.
40 Gurutattvapradīpa 4.36 auto-commentary. Cf. Gurutattvapradīpa 4.22 auto-
commentary, pp. 70–71, where those responsible for the change of reading in
the tavvasena statement are said to be recent (vākyataḥ pāścātyānām apy
ādeśo ‘bhavat). Gurutattvapradīpa 4.36 auto-commentary also refers to the
episode in the Kālaka story given in the Kahāvalī (see note 32) in which King
Śātavāhana instructs his wives to perform a fast on amāvāsyā, ascribing this
assertion either to the carelessness (anābhoṣa) of the author Bhadreśvara or an
interpolation by a recent monk under the influence of the Paryuṣānjkalpa
Cūṇī which describes a fast observed on this day.
in respect of the four-monthly observances. As Dharmasāgara emphasises, since the fourteenth-day observance must be regarded as dating from the very founding of the Jain community by each Jina, it is thus eternal; historical agency in promoting it, as in the possible case of Kālaka, has played no role. The immemorial (anādisiddha) nature of the fortnightly observance and the heretical status of the Paurnamiyaka Gaccha are both confirmed by Dharmasāgara by reference to the description in Haribhadra’s commentary (c. sixth century C.E.) on Āvaśyaka Niryukti, v. 468, of Jinadāsa, a lay follower of Pārśva, the twenty-third Jina, fasting on the eighth and fourteenth days of the month.

Although what was perceived by later polemicists to be the original legitimization for change in the calendar and the prime exemplification of the introduction of customary practice by senior monks, namely Kālaka’s redating of Saṃvatsari from the fifth to the fourth day of Bhādrapada, had supposedly taken place in the fifth century C.E., it was not until the beginning of the second millennium C.E. that disputes about calendrical issues gained identifiable momentum in Jainism. It can be seen from the foregoing that the version of the Kālakācāryakathā best known to western scholars, that edited by Jacobi and Brown, enshrines a reading relating to the ritual calendar which became markedly controversial within Śvetāmbara Jain tradition at that particular time, and we can confidently assert on this basis that at least one portion of the Kālakācāryakathā was not an uncontested text but subject to regular sectarian pressures.

Further conclusions are necessarily conjectural but worthy of more detailed exploration. So it seems possible that the Kālaka story may not

---

42Paryusnādāśāśataka, v. 107 (evaṁ cāuddasiasāṁ tiththām tithappavaṭṭau neam), with autocommentary.
43Śūtravyākhyānavidhiśāśataka, v. 31, with autocommentary.
in fact record a genuine historical event but may rather represent a later narrative attempt to rationalise a period of calendrical complexity for the Jain community as the implications of the novel style of lunisolar reckoning became increasingly appreciated. Furthermore, the insistence by anti-Paurṇamiya polemicists on the immemorial location of the central disciplinary observance of the fortnightly pratikramaṇa on the fourteenth day of the month may reflect the fact that this date had been in actuality influenced by wider calendrical conditions and possibly maintained as a means of sectarian differentiation in the context of the increasing prestige of the new lunisolar calendar.

As we saw at the beginning of this note, the Mūlasarvāstivādin viewpoint observed posadha on the fourteenth day as exceptional, with the full-moon day being regarded as normative for this ceremony. In legislating for potentially difficult situations arising from these datings, Buddhist sources from the beginning of the first millennium appear in general to have been much more articulate about the issues involved in the various forms of calendrical reckoning in circulation in north India at that time than their Jain counterparts. In that case, it seems clear that if the later Jain controversy described in this note concerning whether the fortnightly pratikramaṇa be observed on the fourteenth day or the full-moon day does actually bear witness to the long-range influence of changes in calendrical systems introduced in the opening centuries of the first millennium C.E., particularly in relation to use of the lunar and lunisolar modes of reckoning, then the evidence of Buddhist texts must be a necessary resource for students of Jainism wishing to contextualise fully the early historical situation.

Paul Dundas
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caveat lector

The 125th anniversary of the founding of the Pali Text Society is an occasion for celebration — celebration of the fact of the continued existence of the Society, and of the early work done by T.W. Rhys Davids and his first committee of management (listed as Professor Fausbøll, Dr Oldenberg, Dr Morris, M. Senart) and other contemporaries and successors. All of us who study Pāli or Theravāda Buddhism today stand on the shoulders of those early scholars. We have inherited from them texts, commentaries, translations, dictionaries, grammatical works. Where we are now depends on what they did.

I would like to consider here the next 125 years of the Pali Text Society (PTS). It seems to me that it is time those of us whose main concern is Pāli should pause to think about the direction we should be taking in the twenty-first century.

Let us look at our inheritance. The founder members of the PTS wished “to render accessible to students the rich stores of the earliest Buddhist literature” (JPTS 1882, p. vii). The PTS has indeed done that, as the rows of its editions of the Canon and commentaries on my shelves attest. These editions (and the Pāli–English Dictionary of T.W. Rhys Davids and W. Stede as well as the Pāli Grammar of W. Geiger) have been for most of us studying Pāli, I imagine, the gateway to our knowledge, and indeed the field in which we dig. The great majority of those volumes was already there when I began to learn about Pāli forty years ago. This means that much of what I have on those shelves of mine is the product of pioneering work, rather a first draft than the culmination of centuries’ study (as are my Oxford Classical Texts). The situation has been well described by Mr Norman, whose eighty-two years of life and so many years of Pāli scholarship are another cause for celebration, in his article “Pāli philology and the study of Buddhism” (Norman 1990), and his lecture “Buddhism and Philology” (Norman 2006). I can only reiterate his concerns, and try to reinforce his warnings.

The transmission of the texts covers a very long period, but most of our mss are comparatively recent. We can make no confident assumption that what we have is anywhere near the actual Buddha-vacana (or indeed Buddhaghosavacana); what we have is the product of centuries of careful copying, careless copying, knowledge, incompetence, inspired emendation and bungling (see von Hinüber 1978). And none of that stopped with the beginning of Western scholarship. Mr Norman’s plea for more “philologists” capable of making good new editions of the Canon seems so far to have gone largely unanswered.

In my writing of the PTS Dictionary of Pāli (DOP), I search for occurrences of each word on a CD-Rom of the Thai edition (S\(^{\text{e}}\)) of the Canon and commentaries. This, although I suspect not always accurately transcribed, gives me access to Thai readings, which I can check against the PTS editions (E\(^{\text{e}}\)), the Burmese Chaṭṭhaśaṅgiliṭṭṭakaṁ printed editions (B\(^{\text{e}}\)), and the Sinhalese Buddha Jayanti Tripiṭaka printed editions (C\(^{\text{e}}\)). What has become clear from this process is that the PTS editions have a large number of, at best questionable, at worst, plain wrong, readings.\(^1\) Often these editions are transcriptions of a very few mss, or even of only one; often they follow only one tradition, usually the Sinhalese. Some editors made mistakes because they misread the mss — various characters in the Burmese and Sinhalese scripts can be very easily confused, especially in mss kha and ba, ta and na, bha, ha and ga, pa, ya and sa, va and ca in the Sinhalese script spring immediately to mind. Others made mistakes because they did not know Pāli or Sanskrit well enough (understandably so in the case of Pāli — they were pioneers). The ability to transcribe a Sinhalese or Burmese ms is not a sufficient qualification to produce a reliable Pāli text. I suspect, also, that those who did know Sanskrit emended silently, especially in matters of sandhi. The Dīgha-nikāya and its commentary seem to me to have been tidied in this way. Even those editors, like Fausbøll, whom one had always been taught to respect, produced texts

\(^1\) I will give no examples in this article, but a glance at a few pages of the first volume of DOP will show what I mean.
with many doubtful readings.²

I would count as wrong any reading in Eᵉ which differs from a unanimous reading in the other three editions, when (a) one can explain the difference by a misreading of Burmese or, especially, Sinhalese characters; (b) the Eᵉ reading is metrically incorrect (not just irregular, but impossible); (c) we are faced with an inexplicable form, against something which makes sense. In the case of (c), of course, the argument against dismissing Eᵉ as a wrong reading is a recourse to the principle of *lectio difficilior melior*, and a suggestion that Bᵉ in particular normalises readings and erases difficulties. I am not convinced that the rule of *lectio difficilior* is valid for Pāli texts, given the uncertain and contaminated traditions of mss and editions. And to try to defend a word, for which one can find no real etymological justification or explanation, and reject an alternative, well attested and commented on, which has an appropriate meaning, seems somewhat perverse. In any case, Bᵉ itself exhibits some idiosyncratic readings, which a normalising or rationalising tendency might have been expected to change.³

On other occasions, where Eᵉ differs from the other editions, I would hesitate to say the reading was wrong. I accept that it may represent another, valid, tradition, but I believe readers ought to be made aware of the alternative. Often too there are varying agreements and disagreements among the editions — Eᵉ with Cᵉ against Bᵉ and Sᵉ; Bᵉ and Cᵉ against Eᵉ and Sᵉ; indeed all combinations are found. Nor should one think that any of the editions or traditions is free from error. As an extreme case, it is often hard to make sense of any of the editions of the Peṭakopadesa.

²I have read the statement that Fausbøll’s “great edition of the Jātakas … is still unsurpassed”. Perhaps the writer meant “not yet superseded”. Otherwise it is a meaningless assertion. Studies of individual Jātakas have clearly improved on Fausbøll’s text, and anyone who looked closely and carefully at his text would find much to question.

³See e.g. the consistent reading in Bᵉ of dhamakarana, against the explicable dhammakaraka found usually in the other editions.
If one looks at the readings of the other editions, one finds in all traditions inconsistencies, incomprehensibility, more problems. Often, however, even small differences from Ee give readings which are more convincing, because more subtle, more elegant, more Pāli. But the Pāli of the PTS editions is the only Pāli seemingly used and depended upon by Geiger in his Grammar (Geiger 1916), by Rhys Davids and Stede in the Dictionary, by A.K. Warder in his Introduction to Pali (Warder 1963), and by most writers on Pāli and Theravāda Buddhism even today. It is as if those who studied and researched and published in the past had produced works that somehow have also become canonical. Yet every one of them was fallible, and was working with fallible materials.

I have become convinced that we should take nothing on trust. We should use all existing dictionaries and grammatical works with caution and scepticism, checking statements and references wherever and whenever possible. As Sir Monier Monier-Williams wrote in the Preface to his Sanskrit–English Dictionary:

Nay, I am constrained to confess that as I advanced further on the path of knowledge, my trustfulness in others … experienced a series of disagreeable and unexpected shocks; till now … I find myself left with my faith in the accuracy of human beings generally — and certainly not excepting myself — somewhat distressingly disturbed. [My emphasis.]

When we open Geiger’s Grammar, we are presented with what appears to be an exhaustive account of Pāli grammatical forms. Statements are made, rules devised, paradigms laid out. But what about the evidence? There are forms there I cannot find in the texts; there are rules which depend on one occurrence of a form, not supported in all editions; there is, inevitably, much missing, which could give a different picture of the language.4

---

4The evidence for forms is often weak, e.g. Geiger §39:1: “k appears for g in: akalu Mil 338,13”. But only in Cε and Eε. Bε has agalu-, Sε aggalu-. And cf. Ja
Another inheritance, the Pali Text Society’s *Pali–English Dictionary* (PED), remains useful, but the meanings it gives must be checked against Sanskrit or Prakrit, and its references verified. Especially with rare words or words with no obvious derivation or Sanskrit equivalent, we should look at alternative forms in other editions. When I told a Ph.D. student not to trust everything in PED, her supervisor reproached me, but it is the first thing we should teach any student of Pāli. We should even on occasion question the *Critical Pāli Dictionary* (CPD). Its first editors, Dines Andersen and Helmer Smith, were indeed giants of Pāli scholarship, but their work too should not be treated as canonical. They were not infallible, and for very good reason they could not always be right (nor have all of their successors at CPD had their wide knowledge and intelligent interpretative powers). And

IV 440.25* (E\textsuperscript{E} akalu; B\textsuperscript{E}, C\textsuperscript{E} agalu; S\textsuperscript{E} agalu); VI 144.23* (E\textsuperscript{E} akalu; B\textsuperscript{E}, C\textsuperscript{E} agalu; S\textsuperscript{E} agalu); elsewhere E\textsuperscript{E} has agaru or agalu. — “lakanaka, ‘anchor’ Mil 377.10, 25”. Again, only in C\textsuperscript{E} and E\textsuperscript{E} (nāvālakanaka ... nāvam laketi). B\textsuperscript{E} and S\textsuperscript{E} have nāvālagonakam ... nāvam lageti. — §39:3: “c appears for j in: pāceti ‘drives’ Dhp 135 ... besides pājētij Ja II 122.5”. At Dhp 135 B\textsuperscript{E} and S\textsuperscript{E} read pājeti. I am aware of course of the revision of Geiger by K.R. Norman (PTS 1994), and of the Pāli grammar of T. Oberlies (de Gruyter 2001). But both of these are vulnerable to the same criticism: a reliance on E\textsuperscript{E}.

See e.g. Geiger 1994 §38:1a (not in Geiger 1916): “kh is voiced to gh in nighaññasi, ‘you will dig’, Ja VI 13,18*”; Oberlies 2001 §51: “nighaññati ‘strikes down’ (denominative from) *nighaññya*”. The form is puzzling, and Oberlies may be correct, but it might be of interest to note the various readings: C\textsuperscript{E}, E\textsuperscript{E} yaṁ kāsuyā nighaññasi; B\textsuperscript{E}, S\textsuperscript{E} nihāññasi; Ja VI 13,27*: C\textsuperscript{E} nighaññasi ti nihanissasi, yaṁ tvam ettha nihanissamī ti saññiya kāsuv nikhaññati so aham ti dipeti; B\textsuperscript{E}, S\textsuperscript{E} nihāññasi ti nihanissasi ... ; E\textsuperscript{E} nighaññasi ti nikhañissasi, yaṁ mam ettha ...). The verse is quoted at Cp-a 225,15*, where all the editions read nikhaññasi. We might also compare Ja IV 102.9* where B\textsuperscript{E}, E\textsuperscript{E} read: sace adhammo hañchati dhammam ajja, while C\textsuperscript{E}, S\textsuperscript{E} read haññati, in all cases glossed (102.25*) with hanissati. See also ahañchañ, ahañčhiṭṭha, with vll. of ahaññiṁ. Oberlies, §14.4, gives pāceti, without reference (see above), and without making clear that the more usual form in all editions is pājeti. Re ajakara, also in §14.4, note that this form appears only in E\textsuperscript{E} at Ja III 484,16*; in the other editions, and in E\textsuperscript{E} elsewhere, the form is ajagara.
one of the weaknesses of Franklin Edgerton’s *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary*, useful and enjoyably personal though it is, is its trust in *PED*.

Speaking here as a scholar of Pāli, not of Buddhism, I think we are sometimes limited and confined by our inheritance. We must bring to our study of the texts our knowledge of language, of India, and of religion, from outside those texts. The interpretation of Pāli has looked backwards (and inwards) for as long as we know. Buddhaghosa followed the Sinhalese commentaries, which themselves presumably were based on commentaries brought from India. Aggavamsa in his account of the Pāli language, the Saddaniti, not only describes Pāli as he found it in the Buddhavacana — absolutely legitimately — but explains and interprets it in a way limited by traditional beliefs about the language and its status. Warder, in his *Introduction to Pali*, accepts the same kind of restraints, and indeed often follows Aggavamsa’s interpretations. He teaches the language in a manner that is irritating and bizarre to anyone who knows any Sanskrit. Some of the statements of Aggavamsa and Warder are true only in a very tenuous sense. One feels all three of these scholars are deliberately ignoring or denying certain things that they know in order to keep within the restraints of tradition and the past.

The first Pāli dictionary, the Abhidhānapaddipikā, while including some specifically Buddhist terms and connotations, largely looked to Sanskrit and the Amarakośa, and is not a true reflection of the Pāli of the texts, but it is probably the last work of Pāli scholarship in which we can complain of too heavy a reliance on Sanskrit. The *Dictionary of the Pāli Language* by R.C. Childers includes the material of the Abhidhānapaddipikā, but depends much more on the interpretations of the Pāli commentaries and of the Saṅgha. After Childers, in the work of the early translators of Pāli texts, we often find mere intuition and guesswork, buttressed by a strong conviction of what a Buddhist context required.
These translations are an influential inheritance, but in them, not infrequently, the sense of the Sanskrit equivalent to a word was ignored or rejected — I do not know whether this was due to a conscious decision or to ignorance. Then the sense of English words was stretched and indeed violated, or words were coined, invented. A prime exponent of this method was Mrs Rhys Davids. Fortunately not many of her coinages have survived, but other translators also preferred a rare word to a common one, such as “fruition” for “fruit”; or coined words, perhaps by finding for each part of the Pāli word the equivalent in Latin. Many other neologisms or strained usages of existing words, for example in the translations of Bhikkhu Nāṇamoli, seem to have acquired that canonical status. There was apparently a desire to create what one might call technical terms of Theravāda Buddhism. This is convenient for translators and interpreters, of course, and means that they do not have to consider what the texts are really saying in each context. But I think such a practice obscures the meaning, and is anyway false, since I cannot believe that the Buddha spoke, as for example sociologists do, in a jargon no ordinary person would understand without a glossary.

Another inheritance is the “literal” translation. A literal translation is not a translation, because the meaning of a Pāli word or passage has not been expressed in English. For particular words, one English equivalent is chosen as the basic meaning, and that English word is used

---

5Her oddness can perhaps be fully appreciated only by a native English speaker, with such usages as “Norm” as a translation of dhamma, “the Well-farer” for sugata, “clansman” for kulaputta. Her translations, especially of verse, have a medieval air (e.g. “eke the dappled deer”) not really appropriate to the context, or aim at poetry and attain only obscurity (“In grasping not O well is him”) rendering anupādāya nibbuto; note that in this Samyutta verse E reads nibbuto.

6For example, for vaṭṭati with the preverb ā- an etymological equivalent would be Latin advertere. And so we find used a verb “to advert”, Unfortunately, “to advert” already exists in the English language, and the standard dictionaries do not support a current meaning which is really equivalent to āvaṭṭati. What was wrong with “turn to”?
in all contexts.7 Throughout a whole text, Miss Horner’s translations furnish good examples of literalness (not always even accurate) which produces at times incomprehensibility (e.g. “state of further-men” to translate uttarimanussadhamma). Did such translators ever ask, “What would an Indian hearer have understood from this passage? What indeed is the Buddha’s concern here, what problem is he addressing, what is he saying?” This type of pseudo-translation is also to be found in PED, whose compilers seem sometimes perverse in their refusal to take Sanskrit as evidence for the meaning of a word. It may seem that my criticism is rather of style than of interpretation, but the influence of PED and of past translators has been strong: one sees the same translations and expressions, which often have very little justification, appearing again and again in new translations and works on Buddhism, perpetuating that strange and barbaric language, aptly called Buddhist Hybrid English.8

It is no insult, it is not lèse-majesté to criticise the texts of Fausbøll or Feer, to question the paradigms of Geiger, to disagree with the translations of T.W. Rhys Davids and Bhikkhu Ñānamoli as well as with those of Mrs Rhys Davids and Miss Horner. On the contrary, it is absolutely necessary if there is to be any progress in Pāli.

If we are prepared to look to the next 125 years, I believe we should be prepared also to re-do everything. First, we must re-edit the texts of the Canon and the commentaries. Even before that, however, we need to discuss and decide how this should be done. I myself would advocate a middle way, between one extreme of considering and accepting isolated readings, and the other of simply taking over e.g. the Burmese version. But the task is not simple or straightforward. The question of whether to try to consult as many mss as possible, and how to decide on their

---

7 Like Mr Norman (Norman 1997, pp. 17–18) I particularly dislike “skilful” as a translation for kusala in contexts where it does not make sense. Who decided “skilful” was the basic, literal meaning of Sanskrit kuśala, rather than “good”, or “healthy” or “wholesome”?
8 See Griffiths 1981.
usefulness, is a difficult one. There are many occasions when alternative spellings and perhaps also alternative expressions are equally valid, and when the editions show no consistency. I give twenty-one citations in my dictionary article on the numeral 40; all editions have cattārīsa-sometimes, all have cattālīsa-sometimes, and all but C5 have cattālīsa-sometimes. I expect a similar pattern when I reach the numeral 50. There is alternation between -aka and -ika, e.g. -bhūmaka and -bhūmika, and of course there are the alternatives of -ika, -iya, -ita. For a good example of variation in readings, see the passages quoted in DOP I s.v. āvēthikā. An editor will have to use his or her judgment and provide an informative critical apparatus. We should make use of the considerable amount of good scholarship, especially of the last forty years or so, on the transmission of the texts and on individual words (as long as they are not ghostwords); and of the study of the Sanskrit and Chinese and Tibetan versions. There should also be agreement on spelling and punctuation conventions, so that there can be consistency and clarity. Let us then at least produce a meaningful text, for which we have good evidence in more than one tradition.

9These and other variations can often be explained by reference to other Prakrits or to scribal conventions, and can tell us something of the evolution of the text as we have it. The search for an “original” text (a genuine Buddha-vacana?) is interesting, but always speculative, and is probably not the concern of an editor.

10It is on occasions hard to know what form of a word an editor should choose. Often the present editions are not consistent, e.g. between jāngama and jāngala, or between japa and jappa. Consider also the possibilities upplāvita, ubbilāvita, ubbillāvita, ubbillāpita (see DOP I s.v. upplavati). Note also that Geiger (§38:6) cites only ubbillāvita and ubbillāpita. Or what should the choice be for the name of Mahāvīra, always nātaputta in B5 and S6, sometimes nātaputta, sometimes nāthaputta in C5 and E5?

11Compare the painstaking and meticulous work on tiny fragments, e.g. from the Stein and Hoernle collections, with the way some writers on Pāli do not even consult the Burmese and Sinhalese editions before pronouncing on a word.
On the basis of these new editions, we must then produce a new, accurate, thorough grammar;\(^\text{12}\) then, I am afraid, someone will have to re-write my dictionary. And finally we can produce good, readable, trustworthy translations.

I know, of course, that I am speaking of Utopia. The first, and perhaps insurmountable, difficulty is to find people capable of editing the texts, and willing to do so. Such people must have a solid knowledge of Sanskrit and at least some Prakrit, and a firm grasp of Pāli metrics, as well as a thorough understanding of how Pāli works, and of the whole spread of Pāli literature. And how can they, without reliable grammars and dictionaries?

But it may be that what I suggest is not necessary (or even desirable). As Mr Norman said (Norman 1990, p. 33), “It may justifiably be asked whether the errors which may remain in the editions of Pāli texts really matter, and whether they are likely to have resulted in any misunderstanding of the basic and most important elements of Buddhism.” The state of the texts, and of Pāli scholarship generally, probably does not matter to those, perhaps the majority of the readers of the publications of the PTS, who are interested in Theravāda Buddhism, not in Pāli.\(^\text{13}\) Nothing any of us does, I suspect, will change the understanding of the principal tenets of the religion, or give startling new insights into the thoughts of the Buddha. We can go on, slightly

---

\(^{12}\) I hope that *DOP* will be a foundation and provide material for this new grammar. In my articles on verbs I aim to give examples of all tenses and infinite forms; on nouns and adjectives, examples of significant cases and irregularities. I am also compiling lists of certain formations, e.g. feminines in -ni, such as ārāmikini, isini.

\(^{13}\) cf. Zürcher 1959, p. 356, n. 152: “The ideal of a cursory way of reading the classics without detailed philological studies was much in vogue [in China] in the fourth century; it agreed with the prevailing *hsüan-hsüeh* opinion that the written text is only an imperfect and expedient expression of the hidden wisdom of the Sage, and that the student must try to grasp the general principles underlying the words rather than indulge in a careful and painstaking study of the letter of the text”— a practice taken over by some Chinese converts to Buddhism.
improving the publications in a piecemeal manner, writing articles (in learned journals) about individual words, continuing in a confining circle of compromised accuracy, approximate truth.

Well, it does matter to me. For the few of us whose job is the Pāli language, I believe there is a responsibility to provide information and material as accurate, as true, as we can possibly make them. To provide them not only for those who are drawn to Theravāda Buddhism, but for other scholars — those who study the texts of Buddhism in other languages, who study other forms of Buddhism and other religions, who study languages. Otherwise, what do we think we are doing?

Margaret Cone
Cambridge

---

14 As with the rather arbitrary corrections made when volumes are reprinted. This is a problem for me and the dictionary, as I cannot check readings in every reprint.
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The Buddhist Bhikṣu’s Obligation to Support His Parents in Two Vinaya Traditions

One might get the impression from Buddhist literatures that the Buddha always had something to say about whatever topic or issue arose, even if — as in the well-known case of the avyākṛtavastus or “indeterminate questions” — it was only to say that that topic was not worth discussion.1 Indeed, it is very, very rare to find the Buddha presented as, in effect, throwing up his hands and declaring that it was not in his power to say or do something about something. But while very rare, such presentations do occur and they are always interesting, one particularly so — they all, in one way or another, point to immovable principles or established boundaries.

Some of these boundaries or principles are obvious enough, and the texts then simply give them a striking clarity. In the Bhikṣuṇīvinaya of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins, for example, the fixed principle that Buddhist monastic rules apply only to ordained bhikṣus or bhikṣuṇīs is expressed in one of the rare passages in which the Buddha is presented as having nothing to say. The issue here is what is to be done when a bhikṣuṇi behaves badly (vipratipadyate) with an ārāmika or “monastery attendant”. The bhikṣuṇi’s misbehavior is clearly sexual, and the text in fact begins with similar misbehavior involving a bhikṣu and a bhikṣu or “novice” (śrāmaṇera). There is, of course, no mystery about what is to be done in these cases. É. Nolot renders the first part of the text:

Si un moine faute avec une nonne, d’un commun accord, les deux sont exclus (abhaye pārājikā bhavanti). Si une nonne faute avec un novice, la nonne est exclue et le novice doit être expulsé (nāśayitavya).2

---

1On the “indeterminate questions” see most recently Ruegg 2000 and the sources cited.

Even though the full significance of both the terms pārājika and nāśayitavya is far more complicated and unsure than common translations or paraphrases might suggest, what is found here is by and large what could have been expected: in the case of sexual misconduct between a bhikṣu and bhikṣuni both are said to be, in Edgerton’s words, “deserving of expulsion”; in the case of sexual misconduct between a bhikṣuni and a “novice”, the former, again, becomes pārājika, but the latter, the text indicates without actually saying so, cannot — only a bhikṣu can commit a pārājika offence, and a “novice”, obviously, is not yet that. He can only be “expulsé”, and whatever that might actually mean, at the very least the text would seem to be indicating that the “novice’s” actions were subject to a further formal action of the Sangha or Community; i.e., the Buddha had something to say about them. It is, however, otherwise in the next case the text takes up, and here we have a first instance where the Buddha is presented as expressing his limits, and in this instance the limits of monastic rules.

The text then says, and here again the Buddha is speaking,

\[
\text{atha dåni bhikṣuni a(ā)rāmike[na] saha vipratipadyate bhikṣuni pārājikā bhavati \| ārāmiko agrhita-samvaratvāt kim vradyayati}^3 \| \text{ evam tirthikena} \| \\
\]

Si une nonne faute avec l’intendant d’un monastère, la nonne est exclue ; quant à l’intendant du monastère, puisqu’il n’a pas acquis la retenue [qui découle de l’observance des règles disciplinaires], que peut-on lui dire ? — de même avec un autre renonçant.

What we have in this instance, and in rather clipped diction, is a first variant of a rhetorical question that will be met again; kim

\footnote{It is becoming ever more clear, for example, that the commission of a pārājika did not necessarily involve “exclusion” in the mainstream Indian Vinaya traditions; see Schopen 1998, pp. 157–79 (= Schopen 2004A, pp. 260–84); Clarke 2000. Dr Clarke will be treating the issue in much greater detail in, one hopes, the reasonably near future. On nāśayitavya see Hüsken 1997A.}

\footnote{BHSD s.v. pārājika.}

\footnote{Read vucyi-yati, with the ms according to Nolot. For Nolot’s correction of the reading in Roth’s Bhikṣuni-Vinaya see Nolot 1991, p. 472, §117.}
vucisyati; and it is very likely that Nolot has got the nuance right in her translation “que peut-on lui dire?” In effect, the Buddha first appears to be saying that nothing will be, or can be, said about the āramīka. But in this instance a specific reason is given; nothing will be or can be said about the āramīka because the āramīka is not subject to the authority of the rule “from the fact that he has not accepted the [monastic] restraint[s].” The next sentence — equally clipped — can then be taken in two ways. Evans tirthikena could be taken to mean “it is just as with a member of another religious group”, i.e. the action of an āramīka is like the action of a tirthika — neither is subject to Buddhist monastic rule, so the Buddha declares he will have nothing to say about it. Here the sentence is explanatory. But it could also be taken to mean: “it is just so [when the bhikṣu’s activity is] with a tirthika”, i.e. the sentence is extending the judgement of the case involving an āramīka to a case involving a member another religious group. Either way, the function of the rhetorical question seems clear enough, and the same would seem to hold, though it involves a different kind of principle, in a second text that can be cited.

A second instance where this type of rhetorical question is put into the mouth of the Buddha occurs in the Kṣudrakavastu of the Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya, in its account of the death of Mahāprajyāpatī and the five hundred young bhikṣus who accompany her. After Mahāprajyāpatī was corrected or scolded for not honoring the Buddha in the proper way, she determines to enter final nirvāṇa. She declares her intention to the Buddha, and to a series of Elders who are all related to her, including Ānanda. To anyone familiar with the account of the death of the Buddha himself, this would set up the expectation that her...
announcement would elicit — as it did in the case of the Buddha — a request that she not pass away: she was, after all — again like the Buddha — the “founder” and central pivot of the Order of Bhikṣuṇīs. But in this case no such request is forthcoming. Instead, using a version of the same rhetorical question we have seen, the Buddha says,

gau ta m’i’ dus byas thams cad ni de lda bu’i chos can yin na smra ci dgos

Gautami, since all compounded things have such a nature, what can I say?

He then repeats this to the five hundred young bhikṣuṇīs who announce a similar intention and it is repeated a third time to Mahāprajāpatī and the bhikṣuṇīs by the various Elders.

There is very little doubt that ngas smra ci dgos here is rendering something like kim vadeyam — the first person is certain, the tense or mood a little less so. And here again the Buddha is presented as saying, in effect, that he is powerless to say or do anything about the issue at hand. But as in the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin Bhikṣuṇīvinaya, here too a specific reason is given for his inability: the Buddha can say nothing about Mahāprajāpatī passing away because all compounded things pass away — this is the way it is. The Mūlasarvāstivādin account of the death of Mahāprajāpatī does not, however, simply present us with a second, similar instance of the Buddha verbally expressing — however rhetorically — his limitations. It also provides a first instance in which bhikṣus do, and there are other examples of this as well, examples which might offer aid in understanding an otherwise curious passage in the Pāli Vinaya which will momentarily concern us.

There is, for example, another such instance in the Kṣudrakavastu itself. In this text — part of which has already been treated elsewhere9 — the bhikṣus of the Jetavana, in reaction to an attack by a group of bhikṣuṇīs on another leading bhikṣuṇī, and out of fear that bhikṣuṇīs might be carrying concealed weapons, make a kriyākāra, or local

8Kṣudraka-vastu, Derge ’dul ba Tha 111b.4.
9The text is found at Kṣudraka-vastu, Derge ’dul ba Da 172b.2–174b.5; the treatment elsewhere at Schopen 1996 (= Schopen 2004A, pp. 329–59).
monastic ordinance, forbidding bhikṣunīs to enter the vihāra. The text goes on to say that it was, prior to this, the customary practice of Mahāprajāpāti to come daily and honor the feet of the Blessed One, but after the kriyākāra was put in place she was denied admittance. She says, “Noble Ones, they (i.e. the other bhikṣunīs) have committed a fault, but have I also done so?” But the bhikṣus respond by saying,

dge 'dun nams de ltar bzhed pa la kho bo cag gis byar ci yod\textsuperscript{10}

In that the Communities have wished it so, what can we do?

The biggest obstacle to immediately recognizing that this case is essentially analogous to our first two is, probably, the fact that so little is known about the force and function of local monastic ordinances. It is, however, already known that — at least according to the Mūla-sarvāstivādin tradition — membership in a given monastic community during the rain retreat was determined not by acceptance of, or willingness to adhere to, a specific Vinaya or monastic rule, but by the acceptance of, or willingness to adhere to, these specific local ordinances.\textsuperscript{11}

It is the local ordinances that must be announced at the ritual preliminary to undertaking the rains retreat, not the Prātimokṣa; and a willingness to accept them — signaled by taking a counting stick (śalāka) — makes a bhikṣu a member of the community, not his ordination. That kriyākāras were even more binding than the canonical monastic rule or Prātimokṣa is also suggested from an unlikely source: the comparatively late Bodhisattvabhūmi says in a number of instances that a bodhisattva might disregard, or act contrary to, a Prātimokṣa rule, but — again in several instances — it indicates that he must not act contrary to “a local community ordinance” (sāṃghikam kriyākāram), even if adhering to a kriyākāra results in what the authors of the Bodhisattvabhūmi would otherwise consider a fault (āpatī).\textsuperscript{12}

\textsuperscript{10} Kṣaṇdraka-vastu, Derge 'dul ba Da 174a.4. 
\textsuperscript{11} Schopen 2002, especially p. 361, for the quotation, and what follows here. 
\textsuperscript{12} For numerous examples see Wogihara 1936, pp. 161.11ff.; Dutt 1966,
would seem to be a tacit recognition by Mahāyāna authors that at least local ordinances were strong enough to constrain some of their ideological innovations, even if Prātimokṣa rules were not. Indeed, the strength of local ordinances is suggested as well in the same text when it makes “keeping the local community ordinance’ (sāṅghikam kriyākāram anuraksataḥ) parallel with “keeping royal dictate (rājā-pathyam anuraksataḥ).\(^\text{13}\)

Seen in the light of such considerations, the bhikṣus’ response to Mahāprajāpatī says, in effect, that she is asking them to do something they cannot do. The kriyākāra does not allow them to do otherwise — it is beyond their control. In this regard the present case is all of a piece with our first two. The bhikṣus can no more alter the terms of the kriyākāra than the Buddha can alter the fact that all compounded things pass away, or make rules governing the behavior of non-monastics or non-Buddhists. All of these are simply not possible, and while this is yet another indication of the strength or reach of kriyākāras, what is important to keep in mind for our immediate purposes is the fact that it is only in such situations that the Buddha or his bhikṣus use rhetorical questions like “Que peut-on dire?” “What can I say?”, or “What can we do?” This, in turn, would seem to make the construction of the main Pāli passage that we will be concerned with here that much more curious.

What has already been noted in general terms holds, of course, for the Pāli Vinaya: instances where the Buddha expresses his inability to say something about something are very rare in it. In fact there may only be one clear case, and that alone renders this case notable, and highlights the issue in regard to which it occurs. This case is also odd in another respect as well: it may be one of the equally rare instances in

\(^{13}\)Wogihara 1936, 178.2; Dutt 1966, 122.15; Tatz, 1986, p. 81.
this Vinaya where the Buddha expresses himself using the first person plural. The case concerns a Buddhist bhikkhu giving material goods to, or, in effect, supporting his parents, and it occurs in the Civara-khandhaka. It reads:

tenā kho pana samayena aññatarassa bhikkhuno cīvaraṁ uppannaṁ hoti so ca tathā cīvaraṁ mātāpitunnaṁ dātukāmo hoti. Bhāgavato etam atthaṁ ārocesuṁ mātāpitaro hi kho bhikkhave dadaṁśe kim vadeyyāma. anujānāmi bhikkhave mātāpitunnaṁ dātur̄. na ca bhikkhave saddhādeyyaṁ vinipātētabbaṁ, yo vinipātēyya, āpatti dukkaṭassā ti.14

I.B. Horner has translated this as

Now at that time much robe-material accrued to a certain monk, and he was desirous of giving that robe-material to his parents. They (i.e. the bhikkhus) told this matter to the Lord. He said: "Because he is himself giving to his parents, monks, what can we say? I allow you, monks, to give to parents. But, monks, a gift of faith should not be brought to ruin. Whoever should bring [one] to ruin, there is an offence of wrong-doing."15

Rhys Davids and Oldenberg’s earlier translation of the first part of the Buddha’s statement here was somewhat looser and padded out.

Since they are his father and mother, what can we say, O Bhikkhus, though he give them to them. I allow you, O Bhikkhus, to give [robes, in such a case,] to your parents.16

Neither of these translations is, of course, a bad one, but, perhaps, for one thing. And that thing affects the translation of far more than this single passage. In both translations the Buddha says he allows bhikkhus to give to their parents. The verb here is anujānāmi, and this verb occurs hundreds, if not thousands of times in Buddhist Vinaya texts. But H. Bechert has rejected such a translation on more than one occasion. He has said, for example, that “most Vinaya interpreters down to the present day have translated the word anujānāmi as ‘I permit’, ‘I allow’,

---

14Vin I 297–98. All references to Pāli texts are to their Pāli Text Society editions.


16Rhys Davids and Oldenberg 1882, p. 232.
both of which are incorrect in this context [he is talking about a typical passage in which the Buddha delivers a rule]: it means ‘I order’ here”. In another place he also said, “Unfortunately, some authors still translate anujånâmi in most passages in the Vinaya-piṭaka with ‘I allow’. However, when the Buddha speaks, the appropriate translation in most cases is ‘I prescribe’.” K.R. Norman has more matter-of-factly — as is his wont — said, “It is well-known that in the common Vinaya phrase anujånâti means ‘to ordain or prescribe’.”

The implications of these remarks for understanding our present passage are not difficult to see. Read in light of Bechert and Norman, the Buddha of our passage does not “allow” bhikkhus to give to their parents, he requires it; he does not “permit” bhikkhus to do so, he orders it; and this, of course, is a very different thing. Note too that the parenthetical padding supplied in the translation of Rhys Davids and Oldenberg only makes more obvious the unrestricted range of the text itself. They have: “I allow you, O Bhikkhus to give [robes, in such a case,] to your parents.” The padding appears to be intended by the translators to limit the prescribed (their “allowed”) giving to “robes”, and to situations in which there is “much [bahu] robe-material” or cloth. The text itself, however, says no such thing. There, the material to be given is not specified and is therefore, unrestricted; there, no specific circumstances are stated and, therefore, no temporal limitations. And this too is a very different thing.

Then there is the rhetorical expression of the speaker’s inability. Here — as in our first examples — the speaker is the Buddha; and here too — as in all the previous examples — that expression is preceded by an explanatory reason. But here the force of the explanatory reason is not, perhaps, so immediately obvious. While it is easy enough to see why the Buddha would have nothing to say about the actions of an individual who was not a member of the group who recognized his

---

17Bechert 1993, p. 7; Bechert 1982, p. 63; see also Bechert 1968; Bechert 1997, p. 58.
The Buddhist Bhikṣu’s Obligation to Support His Parents 115

authority — an ārāmika or tīrtha — and it is easy enough to see how he would ask how he could possibly have anything to say about a situation governed by what was — for him — the inexorable fact that all conditioned things must pass away, it is, however, more difficult, at least for us, to understand why an act of one of his bhikkhus would leave him speechless just because it was being done to benefit or support that bhikkhu’s parents. This might be especially so since this was ostensibly the same Buddha who had also said — to quote only one possibly early example — that a follower of his “leaving behind son and wife, and father and mother … should wander solitary as a rhinoceros horn”, and should be “one who does not support another” (an-aññaposī). This would seem to remain something of a mystery, even if it be noted — and this rarely is — that Buddhist Vinaya and Buddhist sūtra literature often do not say the same thing or express the same, or even similar, values.

It might be possible to explain the Buddha’s statement here as an unwanted consequence of an already taken decision. Already by Aśoka followers of the Buddha were publicly called bhikṣus and bhikkunīs, and whatever else this might have meant, it certainly identified them as “beggars”. But to judge from Indian normative texts, this identification would have in turn carried with it certain unavoidable expectations, at least in a brahmanical or even brahmanized world. The Āpastamba-dharmasūtra says, for example, in Olivelle’s recent translation,

The appropriate reasons for begging [bhikṣane nimittam] are the following: to pay the teacher, to celebrate a marriage, to perform a sacrifice, trying to support one’s parents [mātāpitror bubhārṣa], and when a worthy person

19Sutta-nipāta, vv. 60, 65. The translation is from Norman 1992B. For the first of these cf. Salomon, 2000, p. 108 (v. 18), pp. 144–46 (v. 18).
21Bloch 1950, pp. 152, 153, 155. Curiously, and as noted long ago by Lüders (1963, p. 2, n.1) the terms “bhikhu or bhiccchu (bhikshu) for monks are never used in Bhārhat inscriptions”, although bhikkhu and bhicchhuni are, and both “occur very often” at Sāncī.
would have to suspend an obligatory act.22

And the Mānavadharmaśāstra, again in Olivelle’s recent translation:

A man seeking to extend his line, a man preparing to perform a sacrifice, a traveller, a man who has performed the sacrifice at which all his possessions are given away, a man who begs for the sake of his teacher, father or mother [pitṛmātrarthaḥ], a student of the Veda, and a sick man —— these nine should be known as “bath-graduates” [snātaka], Brahmins who are beggars pursuant to the Law [dharmaḥsūka].23

It is possible that passages like these might explain something of our Pāli text. At the very least they suggest that any group that insisted on calling its members bhikkhus or bhikkhunis — that is to say, “beggars” — in an Indian setting in which dharmaśāstric values and expectations were current might well have found it impossible to forbid its followers to give material support to their parents, or to avoid the expectation that its members would be engaged — at least in part — in providing their parents with material goods. This, after all, would have been, in such a place, one of “the appropriate reasons for begging (bhikṣaṇa)”, and begging is what a bhikṣu is supposed to do.

We might, then, have in these brahmanical sources on dharma the elements of a possible explanation of why in the Pāli Vinaya the Buddha, when confronted by one of his bhikkhus wanting to give cloth to his parents, is presented as being unable to say anything about it. But while it might be a possible explanation, it is not a certain one, and there are some further considerations which might render it even less so. To have the heavy inexorability of, for example, the notion that all conditioned things must pass away, these dharmaśāstric norms and expectations would have to have had a cultural facticity that only would have held in a thoroughly brahmanical environment. But we know that the Pāli Vinaya was certainly redacted and continuously edited in Sri Lanka, and that there is little or no evidence of the presence of Indian

22Āpastamba-dharmsūtra 2.10.1 (Olivelle 2000, pp. 86–87).
It could, of course, be argued that such considerations would lose much of their force if our passage could be taken as an old, established survival of the North Indian tradition where brahmanical norms would have been, more reasonably, a factor to be contended with, but this in turn would raise the issue of how well our text was integrated into, and was representative of, the Pāli Vinaya as a whole, and here too there are questions.

There is, indeed, much that is unusual about this passage. It may well be the only place in the Pāli Vinaya where the Buddha is presented as unable to prohibit or alter a practice of one of his bhikkhus. It appears to be the only place in the entire Pāli Vinaya where the Buddha, in referring to himself, uses the first person plural of the verb “to speak”. It is the only passage there where there is any mention of a “gift of faith” (saddhādeyya) being “brought to ruin” (vinipāteyya). In fact the compound saddhādeyya is itself very rare in the Pāli Vinaya and the structure of the text itself is not typical. From the point of view of vocabulary, then, the text could hardly be called representative, and if Rhys Davids and Oldenberg are right in assigning the term dukkata, or “wrong-doing”, to “the latest portion” or “final recension” of the Pāli Vinaya, then our passage also would not appear to be early.26 There are other factors as well that would seem to point in the same direction.

The Pāli text prescribing that a bhikkhu must give material goods to

24In contrast with other Theravāda countries in Southeast Asia — see, for example, Lingat 1949; Schopen, Schopen 2004A, 186, and the sources cited in n. 48; 210 and n. 56.
25For vadeyya and saddhādeyya in the Pāli Vinaya see Ousaka, Yamazaki, Norman 1996.
26Rhys Davids and Oldenberg 1881, p. xxv — they are responding here, however, to a “trenchant attack upon Buddhist morality” based on the Pāli Vinaya by S. Coles, “the first ardent student of Pali among the missionaries after the time of Gogerly”; see Young and Somaratna 1996, pp. 171–72, and n. 372.
his parents is a little one of not much more than six lines, tucked away in the middle of the Cīvara-khandhaka. It is also an isolated one. Neither the prescription nor the practice are referred to elsewhere in the Pāli Vinaya in regard to bhikkhus, and there appears to be but a single, curious or indirect reference to the practice in regard to bhikkunis. Pācittiya 28 of the Pāli Bhikkhuni-pātimokkha has recently been translated by K.R. Norman as

> If any bhikkhuni should give recluses’ robe material [samañña-cīvaraṇa dadeyya] to a householder or to a male wanderer [paribhājakā] or to a female wanderer, there is an offence entailing expiation.27

But the exception clause (anāpatti) attached to this rule in the Bhikkhuni-vibhanga gives as the first exception:

\[ \text{anāpatti mātāpitunāṇa} \text{den.} \]28

There is no offence if she gives [it] to [her] parents.

The first or most obvious thing about this reference to a member of the Buddhist community giving material things to her parents is that it does not occur in the Pātimokkha rule itself, but in the exception clause attached to it in the Vibhanga and since von Hinüber, for example, has more than once suggested that these exception clauses represent the latest layer in the Vibhanga,29 this reference — if he is correct — would appear to be, like the reference in the Cīvara-khandhaka, not an early one. It is, moreover, worth noticing that the Bhikkhuni-vibhanga does not order the bhikkhuni to give to her parents. It does not even recommend it. At the most it allows for it, and tacitly recognizes it as a practice by citing it as an exception to the rule. This might seem curious if the prescription now found in the Cīvara-khandhaka was already in place or known. But the situation in post-canonical and Sri Lankan sources — which we cannot follow here in any detail — is, if anything,

---

28 Vin IV:286,3.
29 See, for example, von Hinüber 1996, p. 14.
In regard to post-canonical Pāli sources we can only note here, for example, that there is a whole series of “stories of the present” (paccuppannavatthu) in the Commentary to the Jātaka dealing with bhikkhus who are supporters (posaka) of their parents, but these bhikkhus are repeatedly still being criticized there by other bhikkhus for doing so, and the criticism is expressed by citing a part — but only a part — of what looks like the Civara-khandhaka prescription. The critical bhikkhus say to the bhikkhu who gives to his parents, āvuso satthā saddhādeyyaṁ vinipātētuṁ na deti. tvam saddhādeyyaṁ gahetvā gihīnaṁ dadamāno ayuttaṁ karosi ti (“the Teacher does not allow a gift of the faithful to be brought to ruin. In giving to householders after you have taken a gift of the faithful you do what is improper”). Since the critical bhikkhus know that the householders in question are the other bhikkhu’s parents, this should have been an issue already resolved in the Civara-khandhaka if the Civara-khandhaka passage looked at the time of the Jātaka Commentary as it does now. Equally odd, perhaps, is the textual fact that in these stories when a bhikkhu decides to support his parents while remaining a bhikkhu — and it is there his decision — he cites as the justification not the prescription in the Civara-khandhaka, but a statement that is attributed to the Buddha that appears not to be found in the Pāli Canon, but is not unlike a statement found in a very different Vinaya: satthā pana pabbajitaputto va upakārako nāma ti vadati (“But the Teacher says, ‘Even a son who has entered the

---

30The “stories of the present” in the following Jātakas deal with bhikkhus who support their parents: Nos. 164* (Gijjha-jātaka), 385 (Nandiyamiga-), 398* (Sutano-), 399 (Gijjha-), 455* (Mātiposaka-), 484* (Sālikedāra-), 513* (Jayaddisa-), 532* (Sona-Nanda-), and 540 (Sāma-). The last of these presents the fullest account of such a bhikkhu, and all those marked here with an asterisk refer to it for a full account; it is the source for what follows here. For the Pāli Jātaka Commentary see von Hinüber 1998, especially pp. 16–24, for both the paccuppannavatthu and mātiposaka bhikkhus.

31Ja VI 71.15.
And finally, although the Buddha in these stories repeatedly praises the bhikkhu who supports his parents in very strong terms, and wants to strengthen his resolve (*tassa ussaham janetukamo*), he nowhere here makes giving to one’s parents a rule for bhikkhus as he had (already?) done in the Civa-rakhandhaka. How best to account for all of this is, of course, far from clear. Nor is it immediately obvious how this disparate material fits — or if it fits at all — with a good deal of inscriptional and historical material from Sri Lanka that would seem to indicate that the support of one’s parents by Buddhist bhikkhus was there a recognized and established practice throughout the medieval period and virtually up to modern times. Two examples must suffice. A Sanskrit inscription dated to the ninth century was discovered more than a hundred years ago at Anuradhapura. It is almost certainly a *kriyakara* or “local ordinance” of the monastery in association with which it was found — such ordinances in Pali sources are called *katikavatas*. It specifies — among other things — what kind of bhikkhu can or cannot reside in the monastery. It indicates, for example, that bhikkhus “ordained at another vihara” can only reside in this one if they have given up their privileges and duties in their original vihara; that bhikkhus who own or receive land may not reside there. As a part of this enumeration it then says,

\[
\text{mithya}jivin\text{a na va[stavyam \{\text{stri}po\text{sa}\text{]}kena na vastavyam \{anyatra m\text{ati}n\text{ip}r\text{byyam}\}^34}
\]

[A bhiksu] getting his living in a wrong way must not reside here. One who supports a woman must not reside here, except for [one supporting his] parents.

What Ratnapala calls the Mahâ-Parâkramabâhu Katikâvata — a twelfth-century set of ordinances promulgated in the name of the king

---

32Ja VI 70.14.
33Ja VI 71.23.
34Wickremasinghe 1904–1912, especially p. 4, line 12. The fact that this inscription is in Sanskrit obviously raises the question of North Indian influence; see below and sources in n. 46.
— has a similar, but even more elaborate exception clause in regard to a different issue:

No permission should be given to any of these [bhikkhus] to enter the village at improper times on any business other than on account of a journey begging food for the unsupported parents who had given birth to them, likewise for their consanguineous and widowed elder and younger sisters.35

In both of these ordinances, which were meant to govern the activities of Buddhist bhikkhus in medieval Sri Lanka, the practice of bhikkhus supporting their parents is not only recognized, but apparently had such significance and currency that other regulations had to be built around it and could not put constraints upon it —— it overrode all sorts of other considerations. Here, however, the Sri Lankan material cannot be further pursued, and we can only return to our main focus and try to sum up what is found in the canonical Pāli Vinaya that bears on the issue of a bhikkhu supporting his parents.

A first point that could be made about the canonical Vinaya is that if one sticks strictly to its wording it, literally, says nothing about a bhikkhu supporting his parents. Unlike the Jātaka Commentary, it does not use a word corresponding to the English word “support”. It uses forms of the verb “to give” —— the bhikkhu “desires to give” (dātukāma), is “giving” (dadamāna), and is ordered “to give” (anujānāmi … dātu) to his parents. This is ambiguous and, as we have seen, allows Rhys Davids and Oldenberg to put restrictions on the giving by padding their translation and limiting that giving to “robes” and to situations where there is an abundance of them. But again, strictly speaking, the order is simply to give, with no limits put on the objects that must be given, and no temporal or situational qualifications put on the obligation. Then there is the textual fact that the order itself is delivered almost unwillingly —— the Buddha is made to say kiṃ vadeyyāma, as if he had no choice. There is the additional textual fact that the language of the text which contains the order is unusual —— the Buddha using a first

35Ratnapala 1971, p. 131 (§9); for other examples see pp. 148 (§78), 156 (§87), 169 (§103), 176 (§14).
person plural form of the verb; the reference to the “gift of faith” (saddhādeyya), etc. There is as well the fact that the prescription is an isolated one and had no afterlife — it, like the practice it enjoins, is referred to nowhere else in the Pāli Vinaya except in an exception clause in the Bhikkhuni-vibhanga. Finally, and as already noted from a different angle, the prescription in the Pāli Vinaya is completely lacking in detail and specificity — it is, for example, only indicated in later sources like the Jātaka Commentary, or the cited katikāvata, that bhikkhus who give to or support their parents do so by begging. In short, the situation in the Pāli Vinaya is a thoroughly unsatisfactory one: a bhikkhu who had to depend on it would have no clear guidance. In this regard — if no other — his northern brothers would have been much better off.

A second Buddhist Vinaya — one that more certainly circulated in India — is slowly becoming better known. Like the Pāli Vinaya or, indeed, all the Vinayas that have come down to us, this Vinaya, the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya, appears to have been redacted relatively late, but its redaction almost certainly took place in North or Northwest India in an environment where brahmanical norms and expectations were a presence that had to be addressed. In this Vinaya the rules governing a whole series of issues — contact with corpses, inheritance of property, for example — were fairly obviously framed in such a way that Buddhist practice would accommodate and incorporate larger brahmanical values. In such an environment there is little doubt that the kind of brahmanical expectations concerning beggars expressed in the passages from Āpastamba and Manu already cited would have been well fixed, and this, in turn, may account in good part for the fact that the redactors of this Vinaya give no evidence that there was a felt need to explain or justify the practice of Buddhist bhikṣus supporting their

---

36 For contact with corpses and “pollution” see, for example, Schopen 1992, Schopen 2006; for inheritance, Schopen 1995 (= Schopen 2004A, pp. 170–92), Schopen 2001 (= Schopen 2004A, pp. 122–69).
The text that delivers the Mūlasarvāstivādin prescription needs little commentary and is short enough to be translated in full. It occurs in what is now called the Uttaragrantha, and although this is the least well known section of the Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya there are already clear signs that it represents a particularly influential, and probably early, part of this tradition.\(^{37}\) Since this portion of the Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya is not yet available in Sanskrit, the translation here is of the Tibetan translation.\(^{38}\)

The setting was in Śrāvasti.

A householder in Śrāvasti took a wife from a suitable family and made love with her. When he had made love with her, and when after that she had become pregnant, then — eight or nine months having passed — she gave birth to a son, a handsome boy who was a delight to see and possessed of all his limbs. And having celebrated the festival of birth for the newborn he was given a name.

The boy was nurtured and grew up, but then later — without asking his father and mother — he entered the religious life (rab tu byung ba = pravrajati) in the Order (bstan pa = śāsana) of the Blessed One. In the morning when he had dressed he, taking his bowl and robe, entered Śrāvasti for alms, and when his old father saw him he said, “Son, since you have


\(^{38}\)The text occurs at Uttaragrantha, Derge ’dul Pa 112b.1–113a.1 — the Sanskrit equivalents inserted into the English translation are all attested in one form or another, but are, of course, only probable.
entered into the religious life (pravrajita) who will support us?” (nged cag sus gso bar ‘gyur = poṣṭiyati; or “will be the supporter (poṣaka) of us?”)

The bhikṣu was crestfallen (spa gong nas = māṅkubhūtu) and said nothing.

The bhikṣus reported to the Blessed One what had occurred, and the Blessed One said, “Bhikṣus, one’s father and mother are the doers of what is difficult (dka’ ba byed pa = duṣkaraka) for a son. Therefore, I order (rjes su gnaṅ ngo = anujāṇāmi) that even a son who has entered the religious life (bu rab tu byung yang = pravrajita-putra?) must procure (sbyor ba = pra yuj) food and clothing for both father and mother.”

When the Blessed One had said “even one who has entered the religious life must procure food and clothing for both father and mother”, and the bhikṣus did not know how it was to be provided, the Blessed One said, “What there is beyond his bowl and robe — with that it must be provided! If there is none, then begging from a donor (sbyin bdag = dānapati), it must be provided! If, as one who receives from the Community (saṃghalābhīn) he has a right to what belongs to the Community, he must give half of that! If he is one who begs his food (piṇḍapatikā), he must give half his alms! If that is not done one comes to be guilty of an offence ("daś pa = atīyaya).

There is — apart, perhaps, from the very idea of bhikṣus supporting their parents — nothing very odd here. Certainly the language, vocabulary, and conceptual world in this text are not at all unusual, but rather typical, or even characteristic, of the Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya as a whole. The whole of the first paragraph, and most of the second, for example, consists entirely of clichés or stenciled passages that occur scores of times in the Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya and the literature dependent on it like the Avadānaśataka and Divyāvadāna.39 Indeed, the construction of the text as a whole, the way in which the “action” unfolds, is entirely typical of hundreds of texts in this Vinaya. The assertion that parents are “the doers of what is difficult” (duṣkaraka) is repeatedly made in its Vibhaṅga, the Uttaragrantha again, its Bhaisajya- and Kṣudraka-vastus.40 The distinction in the text between bhikṣus

40Vibhaṅga, Derge ’dul ba Ca 76a.7; Uttaragrantha, Derge ’dul ba Pa 103a.4;
supported by the Community (saṃghalābhīn) and those who beg (pīṇḍapāṭika) is found again in its Poṣadha-vastu and Vibhāṅga, for example, and is so well established that it can occur in “stories of the past” (bhūtapārva), as it does in the Śayanāsana-vastu.41

Perhaps even more to the point, given the use of the expression pabbajita-putta in the otherwise untraceable citation of the Buddha’s words in the Jātaka Commentary, in the Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya the Buddha himself and other bhikṣus are repeatedly seen using the term pravrājita in making claims or assertions in regard to Buddhist bhikṣus — easily available examples occur in its Čiva- and Kṣudraka-vastus, Uttaragrantha, and Vibhāṅga.42 Even what appears to be an anomaly in our text may not be one. The observant will have noticed that the boy in our text entered the Order without asking his parents. This receives no comment or correction, even though according to specific rule in this Vinaya — and others — it should not have occurred.43 It is, of course, possible to suggest that our text was set in a narrative time that preceded that of the promulgation of the rule that required parental permission for entrance into the Order, but the fact of the matter is that this kind of situation — a narrative situation in which seemingly established rules do not seem to be in place — occurs on a number of occasions in the texts in the Uttaragrantha, and may be indicating that they represent an early and partially independent strand of the Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya

---

41Bhaiṣajya-vastu, Derge ’dul ba Kha 5b.2 (= Divyāvadāna (Cowell and Neil) 51.20); Kṣudraka-vastu, Derge ’dul ba Tha 253b.1. The same expression is also found in early North Indian inscriptive sources; see Salomon 1986, p. 265 (8d.), 271 (8d.) — the inscription dates to the early first century C.E.


43See, for example, the Mūlasarvāstivādin ordination formulary translated in Schopen 2004B, p. 236.
It seems, moreover, that unlike in the prescription in the Pāli Civara-khandhaka, there is little ambiguity in the Mūlasarvāstivādin text, even though it must be filtered through the Tibetan translation. That the issue under discussion is the “support” of the bhikṣu’s parents seems certain; the father’s question uses the expression gso bar ’gyur, which almost certainly is translating either the future form poṣīṣyati, or a construction involving the substantive poṣaka plus a form of bhū, both of which would have the general sense “support”, “nourish”, “foster”.44 The Buddha’s prescription uses the verb sbyor ba to describe what one who has entered the religious life must do, and the sense of the Tibetan verb in a context like this is “procure” or “provide”. The original was very likely a form of pra-yuj which, of course, has a wide range of meanings, among which are “prepare”, “produce”, or even “offer” or “present” (a Sanskrit source we will shortly see uses the verb udvahet). But if there is little ambiguity in the Mūlasarvāstivādin text, there appears to be even less ambivalence — certainly there is nothing like the Buddha’s tacit statement in the Pāli that he had no choice in prescribing what he did. Finally, the Mūlasarvāstivādin text — unlike again in the Pāli one — is detailed and specific; it contains precise instructions on how the prescription is to be fulfilled depending on a range of different situations or circumstances.

But if there are distinct differences between the Pāli and Mūlasarvāstivādin texts in the form, language and delivery of the prescription itself, there also appear to be distinct differences in regard to how well their respective prescriptions are anchored or integrated into their respective Vinayas, and in regard to its continuing influence. The Pāli prescription appears to have been, as already noted, an isolated one — it is not, strictly speaking, referred to anywhere else in the Pāli Vinaya. This is not the case in regard to the Mūlasarvāstivādin prescription. Moreover, there is no doubt — as we will see in a moment — that the

44See Negi 2005, p. 7397, s.v. gso ba.
Mūlasarvāstivādin prescription had a long shelf-life, whereas this has yet to be demonstrated for the Pāli tradition, and we have already seen that in a place like the Jātaka Commentary where bhikkhus are being criticized for giving to or supporting their parents, and where one might therefore legitimately expect to find reference to the prescription in answer to the criticism, there is none. Here again, however, the Mūlasarvāstivādin material can be, and need only be, cited summarily, using two particularly unequivocal examples.

One might, again, legitimately expect that if a rule like the Mūlasarvāstivādin prescription requiring bhikṣus to procure food and clothing for their parents were fully integrated into their Vinaya, it would be referred to elsewhere, and the Mūlasarvāstivādin prescription certainly is. A particularly striking example occurs in its Vibhaṅga, in the longish section there devoted to the issue of bhikṣus paying tolls. The text concerns a bhikṣu from Śrāvasti and says,45

> Once, while wandering through the countryside, when he obtained two great pieces of cotton cloth he thought to himself, “Since it has been said by the Blessed One, ‘Even one who has entered the religious life (rab tu byung ba = pravrajita) must provide (bṣabs par bya ba = pratipādya) the means of support (mkho ba = upakaraṇa) to his father and mother,’ I, therefore, will give one of these to my father, the other I will give to my mother.”

The text continues with the bhikṣu being stopped at a custom-house on his way back to Śrāvasti, and being asked if he had anything “on which duties are wanted”. The bhikṣu says, “No”, but the customs-agent finds the cloth and accuses him of lying. Then

> The bhikṣu said, “But, sir, these two are not mine.”
> “Then whose are they, Noble One?”
> “Sir, one is my father’s; the other my mother’s.”

But the customs-agent is not impressed and says,

> “Noble one, since I do not find your father here, nor do I find your mother, you must pay the tax, then begone from here!”

---

45Vibhaṅga, Derge Ca 75b.5-76b.4.
When the bhikṣus report to the Blessed One what had happened, the text says,

The Blessed One said, “Though indeed, bhikṣus, for that bhikṣu there is no offence, still a bhikṣu should not proceed in this way, but should first declare in this way the praises of parents to the customs-agent, ‘Sir, the Blessed One has said, “Bhikṣus, one’s father and mother are the doers of what is difficult (dka’ ba byed pa = daṣkaraka) for a son — they are nourishers, supporters, fosterers . . .”’ If he declares in this way the praises of his parents, and if he is let go, that is good. If he is not let go, then paying the tax, he should proceed. If he does not proceed in this way he comes to be guilty of an offence.”

There are a number of points worth briefly noting here, the first and perhaps most obvious of which is that the first part of what the bhikṣu thinks here in the Vibhaṅga is a loose quotation or close paraphrase of the rule delivered by the Buddha in the Uttaragrantha, and is marked as such. Internal quotations from one part of this Vinaya in another are not infrequent and are always explicitly marked as such — as here — with the phrase “it has been said by the Blessed One”. Such “quotations” are also — again as here — almost never verbatim.47

A second and perhaps more surprising point has already been alluded to: what the bhikkhu in the Jātaka Commentary thinks when he decides to support his parents as a bhikkhu is also marked as a “quotation” (sattā pana pabbajitaputto va upakārako nāma ti vadatti) but while this quotation cannot, it seems, be traced in the Pāli Vinaya, it is remarkably similar to what the Mūlasarvāstivādin bhikṣu thinks in the Vibhaṅga when he makes the same decision (notice in particular the Pāli upakāraka and the Mūlasarvāstivādin upakaraṇa, and the uncharacteristic use of pabbajita in the Pāli). This situation might be most easily explained as yet another instance of the influence of “Northern”, particularly Mūlasarvāstivādin, sources on the Pāli

46 For the stenciled passage praising parents that I have abbreviated here see the reference cited in n. 38 above; for a translation, Schopen 2004A, p. 179.
47 For some instances and remarks on these internal “quotations” see Schopen 2004A, pp. 103–04, 179–80, 183, 230 and n. 41, 311–12, and 355, n. 44.
commentaries — Frauwallner, for example, goes so far as to say that they are “met with at every step when one scans the pages of the Dhammapada-atṭhakathā”.48 But this raises again the issue of why an “external” source would be cited if the rule now found in the Pāli Civara-khandhaka were already in place.

A final point that might be noted here must be that this Vibhaṅga text would seem to present an example of precisely the sort of thing that one might expect to find if the rule regarding bhikṣus to provide for their parents had been fully integrated into its Vinaya, if the rule had become a practice. Here, as it were, the rule is narrativized and appears in a context other than the one in which it was originally promulgated. Here the rule — like so many other rules in Buddhist Vinaya — gives rise to further rules. And the text would seem to suggest that the practice of bhikṣus providing for their parents was established to the point that the redactors of the Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya, at least, thought it was in need of further regulation and established guidelines here meant to ensure that bhikṣus who engaged in it would not run afoul of the law or create problems with the state.

Beyond, however, a text like that cited from the Vibhaṅga there are still other indications that the rule requiring bhikṣus to provide for their parents was, and remained for a very long time, an integral part of the Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya tradition, none clearer, perhaps, than that provided by Gūnaprabha’s Vinaya-sūtra. The Vinaya-sūtra is a remarkable digest of the Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya, written in true sūtra style, that has come down to us in Sanskrit. Gūnaprabha appears to have written his Vinaya-sūtra sometime between the fifth and the seventh century, but we know from a colophon that it was still being copied in the eleventh–twelfth centuries at Vikramaśīla; that at least four extensive commentaries were written on it in India; and that both the sūtra and these commentaries were translated into Tibetan and became

48Frauwallner 1956, p. 188, and sources cited in his n. 4; Ruelius 1968, p. 175 and the sources cited there; Hüsken 1997, pp. 204–205 and n. 20; cf. Pind 1996.
— and remain — an important part of a bhikṣu’s training in the Tibetan using world.49

Certainly, one of the more remarkable things about Guṇaprabha’s Vinaya-sūtra is that it has reduced the nearly eight thousand pages of the canonical Vinaya to an even hundred. It did this in part, at least, by ignoring the enormous mass of narrative material in this Vinaya, but also by an almost breathtaking economy of expression and a tight focus on the bare essentials. Given these general characteristics it is of some interest that the rule requiring bhikṣus to provide for their parents is treated in some detail, even if it is in a very compact form. The text says,

\[
\text{yogam bhaktāccchādanena pitror udvahet l}
\]
\[
\text{na cel lābhaya pātraçcañcād atirekas samādāpya l}
\]
\[
\text{asampattau bhojanopanater upārdhasyāddānam l}
\]
\[
(pha ma la zas dang gos kyis gtang bar bya’o l}
\]
\[
gal te lhung bzed dang chos las hag pa’i inyed pa med na blangs te’o l
\]
\[
ma grub na zan gyi skal ba las phyed shyin no l)
\]

As with most of Guṇaprabha’s sūtras these three are barely intelligible on their own, hence the four enormous Indian commentaries written on it. But very often knowledge of the canonical passage that he is digesting turns out to provide the best “commentary” on a given set of sūtras, and that is the case here. Armed with a knowledge of the canonical text these sūtras can be translated — with the necessary padding — as

[A bhikṣu] should conscientiously provide his parents with food and

49There is not yet anything like a good overview of the complexities of the Vinaya-sūtra and its associated literature, and little is actually known about Guṇaprabha’s life; for the moment see Schopen 2004A, pp. 64–69; 86, n. 55; 126–28; 257, n.78; 312–18, but there is also important and on-going work being done on the Sanskrit text of the Vinaya-sūtra and Vinayasūtrakṛtya by Masanori Nakagawa and the Study Group of Sanskrit Manuscripts in Tibetan dbu med script at Taishō University which cannot be enumerated here.

50For convenience the Sanskrit text is cited here from Sankrityayana 1981, 89.27, and the Tibetan from Derge, bstan ’gyur, ’dul ba Wu 72b.6.
clothing.

If there is no surplus from the bowl and robes of his acquisition, [it must
be done] after having incited [a donor to provide him with them].

When that does not succeed [the parents are to be] receiving half of the
[bhikṣu’s] share of food.

Although I am less confident than I once was that Guṇaprabha’s
Vinaya-sūtra necessarily reflects the precise vocabulary of the canonical
sources he was digesting — in fact his vocabulary not infrequently
seems far more learned and recherché than that of the canonical texts —
these sūtras are no less important for that. At the very least they provide
a version of the Mūlasarvāstivādin rule in an Indian language. But
beyond that they also indicate the continuing circulation of the rule and
— one might assume — its continuing relevance for the Mūlasarvāsti-
vādin tradition over a very long period of time. The latter, indeed, may
also be underscored by the fact that Guṇaprabha not only digests the
rule itself, he also separately digests the Vibhaṅga passage requiring
bhikṣus to pay tolls on goods they are transporting that are meant for
their parents.\footnote{Sankrityayana, Vinayasūtra 16.29; Derge, bstan ’gyur, ’dul ba Wu 15a.2.}

In trying to summarize what might have been seen here it is
important not to allow the uncertainties and complexities of especially
the Pāli material to conceal or confuse what might be the essential
point: we have here two Vinaya traditions — thought by some to be the
earliest and the latest — in which Buddhist bhikkhus/bhikṣus are
required to give or provide (the exact wording differs) material goods or
support to their parents. Although the integration of, and the attitude
toward, the requirement differs in the two traditions — both have such a
requirement. In one (the Pāli tradition) the rule appears not to be well
integrated and there are indications that it might even be additive; the
attitude towards the requirement there may appear to be ambivalent or
conflicted, even though the actual practice of bhikkhus supporting their
parents in Sri Lanka seems to be strongly suggested. In the other (the
Mūlasarvāstivāda) the requirement appears to be fully integrated, detailed and specific, and its practice further regulated (there is even an incidental reference to bhikṣus borrowing money for the sake of their parents in this Vinaya\(^{52}\)). The attitude toward the requirement in the Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition appears to be straightforward and positive. We have, in short, two positions on a common rule or practice, but it is this shared common rule or practice that is important and that raises the very real question of whether or not the Buddhist bhikṣu or bhikkhu can legitimately, or usefully, be called a “monk”. Although the term “monk” or “moine” or “Mönch” or any other equivalent is itself a contested, and even — as everything today seems to be — a political term, still it seems that by virtually any definition a “monk” would not be allowed to do what our rule requires a Buddhist bhikṣu to do. So even though the issue of whether or not a Buddhist bhikṣu might be called a “monk” is, of course, not a new one,\(^{53}\) it almost certainly will become a more pressing one as Buddhist Vinaya literatures start to be better known and more carefully studied — all of them — and examples like the one treated briefly here begin to pile up. And although it certainly involves and implicates translation, the issue here is far more than an issue of translation. At issue is the very nature of the group of celibate men who created and transmitted Buddhist traditions: it might very well be that this is not best described as “monasticism”. In his recent translation of the Pāli Pātimokkha K.R. Norman has once again not used the word “monk”, but let a bhikkhu be a bhikkhu until we know what that is. We might do well to follow him here, as we must in so many other ways as well.

Gregory Schopen

---


\(^{53}\)See, for example, the discussion in BD, Vol. I, pp. xxxix–l.
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Commentaries, Translations, and Lexica: Some Further Reflections on Buddhism and Philology

In his series of lectures on *A Philological Approach to Buddhism*¹ K.R. Norman has made an excellent case for the importance of philology in the study of Buddhism. In what follows I shall attempt a very modest addition to this picture by looking at some instances that highlight how knowledge of the specific techniques and conventions applied by indigenous commentators and translators can be of importance for lexicography and the interpretation of Buddhist texts.

Consider first of all the following entry in CPD: “udara-jivhā-mansā, n., ‘the flesh of the stomach’s tongue’; description of the spleen: pihakan ti –aṁ, Vism 257,22 (jivhā-saṅṭhānaṁ utarassa matthaka-passe tiṭṭhanaka-maṁsaṁ, mḥ Ā Se II 29,7).” The expression “the flesh of the stomach’s tongue”, even though in some sense “literal”, makes no sense at all, and although the commentary or mahātikā is quoted, it has clearly not been consulted or understood. The commentary’s interpretation of the compound comes a lot closer to describing what the spleen actually is: “The piece of flesh that is located at the upper side of the stomach and has the shape of a tongue.”² This particular CPD entry results from a simple failure to read and take advantage of indigenous commentaries. Matters are not always so straightforward, and it can sometimes be difficult to know exactly when we are in a position to “remonter … à un pali d’intérêt linguistique”, to use an expression from Helmer Smith.³

---

¹The Bukkyō Dendo Kyōkai Lectures delivered at SOAS in 1994; Norman 1997.
²That said, I feel somewhat surprised at the expression *matthaka-passe tiṭṭhanaka-maṁsaṁ* in this passage. Is it possibly an error for *matthaka-passe tiṭṭhanakam maṁsaṁ*? I cannot see why the commentator would opt for a *sāpeksasamāsa* here.
³Smith 1928, p. vi, “C’est donc dans la conviction que notre pali est une fonction de celui du 12e siècle — et que la connaissance de la philologie...
The CPD entry for udānana runs: "udānana, n., vb. noun of udāneti q.v., formed to explain udāna; Sadd 382,21: ken’atthena udānathānī ? om. athena. kim idaṁ ‘aṁ nāma ? piti-vega-samutthāpitto udāhāro (= Ud-a 2.11, reading udān’atthena, udānaṁ nāma).” Turning to the CPD entry for udāna, one finds: ‘udāna, n. and m. [IS], lit. ‘the breathing upwards’; 1. (medic.) one of the five vital airs, rising up the throat and entering the head; 2. a solemn utterance, mostly, but not necessarily, in metrical form, inspired by intense emotion and made without regard to any listeners ...; 3. the fifth of the nine aṅgas (divisions) of the Buddhist scriptures ...; 4. the third book of the Khuddaka-Nikāya divided into 8 vaggas and consisting of 80 suttas each of which contains an udāna introduced by the standing phrase imam udānāṁ udānesi; ... in very frequent standing phrase ‘aṁ udāneti (udānento, ‘nesi, ‘netvā).” The entry goes on to list occurrences. BHSD, on the other hand, has “udāna, m. or nt. (= Pali id.; with acc. pron. usually imam, sometimes idam), a solemn but joyous utterance (acc. to PTSD sometimes a sorrowful one in Pali), usually but not always having religious bearings; almost always in modulation of phrase imam ... udānāṁ udānayati (usually with sma after verb), very common.” Later in the entry we find: “nt. udānam, as n. of a type or class of Buddh. literature, one of the 12 (Mvy) or 9 (Dharmas) pravacanānī, Mvy 1271; Dharmas 62; Udāna-varga, n. of a specific work (abbreviated Ud).” BHSD also has the entry “udānayati, denom., utters an udāna: used virtually always with object udānam, q.v. for forms and passages.”

In Pāṇinian grammar the term kāraka (lit.: “doer; accomplisher”) applies to direct participants in actions. Such a participant is a sādhana,
a means of realising the action,⁴ and every participant is assigned to one of a set of six kāraka categories.⁵ The abstract syntactic level at which kārakas are introduced in the grammar serves to mediate between the levels of semantics and morphology. By this device Pāṇini is able to account for the relationship between possible semantic choices on the side of the speaker and some basic features of Sanskrit syntax and morphology. Such participants in actions are, at the abstract level of kāraka syntax, assigned to particular kāraka-categories. In a similar way the set of lakāras, a set of ten suffixes marked with an L, are introduced after verbal roots at the same abstract level. At this level all verbal endings, except for the ones that denote bhāva (lit.: “being; state of action”), can be said to signify agents and objects in relation to activities. By A 3.4.69 laḥ karmanī ca bhāve cākarmakebhyaḥ an L-suffix is added to a verbal root to denote — in addition to the agent (kartari, A 3.4.67) — the object, or, in the case of verbal roots which are objectless (akarmaka, that is, intransitive verbs), the mere activity expressed by the verbal root (bhāva). When the relevant semantic choices have been considered on the side of the speaker, the abstract syntactic level of kārakas and lakāras is sorted out. The correct distribution of case endings and finite verbal endings is then accounted for in the syntax of a Sanskrit sentence by means of operational rules.

However, kārakas do not pertain to the derivation of sentences alone. Any verbal noun derived by a kṛt-suffix (a primary suffix) is considered to denote either a participant in an action, in which case it is assigned to one or the other of the six kāraka categories, or it is considered to denote the mere activity (bhāva) expressed by the verbal root. By way of example, the suffix LyuT (-ana with guṇa and

---

⁴ I analyse the term sādhana as sādhyate ‘nena, “[something] is realised/ accomplished through it”.

⁵ In the Aṣṭādhyāyī these are defined in the following order: apādāna “stable point when there is movement away”, sampradāna “recipient; indirect goal”, karana “instrument”, udhikarana “locus”, karman “object; goal”, and kārya “agent”. Moreover, a subcategory of agent is defined, namely hetu, the causal agent.
presuffixal accent) is introduced to form neuter action nouns (*bhāve*), by A 3.3.115 *lyuṭ ca*, and also to form nouns expressing the instrument or the locus of the action expressed by the root, by A 3.3.117 *karaṇādhiṣṭaṇyavoṣ ca*. This means that when analysing a particular word, alternative interpretations are often possible. Accordingly, the word *udāna* quoted above can be interpreted as *bhāvasādhaṇa*, that is to say, as an action noun (with *Lyuṭ* by A 3.3.115 *lyuṭ ca*) denoting the mere activity of uttering or pronouncing, or, alternatively, as either *adhikaraṇāsādhaṇa*, that is to say, as a noun denoting a locus, “place of utterance”, or *karaṇāsādhaṇa*, as a noun denoting a means of uttering (the latter two formed with *Lyuṭ* by A 3.3.117 *karaṇādhiṣṭaṇyavoṣ ca* which teaches that this suffix is added also to denote the instrument and the locus). These rules do not permit its analysis as *karmaṇāsādhaṇa*, that is, as denoting the object of the action.

Let me now return to the passage from the *Saddanīti* quoted under the CPD entry for *udānana*, Sadd 382,21–22: *ken’ atheṇa udānana: udānanaṭṭhena, kim idam udānanaṃ nāma: pūtivegasamaṭṭhāpitā udāhāro*, “In what sense *udāna*? In the sense of *udānana*. What is this that one calls *udānana*? It is an utterance (or, rather, an act of uttering) made to arise by the impetus of joy.” The whole point of analysing *udāna* as *udānana* is simply to make it clear that it is interpreted as *bhāvasādhaṇa*, as the act of uttering itself, and not as *karmaṇa*, an utterance in the form of an object, which would be the only reasonable interpretation of *udāna* in expressions such as *imaṃ udānaṃ udāneti* or *imaṃ udānanaṃ udānayeṣi* referred to above. Incidentally, the CPD entry for *udāhāra* runs: “*udāhāra, m. [ts.], utterance, pronunciation; in definitions of udāna.*” The entry goes on to list references. This is clearly running in circles without bringing out the intentions behind the words taken from the glosses or interpretations of the indigenous sources.

Moreover, it certainly seems reasonable here to ask what constitutes “un pali d’intérêt linguistique”, as it is natural to form a verbal noun such as *udānana* from any verb. In Yāska’s *Nirukta*, more
than a hundred words are analysed by a construction that involves the ablative form of a neuter verbal noun in -ana, to be interpreted as a nomen actionis or bhāvasādhana if one adheres to Sanskrit terminology. A representative example of this type of construction is (Nir 9.26) sindhuḥ syandanāt. I suggest the following interpretation: “sindhuḥ (the river Indus, or ‘river’ in general) [is so called] on account of the streaming (syandanam)”. The name sindhuḥ is related to the verbal noun by an ablative construction which explains why sindhuḥ came to signify the river of that name, or any river, and the construction is thus a natural reply to the question kasmāt “why”? The most commonly used Sanskrit dictionaries record that the neuter verbal nouns in -ana employed in this type of construction quite frequently are attested only in the Nirukta, a fact that indicates that these forms are in principle derived by Yāska himself for the technical purpose of nirvacana analysis. This type of analysis is also met with in Buddhist texts, for example in the Abhidharmakośabhāṣya when it explains the word dharma at AK 1.2: nirvacanaṁ tu svalaśṭpadhāraṇād dharmaḥ, “as for the nirvacana: on account of the holding/possessing (dhāraṇaṁ) [its] unique particular, [it is called] a dharma”.

In his article “Sur quelques formations sanskrites en -ti-” Louis Renou (1951) drew attention to the fact that much as nouns in -ii are, in principle, “regular” formations, a number of them are nevertheless listed in the unādisūtras, or, more precisely, in the commentaries on the unādisūtras. As Renou points out (1951, p. 1), Hemacandra’s Dhātu-pārāyaṇa, for example, presents a large number of forms in -ii that are lacking in standard Sanskrit dictionaries. “Plusieurs sont d’une authenticité douteuse, mais toutes méritent d’être signalées dans un Thesaurus, mais toutes méritent d’être signalées dans un Thesaurus, eké donné l’intérêt qui s’attache à l’œuvre lexico-

6The noun dhārana is formed from the causative stem of the root dhṛ, but this root is commonly used in the causative stem with no change of its basic meaning.

7Deccan College was planning a Sanskrit thesaurus at the time of the publication of Renou’s article. The article appeared in the first issue of Vāk, published by Deccan College in 1951.
However, some formations in \(-ti\) raise questions of a similar nature as did the neuter verbal nouns in \(-ana\) above. That forms met with in the epigraphical record should be included in dictionaries is obvious. As examples, Renou (1951, p. 2) mentions \(\text{an}\hat{\text{h}}\hat{\text{at}}\text{i}\) (variant \(\text{amh}\hat{\text{iti}}\)) in the sense of “don”, and \(\text{j\hat{\text{n}}\hat{\text{a}}\text{i}}\) in the sense of “information, connaissance”, among others.

Consider now the analysis of some forms in \(-ti\) and \(-ana\) met with in the Prasannapada, Candrakirti’s commentary on N\^ag\^arjuna’s M\^ula-madhyamakak\^arik\^a (edited by L. de La Vall\^ee Poussin 1903–13, p. 4, ll. 5–6):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{tatra niruddhir nirodha} & \text{h k\^\text{s\=a}nabh\=anga} \text{ nirodha ity ucyate} \mid \\
\text{utp\=adanam utp\=adah \=\text{\=a}tmabh\=avonm\=ajana} & \text{m ity arth\=a} \mid \text{\textsuperscript{8}} \\
\text{ucchittir uccheda} & \text{\=p} \text{\=rabandhavicchittir ity artha} \mid 
\end{align*}
\]

The first line one could render: “In this respect, \textit{nirodha} is \textit{niruddhi}: it is \textit{k\=s\=a\=nabh\=anga} that is called \textit{nirodha}.” In other words, \textit{nirodha} is explained by \textit{niruddhi}, a verbal noun in \(-ti\) formed from the same root with the same preverb. The form \textit{niruddhi} is not met with in extant lexica, including BHSD. It seems therefore likely that it was derived by Candrakirti for the particular purpose of interpreting \textit{nirodha} as \textit{bh\=avas\=adhana} by glossing it with a form in \(-ti\), that is to say as meaning “a ceasing”. Candrakirti goes on to say that \textit{nirodha} is \textit{k\=s\=a\=nabh\=anga}. Now, it is not easy to provide an elegant translation for the term \textit{k\=s\=a\=nabh\=anga}, nor is it unambiguous how best to analyse the compound. Suffice it to say that the term refers to the fact that all phenomena are of momentary existence, hence a \textit{vigraha} of the compound could be \textit{k\=san\=\=a\=d bha\=ih\=a}, the ceasing to exist after only one moment, or, perhaps, \textit{k\=san\=e\=n bha\=ih\=a} or \textit{k\=s\=a\=n bha\=ih\=a}, the ceasing to exist every moment, that is to say, “continuous instant ceasing”.

\textsuperscript{8}J. W. de Jong (1978, p. 29) prefers the reading \=\textit{\=a}tmabh\=avonm\=ajana met with in a manuscript acquired by G. Tucci which was not available to La Vall\^ee Poussin.

\textsuperscript{9}The passage is introduced by the words \textit{avayav\=ar\=thas tu vibhajyate}, “but the meaning of the various parts is explained in detail [as follows]”.

The second line of the passage is a little more problematic, but it brings out the point I wish to make, namely that it is possible for the purpose of interpretation to form verbal nouns in -\(ti\) or -\(ana\) from any verb or verbal noun. The line could be rendered: “\(utpāda\) is \(utpādana\), [that is to say,) the emerging of a bodily form”. Here \(utpāda\) is glossed \(utpādana\), which, as a causative formation, is somewhat difficult to reconcile with the fact that the verb \(un-majj\) “to emerge” is intransitive. Turning to standard lexic, we meet with further problems. For \(utpādana\) as a neuter noun, MW has “the act of producing or causing, generating, begetting”. A Dictionary of Pāli (M. Cone 2001) has “\(uppādana\), n., ~ā, f. [S. \(utpādana\], producing, generating”. Should we emend to \(utpadana\), that is to say, to a non-causative form? Edgerton lists the form \(utpadyana\) in BHSD: “\(utpadyana\) (nt. ; = Pali uppajjana: MIndic -\(ana\) formation to utpadyate), production, origination : Gv 48.5 (prose), read: \(harṣa\)-\(utpadyana\)-\(saṃtānā\) (see s.v. \(saṃtāna\) 2)”. “Production” and “origination” are unlikely synonyms, since they are based on transitive and intransitive verbs respectively. Under \(utpadyati\), however, BHSD has “(2) in mg. of Skt. caus. \(utpādayati\), produces, causes”. Turning to the entry for \(saṃtāna\) that Edgerton referred to above, one finds that he translates \(harṣa\)-\(utpadyana\)-\(saṃtānā\) “their mental conditions productive of joy”. Here he seems to take \(utpadyana\) as transitive.

In any case, \(utpādana\) remains problematic. A form \(utpadana\) is not met with in lexic. To emend to \(utpādyana\) is problematic. The solution that emerges as the most plausible is therefore to conclude that Candrakīrti formed \(utpādā\) directly on \(utpāda\), again to make it clear that he interprets \(utpāda\ as \(bhāvasādhana\, “an emerging”. This conclusion is supported by the continuation of the explanation: \(āma-bhāvonmajjana\, “the emerging of a bodily form”, where \(unmajjana\ is a neuter action noun in -\(oma\).

Finally, \(ucchittir ucchedaḥ prabandhavicchittir ity arthaḥ\ could be rendered: “\(uccheda\ is \(ucchiti\), that is to say, the ceasing of continuity”. Once again, Candrakīrti makes it clear that he takes \(uccheda\ “cutting
off, destruction, annihilation” to be bhāvasādhana by glossing it with a feminine verbal noun in -ti, uucchitti, “a cutting off, a destroying”. Again the gloss is formed from the same root with the same preverb. The form uucchitti, however, is attested in lexica, as is the further gloss °vichitti, another formation in -ti.

Now, one may argue that forms such as niruddhi and utpādana do not merit the distinction of being “d’intérêt linguistique”, but what they convey about the terms they are used to interpret certainly does.

It is of course not only in commentaries on Buddhist texts that problems and issues of interpretation arise, but also in translations of them into other languages such as Tibetan and Chinese. In his article “La légende de Śāntideva”,10 J.W. de Jong (1975) reproduces the Sanskrit text of the Śāntideva legend as edited by Haraprasād Śāstri and the Tibetan text of the Peking edition. Section X of the text reads as follows:

śāntidevanāmā praśāntatvāt pitaatrayaṁ śrutvā dhyāyati sma |
bhuñjano ’pi prabhāsvaram supto ’pi kuṭiṁ gato ’pi tad eveti |
bhūsukumādhisamāpannatvāt bhūsukunāmākkhyātaṁ |
zi-ba dan-idan-paś zi-ba’i lha Žes mín-btags |
| der sde-snod gsum mñan (P. mñam)pa’i rjes-la za-run ŋal-run ’chags-run rgyun-tu 'od-gsal bsgom-pas bhu-su-ku Žes tin-ne’dzin la gnas-pa’i phyir bhu-su-ku žes mín yon-ls su grags-so ||

In a note to the word prabhāsvaram, de Jong (1975, p. 173, n. 29) remarks, “Il y a probablement une lacune dans le texte, cf. T.” (T. = la traduction tibétaine). The Tibetan text de Jong translates (1975, p. 176), “En raison de sa tranquillité on lui donna le nom Śāntideva. Ayant écouté les trois pitaKA, il méditait sur la lumière sans interruption en mangeant, en dormant et en marchant. Persistant ainsi dans le samaDhi appelé bhusuKu, il fut connu sous le nom de BhusuKu.” Somehow, this does not quite hit the mark. The Tibetan der indicates a tatra which is not met with in the Sanskrit version, and rgyun-tu “always” probably means the translator has read sadaiva for tad eva. However, there is no

---

10Apropos Pezzali 1968.
lacuna in the text. Bhusuku is the name of one of the eighty-four Siddhas. The Tibetan translation has not picked up on or been able to render the nirvacana-based reasoning met with in the Sanskrit.

In the passage above, I take *tad eva* to mean *tad eva prabhāsvaram. iti* ...: “For this reason ...”. In his translation, de Jong gives the name in question as Bhusuku, and, for reasons that will be clear below, I too see no reason for retaining the long *ā* of the Sanskrit text. Moreover, I do not feel comfortable with *bhusukunāmākhyātam* as Sanskrit. I would expect a masculine “ākhyātaḥ here: “For this reason he was named Bhusuku” (*bhu-su-ku ız mīn yons-su grags-so*). On this basis, one could then translate the Sanskrit passage as follows: “Called Śántideva because of his tranquility (*prasaṅtatvāt*), after studying the three Piṭakas he meditated on the radiant [mind] even when he was eating (*bhuṭānāh*), even when he was asleep (*suṭāḥ*), even when in the [latrine] hut (*kuṭiṃ gataḥ*), [and] on that alone. So because he was immersed in Samādhi [even] when *bhu[ṭānāḥ*], *su[ṭāḥ*], and *kuṭiṃ gataḥ* he was called Bhusuku.”

---

1That the word *kuṭi* here means “latrine” is indicated by the explanation *vinmātotsargārtham* met with in the *Cāryānālāpapakropadīpa* in a section on *bhusukacaryā* that contains a similar nirvacana analysis of *bhusu* as the one discussed above. Cf. CMP 99.4–11: *anenānupārveṇa yukti-ganābhāyāni adhikāmarāṇām sarvabuddhajanaṁ niścitaṁ sarvārullir viyāyaśaktir ca prabhāya bhusukacaryāya caradya anena kramaṇaṁ. tatrāṇaṁ kramaḥ – bhu iti bhāvayā tannātram anusmarati sāngamam apaharati dūṣkarat niṣvamāṁ iti kimeṁ na cintaityaṁ, su iti suptā eva viṣṭa na viyopalakṣātmā sākṣātkurvita vaiśāvīdyāmyakṣākāraṁ(rām)kitaviṣṭānaṁ punar āvartayati prabhāsvaram eva sākṣātkaro niśvamāvabhāyaṁ. ku iti kuṭiṃ guḍchet vinmātotsargārtham tanātāram anubhavāti sāngam apanayati kāyavedanā- viṣayendriyasvabhāvaḥ ca na cintaiyit. The passage as it stands requires some textual criticism, but that need not concern us here.

2However, Alexis Sanderson informs me that in the *Grub thob brgyad bcu rtsa bzhis lo rgyus*, which the monk Snom grub šes rab claims at its end to have put into Tibetan after the stories had been narrated to him by an Indian guru called *Adbhayadattaśri* (Mi ’jigs sbyin pa dpal), we are told that Bhusuku (identified with Śántideva, as in the text above) was a notoriously ignorant monk of Nālandā. *Grub thob brgyad bcu rtsa bzhis’i chos skor* (New Delhi: Chophel Legdan, 1973), p. 171, ll. 4–5: *mīn du yān bhu su kū zhes grags la
Similar issues arise from sections XII and XIII. Section XII and the first part of XIII run as follows:

XII. पुर्वक्र्तां सुत्रसमुच्चयां शिक्षासमुच्चयां बोधिकर्यावतरार्क्क्यां ग्रन्थारायां आस्तिः केतवा सिन्हासनागालो प्राहा किं आर्षां पश्चाट्तथारर्षां वा

XII. mdo-sde kun-las brus-pa dann bslab-pa kun-las brus-pa danna | byan-chub spyod-pa la ’jug-pa ́z sgan-gsam bdag-gis byas yod-do de-la spyod-pa la ’jug-pa gdon-par ’os ́z bsam-nas gsuṅ-ge lhan-sontson-gis gsuṅ-pa ́an | de ’i-rjes las byun-ba gan gdon |

XIII. tatra ́ṣiḥ paramārtthajñānavān ́ṣa gatav ity atra aṇuāḍikāḥ kviḥ ́ṣiṇā jina prakto aṁrṣam nunā praṇāṭpāramitādau subhūtādidesitaṁ katham ārṣam iṁ atrocyate yuvārājāryamaitreyena

XIII. don-dam rog-pa ni dran-son-do des mdzad-pa gsuṅ-rab-bo | de-la brten-nas gzan-gyi bya-ba bye-slas byun-ba’o | ’phags-pa byams-pa | gsuṅ-pa |

Having compared the two versions of the text, de Jong (1975, p. 177) states, “Il est évident que les textes sanskrit et tibétain doivent remontrer au même texte original. Les différences entre les deux versions dans les sections XIII et XIV sont dûes à des additions. Le texte sanskrit a ajouté une phrase sur l’étymologie de ́ṣi (́ṣi gatav ity atra aṇuāḍikāḥ kin) et une référence à l’enseignement de Subhūti: nunā praṇāṭpāramitādau subhūtādidesitaṁ katham ārṣam ‘Comment ce qui a été enseigné par Subhūti dans la Praṇāṭpāramita, etc. peut-il être ārṣa?’ Le passage précédent explique qu’ārṣa est ce qui est dit par le ́ṣi, i.e. le jina.” However, these “additions” are integral to the two versions of the text themselves. The Sanskrit version of section XIII from nunu through katham ārṣam has been translated by de Jong above. As for the first part, de Jong (1975, p. 174, n. 28), acknowledging a note from Professor Y. Ojihara, points out that one should read ́ṣi gatav ity atra aṇuāḍikāḥ kin.

The Daśapādyunādīvṛtti (DPU) at 1.48 igupadhāt kit states ́ṣi gatau tav | / ṣattit ́ṣiḥ muniḥ / kartā, “the sixth-class [verbal root] ́ṣ”

de ni za nyal chags gsum pa zhes bya’o. Cf. Bengali bhōṣ “fool”; Kumaunī bhus “foolish, wild, uncivilized, rude” (CDIAL §9545).
[occurs] when [the sense of] gati ‘going’ [is to be denoted];\textsuperscript{13} ‘he moves (ṛṣati)’, hence [he is called] ṛṣi, [that is to say,] a sage, [in the sense of the] agent [of the act of moving].\textsuperscript{14} One is now in a position to translate the first part of section XIII: ‘In this respect, a ṛṣi is someone who possesses knowledge (jñāna) of the supreme meaning, [through the addition of] the uṇādi suffix kit to [the verbal root] ṛṣ [which occurs] when [the sense of] gati ‘going’ [is to be denoted], [and] ārṣam [is formed according to the analysis]: promulgated by a ṛṣi, [that is to say,] the Jina.”

The Tibetan version of section XIII begins: don-dam rtog-pa ni draṅ-soṇ-no, “a ṛṣi is someone who has knowledge of the supreme meaning”. A ṛṣi is thus said to possess knowledge of the supreme meaning in both the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions. The explanation of the term ṛṣi as a kpt or primary derivation from the root ṛṣ in the sense of gati “a going” clearly draws on the traditional hermeneutic rule sarve gatyarthā jñānārthaḥ which states that all words that mean “move” also mean “know”. Just as the term ārṣa is explained in the Sanskrit version of section XIII by the phrase ṛṣinā jīneṇa proktam ārṣam, it is explained in the Tibetan version of section XII: draṅ-soṇ-gis gsun-pa, “that which has been proclaimed by a ṛṣi”. At work here is a rule from Pāṇini’s Aṣṭādhvyāyi: A 4.1.83 prāg divyato ‘ṇ teaches that the taddhita suffix aN (-ā with vṛddhi strengthening of the first vowel) is added under meaning conditions given in rules up to rule A 4.4.2 tena divyati khanati jayati jītam. That is to say, A 4.1.83 is a general rule (utsarga) which teaches the addition of aN unless it is blocked by some other suffix under conditions specified by a special rule (apavāda). A 4.3.101 tena proktam then teaches the addition of aN in the sense “promulgated by him”, hence ārṣa in the sense of “promulgated by a ṛṣi”.

\textsuperscript{13} The Pāṇiniya dhātupātha 6.7.

\textsuperscript{14} Incidentally, the Tibetan rendering of ṛṣi as draṅ-soṇ, or, more commonly, draṅ-sron (draṅ-po “straight”, soṇ “became, turned”; sron-po “to make straight, straighten [the body]”) is based on the Sanskrit nirvacana jñāḥ śete “he sits straight”.
Let me finally turn to the form arthārṣa met with in the Sanskrit version of section XII, which ends: prāha kim ārṣam paṭhāmi arthārṣam vā, “He says, ‘Shall I recite ārṣam or arthārṣam?’” Section XIII quotes a verse from the Ratnagotravibhāga, which de Jong (1975, p. 178) points out “ne fait pas de distinction entre ārṣa et arthārṣa (Tib. de-rjes las byun-ba), mais dit que tout ce qui est dit en conformité avec certaines conditions est ārṣam iṣva”. Pointing out that Edgerton (BHSD) has identified the reading ārṣa in Wogihara’s edition of the Bodhisattvabhūmi as a corruption of ārṣabha, de Jong goes on to say (1975, p. 178), “Le mot ārṣa se rencontre dans le Mahāyānasūtraṅkāra (XVIII.31): ārṣaś ca deṣanādharma, mais le commentaire ne l’explique pas. Il se peut très bien que le mot arthārṣa soit corrumpu mais la version tibétaine qui en donne une traduction libre ne permet pas de le corriger. On ne retrouve la distinction entre ārṣa et arthārṣa ni chez Bustom ni chez Tāranātha … Pour conclure cette discussion signalons encore que dans section XV, le texte sanskrit a arthārṣam mais la version tibétaine gzan-pa = anyad.”

The latter part of the Tibetan version of section XII runs as follows: de-la spyod-pa la ’jug-pa gdon-par ’os _BC̓eš bsams-nas gsun-sti dran-son-gis gsun-sti ’am\ de’i-rjes las byun-ba gan gdon, “He says, ‘Shall I recite that which has been proclaimed by a ʃsi or that which has come after that [which has been proclaimed by a ʃsi]?”’ The Tibetan translator has clearly had the reading anvārṣam rather than arthārṣam. That is to say, anvārṣam according to the analysis dran-son-gis gsun-sti’i-rjes las byun-ba, “that which has come after that which has been proclaimed by a ʃsi”, rjes las byun-ba rendering anugata, which is an attested interpretation of anu (e.g. Sadd 883,14: anusaddo anugata; or, Sadd 883,18: tattha anugata anveti). The proposal of anvārṣam for what the Tibetan translates is appealing also because it provides a ready explanation of the corruption through similarity of the conjuncts vetica and ṛṭhā in post-Gupta scripts which indicate pre-consonantal r as a horizontal stroke below the head-line added to the left side of the following letter. This, of course, does not necessarily make anvārṣam
the correct reading, and I am held back from accepting that it was by the absence of citations of other occurrences of the word. The passage of the Ratnagotrabhāga referred to above distinguishes between ārṣam, what is not ārṣam (viparitaṁ anyathā) and what is āṛṣa-like (āṛṣam īva) and therefore acceptable teaching. An example of the last would be the subhātyādideśitam. To accept anvāṛṣam in that sense one would need examples of other anu-words with this of the same kind. Otherwise I would be inclined to think that anvāṛṣam might be a corruption of anāṛṣam. The latter is congruent with the Tibetan gzan (anyad = anāṛṣam) of XV.

Through the instances presented above, I have tried to highlight that some of the specific techniques and conventions applied by indigenous commentators and translators often consist of linguistic and hermeneutical devices rooted in the Sanskrit traditions of vyākaraṇa and nirvacanaśāstra, and that a knowledge of these disciplines can be of importance for a full understanding of Buddhist texts. These were the disciplines Buddhist commentators and translators were versed in, disciplines we might in the end simply call philology.

E.G. Kahrs
University of Cambridge
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A Note on micchādiṭṭhi in Mahāvamsa 25.110

In his pioneering work *The Pali Literature of Ceylon* (1928), Professor G.P. Malalasekera dwells at length on the great Buddhist king Duṭṭhagāmaṇi Abhaya (101–77 B.C.E.) whom he hails as “the hero of the epic Mahāvamsa”. Based on the account of this king in Chapters 24 and 25 of the Mahāvamsa, he details the career of this king, his triumphant victory over the Damila King Eōra and his manifold deeds of piety including the beginning of the construction of the Mahāthūpa. Malalasekera draws our attention to the magnanimity of the victorious king Duṭṭhagāmaṇi for his fallen adversary: The king constructed a cetiya over the ashes of his dead enemy, and decreed that “no man, prince or peasant, should pass the spot … riding in palanquin or litter or with beating of drums.” Malalasekera says further that after his coronation, the “king’s outlook on life had changed, the great and glorious success for which he had lived and dreamed gave him no real joy. He thought of the thousands of human lives on whom suffering had been wrought to encompass this end, and he was filled with poignant grief … he determined to start a new chapter in his life” (p. 35). He devoted himself to the task of erecting several religious edifices.

What is conspicuously missing in this account is a major narrative from Mahāvamsa, Chapter 25, that tells us about an episode of the king’s deep remorse over the death of a large number of warriors in his victory. This particular incident raises a most problematic issue regarding the way Theravādin Buddhists viewed death on a battlefield. The passage in question, in seven verses, is given below from Geiger’s edition (Mhv) and his translation (assisted by Mabel Bode ).

103. sayito sirisampatiṁ mahatim api pekkhyā
kataṁ akkhohināghaṁ saranto na sukhaṁ labhi.

---

1Geiger 1912.

He, looking back upon his glorious victory, good though it was, knew no joy, remembering that thereby was wrought the destruction of millions [of beings].

104. *Piyaṅgudipe arahanto nītavā taṃ tassa takkitam pāhesuṃ aṭṭha arahante taṃ assāsetum issaraṃ…*

When the arahants of Piyaṅgudipa knew his thought, they sent eight arahants to comfort the king…

108. “*kathanu bhante assāso mama hessati, yena me akkhohimahāsenāghāto kārāpi?*” iti.

Then the king said to them again “How shall there be any comfort for me, O Venerable Sirs, since by me was caused the slaughter of a great host numbering millions?”

109. “*Saggamaggantarāyo ca natthi te tena kammunā, diyaddhamanujā v’ ettha ghātīta manujādhipa,*

“From this deed arises no hindrance in the way to heaven. Only one and a half human beings have been slain here by thee, O Lord of Men.

110. “*saranese nhito eko, paṅcasile pi cāparo, micchādi††h¥ ca duss¥lå seså pasusamå matå,*

“The one had come unto the [three] refuges, the other had taken on himself the five precepts. Unbelievers and men of evil life were the rest, not more to be esteemed than beasts.

111. “*jotayissati c’ eva tvaṃ bahudhā buddhasāsanam, manovilekhaṃ tasmā tvaṃ vinodaya narissara.*”

“But as for thee, thou wilt bring glory to the doctrine of the Buddha in manifold ways; therefore cast away care from thy heart, O Ruler of Men.”

112. *iti vutto mahārājā tehi assāsato āgato.*

Thus exhorted by them, the great king took comfort.

The king’s remorse is quite in keeping with the Buddhist teachings. One is reminded of the patricidal king Ajātasattu’s visit to the Buddha as described in the Sāmaññaphalasutta of the Dīgha-nikāya.² There the

²taggha tvaṃ mahārājā, accayo accagamā ...yām tvaṃ pitaraṃ ... jīvitā voropesi. yato ca kho tvaṃ ... accayaṃ accayato dīsvā yathādhammanā paṭīkaroti, taṃ te mayaṃ paṭīghanāma. vuddhi h’ esā ariyassa vinaye ... āyatiṃ samvaram āpajjati ti. Sāmaññaphalasutta, D I 100.
king confesses his guilt over the killing of his father. The Buddha does not absolve him of his crime, but accepts his confession saying “Verily O King it was sin that overcame you while acting thus. But in as much as you look upon it as sin, and confess it according to what is right, we accept your confession as to that. For that, O King, is custom in the discipline of the Noble Ones, that whosoever looks upon his fault as a fault, and rightfully confesses it, shall attain to self-restraint in the future.”

Another historical case is that of the Mauryan King Aśoka who issued his famous Rock Edict after the subjugation of the people of Kaliṅga: “The Kaliṅga country was conquered by King Piyadasi Devānampiya, when he had been consecrated eight years. One hundred and fifty thousand were carried away as captives and one hundred thousand slain and many times that number died…. Devānampiya the conqueror of Kaliṅga has remorse now, because of the thought that the conquest is no conquest, for there was killing…. That is keenly felt with profound sorrow and regret…. Now even the loss of a hundredth or even a thousandth part of all lives that were killed or died or carried away captives is considered deplorable by Devānampiya.”

Aśoka’s inscriptions do not show him seeking either consolation or absolution from any religious establishment, nor does the Mahāvaṃsa allude to his war in the conquest of Kaliṅga.

What is extraordinary about the account in the Mahāvaṃsa is the uncommon arrival of eight arahants representing the Buddhist sangha to console Duṭṭhadārimaṇi Abhaya and to assure him safe passage to heaven. It is much to the credit of the king that he should anticipate


\[Murit and Aiyangar 1951, Rock Edict XII: aṭṭhavasābhīsitāyā Devānampiyaśa Piyadasine lājīne Kaliṅgā vijītā \| diyadhamaṭe pāṇaṣataṣaḥaṣe ye taphā apavudhe, śatasaḥaṣa māte tata hate, bahutāṃvatake vā maṭe \| ... se aṭṭhe aṇuṣaya Devānampiyaśā vijītu Kaliṅgāni, avijitaṃ hi vijinnante e tatā vadhā vā malane vā apavahe vā janaṣā \| se bāḍha vedaniyamute guluṣate cā devānampiyaṣā \|]

\[It may be noted that Dip XIX, p. 101, is content in merely stating that the king was reborn in the Tusita heaven:

\[a\\]
severe obstruction to his rebirth in heaven (saggamaggantarāyo) as a consequence of his act of warfare in which so many warriors perished on the battlefield. The response of the arahants is truly astounding. They not only say that there is no obstruction to the king’s rebirth in heaven but also seek to legitimize their verdict by observing that out of the “million lives” only one and a half men have been truly slain: one who had taken refuge in the three saraṇas (½); and another one who additionally took the five precepts (1). The arahants declare that the remaining dead were micchādiṭṭhis and dussīlas, and thus equal to animals (pasusamā). They add further that the king will (because of this victory) glorify the Buddhist faith and so he should overcome his remorse.

Although Malalasekera saw fit to ignore this episode in his earlier book, in the Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names (1960), he allows a single sentence: “From now onwards [after his final victory] consoled by the arahants of Piyaṅgudipa, who absolved him from blame (italics added) for the slaughter of his enemies …”. In contrast however, another Sinhalese Buddhist scholar, the late Venerable Walpola Rahula in his History of Buddhism in Ceylon (1956), duly notes this particular episode. He reproduces the gist of the Mahāvamsa and notes further that it was the beginning of Buddhist nationalism. In observing the career of King Dutṭhagāmaṇi Rahula says: “The entire Sinhalese race was united under the banner of the young Gāmaṇi. This was the beginning of nationalism amongst the Sinhalese. It was a new race with healthy young blood organized under the new order of Buddhism. A kind of religio-nationalism, which almost amounted to fanaticism, roused the whole Sinhalese people. A non-Buddhist was not regarded as a human...

katapaṇño mahāpaṇño Abhayo Dutṭhagāmaṇi
cāyasā bheda sappāṇṇo tusitaṁ cāyaṁ upāgami.

This suggests the possibility that the authors of the Mahāvamsa introduced the episode of the king’s remorse. The Extended Mahāvamsa makes further elaboration, as below (n. 17).
being. Evidently, all Sinhalese without exception were Buddhists.”

It would not be wrong to assume that both Malalasekera and Rahula were only following the lead given by the Vaṃsatthapakāsini, a tīkā on the Mahāvaṃsa:

tenā kammunā matā means by the act of your slaying a “million”. The words diyaḍḍhamanujā v’ ettha means amongst these “millions”, only one and a half men have been slain by you. sesā pasusanā matā means the remainder were truly not men because they were devoid of the virtues of a human being: they were devoid of proper views, and given to bad conduct. And therefore they said they are pasusanā, equal to animals. Taking the refuges and the five precepts are the virtues that make a human being, and therefore the text says that one person had established himself in the refuges and the other had the five precepts. For this reason, [O King,] you are free from any obstruction in the way to heaven, and in the future you will glorify the teaching of the Buddha.7

The arahants, it should be noted, only assured (assāsito) the king, but the authors of the Mahāvaṃsa were composing a chronicle of the island and would be expected to glorify the deeds of a great king, even to the extent of trying to “absolve” him of the karmic consequences of a bloody war. But what is truly puzzling is the fact that the Theravādins of Lanka over the centuries should accept the validity of the alleged words of the arahants as understood by the author of the Mahāvaṃsa-tīkā. This calls for a search of the canonical expositions on micchādiṭṭhi, given by the Buddha in the sermons specifically addressing the issues of heaven and warfare. If this term is understood correctly, the words of the arahants would appear to be credible and the statements of the Mahāvaṃsa to be consistent with the teachings of the Buddha.

6Rahula 1956, p. 79.
7tena kammunā ti tena tayā katena akkhohinīghātakammena; ... diyaḍḍhamanujā v’ ettha akkhohinisenāya diyaddh’ eva manussā tayā ghātīta; sesā pasusanā matā ti avasesā dīṭṭhīvampannathena ca dussilatthena ca naradhammavirahitaṭṭhena ca manussā nāma nāhun ti, sabbe pasusamā matā ti avocun ti attho. saranasilāni hi manussakārakadhammāni, tena vuttaṃ saranesu ...cāparo ti, manovilekhaṃ tasma ti yasmā tvaṃ tvaṃ sagga-maggantarāyavirahito va ... iti vuttaṃ hoti. Mhv-ṭ II 491–92.
Geiger and Bode’s translation of *micchādiṭhi* as “unbelievers”, i.e. non-Buddhists, is permissible since the context does convey that meaning, intended or not, to a casual reader. Rahula’s translation as “wrong-believers” is too general; it does not identify a particular wrong belief. *Micchādiṭhi* and *sammādiṭhi* are two oft-recurring technical terms found in various places in the canon. The Mahācattārisaka-sutta (M III 71–78) and the Apanṇaka-sutta (M I 400–13) of the Majjhima-nikāya appear to be most relevant in this context.

In the first the Buddha defines the two *diṭhis* in the following words (Lord Chalmers’ translation):^{8}

What are the wrong views (*micchādiṭhi*)? — They are views that — there is no such thing as alms or sacrifice or oblations; that there is no such thing as the fruit and harvest of deeds good and bad; that there are no such things as this world or the next; that there are no such things as either parents or a spontaneous generation elsewhere; that there are no such things as recluses and brahmans who tread the right path and walk aright, who have, of and by themselves, comprehended and realized this and other worlds and make it all known to others.^{9}

And what are the right views (*sammādiṭhi*)? — they are twofold. On the one hand there are right views which are accompanied by Cankers (*sāsavā*), are mixed up with good works (*puññabhāgiyā*), and lead to attachments. On the other hand there are Right Views which are Noble (*ariyā*), freed from Cankers (*anāsavā*), transcending mundane things and included in the Path.^{10}

Those right views which are accompanied by Cankers … lead to attach-

---

^{9}Mahācattārisakasutta, M III 71f.: *katamā ca bhikkhave micchādiṭhi?* *natthi dinnā, natthi yiṭṭham, natthi hutaṇ, natthi sukata dukkaṭanaṇṇaṃ kammanṇaṃ phalaṃ vipāko, natthi ayaṇaṃ loko, natthi paro loko, natthi mātā, natthi pitā, natthi sattā apapaṭikā, natthi loka sanaṇabrāhmaṇṇaṃ sammaggatā sammāpatipannā, ye imaṃ ca lokaṃ paraṃ ca lokaṃ sayasaṃ abhiṇṇā sacchikatvā pavedentī ti.
^{10}M III 72. *katamā ca bhikkhave sammādiṭhi?* *sammādiṭhiṃ pāhaṃ, bhikkhave, dvayaṃ vadāmi. attthi bhikkhave sammādiṭhi sāsavā puññabhāgiyā upadhivepakkā; attthi bhikkhave ariyā anāsavā lokuttarā maggaṅgā.*
ments, recognize that there are such things as alms and sacrifice and obligations; that there is indeed such a thing as the fruit and harvest of deeds good and bad; that there are really such things as this world and the next; that there are really such things as parents and spontaneous generation elsewhere; and that there are really such things as recluses and brahmins who tread the right path and walk aright, who have, of and by themselves, comprehended and realized this and other worlds and make it all known to others.\textsuperscript{11}

In the Apannaka-sutta, as in our Mahāvamsa passage, the words dussīla and micchādiṭṭhi appear together: dussīlo purisapuggalo micchādiṭṭhi nathikavādo. The Apannaka-sutta further elaborates: “The next world (i.e. life after death) truly exists but this person denies it. That constitutes his micchādiṭṭhi.”\textsuperscript{12} As is well known this is a doctrine:

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
  \item[M III 72. By this rather wide definition anyone believing in a life after death (and so forth) can be called a sammādiṭṭhi; the term is no longer restricted only to a lay follower of the Buddha. The āṭṭhakathā on the Sāmādiṭṭhi-sutta of the Majjhima-nikāya (M I 46–55) anticipates such a possibility and hence makes the following comments:

The sāmādiṭṭhi is twofold, mundane (lokiyā) and supermundane (lokuttarā). Of these the former consists of paññā, brought about by knowledge of the doctrine of karma, and knowledge that conforms to the Four Noble Truths.\ldots

Human beings are also of three kinds: an ordinary person, the disciple, and the nondisciple. Of these the ordinary person is of two kinds: The outsider (bāhiraka) and the follower of the Buddha (sāsanika). The bāhiraka is a sāmādiṭṭhi by virtue of his view that affirms the doctrine of karma, but he does not have faith in the Four Noble Truths, and he holds the view there is an eternal self (attadīṭṭhi), whereas the sāsanika is sāmādiṭṭhi by having the paññā of both kinds:

\begin{quote}
 sā ca āyaṃ sāmādiṭṭhi duvidhā hoti-lokiyā lokuttarā ti, tattha kammassakatāññāñ ca saccānulomikaññañ ca lokiyā sāmādiṭṭhi, sankhepato va sabbhī pi sāsavā paññā. ariyamaggalayasa payutta paññā lokuttarā sāmādiṭṭhi. puggalo pana tividho hoti: puthujjano sekkho asekho ca. tattha puthujjano duvidho hoti: bāhirako sāsaniko ca. tattha bāhirako kammavādi kammassakatādiṭṭhiyā sāmādiṭṭhi hoti, no saccānulomikāya attadīṭṭhiparānā lokuttarā. sāsaniko dvīhi pi (Ps I 196).
\end{quote}

\item[S I 196.]
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
of ucceda (“annihilation”) originally attributed to a titthiya named Ajita Kesakambali in the Sāmaññaphalasutta of the Dīgha-nikāya.

This micchādiṭṭhi is truly the antithesis of the (sāsavā or the first variety of) sammādiṭṭhi. A Buddhist is said to be a sammādiṭṭhi because he affirms the existence of the aforementioned ten items that are denied by the “nihilist” (natthikavādo) or the “annihilationist”. Evidently such a meaning of micchādiṭṭhi is not appropriate to the same word in the passage under discussion. Those who perished in the war were warriors and it would be inconceivable that they would not seek heaven or some such reward for their heroism on the battlefield. Fortunately there is a whole section in the Saṃyutta-nikāya, ironically called the Gāmaṭi-saṃyutta, which gives us a detailed description of the beliefs held by the warriors during the Buddha’s time. It contains a remarkable dialogue between a certain Yodhājiva (Fighting-man) and the Buddha, which provides us with a different concept of micchādiṭṭhi, one that is not covered by the earlier usage. This unique dialogue explains both the volitional aspect of the deed of killing (vadhakacetāṇāduṇḍappanihitām) as well as the particular wrong view of the warrior concerning his death and rebirth in heaven (F.L. Woodward’s translation of S IV 308f.):

Then Fighting-man (Yodhājiva), the trainer, came to see the Exalted One…. As he sat at one side, Fighting-man, the trainer, said to the Exalted One:

“I have heard, Lord, this traditional saying of teachers of old who were

evaṃ assaṃva ṅaṇako ḍhammo dussaṃatto samādīṇyo ekāṃṣaṃ pharītā tiṭṭhati, riṃcati kusalaṃ thānaṃ (Aṇṇakaṇasutta, M I 402–403).

13-Thus, Lord, did Ajita of the garment of hair (Kesakambali) … expound his theory of annihilation.” The translators call this “the view of a typical sophist” (DB I 73, n.1).

14KS IV 216–17.

15Bhikkhu Bodhi (CD II, p. 1334) translates Yodhājiva Gāmanī as “the headman Yodhājiva the Mercenary” and gives the following note (p. 1449, n. 339): “Spk explains the name as meaning ‘one who earns his living by warfare (yuddhena jīvikaṃ kappento); this name, too, was assigned by the redactors of the dhamma’. I take the occupation to be that of a mercenary or professional soldier.”
fighting men: ‘A fighting man who in battle exerts himself, puts forth effort, thus exerting himself and putting forth effort, is tortured and put an end to by others. Then, when body breaks up, after death he is reborn in the company of the Devas of Passionate Delight.’ What says the Exalted One of this?’

“Enough, trainer! Let be. Ask me not this question”…. Nevertheless I will expound it to you.

“In the case of a fighting-man who in battle exerts himself, puts forth effort, he must previously have had this low, mean, perverted idea: ‘Let those beings be tortured, be bound, be destroyed, be exterminated, so that they may be thought never to have existed.’ Then, so exerting himself, so putting forth effort, other men torture him and make an end of him. When the body breaks up, after death he is reborn in the Purgatory of Quarrels (a part of the Avīci niraya).

‘Now if his view was this: ‘A fighting-man who exerts himself, puts forth effort in battle, thus exerting himself, thus putting forth effort, is tormented and made an end of by others. When body breaks up, after death he is reborn in the company of the Devas of Passionate Delight,’ — then I say that view of his is perverted (micchādiṭṭhi). Now, trainer, I declare that for one who is guilty of perverted view one of two paths is open, either purgatory or rebirth as an animal (nirayaṁ vā tiracchānayoniṁ vā).”16

16atha kho Yodhājīvo Gāmansi ... etad avoca: sutaṁ me bhante, pubbaṅkaṁ aścaryapācaryānāṁ yodhājīvānāṁ bhāsamānānāṁ, yo so yodhājīvo saṅgāme ussahati vāyamati, taṁ enam ussahantaṁ vāyamantam pare hananti pariyañdāpenti, so kāyassa bhedā paraṁ maraṇā sarañjitānāṁ devānāṁ sahayatam upapajjati tī. … idha Bhagavā kiṁ āhā tī?
   alaṁ Gāmansi tiṁṭhat’ etam, mā mam etam pucchi tī… api ca tyāḥāṁ vyākarissāmi. yo so gāmansi yodhājīvo saṅgāme ussahati vāyamati, tassa taṁ cittaṁ pubbe kīṁnaṁ duggataṁ duṇṇāṁhaṁ: ime sattā haṁṭhanu vā bhajhantu vā ucchijjantu vā vinassantu vā mā ahesuṁ iti vā tī. taṁ enam ussahantaṁ vāyamantarāṁ pare hananti pariyañdāpenti, so kāyassa bhedā paraṁ maraṇā sarañjitāṁ nāma nirayaṁ tathā upapajjati.
   sace kho panassā evaṁ diṭṭhi hoti: yo so yodhājīvo saṅgāme ussahati vāyamati taṁ enam ussahantaṁ vāyamantam pare hananti pariyañdāpenti, so kāyassa bhedā paraṁ maraṇā sarañjitānāṁ devānāṁ sahayatam upapajjati tī, sāsā hoti micchādiṭṭhi.
   micchādiṭṭhikassa kho panāhaṁ Gāmansi parisapuggalassa dvinnāṁ gatīnaṁ aṁñātaṁ gatī vaddāṁ, nirayaṁ vā tiracchānayoniṁ vā tī.
In view of the Buddha’s emphatic words regarding the fate of those who perish on the battlefield while entertaining such a view, there should be no hesitation now in applying this definition of *micchāditthi* to the same word appearing in Mahāvaṃsa (25, 110), instead of the traditional canonical meaning of that term as *natthikavāda* or *ucchedavadā*.

The word *pasusamā* (“equal to animals”) in the Mahāvaṃsa is undoubtedly used in a figurative manner. Even so, the declaration in the Yodhājīva-sutta that such beings are destined to be reborn in *niraya* or in the animal world lends support to the possibility that the figurative expression was a kind of a prognostication of their destiny. The *Extended Mahāvaṃsa* (25, 256) makes it explicitly clear that the king’s remorse was caused by a horrible sight of the countless dead Damiṇī: *addakkhi… asaṃkhīyānaṃ maraṇāṃ Damiṇīnām.* While it is clear that the Damiṇīs are not Buddhists, the texts do not furnish us with any information on their faith. Since they were coming from South India, they may be considered as followers of some form of Śaivism or Vaishnavism, similar to the one practised probably by the *yodhājīvas* in the passage above. They may be open to the teachings such as given in the Bhagavadgītā II, 37, where Lord Kṛṣṇa promises the warrior Arjuna

---
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*evam vutte Yodhājīvi Gāmaṇī parodi, assāni pavattesi... nāham... api cāhaṃ bhante pabhakehī ācāryapācarīyehi yodhājīvehi digharataṃ nikato vahiło paluddo... devānaṃ suhavyatam upapajji tī.*

S IV 308–309

Similar answers are given with regard to the *hatthārohā* and *assārohā*, those fighting while seated on elephants or riding horses (S IV 310–11).

17*Extended Mahāvaṃsa*, 25, 256–59:

tassa hetuṃ apekkhanto addakkhi manuṣjāhīpo  
asamkhīyānaṃ maraṇāṃ Damiṇīnāṃ tadantarē:  
vasundharāṃ katvānāḥ sīṣyaṃ sabbadisūṣu pi  
akkhīni nikkhamitvāna gattāni uddhamātakā,  
kākakankāgijjasūṣagāddēti dhādītā  
hathapādānagapaccaṅgā chavānāṃ ciḍdamānākāṃ,  
sattehi khādayantehi okiriṃsu visūṃ visūṃ  
saddā nesaṃ sattānaṃ mahāntaḥ bheravā abu.

---
that if he is slain in battle he will attain heaven: *hato vā prāpsyasi svargaṁ, jītvā vā bhokṣyase mahīṁ*. The Theravādins of Lankā might well have believed that the Damilas who perished in the war did aspire to be reborn in heaven, and were for the most part born in the animal world. Understood in this manner the arahants’ words can be said to be consistent with the Buddha’s teachings on heaven and warfare as found in the Yodhājīva-sutta.

The above interpretation, admittedly a little farfetched, is supported by a most remarkable corroboration from the Prakrit canonical texts of the ancient *samanās* called Nigaṇṭhas (also known as Jainas), datable to the same period as the Pāli Samyutta-nikāya. As is well known from the Śamaññaphala-sutta, their teacher, a *tīṭṭhiya*, Nigaṇṭha Nāṭaputta (Tīrtha “kara Jñāt€putra Mahāvīra), was a contemporary of Gautama the Buddha and both flourished in Magadha. While the Buddhist texts state that Ajātasattu, the king of Magadha, embraced Buddhism, the Jainas claim that his father Śrenika Bimbisāra was a devotee of Mahāvīra. Both came from the warrior caste and had witnessed many a battle raging in Magadha. Death on the battlefield was considered honourable and questions were being raised regarding the validity of the claim that such death was rewarded by rebirth in heaven. It is not surprising therefore that the questions asked of the Buddha by Yodhājīva and others find their close parallels in the Jaina canon. The Book VII of the canonical text Vīyāhapannatti (Vyākhyā-prajñapti) contains narratives about wars that were waged by the Magadhan King Kūṇiya (Ajātasattu) in his fight against eighteen tribal chiefs (*gana-rāya*), that is to say, the nine Malla and the nine Lecchavi kings of Kāśi and Kosala, in which “millions” are said to have died. The following dialogues between Mahāvīra and his chief mendicant disciple Indabhū Goyama, in the context of such wars, will further demonstrate how close the two rival Śramaṇa traditions were in their views on the problem of death in battlefield and the karmic consequences following such death.

The first narrative is about a war (*saṃgāma*) called Mahā-
P.S. Jaini

Venerable Sir! How many people ... were killed when the War of the Big Stones took place?

O Goyama! In that war 8,400,000 were killed!

Venerable Sir! Among them there were men wounded in that war, who were devoid of the good conduct (nissilā) ... devoid of the holy practice of observing the fasts, angry, malicious ... who had not achieved peace. When they died, what was their destiny, where were they reborn?

O Goyama! A great many of them were born in hells (naraga) and as animals (tirikkha-jo). As in the Mahāvaṃsa, here too the dead are counted in tens of millions, an exaggeration that may be ignored. The term sīla stands for the lay precepts (called anuvratas) that are similar to the five sikkhā-padas of a Buddhist householder. The term nissilā thus agrees with the word dusilā. The animal births declared here for the vast numbers of the dead should enable us to understand the ambiguous Mahāvaṃsa expression pasusamā also to mean the same.

The next dialogue takes place in the context of another major war initiated by King Ajātasattu and is called the War of the Chariot with the Mace (raha-musala-saṃgāma). The monk Goyama asks Mahāvīra the following question:20


19The first four sikkhāpadas of a Buddhist upāsaka are identical with the first four anuvratas (called “minor restraints” as against the mahāvratas of a mendicant) of a Jaina upāsaka. Instead of surā-meraya-majja-pamādaṃ-veramaṇi, the fifth sikkhāpada, the Jainas have parigrahaparimāṇa (“setting limits to one’s property”). See Jaini 1979, pp. 170–78.

20bahujaṃ naṃ bhante! annamannassa evaṃ āikkha jāva parāvei; evaṃ khalu bahave manūsā annayaresu ucchāvaesa saṃgāmesu abhimuhā ceva pahayā samānā kālamāse kālam kiccā annayaresu devaloesu devattāe avavattāro bhavanti, se kahaṃ evaṃ bhante! evaṃ?
Venerable Sir! Many people say to each other … and expound thus: “Indeed, men coming face to face in battles, large and small, wounded there and dead, are reborn among the gods in various heavens.” Is this truly so, Sir?

O Goyama! People who said such things to each other … and expounded, truly have uttered a falsehood (micchaµte āhaµsu). As for me, O Goyama! I say … and expound the following.

The word micchaµ used by Mahåvîra here to characterize the disputed assertion is reminiscent of the term micchådi††hi employed by the Buddha in the Yodhåj¥va-sutta. It is possible that the Jainas did not wish to give the status of a dogma (di††hi) to the “idle talk” of the people, but the term micchå is no less emphatic in conveying the falsity of that talk. Indeed, Mahåvîra’s subsequent explanation lays down the correct course of action, missing in the Buddhist literature, for a warrior to attain heaven after death on a battlefield.

The Mahåvaµsa figuratively states that only “one and a half” men (diyaddhamanujå) — one with only the saraµtas and another with the lay precepts — were truly killed in that war. But there is no narrative, in the Mahåvaµsa-†¥kå, the Extended Mahåvaµsa or even the later work Rasavåhin¥, on these two pious men who were singled out by the arahants out of the “millions” dead in the war. Fortunately, the present Jaina narrative, which by a happy coincidence also speaks of only two such men, illustrates the correct way for a layman to lay down his life on the battlefield and be born in heaven or as a human being.

Mahåvîra gives an account of one of his lay disciples, an expert archer named Varuˆa of Vaißåli. He was a samana-uvåsaga and he had taken the precepts of a layman, the first of which is ahiµså, refraining from killing a human or animal being. At the time of taking his precepts however, he had made an exception that would allow him to participate

---

21The author of Ras simply quotes Mhv 25 108–11 (p. 277) without comment.
in warfare if ordered by the king. Later when he was drafted by King Ajätasattu to fight in the raha-musala-saµgåma, Varuṇa, armed with bow and arrow, mounted his chariot and entered the war. He made a further vow that he would not be the first one to shoot, and so he called upon his adversary to shoot first. Only after his opponent’s arrow was already on its deadly flight did he let fly his own arrow. His enemy was killed instantly, while Varuṇa himself lay mortally wounded. Realizing that his death was imminent, Varuṇa took his chariot off the battlefield, sat down and held his hands in veneration to Mahāvīra, and said,22

Salutations to the Venerable Samana Mahāvīra, my teacher of dhamma.
I pay my respects to him wherever he may be…. Previously I have taken from the Venerable Samana Mahāvīra the lifelong vow of refraining from all forms of gross killing of life … up to … excess possessions. Now at this time of my death, making the Venerable Samana Mahāvīra my witness, I undertake the total renunciation of all forms of violence … and of all my possessions … until my last breath.

Saying thus he pulled out the arrow and, with his mind at peace, died instantly and was reborn in Saudharma, the first heaven.

The second man, a friend of Varuṇa from childhood, fighting in the

---

22namo ’tthu naṃ sanaṇassā bhagavaṃ Mahāvīrassa ... mama dhammadhā-
yaṇiyassā vanḍāmi naṃ bhagavaṃ tanthagayaṃ bhaga. pāṣau me se bhagavaṃ tathagagā jāva vaṇḍai naṃnaṃṣai. evaṃ vaṭāstī: pubhiṃ pi naṃ maae sanaṇassā bhagavaṃ Mahāvīrassa anītī thālae pāṇīvīte paccakkhā āŚavājīvī evaṃ āja thālae pāriyahe paccakkhā āŚavājīvī. iyāni pi naṃ tasseva arīhanṭassā bhagavaṃ Mahāvīrassa antīyaṃ savāṃ pāṇīvīyaṃ ... paccakkhāmi āŚavājīvī ... caramehām āśāsaniśāheṁ viṣorāmi tī kaṭṭu ... samahipādikkaṃte samahippatte ānuṇuvvīte kālaṃgā evaṃvaṭāstī: pāṣau naṃ sanaṇassā ege piyabālaśaṃvāyase rahamsale saṃghāme ... gādhapahāri kae ... Varuṇassā pāṣai ... evanvaṭāstī: jāiṃ naṃ ... Varunassā sīlāiṃ vaṭāiṃ ... veramaṇṇām tāiṃ naṃ maaṃpi bhavaṃtu tī kaṭṭu ... salluddharanam karei ... kālaṃgā.

Varuṇe naṃ bhaṇte ... kālaṃ kiccā kahiṃ gae kahiṃ uvavanne? Goyamañ! Sohamme kappe devātūte uvavanne ... Varuṇassā piyabālavaṇyassā kālaṃ kiccā kahiṃ uvavanne? Goyamañ! sukule paccātāye.

Suttāgama VII, 9, nos. 302–303.
same battle, was also wounded; but seeing his friend mortally wounded, he helped him to sit comfortably. The text does not give his name or his religion, but as he was helping Varuṇa, he heard Varuṇa’s words of renunciation and said, “Whatever vows you have taken, let those be mine too.” And so saying he also died and was reborn as a human being in a noble family.21

These stories of one person totally renouncing all violence at the time of death, and the other person consenting to his renunciation in a friendly way, and thus both dying a holy death on the battlefield, would surely win the approval of the arahants who pointed to the one and a half (diyaddha) good Buddhists in the story of King Duṭṭhagāminī’s remorse.

This remarkable concordance between the two rival Śramaṇa traditions on the problem of heaven and warfare establishes the fact that a study of one tradition sheds light on the other and helps us understand both traditions at a deeper level. On this auspicious occasion of the 125th anniversary of the Pali Text Society, we do well to remember and honour the name of Hermann Jacobi, the editor of the first volume of the Pali Text Society published in 1882. Few now will even know that this volume happened to be not of a Pāli text, but the first book of the Jaina canon, called the Āyārāṅga-sutta. We may recall today the words he used in his introduction to the first volume in the series: “The insertion of a Jaina text in the publication of the Pali Text Society will require no justification in the eyes of European scholars…. But it is possible that Buddhist subscribers … might take umbrage at the intrusion, as it were, of an heretical guest into the company of their sacred Suttas.” We should be grateful to Jacobi for showing us from the beginning of the Pali Text Society that our studies of Pāli and Buddhism should go hand in hand with the studies of Prakrit and Jainism.

Padmanabh S. Jaini
Berkeley

21For an abridged version, see Deleu 1996. This story also appears in Jaini 2000.
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Sankepasarasaṅgha: Abbreviation in Pāli

ratnattayaṁ vampivāna dhirassa bahussutassa
yassa samvapnunāyāyaṁ saṅgho´mhehi racito

yena bahulikhitena raññā uttaranarena
lekhādigamattāya ninditā `smi pubbakāle

tassa dighāyulekhanam nandantī payacchānimam
māgadhāsankhepanassa atisaṅkhittavappanām

In celebrating the longevity and prolific contribution of our cause, I seek to atone with the following brief synopsis of abridgement for former length deemed by him excessive.

Reducing or replacing repetition that contains little or no variation when recording texts in written form, skipping the chorus with a scribal ditto for an aural fullness, is achieved through the term peyyāla “formula, repetition” \(\text{PED s.v. and Norman 2006, pp. 113–14}\) reduced further to \(\text{pa, pe, pe ... la}\).\(^1\) Cf. Sanskrit peyyālanī (e.g.

\(^1\)The characteristic repetition of some Pāli literature is usually identified as an aid to the oral memory of a text, even though it does not assist memory of the non-repetition (summary of theories to date: Allon, pp. 354–57, his own 398). An alternative avenue of exploration would be to consider the performance function, drawing on textual anthropology: The lead/expert monk(s) recite the whole, resting their voice while the larger “chorus” pick up the refrains. This would tie in with the observations made by Norman in his discussion of “Buddhism and Oral Tradition” on the basis of anthropology by Tambiah who in turn describes how the common and repeated formulae are those remembered by most monks (Norman 2006, pp. 62–63). Current theories and observation of the performance of Pāli literature leave me with questions: To what extent has performance shaped the form of the text? To what extent are the Dīgha-nikāya texts more repetitive because important ceremonially? Is the performance function sometimes a factor in the difference between shorter and longer versions of the same text? For example, is a Mahāsatipaṭṭhānasutta used for a grander funeral? Does the repetition really give the audience “an opportunity to grasp” the content (Allon, p. 362) when the repetition is not of the essence, or should we consider that at the time of its taking on that format the text in Pāli was, as today, already understood primarily as powerful sound.

Samādhīrājasūtra) or alternatives such as pūrvavad yāvat (e.g. Divyāvadāna). In a Dīgha-nikāya text peyyāla might replace thirty per cent of unabridged content (Allon, pp. 275ff.), in Abhidhamma even more.

Omission even in cases of variation is possible, where a sample gives an impression of the whole, e.g. progressive intermittent numbers, one verb where grammar requires more (Allon, pp. 354–57). A compound conveys beyond itself, relationships unexpressed, linguistic traces of an original context sometimes not fully erased: the samāsa, plain, aluk, or syntactical (Norman 1991). Contractions, sometimes contortions, also comprise external sandhi (Norman 1993).

Yāva(t) (i)ti ādi, etc., denote lists, whether numeric, specific, or generic, giving only one or a few items.

Na-mo bu-ddhā-ya and a-ra-ha are examples of the parikamma “aids” to practice in pre-reform Theravada, the microcosmic–macrocosmic identification that encapsulates the great within the tiny: five-syllabled nama bu-ddhā-ya representing pentads such as khandha, Buddhas; trisyllabic araha representing triads – gems, robes, breaths, Piṭaka (Crosby 2000, p. 147). They protect aurally or visually, perhaps as a blue tattoo (Bizot 1981). Similarly, the full funerary works can be performed on a budget: extracts of the seven Abhidhamma books precede Praḥ Maleyya. Parallels are found in Sanskrit and Tibetan Buddhism, where the budgetary and temporal restrictions on acquisition of merit result in first-page recitation or simultaneity of all.

Overviews offer condensed coverage, comprehensive accessibility, and decoctions of the essence. Title words: -saṅkhepa, -saṅgaha, -samāsa, sāra, e.g. Saccasāṅkhepa, Abhidhammathasāṅgaha, Nāmarūpasamāsa, Sārasāṅgaha (von Hinüber 1996, Chapters VI, VIII). The earliest is the Suttasaṅgaha (Norman 1983, pp. 172–73). Cognate adverbs express authorial intent: saṅkhittena saṅkhepena the opposite rather than through the verbatim meaning of its specific content?

My thanks to Andrew Skilton for these references to Sanskrit literature and to the avadāna below.
of vistarena. These can also refer to a familiar tale. Cf. Gândhări avadāna and pūrvayoga: “The whole [story] is to be done [i.e. recited] in full … vistare janidave sīyadi … sarva vistare yagyupamano sīyadi” (Salomon 1999, pp. 36, 38–39).

Ritual and regulatory reminders are generated by prompts that provide the beginning but not the end, e.g. namo tassa for namo tassa bhagavato arahato sammāsambuddhassa. Key words are used in the elaborate abbreviation of yogavacara manuals such as the Amatākara-vanāna to encapsulate an array of ritual and meditation instructions in a single verse, fuller formulae to be drawn down from instruction given earlier or elsewhere (Crosby 2005). The result was not recognised as a list of keywords from sentences otherwise unrepresented and was emended as if a set of single sentences with faulty grammar by Ratanajoti and Ratanapali (1963), who then — not recognising the import — in turn abridged the text further from 3818 to 1135 verses (thus not as recorded Norman 1994, reprint, p. 268). A similar “drawing down” familiar from Pāṇini along with the code letters triggering treatment used therein is found in the Pali adaptations of the same, such as the Kaccāyana-vyākaraṇa (Norman 1983, pp. 163–67).3

Mātikā are very productive as tables of content, key words to summarize the whole, the mother who generates the teachings. Multiple functions have been illuminated by Gethin: mnemonic (149), point of access to whole (155), guide to structure (155), to composition (156), to mindfulness (165), and adeptly summarised by Allon (7). In South-East Asia the “mother” also generates the ritual fetus (McDaniel 5), the embryonic Buddha within (Crosby 2000).

Acronyms and acrostics encompass secret and powerful encapsulations, such as the first syllables that form the “hearts” hadaya (Penth). Compare dhāraṇī such as the arapacana (Braarvig). Some are not so secret: in South-East Asia the first letter of the seven Abhidhamma texts (Swearer 1995A); in Thailand, the first syllables of each of the

---

bodhisattas in the final ten Jātakas (Shaw xxxiii).  

Numinous powers of the Buddha are harnessed through the poetic synopses of biographic episodes to empower a statue (Swearer 1995B), to heal or bring peace, or just to entertain (Somadasa: vii with examples from the Nevill collection throughout).

Kate Crosby
School of Oriental and African Studies
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Recent Japanese Studies in the Pāli Commentarial Literature: Since 1984

1. Introduction

After extensive research, my dissertation of nearly 750 pages, entitled *A Study of the Pāli Commentaries: Theravādic Aspects of the Aṭṭhakathās* (in Japanese with an English summary), was published in 1984. Although there had been a few works preceding it abroad,¹ this work (abbreviated as *SPCJ* hereafter) was really the first major publication in this field of study, at least in Japan. In the twenty years or more since then, Japanese studies related to the Pāli commentarial literature (Aṭṭhakathā texts)² have improved remarkably, far beyond my own expectations.

Based on *SPCJ* and other later works by me, many Japanese scholars have done research in the Pāli commentaries using various points of view and lines of inquiry. This research, which dealt with the commentaries not only as objects of research in and of themselves, but also as primary material aiding the exploration of many issues in Buddhist studies, can be classified here into the following six categories. I will subsequently discuss some of the outstanding achievements in each category.³

---

¹ e.g. (1) E.W. Adikaram, *Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon* (Colombo: M.D. Gunasena, 1946). His philological study on the commentaries in this book, however, appeared only in 42 pages of Part I. (2) F. Lottermoser, *Quoted Verse Passages in the Works of Buddhaghosa* (Göttingen: author, 1982). Its subject was very limited, not like a general discussion. Cf. Mori 1985 (in English) as a review.

² This literature is to be limited here to the Visuddhimagga and the direct commentaries to the Pāli Tipiṭaka.

³ As for the works published by foreign scholars, some of which are surely very important, I shall discuss them in another article.

2. Japanese Translations of Some Commentaries

The publication of a Japanese translation series of the Pāli Tipiṭaka with some other texts in Pāli was completed in 1941, six years after it was begun, as a result of the sincere cooperation of many scholars. It contained seventy volumes altogether, and a useful general index was later added by Kogen Mizuno.

As to the Japanese translations of the Pāli commentaries, the Visuddhimagga, Atthasāliṇī, the Bāhiranidāna of the Samantapāsādikā, Kathāvatthu-aṭṭhakathā, and the Nidānakathā of the Jātakaṭṭhakathā had been published before 1984 when SPCJ was published. These translations were generally preceded by their English translations which had been published mostly by the Pali Text Society.\(^4\)

Since 1984, several translations of the commentaries into Japanese have been published: some were preceded by their English versions and others were not, meaning that the latter cases were the first translations in the world. These are Murakami and Oikawa (1985–89) in four volumes, the first translation of the Paramatthajotikā; Naniwa (2004), which consists of a full translation of the Vibhaṅgaṭṭhakathā and the first translation of its Mūlatikā; Katsumoto (2007), as her dissertation contains the initial full translation of the Cariyāpiṭakaṭṭhakathā, a text of the Paramatthadipani. In addition, there is Fujimoto (2006 in Japanese), a dissertation which also contains a new translation, i.e. the translation of the major stories of the Petavatthu-aṭṭhakathā with an abridged translation of the rest of the stories. It can thus be expected that the translation of works of the Pāli commentaries into Japanese will continue concurrently with future English translations.

3. Historical Studies of Buddhist Doctrine and Thought

Prior to the publication of SPCJ in 1984, the Aṭṭhakathā texts which were referred to for the doctrinal studies were usually limited to a few Abhidhamma works such as the Visuddhimagga, Atthasāliṇī,

\(^4\)Regarding all the publications of the Pali Text Society including English translations, see its web site (http://www.palitext.com).
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Sammohavinodani, Kathāvatthu-atṭhakathā, and so on. Since 1984, however, many other commentaries have gradually been taken up as important original texts, and now the achievements of this new approach have progressed splendidly in both quality and quantity. I will introduce here only the following five dissertations out of a great many excellent examples.

Endo (1997), a work in English, discussed in detail the development of the Buddha concept along with the Bodhisatta concept in Theravāda Buddhism, referring to the Pāli Canon, commentaries, and some sub-commentaries. His work was highly esteemed in Sri Lanka, where it was published, as well as here in Japan. Oikawa (1998, in Japanese, unpublished) studied the Paramatthajotikā, the commentary on the Khuddakapāṭha and Suttanipāta, for the first time, focusing on its philological, historical, and social aspects, as well as its background. This was written on the basis of his co-translation of the Pāli original as stated earlier. The greater part of his research appeared as Part II in the work he co-authored with Murakami in 1990 (in Japanese). Fujimoto (2006 in Japanese with an English summary) discussed the Buddhist idea of merit transference with reference to the Peta stories as related in the Pāli Petavatthu and its commentary, a text of the Paramatthadipani. His study added a great deal of new thought and knowledge to that which was already prevalent in the Northern tradition, and contained Japanese translations of many Peta stories in the commentary, related to the above subject. Baba (2006, in Japanese, unpublished) is a very valuable study which discusses the history of the ti-vijjā (three-knowledge) tradition with special reference to changes in the biography of the Buddha and to the formation of the meditation system in Sectarian Buddhism of India. In his research, the Pāli Canon, the Visuddhimagga, and the commentaries on the first four Nikāyas were primarily referred to in comparison with certain classical Chinese texts of Northern Buddhism. Katsumoto (2006, in Japanese, unpublished), already touched on in the previous section, is a very unique piece of research which examines certain Mahāyāna elements depicted mainly in
the Cariyāpiṭaka and its commentary, Buddhavaṁsa and its commentary, and also the Nidānakathā of the Jātakatthakathā. Her research could clear up, as a result, some questions regarding the relationship between the Pāli commentaries and Mahāyāna texts, and the influence of Mahāyāna, especially the Yogācārin school, on the Pāli commentaries. It also raises many new questions as to the historical interchange between Theravāda in Sri Lanka and Mahāyāna in India.

4. Philological Studies in the Source References for the Commentaries

Of the source materials for the Pāli commentaries, SPCJ initially classified them according to the following six categories: (1) the Pāli Tipiṭaka; (2) three semi-canonical texts following the Tipitaka; (3) the Pāli Aṭṭhakathās themselves; (4) the so-called “lost” Sīhaḷa Aṭṭhakathās; (5) source references of other schools: views attributed to “some” (keci) and views attributed to “sophists” (Vitaṇḍavādins); and (6) others: Dīpavaṁsa, Kaccāyanappakaraṇa, Mahāniruttippakaraṇa, and so forth. Among the above source references, (1), (2), (3), and (6) were already known, but (4) and (5) were entirely unknown sources. Consequently, I investigated each of the altogether 35 categories of such sources in SPCJ. However, according to subsequent research done by me after SPCJ, their final number amounted to 40. Meanwhile, more detailed research has been done on some sources. For instance, Endo (1999, in English) studied thoroughly the Paramatthdāpanī of Dhammapāla, with a special reference to “some” (apare, keci, etc.) as its source, and conclusively found certain important differences in passages between the Paramatthdāpanī and some works of Buddhaghosa, and also between those in the Paramatthdāpanī and certain sub-commentaries, both of which have traditionally been ascribed to Dhammapāla himself. These findings provided new

5Incidentally, Adikaram (Early History of Buddhism, p. 10, see n. 1 in this article) listed only 28 categories of such sources.
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questions as to the authorship of some of the commentaries and sub-commentaries together with biographical details pertaining to Dhammapāla. His study exerted a great influence on Katsumoto’s study as will be explained later. Endo (2002) investigated potthaka, a vague source reference in the commentaries (other than those above), and concluded that it was not a particular source reference which is now in question. Then Endo (2003, in English) examined the quotations from the Bhāṇakas, as a sort of old source, and further Endo (2005, in English) discussed the chronology of the “Aṭṭhakathā” which has always been expressed in the singular form, and which, though now lost, is a work regarded as the basic source material of Indian origin.

Concurrently, Hayashi (2005 in Japanese) analyzed the Vipākakathā, another source material referred to in the Visuddhimagga, and reached the conclusion that the section named the Vipākuddhārakathā in the Atthasālinī, which contains a special reference to the Ussadakittana, which is the same as in the Vipākakathā, is none other than the Vipākakathā itself of the Visuddhimagga. Thus the study of the source materials for the commentaries is still very much in progress.

5. Problems of Authorship Pertaining to Each Work

Regarding the traditional belief in the authorship of the Aṭṭhakathā texts, there remain a great many problems yet to be solved. Some scholars have worked on this quite difficult and complicated matter. Hayashi (1997 in Japanese, 1999 in English) criticized the view that the Atthasālinī is not the work of Buddhaghosa, which was once insisted on in detail by P.V. Bapat7 and more recently by O.H. Pind.8 To the contrary, Sasaki (1997, in Japanese, (1), pp. 57–58, n. 23) pointed out a contradictory textual fact existing between the Atthasālinī and the

Samantapāsādikā, both of which are attributed to Buddhaghosa himself in the Theravāda tradition.

Incidentally, Sasaki and Yamagiwa (1997, in Japanese) started their project of research on the Samantapāsādikā, the Vinaya commentary, comparing it with the Pāli Vinaya-piṭaka and other Vinaya-piṭakas, some of which originally contain their respective commentaries from the Northern tradition. As a part of their research, Sasaki (1997–99) examined certain complicated relations among the three works, the Visuddhimagga and the Samantapāsādikā, both equally ascribed to Buddhaghosa, and the Gedatsu-dō-ron, the Classical Chinese version of the Pāli Vimuttimagga authored by Upatissa, which is, in spite of the non-Mahāvihāra fraternity text in ancient Sri Lanka, one of the most fundamental source references for the Visuddhimagga.9 His conclusion at present is as follows: it cannot be asserted that the author of the Visuddhimagga was the same person as that of the Samantapāsādikā, whereas there can be found a certain accord between the Samantapāsādikā and the Gedatsu-dō-ron on some points. In fact the triangulated relations among the Visuddhimagga, the other commentaries and the Gedatsu-dō-ron still remain unclear.

Concerning this, Mori (1982 in Japanese) had already given another example as follows. Regarding the doctrine of the kammabhāna (the object of meditation practice), the Gedatsu-dō-ron states 38 kinds of such objects, while the Visuddhimagga states 40, and since the latter work was followed in this regard by such later Pāli texts as the

---

Abhidhammāvatāra of Buddhadatta and the Abhidhammatthasangahā of Aruruddha, the system using 40 kinds as shown in the Visuddhimagga has been widely recognized as the standard doctrinal system in the Mahāvihāra tradition. With careful examination, however, it could be found that the system using 38 kinds is also described in certain commentaries such as the Samantapāsādikā, Sāratthapakāsini, Sammohavinodani, and Paramatthajotikā, just as in the Gedatsu-dō-ron, a non-Mahāvihāra text. The philological aspects as found among the Visuddhimagga, the other Āṭṭhakathā texts and the Gedatsu-dō-ron show thus such a complicated situation that further research will be needed for the final solution of the authorship problem of the commentarial literature to be revealed.

6. Comparisons with the Texts of Northern Sects

The following has been taken as an effective method for the study of early Buddhism: In a comparison of the Pāli Vinaya- and Sutta-piṭakas (with the exception of the Abhidhamma-piṭaka) with those of the Northern sects in India, the corresponding passages and ideas among them can be generally regarded as an older stratum which had been formed before the initial schism of the Buddhist Order, and are therefore more closely connected to the Buddha. The discordant passages and ideas, on the other hand, are a newer stratum which was later altered or added inside of each sect founded after the initial schism. Based on the above methodological idea, studies on early Buddhism and sectarian Buddhism were accomplished as a whole, searching the older and newer strata of the two Piṭakas. For sectarian Buddhist studies in general, the Abhidhamma-piṭakas and other Abhidhamma texts are of course to be taken up as the essential material.

On the other hand, SPCJ pointed out the textual facts that the present Pāli commentaries consist of two fundamental strata: one is of the older portions which were composed or cited mainly on the basis of earlier source material of Indian origin, the contents of which can be considered as closer to those of early Buddhism, and the other is of the newer portions which were composed on the basis of the later sources of
Sri Lankan addition and alteration, the contents of which were accordingly transformed into the Theravāda tradition. Since then a new methodological tendency has been gradually prevailing which suggests that the Pāli commentaries should be properly utilized for the research of Indian Buddhism including even early Buddhism in certain cases. As a result, some portions which had not been found in the Pāli Sutta- and Vinaya-piṭakas, but were found only in the texts of the northern tradition, could be newly discovered as being dormant in the Pāli commentaries.

For example, Yamagiwa (1996) and Sasaki (20002) respectively searched the Samantapāsādikā in comparison with altogether six sorts of Vinaya-piṭakas available today in Pāli or Classical Chinese, and found that certain corresponding passages or ideas are recorded not in the Pāli Vinaya, but in its commentary, i.e. the Samantapāsādikā under consideration. Based on their findings, they expressed their view that the Samantapāsādikā should be included as a necessary work for comparative study of Vinaya texts within different traditions, which is definitely useful to the study of the history of the Buddhist Order in India.

While on the other hand, Baba (2003, in Japanese) investigated some Sutta texts preaching the theory of the “Chain of Dependent Origination” (paṭiccasamuppāda) which is differently transmitted in some sects. Regarding the Sutta-piṭaka he reached the same conclusion as that of Yamagiwa and Sasaki concerning the Vinaya-piṭaka. Baba’s dissertation, as touched on before, was a result of his further studies on this subject. In any case, it should be noted that various studies which sufficiently make use of the Aṭṭhakathā texts as indispensable references can thus contribute not only to the historical studies of Theravāda Buddhism in Sri Lanka, but also to Indian Buddhist studies in general.

7. Comparisons with Mahāyāna Texts and Studies in Sri Lankan Mahāyāna

Although comparative study of the Aṭṭhakathās with Mahāyāna texts had previously never been considered at all, my research after SPCJ (Mori 1993 in Japanese; 1997, 1999 in English) became a pioneering
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study on this frontier. It can be summarized in the following manner. A view of anonymous elders (ekace therā) is negatively referred to as deniable in some commentaries such as the Sumangalavilāsini, Papançasūdāni, Manorathapūraṇī, and Saddhammapajjotikā, but this anonymous source reference can be known as the “Andhakas” and “Vijñānavādins” through the valuable comment on it recorded in their sub-commentaries (ṭikās). In this regard, setting aside the case of the Andhakas, whose trustworthy texts are not extant today, it is possible to compare the commentaries in question with certain Vijñānavādin texts, i.e. the Viṃśatikā Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi in Sanskrit of Vasubandhu (4–5c) and some Classical Chinese versions. As a result, the comment under consideration could be proven as correct and this study gave us the important insight that some of the compilers of the sub-commentaries and perhaps of the commentaries possessed certain adequate knowledge of the Vijñānavādins, as a Mahāyāna school, at least in this topic.

Next to my study above, Shimoda (2000, in Japanese) tried to examine a similar sort of topic. It was a discussion that made clear a certain similarity between the Aṭṭhakathā and Mahāyāna texts: The similarity in question is that the four kinds of classifications of Buddhist preaching which were adopted in the later stratum, i.e. the commentarial part, of the Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra are actually identical with those explained about in the first four Nikāya-commentaries ascribed to Buddhaghosa, although their terms themselves are not in concord. Shimoda discussed this matter, based on his detailed research of the above Mahāyāna text. At any rate, we can be sure that barely perceptible relations seem to be lying between the Theravāda commentaries and the Mahāyāna Sūtras.

In the Pāli commentaries, it is called suttanikkhepa (attajjhāsaya, para-jjhāsaya, pucchāvasika, attuppattika), whereas in the Mahāyāna Sūtra in question, it is called dharmaparyāya. As for the Pāli terms explained in the commentaries, von Hinüber seems to have found them earlier: Oskar von Hinüber, A Handbook of Pāli Literature (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1996), pp. 114–15.
In the same year, i.e. in 2000, a continuing study by Katsumoto began to be published. Among her already published articles, we may draw special attention to Katsumoto (2005, 2006, in Japanese) for a point of view on the relationship between Theravāda and Mahāyāna texts. Furthermore, an abundant stock of more knowledge and information obtainable from this research in the future will improve the study of Sri Lankan Mahāyāna history, and then the study of Sri Lankan Mahāyāna and that of Indian Mahāyāna should be compared and unified into one theme, giving mutual influence and cooperating on research. Mori (2006 in Japanese) can be a useful guide to further studies in this field.

8. Further tasks and final goals of research
The above is a brief description of the present state of study in the six classified subjects about the Pāli commentaries which have been accomplished by Japanese since SPCJ was published in 1984. Needless to say, further studies in each of these six subjects along with some new subjects, if any exist, have to be continuously made. Concurrently, however, we have to pay attention to a fundamental problem which remains. That is the search concerning the earlier aspects on the older stratum of the Pāli commentaries, which is closely connected to early Buddhism and sectarian Buddhism in India. Incidentally, this new search would contribute to the whole introductory study or general remarks of the commentarial literature, while SPCJ, with the sub-title, “Theravādic Aspects of the Aṭṭhakathās” was none other than the other half. It mainly discussed the later aspects on the newer stratum of the Pāli commentaries, which were surely added in the Theravāda tradition of ancient Sri Lanka. In any case, in order to succeed in this task, the methods of analysis to be adopted are the most essential: any suitable problems which can be related to all commentary texts should be first selected, and also more than one such problem should be independent, with no mutual relationship which would indicate different phases of the older stratum being necessary. I am now considering a few such problems.
Thus, when some matters concerning the older stratum — such as its chronology; or its philological, doctrinal, or historical characteristics; and so forth — have been illuminated as a whole via the methods stated above, more exact and trustworthy results of research will be possible, and then the comparative study of the Pāli commentaries with the northern sectarian or Mahāyāna texts based upon the above results can be further improved. This will surely contribute to the study of Indian Buddhist history itself.

On the other hand, as a final task in this particular field, “the study of the formational history of the Pāli commentarial literature” should be pursued in the future. In addition, another ideal goal of our research should be considered in parallel, that is a publication of the Japanese translation series of all the commentaries in question, as a sequel to the Nandan Daizōkyō, the Japanese translation series of the Pāli Tipiṭaka plus other texts in Pāli, published altogether in seventy volumes between 1935 and 1941 as mentioned above.

I am grateful to Associate Professor Gregory Rohe at Aichi Gakuin University for improving my English.

References to Pāli texts refer to the Pali Text Society’s editions unless otherwise stated.

Sodo Mori
ABBREVIATIONS

JPTS Journal of the Pali Text Society
SPCJ Mori 1984 in Japanese
SPCE Mori 1989 in English (This is not a translation of SPCJ above, but a collection of my articles on Aṭṭhakathā study.)

Mori Festschrift Buddhist and Indian Studies in Honour of Professor Sodo Mori. Hamamatsu: Kokusai Bukkyōto Kyōkai, 2002, in English
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On Mahāyānasūtrālāṃkāra VII.1

1. The seventh chapter of the Mahāyānasūtrālāṃkāra (edited by Sylvain Lévi, Paris 1907, pp. 25–27) deals with the concept of supranormal power (prabhāva) and thus corresponds to the fifth chapter of (the first section of) the Bodhisattvabhūmi. Its structure is based on a kind of standard pattern of six categories, viz. laksāna (or svabhāva, cf. 25,11), hetu, phala, karman, yoga, and vṛtti,1 followed by a concluding verse in the puspitāgrā metre extolling the greatness (māhāmya) of the prabhāva of bodhisattvas.

2. The first verse (indrayajrā metre: -~~~ -~~~ -~~~ -~~~ ), describing the essential characteristic (laksāna) of the supranormal power of bodhisattvas, runs thus:

\[\text{utpattivākcitaśubhāśubhādhisatthānanikārapadāparokṣaṃ} \]
\[\text{jñānaḥ hi sarvatragasaprabhedey avyāhataḥ dhīragataḥ prabhāvaḥ} \]

VII.1

1 I am deeply indebted to Professor Yūshō Wakahara and the Mahāyānasūtrālāṃkāra study group at Ryūkoku University for sharing their materials with me (especially for a CD containing mss N2, N3 and NS, for which see n. 12), and to Professor Oskar von Hinüber for valuable suggestions.

2 For this pattern, cf., e.g., also Mahāyānasūtrālāṃkāra (Bhāṣya) IX.56–59 (verse 57b should probably be read as "bhāvanā-samudāgamah, and 57d emended to "āravathā-ksayatā-phalāh: bahurthā as in 56, 58ab and 59ab); Ratnakotravibhāga (ed. E.H. Johnston, Patna, 1950) I.30, 35, 42, and 45 as well as II.3, 8–9, 18–20, 29, and 38–41 (and the prose lines introducing these verses; read "phalāh in I.35 and "tathābhinnayittātā or even "aḥ in I.45 [cf. WZKS 15/197, p. 147], and perhaps "yuktaḥ sva" in I.42); Yogācārabhūmi, Śrūtagāvabhūmi (T 30.1579) 361a17–20 (Śrūvakaṇhūmi ms fol. 23ra–b1); Abhidharmasamuccayā (ed. P. Pradhan, SANTIKETAN 1950) 103a1–8 (reconstructed, but terminology confirmed by Abhidharmasamuccayabhāṣya (ed. N. Tatia, Patna, 1976), p. 141).

3 The edition by S. Bagchi (Darbhanga, 1970) reads "ādhi tat...pada parokṣaṃ, which does not make sense.

Sylvain Lévi\(^3\) translates:

La connaissance qui n’a pas en dehors de sa portée les Points suivants: naissance, langage, pensée, dépôt de bien et de mal, situation, Évasion, avec leurs subdivisions, qui est universelle, sans entrave, c’est là le Pouvoir qui appartient au Sage.

In the translation edited by Robert Thurman,\(^4\) the verse runs as follows:

Direct knowledge of birth, speech, mind, the deposit of good and evil, place, and escape is unobstructed toward these everywhere with all varieties; and it is the power of the brave.

3. None of the translators\(^5\) indicates any difficulties he may have had with the syntax of the text, but it is obvious that sarvatraga\(^6\) does not construe well. Lévi translates it as an attribute of jñānam, but this is impossible if we keep to the printed text where it is compounded with saprabhedeṣya. Nor is Thurman’s rendering convincing since it ignores "gā" and translates as if there were only sarvatra, as a separate word, as in the commentary (sarvatra lokadātāu saprabhedeṣu ...). But the omission of "gā" in the verse would spoil the metre. For the same reason, a reading sarvatragaṃ, which would fit in with Lévi’s translation and make good sense, is excluded as well.

4. Now, there is a similar case at Mahāyānasūtrālaṃkāra IX.9a (metre mālīni: \(~\sim\sim\sim\sim\sim\sim\sim\sim\) ):

śaraṇaṃ anupamaṃ taṃ cṛṣṭhabuddhatvam iṣṭaṃ ...

Thurman (p. 78) translates:

Supreme Buddhahood is the refuge without compare....

Yet, a karmadhāraya śrēṣṭhabuddhatva would seem to indicate a specific form of Buddhahood that is superior to another one (e.g., better.

---


\(^5\)The unpublished translation by Peter Oldmeadow (Canberra, mentioned by J.W. de Jong in IJ 30 (1987), pp. 154 ff.) remains inaccessible.
than pratyekabuddhavas. This, however, would be somewhat surprising since in the preceding as well as in the following verses buddhatva (and also buddhatā) is, without any qualification, consistently used for Buddhahood proper, i.e., the state of highest, perfect Awakening. Actually, in the following verse (IX.10) śreṣṭha clearly qualifies not buddhatva but saraṇa, and the same is true of a quasi-synonym of śreṣṭha, viz. uttama, in the preceding pair of verses (IX.7–8) of which IX.9 is a more artistic rephrasing. In both cases, the purport is that Buddhahood is the supreme refuge. This doubtless makes better sense. At any rate, the commentary on verse IX.9 does construe śreṣṭha with saraṇa and not with buddhatva:

By this third [verse the author] shows that ... precisely this refuge status [of Buddhahood] is unsurpassed because it (= the refuge status of Buddhahood) is incomparable and supreme (tasyai śaraṇa-
vasyāṇaṇaṃśreṣṭhatvenānuttaryam ... darsayat). Accordingly, Lévi (p. 71) translates the verse as follows:

Cette Bouddhâtê est le Refuge excellent, incomparable....

The Tibetan translation, too, supports this interpretation:

---

6 Cf. XIX.62d bodhiḥ śreṣṭhā (Bhāṣya: śreṣṭhā bodhiḥ), but in contrast to buddhatva the term bodhi is traditionally applied to Śrāvakas (and Pratyekabuddhas) as well and hence requires specification when referring to a Buddha, i.e., when used in the sense of anuttarā samyaksaṃbodhi.


8“Buddhahood protects from ... ; therefore, [it] is the best refuge” (paritṛāṇaṃ hi buddhatvam ... tasmāc charaṇam uttamaṃ).

9The same pattern is also found in the preceding verses, the anuṣṭubh lines IX.1–2 and IX.4–5 being rephrased by IX.3 (śārāṭalavikṛṣṭita) and IX.6 (sraṅgdharā), respectively. This pattern is, by the way, also found in the poetical rephrasing of the Tathāgatagarbhasūtra at Ratnagotravibhāga I, 96–126.

10Thus to be read with Tibetan mchog nyid kyi, against Lévi’s “śreṣṭhasya cāṇu”. Among the mss accessible to me (see n. 12), mss B, N2, N3 and NS read “śāhasvānāṃ”, whereas ms A has “ṣṭa-svānāṃ”, with a dot between ṣṭa (sic) and sva. A misreading of tve as sa seems quite possible from a script where the e-sign is a downward hook on the upper left side of the aksara. See A 34b2; B 36b3; N2 37b4; N3 29b7; NS 31a6.
This Buddhahood is considered to be the incomparable, supreme refuge (Peking Phi 10a1-2: *sangs rgyas nyid de skyabs ni dpe med mchog tu 'dod*).\(^{11}\)

However, such an interpretation is clearly impossible if *sreśṭhabuddhavatvam* is read as a compound. To conjecture a reading *sreśṭham* is out of the question because it would violate the metre. The only way out of the difficulty occurring to me is to suggest that we should probably separate *sreśṭha* from *buddhavatvam* and take it as a BHS form of the nom. sg. neuter (cf. F. Edgerton, *BHSG* §8.31–34). Possibly what the mss\(^ {12} \) write as "अ" was actually pronounced "आ", i.e., a short nasal for which the Brāhmī script has no sign, so that the scribes had only two options: either to indicate the nasalization by means of an *anusvāra* to the effect of obscuring the metre, or to give precedence to the metre and leave the nasalization unexpressed (as they actually do).\(^ {14} \) If my argument is correct, the line should be read (and was at any rate read by the commentary) as

\(^ {11} \)Likewise the Tibetan translation of the *pāda* in Sthiramati’s commentary (P Mi 125b6-7): *sangs rgyas skyabs ni dpe med mchog yin te*. Cf. also P Mi 125b5 (skyabs de nyid dpe med pa dang / mchog tu gyur pa ‘i phyir) and 126a1 (skyabs ’di dam pa yin pas na mchog ces bya ste). The Chinese translation, too, seems to take *sreśṭha* with *sāraṇa* but construes *anupama* with Buddha-hood when paraphrasing the commentary: “Verse: The Buddha is the supreme refuge; because [he] is incomparable, [it?] is unsurpassed. … Commentary: This verse elucidates the supremeness of refuge. Because the Buddha is incomparable, [as a refuge he] is unsurpassed” (T 31.1604: 602c4 and 6: 像曰，佛為勝歸處 無比故無上 … 譯曰，此尊顯歸依勝，由佛無量故 為無上，).

\(^ {12} \)Five mss are accessible to me, viz. mss A and B published in Syōkō Takeuchi et al. 1995 and mss N2 (NGMPP E 1923/5), N3 (NGMPP E 1367/11) and NS (NGMPP A 114/1). According to Wakahara 2003, p. (34), NS is dated Nepal samvat 796 (= 1675/6 C.E.), N2 Vikrama samvat 1957 (= 1900 C.E.), and N3 Nepal samvat 1025 (= 1904/5 C.E.). Cf. also Wakahara’s articles in *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 51.2 (2003), pp. (157)-(163) and 52.2 (2004), pp. (157)-(162).

\(^ {13} \)For cases of *an* to be read as "अ" for metrical reasons in Pāli verses, cf. Alsdorf 1967, p. 17, verses 7c = Sn 921c *patipadā* (but cf. Norman 1992, 342!) and 16b = Sn 930b *payutta*; p. 26 (Jātaka no. 479) verse 2b *Kālingā*; p. 29 (Jātaka no. 485) verse 6a *imā mayhā*; etc.

\(^ {14} \)All mss available to me read “अ", as does S. Lévi’s edition. See A 34b1; B 36b3; N2 37b2; N3 29b6; NS 31a5.
5. Returning now to the verse VII.1, an analogous solution would seem to be possible: the difficulty sketched in § 3 would vanish if we assume that the mss15 should be transcribed not as sarvatragasaprabhedeṣy but as sarvatraga saprabhedeṣy, perhaps to be read as sarvatraga saprabhedeṣy. In this case, it is no longer problematic to construe sarvatrāga (or qā) as an attribute with jīnānām, and Lévi’s translation can, in this point, be accepted.

6. Still, there is yet another problem. At the end of the first line, Lévi’s text reads “niḥsārapadāparokṣaṃ, and in his translation he takes pada to mean “points”, referring to the six items enumerated before with regard to which the cognition of bodhisattvas is immediate or perceptual (aparokṣa). In the verse, this works fairly well. In the commentary, however, such an understanding of pada appears to be precluded. There, after the explanation of the six items we have the following sentence:

\[ \text{esu } \text{ sātv } \text{ artheṣu } \text{ sarvatra } \text{ lokadhātu } \text{ saprabhedēṣu } \text{ padāparokṣam} \text{ avyāhaṃ } \text{ jīnānāṃ } \text{ sa } \text{ prabhāvo } \text{ bodhisattvānām } \ldots . \]

This is translated by S. Lévi (p. 55) as follows:

Voilà les six catégories en question; la connaissance qui porte sur elles sans que nulle part, dans tous les mondes, avec toutes leurs subdivisions, elles soient en dehors de sa portée, sans rien qui l’entrave, c’est là le Pouvoir des Bodhisattvas…

I cannot find an equivalent for pada in this translation, nor in that of Thurman16 who ignores it also in his translation of the verse (see § 2). Actually, in the commentary I find it altogether impossible to construe pada as a prior member of a compound ending in aparokṣa, let alone in any other way. Thurman may well have ignored it because he could not find an equivalent in the Tibetan translation. But a closer inspection

---

15All the five mss at my disposal (see n. 12) read sarvatragasa. See A 25b4; B 27a6; N2 27b6; N3 22a1; NS 23a3.

16“Such knowledge is directly present without impediment in all universes as regards those six topics and their varieties, this knowledge is the bodhisattva’s power …” (Thurman [see n. 4] p. 57).
of the latter does show the way towards a reasonable solution, and moreover suggests a different reading of the verse as well.

7. The Tibetan translation of the commentary passage runs like this:

What is, in this way, a direct, unobstructed cognition with regard to these six items including their subdivisions in every world-system, that is the [supranormal] power of bodhisattvas (P Phi 156b2–3; D Phi 147a3–4: de laur na’jig rten gyi’17 kham thams cad du don drug po de dag rab tu dbye ba dang bcas pa la shes pa mgon sum du gyur pa thogs pa med pa gang yin pa de ni byang chub sems dpa’ rnam sbyi mthu ... yin no /).

It is obvious that the only word which has no equivalent in the Sanskrit text as printed by Lévi is the relative pronoun gang (yin pa),18 which in connection which the subject jñānam would correspond to yad. Since the akṣaras ya and pa are very similar in the mss, the conclusion suggesting itself is that the disturbing padā is nothing but a misreading of the relative pronoun yad followed by āparokṣam or rather aparokṣam, at least according to the mss available to me.19 But even a reading āparokṣam could easily be explained as a metrical lengthening taken over from the verse. For there, too, Tibetan, reading as it does, for pāda b,

... de yi gnas dang ’byung ba mgon sum gang 

shows that padāparokṣam is rather a miscopying of yadāparokṣam, to be resolved into yad āparokṣam.20 This is anyway what one would expect in view of Vasubandhu’s commentary, unless we suspect him of having grossly misread the verse.

17gyi D : gyis P.
18This reading is also confirmed by the pratika in Śthiramati’s commentary (P Mi 95b1: mgon sum gang zhes bya ba ni ...).
19Mss A and N2 pedapa, ms N3 padapa. But ms B clearly reads yadapa, and ms NS either yadapa or yadaya. See A 25b7; B 27b2; N2 28a2; N3 22a4; NS 23a5.
20Mss A, N2 and N3 padāparokṣam; ms B padāroksam, like ms NS where “dā and ro” are, however, separated by a mark indicating the end of the preceding chapter in the preceding line but extending into the line below. See A 25b1; B 27a6; N2 27b5:6; N3 22a1; NS 23a2.
8. However, if this is correct (and I fail to see how at least in Vasubandhu’s commentary a reading padā or even pada could be justified syntactically), there arises another problem: how to construe the compound immediately preceding the relative pronoun in the verse? If niṣārapadāparokṣam is, following the Tibetan and Vasubandhu’s commentary, emended to niṣāra yad āparokṣam, the compound preceding the relative pronoun would end with a stem form, which is of course impossible in standard Sanskrit. What is required is rather a locative dependent on jñānam, as is confirmed by the commentary explicitly construing the six items of the first line as locatives (viśaya-saptami) depending on jñānam (viz. upapattau jñānam, vāci jñānam, citte jñānam, dāhāne jñānam, and niḥsaraṇe jñānam). But emending niṣāra yad to niṣāre yad is, once again, precluded by the metre requiring a short syllable. In view of the solution found for sarvatraga, I suggest to interpret niṣāra, in a similar way, as a BHS form of the loc. sg. (BHSG §8.11). I wonder if in this case a may not be interpreted as a substitute writing for ē, for which, once again, no sign is available in the scripts derived from the Brāhmī alphabet. Among the two available possibilities, viz. to write either e (normally long) or a somehow similar short vowel like a or i, the metrically required

---

21But all the five mss at my disposal read niḥsaraṇajñānam! In the preceding item, mss B and NS read “gamanajñānamāṇḍhi”, but mss A, N2 and N3 have “gamanajjāḍhi” (omitting “jñāna”). See A 25b6; B 27a9; N2 28a1; N3 22a3; NS 23a3.

22The reading “sāra is confirmed by all the five mss available to me. See A 25b4; B 27a8; N2 27b5; N3 22a1; NS 23a2.

23Cf. Mahāyānasūtraśālākāra XXI.48c, where niḥsāre occurs in a similar context (six abhijñās), albeit as the object not of jñāna but of avāda.

24It has to be conceded that a for ē is not unusual, the normal representation preserving the quantity being i (cf. Edgerton 1946, pp. 199 §28 and 204 §67; cf. also, for Apabhramśa, Ludwig Alsdorf, Harivaṃsapaṭarāṇa (Hamburg, 1936) [Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien Bd. 5], pp. 142–44). However, in the analogous case of shortened o (i.e.: ē), both ū and u are attested (Edgerton 1946, pp. 199 §28 and 204 §68).
quantity of the vowel would, in this case too, have taken precedence over the quality.

9. It has, however, to be admitted that the interpretation of "niḥṣāra" in the first line as a locative singular is odd in view of the fact that we have, in the second line, the locative plural saprabhedeṣu, an adjective which doubtless qualifies the six items to be supplied from the first line (cf. the Bhāṣya: esu ṣaṭṣv artheṣu ... saprabhedeṣu). But since the singular in the first line is collective (six items!), a reference to it in the form of a plural ad sensum would not seem to be entirely inexplicable, still less so in view of the constraints of the metre. Anyway, the only alternative solution I for my part could imagine would be to interpret the six-membered dvandva ending with "niḥṣāra" as a virtual locative plural, to be connected with jñānaṃ as a kind of split compound, interrupted by yad āparokṣam; but I am unable to decide whether such a construction is possible at all.  

10. My translation of the verse does not differ too much from S. Lévi’s:

A knowledge which is perceptual with regard to [the dying and rebirth [of beings], to speech [even in other realms of existence], to the thoughts [of others], to the deposit[27] of good and bad [karma], to [how to go to] the place where the [vinyās dwell], and to [the

---

25Anyway, a similar case seems to occur at Jātaka IV 384.14, where the metre requires the reading app-eva nāṃ putta ṭabhemu -jīvitaṃ, on which cf. Oberlies 1996, 119 ("compound in tmesis").

26In the Bhāṣya (25.5–6) we should read, with ms A, "bhūjñā yāṃ vācāṃ tatra tatropapānā bhāṣante"; cf. ms A and N2 vācāntatratropāṃ, ms N3 vācāṃ tatratropāṃ and Tibetan (Peking Phi 156a8) de dang de dag tu skyes pa rnam. Ms B and NS read vācāntatragatropāṃ. In ms NS, some forms of ta are not much different from ga. See A 25b5; B 27a7; N2 27b7; N3 22a2; NS 23b3.

27i.e. the residues (vāsanā) accumulated in previous existences (cf. Sthirāmati, Peking Mi 95a3–5).

28For want of anything better, my interpretation of the telegraphic tat- (there is no word in the line it might refer to) follows the Bhāṣya (25.7–8: yatra vinyās tisthanti tatsthāṇaṃ vicaṇaḥ yadhivaśayābhijñāḥ) and Bhāṣya ad XX-XXI.48 (185,13–14: upetya vinyāsakāśam yadhivaḥbhijñāyaḥ). According to Sthirāmati (Peking Mi 95a6–8), tatsthāna means the Buddha-fields where the
means for] escaping [from sansāra], and which is universal and unobstructed with regard to [its aforementioned objects] along with their subdivisions: [this] is the [supranormal] power of the bodhi-
sattvas.

11. The grammatical explanation of the verses VII.1 and IX.9a pro-
posed in the preceding paragraphs presupposes that the language of the Mahāyānasūtraūlaṁkāra allows for non-standard grammatical features, especially such as are known from Middle Indic, as in many other Buddhist Sanskrit texts. Such features have indeed already been registered by S. Lévi, e.g. in X.14 (janiya), XVII.14 (bahitas), 31 (tāyaka), 45 (arihat), or XIX.69–70 (dharama). Cf. also vā for iva at IX.36. The most interesting case in connection with the present investigation is the shortening of a long vowel at the end of a word at XIX.75, where we find hetuna m.c. for hetunā. There is also a number of non-standard compounds (cf. F. Edgerton, BHSG §23.10) which would deserve special investigation, especially at the beginning of Chapter IX, and significantly in verses composed in fairly demanding metres, viz. 3d: (ratnānām) prabhāva-mahatām;29 6b: dharma-ratna-
pratata-sumahataḥ (Bhāṣya: sumahataḥ pratatasya dharmaratasya!); 6c: suklasa-sasya-prasava-sumahataḥ;30 6d: dharmāmbu-varṣa-pratata-
suvihitasya (Bhāṣya: mahataḥ suvihitasya ... dharmāmbu-varṣasya); 12d: viṣaya-sumahataḥ31 (jñānamārgīt).

Lambert Schmithausen

Buddhas live and the world systems where sentient beings live, and the cognition referring to these means the knowledge how to go there by means of supranormal accomplishments (yuddhi).

29 Looks like a bahuvrihi with its members inverted (cf. Oberlies 1996, p. 119 [see n. 25]; Oberlies 1989–1990, pp. 159–60, n. 7; Oberlies 2001, p. 123; Norman 1992, p. 217 ad v. 370). But the compound could perhaps also be understood as a tatpurusa in the sense of “great as regards their power”.

30 Probably in the sense of sumahataḥ suklasa-prasavasya.

31 See n. 29.
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Sanskrit Ikṣvāku, Pāli Okkāka, and Gāndhārī Iṣmaho

1. Gāndhārī Iṣmaho = Sanskrit Ikṣvāku

Until now, the Gāndhārī word iṣmaho has been known only from the stūpa dedication inscription of Seṇavarma (Bailey 1980, Fussman 1982, Salomon 1986, von Hinüber 2003). This important document, written on a gold leaf and dating from the early first century A.D., is the longest single inscriptive text known in Gāndhārī language and Kharoṣṭhī script. The word in question occurs three times in Seṇavarma’s inscription:

line 3a: utaraseṇaputre vasuseṇe odiraya ʾiṣmahokulaṇe, “Vasuseṇa, son of Utaṇaseṇa, King of Odī, from the Iṣmaho family”.

line 3c: seṇavarme aṇidaseṇaputre aṭe ceva ʾiṣmahorajakulasabhavade odiraja, “Seṇavarma, son of Aṇidaseṇa, and therefore, by virtue of birth in the Iṣmaho royal family, king of Odī”.

line 9c: bhadasena rava upadae yava pravidamaha me diṣaṇeṇo odiraya sava i(ʾṣma)horayakulasambhavo,1 “from King Bhadasena up to my paternal great-grandfather Diṣaṇeṇa, the kings of Odī, all born in the I(ʾṣma)ho royal family”.

The word iṣmaho, whose meaning and etymology have been up to now completely obscure, has usually been assumed to be a non-Indian name. Thus, for example, Fussman (1982, p. 44) commented, “Ce mot semble un nom propre, d’origine non-indienne”, and von Hinüber (2003, p. 34.

---

*We wish to express our gratitude to W. South Coblin (Iowa City), Max Deeg (Cardiff), Zev Handel (Seattle), Oskar von Hinüber (Freiburg), Timothy Lenz (Seattle), and Gary Tubb (Chicago), who provided assistance and advice in the preparation of this paper. Tien-chang Shih (Seattle) in particular generously assisted us in locating and interpreting relevant Chinese materials. Finally, we thank the honoree of this volume, K.R. Norman, for encouraging, assisting and inspiring us over many years and in many ways in our studies of areas of common interest.

1Here the syllable šma was apparently omitted by scribal error, as the normal spelling is confirmed by the two other occurrences of the word in this inscription. This error presumably does not have any linguistic significance.

n. 30) similarly remarked “Unarisch scheint der Name des Stammvaters Īšmaho zu sein”.

Now, however, īsmaho has been observed in another Gāndhārī text in a context which makes it clear that this name is not in fact non-Indian, but rather is the Gāndhārī equivalent of the name of the renowned legendary king known in Sanskrit as Iksvāku and in Pāli as Okkāka. The text in question is a Buddhist birch-bark scroll in Gāndhārī language and Kharoṣṭhī script in the Library of Congress (Washington, D.C.), which appears to date from about the second century A.D. (figs. 1–2). This manuscript, which is only now beginning to be studied, appears to consist of formulaic accounts of the lives of fifteen Buddhas, from Dīpankara to Maitreya, enumerating for each Buddha the kalpa in which he lived, his life-span, his class (brāhmaṇa or kṣatriya), the size of his assembly (saṃnipāta), the duration of his dharma, etc. Thus in its format and contents this new text resembles biographical texts such as the Mahāpadāna-sutta / Mahāvadāna-sūtra, Buddhavaṃsa, and Bhadra-kalpika-sūtra, but it seems to have a particularly close similarity to portions of the Bahubuddha-sūtra contained in the Mahāvastu (ed. Senart, III 224.10–250.8).

The portion of the new text described above is preceded by a set of fifteen verses containing a prediction (vyākarana) of the future Buddhahood of Śākyamuni, which are presumably being spoken by a previous Buddha. The passage in question here is part of what appears to be the third verse in this series. The surviving portion of the verse, comprising part of the second and fourth quarters and all of the third, reads as follows:

```
+ + + (*ka)///[p][*e] ido asakhae ·
īsmahovatsañarasakasihō ·
tariśasi devamanu[śa] ??/ +
```
[An] incalculable world-age from now,² as the Śākya man-lion in the Ismāho lineage,³ you will cross over ... gods and humans.⁴

²Cf. Mvu I 53.2, kalpasmin ito asanṭkhyeye.

³The sense of this line is not completely certain. We propose to read the entire quarter as a single compound, ismāho-vatiśa-nara-saka-siho, although superficially it might seem easier to divide it into two words, ismahovatiśaṇara śakasioh, and translate “as a man of the Ismāho lineage, the Lion of the Śākyas”. But we provisionally reject this interpretation, mainly because -nara at the end of a compound ismahovatiśaṇara would be superfluous and stylistically weak. We suspect that naraśakasiho should rather be read as a sub-compound, by way of a conflation of the two expressions śakasiho (= Skt śākyasimha) and naraśiho (= narasimha). Narasimha and equivalent epithets of the Buddha such as puruṣasimha and puruṣavāgyha, though rare in Pāli, are common in some Buddhist Sanskrit texts, especially in the Mahāvastu, with which the new Gāndhārī text under discussion here has many common features of style and contents. For example, in narasimhatīye pranidḥeti, “He makes a vow to attain the state of a man-lion”, that is, “of Buddhahood” (Mvu I 83.8), narasimha is used in a context of predictions of future Buddhahood, as in our text. Similarly, the synonymous puruṣasimha occurs in a context similar to that of the passage in question in puruṣasimha sākyakulānandajananu (Mvu II 164.13).

But it must be conceded that in the proposed interpretation the construction is still somewhat odd, with the sub-compound -naraśakasiho instead of the expected -śakanaṇarasiho. However, compounds with irregular word order are not unknown in Buddhist usage (see Edgerton 1953, §23.10), and in this case the peculiarity could be explained on metrical grounds, since the irregular ordering of the words in -naraśakasiho provides a normal ending for a triṣṭubh line - - - - - - -), whereas the normal compound order śakanaṇarasiho (- - - - - - -) would not fit the metre. Although ideal metrical patterns are often treated rather loosely in Gāndhārī texts (see, for example, Salomon 2000: 49–51), a preliminary analysis of the new text in question here seems to show that it followed the standard metrical pattern of the triṣṭubh metre much more closely than many other Gāndhārī texts, perhaps because the text was originally composed in Gāndhārī rather than translated into Gāndhārī from some other Indo-Aryan language. For this reason, we take the metre of this text to be phonetically and etymologically reliable, although we would not necessarily do so for all Gāndhārī texts.

⁴Possible reconstructions of the last quarter of this verse include deva-maṇuṣaśa[l]a(*)ga (compare Buddhavanśa 2.55, sabbaññatam pāpamitvā saṇāressam sadeva[ke] or devamaṇuṣaśa[ul](*)sta (compare, e.g., Mvu I 239.9, sāstā devānā ca manusyaṃnām ca).
The key phrase for our purposes is the second quarter, *ismahovatšaṇaṇaṇaśakasito*. The reference to *śakasito* = Skt *śakyasimha* makes it certain that the addressee here is indeed the (then) future “historical” Buddha Śākyamuni, while the phrase *ismahovatša* indicates that he is being associated with the Iṣmaho lineage (*vaṃśa*).\(^5\) Since the Śākyas are universally deemed in Buddhist tradition to be descended from the lineage of the legendary *cakravartin* emperor Ikṣvāku, there can hardly be any doubt that *ismaho* here is the equivalent of Sanskrit *ikṣvāku*, despite the several unusual phonetic correspondences between the two — correspondences which, however, are no more unusual, indeed somewhat less so, than those between Skt *ikṣvāku* and Pāli *okkāka*, as will be discussed in detail below (section 2).

Moreover, the association of the descendants of Ikṣvāku with the Śākyas is expressed in similar terms to those of the new text in, for example, Mahāvastu III 247.12–13, *suddhodanasya rájñō ikṣvākujasya putra māyāya śākyakulanandijanano śākyo bhūt śākyasukumāro*, “King Śuddhodana, the descendant of Ikṣvāku, had with Māyā a son, the Śākya who brought delight to the Śākya clan, the tender Śākya youth”. Similarly, the expression applied to the Buddha in Mahāvastu III 343.15, *ikṣvākuvalasambhave*, “born in the Ikṣvāku clan”, is virtually identical to *ismahorajulasabhave*, the epithet adopted by Senera-varma in his inscription (line 3c). These parallels thus confirm that Gāndhārī *ismaho* does in fact correspond to Skt *ikṣvāku* / Pāli *okkāka*.

Though not previously attested as such, *vaṭśa* in the compound *ismahovatšaṇaṇa* is a more or less normal Gāndhārī correspondent to Skt *vaṃśa*. Here the *t* has arisen as an excrecent consonant between the underlying nasal (here left unwritten, as very often in Gāndhārī) and the following sibilant: *vaṃśa* ([vaš] or [vaša]) > *vaṭśa* ([vantiša]). Parallel developments (though involving the dental rather than the palatal sibilant) are attested, for instance, in the Gāndhārī Dharmapada from Khotan, in *matsa* = Skt *mamsa* and *satsara* = *samsāra* (Brough 1962,

\(^5\)The equivalence of Gāndhārī *vaṭśa* with Sanskrit *vaṃśa* will be explained below.
The ligature representing the consonant cluster in question in our text, ṭi, is nowadays usually transliterated as tsa, though t̐a has also been used for it. On purely visual grounds, it is difficult to distinguish whether the second member is n ṭa or a simplified form of t̐ ta. This issue was discussed at some length by Brough (1962, pp. 73–77).⁶ who preferred the transliteration tsa on both graphic and phonetic grounds, since most of the examples available to him, such as the aforementioned matsa = māṃsa and satsara = sansāra, involved original dental sibilants. However, the present case of vatśa = vamśa revives the question of the correct transliteration, or perhaps rather transliterations, of ṭi, and suggests that it perhaps did double duty for both ts and ti. Whether this represents an actual merger of the two, either in the writing system or in the phonology of the language, is difficult to determine on the basis of the data currently available. Although in general the three sibilants of Old Indo-Aryan are retained as such in Gândhārī, they tend to merge or alternate graphically, if not phonetically, in consonant clusters; for example, the absolutive corresponding to Sanskrit dṛṣṭvā is written in different texts as dispa and dhriśpana, and also, possibly, as dispa.⁷ In any case, the equation between Sanskrit vamśa and Gândhārī vatśa is supported on contextual grounds by a passage in Asvaghoṣa’s Saundarananda (ed. Johnston, 1.24): tasmād Ḣvākuvamśyās te bhuvī ṣākyā iti smṛtāh, “Therefore those members of the lineage of Ḣvāku are known in the world as Śākyas”. Here the compound Ḣvāku-vamśyās mirrors Ḣmaho-vatśa- in our new manuscript.

---

⁶See also the further discussion in Glass 2000, pp. 130–31.

⁷The last reading is however uncertain and largely reconstructed; see Salomon 2000: 143–44 and Allon 2001: 93. For other citations, refer to the Early Buddhist Manuscripts Project’s online Gândhārī dictionary (http://depts.washington.edu/ebmp/dictionary.php).
2. Etymological problems

Thus there can be no reasonable doubt that *ismhaḥ is the Gāndhārī equivalent of Sanskrit ikṣvāku and Pāli okkāka. Although the form *ismaḥo cited here is a transliteration from Kharoṣṭhī script, in which vowel quantity is not distinguished, we can safely assume that the vowel of the second syllable was long. This is suggested first of all by the corresponding long vowel of the Sanskrit and Pāli forms, although this alone is not conclusive in light of the several other problems in the phonetic correspondences between these three words (as discussed below). But it is confirmed by metrical considerations,8 since the word in question appears at the beginning of a triśṭubh line, where the expected metrical pattern would be – – –.

Although this metrical pattern confirms the expected quantity of the vowel of the second syllable, at the same time it suggests that the o vowel of the third syllable is to be read as short. This is a bit surprising, since we otherwise have no direct evidence of the existence of ो as an independent phoneme in Gāndhārī or other MIA languages. Since u and o alternate frequently in Gāndhārī orthography, one might suppose that *ismaḥo is merely a graphic alternative for *ismaḥu, with final u as suggested by Sanskrit ikṣvāku. However, the fact that the name is consistently written with -o in all four attestations speaks against this, and we can therefore suppose that the pronunciation was िस्माहो, although the phonological status and etymological significance of the final vowel remain uncertain.

As noted above, although the functional equivalence of Gāndhārī ismahaḥ to Sanskrit ikṣvāku and Pāli okkāka is clearly established, the phonetic correspondences of the three forms of the name are anything but normal:

For the initial vowel, Pāli has o against Sanskrit and Gāndhārī i.

---

8Compare n. 3 above.
For the consonant clusters in the second syllable, the three languages have respectively \( kk \), \( ky \), and \( \text{ṣn} \), none of which are normally equivalents for any of the others.

For the consonant of the third syllable, Gāṇḍhārī has, untypically, \( h \) against \( k \) of Pāli and Sanskrit.

For the final vowel, Pāli, Sanskrit and Gāṇḍhārī have \( a \), \( u \), and \( o \) respectively.

At first glance it therefore seems likely that in \textit{iksəvəku / okkəka / ismahə} we have an instance of the frequent pattern whereby proper names in the various Indian Buddhist languages\(^9\) exhibit irregular phonetic correspondences. This pattern was already well-established in connection with Pāli and Sanskrit, and recent discoveries of numerous Buddhist literary texts in Gāṇḍhārī\(^{10}\) have shown that it applies there as well. One example where the newly discovered Gāṇḍhārī form of a proper name fails to correspond normally with either the Pāli or the Sanskrit forms — involving the name of the city of Taxila, namely Sanskrit \textit{taksəsilə}, Pāli \textit{takkasilə}, and Gāṇḍhārī \textit{taksəila} — is discussed in detail in Salomon 2005B, and several other cases (some involving material that has not yet been published) have also been observed. For example, the Gāṇḍhārī equivalent of the name of the king known in Pāli as \textit{pasenədi} and in Sanskrit as \textit{prasenajit} — which, as usual, themselves do not correspond normally — has now been revealed to be \textit{prasəniga}, which again corresponds neither to the Pāli nor the Sanskrit form (Allon 2001, p. 304; British Library Kharoṣṭhī fragments 12 + 14, line 75, \textit{pəɾəʃənəɡ[ə]nə}). The overall problem of the relationship of the aberrant manifestations of proper names in different Buddhist languages has not yet been studied in any organized and comprehensive manner.

---

\(^9\)This is not to suggest that this phenomenon is unique or peculiar to Buddhist languages, or even to Indian languages only. Similar inconsistencies between dialectal forms of proper names, involving special etymological, phonological, and/or orthographic patterns, could presumably be documented in other language groups in India and elsewhere, although we are not aware of any systematic studies of this phenomenon.

\(^{10}\)For an up-to-date summary of these and related finds, see Allon, forthcoming.
(though we intend to address it in a future study with special reference to proper names in Gândhâri).

Buddhist scholars in ancient times, like us, wrestled with the problem of the etymology of such proper names, and often had to resort to explanations that from the modern perspective it is easy to dismiss as “folk etymologies”, but that doubtless, once established, themselves began to exert an influence on the transmitted forms of these names in the Buddhist tradition. For example, the Sanskrit form of the name ikṣvāku is typically derived from ikṣu, “sugar-cane”, for which derivation a legend was created according to which the eponymous king Ikṣvāku was born from a sugar-cane plant and named accordingly: eṣo kumāro ikṣuto jāto bhavatu imasya ikṣvākutti nāmam, “This baby was born from the sugar-cane (ikṣu), so let his name be Ikṣvāku” (Mahâvastu II.422.19–20). In a variant of this legend recorded in the Mûlasarvâstivâda-vinaya, the sage Suوارgadvaiपâyana found two newborn boys in a sugar-cane field and named them after this findspot: ikṣuvâtâ labdhvā ikṣvâkâ ikṣvâkâ iti caturthâ samjñâ samvṛttâ, “Because they were taken from a sugar-cane field, their fourth name became ‘Ikṣvâka, Ikṣvâka’”11 (Saṅghabhedavastu, ed. Gnoli, I 25–26). After they grew up, both brothers in turn succeeded to the throne, and the younger became the progenitor of the Ikṣvâku clan.

The corresponding Pâli name, okkâka, is differently but equally fancifully derived by Buddhaghosa in his commentary on the Digha-nikâya from ukkâ “torch” (= Skt ulkâ), on the grounds that when King Okkâka spoke it seemed as if the light from a torch (ukkâ) came out of his mouth: tassa kira rañño kathanakâle ukkâ viya mukhato pabhâ niccharati, tasmâ nam okkâko ti sañjānîmsu, “They say that when that king spoke, a light like [that of] a torch (ukkâ) came forth from his

---

11Note the final vowel -a, as in Pâli okkâka and Jaina Prakrit ikkhâga (cited below).
mouth, and therefore they named him Okkāka” (Sumaṅgalavilāsini I 258.6–8).12

Yet despite these very different traditional etymologies for Sanskrit iksvāku and Pāli okkāka, and despite the striking phonetic inconsistencies between them, it is clearly not out of the question that they are in fact etymologically related. No less an authority than Wilhelm Geiger maintained that this was the case, supporting this correspondence with the following three arguments:

1. The initial o of the Pāli name comes from the u- of an original *ukkhāka, according to the rule that “[n]ot infrequently i and u become ē and ō before double-consonance” (Geiger 1943, p. 65).

2. The form *ukkhāka is justified on the grounds that “Sometimes in Pāli [k]h and cḥ alternate in one and the same word” (Geiger 1943, p. 100), so that a hypothetical *ukkhu could have coexisted in Pāli or related dialects with uccha, which is the usual Pāli equivalent of Sanskrit ıkṣu “sugar cane” (Geiger 1943, p. 66, n.1).

3. The deaspiration of the second syllable (*ukkhāka > ıkkāka) is explained by comparison with other instances of “[m]issing aspiration in sound-groups with the sibilant in second position” (Geiger 1943, p. 105).

Each of these proposed changes is in and of itself plausible and more or less well attested, but it is still noteworthy how much special pleading is required to establish a regular etymological correspondence between iksvāku and okkāka, and it must also be pointed out that the irregular contrast between the final vowels (u/a) remains unexplained. The situation is further complicated by the corresponding name in the Jaina Prakrits, which usually appears as ıkkhāga, although (test Mehta and Chandra 1970, p. 103) ıkkhāgu is also attested in the compound ıkkhāgu-vamsa. Thus the usual Prakrit form, ıkkhāga, corresponds to Sanskrit iksvāku except for the final vowel, which agrees with Pāli

---

12Compare also the etymology of the name iksvāku found in the Brahmanical tradition, where it is said that Iksvāku was born from the nose of his father Manu when the latter sneezed (vksu); e.g., ıkṣuvatas tu manor jaihe iksvākur ghrāṇataḥ sutah (Bhāgavata-purāṇa 9.6.4ab).
okkāka (and with the Buddhist Sanskrit form ıkṣvāka in the Saṅghabheda-vastu passage quoted above).\textsuperscript{13}

Thus one can feel some sympathy for the opinion of E.J. Thomas, diametrically opposite to that of Geiger, who declared that “Pāli … Okkāka … cannot by any device be treated as a form of the name Ikshvāku” (1927, p. 6). Nonetheless, the peculiar phonetic correspondences between certain proper names in Sanskrit and Pāli, including ıkṣvāku / okkāka as well as takaśiśā / takkasilā, may yet prove to be regular as our knowledge of their transmission improves. They may, for instance, find a partial explanation in phonological features of the Sinhala language which could have affected their rendition in Pāli texts as transmitted and canonized in Sri Lanka. This could explain the otherwise anomalous deaspiration of expected kkh in both of the aforementioned Pāli forms (cf. Geiger 1938, pp. 39–40, and the third argument from Geiger 1943 cited above).\textsuperscript{14}

In balance, it may tentatively be concluded that, despite their rather peculiar correspondence, Sanskrit ıkṣvāku and Pāli okkāka probably are etymologically related. The next question, then, is whether the same can be said for the newly identified Gāndhārī form of the name, ɨsmāho. As noted previously, there are two main problems in establishing a direct parallelism between the consonants in ɨsmāho and Sanskrit ıkṣvāku. Regarding the initial of the final syllable, the usual Gāndhārī reflexes of Sanskrit intervocalic -k- are g, gh or باء, but not h. There is, however, at least one fairly clear instance of -k > h-, namely tuspahu as the equivalent of Sanskrit yusmākam, occurring eight times in scroll 5 of the

\textsuperscript{13}The form of the name which appears in the Prakrit inscriptions of the Ikṣvāku kings of the Deccan (see section 3a) is ikhkāku (graphic for ikkhāku; Vogel 1929, p. 27). This relatively late form corresponds directly to the Sanskrit and is presumably derived from it. It is therefore of no further significance for our discussion.

\textsuperscript{14}It is less clear whether Sinhala vowel harmony (Geiger 1938, pp. 22–25) can be invoked to explain the variation in the final vowel of the name (Pāli a, Sanskrit a) since forms with final a also occur on the Indian mainland, as noted above.
Senior Gāndhārī manuscript collection (Glass 2007, §§5.2.1.1, 6.2.1), and on the basis of this data it is at least plausible to equate the h of īṣmaho with the k of ıkśvāku.\footnote{There is also one instance where an intervocalic -h- in Sanskrit is represented by -k- in Gāndhārī, namely satakam = *saptāham, “for a week”, in an unpublished fragment of a Gāndhārī version of the Anavatapta-gāthā in the Senior collection (fragment 14, line 20; Salomon 2003A: 79; Salomon, in progress). This could be interpreted as a hypercorrection resulting from a (near)-merger in the scribe’s dialect of the reflex of Skt intervocalic k and g with h. (The Kharoṣṭhī letter ḷ, a modified form of k, probably indicates the voiced fricative [ɣ].)}

It is more difficult, though not impossible, to establish a connection between the clusters ṣm of īṣmaho and kṣv of ıkśvāku. Two separate problems are involved in this and will be discussed in turn: the apparent reduction of OIA kṣ to G ṣ, and the correspondence of OIA v to G m. The reduction of kṣ to ṣ is initially puzzling, since in isolation the OIA cluster kṣ is usually retained in Gāndhārī as such, or rather is represented in writing by the Kharoṣṭhī character ḷ which is conventionally transliterated as kṣ but which was probably a unitary consonantal phoneme whose pronunciation cannot be precisely determined, but which may have been [tʃ] or the like (Brough 1962, p. 72 and n. 4).

There are, to be sure, exceptions to this pattern. Thus, in certain cases the equivalent of OIA kṣ is represented as ḷh in Gāndhārī, as in the frequent bhikhu = bhikṣu, but this and most other such cases are explainable as borrowings of Buddhist technical terms into Gāndhārī from another MIA dialect. There is also at least one case, namely kuchie = kukṣau “in the stomach”,\footnote{In the British Library manuscript of another Gāndhārī version of the Anavatapta-gāthā (British Library Kharoṣṭhī fragment 1, line 38; Salomon 1999, pp. 30–33; Salomon, in progress).} where OIA kṣ is reflected by Gāndhārī ch. But there is no instance known to us where Gāndhārī has ṣ for isolated OIA ks.

In OIA ıkśvāku, however, special conditions obtain since here kṣ is part of the rare three-consonant cluster kṣv. No other parallel is
available in Gândhārī for this particular cluster; the only attested case of a Gândhārī reflex of an OIA cluster of the type ksC involves ks, which is represented in Gândhārī as ks in dhreksatu = *draksyantu (Allon 2001, p. 89) and mukṣasa = mokṣyalha. We do, however, know that in other forms of MIA three-consonant clusters could receive special treatment, and in particular that sometimes the second consonant in such clusters seems to have been articulated more strongly than the first, outweighing it in assimilation:


Among the several examples listed by von Hinüber, two are especially relevant for our discussion of OIA ikṣvāku and G ismahō: “Skt tikṣṇa: tik-ṣṇa > *tiṣ-ṣṇa > mi. tiṇha neben mi. tiṅkha [...] und P tikhiṇa < *tikhiṇa” and “Skt abhiṅkṣṇa > *abhiśṣṇa > P abhīṅha neben P, Amg abhikkhaṇa”. In the light of these parallels, G ismahō would represent exactly the reconstructed middle stage in the development of such clusters: ks [ks] has undergone assimilation to śm [śm] (see next paragraph on the change from n to m), but sibilant and nasal have not yet been metathesized. Indicating syllable boundaries by hyphens, as in von Hinüber’s examples, the sequence of developments would then have been: OIA ik-ṣvā-ku > *[iṣ-ṣvā-ku] > *[iṣ-ṣmā-ku] > G ismahō. The apparent counter-examples of stable ks in G dhreksatu and mukṣasa, cited above, have to be seen on the background of independent assimilation of OIA sy > G ś and the need for morphological clarity at the boundary of verbal root and tense suffix.

The other problem in the correspondence of OIA ks to G śm is the apparent change of sy into śm. The normal outcome of OIA sibilant + v in Gândhārī is śp: prabh(*a)[śp][śpra] < prabhāsvara (Allon 2001, p. 96), pariśpeidāṇa < pariśveditāṇi (Glass 2006, p. 145), iṣparasa <

---

17British Library, Anavatapta-gāthā, lines 95, 122.
śvarasya (von Hinüber 2003, p. 41). Alternative outcomes, especially in the Khotan Dharmapada and the Niya documents, are preservation of the original cluster and complete assimilation (e.g. svaga and saga < svarga, Brough 1962, p. 103), but as far as the available data allows us to judge, original sibilant + v never turns into sibilant + m in Gāndhārī (as already noted in Allon 2001, p. 96, n.8).18

OIA sibilant + m, on the other hand, has a broad range of G outcomes, including besides sm, šp and s (cf. Allon 2001, pp. 95f.) also sv: rasvi < OIA raśmi or MIA *rasmi, svadi < smṛti (Brough 1962, pp. 102f.), [s]v(∗a)[d](∗ima) < smṛtimant (Salomon 2000, p. 91).19

Thus, while it may be true that G śm itself cannot be considered a regular outcome of OIA śv, in a more general sense sibilant + m and sibilant + v seem to have functioned as phonetic variants in Gāndhārī. If we further keep in mind that none of the currently attested G outcomes of OIA sibilant + v involve an original retroflex sibilant and that none of them involve an original three-consonant cluster, we may cautiously suggest that śm in iṣmaho is at least a plausible Gāndhārī phonetic development of earlier śv. In conclusion, it appears possible to consider the medial cluster śm in G iṣmaho not only a regular MIA development of OIA kṣv, but in fact an attestation of the type of reconstructed intermediate form posited by Berger and von Hinüber for P tinaḥa and abhinha.

Having considered the relationship of the three main attested forms of the proper name Iksvāku, we now turn to the question of its ultimate origin and meaning. Since we have seen that G iṣmaho can plausibly be derived from a form like OIA iksvāku whereas the inverse is not true (expected back-formations would have been *iṣmā(h)hu or even

---

18 For a comprehensive discussion of the MIA development of stop or sibilant + v see Sakamoto-Goto 1988.

19 These examples also show that the G sound change śm > śv is of wider application than the corresponding change in other dialects of MIA that is usually explained as nasal dissimilation (Sakamoto-Goto 1988: 96–100, von Hinüber 2001: 190).
*iṣvā(b)hu, but not iṣvāku), and since Skt iṣvāku and P okkāka agree in having a k in their first cluster that G iasco lack, it appears that in this case the G form of the name has no claim to greater antiquity than either the Skt or the P form. In fact, in some respects it would seem to be farther removed from the ultimate origin of the name than both the Skt and the P form, and while any future investigation into this origin will have to account for the newly-discovered G form, it would be unwise, despite the early attestation of the G form, to base any ultimate etymology on the form iasco alone without giving equal consideration to the other two forms.  

The traditional derivation from the word iksu “sugar cane” is thus neither confirmed nor contradicted by the new G evidence. It is clear, however, that at the linguistic stage of Gāndhārī itself any original connection with iksu would have ceased to be transparent and that a secondary folk-etymological connection with iksu (as in the Mahāvastu and Saṅghabhādavastu passages quoted above) would likewise have been difficult to maintain: while the word for “sugar cane” has not yet been found attested in Gāndhāri, its form would almost certainly have been *iksī (or maybe *ukṣī) and thus clearly distinct from the word iasco. This is of course the same situation as obtains in Pāli where, as we have seen, Buddhaghosa did not attempt to establish a connection between okkāka and ucchu, but instead drew on the word ukkā “torch” (pace Geiger’s attempt to connect okkāka with ucchu).

The connection of the name Ikṣvāku with iksu has independently been cast into doubt by several modern authorities. Thus the derivation from iksu (“Augenwimper, Zuckerrohr”) plus a suffix āku, as proposed

---

20Were it not for this, one could have speculated that iasco might be related to īṣu ‘arrow’ or the rare Skt īṣma / īṣva / īṣva ‘spring, name of the god Kāma’ (comm. on Unādisūtra 1.144; īṣaḥ kāmavasamātayoḥ (Pande 1985), p. 18; cf. also Monier-Williams, Sanskrit-English Dictionary, s.v. īṣma). But in view of the preceding arguments, these two words could at most have assumed a local Gandhāran folk-etymological relationship to the nameform īṣmaho and are highly unlikely to be the ultimate source of the attested triplet of forms iṣvāku / īṣmaho / okkāka.
by Wackernagel and Debrunner (1954, p. 267), was dismissed by Mayrhofer (1992, p. 186) as “nicht zielführend”, and Witzel (1999, p. 357) characterizes the supposed suffix ākū as “strange”. It may be the case that the true origin of this proper name, as of so many others in Sanskrit and other languages, lies buried, probably irretrievably, beneath the sands of time. That is to say, it may ultimately go back to some long-lost word, whether Indo-Aryan or quite possibly belonging to an indigenous substrate language. This in fact is the conclusion of Kuiper (1991, pp. 6–7), who includes ikṣvāku among the “group of persons who were on the side of the Aryan society but whose names must, on morphological grounds, be considered non-Aryan”. This view is also endorsed by Witzel (1999, pp. 356, 360), who classifies ikṣvāku among the numerous proper names in the Ṛgveda which he considers to be “Non-IA or of doubtful etymology” (p. 356), and this conclusion appears to be cautiously endorsed by Mayrhofer (2003, p. 18), who lists ikṣvāku as “Fremdname?”. An attempt to trace such a pre-Indo-Aryan etymology was in fact made by Berger (1959, p. 73), who explained ikṣvāku “bitterer Kūbris, Citrillus Colocynthis” as a survival of an Austroasiatic word for “pumpkin” (Kūbris), allegedly functioning as a totemic clan name. This etymology is cited by Mayrhofer (1992, pp. 185–86) without comment, but the justification provided by Berger is sketchy at best and can hardly be considered definitive.

Of course, it is always possible that some future discovery or insight may provide a more convincing solution to the problem of the ultimate origin of the name Ikṣvāku, but at this point one hardly dares to hope for this. For such a new source of information could have been hoped for, if anywhere, in Gāndhārī; but in fact, we find that the Gāndhārī form does not do much to clarify this issue, at least for the time being. This means, most likely, that the etymological issue is not one that is definitively soluble, and the ultimate origin of the name may be lost in the mists of prehistory.
3. Ramifications, historical and Buddhological

3a. The Ikṣvākus and the Kings of Oḍi

This, however, is by no means to say that the new Gândhārī data is of no use to us. Quite to the contrary: although it does not solve the etymological problem surrounding the name Ikṣvāku and its equivalents, it does provide new insight into other issues. The first of these involves the history of the Iṣmaho kings of Oḍi, in one of whose inscriptions, the stūpa dedication of Sēṇavarma, the Gândhārī form iṣmaho was first noticed (section 1). The Iṣmaho kings, who are known only from three Buddhist reliquary inscriptions in Gândhārī, ruled, apparently, in lower Swat in or around the first century A.D.21 Like their neighbours, the kings of Apraca,22 the Oḍi kings seem to have been feudatory allies of the Saka and early Kuśāṇa dynasties of Gandhāra and adjoining areas.

Now that it has become clear that their dynastic name Iṣmaho is not “non-Indian” or “non-Aryan” as once thought (see section 1), but rather is the Gândhārī equivalent of the ancient and renowned name Ikṣvāku, we can see that the nomenclature of the Iṣmaho dynasty is part of a recurrent historical pattern. For there are at least two other instances in which Indian Buddhist dynasties of the historical period took on the name Ikṣvāku in order to lay claim to an association with the lineage of the Buddha himself, who, as a Śākyu, was held to have belonged to the venerable Ikṣvāku line. The first such case is the Ikṣvāku (ṁ ikhaṭu; see n. 13) dynasty of the eastern Deccan, which patronized the great Buddhist monasteries at Nāgarjunikōṇḍa and elsewhere in the Kuśāṅa River Valley in the third century A.D. The second instance of this pattern is documented in the Sri Lankan Buddhist historiographic tradition, where the Dīpavaṃsa “portrayed the Sri Lankan kings as the true heirs to the Ikṣvāku legacy, a claim that the Ikṣvākus of Andhra had

21See Salomon 2003b: 39–51 for the most recent information on the inscriptions and history of the Oḍi kings.

22For recently discovered inscriptions of and information on the Apraca kings, see Salomon 2005a: 378–83.
earlier staked out for their imperial kingdom in which, at Nāgārjunikoṇḍa, Sri Lankan Buddhists had received their first recorded recognition” (Walters 2000, p. 118). Furthermore, in various Buddhist literary traditions (as summarized in Lamotte 1988, pp. 218, 681–82) the Mauryas and other dynasties are credited with a familial relation to the Śākyas and thereby to the Ikṣvākus, and no doubt many further examples could be cited.

Of course, the skeptical historian cannot fail to doubt the legitimacy of these alleged descents from the Ikṣvāku line, and this skepticism need not be restricted to the instances from the relatively later periods. For even the claim of the Śākyas themselves to Ikṣvāku descent23 has, to say the least, a legendary air about it. According to the account in the Ambaṭṭha-sutta of the Pāli Dīgha-nikāya (D I 92–93)24 and Buddhaghosa’s commentary thereon, the original King Okkāka, under the influence of his favorite wife, exiled his five eldest sons from his kingdom, whereupon they settled near the slopes of the Himālaya and became known as the Sakkas (= Śākyas). The legend of the exiled sons seems a “likely story”, which could easily inspire one to question the historicity of Śākyamuni’s Ikṣvāku descent. That is to say, one may suspect that the association of the Buddhist lineage with the venerable line of Ikṣvāku, who in Brahmanical tradition was the son of Manu, the grandson of the Sun, and the progenitor of the royal line of Rāma, was a device to establish legitimacy and nobility for the Buddhist line in the eyes of the wider, non-Buddhist world of the time.

However this may be, we can be quite certain that the claims of the kings of Oḍi to Ḵṣṇa’s Ikṣvāku lineage is, historically speaking, a spurious one. For, although their dynastic name is now known to be an Indian and not a foreign one, and although their personal names are all (with one partial exception, Diśasena) “durchsichtige und gut deuthbare

---

23 As recorded, for example, in the Saundarananda (1.24), as quoted above (section 1).
24 This legend is also referred to in Asvaghosa’s Saundarananda 1.18–21 and in Mahāvastu I 348.11–351.14.
Sanskritnamen” (von Hinüber 2003, p. 33, n. 30), this does not mean that they were in fact of Indian ethnicity. A priori, given their historical and geographical situation, one may expect that they were, like their neighboring rulers and allies, Sakas or other Central Asian nomads who had conquered territories in the northwestern borderlands of India around the beginning of the Christian era and adopted the Buddhist religion and Indian names. This suspicion is confirmed by the reference in the inscription of Senavarma (line 1c) to his identity as a “Kadama” (tasa dayateṣa me kadamasā, “of me, by descent from him a Kadama”). This term is in all probability equivalent to the label kārddamaka which was applied to a member of the Saka dynasty of Western India in an inscription at Kanheri, and also to kardamaga, the name of a king, very likely also a Scythian, who is mentioned in one of the Gāndhārī avadāna texts among the British Library scrolls (Salomon 2003B, pp. 48; 58, n. 9; Salomon 2005C, p. 318). Therefore it is very likely that the Ḫsmahō kings of Oḍi were in fact Sakas or members of some other Central Asian ethnic groups who claimed a spurious Indian lineage in order to legitimize their Buddhist kingship.

3b. Ḫsmahō and the Gāndhārī Hypothesis

Another point of interest regarding the name Ḫsmahō involves its implications for the early history of Buddhism in China, and in particular for the “Gāndhārī hypothesis”, according to which some of the earliest Chinese translations of Buddhist texts were prepared from originals not in Sanskrit, but in Gāndhārī or Sanskritized versions of underlying Gāndhārī texts.25 This theory was originally proposed on the basis of the transcriptions of certain proper names in early Chinese Buddhist translations which seemed to reflect Gāndhārī rather than Sanskrit pronunciations, or features of Kharoṣṭhī rather than Brāhmī script, and the body of relevant evidence has grown and expanded in recent years. The newly discovered Gāndhārī word Ḫsmahō constitutes

25For a general discussion of the “Gāndhārī hypothesis”, see Boucher 1998: 471–75.
another such case, in that it, rather than the Sanskrit form *ikṣvāku*, is clearly reflected in certain Chinese renditions of this name.

The Chinese equivalents of *ikṣvāku* etc. are numerous, but they appear to fall into three main groups. These are:

1. 一又鳩 *yīchājū* (reconstructed Old Northwest Chinese [ONWC] pronunciation, following Coblin 1994: "hit-tshā-ku"), a transcription of Sanskrit *ikṣvāku*. This appears, for example, in the 大般涅槃經 *Dà bānniépán jīng* (= Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra; T. vol. 12, no. 375, p. 839c23).

2. 甘蔗王 *gānzhèwáng* “Sugar-Cane King”, a translation of the Sanskrit *ikṣvāku* on the basis of the traditional etymology from *ikṣu* “sugar-cane” (as discussed in section 2). This form occurs, for example, in the 根本訥一切有部毘奈耶事 *Gēnběn shuō yīqiéyìyì bǐ píniàiyī yùoshì* (= Mulasarvāstivāda-vinaya-bhāṣajyavastu; T. vol. 24, no. 1448, p. 33c23).

3. 悲師摩 *yīshīmó* (ONWC ฤ(s)-si-ma; also several related forms and variants, discussed below), a very good phonetic approximation of 根據略 *gēnjiùliào*, which cannot be connected with Sanskrit *ikṣvāku* or Pāli *okkāka*. This form of the name appears in the 四分律 *Sìfèn lǜ* (= Dharmaṇukā-ta-vinaya; T. vol. 22, no. 1428, p. 779b1, etc.).

It is particularly interesting that this third rendition of the name, the one which clearly reflects a Gāndhārī substrate, occurs in the vinaya of the Dharmaṇukāta school, because this concords with an already established pattern of associations between the Dharmaṇukātas and the recently rediscovered remnants of Gāndhāran Buddhist texts. This association is manifested in the following data:

1. The British Library scrolls, the oldest and largest collection of Gāndhārī manuscripts known to date, were found in a pot bearing a dedication to the Dharmaṇukātas (Salomon 1999, pp. 166–67).

2. A manuscript among the British Library scrolls containing the Saṅgīti-sūtra with commentary has a close relationship in its contents and arrangement to the version of the Saṅgīti-sūtra contained in the Chinese translation of the 德箇舍 (Cháng ēhán jīng), which is almost certainly a Dharmaṇukāta text (Salomon 1999, pp. 171–75).
(3) Fragments of a Gândhārī version of the Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra in the Schøyen manuscript collection similarly resemble the corresponding version of this sūtra in the Chinese Dīrghāgama more closely than the several other versions, although here the pattern is not as distinct as in the case of the Saṅgīti-sūtra (Allon and Salomon 2000, pp. 272–73).

(4) The Gândhārī version of the Śrāmanyaphala-sūtra contained in scroll 2 of the Senior collection of Gândhārī manuscripts (Salomon 2003a) similarly seems, on the basis of a preliminary study, to resemble the Chinese Dīrghāgama recension of this sūtra more than any of the several other versions (Allon, in progress).

(5) Episodes from the life of the Buddha recorded in scroll 24 of the Senior collection apparently resemble the corresponding versions of the same stories in the Chinese Dharmaguptaka-vinaya more than those in other vinayas (Allon, in progress).

The correspondence of Gândhārī īṣmāho with 鼓師摩 yishmó of the Dharmaguptaka-vinaya is thus consistent with the several other indications of connections between the newly rediscovered Gândhārī literary corpus and the Dharmaguptaka tradition as it was transmitted to and preserved in China. However, the matter becomes considerably more complicated when we take into account the several other Chinese renditions of the name in question, as follows:

聲摩 shēngmó (ONWC ʂeq-ma): 長阿含經 Chāng āhàn jīng (= Dīrghāgama), e.g., T. vol. 1, no. 1, p. 82c23 (sūtra no. 20) and p. 149a20 (sūtra no. 30).


26Also of interest in this context is a passage in the Dharmaguptaka-vinaya (T. vol. 22, no. 1428, p. 639a14; discussed in Lévi 1915: 440, Salomon 1990: 255, and Boucher 1998: 474) which refers to the recitation of the Arapacana syllabary by monks. Since it is now established that the Arapacana was originally the ordinary alphabetic order of the Kharoṣṭhī script (Salomon 1990: 262, 265), this passage provides a further suggestion of an association between the Dharmaguptaka school and Gândhārī textual traditions.
The origins and relationships of these alternative forms of the name are quite complex, but they all seem to be related to the Gândhârî-derived 鼓師摩 yishimó as graphic and/or phonetic variants. For example, in the Dirghâgama (T. vol. 1, p. 149a20) 鼓摩 yimó is given as a variant (Sông and Ming editions) for 鼓摩 shèngmó. This 鼓摩 yimó is presumably a graphic variant, and since 鼓摩 shèngmó is difficult to explain as a phonetic equivalent of ḳṣvāku etc., it is perhaps a corruption of an original 鼓摩 yimó, the latter being in turn a shortened transcription in place of the fuller form 鼓師摩 yishimó, of a sort that is common in Chinese Buddhist translations (e.g. 目連 múliàn = Maudgalyâyana / Moggallâna).

鼓摩 gāmò, occurring in an early independent sūtra translation by Zhīqīán 支謙 (A.D. 222–253), can similarly be explained as a graphic variant for the aforementioned 鼓摩 yimó. 鬱摩 yīmó in the Mahāsākā-vinaya is conceivably also a graphic variant for 鼓摩 yimó, while 伊摩 yīmó in the independent sūtra translation 大樓炭經 Da lòutān jīng might be a sound variant for it or a similar form.

The association of all of these forms with each other as graphic or phonetic variants of an original 鼓(師)摩 yi(ṣī)mó is in fact endorsed by the Liáng-dynasty scholar Sēngyōu 僧佑 (d. A.D. 518) in his treatise 釋迦譜 Shìjiā pǔ “Genealogy of the Śākya Clan” (T. vol. 50, no. 2040). Sēngyōu notes (pp. 323–42) with regard to this name: “In ancient times there was a king named Yımó 鼓摩. (The Lòutān jīng says Yımó一摩.) The Dharmaguptaka-vinaya says Gūshimó 鼓師摩, but the Mahāsākā-vinaya says Yımó 鬱摩. These three sounds, yī (一), yi (懿), and yù (鬱), are close to one another. Considering their sounds, I suppose that Yımó 鼼摩 is the original one. But as for the characters 鼓 gǔ and 懿 yi, they resemble each other, and therefore in the copying [懿 yi] was just a mistake for 鼓 gǔ.”

27 乃往過去有王。名懿摩(樓炭經云一摩)。瞿無德律云。鼓師摩。彌沙塞律云。鬱摩一懿鬱。此三音相近。以音而推。竊謂懿摩是正。但鼓懿字
If the interpretation proposed above is correct, it would mean that the Gândhārī-derived or Gândhārī-influenced forms of the name Iksvākū occurring in Chinese translations are not limited to Dharmaguptaka texts. They are, to be sure, prevalent there, both in the Dharmaguptaka-vinaya which has the clearly Gândhārī-based 毘師摩 yishīnò and in the Dīrghāgama, a probable Dharmaguptaka collection, whose 聲摩 shēngmó is, as noted above, probably a variant of the former. But we also have 鬱摩 yūmò, again likely a variant of 毘師摩 yishīnò, in the Mahiśāsaka-vinaya, as well as several other variants in early individual sūtra translations of uncertain sectarian affiliation. Therefore, although the data derived from the Chinese forms of this name does support an association between the textual tradition of Gandhāra and that of the Dharmaguptakas as reflected in early Chinese translations, it also reminds us that this is no by means necessarily an exclusive relationship. Indeed, we should rather expect that texts of other schools would have existed in Gândhārī (whether or not they have survived or will ever be found), and that Chinese texts affiliated with those other schools also would reflect Gândhārī substrate forms.28

相似。故傳寫謬為或耳。Interestingly enough, Sēngyōu here gives 鬱師摩 gūshīnò as the reading of the Dharmaguptaka-vinaya, rather than 毘師摩 yishīnò as given in the Taishō text edition (cited above). These and similar textual variations themselves confirm the author’s point that the various readings are merely alternatives for the same name.

A somewhat different interpretation is offered by Bāochāng 寶唱, another Liàng-dynasty scholar-monk, in his treatise 經律異相 Jīnglǜ yìxiàng “Sūtra and Vinaya Miscellany” (T. vol. 53, no. 2121, p. 32a23). He gives the name corresponding to Iksvākū as 鬱摩 yūmò and explains the alternative renditions 鬱摩 yūmò and 鬱得 gūmò as dialect approximations (方言之左右 fāngyán zhī zuòyòu) of 鬱摩 yūmò (又云鈞摩。長阿含經云鈞摩。蓋方言之左右耳。).

28 Although references to the Dharmaguptakas are particularly prominent among Gândhārī inscriptions, several other schools, such as the Sarvāstivādins, Kāśyapīyas and Mahiśāsakas, are also mentioned in them (Salomon 1999: 176–77). Thus we could reasonably expect that these schools, or at least their Gandhāran branches, would also have had textual corpora in Gândhārī.
We can only hope that further studies of this and other words by specialists in Chinese Buddhist translation literature will clarify both the immediate problem raised here and the broader issues that it involves and implies. But in the meantime, this new data does, on the one hand, provide further evidence in favor of the “Gāndhārī hypothesis” and, on the other hand, confirm the significant role of the Dharmaguptaka literature in it.

Richard Salomon and Stefan Baums
University of Washington
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Fig. 1: A fragment from the beginning of the Library of Congress Scroll.

Fig. 2: Detail of verse 3c on the fragment shown in fig. 1, with the word ʾismaho highlighted.
A Gândhâri Version of the Simile of the Turtle and the Hole in the Yoke

1. Introduction

The simile of a blind (or one-eyed) turtle, which surfaces every hundred years, inserting its neck into a single hole in a (wooden) yoke that is floating on a vast ocean is well known in Buddhist, Jain, and even Brahmanical literature, where it is used to illustrate the rarity of something occurring, such as birth as a human being.

Among the numerous Gândhâri texts preserved in the Senior collection of Kharoṣṭhī Buddhist manuscripts is a short sūtra for which this powerful image is central.1 Appearing as the third of six texts written on scroll 22r (ll. 31–56), which is one of the longest scrolls in the collection, the sūtra represents a Gândhâri version of the second of two Pāli suttas found in the Sacca-saṃyutta of the Saṃyutta-nikâya which utilise this simile (nos. 56.47–48; V 455–57). The uddâna entry for these two Pāli suttas is chiggalena ca dve vuttâ (S V 459,11),2 where chiggala- “hole” is a reference to ekacchiggalagam yugam “yoke with a single hole” of the simile. Based on this uddâna entry, the Burmese edition (B1), for example, gives Dutiyachchiggalayuga-suttaṃ as the title of the second sutta (S no. 56.48; V 456.18–457.16).3 Although the Gândhâri sūtra lacks a title, the uddâna-like reference to it in the

---

1 I would like to thank members of the Early Buddhist Manuscript Project (Seattle), including Richard Salomon, Collett Cox, Timothy Lenz, and Stefan Baums, for their comments on my reading of the Gândhâri passage. I am also indebted to Richard Salomon, Stefan Baums, Arlo Griffiths, and Oskar von Hinüber for their remarks on several of my interpretations.

2 For the Senior collection, see Salomon 2003 and my introductory chapter to Glass 2007. I am currently writing a detailed catalogue of this collection (Allon [forthcoming]) with financial support from the Australian Research Council.

3 It reads chiggalena against chiggala- of the text (see below).

A title for this sutta is not recorded in the Pāli commentaries.
“index” scrolls nos. 7+8 (l. 6) is ekatarmao yuo “yoke with a single hole” (see below for further discussion).  

There is apparently no Sanskrit parallel to this sūtra. Where the Pāli Samyutta-nikāya has two chiggala suttas (nos. 56.47–48), the Chinese Samyuktāgama (SĀ), Zá āhán jing 雜阿含經, has only one, no. 406 (T 2 no. 99 108c6–20).  

The Chinese sūtra is a closer parallel to the first of the two Pāli suttas (no. 56.47). However, as it shares many elements in common with our Gāndhāric sūtra and with the second Pāli chiggala sutta, it will be utilized in the following study. Like the Pāli suttas, the Chinese sūtra forms part of the samyukta on the (four) truths, the Dīxiāngyìng 誦相應 (= Pāli Sacca-samyutta).  

In the Gāndhāric sūtra and in the second Pāli chiggala sutta, the simile illustrates the rarity of the occurrence of the optimal conditions under which one may attain enlightenment, those conditions being the presence of a Tathāgata, his teaching the Dharma, and one’s birth as a human being (according to the order of the Gāndhāri). Both sūtras advance the Four Noble Truths as the subject most worthy of attention when these conditions are in place (this being the factor that qualifies the Pāli sutta for inclusion in the Sacca-samyutta).  

In the first Pāli chiggala sutta and in the Chinese sūtra, the simile illustrates the rarity of human birth only, as it does in many of the occurrences discussed below. These two sūtras also refer to the Four Noble Truths.  

In an interesting article entitled “Middle Indo-Aryan Studies IX: The Blind Turtle and the Hole in the Yoke” published in 1972, Mr Norman discussed occurrences of this simile in Pāli and Jain literature. Space does not permit me to publish the full Gāndhāric sūtra here, but as this Gāndhāric version of the simile contains several very

---

4For a brief discussion of the two “index” scrolls, see Salomon 2003, pp. 80–83, and § 5 of my introductory chapter to Glass 2007.  
5In Yin Shih’s reordering of the SĀ this sūtra is no. 598 (1983, Vol. 2, p. 130), while according to the Fōguāng (1983, Vol. 1, p. 22) it is no. 405.  
6There are no uddānas in this section of the SĀ.
interesting features, the most notable among them being the preservation of an archaic word for the hole in the yoke, I present here an edition, translation, and analysis of this section of the text in honour of Mr Norman’s eightieth birthday and as a token of my admiration for his scholarship and in gratitude for all I have learnt from him.7

2. The Gândhâri, Pâli, and Chinese versions of the simile
The edition of the Gândhâri text (RS 22r, ll. 33–43) presented here is based on a reading of the digital colour and infrared images. Further work on the manuscript is unlikely to significantly improve the reading of this section of the text, unless some of the small, currently unplaced fragments are found to belong to this section of the manuscript. In order to save space, I have combined the edition and reconstruction. Text that is difficult to read is contained within square brackets [ ]; âsaras of uncertain reading are marked by a question mark (?); reconstructions are marked by an asterisk within parentheses (*).

The reading of the Pâli parallel (S V 456.18–457.5) is based on the four main published editions: European (E°), Burmese (B°), Sinhalese (C°), and Thai (S°).8 The reading of the Chinese version follows the Taishô edition (T 2 no. 99 p. 108c7–14).

The numbering of the major divisions of the text (§§ 1, 2, 3) follows that employed by the European edition (E°) of the Pâli. To facilitate analysis of the text, I have subdivided § 3 into two subsections (§ 3a and § 3b) in the case of the Gândhâri and Pâli, and into three (§§ 3a–c) in the case of the Chinese.

7The full text will be published in the near future along with the other texts on this scroll in the series Gandhâran Buddhist Texts, Seattle: University of Washington Press.
8The readings of B° and C° are based on the electronic versions as the printed editions were not available to me. See abbreviations for details.
§ 1.
Gândhāri "bhaya[va]° eda[ḍ aya]: (l. 33)

The Bhagavat said this:

Pāli (bhagava etad avoca):¹¹

The Bhagavat said this:

Chinese 習時世尊告諸比丘。 (p. 108c7)

Then the Bhagavat said to the monks:¹²

§ 2.
Gândhāri sayaśavi bhikṣava aya mahapaḍaṇavi [34] [ekoji]a asa. tatra
purṣa[e] ekaturmao yua pakṣive. [35] tam eṣa purime vaḍa paćimo
saheya paćimo vaḍa ¹²purme [36] saheya utare vaḍ[a] dakṣīṇo
saheya dakṣīṇa ¹⁵va(de ¹⁶u ¹⁷r)(*a)¹⁹ re(a). [37]
²⁰atra hasa kasa kachavo vasāṣaḍa umi[jo] vasāṣaḍ[a]sa ²¹aca(e)[r](*a)
[38] ²²sahe samaṇa umi[e]a.²² (lI. 33–38)

“Monks, suppose that this great earth were one mass of water, and a
man were to throw a yoke with a single hole into it. An easterly wind
would carry it west; a westerly wind would carry it east; a northerly
wind would carry it south; a southerly wind would carry it north. In it

⁹ Frag. A.
¹⁰ The reading could be su.
¹¹ Missing in E², B², C⁶, and S⁷ (see commentary below).
¹² Am indebted to Lily Lee and Rod Bucknell for their comments on my transla-
tion of the Chinese text.
¹⁴ Frag. A.
¹⁵ Frags. A+Am-5.
¹⁷ Frag. A.
¹⁹ The original reading could have been -ro or -ra, but not -re.
²⁰ Frag. A.
²¹ Frags. A+B.
²² Frag. A.
²³ The scribe discontinued writing this line to avoid writing across the raised join
two sections of bark.
there were a blind turtle which, emerging after a hundred years, with the passing of a hundred years, would emerge over and over.

Pāli: seyyathāpi bhikkhave ayaṃ mahāpathavi ekodakā assa. tatra puriso ekacchiggalām yugāṃ pakhipeyya. tam enam purathíhino vāto pacchinena samhareyya pacchīmo vāto puratthinena samhareyya uttaro vāto dakkhiṇena samhareyya dakkhiṇo vāto uttarenā samhareyya. tattassa kāṇo kacchapo so vassatassā vassasatassā accayena sākīṃ sākīṃ ummujeyya (p. 456.18–24).

“Monks, suppose that this great earth were one mass of water, and a man were to throw a yoke with a single hole into it. An easterly wind would carry it west; a westerly wind would carry it east; a northerly wind would carry it south; a southerly wind would carry it north. In it there were a blind turtle which would emerge once each time with the passing of each hundred years.

Chinese: 譬如大地悉成大海。有一盲龟夆無量劫。百年一出其頭。海中有浮木。止有一孔。漂流海浪。隨風東西。(p. 108c7–9)

“Suppose the great earth were completely covered by a great ocean, and there were a blind turtle of long life, an immeasurable kalpa [in duration], which poked his head out every hundred years. In the ocean there was a floating piece of wood with only one hole, floating on the ocean waves to the east and west according to the wind.”

§ 3a


What do you think, would this blind turtle, emerging over and over, with the passing of a hundred years, insert its neck into that yoke with the single hole?

24-Pathavi in C and S 25Ekodakā in S 26Chiggalām throughout C 27Purimo in the Sinhalese mss (S 28Attare in the Sinhalese mss (S 29So is missing in the Sinhalese ms S used for E 30Frag. B.
Pāli  

tam kiṃ maṇiḥtha bhikkhave api nu so31 kāṇo kacchapo vassatasassa vassatasassa accayena sakīṇa sakīṇa unmujjanto 32 anusmin33 eka-cchiggale yuge givam paveseyā ti (p. 456.25–457.2).

What do you think, monks, would that blind turtle, emerging once each time with the passing of each hundred years, insert its neck into that yoke with the single hole?

Chinese  

盲龟百年一出其頭。當得遇此孔不。 (p. 108c10)

Would the blind turtle, poking his head out every hundred years, meet this hole or not?

§ 3b


It would be by chance, Bhagavat, it is very rare indeed, that this blind turtle, emerging after a hundred years, with the passing of a hundred years, emerging over and over, would put that yoke with the single hole on his neck, or he may not put it on.

Pāli  

adhiccam idam bhante yam so kāṇo kacchapo vassatasassa vassatasassa accayena sakīṇa sakīṇa unmujjanto anusmin ekacchiggale yuge givam paveseyā ti (p. 457.3–5).

It would be by chance, venerable sir, that that blind turtle, emerging once each time with the passing of each hundred years, would insert its neck in that yoke with the single hole.

---

31 kho in S, B and in the two Burmese mss (B1.1) used for E.
32 ca is added in the Sinhalese mss (S1.1) used for E.
33 anusmin in the Burmese ms B used for E.
34 The scribe has marked both the e and o mātrās on n. He probably wrote the o mātrā second in accordance with the spelling elsewhere.
35 da could also be read as ha.
36 The bottom of the e aksara is preserved on frag. Bb-2.
37 The scribe has left the line short to avoid writing across the join between two sections of bark.
38 Frags. B+Bd-1.
Chinese 阿難白佛，不能。世尊。所以者何。此盲龜若至海東。浮木隨風。或至海西。南。北四維圍斀亦爾。不必相得。(p. 108c10–13)
安娜达 said to the Buddha: “It would not be able to, Bhagavat. Why is that? If this blind turtle should arrive in the eastern part of the ocean, the floating piece of wood might, according to the wind, arrive in the west, south, or north of the ocean. Going around the four directions in this way, they would certainly not meet each other.”

§ 3c
Chinese 佛告阿難。盲龜浮木。雖復差違。或復相得。(p. 108c13–14)

The Buddha said to Anna, “Although the blind turtle and the floating piece of wood may miss [each other], perhaps they may also meet each other.”

The wording of this section, which is missing in the Gāndhārī and Pāli, seems odd, unless the Buddha is merely confirming that they may or may not meet each other.

3. Commentary

§ 1. The Buddha addresses the monks
The Sāvatthi-Jetavana nidāna and initial interchange between the Buddha and the monks are missing in the Pāli editions and in the manuscripts used for them. However, as this passage is given in full in the first sutta of the Mahāvagga of the Samyutta-nikāya in E (V 1), B, and C (and elsewhere throughout the Mahāvagga) and in the first sutta of the Sacca-samyutta in C and the Sinhalese manuscripts (S¹ ³) used for E, it has clearly been omitted through scribal abbreviation. Undoubtedly, this passage would have been included when this sutta was recited, as would the conclusion to this sutta which is also abbreviated in the Pāli editions and manuscripts (see Allon 2001, pp. 253–55).


bhayava? eda[d aya] (l. 33): The reading in the line 57–59 example of this phrase is bhayava [ṣu] eda[d aya]. The aksara of uncertain reading
(?) in line 33 could be read as [ṣu], as in this second example. The corresponding Pāli expression is bhagavā etad avoca. The nominative singular corresponding to Pāli bhagavā/Skt bhagavān is bhayava or bhagavā throughout the Senior manuscripts and bhayavada in the EĀ-G (Allon 2001, pp. 113–14). However, in the one complete example of the equivalent of Pāli bhagavā etad avoca in EĀ-G (l. 28) the reading is bha[y]a[va]ṭ[ṣu] rather than bhayavada as expected. In my edition of that text I took this to be a scribal error and amended it to bhayava<ṭ>du> (Allon 2001, pp. 225–26, 232), but these two examples in the Senior manuscripts suggest that this amendment may not have been justified. Given that bhayava/bhagavā is the nominative singular in all other contexts in the Senior manuscripts, it is possible that we should take ṣu39 as a separate word rather than as the termination of bhayava. The most likely explanation is that ṣu is the equivalent of the Sanskrit particle sma (or possibly su), which is attested elsewhere in Gāndhārī as sa, ṣa, su, and possibly ṣa,40 although the usage of this particle in such a context (e.g. Pāli bhagavā (ṣ)su etad avoca or the like) is not attested in Buddhist literature to my knowledge.

Brough (1962, pp. 228–29) noted that hi ṣa in the Khotan Dharmapada (160d) corresponds to Ṛgvedic hi śma, in contrast to ha ve of the Pāli version, which corresponds to ha vai of the Brāhmaṇas, and concluded that “[w]e have thus the interesting situation that the Prakrit, from the North-west, appears to represent the survival of a common Ṛgvedic usage, while the Pali, from a more central region, has instead a group which is most familiar from the Brāhmaṇas”. If ṣu in bhayava ṣu in the Gāndhārī manuscripts discussed here does correspond to Skt sma, then this would represent another instance of the archaic usage of this

39Although ṣ and k are indistinguishable in the Senior manuscripts, in EĀ-G they are not. The reading is therefore unlikely to be ku in the Senior examples.  
40See Norman (2004, p. 128) for the Pāli, BHS, and Gāndhārī forms, and for references to previous discussions. For the Gāndhārī spelling ṣu, see Norman 1971B, p. 218 = Collected Papers, Vol. 1, p. 118.
particle being attested in Gândhârî (for which compare the appearance of the archaic *tardman*- in this text discussed below).

For *edad aya*, which corresponds to the Pâli expression *etad avoca*, see Allon 2001, pp. 163–65 where it was transcribed as *edad aya*.

§§2–3. The simile of the blind (or one-eyed) turtle
As noted by Mr Norman (1972) in his article on this topic, the simile of the blind turtle inserting its neck into a single hole in a yoke floating in the ocean is referred to in Therîgâthâ 500 as illustration of the rarity of being born a human being:

\[sara \text{kâ\=nakacchapa\=m} \text{pubbadhanude, aparato ca yugachidda\=m} \]
\[sir\=a ca pa\=\=timukka\=m, manussalâkhamhi opamna\=m.\]

In his translation of the Therîgâthâ, Mr Norman (1971A, p. 49) translated this verse as “Remember the blind turtle in the sea in former times, and the hole in the yoke floating [there]; remember the putting on of it (= the yoke) as a comparison with the obtaining of human birth.” But in view of his later comments (Norman 1972, pp. 157–58), the first line would be better translated “remember the blind turtle in the eastern ocean, and the hole in the yoke [floating] from the western [ocean]”. 42

In his 1972 article, Mr Norman also quotes several other Pâli references for this simile (M III 169.9–16; S V 455.24–29 [the first of the two *chiggala* suttas currently under view]; Mil 204.11–13; As 60.17–18) and examples from Jain literature.

In a much earlier article on this topic, Harinâth De (1906–1907, pp. 173–75) refers to two similar passages in Sanskrit Buddhist literature. The first appears in Sântideva’s Bodhicaryâvatâra (4.20):

---

41 The reading *sir\=a* (= *sira[n]*) was proposed by Ahldorf in the European edition the Thi (p. 248). C*’* has *sara* (cf. Mr Norman’s translation).

42 Winternitz (1913, p. 44 = *Kleine Schriften*, 1991, p. 547) translates the verse as “Denke an das Gleichnis für die Erlangung einer Wiedergeburt als Mensch: an die einäugige Schildkröte und das im Ozean nach Osten und Westen herumgetriebene Loch des Joches und daran, ob der Kopf dieser (Schildkröte in jenem Loch) stecken bleibe.”
translated by Crosby and Skilton (1995, p. 26) as “That is why the Fortunate One declared that the human state is so hard to attain; as likely as the turtle poking its neck through the hole of a yoke floating on the mighty ocean.”

The second is found in a prose passage in the Saddharma-pundarika-sūtra (463.4–5):

*durlabho hy ambā tāta buddhopāda udambarupasadṛśo mahārṇava-vayugacchidrakārmagrīvārpaṇopamām.*

For, father and mother, the appearance of a Buddha is rare as a flower on a fig tree, as the likelihood of the turtle inserting its neck into the hole of the yoke floating on the great ocean. Father and mother, Buddhas, Bhagavats are ones whose appearance is rare.

Kumārajīva’s Chinese translation has 又如一目之龜，俯浮木孔 “and as the one-eyed turtle meeting the hole in the floating log” (T 9 no. 262 p. 60a29–b1).

In an article on the same topic, A.N. Upadhye (1972) quotes many examples from Jain literature and the following Buddhist verse from Mātṛceta’s Adhyāyadha-śataka (5):^44

\[
\text{so 'haṃ prāpya manuṣyaṇaḥ, sasaddharmamahotsavaṇ, mahārṇava-vayugacchidrakārmagrīvārpaṇopamām}
\]

I, attaining the human state, accompanied by the good Dharma which is the great festival, which is as likely as the turtle poking its neck through the hole of a yoke floating on the mighty ocean …

Not surprisingly, the image is also found in Brahmanical texts. An example is the *Laghu-Yogavāsiṣṭha* 6.15.14 (= YV 6a.126.4), which is

---


quoted verbatim in the eighteenth century Bodhasāra by Narahari (14.2.17).\(^{45}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{calāṇavayugachidrakāmaṃgriṃvapraveśavat} \\
&\text{anekajñananām ante, vivekā jñayate pumān}
\end{align*}
\]

Like the turtle inserting its neck into the hole in the yoke floating on the agitated ocean, a person becomes discerning at the end of many births.

There are numerous examples in Chinese and Tibetan Buddhist texts, but my primary concern here is with the wording of the Indian versions.\(^{46}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
sayaṣāvi bhikṣava aya mahapaḍavi [eko]dīa asa (ll. 33–34): \text{Pāli seyyathāpi bhikkhave ayaṃ mahāpathavi ekodakā assa.}
\end{align*}
\]

For sayaṣāvi = Pāli seyyathāpi, see Allon 2001, p. 209.

The spelling of paḍavi in maha-paḍavi, which corresponds to Skt pythivi/Pāli pathavi, pathavi,\(^{47}\) is a further example of “[s]poradic non-etymological alternations between unaspirated and aspirated consonants” in the Senior manuscripts noted by Salomon (2003, p. 86), for which cf. also adīca = Pāli adhīcchām in §3b (l. 40) below and paḍama = Skt prathamam / Pāli pathamam in another Senior manuscript (12.31). Previously attested spellings of this word in Gāndhārī are prathavi and padhavi found in inscriptions.\(^{48}\)

[eko]dīa: The reading is ekodakā in E° and B° of the Pāli parallel, but ekodikā in S° and C°, and in the two Sinhalese manuscripts (S° 3°)

---

\(^{45}\)For the commentary on the Bodhasāra verse, see Jacob 1909. I would like to thank Jenni Cover for bringing the Bodhasāra reference to my attention and for providing the context to it and Walter Slaje for drawing my attention to the Jacob article and for verifying the details of the Yogaśāśṭha reference.

\(^{46}\)The occurrences of the simile in the Chinese translation of the Sūtramkāra are discussed by Winternitz (1913, pp. 45–46 = Kleine Schriften, 1991, pp. 548–49), who quotes Huber’s French translation of these. The Central Asian manuscript of this text (Kalpatanāmanḍitikā) edited by Lüders (1926, p. 156; frag. 123 R2) preserves the words taddṛṣṭaḥcchidram.

\(^{47}\)See PED s.v. pathavi. For references to th < th when preceded by r or r in Pāli, see Oberlies 2001, p. 80.

\(^{48}\)prathavi: Mānsehra inscription of the year 68, line 9 (Konow 1929, p. 20); padhavi: Ajitasena inscription, line 5 (Fussman 1986).
used for E (S was not used by the editor for this volume of S). The CPD (s.v. ekodaka) questions the variant reading ekodikā as a possible feminine form. However, the SWTF (s.v. ekodaka) accepts Sanskrit ekodikā on the basis of its occurrence in the similar phrase ekodikāyāṃ mahāpṛthivyāṃ ekārṇavāyāṃ found in a fragment of the Sanskrit version of the Aggañña-sutta from Central Asia,\(^{49}\) for which also cf. tadyatheyāṃ mahāpṛthivy ekodakajātā bhave in the Larger Sukhāvatīvyūha (56.4).\(^{50}\) Gāndhārī ekoddha could go back to a form such as ekodikā in the MIA version from which this text was translated or have resulted from palatalisation of a under the influence of secondary -y- (ekodakā > *ekodayā > ekoddha), which is common in Gāndhārī. It is, of course, possible that an MIA palatalised form lay behind ekodikā in a Central Asian Sanskrit manuscript.

ekatarmao yuo (l. 34) “a yoke with a single hole”: Pāli eka-cchiggala-yuga-. This occurs three times in this sūtra: once in the accusative singular tatra puruṣe ekatarmao yuo pakṣivea (l. 34) “a man were to throw a yoke with a single hole into it [the ocean]”, where the Pāli has tatra puriso ekacchiggālam yuṣaṃ packhīpeyya, and twice in the locative singular am[ā]spi ekatarmao yuo grive pakṣivea (l. 40) “would insert its neck into that yoke with the single hole” and amasaṃ ekatarmao yuo grive padi[μ](ve)a (l. 43) “would put that yoke with the single hole on his neck” (see below), where the Pāli has amusmiṃ ekacchiggalē yuge givaṃ paveseyya. As stated above, the words ekatarmao yuo also occur on scrolls 7+8 (l. 6) as the uddāna-like reference to this sūtra.

An etymology for Pāli chiggalā, chiggala “hole”, which is recorded in the Pāli canon in eka-cchiggāla-yuga- “a yoke with one hole” of the current context and in tāla-cchiggalā, tāla~ “key hole”, is not given by the dictionaries and grammars (e.g. PED s.v.),\(^{51}\) where it is often

\(^{49}\)See SWTF s.v. ekodaka for references. The Mahāvastu version (I 339.7, ed. Senart) has ayam api mahāpṛthivi udakahradaṃ viṣya samudāgacchet.

\(^{50}\)Ed. Ashikaga 1965.

\(^{51}\)For tāla-cchiggalā, ~cchiṭḍa, see von Hinüber 1992, pp. 17, 31.
compared with Pâli chidda-/*Skî chidra- “hole”.\(^5\) Nor is it listed in the CDIAL. As noted by O. von Hinüber (1992, pp. 17, 31) the word is certainly non-Aryan in origin,\(^5\) although a comparable word (Pâli chiggala-) is not listed in A Dravidian Etymological Dictionary (Burrow and Meneneau 1961 and 1968).\(^5\)

The Gândhâri word ekatarmao is to be taken as a compound of eka- and -tarmao,\(^5\) where tarmao must be the equivalent of Skt tārdman-\(^5\) n. “hole” (cf. vṛtṛ “to cleave, pierce”; MW and CDIAL s.v.), with -ka suffix. The word has not been recorded previously in Gândhâri and there appears to be no Pâli or other MIA equivalent.\(^5\) Based on the model of the development of Skt vartman- “road” to vajña- in Prakrit or vatūma- (cf. vattani) in Pâli, vatāmaya-, vadāmaga- in Prakrit (CDIAL s.v. tārdman-), the expected MIA forms for Skt tārdman- would be *taḍḍa- with -rd- > -d̐l- or possibly *tadda- with rd > dd,\(^5\) both involving the last member of the cluster -rdm- not being taken into consideration in the assimilation of the cluster,\(^5\) or *taḍḍuma- or

\(^5\)The Abhidhānappadīpikā-ṭīkā (Nandawansa 2001, p. 239) gives chinidivā guccatī i chiggalaṃ; yadhāi.

\(^5\)The similarity between Pkt gaḍa- “hole” (CDIAL s.v. gaḍa-\(^1\)), corresponding to Skt garta- “hole” (cf. śamyā-garta- “hole (garta) for the yoke pin (śamyā)”, CDIAL s.v.), and the latter part of chiggala- is therefore merely coincidental.

\(^5\)If the word does have a Dravidian origin, then the latter part of the word may be connected with Malayalam ada “hole” listed in this dictionary (1961, § 261).

\(^5\)In this scribe’s hand ṭ and ḍ are indistinguishable. However, in view of the interpretation given below, the reading -darmao and a connection with dāra- “hole” (MW s.v.; see also CDIAL s.v. dāra-\(^1\)) is unlikely.

\(^5\)Although tārdman- is only found in the Vedic corpus, most Sanskrit words quoted in this paper are not (e.g. kha-, chidra-). For the sake of consistency, I have therefore omitted the accent from all Sanskrit words in my discussion, including tārdman-.

\(^5\)None are listed in CDIAL s.v. I am indebted to Mr Norman for verifying this absence.


*taḍḍuma- with the cluster split by epenthesi.

The Gândhāri form, with its apparent omission of the dental stop, is unexpected. As the cluster rd is regularly retained in Gândhāri, we would have expected *taḍḍo or *taḍḍuṃo for this word. Alternatively, the development could have been -rdm- > *-rm- > -rm- following von Hinüber 2001, §261. Noteworthy is the spelling tarman- throughout Kaul’s edition of the Laugāksigṛhyasūtra mentioned below, which is transmitted only in Kashmiri manuscripts.

In the Thērigāthā verse (500) quoted above, the word for hole is chidda- (yuga-[c]chiddam) = Skt chidra- in contrast to chiggala- of the Saṁyutta-nikāya sutta under discussion, for which compare the example of the older tāla-chiggala of the Saṁyutta-nikāya being replaced by tāla-cchidda in the Vinaya discussed by von Hinüber (1992, pp. 17, 31). The interchangeability of chiggala- and chidda- in the context of a yoke in Pāli texts is also seen in the various commentaries on saṃmā- (Skt śamā) “yoke pin” of the Brahmanical sacrifice saṃmāpāsa- (Skt śamāprāsa-) mentioned in a verse found in several places in the Pāli canon (e.g. Sn 303: S I 76.20; A II 43.30): sammā ti yugacchidde pakkhipatabbādāṃdakam (e.g. Spk-ṭ I 180 B§; Mp-ṭ II 299) and ... saṃmāpāso, yugacchiggale pavesanadānḍakasankhātāṃ samman khipitvā ... (It-a I 94.20–21; Mp IV 70.11–13).

In the Buddhist Sanskrit examples mentioned above, the word is yuga-cchidra-; as it is in the Jain examples quoted by Norman (1972) and Upadhye (1972): Skt yuga-cchidra- or Pkt juga-chidda-.

As already noted, the equivalent of Skt tarman- is not found in Pāli texts. The word does not appear, for example, in any commentarial gloss or in the list of words for hole in the Abhidhānappadīpiṇī, namely, randhaṃ tu vivaram chiddam kuharam susiram bilam susi ’thi chiggalaṃ soppaṃ (649–50), which is clearly based on the Amara-

\[\text{Pischel 1965, §139; von Hinüber 2001, §§152–56.}\]

\[\text{Cf. also those reported in Mr Norman’s notes on Thi 500 (Norman 1971A, pp. 174f.).}\]

\[\text{Nandawansa 2001, p. 239.}\]
koṣa,\textsuperscript{63} where the word is similarly absent: ... kahāram suṣiraṃ vivaram bilam | chidraṃ nirvayathanaṃ rokaṃ randhraṃ svabhram vapā susīh ... (1.8.486–89).\textsuperscript{64} Again, the word does not appear to be recorded in Buddhist literature in Sanskrit (e.g. the word is not listed in SWTF).

Although apparently not found in Buddhist literature, tārdman- in conjunction with yuga-, meaning hole in the yoke, does occur in early Brahmanical literature.\textsuperscript{65} The earliest attested example is the Atharva-veda (Śaunaka) 14.1.40 (= AVP 18.4.9).\textsuperscript{66}

\begin{quote}
sām te hiranyam sām u santy āpaḥ sām metir bhavatu sāṃ yugāya tārdma sām ta āpaḥ satāpavītra bhavantu sām u pātyā tanvātṛn sām sprśasva
\end{quote}

translated by Whitney (1905, p. 747) as

Weal be to thee gold, and weal be waters; weal be the post (methī), weal the perforation (tārdma) of the yoke; weal be for thee the waters having a hundred cleaners (-pavītra); for weal, too, mingle thyself with thy husband.

The following verse (AVŚ 14.1.41 = AVP 4.26.7), which also refers to the hole in the yoke, is of some interest since it is taken from the Ṛgveda (8.91.7):

\begin{quote}
khē rāthisya khē 'nasah khē yugāya saṭakrato apālām indra trīṣ pūtvākṛṇoḥ sūryatvacam
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{63}For the relationship between the Abhidhānappadīpiḍā and the Amaroṣa, see Nandawansa 2001, pp. xxvii–xxx.

\textsuperscript{64}Ed. Ramanathan n.d., Vol. 1, p. 146. The word does not appear in the commentaries on the Amaroṣa edited by Ramanathan (pp. 146–47) or in the Abhidhānacintāmaṇīnāmamāla (1363–64), a similar lexicographical work by Hemacandra (eleventh-twelfth centuries), or its commentaries (ed. 2003, pp. 624–25).

\textsuperscript{65}Several of the following references are mentioned in Winternitz (1913, pp. 43–44 = Kleine Schriften, 1991, pp. 545–47). I would like to thank Arlo Griffiths for his responses to my questions on this Brahmanical material.

\textsuperscript{66}Ed. Roth and Whitney 1856.
In the hole of the chariot, in the hole of the cart, in the hole of the yoke, O thou of a hundred activities, having thrice purified Aplā, O Indra, thou didst make her sun-skinned (tr. Whitney 1905, p. 748).

In this Ṛgveda verse the word for hole is kha- (khé yugāṣya “in the hole of the yoke”) rather than tardman-, which does not occur in the Ṛgveda, or chidra-, which occurs only once in the Ṛgveda (1.162.20) as an adjective meaning “pierced”, “torn asunder” (MW s.v. chidrā). These two verses of the Atharvaveda are not commented on by Sāyaṇa,67 but in his commentary on the second verse as it occurs in the Ṛgveda, kha- is glossed with chidra-.68

The compound yuga-tardman occurs several times in the Kauśikasūtra of the Atharvaveda, which the commentaries consistently gloss with yuga-chidras.69 The three occurrences of tardman- in the Śrautasūtra of Kātyāyana (6.1.30; 7.3.20; 15.5.27), which do not occur in conjunction with yuga-, are similarly all glossed with chidra- by the commentators (Karka and Yājñikadeva).70 The Kāṭhakagṛhyasūtra of the Black Yajurveda (ed. Caland 1925), also known as the Laugāksi-grhyasūtra, contains two relevant sūtras. The first (25.9) quotes the Ṛgveda verse (8.91.7) referred to above, which is also found in the Atharvaveda (14.1.41), glossing khé yugāṣya with yugatardman,71 then

69Extracts from the commentaries are given by Bloomfield (1890) in footnotes to his edition of the Kauśikasūtra and in an appendix (Paddhati of Keśa). The references are 35.6 (p. 94; see also p. 336); 50.18 (p. 146; see also p. 355); 76.12 (p. 203); cf. 76.13. For Dārila’s commentary, see the edition by Diwekar et al. 1972, which only covers the first occurrence. Cf. also Caland’s notes to his translation of the Kauśikasūtra (1900, pp. 31, n. 5; 115, n. 5; 175, n. 10).
70Ed. Weber 1972. Ranade ([1978]) translates tardman in these three occurrences as “cavity”, “holes”, and “perforations”, respectively (his numbering is 6.1.28; 7.3.17; 15.5.25).
71hiranyam niśtarkyaṁ buddhāḥadhi mārđhāni daksiṇasmin yugatardmany adbhīr avakṣārayate suṇ te hiranyam iti.
quotes the preceding Atharvaveda verse (14.1.40), also quoted above. The second sūtra (26.3) is of similar wording, mixing kha- and tardman-. The commentaries of Devapāla, Brāhmanabala, and Ādityadarśana presented in Caland’s edition of the Kāṭhakaghyasūtra all gloss khe and yugasya tardma of these two sūtras with yugacchidra- (Devapāla gives randhra- for kha-of the first sūtra). Finally, tardman- also occurs in the Śatapathabrāhmaṇa (Mādhyandina 3.2.1.2), but the commentaries of Śāvāṇa and Harivāmin (published Delhi 1987) lack such a gloss.

There are, no doubt, other instances of tardman- and yuga-tardman-in Brahmical literature, but the above will suffice for the current purposes.

Apart from yuga-tarmao of the Gāndhārī text under review, there is only one other instance of a word meaning hole recorded in Gāndhārī to my knowledge. This is chidra-, which appears in the Senior manuscripts in the expression paśaṇaṣa chid<*[r]>a (20.6) “a hole in the stone (of the city wall)” (Gāndhārī paśaṇa- = Skt pāśaṇa- “stone”). The Pāli parallel has pākāra-sandhiṃ “a hole in the [city] wall” (e.g. S V 160.22–23; A V 195.2) with v.l. pākāra-cchiddaṃ recorded in the European edition of the Aṅguttara-nikāya occurrence.

72The reading throughout M. Kaul’s edition of the Laugāksigṛhyasūtra is tarman-.
73khe rathasya khe ’nasah khe yugasya ca tardmasu khe akṣasya khe ava-dadhamiḥ yugatardmasaṃ sāṃsākham avadamahāti.
74The Āpastambaghyasūtra (4.2.8, ed. U.C. Pandey) uses the word yuga-cchidraṃ.
75The reading appears to be chidva, but the context demands chidra. It appears that the scribe accidentally overwrote the upward stroke of the post-consonantal r making it appears like a post-consonantal v.
76chidra- also appears in the unrelated expression achidra-vuti in the Khotan Dharmaṇapada, where the corresponding Pāli Dhammapada verse has the equivalent achidda-vṛtti- (= Skt achidra-vṛtti-) “impeccable conduct” (Dhp-GK 241c; cf. achidra-vṛtti in Klvs-G 23a).
The occurrence of *yuga-tarmaṇa* in our Gāndhārī text suggests that the equivalent of Skt *tardman-* was the word current in Gandhāra for the hole in a yoke, in contrast to *chidra-* (or *chiggala-* in the case of some Pāli texts), which is the term found in Buddhist literature from other regions and in Jain and later Brahmanical Sanskrit literature. Given that *tardman-* is found in some early Brahmanical Sanskrit texts, but is commonly replaced by *chidra-* in later texts, particularly commentaries, it would appear that an old lexical item was preserved in usage in Gandhāra. Of course, although the Senior manuscripts date to the second or third century A.D. (Salomon 2003, pp. 74–78; Allon et al. 2007) and *yuga-tarmaṇa* may therefore have been the expression for the hole in the yoke current in Gandhāra at that time, its usage cannot be fixed more accurately in time and space. For instance, it remains possible that this term was not current when these manuscripts were written, but is rather a vestige of a much earlier period when this sūtra was first translated (or transposed) into Gāndhārī from another MIA dialect.

Finally, it is impossible to tell what word for hole the translators of the Chinese texts had before them in their Indian originals. For example, throughout the Samyuktāgama parallel and in Kumārajiva’s translation of the Saddharñmapûndarikasūtra simile, the term is *kōng* 穴, “hole”.77 But what is interesting is that these two Chinese translations refer to a piece of wood with (one) hole, rather than a yoke: the Samyuktāgama parallel has 浮木止有一孔 “a floating piece of wood with only one hole” (p. 108c8–9), while Kumārajiva has 浮木孔 “hole in the floating log” (T 9 no. 262 p. 60b1).

tam ena purime vādo pačimo saharea (l. 35): Pāli *tam enam puratthimo vāto pacchimena sanhareyya*. The propensity for *purima-* to replace *puratthima-* is witnessed in the Sinhalese manuscripts used for E2 of the Pāli, which read *purimo for puratthimo*, and in the B2 reading

---

77 Surprising is Wogihara’s (1979) actual listing of *tardman* in his Sanskrit–Chinese–Japanese dictionary (s.v. *tardman*); the first of the two entries, *xuè 穴*, is also listed under *chidra*. 
of the commentary on this word in another text: purathitam disam dhavatit purimam (E' purathitam) disam gacchati (Nidd-a II 432,5–6). For purima- as “eastern” in Pāli, see BHSD s.v. purima.

The grammatical case of pačimo “western” in pačimo saharea, and of the word which replaces it in each of the following parallel clauses (purime, dakśino, and ut(*a)r(*o)), must be accusative, in contrast to the instrumental of the Pāli pacchimena saṁhareyya, etc.

atra hasa (l. 37): The Pāli has tatrasā = tatra asa “in it there would be”. The Senior manuscripts contain several further examples of the occasional writing of h plus vowel mātrā where a word-initial vowel is expected: hiḍam e[yi] (5.27) besides idam eyi (5.21) = Pāli idam avoca; himasi (15.7) = Pāli imasmīṃ; hidrāṇa (5.34) besides idrāṇa (5.39) = Pāli indrīṇānam; and hirdhaipadaṇa (5.34,38) = Pāli iddhhipaḍānma (see Glass 2007: §5.1.1.). The expected initial vowel in each of these latter Senior examples is the palatal vowel i. Several interpretations of this phenomenon were presented in my discussion of the word hasavaro = Skt/Pāli athāparaṃ (which is preceded by sughadu = Pāli sugato) found in the EĀ-G (l. 16), including that it represents sandhi h-, an “easternism”, or “emphatic” h-.78 Although I considered sandhi h- to be the most likely of these interpretations, the rarity of the phenomenon led me to dismiss it. Rather, I concluded that h- in these words represented the “sporadic, and as yet to be fully understood, appearance of prothetic h- in Gändhārai” (Allon 2001: 181).79

It is interesting that the majority of examples of prothetic h- in the Senior manuscripts appear in palatal environment. This parallels the occasional appearance of glide h in internal position, most examples of


79It is tempting to see this phenomenon as purely graphic, since the only difference between a word-initial vowel (e.g. i-) and h plus that vowel (e.g. hi-) in Kharoṣṭhī is that the latter has a short horizontal stroke to the right at the bottom of the aṅkara.
which also appear in palatal environment. Examples from the Senior manuscripts are udāhivadre (2.65[v29]), besides udāivadra (2.9) = Skt udāyibhadra- /Pāli udāyibhadda- “[prince] Udāyibhadra”; brhamahī (19.13.30), besides bhamaio (17.10) = Pāli brhamacariya- “the holy life”; sahīna- (12.10) = Pāli sāyahta- “evening”. For examples in the Khotan Dharmapada, see Brough 1962: §39. In other words, when they do occur there is a marked tendency for prothetic h- and glide -h- to appear in the neighbourhood of palatal vowels, which may be due to the palatal character of h (Wackernagel 1957: §§ 213–16; Burrow 1973: 77ff.; von Hinüber 2001: §223).

kaṇa kachavo (l. 37), kaṇo kachava (l. 39), kaṇo kachavo (l. 41): Pāli kāṇo kacchapo. Mr Norman (1971A: 49) and Bhikkhu Bodhi (2000: 1871–72) translate the Pāli as “blind turtle”, while Winternitz (1913: 44 = Kleine Schriften 1991: 547) gives “one-eyed turtle (einzügige Schildkröte)”. The Chinese Saṃyuktāgama parallel has “blind turtle”, máng guì 盲龜, while Kumārajiva’s translation of the Saddharmapuṇḍarikāśūtra simile quoted above has “one-eyed turtle” yíyān zhī guì 一眼之龜. These translations reflect the dual meanings of one-eyed and blind (in both eyes) for kāṇa-, which are attested in the Pāli commentarial glosses (see DOP and CPD s.v. kāṇa-), such as kāṇo ti ekakkhiṇa vā ubhayakkhiṇa vā (Ps IV 231.21).81

The phrases expressing the number of years after which the turtle would surface in §§ 2, 3a, and 3b and their Pāli counterparts are best discussed together. They are

§ 2


Pāli vassasatassa vasṣasatassa accayena sakīṇa sakīṇa umuṣyeṣa

81 The B² of the commentary on the Dutiyacchiggalasutta (Spk III 302.17) and a Burmese and a Sinhalese manuscript used for E² read andha-kacchapassa against kāṇa-kacchapassa of E².
§ 3a
Gāndhārī vasi[ad][*a]sa aj ae na saha 3(*am)[l]da um[il]jata (ll. 39–40)
Pāli vassasatassa vassasatassa accayena sakiṁ sakīṁ ummujanto

§ 3b
Gāndhārī vaṣṭhaṇḍa omica vaṣṭhaṇḍasa aca[en]a saha samiḍa umi[jata (ll. 41–43)
Pāli vassasatassa vassasatassa accayena sakiṁ sakīṁ ummujanto

The Gāndhārī and Pāli differ in several ways. Where the Pāli has vassasatassa vassasatassa accayena “with the passing of each hundred years” in each section (§§ 2, 3a, 3b),82 the Gāndhārī has vaṣṭhaṇḍa (vaṣṭhaṇḍa) umi[jo] (lomica) vaṣṭhaṇḍaṣa (vaṣṭhaṇḍaṣa) acaṇṇa saha83 “emerging after a hundred years, with the passing of a hundred years” in § 2 and § 3b, but vasi[ad][*a]sa aj ae na saha “with the passing of a hundred years” in § 3a. I take saha of the Gāndhārī to be the equivalent of Pāli/Skt saha “with”, rather than sakiṁ of the Pāli parallel, although the expression accayena saha is not attested in Pāli. The Chinese parallels the Pāli with bāi nián yì 百年一 “every hundred years”.

The interpretation of umi[jo], omica in vaṣṭhaṇḍa umi[jo] (l. 37), vaṣṭhaṇḍa omica (l. 41) is problematic. Although faint, the final o vowel in umi[jo] is certain. This spelling suggests that umi[jo], omica is the present participle nominative singular masculine of the verb corresponding to Skt ut-vmajj construed with the ablative (or accusative?), the phrase meaning “emerging after a hundred years”. The Pāli equivalent would be vassasatā ummujjao, which is not recorded. However, the nominative singular of this participle appears as umijata in the following lines (ll. 40, 43), where the Pāli has ummujjanto. It may therefore represent the gerund of this verb, which appears in Sanskrit as

82The reading in E of the Majjhima-nikāya occurrence (M III 169,13–14) is vassasatassa accayena sakiṁ ummujjeyya, with the v.l. in two Sinhalese manuscripts of vassasatassa vassasahassassa vassasatasaḥassassa accayena ..., which is also recorded in B as the Sinhalese reading.

83I have removed the square brackets where the reading is verified by the repetitions.
umajja or ummajja (MW s.v. un-maj), but in Pāli as umujjivā. However, the final $o$ in um[j]o is unexpected in a gerund. Both interpretations would give more or less the same meaning. I translate this phrase as “emerging after a hundred years”, which covers both possibilities.\(^{84}\)

The optative third singular of the same verb appears as umie[e]a in line 38, where the Pāli has ummujjeyya. In contrast to the Pāli verb, which shows labialisation of the root vowel $a$ under the influence of the preceding labial consonant cluster $mm$, the Gāndhārī shows palatalisation of the vowel under the influence of the following palatal consonant cluster (original $jj$).\(^{85}\)

The alternation between $j$ and $c$, as witnessed in the Gāndhārī spellings of these words, is common in the Senior manuscripts. The reflexes of original intervocalic -$jj$-, -cc-, -j- and -c-, and of initial $j$- and $c$- may appear as $j$ or $c$ in this scribe’s orthography. As noted by Salomon (2003: 87), this suggests “that this scribe, and presumably at least some other contemporary speakers of Gāndhārī as well, did not distinguish between $c$ and $j$ in their dialect”.

The Gāndhārī equivalent of Skt varśāṣata/-Pāli vassasata- “hundred years” shows three spellings: (i) vaśāṣaṭha- (l. 37 [x 2]), which could be read as vaśāṣaṭha- since $ś$ and $y$ are indistinguishable in this scribe’s hand; (ii) vaśi[ad.] (l. 39); and (iii) vaśihaṭha- (l. 41 [x 2]). I transcribe the two line 37 examples as vaśaṣaṭha- rather than vaśāṣaṭha- on the basis of the spelling of this word in Gāndhārī inscriptions and in the Khotan Dharmapada. Examples from the latter document are varśaṣada- (141a) and vaṣa-ṣada- (316a). The above spellings vaśi[ad.] and vaśihaṭa- show the palatalisation of final $a$ of Skt varṣa- under the

---

\(^{84}\)A neuter noun ummujja- “emerging” is recorded in Pāli (CPD s.v.). But this is not likely here.

\(^{85}\)Berger 1955, p. 60; Norman 1976a, p. 45 (= Collected Papers, Vol. 1, p. 250); cf. CDIAL s.v. ummajjati.

\(^{86}\)Cf. Norman 1976a and 1983.
influence of the following initial ś of śata-,87 with the development -ś > -h- in the case of vasīhaḍa- and further weakening (-ś > -h- > Ø) in the case of vasī[ad]. The same sound changes (-ś > -h- and -ś > -h- > Ø),88 but this time in the context of a preceding or following original palatal vowel, are seen in yoniho = BHS yonīsah “thoroughly” (l. 36) and baithodu (l. 82), baithoda (l. 110) = Skt vaśībhuṭah found in the Gândhārī Anavataptagāthā currently being edited by Richard Salomon. A further example is the Gândhārī spelling for the place name takaśaśila-, which appears as takaśila- besides takaśaśila-.89 The above can be compared with the development of original -h- > -ś = [z] and -h- > Ø in palatal environment. Examples of the former are (i) iṣa = Skt iha “here” found in the Niya documents, inscriptions, and in some of the British Library manuscripts90 and iśe found throughout the Senior manuscripts (e.g. 2.37) and in some inscriptions, which shows palatalisation of final a; and (ii) the Gândhārī version of the epithet of king Ajāṭasatru found in the Senior manuscripts: vediśaputra- (2.21, 31, 44, etc.), vediśaputra- (2.13, 18, etc.) = Skt vaidehiputra-/Pāli vedehiputta-.91 Examples of the latter development (-h- > Ø in palatal

88 Cf. the examples of ś > h in Gray 1965, §401, and -ś > -h- > Ø in the Gândhārī Dharmapadas discussed in Lenz 2003, p. 43 (see also von Hinüber 2001, §221).
89 Examples of takaśila- are found in the British Library manuscripts (e.g. BL16+25, II. 45–46 [see Lenz 2003, pp. 182–83]; and BL2, l. 7); for references to examples of takaśaśila- in the inscriptions, see Konow 1929 index.
90 E.g. BL 16+25, II. 21, 29, 32, 43 where the spelling alternates between iṣa and iśa (see Lenz 2003, pp. 155–56). For comments on this word, see Burrow 1937, §§17.91.
91 Note that the original final palatal vowel in vaidehi- is not marked.
environment) are Aśokan *ia = iha* found at Shāhābāzgarhī; *sabaraka-
*idaś = Skt *samparāya-hitaśa* “for the benefit of the next life” and
vayariś = Skt *vihārin* in the Khotan Dharmapada (Brough 1962: § 39);
and in the Senior manuscripts *amatreś (17.15) = Pāli *āmantehī,
padigaeśu (12.19) = Pāli *patiggahesuṃ, and priao (5.3) = BHS
piṅhak-/Pāli *piṅhaka* “spleen”.*93 This indicates that both -h- (< -ś-)
and -ś- (< -h-) in the above examples are an approximation at representing
[ţ], which tends to undergo further weakening (> 0).

The palatalisation of a neighbouring vowel by ś and the weakening of original -ś- and -h- in palatal environment as witnessed in the examples listed here are, however, uncommon. The spellings for the equivalent of Skt *vargaśata*- in Gāndhāri are more regularly *vasaśaṅ-
śaśaśada-/vasaśaśada-. Similarly, original -ś- and -h- in palatal
environment normally remain, as they do in other contexts generally.*94
Examples from the Senior manuscripts are *kāśa-cadapa (13.9) = Skt
kāśika-candanaṃ “sandal from Kāśi”; deśiṣama (13.12) = Skt
desiṣyāmi “I will teach”; and suha-vihara (12.42) = Pāli *sukha-vihāri
“living at ease”.

*samīḍa uni[e] (l. 38), samīḍa umijata (ll. 39–40, 42–43): The two
Sanvittika-nikāya occurrences of the simile read *sakīṃ sakīṃ
ummujiyeya* “would emerge once each time” and *sakīṃ sakīṃ
ummujiyanto* “emerging once each time”, while the European and
Burmese editions of the Majjhima-nikāya (M III 169.14) occurrence of
the simile do not repeat sakīṃ.*95 G *samīḍa* must be the equivalent of
Pāli/Skt *samitaṃ* “continuously”, “over and over” (see PED s.v.
samita1). This appears in Pāli texts in the expression *satataṃ samitaṃ
“constantly and continuously”, an example being māro pāpimā satataṃ

Himüber 2001, § 223.
93For priao, see Glass 2007, § 5.2.1.7.
94See Allon 2001, pp. 86–87 for references.
95Cf. *tan enam puriso vassasatussa vassasattussa accayena kāsikena vathena
sakīṃ sakīṃ parimajjeyya* (S II 181.27–28).
samitaṃ paccuṇṭhito (S IV 178.13–14) “Māra the Evil One is constantly and continuously waiting by”, which occurs in conjunction with a simile involving a jackal waiting for a turtle to extend its limbs.

avi ṣe (l. 39) [§3a]: The Pāli parallel has api nu so. The Pāli equivalent of the Gāndhārī would be api nu eso. Cf. ya eṣe (= Pāli yam eso) in line 41, where the Pāli parallel has yam so.

The phrase used to express the idea of the turtle inserting its neck into the hole in the yoke is am[a]spi ekatarmao yuo grive paksīvea in § 3a (l. 40) and amaspi ekatarmao yuo grive padī[mu](∗ce) a [va] paḍīmu[ce](∗a) in § 3b, where the Pāli parallel has anusmiṃ ekacchiggale yuge givaṃ paveseyyā ti in both sections.

The verb in the Pāli is paveseyya “would insert”. In contrast, the verb in § 3a of the Gāndhārī is paksīva = Pāli pakkhiyeYYa/Skt pra-Śkṣip, which can also mean “would insert”. This is the verb used to express the idea of the man casting or throwing the yoke into the ocean in § 2: Gāndhārī tatra puruṣ[e] ekatarmao yuo paksīvea, Pāli tatra puriso ekacchiggalaṃ yugaṃ pakkhiyeYYa. The verb in Gāndhārī § 3b is paḍī[mu](∗ce)a, which is repeated in the negative na [va] paḍi-mu[ce](∗a), where na va = Skt na vā “or not”. The Pāli form of this verb is paṭimmuṇcati (see PED s.v.), which, interestingly, occurs in the Pāli Jātakas and commentaries in conjunction with giva “neck” in the sense of “put on”, “attach”. A particularly good example for our purpose is pāsaṃ givāya paṭimmuṇcati “he puts the snare on his neck” (Ja IV 405.10), where the commentary (line 15) glosses paṭimmuṇcati with paveseti, the verb found in the Pāli sutta under discussion.96 Also of interest is paṭimmuṅkaṃ in the Therīgāthā verse discussed above, a derivative of paṭimmuṇcati.97 The active form of the verb (“would put that yoke with the single hole on his neck”) does seem a little strange

96 Other examples are (passive) kākassa givāya paṭimmucce (v.l. paṭimmucce; As 272.32–33) and kaccham nāgānaṃ bandhattha, giveyyaṃ paṭimmucathā (Ja IV 395.17).

here, and it is possible that we are dealing with a passive (Pāli ~mucaññi). If so, the translation would be “this blind turtle … would be caught (or fastened) at the neck in that yoke”.

Finally, the Gāndhārī expression amaspi ekatarmao yuo grive pad[ī[ma][*ce]a na [va] padimu[ce][*a] “would put that yoke with the single hole on his neck, or he may not put it on” is reminiscent of the Buddha’s statement in §3c of the Chinese: “Although the blind turtle and the floating piece of wood may miss [each other], perhaps they may also meet each other” (盲龜浮木，雖復差遠，或復相得).

āḍicam eda bhayaṁa sūḍalaṁ eva (ll. 40–41): Pāli adhiccam idām bhante. For the non-aspirate consonant in āḍicam = Pāli adhiccam, see the discussion of -padāva = Skt prthivi above.

sūḍalavaṁ = Skt sudurlabhham. The Senior manuscripts contain many examples of medial vowels not being marked, including u/o, as here, and i/e. Further examples of u not being marked are caḍamaśja (2.11,14,16) = Pāli cāṭumāsini- “of four months” and veḍadala[va] (13.5) besides veḍala[da] (13.2) = Pāli veḷudvāreyya(ka)- “belonging to Veḷudvāra”.

Summary

This Gāndhārī sūtra, for which the simile of the blind turtle and the hole in the yoke is central, is as a whole quite close to the second of the two Pāli chīggaḷa suttas preserved in the Saṁyutta-nikāya (no. 56.48), while the one similar sūtra found in the Chinese Saṁyuktāgama is closer to the first of these two Pāli Saṁyutta-nikāya suttas (no. 56.47).

With regard to the portion of these suttas/sūtras analysed in detail here, the prose simile, the Gāndhārī and Pāli versions exhibit only minor differences in terms of structure and wording. Both differ in several important ways from the Chinese version.

The main differences between the Gāndhārī and Pāli versions are

(i) different synonyms or near synonyms used: e.g. Gāndhārī -tarmo (= Skt tārdmaṇ + ka), Pāli -chīggaḷa- “hole”: Gāndhārī pakṣiveṇa, Pāli paveseyya “would insert” (§3a) and padimuṣa
“would put on” (§3b); cf. also Gândhârî bhayava, Pâli bhante (§3b);

(ii) different pronouns or indeclinable used: Gândhârî eśe “this”,
    Pâli so “that” (§§3a, 3b); Gândhârî atra “here”, Pâli tatra
    “there” (§2);

(iii) differences in syntax: the accusative case of Gândhârî pacâmo
    saharea in contrast to the instrumental of the Pâli puratneathena
    saṃhareyya;

(iv) a near synonym added: Gândhârî adicam ... suñjalavam, Pâli
    adhīccham (§3b).

Although still relatively minor, the greatest point of difference
between the Gândhârî and Pâli versions of the simile is in the phrase
used to express the period of time after which the turtle surfaces (§§2, 
3a, 3b).

Greater differences are, however, evident in the sections of the
sutta/sûtra not discussed in this article (§§4–7). This includes the order
in which factors are listed (e.g. the three conditions that are most
conducive to attaining enlightenment) and in the wording used to
describe these, although much of the wording of the Gândhârî text that
diffs from the Pâli parallel is in fact found elsewhere in the Pâli
canon, a phenomenon already noted for this genre of text (see Allon
2001, e.g. pp. 178, 184, 256, 279).

The differences noted for this sutta/sûtra are of the same type as
those identified in a comparison of three Gândhârî Ekottarikāgama-type
sûtras with their Pâli and Sanskrit parallels, for which the reader is
referred to Allon 2001: 30–38.

Mark Allon
University of Sydney
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Remarks on the Third Precept: 
Adultery and Prostitution in Pāli Texts*

The Third Precept: Men, Women, and Wives

The Third Precept is to refrain from kāmesu micchācāra, “misbehavior in [matters of] kāma”, a rather general category. The word kāma refers internally to the subjective emotions of desire and experience of all sensual pleasures, and externally to the objects of those emotions and experiences, so a broad construal of the Precept could be broad indeed. However, commentaries usually elucidate it in relation to sex: kāma is methuna-samācāra, the act of intercourse, which is twofold: contentment with one’s wife (or wives), or going to the wife of another man, sadāra-santosa-paradāra-gamana. As one of the Six, Eight or Ten Precepts, it requires chastity, so both kinds count as misbehavior, but as one of the Five only the second does.

Many texts give two standard lists of ten kinds of women with whom intercourse is forbidden, which include young women “under protection” as well as “wives of other men”. They are agamaniya-

---

*It is an honour and a delight to contribute this small piece, intended as no more than a preliminary and incomplete introduction to a much wider field of study, in honor of K.R. Norman, from whose unfailing kindness I have benefited for almost thirty years, up to and including this article.

1Saddhatissa 1987, pp.88–92.

2The existence of polygyny is widely attested in Pāli (see remarks on the word dāra in text and the notes below). Many texts praise monogamy for man and wife, in deed and thought, as a virtue; see, e.g., the Suruci Jātaka (Ja IV 314ff.), which contains the very widespread motif that jealousy of one’s co-wives (sapattiyo) is one of the sufferings particular to women. A man is urged not to visit other men’s wives; women are encouraged not even to think of other men (e.g. D III 190 with Sv 955). See also DPPN s.v. for the story of Nakulapitā and his wife. The motif of couples being together over a series of lifetimes is common in the Jātakas. With the exception of the story of Kaṇhā in the painfully misogynist Kuṇāla Jātaka, which is modeled on Sanskrit literary sources (see Bollée 1970, pp.132ff.), I know of no instance of polyandry.

vatthu, literally “objects not to be gone to”: Forbidden Zones. The first gives Ten Women (dasa itthiyō), all of whom are under some form of protection, and the second gives Ten Kinds of Wife (bhariyā). In the first list, of the Ten Women the first eight are protected by

1. mother (māturakkhitā)
2. father (piitu-)
3. mother and father (mātpitu-)
4. brother (bhātu-)
5. sister (bhagini-)
6. relatives (nāti-)
7. clan (gotta)
8. fellow monastics (dhamma-, glossed as sahadhammika-)

The Protectors, in order to prevent their ward from having intercourse with a man before she has come of age, do not allow her to go anywhere, see other men, live by herself, and they tell her what to do and what not to do. The final two are:

9. One who is under guard (sārakkhā), i.e. a girl who has been promised to a man, from as early as when she was in the womb.
10. One for whom a punishment has been set (saporidāṅgā) — i.e. a girl, promised to someone, whose name has been put on a public notice set up in a village, house, or street announcing a penalty for anyone who “goes to her”.

The Ten Wives are:

1. “one bought for money” (dhanakkītā), i.e. through a bride price or some such;
2. “one who lives [with her husband] through choice”

---

3See entries for itthi in PED, DOP, CPD. Searching the Chatthasāṅgāyana CD will reveal many more. There are some textual variations, of no importance here. The term ajjhācariya-vatthu, “object for transgressions” is also used (Pj I 31); ajjhācariya can refer to the transgression of any Precept.
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(chandavásini); i.e. man and wife marry through mutual affection;

3. “one who lives [with her husband] because of possessions” (bhoga-); a woman from the country who acquires tools such as mortar and pestle, i.e. who marries for social advancement;

4. “one who lives [with her husband] because of clothes” (pata-); a poor woman who acquires even a small amount of clothing, i.e., as in 3, who marries for social advancement;

5. “one who lives [with her husband] because of [the ceremony with] a bowl of water” (odapattakini) — oaths and vows were often taken by two people putting their hands in a single bowl of water; here the officiant says “may you be joined together unbreakingly as is this water”;

6. “one who has taken off the head-pad” (obhaṭacūbaṭā) [a head-pad is for carrying firewood, etc.], i.e. a former menial or slave raised in status;

7. “a wife who is also a slave” (dāsī);

8. “a servant-wife who works for wages” (kammakārī) — a man lives with her because his own wife is insufficient (anathiko);

9. “one brought back under a flag” (dhajāhaṭā), i.e. a war-captive;

10. “a temporary wife” (muhuttikā), i.e. a prostitute, used for a shorter or longer period.4

For men all Ten Women and all Ten Wives are Forbidden Zones. In the case of women, however, there is precise limitation: all Ten Wives are guilty of wrongdoing if they have sex with a man, but only the last two of the list of Ten Women are. This is because they have been promised to a man, and are counted as “having a husband” (or “owner”,

4On the phenomenon of “temporary wives” in Southeast Asia see Reid 1988, pp.154ff.; Andaya 1998. Thanissaro 1994, p.119, interprets this term more widely as “a date”, which is certainly possible linguistically, although it raises intriguing historical and cultural questions.
sāsāmikā). The texts say (using Sp 555 with Sp-†† Be II 329 [Sās 90–91]3:

\[\text{imāsu dasasu pacchimānaṃ dvinnam eva purisantarāṃ gacchantinaṃ micchācāro hoti, na itarāsan.}\]

Of these Ten women there is Misconduct in having sex with a man for the last two, but not for the others.

\[\text{pacchimānaṃ dvinnan ti sārakkhasaparidādānaṃ micchācāro hoti tāsaṃ sasāmikahāvato. na itarāsan ti itarāsaṃ māturakkhadiṇānaṃ aṭṭhannaṃ purisantaragamane natthi micchācāro tāsaṃ sāmikabhāvato }\]

\[\text{na ca mātādayo tāsaṃ phasse issarā. mātādayo hi na attanā phassānu-bhavanatham tā rakkhanti, kevalaṃ anācāraṃ nisedhentā purisantaragamanāṃ tāsaṃ vārenti, purisassa pana etāsu aṭṭhasu pi hoti yeva micchācāro. mātādhi yathā purisena saddhiṃ saṃvāsaṃ na kappenti, tathā rakkhitattā paresaṃ rakkhitagopitaṃ phassaṃ thenetvā phussabhāvato.}\]

For the last two: for those who are under guard and for whom a punishment has been set there is Misconduct because they have a husband/owner. But for the others there is not: for the other eight Women, those under the protection of their mothers, etc., there is no Misconduct in having sex with a man, because they do not have a husband/owner … Mothers, etc., do not have authority over them in relation to [sexual] contact; they do not guard them for the sake of their own experience of [such] contact; they [try to] stop them from having sex merely to prevent misbehavior.6 But for a man there is Misconduct in the case of these eight also. Because mothers, etc., do not arrange for [their wards to have] intercourse with men, therefore [there is Misconduct for a man] through the fact of Protection, through the state of having stolen [sexual] contact which is protected and guarded by others.

The argument is not entirely clear to me, and more work will have to be done, both text-critical and interpretative. The point seems to be that mothers and other protectors of the eight kinds of women do not have the kind of authority or ownership which a husband (actual or promised) does. A husband owns the right to exclusive sexual access,

---

3I am grateful to Thanissaro Bhikkhu for help with some of the passages translated here.

6Presumably anācāra here must refer to behavior contrary to social mores but not the Third Precept.
and so adultery with any of the other twelve women constitutes a form of theft. This seems to be the point of the sentence omitted from the passage just cited:

\[ yā hi sānikassa santakaṁ phassaṁ thenetvā paresaṁ abhiratīṁ uppadenti, tāsaṁ micchācāro. \]

When women cause sexual desire to arise for [or in] other men, [thereby] stealing the contact which belongs to their husbands, there is Misconduct on their part.\(^7\)

Perhaps light can be thrown on this by a passage from the Upāsakajanālaṅkāra (nos. 2, 24, p. 179):

\[ māturakkhitādayo ... aṭṭha rakkhakānaṁ anuññāya vinā vitikkamesu parisassa micchācāraṁ bhažanti. tāsaṁ pana nathī micchācāro. rakkhakānaṁ anuññāya upagane ubhinnanā pi nathī micchācāro. \]

The eight who are protected by mothers, etc., share in a man’s misconduct\(^8\) in cases of transgression [= sex] which occur without the permission of their protectors. But there is no Misconduct (i.e. no breaking of the Precept) on their part. When there is a [sexual] approach\(^9\) with the Protectors’ permission, there is no Misconduct for both [man and woman].

So a man’s breaking the Third Precept is connected to breaking the Second, against theft. The eight women, not being the property of their Protectors, do not steal anything by having sex with a man. But the Protectors’ relationship to their wards is something akin to ownership, since they can annul Misconduct for the man by giving their permission.

---

\(^7\) It is possible to take the absolutive thenetvā here as going with paresam rather than the subject of the sentence, in which case one would translate “when women cause sexual desire to arise in other men, [making] them steal the contact which belongs to their husbands …”. This would fit better with the last sentence, which clearly uses thenetvā of men.

\(^8\) It is not clear to me what “share” means here, and I have not found other passages which use the phrase.

\(^9\) This sense of upagama is not, to my knowledge, found elsewhere in Pāli. Pāli lexicographical texts (and cf. Sadd 883–84) relate it to upa-ni-ṣad, “to sit [next to]”, and a sexual use of upa-gam is found in Sanskrit (MW s.v.). It would seem here that it must be taken as a euphemism for sex.
Thus, as is often the case worldwide, sexual transgressions are committed by men not directly against a woman but against those who either “own” her or are in some other way legally responsible for her.\footnote{For this point in later Thai legal codes on marriage, adultery, rape, etc., see Loos 2006.}

In all twenty cases wrongdoing is “adultery [which is] behavior in a Forbidden Zone based on desire which transgresses conventional social boundaries” (lokamāriyādām atikkamitvā, Vv-a 72–73).

In a specifically Buddhist jurisprudential-ritual sense, therefore, lay single women, of any kind (the unmarried [whether young or old], divorcées, widows, and prostitutes, on which see more below), do not break the Third Precept by having sex with a man. If they do, then what is “wrong” about it is twofold, in quite different ways. First, it is practically imprudent, given (male) marriage-expectations and social disapproval.\footnote{E.g. S I 6 komāri seṭṭhā bhariyānam, “a virgin is the best of wives”, to which Spk I 33 comments kumāri-kāle gahitā, “taken [in marriage] at the time of their youth”. A number of compounds with the word kumāra- refer to women who marry as virgins or men who marry virgins: cf. DOP s.v. kumār-/komār-.}

Second, from the ascetic–ultimate, karmic point of view — augmented by misogynist attitudes toward the imagined promiscuity of women — it is the expression of samsaric defilement.

Intercourse is defined very precisely in the Vinaya tradition (e.g. a penis enters any of a woman’s three orifices as much as the length of a mustard seed); it is not said whether this is to be taken as paradigmatic for non-monastic cases. The word magga, literally “pathway”, which is used there for “orifice” and where appropriate “sexual organ”, does appear in a standard list of four sambhārā, “prerequisites”, or “constituents” necessary for there to be an infraction of the Third Precept (e.g. Sv 1049, As 98):

i. the existence of a Forbidden Zone (agamaniya- or ajjhācariya-vatthu)

ii. the intention to perform the act (sevanā-citta)

iii. an [appropriate] means (payoga) (transgressing the Precepts

\footnote{For this point in later Thai legal codes on marriage, adultery, rape, etc., see Loos 2006.}
Remarks on the Third Precept

involves one or more of a list of six such means, which include, for example, getting someone else to break a Precept; in relation to sex there is but one means: sāhaṭṭhika, literally “with one’s own hand”, but better “personally”

iv. consent to the physical interaction between the sexual organ and an orifice (maggena magga-patipatti-adhivāsana; Pj I 31 has simply sādiyati, “s/he agrees”).

The question of consent, and at what moments during an act of intercourse consent can be given or refused, receives a fair amount of discussion which I cannot go into here. Whether or not the woman is willing, and in whatever senses that is understood, the man’s Misconduct depends on the status of the woman. If she has not taken the Precepts it is “not very blameworthy”, but great if she has, and the offence gets worse as the status of the woman increases (e.g. Vibh-a 383):

[T]he wrongdoing is not very blameworthy [when it involves] transgression with a woman of bad Virtue, greater when the woman’s Virtue is like a cow’s, greater [still, and incrementally] when she has gone for refuge, has [also] taken the Five Precepts, is a novice nun, an ordinary nun [i.e. one who has not attained any level of the Path], a Stream-Enterer, Once-Returner, Never-Returner; with an Enlightened Woman it is wholly and completely blameworthy.

“Like a cow’s” is gorūpa-sīlaka. This is equivalent to what is called

12 Many texts discuss volition, on both the man’s and the woman’s part; this needs much more research, but it does seem that women’s volition is sometimes treated in misogynist ways: e.g., as Thanissaro Bhikkhu puts it (personal communication), in a discussion of rape at Sv-p†† III 346 there seems to be “the old excuse ‘The fact that she didn’t show any desire doesn’t mean that she didn’t want it, for that’s the way women are’”. For a man, one precise example is the case of ejaculation in dreams: being unintentional it does not break any Monastic Rule, but as a manifestation of desire it does have a karmic result. See Collins 1997, p.190.

13 e.g. Ps I 199: so pan’ esa micchācāro sīlādīgumaraṇāhite agamaniyaṭṭhāne appasāvajjo, sīlādīgumasaṃpanne mahāsāvajjo
elsewhere “an ordinary person’s Virtue” (puthujjana-sīla); the image may be that a cow is innocent, intending no harm: one sub-commentary says “naturally good” (pakati-bhadda, Dhs-anuṭ B° 189). But another says that such a person is “blind, of blundering intellect” (mâlho khalitapañño, Spk-pt (B°) I 160).

**Adultery**

Adultery in a general sense, when not tied to discussions of the Ten Women and Ten Wives, is expressed by verbs such as aticarati or atikkamati, “going too far, transgressing”, and also by nominal and verbal forms derived from gam, to go, most commonly with the compound paradāra-, “another man’s wife” (or wives, on which see below) as their object; the word paradārika is used for an adulterer. The words jāra (masculine) and jårā/jårī (feminine), “lover”, are used for partners in a sexual relationship outside normal marriage: the relationship, real or alleged, can be between monks and nuns, or other ascetics, monks and laywomen, and married men and women and their lovers. It is hardly likely that any extensive story-literature, in any culture, would not know of adultery; in Pāli, especially given the many misogynistic Birth Stories which aim to demonstrate the untrustworthiness and moral depravity of women, naturally many such stories are found. Admonitions against adultery in sermons by the Buddha and others scarcely need documenting. But what is wrong with it, why should one avoid it?

If one or both partners are in one or more of the categories which mean that their adultery breaks the Third Precept, the reasons are obvious. But adultery is spoken of usually without reference to that

---

14M III 255, glossed as go-sīla-dhātuko at Ps V 71, which adds that such a person is honest, not deceitful, does not oppress others, and makes a living rightly and properly through farming or trade.

15Monks, nuns, e.g. Vin II 259, IV 91, monks and laywomen Vin IV 20, married men, women and lovers Vin II 268, III 83, 138, 139, Ja II 292, III 92, 223.

16See Jones 1979; Bollée 1970; Amore and Shinn 1981.
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particular jurisprudential manner of evaluation, and the arguments offered against it are various. One story, the “Foot of a Mountain” Birth Story (Ja II 125–27), has a remarkable mixture of disapproval and acceptance. In both the Story of the Present, with the king of Kosala and the Buddha, and that of the Past, with King Brahmadatta in Benares and a wise councillor, one of the king’s ministers “does something wrong” in the harem. In the Present, the king reflects that the minister is useful, and the woman is dear (piyā) to him, so he cannot destroy them. The Buddha agrees, saying that when servants are useful and women dear one cannot do them harm, and he then tells the Birth Story, where King Brahmadatta tells the minister what has happened in a riddling verse, “At the pleasant foot of a mountain was an auspicious lake; a jackal drank from it, though he knew it was protected by a lion.” The minister understands, and replies, “Great king, [whatever] animals drink from a great lake, it is none the less a lake; if she is dear to you, forgive (khamassu) [them].” “None the less a lake” renders na tena anadi; a-nadi is literally “a non-lake”, and as usual the negative prefix can be taken in the sense of a logical negation and/or in the sense of a negative evaluation: “a not-X” and/or “a bad X”. The commentary says,

[A]ll creatures, two-footed, four-footed, snakes and fish, drink water from a lake when they are thirsty, but it is not for that reason any less a lake: it is not a polluted lake. Why? Because of its being common to everyone. Just as a lake drunk by anyone and everyone is not corrupted, so a woman who through defilement transgresses against her husband by having sex with another man is none the less a woman. Why? Because [of her, or all women’s?] being common (sādharāṇa) to everyone. She is not a polluted woman. Why? Because of becoming pure [again] through washing at the end …. [So, the advice is] forgive both of them and preserve [your] equanimity.

17The verb is padussi, from pra-duś, whence the word dosa (Pāli dosā), one of the commonest and least specific words for a wrong, in some sense of that word.

18“Polluted” is ucchita, for which DOP has “left-over [of food], touched, spat out, used, cast-off, polluted”, citing the compounds -odaka, “water that has
The king does so, telling them not to commit such evil (pāpakamma) again, and they stop.

The most general argument against adultery is a version of the golden rule given by the Buddha to dissuade male householders:

Again, householders, a noble disciple should reflect thus: “If someone were to commit adultery with my wives, that would not be pleasing and agreeable to me. Now if I were to commit adultery with the wives of another, that would not be pleasing and agreeable to the other either. What is displeasing and disagreeable to me is displeasing and disagreeable to the other too.” Having reflected thus, he abstains from sexual misconduct, exhorts others to abstain from sexual misconduct, and speaks in praise of abstinence from sexual misconduct. Thus his bodily conduct is purified in three respects.19

There are also more immediate disadvantages. A poem of the Sutta-nipāta, “The Discourse on How Not to Thrive”,20 lists twelve kinds of misfortune resulting from such things as being too fond of sleep or lazy, not supporting one’s parents, and being rich but enjoying oneself alone. The eighth (106) is “being a womanizer [which leads to] squandering what one has acquired”. The tenth (110) is “being an old man who brings home a [young] woman with breasts like timbaru fruit, [which leads to his] not sleeping because of jealousy over her”; the commentary explains this as an eighty- or ninety-year-old man thinking that his young wife will have no pleasure living with an old man and so seek a younger one: burning with lust and jealousy he forgets to look after his affairs and so comes to ruin. The ninth (108) is “being unsatisfied with one’s wife and being seen with prostitutes and other men’s wives”; the commentary explains that visiting prostitutes means giving away money, while adultery involves being punished by the king.

Other texts also suggest that adultery is a public crime, but not all. The issue requires further research, and as with many other issues discussed here, such research may reveal differences between different Pāli texts, which may reflect local variations in practice. Two verses in the Dhammapada (309–10), in a chapter entitled “Hell”, state:

A careless man who courts another’s wife gains four things: acquisition of demerit, an uncomfortable bed, third blame and fourth hell.

Acquisition of demerit and an evil state of rebirth, and a brief delight for the frightened man with the frightened woman, and the king imposes a heavy punishment. Therefore a man should not court another’s wife.

The word-commentary says that the king’s punishment involves such things as cutting off hands and feet, but the story attached to the verses in the same text — which might well be of different provenance — is quite different (Dhp-a III 479–81). It concerns a handsome young man called Khema, a nephew of the rich banker Anāthapiṇḍika and an habitual adulterer. Women have merely to look at him to lose control of themselves. (He has this ability thanks to the fact that in a previous life, at the time of the Buddha Kassapa, he had offered two colored flags at a Buddha-shrine with the wish “May all women apart from my family and relatives fall in love with me on sight.”) He is arrested three times, but the king releases him each time, feeling ashamed for the banker.

\[\text{Sp 561, commenting on } \text{alamv\c{a}c\u0142y\u0107}, \text{a woman who is or can be divorced, says at Vin III 144: } \text{y\u00e2 hi yath\u00e2 yath\u00e2 yesu yesu janapadesu pariccatt\u00e2 va hoti, \ldots aya\u00e2 \text{alamv\c{a}c\u{a}y\u0107 ti vuccati, } \text{a woman is called ‘One about whom Enough! is to be said’ when she has been abandoned by whatever means [is current] in whatever region’}; \text{the sub-commentary (Sp-\text{†† B} II 329) adds: alamv\c{a}c\u{a}y\u0107 hont\u00e2 ti desac\u0161r\u0107tavasena p\u0161a\u0107d\u0161\u0161\u0101n\u0107 pariccatt\u00e2 honti}, \text{such women “are abandoned by such means as giving a letter, according to the custom of the region”}.\]

\[\text{catt\u0161\u00b5ri \text{\text{-\text{-n\u0107}ni naro pamatto, \text{\text{-\text{-p\u0161j\u0107jati par\text{-\text{-d\u0161r\u0107p\u0161sevi } \text{\text{-\text{-apu\u0161n\text{-\text{-l\u0161bh\u0107m na nik\u00e2maseyy\u0107, ninda\u00e2 }\text{tatiy\u0107m niraya\u00e2 catath\u0107m } \text{\text{-\text{-apu\u0161n\text{-\text{-l\u0161bh\u0107o ca gati ca p\u0161pik\u0107, bh\u00e2tassa bh\u00e2t\u0107ya rati ca thokik\u0107 } \text{\text{-\text{-r\u0161j\u00e2 ca dan\text{-\text{-\u0161m garuka\u0161 paneti, tasm\u0161 naro par\u0161d\u0161r\u0107m na seve. The translation is from Norman 1997, p. 45. The commentary explains an uncomfortable bed as meaning that he cannot sleep when he wants to, and sleeps little.”}}}}\right)\]
Anāthapiṇḍika tells all this to the Buddha, who speaks the verses to Khema “to show the fault (dosā) in going after other men’s wives”. Leniency for adulterers is also suggested by another remark of the Buddha in the same text, in which he “does not make any one Precept lesser [than another]” because “they are all difficult to keep”. This precedes a verse which says that “whoever … goes to another’s wife digs up his own root here in this very world”. The word-commentary specifies this as not paying attention to his business affairs and wasting money, without mentioning public punishment.

In the long term, the karmic punishment for adultery is bad rebirth. Male and female adulterers go to hell: an example very common in modern Thai temple wall-paintings is one where they are forced by armed guards repeatedly to climb a tree with sixteen-finger-long iron thorns (see, e.g., Ja V 269, explained at 275). Various other karmic effects are described: male adulterers are reborn as human women; women who avoid adultery are reborn as men (e.g. Dhp-a I 327, where the text remarks that “there are no men who have not previously been women, nor women who have not previously been men”); one male adulterer is reborn submerged head-deep in a pit of excrement, and an adulteress flies through the air with flayed skin, attacked by vultures (S II 259). In both cases, he/she “as a result of that deed cooked in hell for many hundreds of years, many thousands of years, many hundred thousands of years … through the power of the ripening of that same deed”.

**Single Women (Young and Old), Divorcées, Widows, and Prostitution**

It would seem to follow from the logic of the remarks about the last two of the Ten Women and the Ten Wives that no other woman breaks the Third Precept in having sex. This is said in some texts about

---

23Dhp-a III 355, ekasālam pi kaṭṭhakavā akatvā sabbāvā eva durakkhhāni ti, preceding Dhp 246. The particle eva here could be read as meaning “equally”, though that might be an exaggeration.
prostitutes (see below), but I do not know of it being said specifically of other single women, who are usually referred to disparagingly. Young girls, starting at around sixteen (the usual age for marriage) “wish for men, lust for men”; “the madness of youth” can make them enter into inappropriate sexual liaisons. Older women who do not get married or enter the Monastic Order are called thullakumārikā, which is best rendered simply as “spinster”. The word thāla/thulla can mean physically big; Horner has “grown girl”, referring to the commentarial gloss mahallikā, “old”. It can mean “gross” in an evaluative sense: Rouse has “coarse”, translating an explanation in the Cullanārada Jātaka: “You must understand that a ‘coarse’ girl does not mean one whose body is fat, but be she fat or thin, by the power of the five sensual passions she is called ‘coarse’.” Spinsters are one place to which a monk should not go for alms — they are agocara: “such girls have grown up, and are past their prime — they go about desiring men, looking for intimacy with anyone”. The usual word for widow is vidhavā (possibly simply vi-ḍhava, “without a man”); widows, like spinsters, are also said to be a place monks should not go for alms, since they also “are on the lookout for intimacy with anyone”. On the other hand, widows, like young girls, could be victims, as the terms kaññero and vidhavero, “preying on virgins [and] widows” suggest. The

24 e.g. Dhp-a II 217: tasmiṁ ca vaye thitā nāriyo purisajhāsayā honti purisalolā; Dhp-a I 239–40: yobbanamadamattatiya purisalolā (purisa-lola is said to be one of five kinds of lust or greed afflicting women, Pj II 35-6, Sās 220)
26 Sp 991, yobbanappattā yobbanāṭtitā vā kumāriyo; tā purisādhippāyā va vicianoti, yena kenaci saddhīṇa mittabhāvaṃ pathenti; Nidd-a 451, Viṭh-a 339–40 have mahallikā anīvīṭhakumāriyo.
27 e.g. Sp 991–92 tā yena kenaci saddhīṇa mittabhāvaṃ pathenti.
28 Norman 1992, pp.88–90, referring to Ja IV 184, VI 508, and discussions in grammatical texts.
difficulty of life as a widow is a familiar topos of South Asian literature; widowhood is one of ten things “looked down on by people” (Mil 288). I have not yet examined texts referring to divorcées, but the fact that commentaries define a widow as a woman whose husband is dead or living somewhere else would suggest that their moral–legal status might be comparable.29

Limitations of space prevent further exploration of these issues. But both for its own sake, and because of the contemporary significance of prostitution in countries where Pāli texts are seen as “the Buddhist tradition”, where some people connect its growing prevalence with the misogyny which is certainly found in some Pāli texts, it is perhaps worth while looking more closely at the issue. The Pāli imaginaire as a whole is uneven: on the one hand, prostitution is called a “defiled form of action” which results in blame in this life and bad destinies in the future; words for “prostitute” are used as insults; prostitutes are an unsuitable source of alms for monks; and their alleged obsession with sex and availability to all is used as a denigratory figure in misogynist characterizations of women in general. On the other hand, prostitutes are capable of virtue (sīla); to be a wealthy and cultured prostitute can be a reward for good karma; they can give alms to monks; and they may be ordained as nuns, and go on to attain enlightenment.

The most common word for prostitute is gaṇikā. The word is from gaṇa, an amount, a number, or a crowd, but the exact etymology of the term is uncertain: it may mean “one who belongs to a crowd”, or “one who [is had ] for a [specific] amount”. It is sometimes said in secondary sources that gaṇikā denotes a high-class “courtesan”30 — that is, a

---

29 e.g. Vibh-a 339 vidhāvā vuccanti matapatikā vā pavutthapatikā vā. Although they may not technically speaking break the Third Precept, one should note such texts as Mil 205ff., which describes a woman whose husband was living away but who nonetheless did not do wrong (pāpaṇā nākāsi) with any man even though she was offered large sums of money to do so.

30 This word is often used simply as a euphemism. I use “prostitute” with no pejorative sense intended.
woman who, like an ancient Greek hetaira or Japanese geisha, is cultured and accomplished in the arts (especially dancing) as well as a sexual partner — in contradistinction to *vesī*, which denotes a lower-class harlot.\(^{31}\) This is not consistently borne out by the use of the words, however. They are given as synonyms\(^ {32}\); in one story (Vin III 138–39), a group of womanizers\(^ {33}\) send a messenger to summon a *vesī* to a park where they are enjoying themselves. She refuses, saying that she is rich and prosperous and will not leave the city. They engage the services of the monk Udāyi, who acts as a go-between with her, thus causing the Buddha to promulgate Saṅghādisesa Rule no. 5, prohibiting monks from acting as go-betweens to arrange for a marriage, a lover or a “temporary woman”. The word *vesī*, or *vesiyā/vesikā*, has been connected with *vessa*, Sanskrit *vaiśya*, the third of the four Brahmanical social groupings (thus *PED* s.v. “a woman of low caste, a harlot”), but it is probably from Sanskrit *veśa*, “a house (sc. of ill-repute)”, from *viś*, “to enter or settle down”. All prostitutes are *rūpāpājivini*, “women who live off their *rūpa*”, which here may mean “[good] looks” or simply “body”. Some higher-class ones, especially those who seem to have been established by a city or township, are called *nagarasobhinī*, “women who beautify the city”. Another word is *vannadāsi*, “slave of beauty”.\(^ {34}\)


\(^{32}\)e.g. Sp 1293 on Vin II 267, Abh 233.

\(^{33}\)They are called simply *duttā*, “rogues”, “abandoned” to one or more of three things: women, alcohol and gambling. The commentary here (Sp 553) naturally specifies them as womanizers, *itthi-duttā*.

\(^{34}\)Abh-†† B e 169 explains the term at Abh 233 as *vannasampannā dāsi vannadāsi, dāsim pi hi vannasampannaṃ keci sāmikā dhanalobhena gaṇikāṃ karonti*, “a slave endowed with beauty is called a slave of beauty. Some owners make a slave-woman a prostitute because of their greed for money.” Some mss of Thī 442 + Thī-a 248 use the word of someone said to be “neither man nor woman” and “neuter” (*napumsaka*) — presumably intending to refer to a male prostitute.
Prostitution is described, sometimes by prostitutes themselves, as a “defiled form of action” (kiliṭṭha-kamma).\(^{35}\) Kiliṭṭha is from kliś, to be troubled, defiled, whence the term kilesa, an ubiquitous Buddhist term: kilesa-nibbāna, “the nirvana of the Defilements”, is a defining characteristic of final nirvana (Collins 1998: 148, 151). Texts list various kinds and numbers of kilesa;\(^{36}\) those most relevant to prostitution would appear to be no. 1 lobha, “greed”; no. 9 ahirika, shamelessness; and no. 10 anottappa, not fearing blame. Vimalā, a prostitute who became a nun and Arhat, falls in love with the monk Moggalāna; she goes to him and does palobhana-kamma in his direction, which Pruitt (1998: 101) translates “make seductive action”\(^{37}\). He repels her with verses on the foulness of the body and so causes her to establish Shame and Fear of Blame (hiri-ottappa). Later she recalls how, intoxicated with her youthful beauty, she used to stand at the brothel door like a hunter, “revealing many secret places” (specified as thighs, hips, and breasts, Th¥ 72ff. and Th¥-a 76–77). Yet worse, some prostitutes abandon baby sons, preferring daughters they can train in their own métier.\(^ {38}\) Adhakāsī (e.g. Thi-a 29–31) and Ambapālī (e.g. Thi-a 198–204), both of them wealthy, and who both became nuns and Arhats, are said to have used the word ganikā as an insult to Buddhist nuns in previous lives, and as a result to have been

\(^{35}\) E.g. the term is used of Sirimā, who abandons it and attains the Fruit of Stream-Entry (Vv-a 74–75); it is said by a nagarasobhīni of herself at Ja III 435ff., and of a ganikā at Pv-a 195). It is used for other misdeeds, e.g. a proposed act of incest (Ja IV 190), pork butchery (Dhp-a I 125–28), and refuse-sweeping (Vbh-a 440–1). At Ja III 60 a ganikā calls her trade nīca-kamma, “inferior work”.

\(^{36}\) E.g. ten (Vbh 341, Vism 683 = XXII 49), five hundred (Spk I 187), fifteen hundred (Ud-a 138–39, 335f.)

\(^{37}\) Palobhana, I think, has both simple and causative senses: action based on and intended to incite greed.

\(^{38}\) E.g. Sālavatī (Vin I 269), whose son survived and went on to become the prosperous physician and Buddhist lay-supporter Jivaka (cf. also Pv-a 195); cf. Dhp-a I 174, and see Horner 1930, pp.87ff. Their métier is called a “tradition” (paveṇī).
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reborn in hell and as prostitutes. Prostitutes are the first of the list of five places to which a monk should not normally or regularly go for alms (agocara), the others being widows, spinsters, nuns and bars. The reasons given for this are that monks are likely to develop a fondness for going there often, and that in any case their going there would be a cause for reproach from others. (But if prostitutes wish to make merit to transfer to dead relatives or to give monks “ticket-food”, monks may go there as long as they establish mindfulness.) Just one example of the image of prostitutes in characterizations of women as a whole will suffice, from the Kuṇāla Jātaka. A verse and its commentary have: “Like a lion eating blood and meat, a beast of prey, grabbing with its paws and jaws, greedy, obtaining his food by force, ready to hurt others, so are women: a man should not confide in them … Not only … are [women] whores, harlots and prostitutes, not only strumpets: murderesses are they!” “Murderesses” (vadhikāyo) is explained as “husband killers” (431), where reference is made to another Birth Story (Ja V 367), where “many women” are said to be common property like a bar to drunks, and (a common trope) “the snare of Death”.

Nonetheless, other texts describe prostitutes as capable of sila. The Kurudhamma Jātaka (no. 276, Ja II 365–81) tells a utopian story of the Kuru kingdom, where everyone, including prostitutes, keeps the Five Precepts so assiduously that they worry that they may have broken them because of “a trifle”. They are all “sages of old”, even though “they were living the defiled life in a household” (agāramajjhe sankālittha-bhāva). Eleven examples are given, to messengers who come from another kingdom where no rain falls in order to learn what it is about the Kurus’ Virtue which causes rain to fall there. Each person doubts that they have kept one or other Precept: two concern the Third. The queen saw her husband’s brother, the viceroy, riding on an elephant one day,

felt greed for him and fantasized that her husband would die, the viceroy would become king and marry her; she then doubted her virtue because she had looked at another man “in a defiled manner”; the messengers assure her that “there is no adultery in the mere occurrence of a thought” and pass on. The last is the prostitute. She doubts her *sīla* because in the past Sakka, in the form of a young man, gave her money in advance of an assignation, but then returned to heaven for three years. The prostitute, “fearing to break her Virtue”, refuses to accept anything from any other man; she thus falls on hard times and goes to the Chief Justices to ask permission to start earning her wages as before. They give it, but as she is about to take money from another man, Sakka reappears and she refuses the money. He reveals his true identity, admonishes the crowd to preserve Virtue as she has done, and leaves. She nonetheless thinks that her virtue is faulty because she stretched out her hand to take money from another man. The messengers insist that her *sīla* is in a state of “perfect purity” (*paramā pārisuddhi*).

In another story a young woman and a prostitute are among fourteen cases of people who have fallen on hard times. A wise king explains how they must mend their ways: the woman has a lover living between her husband’s and her parents’ villages; she pretends to visit her parents but stays with her lover. The king says she should stay with her husband, otherwise he (the king) might seize her and put her to death. The prostitute used not to take money from another man until she had fulfilled her contract with whoever had given her money, and so she earned a lot; but now, giving up that practice (or: form of propriety, *dhammatā*), she takes money from one man, but gives an opportunity to another man instead of him, and so no one comes to her. She should keep to her old dhamma (Ja II 308–309).

One text argues explicitly that prostitutes do not break the Third Precept. It was edited by Jaini — who says that “this passage is probably the only place in Buddhist literature where the problem of the application of the lay discipline to a courtesan has been raised” — under the title Lokaneyyapakarāṇaṃ, on the basis of one nineteenth-century
Thai manuscript in Khmer script, and dated by him tentatively “not later than the fourteenth century A.D.” (1986: xlii, xlvii). The relevant section is found in the Kurudhamma Chapter (based on the Kurudhamma Jātaka), and it is not easy to interpret. A series of arguments and analogies begins with the statement that a gañikā has a fourfold duty (kicca): she is to (i) preserve sila by taking money from anyone, whatever their social level; (ii) remain calm (niccalā) throughout her sexual encounters; (iii) after taking money for a later assignation, not go with anyone else even if they offer more money; and (iv) remain equanimous during encounters and not afterwards show personal preferences for any customers, whatever their social level. It then — in a style typical of Southern Asian philosophical texts — refutes an imagined objector who claims that a prostitute breaks the Third Precept because she goes with other women’s husbands. First, it argues that just as a person whose retinue or slaves or relatives go on board a boat in order to trade is competent (or: has the right, samattha) to rebuke or strike them, but cannot impute blame to the ferryman, so the wives of the men who have sex with a prostitute cannot impute blame to her. Second (Lkn 194):

yasnā poroṇā rājaḥo tam ānetvā tassā yattakaṅ kālaṁ bhaṭiṅ denti tesaṅ tāya saḍḍhim methunasuṇvāso tattakaṅ kālaṁ hoti, te pi sakasaka-bhariyāyo mā tassā dosam āropetha, idaṁ rājadhanaṅ vaṭṭhanathāya saṃvattati ti saṭṭhesuṁ, tesaṅ pi bhariyāyo ayaṁ ca ayaṁ ca me me sāmiko ti paggahesuṁ, tasmā tassā majjhatacittena kāmesu micchācārā verāmani hoti n’ eva nindā hoti.

Just as when kings in the past, bringing a prostitute [to their realm] had sex with her for however much time they had paid her for, and conciliated their respective wives, [saying,] “Do not impute blame to her, this is conducive to increasing the royal wealth”, [while] the wives on the other hand accepted it [each saying] “This is my sāmika”; therefore because of her

41 Jaini’s summary (1986, p.xlii) appears to be studiedly vague, and may be mistaken in some details. I thank K.R. Norman (personal communication) for help with the sentences I have been prepared to translate here.

42 Reading (as suggested by K.R. Norman) pārijana dāsā vā nātisālōhiṁ vā.
psychological equanimity there is abstinence from sexual misconduct, [and so] there is no blame.

(Presumably the increase to royal wealth came from taxation of the prostitute’s earnings from other men.)

A number of texts describe prostitutes who were expensive: they become rich and those who tax them profit also. There are many examples of ex-prostitutes who became nuns and even Arhats: see DPPN, for example, for the stories of Āḍḍhakāsi, Sirimā, Abhayamātā, Vimalā, and others, especially the doyenne of prostitutes in Pāli texts, Ambapāli, who receives special attention and privilege from the Buddha while still a prostitute.

In general, therefore, the attitude to prostitution in Pāli texts seems to be this: from the ascetic–ultimate perspective, prostitutes’ behavior is a prime example of the greed, attachment, and defilement which tie all those who live the household, married life to rebirth. Some can, however, reform and attain enlightenment in the same life. From within a karmic perspective prostitutes do not, or at least do not necessarily do, wrong, and do not break the Third Precept. Men who visit them likewise do not break the Precept (they are not a Forbidden Zone, as are the Ten Women and Ten Wives), although the psychological and interpersonal ideal of monogamous fidelity would seem to tell against the habit.

Steven Collins
University of Chicago
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A Note on *vinaya*

The word *vinaya* is well known in Buddhist circle as the “norm of conduct” in general and as a name of the Tripitakas in particular. The word is originally a verbal action noun (nomina actionis) formulated out of the verbal root *vi-n*- which means “drive out”, or “remove”. Thus, the original meaning of the word *vinaya* is the act of driving out or removal. This meaning is preserved in Pali, as is seen in such compounds as *pipāsa-vinaya* (removal, or quenching of thirst),\(^1\) *kodha-vinaya* (removal, or repression of anger), etc. Apparently, its application to the disciplinary meaning in the Vinaya texts is a later development through the “removal” of immoral thought and evil actions. Yet, on the other hand, in Classical Sanskrit literature the meaning of “removal” is also developed in another direction and appears in an erotic context, which is hardly compatible with the moral and disciplinary one. Under such circumstances, it might be interesting to investigate how far its semantic field is extended in Pali as well as in Sanskrit, and to locate the Buddhist meaning within it.

However, according to the nature of the material which the present writer has been able to collect so far, it is convenient to deal with the problem in two sections. In the first section, we shall examine its wide range of usage, extending from erotics to ethics in Sanskrit as well as in Pali, and in the second, we shall discuss the meaning peculiar to Sanskrit.

It is out of great respect for the scholarship of Mr K.R. Norman that the present writer takes up the word *vinaya* and dedicates it to his Festschrift.\(^2\)

---


\(^1\)A II 34.25, Ja III 290.26. Cf. also *pipāsa-vinayana* in Mil 318,25–27.

\(^2\)In fact, the present writer was inspired by an article by Mr Norman (1993).
For clarity’s sake, let us start with its usage in the erotic context.

1.1. Removal of a Garment (in an erotic context)

In sharp contrast to its moral meaning of “the rule of conduct”, the word appears in an erotic context. Two examples suffice to illustrate the situation.

\[
\text{uttariya-vinayat trapamānā rundhati kila tad-ikṣaṇa-mūrgam āvariṣṭa vikājeta vīvṛdhur vākṣasaiva kuca-mandalam anyā.}
\]

Siṣūpadāvadha 10.42

Another woman, ashamed of the removal of her upper garment (\textit{uttariya-vinaya}) [by the hand of her husband, with the intention of] obstructing the line of his sight, covered her plump breasts by means of the broad chest of her husband.\(^3\)

It is because of shyness to disclose her breasts that a woman wishes to have the tight embrace of her husband.

A similar use is also seen in its verbal usage (\textit{vinayat-}).

\[
\text{ambaram vinayataḥ priya-pān̄er yoṣita ca karayoh kalahasya vārān̄am iva vīdhātum abhikṣṇ̄am kākṣyayā ca valayaś ca śiśiṇe.}
\]

Siṣūpadāvadha 7.57

Girdle and bracelets twanged incessantly to ward off, so to speak, a quarrel between the beloved’s hand [which tries to] remove her garment.

It is remarkable that the word \textit{vinaya} is used in the sense of the removal of a garment (\textit{uttariya-, ambara-}) of a woman in love-making by the hand of her lover.\(^4\)

---

\(^3\)\textit{kucāṁśukākarṣaṇa}: (Mallinātha) “slipping off of garment covering her breasts”.

\(^4\)Another example is taken from a romantic context, though not so erotic. Here the etymological meaning of “removal” (\textit{vi-} and \textit{nī-}) can be observed.

\[
\text{vinayati sudṛśā dhṛśaḥ parāgam praṇayini kausumam ānanānilena tad ahita-yuvater abhikṣṇam akiṣṇor dvayaṁ api rōsa-rajabhir āpupūre.}
\]

Siṣūpadāvadha 7.57
1.2. Removal of physical difficulties

As we have the Pali compound *pipāsa-vinaya* in A II 34.25 or *pipāsā-vinayana* in Mil 318.25-27, so we have *ṭṛṣṇā-vinayana* in MBh.

1.2.1. *ṭṛṣṇā*—(thirst)

Regretting what he has done, the old king Dhṛtarāṣṭra says as follows:

\[ \text{caturthe niyate kāle kadācid api cāṣṭane} \\
\text{ṭṛṣṇā-vinayanaṁ bhunje gāndhāri veda taṁ mama.} \]

MBh.15.5.10

Now at the fixed time, that is, at the fourth division of the day or sometimes at the eighth division, I take a little for quenching my thirst (*ṭṛṣṇā-vinayana*). [My wife] Gāndhāri knows this.

1.2.2. *adharma-śrama*—(fatigue)

\[ \text{āsīnāṁ surabhita-śilaṁ nābhi-gandhair mṛgāṇāṁ} \\
\text{tasyā eva prabhavaṁ acalam prāpya gauram tuśāraṁ} \\
\text{vaksyasya adharma-śrama-vinayane tasya śṛṅge niśanpañh} \\
\text{sobhāṁ śubhra-trīnayana-ṛṣotkhaṁ-paṅkopameyāṁ.} \]

Meghadūta 52

When thou hast come to the source of that river, the mountain white with hoar-frost, where seated deer perfume the rocks with must, settle on its peak to relieve the weariness of thy journey (*śrama-vinayana*), and thou shalt assume beauty that matches clay cast up on himself by Shiva’s lustrous bull.

Tr. Edgerton

1.2.3. *kapola-kandu*—(the itch of the temple [of an elephant])

In describing the Mt. Himalaya, it is said,

\[ \text{kapola-kandaḥ karibhir vinetuṁ} \\
\text{vighaṭṭitānāṁ sarala-drūmanāṁ} \]

While a lover was removing (*vinayati = apanayati* (Mallinātha)) the pollen of a flower from the eye of the charming-eyed one by means of his mouth-breath, both eyes of her rival-lady were immediately filled with the dusts (passion: *rajas*) of [jealous] anger.
Where the perfume arising from the milk-emitting nature of the pine trees, rubbed by elephants for allaying (vinetum) the itch of [their] temples, renders the summits fragrant.

1.3. Removal of mental difficulties

As we have the compound parissaya-vinaya (dispelling dangers) in Sn 92, the phrase kankham vinaya no ise (remove our doubt, O great one) in M II 143.12 and its verbal form hadaya-parilåham vinaya in Mil 318.4, the word is also construed with mental difficulty in Hindu texts.

1.3.1. duhkha (grief)

Seeing the increasing number of creatures and intending to lighten the burden of the earth, Prajåpati created a girl mrtyu (death) and asked her to kill the creatures. She was frightened and entreated him to relinquish his design.

vinîya dukkham abalà sà tv ativayatekanà
tvà bhrigu prajñalir bhūtvà latevāvarjītā tadā.  
MBh.12.250.1

Having driven off her grief, the large-eyed woman said with joined hands and bending [her body] like a creeper …

1.3.2. bhaya (fear)

Toward the end of the great war Yudhiṣṭhira addressed Duryodhana, who hid himself in a pond, as follows,

sa tvam atiṣṭha yudhyasva vinîya bhayam àtmanaḥ

---

5 Cf. Sn 58, 559, 1025, Ja V 501.12, VI 375.20 and VI 222.15. 19, 21.
6 vinîya khalu tad dukkham ägañ vaimanasya-jam
dhyåtavyam manasà hñyam kalyànañ samvijñatà.
MBh.12.219.6

ramasva råjan piba cádyà varùnîṁ kuruṣva krtvåmi vinîya dukkham
mayådyà råne gamite yama-kåṣayàm ciråya sità vaśagå bhaviṣyati,
R.6.63,66 Bombay
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ghātayitvā sarva-sainyaṁ bhṛāṭīṇāṁ caiva sūryodhana (27)
nedāṁśu jīvite buddhiḥ kāryaḥ dharma-cikīrṣayā.

Mbh.9.30.28ab

Arise and fight, casting off fear for yourself! Having caused all your troops and brothers to be slain, O Suyodhana, now you should not think of [saving your] life, if you wish to do justice!

1.3.3. jvara (affliction)

Kumbhakarna encouraged his brother Rāvana in distress, saying,

ramasva kāmaṁ pibā cāgrya-vāraṁ
kuraśva kṛtyāni vinītāṁ jvaraḥ
mayādyā rāme gamite yama-kṛṣaṁ
cirāya sitā vaśagā bhaviṣyati.

R.6.51.47

Make love, drink wine, do what you have to do and banish affliction!

Today, when I send Rāma to the abode of death, Sītā will become yours for ever.

1.3.4. āśā (distress)

When Bharata was summoned to Ayodhya by Kaikeyi, he saw a terrible dream and was greatly distressed.

tapyamānam samājñāya vayasyāṁ priya-vādinah
āśāṁ hi vineṣyantah sabhāyāṁ cakrire kathāḥ.

R.2.63.3

Observing how troubled he was, his affable companions tried to ease his distress by engaging him in conversation in the assembly hall.

Tr. Pollock

1.3.5. hrdaya-granthi (knot in the heart)

As we have hadaya-parifāhāṁ vinaya in Mil 318.4, so we have the expression granthiṁ vinīya hrdayasya. The sage Ātreya in the disguise of a hamsa bird encouraged the Śādhyas as follows:

etat kāryam amarāṁ saṁsūriṣam me
dhṛtiḥ śamaḥ satya-dharmānuvṛttaṁ
I have learnt, Immortals, that this is one’s task; to be steady and
serene and to pursue truth and Law; having undone all the knots
of the heart, one should bring both the pleasant and the
unpleasant under control.

Tr. van Buitenen

1.3.6. *asīya* (jealousy)

Furthermore, its verbal form takes *asīya* in the accusative case.

Despite the request of Dhṛtarāṣṭra, Saṁjaya refused to speak in secret
and promised to speak out only in the presence of Vyāsa and Gāndhāri.

For both of them, clever, knowing justice and resolute, can
dispel any ill-feeling you might cherish [against me].

In their presence I shall tell you all that Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna have
in their mind.

1.4. Removal of *yuddha-śraddhā*

In the epic battle scene, we often meet warriors’ determination to
mar the warlike spirit (*yuddha-śraddhā*) of their adversary. It is natural
in these contexts for *vi-nī* to appear in the future tense, either in the
simple form or in the periphrastic one.

---


8The literary meaning would be “the conviction (*śraddhā*) [of victory] in battle”. 
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Wait, wait, O son of Droṇa, you shall not go [escaping] from me with your life. I shall today dispel your eagerness for fighting.

1.5. darpa (arrogance)

In a similar context of battle we also meet darpa.

\[ \text{anukṛṣṭa śāstra śūra yudhyantī śaktīḥ} \]
\[ \text{sa yudhyasva mayā śaktīḥ vineśe darpaṁ adya te.} \]

MBh. 8.17.54

Heroic men fight their utmost in the battlefield without saying anything. Thus, fight with me to the utmost. Today, I shall destroy your arrogance.10

1.6. Removal of vices (= restraint or control)

The removal of jealousy (asāya) and arrogance (darpa) leads us to that of vices in general. It is from this “removal of vices” onward that the word vinaya is imbued with the tinge of moral and disciplinary meaning.

9Hara 1996.
10v.l. haniṣye, vinaśyed for vineśye.

Cf. also,

\[ \text{ekaśāḥ samantāḥ śrava vijetum sarva-pārthivān} \]
\[ \text{agyacchantu vineśyāmī darpaṁ eṣāṃ śītaḥ śaraḥ,} \]

MBh. 5.54.19

\[ \text{eso yotsyāmi vah sarvān nimāya śara-vāgurām} \]
\[ \text{tīṣṭadhvaṁ yuddha-manaśo darpaṁ vineśyāmī vah.} \]

MBh. 14.77.5

\[ \text{ṣīghram eva hi rākṣasyo vikṛtā ghorā-darśanāḥ} \]
\[ \text{darpam asāya hi vineśyāntu māṁsa-śoṇita-bhojanāḥ.} \]

R. 3.54.24

The contrast between darpa and vinaya is also discerned in the following passages:

\[ \text{tad yuddham abhavad ghorāṃ deva-dānavī-sāṃkulaṁ} \]
\[ \text{kṣamā-parākrama-mayaṁ darpaṁ vyinaśya ca.} \]

H. 37.21

\[ \text{tat surāśura-saṁyuktam yuddham atyadhutāṁ bābhau} \]
\[ \text{dharmādharma-saṁyuktar darpaṁ vinayena ca.} \]

H. 35.3
1.6.1. In Pali text, the word *vinaya* is compounded with various kinds of vice, such as

- **asmi-māna** (the sense of ego) (Vin, I 3,10),
- **icchā** (desire) (D III 252.19–20, A IV 15.12–13, V 165.7–8),
- **kodha** (anger) (A I 91.20, A V 165.12–13, S II 282.20),
- **upanāha** (grudge) (A I 91.20),
- **gedha** (greed) (Sn 152, 1098),
- **makkha** (hypocrisy) (A V 165.17–18, S II 282.20),
- **måna** (pride) (S II 282.20),
- **sāthheyyā** (treachery) (A V 165.22–23),
- **māya** (fraud) (A V 165.26–28),
- **chanda-rāga** (exciting desire) (S IV 7.9, 13–14, 19)
- **råga** (lust) (S V 137.25, 241.24),
- **dosa** (hatred) (Sn 37.25, 241.24),
- **moha** (delusion) (S V 137.26, 241.24),
- **bhaku††i** (superciliousness) (Sn 485).

Yet, the commonest construction of *vinaya* with vices is summarized in that of *akusala dhamma* in the plural, where these three (råga, dosa, mohā) are also included. For example:

> ahaṁ hi Sīha vinayāya dhammaṁ desemi rāgassā dosassā mohassā aneka-viḥitānām pāpakānām akusalānām dhanmānām vinayāya dhammaṁ desemi.

Vin I 235.26–28 = A IV 175.7–9

O Sīha, I am teaching this dhamma in order to remove lust, hatred and delusion. [That is to say,] I am teaching this dhamma in order to remove evil and unfit qualities of various sorts.\(^{11}\)

1.6.2. However, in classical Sanskrit literature, these vices are mostly preceded by *vinīta-* as is seen in such compounds as *vinīta-rāga* (MBh. 12.172.37), *vinīta-mohā* (MBh. 12.237.35), *vinīta-krodha-harṣa* (MBh. 5.88.6), *vinīta-roṣa-trīṣṇā* (MBh. 12.172.36), *vinīta-kilbiṣa* (MBh. 5.193.29). Of these, the commonest one is *vinītātman*.

---
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tam sa-dāro vinītātmā sugrīvaḥ plavagādhīpah
pājaya pratiṣṭhārāḥ priyamānas tad arhayā.

MBh.3.266.13

With his wife, the courteous (vinītātmā) king of apes, Sugrīva, kindly received him with the honor due to him.

Tr. van Buitenen

1.7. Training

From the “removal” of vices, it is an easy transition of meaning to that of shortcomings in general, that is “training”. Yet, this “training” is exercised not only to human beings, but also to animals.

1.7.1. Taming of wild animals

In praise of Rāma we read,

ārohe vinaye caiva yukto vārana-vājinām
dhanurveda-vidāṃ sreṣṭho loke 'tiratha-sammataḥ.

R.2.1.23

He was proficient in riding (āroha) and the training (vinaya) of horses and elephants, and was regarded as the best expert among masters of martial arts.12

12 For vinīta-sattva, cf.

tapasvī-saṃsarga-vinīta-sattve tapo-vane vītā-bhayā vasāsmin.

Raghuvrṇśa 14.75ab

For vinīta-mrga, cf.

agastyasyāśramaḥ śṛṅṅān vinīta-mrga-sevitaḥ.

R.3.10.84

For elephants, cf.

vinaya-vidhāyini bhagye 'pi cāṅkuṣe vidyata eva vyāla-vāraṇasya
vinayāya sakala-matta-nātanga-kumbha-sthala-sthira-śīrobhāga-bhiduraḥ
kharataraḥ kesari-nakharah.

Harṣacarita 188.14-6

prabhinnāś ca mahānāgā vinīta hasti-sādhibhiḥ
parasparaṃ saṅsāsādyā saṃnīpetus abhītavat.

MBh.6.91.26

ye tv ete sumahā-nāgā añjanasya kalodbhavāḥ
idhodaka-pradātāraṃ śunya-pālakam āśrme
1.7.2. Training of youths

The “taming of animals” is akin to “the training” of children. Human beings in the prime of their youth should be trained and cultivated. Hence its construction with śāśava, yauvana, etc.

1.7.2.1. śāśava

The sage Divākaramitra praises the inborn courtesy of Harṣa as follows:

\[
\text{asya tv idṛśe śāśave vinayasyopādhyāyan dhyāyann api na sambhāvayāmī bhuvī.}
\]

Harṣa’sitaka 239.25–26

In my pondering, I cannot imagine any instructor in decorum on the earth (vinayasyopādhyāya) in his childhood.

1.7.2.2. śiśutva

Mischief (a-vinaya) is natural to childhood. Hence its construction with śiśutva and bāla-bhāva.

\[
\text{janaka iva śiśutve supriyasyaika-sūnor}
\]

\[
\text{vinītam ācārya-kule suyuktam guru-karmanī.}
\]

MBh.13.105.9

For horses, cf.

\[
\text{aśvānām prakṛtīm vedmi vinayaṃ cāpi sarvasāh duśṭānām pratipattiḥ ca kṛṣṇaṃ caiva cikitsitam.}
\]

MBh.4.11.7

\[
\text{vinayantām jāvenāśvān mahārājasya paśyate.}
\]

MBh.4.18.32

\[
\text{karkaśāś cа vīṇītāś cа prabhinna-karaṇaṃkāḥ.}
\]

MBh.7.87.33

For bulls, cf.

\[
\text{tasmai pradeya prāyacchat pṛito rājā dhanaṃ bahu vinītan vṛṣabhān dṛṣṭvā sahadevasya cābhīh.}
\]

MBh.4.12.31

\[
\text{tathānaḍvāḥam brāhmaṇāyaśa dhuryaṃ dattvā yuvānaṃ balīnaṃ vinītan halasya vodhāram ananta-vīryaṃ prānapati lokān duśadhenudivasya.}
\]

MBh.13.72.43
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avīnayam api sehe pāṇḍavasya smarāriḥ.

Kirātārjuniya 17.64cd

Śiva put up with Arjuna’s indecorum (avīnaya), as a father puts up with his loving single son in his childhood.\textsuperscript{13}

1.7.2.3. yauvana

Youth and decorum are often incompatible. In the praise of Mādhavagupta we read,

\begin{quote}
paraspara-viruddhayor vinaya-yauvanayos cirāt prathama-
sangama-cihnam iva bhrū-sangatakaṇa kathayantam …
\end{quote}

Harśacarita 139.20

His meeting brows seemed to suggest the reconciliation after a long time of those irreconcilables, youth and decorum …

1.7.2.4. abhinava-yauvana

avīnaya-bahulatayā cābhīnava-yauvanasya …

Kādambarī 270.5

Since the prime of youth (abhinava-yauvana) is full of ill-
behaviour or mischief (avīnaya) …

1.8. Education

Cultivation of youths is nothing but “education”. As we have abhi-
dhamme vinesi (“taught in the Abhidhamma”) in Mil 12,19, 13,19–20, the
word has the meaning of education.

1.8.1. Martial arts

pūrvam ahar-bhāgaḥ hasty-aśva-ratha-praharaṇa-vidyāsu

\textsuperscript{13} sa evaṣa punaḥ svayamkṛtenāvinAyena …

Kādambarī 578.9

avīnaya-nīścetano nakha-pratibimbitam ātmānāṁ bahu manyate.

Kādambarī 410.7

As for bāla-bhāva, see H.2.51.1–2 and 4 (Bombay) which is paraphrased
by putra-durnaya in H.2.51.3. Cf. also Harśacarita 78.11 where an elephant-
charmer gives instruction to a youth while scolding a young elephant “give up
fickleness (lolaṭa) and practise courtesy (vinaya-vrata)”.

kari-kalabha vimūca lolaṭoṁ cara vinaya-vratam ānātānanaṁ.

Harśacarita 78.11
During the first part of the day, he (the prince) should undergo training in the arts of [using] elephants, horses, chariots and weapons.

Tr. Kangle

1.8.2. Arts (kalā)

In enumerating the education of the courtesans, we read,

\[ \text{nṛtya-gīta-vādiya-nātya-citrāsvāda-gandha-puspakalāsu līpī- jñāna-vacar-kāsikālādiru ca saṃyag-vinayanam.} \]

Daśākumāra-carita 81.2-3

Proper training in dancing, singing, musical instruments, theatre, painting, cooking, perfume, flower-arrangement …

1.9. Courtesy and Decorum

As the result of training and education, a youth learns how to behave, and becomes modest and courteous. The meaning of “moral discipline” is now well-established in Hinduism. The Nītīvāyaṁṭa defines it as follows:

\[ \text{vrata-vidyā-vaya "dhike śtu acaśan iṣṭa vinayam (6)} \]

---

14 Cf. KAS.9.2.24 (praharana-vidyā-vinīta tu kṣatriya-balaḥ śreyah). Cf. also MBh.6.15.41 (sarvāstra-vinayopeta) and MBh.1.181.15 (śastra-vinaya-vinaya).

Furthermore,

\[ \text{viśeṣārthi tato bhīṣmaḥ paurāṇaḥ vinayopeta}\]

\[ \text{īśvāstra-jhāna paryapprachad acāryān virya-sāṃkātan (1)} \]

\[ \text{nāḷpa-dhir nāmaṁ añabhāgas tathā-nāśātra-kovidah} \]

\[ \text{nādeva-sattva vinayet kuruḥ astre mahā-balān.} \]

MBh.1.121.2

\[ \text{gadāsi-carma-grahaṇeṣu śurān astraṣeṣu śiksāsu rathāsya-yāne} \]

\[ \text{saṃyagyāṝaḥ vinayat atandris tāṁś cābhimaṁyaṁ satataṁ} \]

\[ \text{kumārah} \]

MBh.3.180.28

15 Cf.

\[ \text{sā rāja-haṃṣaṁ ivu saṃkātanī gateṣu līlācita-vikrameṣu} \]

\[ \text{vyanāyata pratypadeṣa-labdhaṁ ādītsubhīr nāpura-sītiṁṭiṁ.} \]

Kumāra-saṃbhava 1.34
A Note on vinaya

puṇyāvāptih śāstra-rahasya-parijñānaṁ sat-puruṣābhigamyāṁ
ca vinaya-phalam

Nitivākyāṁta 11.7

Vinaya is to behave humbly toward those who are advanced in
religious observance (vrata), knowledge (vidyā)\(^{16}\) and age
(vayas).\(^{17}\)

The fruits thereof are the attainment of religious merit, insight
into the secrets of scriptures and association with good people.\(^{18}\)

But in Hindu political literature, this quality is particularly desirable
for the education of the young prince.\(^{19}\)

tebhya ‘dhigacched vinayaṁ vinatātmāpya nityasāh
vinatātmā hi napatīr na vinaśyati karhi cīt.

MS.7.39

Let him, though he may already be modest (vinatātmam), con-
stantly learn modesty (vinaya) from them (the elders); for a king
who is modest never perishes.

Tr. Bühler\(^{20}\)

In describing Rāma and his brothers, it is said,

svābhāvikaṁ vinītātyaṁ teyeṁ vinaya-karmaṁ
mumūrcha sahaṇaṁ tejo haviśeva havi-bhujām.

Raghuvaṁśa 10.79

Their inborn courtesy\(^{21}\) became stabilized\(^{22}\) by education,\(^{23}\) as

\(^{16}\)Cf. KAS.1.5.11: nityas ā ca vidyā-vyddha-saṁyoga vinaya-vyddhy-arham, tan-
mālāvatād vinayasīs.

\(^{17}\)Though the first chapter of KAS is called vinayādhikāraṁ “the topic of
training” (Kangle), “von Sachen der Erziehung und des Wohlverhaltens”
(Meyer), there is no definition of the word vinaya as such.

\(^{18}\)Cf. Kane 51–52 and Botto 82–83.

\(^{19}\)For king and vinaya, cf. Kane III 51–53.

\(^{20}\)For its opposite avinītaṁ ca duṣṭātmā, cf. MBh.4.20.25.

\(^{21}\)The youth of a noble-family is courteous by birth. Hence the expressions
svābhāvika vinītātya here, and svabhāva-vinīta in R.2.17.13 and vinaya
sahaja in Uttararāmacarita 4.22.

\(^{22}\)Cf. Hara 2000C.

\(^{23}\)For the inborn courtesy and later education, cf. kṛtaka and svabhāvika in
the innate splendour of fire becomes strengthened by clarified butter.\textsuperscript{24}

1.10. \textit{a-vinaya} (insolence, mischief)

In the story of retribution we meet often the word \textit{avinaya}. Ugly-looking Kabandha tells Lakṣmaṇa the story of his previous life.

\begin{equation}
\text{virūpaṃ yac ca me rūpaṃ prāptaṃ hy avinayād yathā}
\text{tan me śṛṇu naravyāghra tattvataḥ śaṃsatas tava.}
\end{equation}

\text{R.3.66.15}

Listen, tiger among men, truly I shall tell you why my form was deformed through an act of insolence.

Also in Kādambarī we read,

\begin{equation}
tad yah sa kāmopahata-cetāḥ svayam-kṛtād evāvinayād divya-
lokataḥ paribhṛṣṭaḥ manyya-loke vaiśampāyana-nāṁ
\text{Śukanāśa-sūnur abhavat.}
\end{equation}

\text{Kādambarī 578.8–9}

Stupefied by love, he fell from heaven to the mortal world because of his own mischief, and was born as the son of Śukanāśa with the name of Vaiśampāyana.\textsuperscript{25}

1.11. In the above, we have surveyed step by step the various aspects of \textit{vinaya}, whose original meaning is “removal”. The original meaning is apparently characterized by the “disjunctive” function of the prefix \textit{vi-}, and the usual meanings of “modesty” and “moral discipline” are later developed in the course of its association with vices in general. Next we shall proceed to its special meaning in Sanskrit literature.

\textsuperscript{24}For other expressions “modest” and “courteous”, cf. \textit{vinayānvita} (MBh. 13.76.1), \textit{vinayopeta} (MBh.12.285.38, 14.35.18) and \textit{vinaya-sampanna} (MBh.1.106.14, 2.5.29, 6.27.17). For \textit{vinīta-vēṣa} (soberly dressed), cf. MS.8.2.

\textsuperscript{25}For the adjectives \textit{avinīta (-putra)}, cf. MBh.5.133.9, KAS.1.17.51 and for \textit{durvinīta}, cf. R.3.18.9, 7.53.18, 7.30.34.
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2. Its particular use in Sanskrit

2.1. vi-naya in the sense of the absence of naya.

Besides its disjunctive function, the prefix vi- indicates absence (yoga: viyoga) or reverse (kraya: vikraya). As a result, it is possible for vi-naya to mean the absence of naya. It is this possibility of which the skilled writers in Kāvya took advantage and succeeded in composing a verse with the double-entendre. We shall see the skill of Māgha in his Śisūpālavadha, where a verse can be read in the two ways of praise and blame.

\[\text{ahitād anapatrapas trasann atimātrojhihtā-bhīr anāstīkah vinayopahitas tvaṛā kutaḥ sadṛśo 'nyo guṇavān avismayaḥ.}^\text{16.7}\]

2.1.1. The first meaning, in the good sense:

Where is someone else virtuous (guṇavat) equal to you, possessed of decorum (vinayopahita), afraid of (trasan) evils (ahita), prudent (an-apatrapa), yet tremendously brave (ujjhita-bhī), pious (a-nāstika) and without arrogance (avismaya)?

2.2.2. The second meaning, in the bad sense (paruṣa):

Where is someone else unvirtuous (aguṇavat) equal to you, afraid of the enemy (ahita = śatru), shameless (an-apatrapa = nirlajja), cowardly (nāti-mārojhihtā-bhī) (literally, “escaping fear only by obeisance” = “without fighting bravely”), an atheist (an-āstika), without policy, and yet arrogant?

According to Mallinātha, here the compound vinayopahita in the first reading is vinayenāuddhatenopahito viśīṣṭa, taking vinaya in the sense of anauddhatya (freedom from pride, modesty).

In the second reading, the compound is divided as vinayo 'pahita, and vinaya is used in the sense of nayātīto (gone beyond good policy (naya), that is, neglected policy) and apahita is taken in the sense of hitād apetah (deviating from the beneficial).\textsuperscript{26}

\textsuperscript{26}\text{For other word-play of a-naya, vi-naya, cf. tasya tat prāpya dusprāpyam aśvaryaṃ muni-satktam}
2.2. vinaya as a repetition of naya

The repetition of a word with its prefix is not uncommon in Pali, but it appears also in Epic Sanskrit. For example, the prefix upa- is used in vana, upa-vana, diś, upa-diś and also in niśad, upa-ṇiśad. People often translate upa-vana as “small wood”, and upa-diś as “intermediate quarter”. The same is also the case with the prefix vi-, for we have such examples as diś, vi-diś, dhätä, vi-dhätä, jhāna, vi-jhāna and, here including naya, vi-naya. We notice that in addition to the “disjunctive” function, the prefix vi- here has a function of “differentiation”. We shall see examples below.

2.2.1. diś and vi-diś

sā rāja-bhuja-nirmuktā nirmuktoraga-saṁnibhā prajvālayanti gaganām diśā ca vidīśas tathā dronāntikam anuprāptā diptāsya pannaḥ yathā.

MBh.7.81.31

The spear (śakti), hurled from the king’s arm, reached close to Drona, burning the sky and various quarters, like a female snake with gleaming mouth which has just cast off her skin.

dīpo yathā nirvṛtim abhyupeto naivāvaniḥ gacchati nāntarikṣam dīśam na kāncid vidīśam na kāncit sneha-kṣayāt kevalam eti sāntim.

Saundarananda 16.28

vibabhṛṇa matis tāta vinayād anayāhātā.

H.20.28

For naya, apa-naya, vi-naya, cf.

vinayām guṇā iva vivekam apanayā-bhidam nayā iva
nyāyan avadhāya ivāśraṇāḥ saśraṇāḥ yayuḥ śīvam aṭha mehṛṣayaḥ.

Kirātārjunīya 12.17

Cf. Allon 199 note and 248 (kampati, saṁkampati, saṁpakampati) and Dhadphale 217 (neti, vineti, anuneti), 222 (kampi, saṁkampi, saṁpakampi), 225 (jhāyanti, pājjhāyanti, nijjhāyanti, apajjhāyanti).

Hara 2000a.

Hara 2000b.

Cf. MBh.13.151.27, H.31.37, R.6.66.27.
Just as a lamp, which has reached the stage of extinction, does not depart to the earth or the sky or any of the quarters or intermediate quarters but from exhaustion of the oil merely goes out.

Tr. Johnston

As Johnston takes it, the word vi-diś means the intermediate quarters, differentiating the preceding word diś.

2.2.2. šeṣa-, višeṣa

rājñō 'pi vāsya-yugam ekam eva kṣat-saṁniruddhāya tathānmaṁātra
śayyā tathaikāxanaṁ ekam eva šeṣā višeṣā nṛpataṁ madāya.

Buddhacarita 11.48

A king too can only wear one pair of garments and similarly take only a certain measure of food to still his hunger: so he can only use one bed, only one seat. The other luxuries of a king lead only to the intoxication of pride.

Tr. Johnston

Here Johnston takes šeṣā višeṣā as “the other (šeṣa) luxuries (višeṣa) (of a king)”, but one may interpret the second word vi-šeṣa as a specification or differentiation of šeṣa. Then šeṣa, višeṣa means “the rest”, or “the various remainings, large and small”.

2.2.3. dhātā-, vidhātā

These two are often rendered into “creator” and “distributor”, but we may take them in the sense of “various gods”. In enumerating the gods who attended the rite of the royal consecration of Skanda Kārtikeya, the text says,

indrā- viṣṇu mahā- vīryau sūryā- candra- maṇḍau tathā
dhātā caiva vidhātā ca tathā caivaśānām.

MBh.9.44.4

Indra and Viṣṇu of great energy, similarly the sun and moon, and dhātā and vidhātā, wind and fire

31 Cf. Saundarananda 16.29.
32 Cf. Durga ad Nirukta 11.11 (dhātāva vidhātā) as quoted in Dhadphale 223.
33 Cf. MBh.7.69.46, 13.15.31, 13.145.39 (sa dhātā vidhātā …); 3.249.4 (dhātur
The gods here enumerated (the sun and moon, wind and fire) compose the typical pairs, and we do not need to take the second vi-
đhåty in the sense of “distributor”. Here đhåtå, vidhåtå simply means “various gods”.

2.2.4. jñåna-, vijñåna

As is well-known, F. Edgerton proposed to translate jñåna as “theoretical knowledge” and vijñåna as “practical knowledge”.34 Thus he translated, for example,

\[
tasmåt tvam indriyå ा adau niyamya bharatamsabhå
apāmānåm prajahi hy ena jñåna-vijñåna-nåśanam.
\]

BhG.3.41

Thou, therefore, the senses first controlling, O bull of Bharatas, smite down this evil one, that destroys theoretical and practical knowledge.

Tr. Edgerton35

But we may take them in a similar way, taking them simply as “various sorts of knowledge”.

2.2.5. naya-, vi-naya

Now we come to naya vinaya.36 As diś-, vi-diś mean “quarters and

viđhåtuḥ), 12.224.49 (dhåtaiva vidadhåty uta), R.7.20.24 (yo viđhåtå ca dhåtå ca sukåte duśkåte tathå).

34Edgerton 1933.


36Of course, we would not entirely exclude the meaning of “modesty” for vinaya, even when it appears in conjunction with naya. For example,

\[
vipanne ca samårâmbhe saṃtåpaṇå må sma vai kṛtåh
gåtåte vinayas tåtå råjñåm eśa nayaḥ paraḥ.
\]

MBh.12.56.16

Even when some undertaking has failed, do not grieve! [In such a case] modesty (vinaya) is proper (to be followed), for modesty is the highest policy (naya) of kings.

We have mentioned above that courtesy (vinaya) is indispensable for the education of princes.
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intermediate quarters”, that is “various quarters” as a whole, so naya-, vi-naya may mean “various naya (policy, stratagems)”, instead of “policy and modesty”. Below we shall list some examples where vinaya is used in this sense.

2.2.5.1. In the self-praise of Kaṃsa, we read,

\[
\text{ahaṃ balena viryena nayena vinayena ca}
\]
\[
\text{prabhāveṇāvāva sauryena tejasā vikramena ca}
\]
\[
\text{satyena caiva dānena nānyo ’sti sadāśah pumān.}
\]

H.2.28.113 Bombay = H.73.822*7-9

Nobody is equal to me with respect to power, energy, majesty, [using] various stratagems, heroism, splendour, courage, truthfulness and giving.38

2.2.5.2. In describing Kṛṣṇa, we read,

\[
\text{manusyānāṃ mano-bhūtas tapo-bhūtas tapasvināṃ}
\]
\[
\text{vinayo naya-vṛttānāṃ tejas tejasvināṃ api.}
\]

H.30.36

He is the [true] mind of men, and the [true] asceticism of the ascetics, vinaya of naya-vṛttas, and the splendour of the splendorous.40

Though we have here vinaya metri causa, otherwise we might expect naya-bhūta in parallel with mano-bhūta, tapo-bhūta in the first line, or naya with tejas in pada d. In this context, it is not necessary to take vinaya as being independent of naya in the sense of “modesty”, or “moral discipline”, but “the [true] naya of naya-vṛttas (the true [= distinctive] policy among politicians)”.

---

37 We have similar constructions in diś-, upa-diś-, pra-diś-, pratidiś- also.

38 Except for satya and dāna in the last line, all the items enumerated in the first two lines are concepts of a military and heroic nature. If so, vinaya in the first line is not necessarily to be taken in the sense of “modesty”, but goes together with naya in the sense of “various” nayas.

39 Here I take -bhūta in the sense of “true”, as is the case with caitya-bhūta and kumāra-bhūta. Cf. Schopen.

40 Cf. Vāyu-purāṇa 97.42 which has vinayo naya-tṛptānāṃ in c.
2.2.5.3. In his monologue, Yaugandharāyaṇa says as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{vairāṇ bhayam paribhavam ca samāṇ vihāya} \\
\text{kṛtvā nayaṁ ca vinayaṁ ca śaraṁ ca karma} \\
\text{śatruḥ śīvaṁ ca suhṛdām ayaśaṁ ca hitvā} \\
\text{prāpto jayaṁ ca nṛ-paitīḥ ca mahāṁś ca śabdaḥ.}
\end{align*}
\]

Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa 4.6

[For I,] disregarding enmity, fear, and insult alike, have accomplished my work with my designs, by self-control and arrows, ending the glory of the foe and the disgrace of my friends. Thereby have I won victory, the king himself, and great renown.

Tr. Woolner

Though Woolner takes naya in the sense of “design” and vinaya “self-control”, we may take them in the sense of various sorts of naya (stratagem, tactic), the diplomatic means, both of which are contrasted to śara (arrow), the military means.⁴¹

2.2.5.4. Similarly,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{sīlena sāmnā vinayena sitāṁ} \\
\text{nayena na prāpsyasi cen narendra} \\
\text{tataḥ samutsādāya hema-punkhair} \\
\text{mahendra-vajra- pratimaḥ śaraughaiḥ.}
\end{align*}
\]

R.3.61.16

If you cannot recover Sītā by peaceful means (śīla), by conciliation (sāman), tact (vinaya), or diplomacy (naya), lord of men, then unleash the flood of your gold-feathered arrows, as devastating as great Indra’s thunder-bolts.

Tr. Pollock

---

⁴¹Apparently, the second line refers to the various means of defeating an enemy. According to the niti literature, the means (upāya) consists of peaceful tactics (sāman, dāna, and bheda) and violent means (daṇḍa). In the above verse, naya, vinaya correspond to peaceful means, while śara to the violent one.
Pollock rightly takes vinaya as “tact”. Here again the second line refers to arrows, a violent means, whereas the first line refers to peaceful diplomatic means. Under such circumstances, we do not necessarily take the words naya and vinaya literally, that is, in the sense of “tactics” and “self-control”.

3. Other special meanings

Apart from vi- with the “disjunctive” and “differenciating” function, we shall list below three special meanings of vinaya as induced from context and commentary literature.

3.1. vinaya in the sense of nigaḍa (fetter)

In the Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa, a chamberlain tells Pradyota how Vatsa is as a captive as follows:

\[
kāñcukiyāḥ — āhita-vinayatvāt pādayor ange tasya bahu-prahāratvāc ca skandha-vāhyena śayanīyena maḍhayama-gṛhe praveśitāḥ.
\]

Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa 2.13.10-11

Chamberlain: He was so tractable and had so many wounds on his feet and body, that he was carried into the Middle Palace on a litter.

Tr. Woolner

Though Woolner translated āhita-vinaya as “tractable”, here the compound should be taken in the sense of “having fetters placed”, as Ganapatisastri commented (āhita-vinayatvād viniyate ‘nenāparādhitī vinaya iha nigaḍe, sa āhito nivesito yasya sa āhita-vinayāḥ). Here the passage describes king Vatsa as a captive, having his feet and body fettered as a criminal (aparādhi).

---

42As is well known, sāman (conciliation), dāna (bribery), bheda (sowing dis- sension) and daṇḍa (open attack) are means of success against an enemy (MS.7.109, KAS.7.16.3). Here the first line corresponds to peaceful means and śara in the second line to violent means. Cf. also, MBh.12.223.8, R.2.37.5, 4.17.28, 4.18.8, R.6.128.82 (Bombay), H.2.28.113 (Bombay).
3.2. *vinaya* as contrasted to *visarga*

Bhīṣma enumerates various aspects of *daṇḍa*, the rod of punishment.

\[
\text{asākrīḥ śaktir ity eva māna-stambhau vyayāryayau} \\
vinayaś ca visargaś ca kālūkālau ca bhūrata.
\]

MBh.12.121.28

[It is] power and impotence, arrogance, obstinacy, change and stability, discipline and letting loose, the right time and the wrong time.

Tr. Fitzgerald

Since positive and negative concepts are contrasted here, *vinaya* is the reverse of *visarga* and thus *pada c* should be translated something like “restraint and freedom”.

It is interesting to note that *vinaya* which means originally “removal” here comes to mean “confinement [in fetters]” or “restraint”, nearly the reverse of its original meaning of “taking away”.

3.3. *viniṭa* in the sense of *prasārita* (stretched, strewn)

Finally, we shall examine *viniṭa* in the sense of *prasārita*. BR lists under *vi-nī- (ausbreiten)* an example from the Rāmāyaṇa. Prior to the well-known scene of Sītā’s abduction, she was curious about a golden deer and asked Rāma to capture it, saying:

\[
nihatasyāsya satvasya jāmbūnada-maya-tvaci \\
śasparṣyāṁ viniṭāyāṁ icchāmy aham upāsitum.
\]

R.3.41.19

Were the creature to be killed, I should like his golden skin to be stretched over a cushion of straw, to make a seat.

Tr. Pollock

---

43 This meaning of *vinaya* as confinement and restraint may be related to that found in Pali *ariyassa vinaye*, which means “in the restricted sense of ayan”, that is, “in the Buddhist sense of the term”. However, the discussion on this subject needs another lengthy paper to be written.

44 The commentary reads as follows:

\[
śaspa-hṛṣyāṁ bāla-ṭṛṇa-parikalpita-tāpasāsane vinitāyāṁ prasāritāyāṁ asya
\]
Above, we have discussed *vinaya* used neither in the original sense of “removal”, nor in the ordinary sense of “discipline” in classical Sanskrit literature. Finally, we shall examine an allegorical story of *vinaya* and its relationship to *lajjā*.

**4. *vinaya* and *lajjā***

4.1. It is believed that *vinaya* is essential to the well-bred woman, as is expressed by the Sanskrit compound *sādhvā-vinaya*. When Hanumān extended his hand to help her, Sītā refused his offer, being afraid of touching a man’s hand other than her husband. In his praise, we read:

\[
yuktā-śūpāṇaḥ tvāyaḥ devi bhūṣiṇāḥ śubha-darśane
sādvāṃ strī-svabhāvasya sādhvān vinayasya ca.
\]
R.5.36.2

Oh queen, charming lady, what you said is appropriate. It is suitable for womenhood (*strī-svabhāva*) and the providence (*vinaya*) of a chaste woman!

4.2. So bashfulness (*lajjā*) is proper for the well-bred young lady.

\[
asaṃtusṭā dvijā naśṭā saṃtusṭāḥ ca mahābhujāḥ
salajjā gāṇikā naśṭā nirlajjāḥ ca kula-strīyāḥ.
\]
Hitopadeśa 3.64

The following [four] perish: twice-borns unsatisfied, kings satisfied, bashful courtesans, and unbashful women of a noble family (*kula-strī*).

Then, how are these two, *vinaya* and *lajjā*, related to each other?

\[jambūnada-maya-tvacy upāsitum tvat-samīpe sthātum icchāmi/yad vā bhagavat-upāsanāṃ kartum ity arthāḥ.\]

Upon a golden hide, strewn (*vinita = prasārita*) over an ascetic seat, prepared with young *kusa* grass, I wish to sit in your side, or to serve you. That is the meaning.

45For the meaning of *Anstandsbusse* (fine due to indecorum (*Geldstrafe bei Ungebührlichkeit*) = solatium?), cf. Meyer 291 1ff. Cf. also Nārada-smṛti 6.21d (“fine”, Lariviere translation 120).
4.3. It is in the Kūrma Purāṇa 1.8 that vinaya is allegorically called the son of dharma and lajjā. Twenty-four daughters of Dakṣa are mentioned there, and thirteen of them are married to Dharma. Here, lajjā is enumerated as one of them, and she brought to her husband a son called vinaya. The relevant passage reads as follows:

*buddhyā bodhaḥ sutas tadvad apramādo vyajyata*
*lajjāyā vinayā putro va paśo vyavasāyakah.*

Kūrma-purāṇa 1.8.23

Enlightenment (bodha) was born of intelligence (buddhi), so was mindfulness (apramāda). Decorum (vinaya) is the son of shame (lajjā), the determinant (vyavasāyaka) is the son of a handsome figure (vapus).

4.4. The mother-son relationship between lajjā and vinaya can be illustrated more concretely by some romantic passages of Bāṇa’s Kādambarī.

4.4.1. We read:

*prāyeṇa prathamaḥ madanānalo lajjāṁ dahati, tato hṛdayam/ ādau vinayādikāṁ kusumeṣu-sarāḥ khaṇḍayanti puścān marmāṇi.*

Kādambarī 409.9–10

Generally, the love-fire first burns bashfulness (lajjā), and then the heart. Kāma’s arrows first attack decorum (vinaya), and later the vital parts.

Once lajjā is defeated, it is an easy step for Kāma to destroy her son vinaya.

4.4.2. Similarly,

*skhalite cetasi tal-lagnā pataty eva lajjā/trapāvaraṇa-śūnye hṛdi/ praviṣya padaṁ kurvan kena vā nivārito durnivāraḥ*

46 Cf.

*lajjāyā vinayā putro vyavasāyo vasōḥ sutāḥ.*

Līṅga-purāṇa 70.296

*lajjāyā vinayā putro vyavasāyo vasyoḥ sutāḥ.*

Vāyu-purāṇa 10.36
When the mind stumbles, shame (lajjå) which clings to it falls. Into the heart devoid of its protecting cover (of lajjå), the flower-banneled one (Kåma) enters. Once he has entered, who can drive him away, the god who is hard to drive out and causes all sorts of indecorum (avinaya)?

When bashfulness is taken away, all sorts of decorum are exposed to danger.

4.4.3. In her self-reproach, the well-bred lady in love laments as follows:

\[
yadi tåvad itara-kanyakeva vihåya lajjåm, utsåjya dhairyam, avamucya vinaya, acintayitvå janåpavådam, atikramya sadåcåra, ullaanghya šilam, avagaññiya kulam... svayam upagamya gråhayåmi påñinåevå guru-janåtikramåd adharma mahån.
\]

If I approach by myself and grasp [his] hand [for marriage], like a common girl — abandoning shame (lajjå), giving up steadfastness (dhairya), unharnessing decorum (vinaya), neglecting people's rumour (janåpavåda), transgressing good conduct (sadåcåra), traversing morality (śila), neglecting the noble family[ness] (kula) ... — then, through the offence to my respected elders, there would be a great sin.\(^{47}\)

The urge of love-passion deprives the young lady of all the virtues.\(^{48}\) All these passages illustrate the close connection of lajjå and vinaya.

Minoru Hara
Tokyo


\(^{48}\)Besides kåma, mada (alcoholic drink) also destroys vinaya.
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Zombies and Half-Zombies: Mahāsūtras and Other Protective Measures

My work on the Mahāsūtras, a set of Mūlasarvāstivādin texts preserved in Tibetan translation, was supported by the Pali Text Society during the presidency of Mr K.R. Norman. As a result, the Society published the first two volumes of Mahāsūtras: Great Discourses of the Buddha in the series Sacred Books of the Buddhists. It is therefore with great pleasure that I present further research pertaining to the Mahāsūtras in this volume dedicated to Mr Norman.

The Vinayavibhaṅga is a section of the Mūlasarvāstivādin monastic code, the Vinaya. Lost in the original Sanskrit, it is preserved in Tibetan and Chinese translations. An important primary document for the study of northern Indian Buddhism, it has not, so far, been edited, systematically studied, or translated into any European language. In my study of the Mahāsūtras, I used a passage from the Vinayavibhaṅga for two purposes: as an example of a Mūlasarvāstivādin list of Mahāsūtras, and as supporting evidence that the Mahāsūtras were recited as protective or raksā texts.

The Vinayavibhaṅga is “supporting evidence.”

I am grateful to Shayne Clarke, Jan Nattier, and Mark Allon for their close readings of this paper and for their valuable comments and corrections.


2For a survey of this voluminous collection see Clarke 2002.

3For Mahāsūtra lists, see Mahāsūtras II, Parts I & II, 3–61. Earlier studies include Höbõgirin 1 and Sasaki 1985.

4For the raksā status of the Mahāsūtras, see Mahāsūtras II, Parts I & II, 63–88.

because several of the texts number among the great apotropaic classics of early Buddhism — notably the Dhvajāgra, the Ātānātiya-, and the Mahāsāṃjña-sūtras.

We still know very little about how the Mahāsūtras were actually used as a set, or to what degree the rituals may have corresponded to or differed from the Paritta recitations of Sri Lanka and South-East Asia or the Rakṣa rituals of Nepal. Certainly, several of the Mahāsūtras have parallels in the Paritta, and certainly, protection through recitation and ritual was — and continues to be — one of the main functions or even duties of Buddhist monastics.

An inscription on the “pedestal of a bronze image of the Buddha in the bhūmisparśa-mudrā” from Bhagalpur District, Bihar, mentions “Mahāsūtradhārā Vahākāya”, in “characters of about the twelfth century”.5 Is this to be taken as published, with long “a” in “-dhārā”, meaning architect, or perhaps stage-manager? The reading remains to be confirmed. Even if the reading is correct, could “Mahāsūtradhārā” be an engraver’s error for “Mahāsūtradharā”, with short “a” in “-dharā”? If that is the case, how do we read the compound? Was Vahākāya a textual specialist, a “great Sūtradharā”, a master of the Sūtra literature, or was he a ritual specialist, an “expert in or master of the Mahāsūtras”? Could “Mahāsūtradharā” be a title, a rank, for a “master of the Mahāsūtras”? “Sūtradharā” is a technical term of some antiquity, used widely by all traditions, and attested in epigraphy, while “mahāsūtradharā” is unattested in text or epigraphy. Perhaps the full inscription will help determine the context; at present the record is ambiguous, and it is impossible to decide whether or not the inscription has any bearing on the Mahāsūtras.

In this paper, I give an English translation of the Vinayavibhaṅga passage, extracted from the commentary on the third pārājika, followed by editions of the Tibetan from the Vinayavibhaṅga, supplemented by


5Srinivasan 1986, p. 34. As far as I know the inscription has not been edited and no photograph or rubbing has been published.
its commentary, the Vinayavibhaṅga-padavyākhyāna. Both texts were translated by Jinamitra and Lui Gyaltsan (Klu’i rgyal mtshan), two of the leading translators during the “first diffusion” of Buddhism in the Land of Snows, circa 800 C.E. Given the extraordinary proficiency of the two translators — and their teams, since they undoubtedly headed translation committees — the passages are clearly and consistently rendered. The author of the Vinayavibhaṅga-padavyākhyāna is Vinītadeva, about whom very little is known. He seems to have lived and worked in northern India in the eighth century.

The passage itself is macabre. It concerns a monk who raises a corpse — a vetāda or zombie — and orders it to kill someone, sending it on its way in a two-wheeled cart, with two bells round its neck and a double-bladed sword in hand. The primary concern of our text is not the ethics of the matter as such, but what sort of infringements of the monastic rules might be involved. The protective measures against such an eventuality are interesting in their own right. I have divided them into three groups. Group A lists protections that belong to the folklore of the time, and are not as such Buddhist. In Group B, the protection comes from the presence of a powerful and meritorious being — a Buddha, a cakravartin, or a bodhisattva. The idea of the protective presence of the Buddha is certainly ancient. In the Soṇadaṇḍa-sutta, for example, it is said that “in whatever village or town Samaṇa Gotama...

---

6For what little we know about Jinamitra, who along with Xuanzang ranks among the great translators of all time, see Mahāsūtras II, Parts I & II, 115–125.
7For the spelling vetāda see Skilling 1992, 111 n. 4; the Pāli equivalent is vetālavetāla. For vetāda see Hōbōgirin I 68–69, s.v. “Bidara”. The creature has become well-known as a “vampire”, for example in Burton (tr.) 1893. But the habits of the “vampire” of Burton’s “Baital-Pachisi” are quite different from those of the vetāda of our text, which seem closer to those of the “zombie”. We therefore choose to translate the term with “zombie”, a name of African origin, rather than with “vampire”, a term of Slavic origin.
8There is nothing remarkable in this, since the Vinayas do not deal with ethics as such — they are monastic codes.
stays, non-humans do not harm the people of that village or town”.

Group B has close parallels in the Sāṃgīti-parāyaṇa, which modern scholarship describes as one of the earliest texts of the Sarvāstivādin Abhidharma; it is possible that the passage is old, dating back to at least the first century B.C.E. Group C names texts which if recited will offer protection — the Prātimokṣa and the Mahāsūtras.

If the frustrated zombie turns back on the instigator and kills him, the monk incurs a heavy fault (sthālātyaya). I do not know whether there are any other cases of posthumous penalties in the monastic codes, but here we have at least one. At the end the text notes that the transgressions are the same in the case of a “half-zombie” (ardha-vetāḍa). This curious creature is similar to the common or garden-variety zombie: but in its case the monk installs it in a one-wheeled cart, ties a single bell around its neck, and places in its hand a single-bladed sword. The Sanskrit term ardha-vetāḍa is confirmed in the Saṃgha-bhedavastu of the Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinayavastu from Gilgit, and it also occurs in other sections of the Vinayavastu preserved in Tibetan translation but no longer extant in Sanskrit. That is, the “half-zombie” belongs to the necromantic bestiary of the Mūlasarvāstivādins. To the best of my knowledge there is no equivalent Pāli term.

The narrative runs smoothly, and is a good example of the style of at least certain sections of the Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya. It appears that for the redactors the didactic function of narrative was paramount: good stories, to be recited at least to the monastics within the walls of the Mahāvihāras, were used to communicate the monastic rules. This


10To the references given in the notes may be added Stache-Rosen 1968, p. 111, last paragraph of translation of Sāṃgīti-parāyaṇa.

11The half-zombie is not well-known, and it is comforting to think that at least the readers of this journal will know what to do in the event — the unlikely event, I dare say! — that they encounter one.

12See below, footnote 34.
editorial goal has, perhaps, confused modern scholarship, which has tended to read Buddhist texts through the dim spectacles of historicism.

Translation

1. With the intention to kill a man, a woman, or a hermaphrodite, a monk goes to a charnel ground (śmaśāna) on the night of the fourteenth day of the waning moon (kṛṣṇapakṣa), and looks for a corpse that has not been harmed (akṣata) or damaged (akhaṇḍa) by any creature, even by one as tiny as an ant (pipīlīkā).

2. Finding one, he rubs it with white chalk (makkola); having rubbed it with white chalk, he bathes it in scented water (gandhodaka). Having bathed it in scented water, he dresses it in new cloth, anoints its feet, and utters a spell (mantra): when it gets to its feet and stretches, he places it on a two-wheeled cart, ties two bells round its neck, and places in its hand a double-bladed sword.

3. When it gets up, it grunts and asks, “Whom should I slay? Whom should I kill? Whose life should I take?” Then the monk says to the zombie (vetāda), “Do you know such and such a man, woman, or...

---

13I am grateful to Fritz Grohmann (Taipei) for explaining the Chinese, for which see also Hōbōgirin I, 69.

14The commentary points out that this is the twenty-ninth day of the month.

15For the use of white chalk and scented water, see Schopen 2004: 288 (translating from Vinayavibhaṅga, D 65a2–66a4) and his remarks on terminological problems, pp. 291–92.

16De’l rkna pa gnis kyan skud par byed: skud pa translates forms of the roots vlip and vrmarṣ; see e.g. Negi 1993, 182 (skud pa), 279 (bskus). The Chinese has here “besmears its feet with ghee” (Shayne Clarke).

17This is a guess for what the commentary helpfully describes as “utters the blag blag sound”. I do not know what zombies do in such circumstances.

18From the context, the verb gto ba (= vīmuc) in its various forms here (gtañ bar bya) and in the following (thoñ sig, gtoñ bar byed) can only mean kill, although I have not found this meaning in any Tibetan lexicons or, for vīmuc, in Buddhistic Sanskrit or Pāli usage. Cf. Monier-Williams 1976, p. 820c, vīmuc “with prāṇāṇ, to deprive of life, kill … with kalevaram, deham, prāṇāṇ, or jīvatam, to quit the body or give up the ghost, i.e. to die”.

19I am grateful to Fritz Grohmann (Taipei) for explaining the Chinese, for which see also Hōbōgirin I, 69.
hermaphrodite?" When it replies, "I do", he says, "Slay him! Kill him! Take his life!" If the zombie slays, kills, or takes [that person’s] life, then that monk is defeated.

4. If protective measures are taken, such as:\n
4.A. (1) at the door a garland of forest-flowers is strung up,\n(2) a vase full [of water] is set out,\n(3) a cow and calf of matching [colour] are tethered,\n(4) a sheep is tethered,\n(5) a mortar and pestle are set out,\n(6) an indrakīla is laid at the door,\n(7) or a fire is kept burning.

4.B. (8) if the Conqueror (Jina) is staying there,\n(9) or one appointed by the Conqueror [is staying there].

The list of protections in the Chinese Bhikṣu and Bhikṣunī Vinayavibhaṅgas is very close in items listed, order, and number. Cf. Hūbogirin I, 69.

Commentary: "a garland made from flowers and fruits that grow in the forest"; Chinese: "medicinal herbs made into garlands". Cf. Śīkṣāsamuccaya in Bendall 1992, p. 139, vanakusumāni, in the context of rakṣā.

The Chinese has "a cow together with a calf of the same colour is tethered at the door". The Commentary has "the offspring, both, [have] the same hair colour" (?). "Garland" (mālā), "vase full of water" (pārṇakumbha), and "cow" are included in lists of māṅgala, "auspicious things": see Karunaratne 1971, p. 48. "Cow with call" (savacchakadhenu) is one of the māṅgala on the feet of the Buddha: see Karunaratne 1976, p. 60 (item 79). The "full pot" is important in the Theravādin paritta ceremony: see de Silva 1981, pp. 79–86. Cf. the list of auspicious symbols connected with the Buddha in Skilling 1992B.

Chinese: "a ewe together with a lamb of the same colour is tethered".

The indrakīla is important in the Theravādin paritta ceremony: see de Silva 1981, pp. 57–79. Cf. the list of auspicious symbols connected with the Buddha in Skilling 1992B.

For the last three, the Chinese has "(5) or in the house is a stone for pounding medicine together with a grinding stone; (6) or at the door is an indrakīla; (7) or a never-extinguished fire".

The Commentary interprets the phrase "one appointed by the Conqueror" as
(10) if a Wheel-turning Emperor (cakravartin) [is staying there],
(11) or a Wheel-turning Emperor is entering his mother’s womb,
(12) if a bodhisattva [is staying there],
(13) or a bodhisattva is in the process of entering his mother’s womb,

4.C. (14) if one is about to recite the Prātimokṣa-sūtra, or recites it out loud in full (vistareṇa svareṇa
referring to “a messenger (dūta) of the Lord” or “one specified (ādiśta) by the Lord”. Cf. Kośabh 2:45ab, (P) 75.3, and Dipa 103.8: a messenger of the Conqueror (jinaidūta) or one appointed by the Conqueror (jinaidūta) cannot be killed by either self or another; Kośabh 3:8ṣa, (P) 176.4: a jinaidūta and a jinaidūta cannot die before their time. Cf. La Vallée Poussin 1971, I 220, nn. 1, 2.

26Cf. Kośabh 2:45ab, (P) 75.6, Dipa 103.9: a cakravartin is not killed by either self or another.
27Cf. Kośabh 2:45ab, (P) 75.6, Dipa 103.10: a cakravartin’s mother is not killed by either self or another; Kośabh 3:8ṣa, (P) 176.5: a cakravartin’s mother cannot die before her time.
28The Commentary glosses “a bodhisattva in his last rebirth” (caramabhavika). Cf. Kośabh 2:45ab, (P) 75.5, Dipa 103.9: a bodhisattva in his last rebirth (caramabhavika) is not killed by either self or another; Kośabh 3:8ṣa, (P) 176.4: a bodhisattva in his last rebirth cannot die before his time.
29Cf. Kośabh 2:45ab, (P) 75.5, Dipa 103.9: a bodhisattva’s mother is not killed by either self or another; Kośabh 3:8ṣa, (P) 176.5: a bodhisattva’s mother cannot die before her time.
30I am not certain of the meaning of ma bton pa ’don par byed pa. The Commentary has kha ton du ma bsalbs pa’o: does this mean “in the reading of which one is not trained” or “silently”? There seems to be some contrast with the following “reads out loud in full”, which the commentary glosses as “with a voice heard by others”. The Chinese seems to interpret the first phrase as “is going to recite”, “is about to recite”. For now I follow this interpretation, with the idea that the power of the text is sufficient to drive away zombies and other nuisance-makers even when it is about to be read.
31In the Antagada Dasā, Chapter 6, the Jain ascetic Sudamāsa is protected from a dangerous Jakkha by making “full profession of the monastic vows” (Coomaraswamy [1928–29] 1980, Part I, pp. 21–22).
(16) if one is about to recite any of the four classes of sūtras (caturṇām śūtrānīkāyānāṁ anyatamānyatamaṁ śūtrānīkāyāṁ),
(17) or recites them out loud in full (vistarendra svarena śūdhyāyam karoti),
(18) if one is about to recite the great and lofty sūtras:
   1. Cāḍāsūnyatā
   2. Mahāsūnyatā
   3. Pañcatraya
   4. Māyājāla
   5. Bimbisāra-pratryudgama
   6. Dhvajāgra
   7. Āṭānāṭiya
   8. Mahāsamāja
(19) or recites them out loud in full (vistarendra svarena śūdhyāyam karoti):

5. and, because of his failure [to kill his victim], the zombie decides to
kill the monk instead: if the zombie kills the monk, the monk incurs a
heavy fault (sthālātīyā).

6. If the monk kills the zombie, the monk incurs two heavy faults: the
first from killing the zombie, the second from the previous stratagem
(pārva-prayoga).

7. As for a zombie, so for a half-zombie (ardha-vetāḍa), but between a

---

32For the Sanskrit see Carmavastu, in Gilgit Manuscripts (Dutt 1984) III–4
188,10.
33The commentary interprets the “four classes of sūtras” as “the Dīrghāgama,
Madhyāgama, Samyuktāgama, and Ekottarikāgama”: see Mahāsūtras II,
20–22.
34Cf. Saṅghabhedavastu (Gnoli 1978 238,24) vetādārdhavetāḍa (Tibetan in
Gnoli’s note has here); Bhaisajyavastu (Tib.) ge 68a6; Vinayakṣudraka (Tib.)
ne 200b3, Tib. idem. The “definition” of vetādārdhavetāḍa in the
Āgamakṣudraka-vyākhyāna, ūn 197b4, resembles that of our text: ro lais ni
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zombie and a half-zombie there are these differences: [the monk] places it in a one-wheeled cart; he ties a single bell around its neck; he places in its hand a single-bladed sword. This is a half-zombie. The establishment of transgression (āpatti) should be described as entirely the same as the preceding.

Peter Skilling
École française d’Extrême-Orient
Bangkok, Thailand

ABBREVIATIONS

Dīpa: see Jaimi 1977.
Kośabh (P): see Pradhan 1975
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'khor lo gñis dañ ldan pa’i šin rta la żon pa lag pa gñis kyis ral gri so sor ’dzin pa’o. ro lañs (read ro lañs phyed? ’khor lo gcig pa’i šin rta la żon ciñ ral gri gcig ’dzin pas ne bar mtshon pa’o.


**Peter Skilling**

**TIBETAN TEXTS**

“Text A” compares ten Kanjur versions of an excerpt from the *Vivavibhangā* on the subject of *vetāda*. All variants, including contractions and the use of the *śad*, are recorded. Minor variants, most involving the *śad* (especially after *dan*, *'am*, or *cit*), are listed separately at the end by paragraph number and reference letter. Retained as notes are genuine variants and variants that show the main lines of affiliation of the Kanjurs consulted; sub-groups such as BQ, CJ, or LN are placed with the minor variants. The pattern of affiliation agrees with that shown for the Pravrajyāvastu in Eimer 1983: LNST represent the Them spangs ma lineage, and BCDQ the Tshai pa lineage. As with the Pravrajyāvastu, there are no major recensional differences (of the type seen in, for example, the Drumakinnarājā-pāripṛcchā or the Samdhinirmocana-sūtra) between the two lineages.

“Text B” is an excerpt from Vinītadeva’s commentary on the *Vivavibhangā*. It compares five Tanjurs, noting all variants. The general affiliation is CD against GNQ. The root text is given in bold-face type.

**A. Extract from Mūlasarvāstivādin Vivavibhangā**

*'Dul ba rnam par 'byed pa* (Vivavibhangā), translated by Jinamitra and Klu’i rgyal mtshan, 3rd pārājika (10th *būm po*):

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B6.2</td>
<td>‘dul ba</td>
<td>cha</td>
<td>191b1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Vol. 6]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1033</td>
<td>‘dul ba</td>
<td>ca</td>
<td>159a3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Vol. 99]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>‘dul ba</td>
<td>ca</td>
<td>142b3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Vol. 5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>‘dul ba</td>
<td>ca</td>
<td>200a1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Vol. 5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J3</td>
<td>‘dul ba</td>
<td>ca</td>
<td>143b3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Vol. 5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>‘dul ba</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>173b4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Vol. 1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N3</td>
<td>‘dul ba</td>
<td>ca</td>
<td>212a1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Vol. 5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1032</td>
<td>‘dul ba</td>
<td>che</td>
<td>128b5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Vol. 98]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>‘dul ba</td>
<td>ca</td>
<td>205a3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Vol. 5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>‘dul ba</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>158a6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Vol. 1]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. dge sloṅ gis skyes pa ’dan (b) bud med ’dan (b) ma nin la gsad pa’i sems kyiš

---

35 Sigla, abbreviations, conventions and editorial principles are as in *Mahāsūtras* I.

36 Berkeley reprint Vol. 2, p. 223.3.3.

37 Otani reprint Vol. 42, p. 193.4.5.
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2. rhed nas sa kar(a) gyis dril phyi byed cin l sa kar(b) gyis dril(c) phyi byas nas sposs chus 'khru bar byed la li d spos chus blkus nas ras sar pa skon par byed cin l de'i rka'n pa(e) giis kya'n skud par byed l gsa'n snags kya'n rjod par byed pa na i2 de lais par (T158b) 'gyur te bya smya'as(f) byed pa'i tshe i4 des de(e) 'khor lo giis dan ldan pa'i sin rta la 'jog par byed cin l de'i ngul du(h) dril bu(i) giis kya'n 'dogs par byed l lag par ral gri(i) so giis pa ya'n shyin par byed pa na i46

3. de lais te(a) blag blag(b) zer zi'n(c) 'di skad ces nas gan gta'n bar(d) bya l nas gan gsad(d) par bya l nas gan srog (S205b) dan bral(e) bar bya 'zes zer ba'i (L174a) tshe i48 dge sloop des ro lais de la 'di skad ces khyod kyis(f) skyes pa dan(f) bud med (Q129a) dan (h) ma ni'n che ge mo zig 'ses sam (i) 'zes(g) smras pa na l 'ses so(k) 'zes zer ba'i tshe i49 de thon zig(g) (l) de sod cig l de srog dan bral bar (B192a) gyis zig ces smras nas (m) (C159b) gal(m) te ro lais des de gta'n bar byed dam l (D143a) gso'd par byed dam l srog dan bral bar byed na i51 dge (N121b) sloop pham par 'gyur ro il(f)

4. gal te de na srun bar byed pa 'di ita bu 'di ita ste i52

(1) sgor nags kyi phren ba btags pa 'am l

38] LNST : BCDHQ om. l.
40] gorg shur CDJQS : gorg shur BHNT : bur (only) L.
41] chus BCDHQ : chu LNT.
42] HLNST : BCDJQ om. l.
43] gyur BCDJQ : gyur HLNST.
44] HLNST : BCDJQ om. l.
45] ral gri BCDHQ : ral gri L : ral gyir NT : ral gri'i S. For the spelling ral gyi in Tun Huang Mss, see Skilling 1992n, p. 79, n. 94.
46] HLNST : BCDJQ om. l.
47] gta'n bar CDJST : gta'n par Q : gta'n bar BHLN.
48] HLNST : BCDJQ om. l.
49] HLNST : BCDJQ om. l.
50] zig BCDJQ : zig HLNST.
51] HLNST : BCDJQ om. l.
52] BCDJQS : HLNT om. l.
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(2) bum pa\(^a\) gaṅ (H200b) ba (J144a) bţag pa\(^b\) 'am l
(3) ba daṅ\(^c\) be' u 'dra ba btags\(^d\) pa 'am l
(4) lug btags pa 'am l
(5) mchug mchug gu\(^e\) daṅ bcas pa bţag\(^f\) pa 'am l
(6) sgor 'khor gan bshñal\(^3\) ba 'am l
(7) me\(^g\) tshugs sbar ba 'am l
(8) rgyal ba bţugs pa 'am l
(9) rgyal bas bka' stsal pa 'am l
(10) 'khor los sgyur ba 'am l
(11) 'khor los sgyur ba'i ma'i mñał du 'khor los\(^h\) sgyur ba žugs pa 'am l
(12) byaṅ chub sms dpa' 'am l
(13) byaṅ chub sms dpa'\(^i\) ma'j\(^j\) mñał du byaṅ chub sms dpa' žugs pa 'dug pa 'am \(^k\)
(14) so sor thar pa'i mdo ma bton pa\(^5\) 'don par byed pa\(^l\) 'am l
(15) bton pa\(^5\) rgya ches dbyaṅs kyis kha ton byed pa 'am l
(16) (T159a) mdo sde'i sde tshan bţi po gaṅ yañ\(^5\) run ba ma bton\(^5\) pa 'don par byed pa 'am \(^m\) l
(17) bton pa rgya ches dbyaṅs kyis\(^n\) kha ton byed pa 'am l
(18) mdo (S206a) chen po che ba 'di lta ste l chuṅ nu ston pa ċiṅ daṅ l chen po ston pa ċiṅ daṅ l lha gsum pa daṅ l sgyur ma'i dra ba daṅ l gzugs can siṅ phos bshu ba daṅ l (L174b) rgyal mitshan dam pa daṅ\(^{6\}l\) kun tu\(^p\) rgyu ba daṅ \(^{6\}l\) kun tu\(^l\) mi rgyu ba daṅ \(^{5\}l\) 'thun\(^8\) pa'i mdo daṅ l (B192b) 'dus pa chen po'i mdo de dag ma bton\(^5\) pa 'don par byed pa daṅ l
(19) bton pa dag rgya ches dbyaṅs kyis kha ton byed pa\(^i\) bţag par gyur na l

5. gtaṅ ţes pa yin pas ro laṅs (N213a) kyis dge slon bdag ċiṅ gsdø par sms par\(^{6\}l\) gyur bas\(^6\) l gal te ro laṅs kyis dge slon gsdø\(^a\) par byed na\(^6\) dge slon

\(^{3}\)bshñal BCDHQ : śñal LNST.
\(^{5}\)pa BCDQ : par HLNS. See below, item (16).
\(^{5}\)pa CDHJLNST : la BQ.
\(^{56}\)yaṅ BCDQS : HLNT om. yaṅ.
\(^{57}\)bton CDHJLNST : gton BQ.
\(^{58}\)吞 CILNT : mthun BDHQST.
\(^{59}\)bton CDHJLNST : gton BQ.
\(^{60}\)par BCDQS : pa HLNT.
\(^{61}\)gyur bas BDQS : gyur pas HLNT.
\(^{62}\)l HLNST : BCDQ om. l.
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6. gal te dge slon gis\(^a\) ro lañs ggod par byed na \(63\) dge sloñ la\(^b\) ñes pa sbom po\(^c\) ghis su\(^d\) 'gyur te l geig ni ro lañs bsad (Q129b) pa las so \(65\) ghis pa ni sbyor ba snä ma de ñid las so \(61\)

7. ro lañs (C160a) la ji lla ba (H201a) bžin du ro lañs pheyed la\(^64\) yan de bžin te l ro lañs dān\(^65\) ro lañs pheyed la bye brag ni 'di yod de l 'khor lo geig dān ìdan pa'i śîn rt\(a\) la 'jog pa dān l mguł du drīl bu geig 'dogs pa dān l lag par ral gri so (D143b) geig pa sbjīn pa ni ro lañs pheyed ces bya'o \(61\) luña ba nmā par gžag pa ni thams cad snä ma bžin du brjod par bya'o \(61\)

Minor variants to Extract "A"

1(a). l BCDJLNQS : HT om. l.
1(b). l BCDJQS : HLNT om. l.
1(c). tshes CDJLNQST : tshe B.
1(d). T adds la below line.
1(e). dur khrod CDJLNQST : du khrod B.
1(f). ro CDJLNQST : no B.
1(g). phra CDJLNQST : phu B.
1(h). smas CDJLNQS : smras BT.
1(i). ñams CDJLNQST : ñems B.
1(j). S adds l : not in BCDHJLNQT.
2(a). nas sa kar CDJQS : nas sa dkar H : na sa kar NT : nas kar BL.
2(b). sa kar BCDJLNQST : sa dkar H.
2(c). gyis drīl BCDJLNQS : gyi drī T.
2(d). l BHQS : CDJLNQ om. l.
2(e). T adds pu below line.
2(f). smyais BCDHJLNQT : rmyais S.
2(g). de BCDHJLNQT : de'i S.
2(i). drīl bu CDJLNQST : drī bu B.
3(a). te CDJLNQST : B om. te.
3(b). blag CDJLNQST : glag B.

---

\(^63\) ST : BCDJLNQ om. l.
\(^64\) la CDJHLNST : pa BQ.
\(^65\) BCDJQS add l : not in HLNST.
3(e). T adds žû below line.
3(d). gsod BDHJLNQST : gsod C.
3(e). bral CDJLNQST : zlal (l) B.
3(f). kyis CDJLNST : kyi BQ.
3(g). | BCDIQS : HLNT om. l.
3(h). | BCDIQS : HLNT om. l.
3(i). HLNT add l : not in BCDIQS.
3(j). žes CDJLNQST : žû B.
3(k). žes so BCDIQS = šeso LN : T om. žes so.
3(l). | BCDHIQS : LNT om. l.
3(m). | BDHJLNQST : C (end of line) om. l.
3(n). gal CDJLNQST : lag B.
3(o). ’gyur ro || BCDIQS : ’gyuro || LN : ’gyur ro | T.
4(a). bum pa BCDHIQS : bun pa LN : bun ba T.
4(b). pa BCDHJLNST : Q om. pa.
4(c). dan CDJLNQST : lan B.
4(d). ba btags BCDJLNQS : bar tags T.
4(e). T adds gu below line.
4(f). bûag CDJLNQST : bûag B.
4(g). me BDLNQS : mi CJ : ma T.
4(h). los CDJLNQST : lor B.
4(i). dpa’i BCHJLNQST : dpa’ D.
4(j). ma’i CDJLNQST : mi’i B.
4(k). | BDHJLNQST : C om. l.
4(l). pa BCDHJLNST : ma Q.
4(m). B adds ditographic par byed pa ’am l.
4(n). kyis BCDHIQNQST : kyî L.
4(o). dan BCDHJLNQT : dam S.
4(p). kun tu CDHJLNST : kun du BQ.
4(q). | DHLNST : BCJQ om. l.
4(r). kun tu CDHJLNST : kun du BJQ.
4(s). DHLNST add l : not in BCJQ.
4(t). pa BCDJLNQS : par T.
5(a). gsod BCDHJLNQT : bsod S.
5(b). la CDHJLNST : BQ om. la.
5(e). 'gyur ro || BCDJNS : 'gyuro || L : 'gyur ro || QT.
6(a). T adds giš below line.
6(b). la CDJLQST : kha (!) B.
6(c). po BDHJLQNT : por CS.
6(d). giši su BCDHJQST : gišisu LN.
6(e). las so || BCDHJS : las so || QT : laso || LN.
6(f). las so || CDHJS : las so || QT : laso || LN : las (!) so || B.
7(a). šin rta DLNQST : šin ta BC(J).
7(b). bya’o || CDHJLNS : bya’o || T : bya ba’o || B : bya ba’o || Q.
7(c). || BCDJLNS : || QT.

B. Extract from Vinayabhaṅga-padavyākhyaṇa of Viniṭadeva

'Dul ba rnam par byed pa’i tshig rnam par bṣad pa (Vinayabhaṅga-padavyākhyaṇa) of 'Dul ba’i lha (Viniṭadeva), translated by Jinamitra and Klu’i rgyal mtshan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Line Number</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>'dul ba' tshu</td>
<td>71b4–72a5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>'dul ba' tshu</td>
<td>62b2–63a2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>rnam 'byed vu</td>
<td>84b3–85a4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>mdo vu</td>
<td>69a6–69b5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>'dul ba’i 'grel pa' vu</td>
<td>74a4–74b5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. za la mar gyi no’i tshes buc nī žes bya ba ni tshes nī su dgu’o || ſi la’i ro žes bya ba ni mi’i ro’o || ma smas žes bya ba ni bu gu ma byun ba’o || ma ſams pa žes bya ba ni yan lag dum bur ma gyur pa’o ||

2. bya rmyaṅsžes bya ba ni lus gyen du ‘chu’68 ba’o ||

3. blag blag zer žiñ žes bya ba ni sgra blag blag zer žiñ no || ro laižes bya ba ni ’dre69 la sogs pa mi ma yin pa’o ||

4. (1) nags kyi phren ba žes bya ba ni nags tshal gyi nañ nas skies pa’i me tog dañ ’bras bu la byas pa’i phren ba’o ||

   (2) bum pa gan ba žes bya ba ni70 chus bkañ ba’o ||

66All variants are recorded. The paragraph numbers correspond to those of the root-text (Text A). Citations from the root-text in the Commentary are placed in bold-face type.

67rmyaṅs GNQ : rmyaṅ CD.
68‘chu CDNQ : ‘chu G.
69Q adds ba : not in CDGN.
70ba ni GNQ : ba’i CD.
(3) ba dañ be’ur ’dra ba žes bya ba ni smad gâis spu ga mhun pa’o ǁ
(5) mchig mchig gu dañ bcas pa žes bya ba ni mchig smad phrugs su ldan pa’o ǁ
(7) me tshugs sbar ba žes bya ba ni me bud pa’o ǁ
(8) rgyal ba žes bya ba ni de byin gšegs pa’o ǁ
(9) rgyal bas bka’ stsal pa žes bya ba ni becom ldan ’das kyi pho ña ’am l becom ldan ’das kyi bstan pa’o ǁ
(12) byañ chub sms dpa’ žes bya ba ni srid pa tha ma pa’o71 ǁ
(14) so sor thar pa žes bya ba ni dañ por thar pa’o ǁ ma bton72 pa žes bya ba ni kha ton73 du ma bslabs pa’o ǁ rgya cher dbyâns kyis žes bya ba ni gzan gyis thos pa’i sgras so ǁ
(16) mdo sde’i sde tshan74 bzhî po žes bya ba ni luñ riñ po dañ l luñ bar ma dañ l yañ dag par ldan pa’i luñ dañ l gcig las ’phros75 pa’i luñ dag go ǁ
(18) mdo chen po žes bya ba ni phas kyi rgol ba las rgyal bar byed pa’i phyir dañ l gnod sbyin gđug pa la sogs pa las rgyal bar byed pa’i phyir l ’bras bu chen po žes bya ba’i tha tshig go ǁ che ba žes bya ba ni don zab pa ŋid kyis76 don che ba’o ǁ de dag kyañ gañ že na mdo chen77 che ba brgyad de l ’di ltu ste žes bya bas dños su bstan pa dag yin no ǁ de dag gi luñ riñ po la sogs pa dag gi78 rgyud du gtogs pa yin no ǁ

5. gtañ žes bya ba ni gnas ma yin par gtañ ba’o ǁ dge sloñ bdag ŋid gsod par sms par ’gyur bas žes bya ba ni ro lañs des dge sloñ snags pa rañ ņid gsod par byed do žes bya ba’i tha tshig go ǁ

71 ma pa’o GNQ : ma’o CD.
72 ma bton GN : ma gton Q : kha ton CD.
73 kha ton GNQ : kha don CD.
74 tshan CDGQ : mtshan N.
75 ’phros CD : ’phos GNQ.
76 CDNQ : kyi G.
77 GNQ : CD om.
78 CGDN : dgag Q.
Three Pāli Works Revisited

Since it came into existence 125 years ago, the Pāli Text Society has kept editing works belonging to the Tipiṭaka in its narrow sense as well as other texts of all kinds. Some of those, however, have perhaps not attracted as much attention as they deserve, partly because the interests of Pāli scholars and the fashion of scholarship have not been in their favour. My modest purpose here is to awaken two of these somnolent works which are fully entitled to have corresponding entries in any history of Pāli literature: (1) the Buddhaghosuppatti (Bu-up) and (2) the Paṭṭhamasambodhi (Paṭṭh). Finally, I would like to collect some preliminary information on a third work, this time unpublished, (3) the Viddhamukhamanḍana (Vid), with the hope that the Pāli Text Society could include it on its agenda, thus contributing to fulfilling one of the desiderata for further Pāli studies mentioned by K.R. Norman: “The biggest deficiencies in Pāli publications in the West, however, are in editions of tikās and of Pāli texts composed in South-East Asia” (1994: 13–14 = 1996: 80–81).

1. The Buddhaghosuppatti or Buddhaghosanidāna

As the author of the Visuddhimagga and the famous commentator of the Tipiṭaka, Buddhaghosa is a highly venerated figure in the Buddhist world, especially in South-East Asia. The recent reprint by the Pāli Text Society (in 2001) of the edition and translation of the so-called Buddhaghosuppatti by James Gray, originally published in 1892, is an occasion to have a new look at the way the Pāli tradition at some point, in some

---

1. Both of them were read in toto or in part with students during classes held at the Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes (“Philologie moyen-indienne”) in 2001–2002 and 2004–2005. Brief preliminary remarks are available in the annual reports (Livret-Annuaire) and, for Bu-up, in Balbir 2001. — I am grateful to Dr Peter Skilling who provided Thai editions of these two works and a Burmese edition of the Jinālankāra (Jināl, see below section 2).

2. See below, n. 21.

place, looked at Buddhaghosa. Although Gray does not stand among the
most famous representatives of Pāli philology, he did some useful work
in the field during the years he spent in Burma where he taught Pāli in
schools and translated some works which were of current use among
Buddhists of Burma at the end of the nineteenth century.3 His interest in
biographical and hagiographical works was materialised by his edition
and translation of two works: the Jinālāṅkāra (see below, section 2) and
the Buddhaghosuppatti, for which he expressed his strong liking in
unambiguous terms: “The narrative is intensely interesting…. It reads
in fact like an Arthurian romance…. The story in its entirety will be
found highly diverting as well as instructive” (Bu-up 1892, 1981: 2, 9).
But he was aware of the historical limitations of the work: “Facts of
historical value cover only a limited space on the comparatively broad
canvas of the narrative, and will probably add very little to what is
already known of Buddhaghosa. The story, however, brings the per-
sonality of that eminent man vividly before our minds and enforces a
greater interest in him than ever; and if it does this only, it can be safely
said that it was not written in vain” (Bu-up 1892, 1981: 9). Indeed,
given the interests of Buddhist studies of those times in chronology, this
brief work of thirty pages had less to bring than the Sinhalese vamsas
since it does not mention any king’s name or any date which could be
cross-checked. But it certainly contributes to constructing “la légende de
Buddhaghosa”, to quote the title of Louis Finot’s stimulating article
(1921), and could well have been included among the sources studied
by the contributors to the volume Sacred Biography in the Buddhist
Traditions of South and Southeast Asia (ed. Schober 1997).

Like other works dealing with Buddhaghosa, the present account is
organized around his pivotal rôle in the transmission and renewal of the
scriptures and their original language. It starts with his birth on earth as
a reincarnation of a god sent by Sakka for the special mission of
“translating” the teachings from their original “Sinhalese”, which could

3See Balbir 2001, n. 2.
no longer be understood, into “the language of Magadha”.\(^4\) This narrative frame, which has been clearly drawn along the lines of Nāgasena’s career as sketched in the Milindapañha (see Finot 1921: 113; Bu-up 1892, 1981: 69; Law 1923: 25–47), sets Buddhaghosa in the broad perspective of an *avatāra*. The biography extends “before the Cradle and past the Grave”, in the way traditional Burmese biographies do (*at-htok-pat-ti*, Houtman in Schober 1997: 311): before his advent on earth Buddhaghosa is a god, after his death on earth he will be Maitreya’s disciple. In between, the eight brief chapters which recount his life are meant to show that in order to become a great man one requires more than intellectual qualities.

If several episodes are viewed from this perspective, they do not appear to be secondary or simply entertaining. On the contrary, they play a part in providing the biography with meaning. The emphasis laid on Buddhaghosa’s childhood is a part of the plan meant to show that the intellectual brightness which is his outstanding characteristic has always been there. The utterance of a paradoxical assertion which cannot be understood by the audience first provokes derision, then a respect which leads to an inversion of the ordinary social rôles when Buddhaghosa’s father admits, “You are my father and I am like your son” (40,7ff.). In the fifth chapter, which could seem a diversion, Buddhaghosa is a witness to a dispute which has come up between two ladies and takes note of the insults they throw at each other. These notes will have a determining rôle to play in solving the matter at a later stage. They are one of the several cases in this biography where the written document appears to be of importance as a reserved, discrete testimony which can be used when the situation arises. Such episodes underline both the lucidity and modesty of the teacher and his connection with transmission in general. The question of learning and the use of languages is also dealt with in narrative disguise: apart from the initial replacement of Sinhalese by Pāli, the competition between Pāli and Sanskrit, and the

\[^4\]On this question see Granoff 1991.
status of Sanskrit in the context of Buddhism are salient: as the son of a Brahman working as a royal chaplain, the young Buddhaghosa is probably conversant with Sanskrit. After his conversion to Buddhism, he seems to leave it in the background and follows a purely Buddhist curriculum sketched out in the story through selected technical terms. But the idea that no education could be complete without a knowledge of Sanskrit seems to be stressed when Buddhaghosa has to prove that he masters this language in front of monks who thought he was ignorant of it by reciting a few Sanskrit stanzas (rather badly treated in the manuscripts: Bu-up 1892, 1981: 72–73).

The origin and diffusion of the text need further investigation. Gray’s edition is based on four manuscripts in Burmese script, for which no details are given. On the other hand, on the basis of the ascription of the text to a Thera Mahâmañgala found at the end, Gray was of the opinion that the text could have come from Ceylon or could be dated “to the thirteenth century as the period when the Pitakas and their commentaries were taken to Ceylon from Burma” (Bu-up 1892, 1981: 33). A little more can be said now that more documentation is available. First, no manuscript seems to have emerged from Ceylon, whereas a rather large number are to be found in South-East Asian collections, whether they are kept in Burma, Thailand, or the West.5

The title Buddhaghosanidåna is largely prevalent over the title uppatti (which, anyway, is a sort of synonym, and could remind us of the term used in Burma). The text is often provided with a nissaya and was sometimes equated to a Jåtaka (in the broad acceptation of the term). References to it or summaries are met with in late Pāli historical texts written in Burma (Jinakālamāli, Gandhavaṃsa, Sāsanavaṃsa), where it seems to have become the standard for other works on Buddhaghosa.6 As for Thailand, the Pāli scholar Sammot Amarabandhu (1860–1915), who wrote an introduction in Thai to an edition of the Pāli

5See Balbir 2001, n. 28 for further details.
6See, respectively, PTS ed., p. 71, line 17; Minayeff 1886, pp. 65 and 75; B.C. Law’s translation (London, 1923), pp. 32–33 (text, pp. 29–30).
text and its Thai translation, mentions the fact that people liked very much to have sermons on this subject, which was called Thet Phra Phuttakhosa, and that it was considered to convey benefits (ānisamsa). He also indicates that the verses, which are interspersed at several places in the text, are borrowed from the Vaṃsamālīni, that the style of composition does not resemble older texts and that it is likely that the work was composed in Thailand, Laos, or Burma, since it is not in the style of old texts from Lanka.

In Burma, the Pāli Bu-up has served as a basis for retellings in Burmese.\(^7\) I would also suggest that Bu-up seems to exhibit a combination of canonical and local elements. Some technical details seem to be in tune with what is known otherwise from South-East Asian traditions and practices, although any interpretation should be done with great caution. The narrative of Ghosa’s conversion to Buddhism, which could be inspired by the Milindapañha, is not a mere reproduction of it. The ordination ritual is different from canonical narratives as well. After the first stage, the removal of hair and beard expressed through the well-known formula kesa-massu ohāretvā, the next one is to “take off the layman’s smell through moist sandal powder” (alla-candana-cuṇṇehi gihi-gandham jhāpetvā, 44.27). This feature does not seem to be mentioned before the commentary on the Vinaya and the texts based on it. More relevant, the candidate wears white clothes and receives as the ordination formula the five topics of meditation (pañca kamma††††håna), i.e. the list of the first five body elements (kesā, lomā, nakhå, dantå, taco, 44.26ff.). This process recalls the traditions of the pabbajjå as they have been observed in South-East Asia.

Bu-up is a vivid example of the way religious instruction is provided. Conversion of both Ghosa’s father (chapter 3) and Ghosa himself is achieved through a teaching with practical or immediate purpose, not through any elaborate doctrinal discussion, and the Buddha’s teaching is called a manta (43.5, 44.4 ff.). Strikingly, the iti pi

\(^7\) See Braun and Myint 1985, No. 222.
so formula is one of the media in use. Finally, the way Buddhaghosa as an enthusiastic new convert proceeds with his father, putting him for a time in a gabbhaku††¥ (46,24) carefully locked (cf. yanta, 47,2) is reminiscent of the "embryogénie sacrée visant à fournir à l’adepte un modèle dans sa quête du Nibbåna qui passe par une régression utérine".

On the other hand, it remains to be seen whether any conclusion can be drawn from the analysis of the verses scattered in Bu-up and from their identification or available parallels. In some cases, they are helpful for a better establishment or understanding of the text. One of the most striking cases is provided by the technically elaborated passage of chapter 2 (43,16*-23*), the edition of which is unsatisfactory but can be improved through recourse to the Abhidhammåvatåra and its commentary (chapter 1, stanzas 29, 31, 62).

2. THE PATHAMASAMBODHI
The Pathamasambodhi (Pa††h) can be described as a biography of the Buddha coming from South-East Asia, and even more precisely from Thailand, where the nineteenth-century version written by the prince-monk Paramanuchit-chinorot (= S*) is a well-known text: "[The Pathamasambodhikatha] is a series of sermons intended for ritual recitation at events such as the Wisakha Buuchaa, which are held all night in commemoration of the Buddha’s birth, enlightenment, and decease. It represents a Thai version of the standard biography of the Buddha, which is based on canonical and Sinhalese commentarial works and written in ornate prose style" (Taylor 1997: 292). Although the Pāli Text Society edition was published only a few years ago, the interest in this work is not new. It was brought to light by the French scholar George Cœœdès (1886–1969) who published two articles on this work (1916A and 1968) and had prepared its text using a large number of

---

8For bibliographical references regarding these two elements see Balbir 2001, nn. 18 and 19.
9Bizot 1980, p. 222.
manuscripts. This text is the basis of the PTS edition (= E°), finalized for publication by Dr Jacqueline Filliozat. Reading Pa††h through this edition leaves the reader in a rather confused state, facing a large number of variants which are not really helpful. On the other hand, the tools which could be of use in understanding what Pa††h is or is meant to be are missing. Given the form of the work where prose and verses alternate, an index of stanzas, for instance, with a concordance would have been appropriate; instead the concordances to the verses of the Nidånakathå (Nidåna-k),\textsuperscript{11} to which the Pa††hamasambodhi is obviously connected, when mentioned, are buried among the variants. The stanzas other than those examined below are either difficult to identify or come from canonical works of wide circulation.\textsuperscript{12}

Both George Coedès and Jacqueline Filliozat were rightly puzzled by the varying structure and contents of the work as evidenced by the manuscripts. The number of chapters, for instance, is not always the same. But one may go further into the textual history of the Pa††hamasambodhi and its composition. In many ways the form of Pa††h is reminiscent of a prose commentary to a verse text. Narrative prose passages of varying lengths end with formulas of the type tena dassento åha, accusative + dassento åha, or tena vuttam, followed by one or

\textsuperscript{11}Ja I 2–94.

\textsuperscript{12}For instance Pa††h (references are to verse numbers) 70 = Nidåna-k (references are to verse numbers) 271; Pa††h 106 = Nidåna-k 272; Pa††h 184–85 = Sn 544–45; Pa††h 190–91 = Dhp 153–54 and Nidåna-k 278–79; Pa††h 160 = Dhp 179 and Nidåna-k 280; Pa††h 198–99 = Vin I 3,27–30 and Ud 10,18*–21* (my attention was drawn to these two stanzas by Thi Phumthapthim, Kânsakså priapthiap kamphi lalîvisatara ke khamphï pathomsomphôt. A comparative study of the Lalitavistara and the Pathamasambodhi, Bangkok, Silpakorn University, 2543 [2000], who on p. 6 draws a parallel between two Pa††h stanzas and Lalitavistara, p. 380, lines 16–19 (Lefmann edition), p. 276 (Vaidya edition), but does not mention their old Pâli occurrences. The parallel is interesting but is it conclusive for any connection between the Pâli and the Sanskrit biographies of the Buddha?); Pa††h 224 = Nidåna-k 289; Pa††h 225 = Nidåna-k 290; Pa††h 226 = Dhp 168 and Nidåna-k 292; Pa††h 227, 228 = Dhp 169 and Nidåna-k 293.
several stanzas. Their total number is 254 in E, but for a right assessment of the situation it is better to take into account only the part of the text going up to the end of the chapter *Dhammacakkaparivatta* which is common to E and S, i.e. the first 223 stanzas of E, to which nine stanzas wrongly not printed as verses (see n. 14) should be added.\(^\text{13}\)

Fifty-nine of them, i.e. approximately one fourth, are similar to or identical with stanzas found in the Jinālāṅkāra (Jināl; see Table below). This starts almost at the very beginning:

\begin{quote}

\textit{tath’ eva saṃsāra-pathe janānaṃ …} (= Jināl 30)

\textit{yo sāgare jalam adhika-rudhira adāsi …} (= Jināl 31)

\textit{buddhā lokāloke loke jāto …} (= Jināl 172)
\end{quote}

Here, the verse concordance is not the only sign of the presence of the Jinālāṅkāra. The preceding prose sentence ("like the shade for people similar to the mango tree even at the time of sowing the seed of merit for the enjoyment of the fruit") is already a somewhat terse and elliptic rewriting of verse 29 of this text preserving its important words with a loose syntactic connection between them:

\begin{quote}
*yo magga-passe madhur’-amba-bijaṃ  
chāyā-phal’-atthāya mahā-janānaṃ  
ropesi tasmiṃ hi khaṇe va tena  
chāyā-phale puṇāṃ aladdham uddhamā* (Jināl 29)
\end{quote}

He who has sown the seed of a sweet mango on the roadside with the object of providing shade and fruit, even in the very moment of sowing it, in virtue of the shade and the fruit [he intends to provide], there is acquired by him whatever merit had not been obtained before (Gray’s translation, p. 85).

\(^{13}\)S\(^{\text{S}}\) represents an amplified version in 29 chapters (Cœœdès 1968 in PTS edition: lvi–lvii) where, after this point, a great deal of additional material in prose and verse is found.
In one case, the verses are precisely introduced with reference to their literary form (*yamakagāthāṃ āha*, Paṭṭh E 73,12), unmistakably pointing to the Jinālāṅkāra, which is well known as a unique composition replete with *tours de force*, especially *yamakas* (see Paṭṭh 74 = Jināl 73). In another case, the sophisticated style of the stanza which makes use of alliterations and paradoxical statements speaks for itself:

*bhajitaś cājitaś pavanāṃ bhavanāṃ*

*jahitaś gahitaś samalaṃ amalaṃ*

*sugataś agataś sugatiṃ agatiṃ*

*namitaś (v.l. namāti) amitaṃ namatiṃ sumatiṃ*

Paṭṭh 53 [= 136,19–37,2 not printed as verse in E'] = Jināl 173

In a single case, an author’s name is explicitly mentioned: *taṃ dasento Buddharakkhitācariyo āha* (E 114,12; S p. 87), followed by a verse (numbered 145 in E') which is identical to Jinālāṅkāra 115 (E'). This suggests that the connection between the two works was clear to the redactor of the Paṭṭhamasambodi himself and that the implied grammatical subject of āha in many other cases is also the author of the Jinālāṅkāra. This gives support to the identity of Buddharakkhita as the author of the Jinālāṅkāra, a fact which was not unanimously admitted in the tradition.\(^\text{14}\) The evidence of the Paṭṭhamasambodi confirms what we know for certain from the statements found at the end of the commentary on the Jinālāṅkāra and from the colophons (Norman 1983: 157; von Hinüber 1996 §407), that the author of the Jinālāṅkāra was indeed Buddharakkhita, a Thera born in Rohaṇa (Ceylon) who wrote it in 1156 C.E.

On the other hand the distribution of the fifty-nine stanzas common to the Paṭṭhamasambodi and the Jinālāṅkāra is not without significance. They are not spread over the fourteen chapters which build Paṭṭh in its most complete form. They are found only in the part narrating the life of the Buddha from his last incarnations in the Tusita heaven up to his

---

\(^{14}\) See the conflicting evidence of the Gandhavamsa (Buddhadatta) and of the Saddhammasangaha (Buddharakkhita) quoted in I.B. Horner’s foreword to the reprint of the Jinālāṅkāra.
Enlightenment (Abhisambodhi, chapter VIII in E; chapter XI in S), not in the later chapters. This fact could be additional evidence to support the hypothesis made by Cœœdès about the progressive development of Path in three stages starting around a core corresponding to this period of the Buddha’s life:

The Pathamasambodhi originally may have included eight chapters which traced the life of the Buddha from his life in the Tusita heaven to his awakening.... A little later, the addition of two or three chapters continued the story up to the sermon in Benares. This stage corresponds to the Yuon translation in the manuscript of Copenhagen. Later still, the story was continued up to the *parinirvāṇa*. This stage included about fifteen chapters and is represented by the eighteenth-century manuscripts (Path E lx).

As for the first stage, one can now state that the Jinālāṅkāra stands among its main sources. The table of correspondences (below) shows that verses from the Jinālāṅkāra are often quoted in blocks so that some sections of the Jinālāṅkāra are incorporated *in toto* or in part in the Pathamasambodhi. Thus both works have a close intertextual relation. This observation also gives weight to the chronological deductions proposed by Cœœdès on the basis of two other converging facts: (1) the oldest sculptures that depict the Earth wringing out her hair in order to inundate Māra’s army date from the twelfth century; (2) a stanza of the Path found in an inscription from Nakhon Pathom in Thailand also appears in the Sāratthasamuccaya, which also dates from the twelfth century. Since the Jinālāṅkāra also dates back to the same period, and since the quotations from the Jinālāṅkāra appear precisely in the same part of the work, we could be slightly more assertive than Cœœdès, who wrote, “We should not go as far as to imply that the Pathamasambodhi itself dates from this period, even if the two chapters that include the legend of the Earth and the stanza are part of the oldest part of the text” (Path E lxiv).

Trying to read the verses of Path through the PTS edition is not an easy task. First, there are passages which have been printed as prose
while they should have been printed as verses,\textsuperscript{15} or incorrect word separations. Despite the considerable number of manuscripts used, the text is often unsatisfactory, even in cases where it offers no special difficulty. Both the Thai edition of Paññh re-reflecting the full modern version prepared by Prince Paramanujit in 1845 (= S\textsuperscript{e}, pp. 278–79 for the colophon verses already quoted in Cœœdès 1916B: 4, n. 1) and the editions of the Jinālāṅkāra have to be called on for help. On the other hand, the establishment of the text of the latter would also benefit from a comparison of the two texts (see Table below).

It is not only in the verses that the connection between the Paññhamasambodhi and the Jinālāṅkāra is clearly seen. Comparing the prose of the former with the commentary on the latter underlines their mutual affinity. Although Paññ is not strictly speaking a commentary, it has some formal features of the genre: the style of the introductory formulas preceding the quotation of stanzas is one of them (see above). Another one is the typical device of singling out a word of a stanza just quoted for explanation:

\begin{quote}
\textquote{sayāṃ Nārāyanabalo abhiññabala\textbar pāragā}
jetum sabbassa lokassa Bodhi\textbar mantam upāgamī ti (Paññ E\textsuperscript{e} 148, S\textsuperscript{e} p. 88, v.1. pāramibala\textbar pāragā = Jināl 118)
tattha “Nārāyanabalo” ti … tattha Nārāyanabalo nāma dassento āha:
kālāvaka ca Ga\textbar geyya
panḍaram tānha-pi\textbar gala
gandha-ma\textbar gala
uposatha ca
\textquote{The wording of the commentary on Nārāyanabalo in Paññ and in the Jinālāṅkāra-\textbar kā (Jināl-\textbar B) are almost identical, and the stanza listing the ten powers is also found at the same place in this commentary. A}

\textsuperscript{15}The following passages should be printed as verses: E\textsuperscript{e} 23.8–10 (S\textsuperscript{e} p. 40); E\textsuperscript{e} 79.11–13 (Māra … athiko) and 79.13–14 (sabbam … anuttaro) are two anu\textbar ūthbhās (S\textsuperscript{e} p. 69); E\textsuperscript{e} 95.5–7 (S\textsuperscript{e} p. 77); E\textsuperscript{e} 111.14–15 is the continuation of the stanza numbered as 142 (S\textsuperscript{e} p. 86); E\textsuperscript{e} 128.15–17 (S\textsuperscript{e} p. 96); E\textsuperscript{e} 136.15–137.2 (3 stanzas, see below; S\textsuperscript{e} pp. 100–101).
full fledged comparison of the prose of both texts, which cannot be
undertaken here, would easily show that this is just an instance out of
many where prose passages in both works have the same wording and
where stanzas incorporated in Paññ are quoted at the same place in the
Jināl-1.16 The ultimate source of these common stanzas could well be a
third text: the five stanzas listing the bad omens appearing before
Māra’s army in Paññ (Ee 161–65) are also found (with variant readings)
in the Jināl-1 (Be pp. 277–78), where they are introduced with the
sentence: vuttaṃ h’ etam porāne ti. Needless to say, great benefit could
be taken from such a comparison for improving the often deficient or
unclear text of Paññ as given in Ee (despite the impressive critical
apparatus). The interrelation with Jināl, however, is rather complex. The
passage where the goddess Earth (Vasundhāra vanitā) wrings out her
hair in order to inundate Māra’s army and cause his final defeat (Paññ Ee
134.17ff.), made famous by Cœœdès’s article (1916A) is specific to the
Paññamasambodhi, and appears to be deliberately so, as the version of
the Jinālāṅkāra is in conformity with the classical depiction with the
earth shaking, the terrestrial noise, and the roaring noise in the sky
caused by a thunderbolt.17 Except for these few lines, the rest of the
prose of Paññ is rather close to what can be found in the corresponding
Jinālāṅkāra-ṭīkā (Be p. 285): what comes before this episode is a
commentary on stanza 181 (= Jināl 138) similar to Jināl-1 and what
comes after it (135.11ff.) is similar to Jināl-1 on Jināl 140–41 (not quoted
in Paññ).

16Compare, for instance, Paññ Ee p. 137 and Jināl-1 quoted in Jināl Ee p. 63 (Be
p. 289); Paññ Ee 136.15–19 (not printed as verses!) = Se p. 86 = Jināl-1 Be
p. 286 as stanzas 161 and 162.

17The Earth as a beautiful lady who appeared in front of the Buddha is given at
an earlier stage of the narrative as told in Paññ, at the time of the Great
Renunciation: tadā Dharaṇī varavanitā Bodhisattassa vittakkā niḥtvā, etc.
(Ee 80.8).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pathamasambodhi verse number in E&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt; (chapter)&lt;sup&gt;19&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Jinālāṅkāra verse number in E&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt; (chapter)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 (Tussita); b reads differently in S&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;: atthāya attānām achādāvyanto; c has been transmitted differently in Path and Jināl&lt;sup&gt;20&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>30 (Bodhisambhāradhipaniṅgāthā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (Tussita); read jaladhikarudhiran in a E&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>31 (Bodhisambhāradhipaniṅgāthā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (read ko na mmatto; bho prob. to be read as ko); = 54 (Tussita)</td>
<td>172 (Abhisambodhidipaniṅgāthā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (Tussita)</td>
<td>32 (Gabhokkantidipaniṅgāthā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (Tussita)</td>
<td>33 (Gabhokkantidipaniṅgāthā); superfluous ca in c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 (Gabhābhinnikkhamana); d is unmetsrical in all versions (dasa-sahassi pakampitha Jināl).</td>
<td>34 (Gabhokkantidipaniṅgāthā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 (Gabh.)</td>
<td>35 (Gabhokkantidipaniṅgāthā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 (Gabh.); note Lumbali / Lumbani in b; read vijīyī tām in d E&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>36 (Vijāyanamaṅgaladipaniṅgāthā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 (Gabh.)</td>
<td>39 (Vijāyanamaṅgaladipaniṅgāthā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 (Gabh.); c vivattati; d na dissare cāmarachattagāhakā</td>
<td>38 (Vijāyanamaṅgaladipaniṅgāthā); c vipatanti E&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;; vijenti B&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;; d kha-jjimsu bherī ca nadimsu samkhā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 (Gabh.); d te devā dātā E&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt; is strange (no v.l.); S&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt; te devā tadā makes more sense.</td>
<td>178 (Navagunadipaniṅgāthā); d te devā brahmā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 (Lakkanaparīggaḥ); b E&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt; subhattā, S&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt; subhuttā</td>
<td>44 (Vijāyanamaṅgaladipaniṅgāthā); b subhuttā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 (Lakkhāna.)</td>
<td>173 (Abhisambodhidipaniṅgāthā)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>18</sup>Based on the comparison of Pathamasambodhi E<sup>e</sup> with Jinālāṅkāra E<sup>e</sup>.<sup>19</sup>Chapter division as in E<sup>e</sup>.<sup>20</sup>Only the most significant variants are recorded here; incorrect word separations are not taken into account. For a full critical edition of the verses all available documents would have to be taken up systematically and their readings considered in view of the metrical constraints.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>(Lakkhaṇa); not in S&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt; at this place; see above 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>(Lakkhaṇa); wrong divisions of some words in E&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;; not in S&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt; at this place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>(Rājābhiseka); b E&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt; ābhāyikā; S&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt; abhāyikā, compare Gray Jināl p. 56.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>(Rājābhiseka); d E&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt; S&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt; devaputtattam upāgami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>(Rājābhiseka); minor variants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>(Rājābhiseka); minor variants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>(Mahābhīnīkkhamana); d itthiyō in E&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt; to be cancelled as indicated in the note.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>(Mahābhīnīkkhamana); 73 (Pāduddhāravimhayadīpāni)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>(Mahābhīnīkkhamana)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>(Mahābhīnīkkhamana); d E&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt; S&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt; samghuttā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>(Mahābhīnīkkhamana); b E&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt; jināviriypāṇi raticcidāni but S&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt; thīnapa viypāṇi raticcidāni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>(Mahābhīnīkkhamana)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>(Mahābhīnīkkhamana); c E&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt; paccamukhe but S&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt; maccumukhe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>(Mahābhīnīkkhamana)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>(Mahābhīnīkkhamana); c E&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt; payāte; S&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt; mayā te; d vinay(y)ā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>(Mahābhīnīkkhamana); c E&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt; vīyāte; S&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt; mayā te; d vinay(y)ā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>(Mahābhīnīkkhamana); c E&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt; sattā satanā; S&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt; sattā sataṇṭaṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>(Mahābhīnīkkhamana); c E&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt; Gāyabhirāpaṇam pi Yasodhara-varan; S&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt; tāyabhirāpaṇam pi Yasodharaṃ varan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>(Mahåbhìnìkkhamana); c to be emended: the pun on the verb <em>riñcati</em> which is the main point of the verse is lost in the text as it is printed; compare Jìnàl 89 (Dvipåda.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>(Mahåbhìnìkkhamana); c is different in Path and Jìnàl 68 (Påduddhàravimhaya dipaniyàtthà)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>(Mahåbhìnìkkhamana); b the correct reading should be <em>bhåbhånibhåni</em> 85 (Apunaràvattigamanadipaniyàmakagàthà)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>(Mahåbhìnìkkhamana); d £S* yàto tato hi nimittëhi surissarehi* 86 (Apunaràvatti.); d yàto tato hi mahito purisassarehi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>(Mahåbhìnìkkhamana); minor variants 69 (Påduddhàra.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>(Mahåbhìnìkkhamana); to be fully reconsidered 70 (Påduddhàra.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>(Mahåbhìnìkkhamana) 78 (Apunaràvatti.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>(Mahåbhìnìkkhamana) 79 (Apunaràvatti.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>(Mahåbhìnìkkhamana) 80 (Apunaràvatti.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>(Mahëãhi.) 81 (Apunaràvatti.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>(Mahëãhi.) 82 (Apunaràvatti.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>(Mahëãhi.) 83 (Apunaràvatti.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>(Mahëãhi.) 84 (Apunaràvatti.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>(Buddhàpijà); c <em>Bodhim pariñjitasane</em>; d £E* S* yuddhàya Måre niccalo nisìdi*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>115 (Mårapàràyadipaniyàtthà); c £E* bodhimhi pariñjitasane*; B* bodhim upariñjitasane*; d yuddhàya Mårenàcalo nisìdi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>(Buddhàpijà) 117 (Mårapàràyajà.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>(Buddhàpijà); S* pàramìbala-pàragà* 118 (Mårapàràyajà.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>(Må ravijàya); b £E* S* chaddetha chedakam ìnam* 120 (Mårapàràyajà.); b chañçetha cetakam ìnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>(Må ravijàya); a £E* åsino* ; S* åsi no* 123 (Mårapàràyajà.); a kaså åsi nu £E*, no B*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: £ denotes the Path text, S denotes the Saïyàl text.
3. THE VIDADDHAMUKHAMĀṇḍANA

A solid hint as to the existence of this work in Burma is supplied in Aggavaṇḍa’s Saddanīti (see Kraatz 1968 i : xvi):

\[ \text{mā vuccatī sīri}; \text{tathā hi Vidaddhamukhamāṇḍana-ṭikāyāṃ mālinī ti pādaśi' atmām vadatā “mā vuccatī Lakkhī, alinī ti bhamarī” ti vutām, lakkhī sadā ca sīri-saddena samān’-attho, tena “mā vuccatī sīri” ti attho anhehi anumattato (244.19’).} \]

\[ \text{mā means “prosperity”. In fact, when giving the meaning of the word mālinī, the commentary on the Vidaddhamukhamāṇḍana says, “mā means} \]

---

21At this stage I can only collect a few preliminary remarks. More details on the text will follow on another occasion. I am grateful to all those who, in addition to Dr Peter Skilling, helped me to progress in this research during my stay in Bangkok (August 2007): Peter Nyunt, who is cataloguing the Fragile Palm Leaves Manuscripts; Venerable Mahathiab Malai of Wat Jetuphon (Wat Pho), who granted permission to see the manuscripts kept there; Jacqueline Filliozat, who kindly sent the relevant information contained in her unpublished catalogue of the manuscripts at Wat Jetuphon (Wat Pho) and accompanied me there during our brief visit on 29 August; Mr Dokrak Payaksri and Mr Wisithisak Sattapan (EFEQ, Bangkok), who kindly devoted a few hours to the reading of parts of the two Tham manuscripts, photocopies of which were kindly provided by Dr Peter Skilling (see below).
prosperity, *alini* means bee." The word *lakkhi* has the same meaning as the word *siri*. This is why we have admitted the statement "*mā* means prosperity".

This passage occurs within a section devoted to the discussion of monosyllables (*ekakkhara*, 239.6–46.8) in the context of nominal declension and the establishment of grammatical gender of the words considered. They are reviewed in alphabetical order, just as a specialized lexicon of the class *Ekakkharakosa* would do. Starting with *ko* meaning "Brahmā, wind, and body" (239.6ff.), the list ends with *samī* (245.4ff.). Compounds formed with monosyllables are treated along the way (such as *vindo*, "lord of the birds", *vi + indo*, 240.4–5). As always with Aggavaṃsa, the discussion is substantiated by examples and quotations taken from various texts.

The presence of this quotation in the Saddanīti implies that not only the work itself but a corresponding commentary were known at the time of Aggavaṃsa, that is to say, in the second half of the twelfth century C.E. The question of its origin and diffusion, however, have not yet been solved. Vid is not specifically a Pāli work; there is a Vid in Sanskrit, which, in four chapters, presents both definitions and illustrations of various types of riddles, and was widely disseminated in India. It is a sophisticated work which calls for knowledge of grammar and vocabulary (especially monosyllable words or rare words) in all their niceties. Therefore in addition to manuscripts and editions containing the verses only, there are many where an elucidating commentary is also provided. The religious affiliation of the author, a certain Dharmadāsa, about whom nothing reliable is known, has been debated: was he a Buddhist, a Jain (Vid is highly popular in Jain circles, where other authors have also composed similar works), or neither? His date is also very uncertain: near the seventh century (Kraatz 1968: xviii) or much later (the eleventh, thirteenth, or fifteenth century).

The passage quoted by Aggavaṃsa refers to a stanza which reads as follows in Sanskrit:
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urasi Mura-bhidaḥ kā gādhām āloṅgītāste?
sarasija-makaramômôdítâ nandane kā?
giri-samam-laṅghu-varnum aṅavâkhyâitisaṅkhyâir
gurabhir api kṣāt kā chandasâm vṛtt-ramyâ?
mâlîni. mā = lakṣmîn; alini = bhramarî; mâlîni nāma chando vṛttam

(2.36).

Which lady remains closely embraced to Mura’s murderer?
In the Nandana who (fem.) is rejoiced in the pollen of the lotuses?
Having a number of light syllables identical to [the number of] mountains, and heavy syllables numbering the word “ocean”, which among the metres is pleasant?

The answer to the first question is mā, a monosyllabic designation for Lakṣmî, the answer to the second one is alini “a bee”, whereas the addition of both produces the answer to the third question, mâlîni, as the name of the famous metre having eight light and seven heavy syllables (4×−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−−). The stanza is meant to illustrate the variety of riddles known as vṛttanāmajâti, where the answer to be found is the name of a metre. It is is the second example of this variety: in the preceding stanza, 2.35, the name of the metre to be guessed through a similar method is sîkharînî. An additional nicety: although Dharma-dāsa’s definition does not state it explicitly, both his examples show that the riddle verse is written in the metre to be discovered.22

This parallel suggests that the Pāli and the Sanskrit Vid are closely interrelated. Further, Aggavamâsa’s quotation could make one expect that manuscripts of a Pāli Vid with commentary following the Sanskrit model could be found in Burma. There are serious hints, indeed, to suggest that the tradition relating to Vid was kept alive in Burma even later than Aggavamâsa’s time. At a later period there are stray references found in historical documents or lists of books. For instance, Vidagdha, rightly understood by Bode (1909: 108, No. 265) as the abbreviation of Vidagdhâmukhâmânâdana, is mentioned among the non-canonical works found in the Pagan inscription dated 1442 A.D. which gives the contents

---

22This additional feature is made clear in the Jain reworking of the definition in Mahâkavi Ajitasena’s Alamkâracintâmaṇi, see Balbir 2004, p. 299.
of the library (Luce & Tin Htway 1976: 246, No. 268). The Gandhavaṃsa mentions Vid in a discussion relating to Vepulabuddhi’s works (see below). The Piṭakat-tō-samuit: (= Piṭakatthamain, Nos. 1065 and 1066) mentions a manuscript of the text of Vid (the language of which is not given) and a manuscript of a commentary composed by Vimalabuddhi, described as a monk from the Mahāvihāra in Anurādhapura, a fact which suggests that the commentary could have been written before 1017 (Kraatz 1968: xvi–xvii).

So far no manuscript evidence of Vid seems to be available from Sri Lanka. The only manuscripts of Vid which have been traced come from South-East Asia.

The only Burmese manuscript of Vid which could be traced and consulted so far is not a Pāli work (Ms 510 belonging to the Fragile Palm Leaves collection, “Manuscript House”, Pakkret, Bangkok). It is a very clearly written manuscript of the Sanskrit work by Dharmadāsa in Burmese script, with the usual signs for noting Sanskrit phonemes.23 Vid occupies folios ka to khi (8 lines per page) and is at present in a bundle containing the following works: Sandhikālāp pāṭh, Paroparissabheda nī pat nisya, Abhidhammavibhāvani-ṭīkā and Ṭīkā-kyo.

Beginning: namaḥ sarvajñāya ||
śiddhau adhāni bhava-duḥkha-mahāgadānām, etc. (= Skt VMM 1.1)
End: iti Dharmmādāsa-kīte Vidaggamukhamanḍane caturttīha pari-cchedah || Vidagga-granthan niśhitam || ||
akkharā ekkam ekañ ca Buddha-rūpaṁ samāṁ siyā
tasmā hi paṇḍito poso likheyā pīṭaka-ttayam ||
Marginal title on the last folio: Vidag kwyam mrat.

This is a manuscript of the mūla only without any commentary. The four chapters of the work as distributed as follows: 1 ends on kī verso, line 7; 2 on kai recto, line 1; 3 on kah recto, line 1. The author’s name is consistently written throughout as Dharmmādāsa. The verses are numbered, starting from 1 at the beginning of a new chapter, but not

23See Bechert 1979, p. xxi (“Table of Transliteration”).
throughout. The verse to which Aggavamsa refers is found on fol. kū recto and verso:

\[
\text{urası muda (sic)-bhidā kā gūḍhyam ālīṅgūtāste?} \\
\text{sarasija-makrandandítā moditā kā?} \\
\text{gīrī-sana-laghu-varṇśair aṇṇavākhyāta-sāṅkhye (sic)} \\
\text{garubhīr api kītā kā cchandasā (sic) vīṭṭir agrā? || mālīni || vītanāma-jātī ||} \\
\]

A few lines above (kū recto, line 5) the verse occurs which successively gives the definitions of two varieties of riddles, the second of which is the vītanāma-jātī (see below). On the whole, the manuscript is correct. Neither Vid nor the rest of the manuscript have any date or place of copying. As is well known, the position of Sanskrit learning in Burma was very different from that of Ceylon. Pāli and Burmese were the common languages in monastic education. Sanskrit, however, was not absent and remained associated with specialized traditional disciplines of knowledge (śāstras). Vid, which combines knowledge of grammar, lexicography, metrics, poetics, etc., belongs to such a sphere. In particular, “King Bodawpaya (1781–1819) … sent a number of missions to collect Sanskrit works in Varanasi and other places in India and Ceylon. These books were transliterated into Burmese script and many of them were translated into Burmese language or into Pāli” (Bechert and Braun 1981: xxxix). The manuscript of Vid could date from this period and could belong to this Sanskrit renaissance, although the work does not appear in the rich list of “Sanskrit texts imported into Burma between 1786 and 1818” (Than Tun 1960: 132–41). Thus, this idea is only a mere hypothesis for the time being. Given the small number of Sanskrit works in Burmese script, it is certainly remarkable:

The scope of Sanskrit studies in Burma remained, however, a quite limited one so that today not many Sanskrit works can be found in manuscripts written in Burmese script (Bechert and Braun 1981: xxxix).²⁴

²⁴See loc. cit. for examples: “only eight Sanskrit manuscripts in Burmese script with 14 different works, mostly grammatical and lexicographical texts, can be traced” in the unpublished catalogue of the Mandalay collection.
As for the presence of Vid in other South-East Asian countries, the situation is the following: no manuscript seems to be available today in Cambodia. A manuscript from Laos has been reported long ago. The existence of vernacular versions, however, has been reported (Skilling and Pakdeekham 2002, 2004).

Nevertheless, the existence of a Pāli Vid is not a myth. It is attested in several manuscripts from Siam, all of which have not yet been collected. On the other hand, the list of works making an extensive “painted Tipitaka” found on the walls of the main hall in Wat Thong Noppakhun (Thonburi; end of the nineteenth century) shows that Vid was known among works dealing with language (Saddāvītesa), both in its Pāli and in its Sanskrit versions until late: sixty titles are listed in this category. No. 27 is Pālli-Bidakdha and No. 55 is Pālli-Bidakdha-sakaṭa (Skilling, forthcoming).

My preliminary investigation of the Pāli Vid is based on the following material:

One manuscript in Khom script kept at Wat Jetuphon (Wat Pho), No. 6/40. See Jacqueline Filliozat, “EFEO DATA Filliozat 2005, fichier 108”. The whole bundle concerns Vid. The Pāli version (Brah pāli vidagdhamukhamandaṇana) is found on fol. ka to gū and was the only one I could see briefly during my visit. The next ms (7 phūks) is the Vidagdha-mukhamandaṇana-dipani-ṭikā, followed by the Vidagdhamukhamandaṇana-yojana (4 phūks) and the Mukhamandaṇanavidagdha-apadesa.

Two photocopies made on the basis of the microfilms of two manuscripts in Tham script from Wat Sung Men, Phrae Province. These manuscripts

25Information kindly given by Dr Olivier de Bernon (EFEO; letter dated 7 May 2001). But see Coedès 1912 : 178 who saw a manuscript of the ṭikā.

26Finot 1917 : 214 : R 676 (= Luang Prabang Royal Library) containing 6 phūks.

27It would be important for a further study to have access to the ms kept in the Royal National Library.

28For other manuscripts, including some containing vernacular renderings or explanations, see Skilling & Pakdeekham 2002 under 4.49, 4.72 (Nissaya-Vidagdhamukhamandaṇana-Phadet), 4.99 (Yojana-Vidagdhamukhamandaṇana “composed in Pukām [Pagan] by Dhammakitti Thera Lokarājamoli”), 4.110 and 111; Skilling & Pakdeekham 2004 under 5.101–104.
were microfilmed under the “Preservation of Northern Thai Manuscripts Project” (a Thai–German undertaking on which see Hundius 1990: 15ff.). Reference is to the phāk number and the Arabic numbers added on each page of the microfilmed manuscripts.

WS 010408801 (= A), 6 phāks, 5 lines, complete, dated C.S. (= Cūlasakarāja) 1198 = 1836 C.E.

WS 010409203 (= B), 6 phāks, 5 lines, complete.

Both manuscripts are additional documents attesting the brilliant activity of the senior monk Venerable Gruu Paa Kañcana Araññavāsin whose personality emerges from the colophons of the manuscripts he had copied, and came to light through the superb study of the colophons of Pāli manuscripts from Northern Thailand conducted by Hundius (1990, especially 34–36). In the 1830s this monk was greatly instrumental in preserving and restoring Northern Thai culture in Lanna. His home monastery, Wat Sung Men, “rose to become a centre of Pāli and Buddhist studies. Manuscripts were systematically collected and numerous copying campaigns covering Phrae, Nan, Chiang Mai, Chiang Saen, Rahaeng and Luang Prabang were pursued” (Hundius 1990: 34). Together with the ruler of Phrae he had ms A copied. His name also appears in the colophon located at the end of each phāk of ms B. Under his leadership, and with the cooperation of his disciple, this ms was copied in Luang Prabang and brought to Lanna.

The Khom manuscript contains the root text of the Vid in Pāli: definition verses, illustrative verses followed by the answers to the riddles. It is the work of Vipulabuddhi Thera, disciple of Sāgarabuddhi Thera:

\begin{verbatim}
iti Sāgarabuddhither'–antevāsika-Vipulabuddhithera-viracite Vidattha-
mukhamanḍane catuttho paricchedo ... pālī Vidatthamukhamanḍanaṁ
niṭṭhatam (fols. gū–ge).
\end{verbatim}

This should be compared with the Gandhavamsa of Nandapañña, admittedly a modern work, where the number of works composed by Vepulabuddhi Acārya (either five or six as there seem to be conflicting opinions) is discussed. Among them is one Vidadhimukhamanḍanaṭṭkā
Three Pali Works Revisited

(Minayeff 1886: 64 and 74–75). The variant spelling *vidadh* is no hindrance to the identification. But the work available in the Khom manuscript is not a commentary.

The two Lanna manuscripts are identical to each other and contain the Vidagdhamukhamanḍana-dipani ( = Vid-d; cf. *Vidagdhamukha-maṇḍana-dipaniya vakkhāmi*, B I, line 3; A I, line 3). It is an extensive Pāli commentary on the Pāli Vid. The verses of the mūla are quoted pada by pada. They are identical to the work represented in the Khom manuscript. Vid-d ends: *iti varamati-seṭṭhagaruna vajjirapaṇṇo ti vihita-nāmadheyyena para-hitesinā uttama-dhamma-gavesi tena nibbānālambaṇa-cūtāna therena racitā Vidaggamukhamanḍana-dipani nāmāyaṃ ākā anantarāyena samattā* (B VI, 30, line 5).

The author of the Pāli Vid explicitly considers himself to be a translator of Dharmadāsa’s work at the outset:

... karissāmi sa-maṭikā ahaṃ Magadha-bhāṣāya Vidagdhamukha-maṇḍanaṃ.

The verses that follow, ending with the conclusion *ti māṭikā* (Wat Pho ms, fol. ki recto), list all the varieties of riddles which will be treated in the work. These verses are Pāli translations of the corresponding verses found in Dharmadāsa’s work (1.9–18) with minor adjustments in the use of particles. The technical designations are identical. The verses supplying the definitions also conform to their Sanskrit model. The definition of the first variety discussed in the Pāli Vid reads:

sīyā pada-vibhāgena kevalena eva pucchitaṃ
yan byathāṃ taṃ samatthāṃ yan samudāyena pucchitaṃ (fol. ki recto, line 2)

29 The Vidagdhamukhamanḍanadipani-ākā in Khom script (Wat Pho ms, see above) has the same end and is the same work.
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cf. Dharmadåsa:

\[ \text{piṣṭan pada-vibhågena kevalenaiva yad bhavet} \]
\[ \text{vidar vyastaṃ samastam yat samudåyena pîcchyate (1.19).} \]

This is just one instance to illustrate an overall conducted method. The \( \text{vîtta-nåma-jåti} \), which I focus on here because of Aggavamsa’s quotation, is defined along with the \( \text{viṣama-jåti} \) in the same verse. In Dharmadåsa’s version:

\[ \text{yatra bhaṅgasya vaiśamyam viśamam taṃ nigadyate}^{30} \]
\[ \text{vîtta-nåmottaråṃ piṣṭaṃ bhavet taṃ vîtta-nåmakam (2.32)} \]

variant: \( \text{vîtta nāmottaraṃ yatra praśnaṃ taṃ vîtta-nāmakam} \)

(Kraatz 1968: 32).

… [Where] the question has as its answer the name of a metre it would be a \( \text{vîtta-nāmaka} \).

In Dharmadåsa as found in the Burmese manuscript (No. 510 see above) it reads:

\[ \text{yatra bhaṅgasya vesamanam viśamanam taṃ nigadyate} \]
\[ \text{yatra praśnåsthitaṃ s taṃ nāmottaråda (?) vîtta-nåmakam.} \]

In the Påli Vid (ms B III,25, line 2):

\[ \text{yatra pabandhe bhaṅgassa vesamanam athi taṃ visamanam taṃ nigadyate} \]
\[ \text{yatra pabandha (for: -e) nāmottaråṃ pâihā-ṭṭhitam (sic) taṃ vutta-} \]
\[ \text{nåmakam.} \]

Thus, the general plan of both the Påli and the Sanskrit versions goes along the same line. The fourth and last section, for example, also deals with the same varieties as the Sanskrit model in the same sequence. It relates to varieties where one has to discover a hidden verb, a case form, a compound or a ending: \( \text{kriyå-gutta, katta-gutta, kamma-gutta, sampadåna-gutta, apadåna-gutta, adhikaraṇa-gutta, sambandha-gutta, álapana-gutta, samåsa-} \)
\[ \text{gutta, etc.}^{31} \]

---

30Cadence of an even pāda in a.

31Ms B phûk 6 fols. 4–15; compare Vid in Skt. chap. 4 vv. 33ff.
If the matter stopped here, it would be very artificial to speak of a Pāli Vid. The originality of the Pāli tradition regarding this work lies in the illustrative verses. This is not surprising as the riddles are highly dependent on linguistic constraints, which are partly different for Sanskrit and Pāli. No generalization is possible without a complete reading of the work (not done so far). But the section concerning the “metre name variety” shows that the examples are utterly different from those in Dharmadāsa’s Vid. Therefore, up to now, Aggavamsa’s reference remains the only available trace of a Pāli commentary on Vid where the illustrative verse is supposed to be the same as in the Sanskrit version.

Dharmadāsa had two examples for this variety (2.35 śikharini and 2.36 mālini). The Pāli Vid as represented in our Khom and Tham manuscripts also supplies two. But the metres they select are rucirā and ketumati.

Example 1

(i) jinassa kā jalati varassa bhuvane?
(ii) pahanti ’kena ’ghika-pajāya tena ke?
(iii) abhiṇṇa paṁca garu lāhu ’ṭha sāníkā
(iv) muni’-gga-vanṇa-ghaṭita-bandha-vutti kā? — rucirā

Commentary: aṇṇa lākhaṇassa lākhaṇam āha jinass’ icc-ādinā. tattha rucirā ti.

(i) varassa jinassa kā bhuvane jalati? ruci. tattha bhavanti34 sattā ettha bhuvana(m?)35 loko “bhū sattāyan” [= Dhātupāṭha I.1] ti ti vā tu

32Ms A phūk III, 35–37; ms B phūk III, 28–30. My aim is to give a sample of the text because so far no discussion of the Pāli Vid has been based on any textual evidence. The present transliteration and translation, however, are highly tentative and have gaps. Unfortunately, the relevant pages of the photocopies are of rather poor quality and, at some places, hardly legible.

33These numbers refer to the question in the riddle. In Example 2 one of them does not correspond to the para boundary.

34B: bhavanta.

35A: etthā ti bhavanaṃ.
yu-ssa\textsuperscript{36} anattæm u-kārassa\textsuperscript{37} uvattaⁿ ca.\textsuperscript{38} rucati attano guṇena virocati ti ruci raṃsi.

(ii) \textit{tena ekena}\textsuperscript{39} aghika-pajāya ke pahanti\textsuperscript{40} ti. arā. arā. tattha pahanti 'kenā ti pahiyyante ekena setṭhena.\textsuperscript{41} aghika-pajāyā ti dukkhita-sattassa. arā ti kilesā saṃsāra-cakkāra vā.

(iii–iv) abhiñña pañca garu laṭṭha sānikā\textsuperscript{42} muni-'gga-vaṇṇa-ghanita-bandha-vutti kā? rucirā. tattha abhi. la. sānikā ti abhiññāsamākhātehi pañca-garuhi ceve\textsuperscript{43} sānikā jhāte samāpatti-saṃkhātehi ca aṭṭhahi lahuhi ti samāno. muni. la. vutti ti agga-munino guṇena ghamṭita-bandha-gāthā. kā? ti, kā nāmā? rucirā ti evam-nāmakā\textsuperscript{44} gāthā abhivisesena ra-γuṇam\textsuperscript{45} jānīti ti. abhiññā gāraviyate alahu-karaṇa ca sena bhāniyate ti garu, lahu ...\textsuperscript{46} guṇiyate ti garu-niruttinayena,\textsuperscript{47} sānati\textsuperscript{48} vā ...\textsuperscript{49} karoti ti sāna samāpatti tāya sānāya sampannā sānikā gāthā. vaṇṇiyate saṃsīyate\textsuperscript{50} ti vaṇṇa,\textsuperscript{51} gunā sa garu.

\textsuperscript{36}A: yussā.

\textsuperscript{37}A: u-kārass’ uvattaⁿ ca.

\textsuperscript{38}Indigenous etymology of \textit{bhavana}/\textit{bhuvana} with reference to the root bhū and grammatical formation of the word: \textit{yu} is the technical name of the suffix -\textit{ana-} (cf. Kaccāyana 549 nandādhī \textit{yu} and 624 or Sadd 859,23); -\textit{u-} in words having this suffix.

\textsuperscript{39}So A; B: te jinena na ekena aghika°.

\textsuperscript{40}B: panti.

\textsuperscript{41}B: written as sebbena.

\textsuperscript{42}A: samānikā (here, but later: sānikā).

\textsuperscript{43}B: cava.

\textsuperscript{44}A: evam-nānikā.

\textsuperscript{45}So in both mss. Read: 'gamaⁿ ?

\textsuperscript{46}Very uncertain reading: ke vyaḍḍhi vya (?)).

\textsuperscript{47}Indigenous etymology of the word garu.

\textsuperscript{48}Any connection with Sadd 398,5 sāna tejane. tejanaṃ nisānaṃ, sānati 7.

\textsuperscript{49}Too uncertain.

\textsuperscript{50}So A; B: pasiṣyate.

\textsuperscript{51}B: vaṇṇo. Indigenous etymology of the word vaṇṇa.
lahu hi rucati dippati ti\textsuperscript{52} rucirā.

(i) What is it (fem.) of the excellent Jīna that shines in the world? ——
His brightness (rucıे; i.e. his rays, see cty ransī).

(ii) What are those (plural masc.) of a suffering creature that he alone kills? ——
The spokes (arā).

(iii–iv) Five higher knowledges [are] heavy, eight light ...\textsuperscript{53} which
is the syllabic verse arrangement produced by the best of the sages? ——
The (metre) rucirā.

The metrical structure of this metre is as follows: 4 \textbullet\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet\textbullet
(thus eight light and five heavy syllables; cf. Sadd 8.3.2.4 and Vutt 89). As per Dharmadāsa’s model, the riddle verse itself is composed in
the metre to be discovered. It is a rucirā.

Example 2

(i) kissa vidhassa jantu muni bhaṅgo

(ii) loka-varo ‘ssa dhamma-vidutā kā?

(iii–iv) vutti lahu ccha panca garu bandha
nātha-guṇaṅga-vanṇa-racitā kā? —— ketumati.


(i) loka-varo muni jantu kissa vidhassa bhaṅgo (?) ti. ketu. tattha kissa
vidhassā ti kidisassā mānassa, jantu ti jantuno. ketu hi unnati-
bhāvena dhaja-sadisassa mānassa ...\textsuperscript{54} māno kināti\textsuperscript{55} unnamati ti ki
unnamati ketu\textsuperscript{56}.

(ii) \textsuperscript{57}as(s)ja dhamma-vidutā kā? ti mati. tattha dhamma-vidutā ti
dhamma vijānana-bhāvo, mati ti.

(iii–iv) pañcāsanātha-guṇaṅgavaṇṇa-racitā lahu ccha paṅca garu

\textsuperscript{52}Indigenous etymology of rucirā as the name of the metre, meaning “pleasing, shining, illuminating”.

\textsuperscript{53}Despite the commentary I am at a loss to understand the word sānikā.

\textsuperscript{54}Uncertain: vidhati ettha naṃ vidahati ti vivo (?) in B; A is illegible.

\textsuperscript{55}Compare Abhidhamma-avatāra 2: kināti vināseti vā para-dukkhan ti karuṇā.

\textsuperscript{56}Etymology of ketu connected with the root ki, kināti.

\textsuperscript{57}This part not in A.
bandha-vutti kā? ti sa ketumati. tattha akkharehi vutti ti gāthā. lahu pañca ga?ru bandha ti saha lahuhi, .. pañca garuhi ca bandha nāma guṇaṅga-vanṇa-racitā ti. nāthassa guṇa aṅgā .ehi vanṇehi racitā ketumati ti, evaṃ-nāmikā gāthā akitabbā lakṣhitabbā ti akāte yeva aṅgā. garu lahu li una. tatthā ketu viyā ti ketu. .. asā athi ti ketumati. vutta-nāmaṃ tassa jāti ti. 58

(i) A being (?) of which type does the sage, the best in the world, break?59 — The banner (i.e. conceit) (ketu).

(ii) What is it (fem.) belonging to him that enables him to know the Dhamma? — The intellect (māti).

(iii–iv) A metre with six light and five heavy syllables. . . . 60

According to Vutt 111 (and Sadd 8.7.2.16), the metrical structure of the ketumati metre, which belongs to the visama category where odd and even quarters are different is as follows: 2 x - - - - - - - - - - || - - - - - - - - - - . Five is the number of heavy syllables in the even ones. In our verse, however, this pattern seems to be reversed. The quarters with five heavy syllables are a and d.

The general pattern of the riddles is the same as in the Sanskrit examples: the first two or three questions relate to any topic, but the last one always gives an indication about the structural pattern of the metre to be guessed (number of light and heavy syllables, indicated in an indirect manner to make the matter more attractive!). The first two

58This is the text as in B. A (III,36, line 4 to 37, line 2) reads (with some repetitions): lahu ccha pañca garu bandha-vutti kā? ketumati. tattha vutti ti gāthā. lahu ccha pañca garu bandha ti va lahuhi ceva pañca garuhi bandhā nāma guṇaṅga-vanṇa-racitā ti nāthassa guṇaṅga-vanṇa-racitā. la. pañca garu bandha vutti kā? ketumati. tattha vutti ti gāthā. lahu pañca garu bandha se lahu ceva pañca garuhi bandha nātha guṇaṅga-vanṇa-racitā ti nāthassa guṇaṅga astitabbehi vanṇahī vanṇehi racitā ketumati ti eva(m)-nāmakā gāthā akitabbā va astitba va akāte yeva aṅgā va garu lahu ti ti una tatthā ketu viyā ti ketu assā athi ti ketumati. vutta-nāma-jāti vuttaṃ.

59The syntax is not clear to me.

60Not fully clear.

61visama sa-jā sa-guru-yuttā ketumati same bha-ra-na-gā go (Vutt).
questions are a *charade*: Answer 1 + Answer 2 are components of the complete word (*ruci+arā > ruci‘rā*; similarly *ketu+mati > ketumati*).

As could be expected, in contrast with Dharmadāsa’s riddles the cultural references of which are Hindu mythology (and this could be a clue to his religious affiliation), the universe of the Pāli Vid is a Buddhist universe. The questions concern the Buddha’s personality, his physical and intellectual features. The answers presuppose a knowledge of the tradition, which is expanded in the commentary. Thus, (ii) of Example 1, where *hanti* “to kill” occurs in the question and *arā* in the answer (equated with *kilesā* in the commentary), is a reference to some of the etymologies of the word *arahā* where two components are distinguished:

\[
\text{arā sansāra-cakkassa hatā ṃānāsinā yato} \\
\text{loka-nāthena ten’ esa arahan ti pavuccati ti (quoted in Sadd 579,9-110) or} \\
\text{sāṃsāra-cakkassa vā arā kilesā hatā anenā ti arahā.}
\]

(Abhidhammatthasangaha)

Similarly, the metrical structure of the *rucirā* with five heavy and eight light syllables is also understood at a doctrinal level and connected with the five *abhiññās* and the eight *samāpattis*. These qualities are ascribed to the Buddha in several passages (e.g. *Mahāvagga-āṭṭhakathā* II 632: *mahāpuriso pana sabbā pi aṭṭha samāpattiyo, pañca abhiññāyo ca nibbattetvā…*; *Ja I* 30,11). Finally the equation *ketu/māna* (Example 2, i) is common in traditional exegesis, where the two words are synonyms (*māno ahaṁkāro unnati ketu paggaho avalepo ti pariyāyā*, Sadd 485,14) or where *ketu-hā* is explained as *māna-ppahāyā* in the commentary on Th 64 (a stanza revolving around the manifold meanings of *ketu*).

On the other hand, the *genre* of learned riddles such as those of Dharmadāsa or his Pāli counterpart implies a special usage of the language where all its niceties and rarities are called for. Monosyllables

\[\text{62A similar tendency can be observed in Jain riddles whether they are adapted or not from Dharmadāsa’s work: the personality of the Jinas is a source of the questions asked. See Balbir 2002.}\]
are one such extreme case. They are not used in our Pāli illustrative verses. Rare words or formations are, however, present. Pāli aghika (example 1, ii) seems to be based on agha or, at least, seems to be understood in this way by the commentator when he equates aghika-pajāya with dukkhitā-pajāya. This equivalence is similar to Aggavamsa’s discussion of the word agha (Sadd 527,30ff.): aghan ti dukkham ... agho ti kilesa, tena aghena arahā anagho. The abstract noun vidutā (in dhamma-vidutā, example 2, ii) is a secondary derivative from a well-known compound and shows the productivity of the suffix –tā.

In brief: for a correct appraisal of the diffusion of Pāli literature, for the understanding of its making and for the establishment of the texts, the intertextual Pāli (or Sanskrit) network to which a given work belongs should not be put aside. For works combining prose with verses, no edition should be published without the basic tools that make it possible to assess the place and possible sources of these verses. This is a necessary stage in the process of any critical edition, as relevant as the consultation of a large number of manuscripts.

Nalini Balbir
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What’s in a Repetition?
On Counting the Suttas of the Saññyutta-nikāya

1. Introduction
One of the stylistic features of ancient Indian Buddhist texts is their repetitiveness. Of course, other ancient Indian literatures display some of the same repetitive devices, yet it seems that none develops the art of repetition quite to the extent that Buddhist texts do (cf. Allon 1997, p. 360). While this stylistic feature has been frequently noted, as Allon comments, it “has never been satisfactorily analysed or quantified” (1997, p. 273). Certainly Mark Allon’s own 1997 study of the function of certain stylistic features in Pāli texts (the product of doctoral research carried out in Cambridge under the supervision of K.R. Norman) makes an important contribution to our understanding of the nature of repetition in early Buddhist literature, but his study was not intended as exhaustive and more remains to be said.

In his analysis of repetition in the Udumbarikasāhanāda-sutta (D III 36–57), Allon calculates that 30% of the full text can be classified as “verbatim repetition”, while 86.8% can be classified as repetition of one sort or another (pp. 358–59). He distinguishes five types of repetition: verbatim, repetition with minor modifications, repetition with important modifications, repetition of structure types 1 and 2 (p. 287). While the five different types are important for his calculations, in the present context I shall collapse Allon’s first three categories into what might be called “narrative repetition” and his last two into “structural repetition”.

By “narrative repetition” I refer to repetition of blocks, with or without modification, in the course of a narrative. Thus a text may describe events relating to person A who then describes these events in full to person B who then in turn relates to them to person C in full who then meets person A and asks, describing the events in full yet again,

---

*I am grateful to Peter Jackson for his observations on a first draft of this paper.

whether they are true.\footnote{As K.R. Norman (2006, pp. 70–71) has pointed out, this kind of repetition is well exemplified by the opening of the Alagaddāpama-sutta (M I 130–31); this describes how Ariṭṭha is beset by a pernicious view, how bhikkhus hear of this and proceed to ask Ariṭṭha if it is true, how Ariṭṭha confirms it is true, how the monks reprimand Ariṭṭha and then report to the Buddha, relating everything in full to him.} By “structural repetition” I refers to the practice of providing a framework structure which can then be used as the basis for a series of repetitions by substituting different items and/or modifying the frame. For example, the Gangā-peedāla of the Saṃyutta-nikāya uses the following frame: “Just as the river Ganges flows to the east, so a bhikkhu who develops the noble eightfold path resorting to seclusion flows to nirvana.” By substituting different rivers for the Ganges, different items for the noble eightfold path, “great ocean” for “east”, different expressions for “resorting to seclusion”, a whole series of repetitions are achieved (S V 38–41). Such repetitions are especially characteristic of the Saṃyutta- and Aṅguttara-nikāyas and also the canonical Abhidhamma texts.

Both kinds of repetition are routinely abbreviated in the manuscripts and printed editions by the use of the term peyyāla, itself usually abbreviated to pe or la. The use of abbreviation in this connection poses something of a problem for the full analysis of repetition in Pāli texts, since it is not always clear precisely what is to be repeated. In the present paper, offered on the occasion of the 125th anniversary of the founding of the Pali Text Society in 1881 and K.R. Norman’s 80th birthday in 2005, I should like to focus on the use of structural repetition in the Saṃyutta-nikāya, considering in the first place its extent and in the concluding section its possible significance and function.

2. Counting the suttas of the Saṃyutta-nikāya

With reference to the 56 ṛaggas that make up the Saṃyutta-nikāya, K.R. Norman observes that “[t]hey contain 2,889 suttas in all, in the European edition, although Buddhaghosa states there are 7,762 suttas”
This discrepancy between the European edition and Buddhaghosa is worth pondering. Buddhaghosa also gives figures for the number of suttas in the other Nikāyas: 34 for the Dīgha-nikāya, 152 for the Majjhima-nikāya and 9,557 for the Aṅguttara-nikāya.² The fact that the figures Buddhaghosa gives correspond to the number of suttas found in modern European editions in the cases of the Dīgha-nikāya and Majjhima-nikāya but are wildly out of line in the cases of the Saṁyutta-nikāya and Aṅguttara-nikāya (the European edition of the latter counts between 2,308 and 2,363)³ should give us pause for thought. Buddhaghosa’s figures do not seem intended as vague big numbers — like, say, 84,000 — but as a precise count, so either the tradition he reports was talking about a very different text from the one that has come down to us, or it counted suttas in a very different way. In fact it is clear from the introductions to their editions that both Feer and Hardy struggled with how to present the Saṁyutta-nikāya and Aṅguttara-nikāya and that a significant issue was the problem of repetition and what to count as a single sutta. Feer claims that by counting the suttas of the Saṁyutta-nikāya in a different way “the sum of 7,762 can be attained, but not be got from the data of the MSS” (S V ix). Yet his claim that he “counted the suttas according to the Uddānas” is problematic,⁴ because, as we shall see, in the first place the uddānas are not always clear on numbers and in the second place he seems on occasion to ignore — or at least interpret in a conservative way — the uddānas’ instructions to expand.⁵

²Sp 18 = Sv I 17 = As 18 (cf. Spk I 2). The Chinese translation of Sp gives the number of suttas for D as 44 (possible variant noted), for M as 252, but the numbers for S and A are as in the Pāli Sp. See Bapat and Hirakawa 1970, pp. 10–11.
³See Norman 1983, p. 54.
⁴Elsewhere Feer seems in fact to favour counting larger numbers in certain instances S IV xii: “But if we count 247 suttas in the Saḷāyatanas and 1,463 in Asañkhata, — what the text seems to permit — if not require, — this total would amount to 1,850 suttas.”
⁵For example the uddāna at S II 133 is explicit that 132 suttas should be counted.
The same problem has troubled these texts’ translators. For the most part C.A.F. Rhys Davids and Woodward followed Feer’s lead, though correcting some obvious slips. In the introduction to his recent translation Bhikkhu Bodhi makes some attempt to address the problem of the number of suttas in the Saṁyutta-nikāya, providing tables of Feer’s and his own count, and suggesting that since Buddhaghosa’s Sāratthapakkāsini comments on a text that seems to correspond to what we have, “the difference in totals must certainly stem merely from the different ways of expanding the vaggas treated elliptically in the text”, although he still finds it “difficult to see how the commentator could arrive at so large a figure” (2000, p. 26).

The “problem” of repetition seems to have two facets. The first is that, as the editors point out, the manuscripts they had before them were inconsistent, using different ways of presenting an abbreviated text, though it is not exactly clear that this meant different numbers of repetitions were evidenced in the manuscripts. The second facet of the problem is that editors seem to have found the repetitions “ tiresome”, so much so that they were predisposed to play down the numbers of suttas implied by the repetitions. 6 Certainly it seems worth trying to establish whether it is possible on the basis of the text of the Saṁyutta-nikāya that has come down to us to arrive at the number of suttas Buddhaghosa counted. It also seems worth pondering further the question of why all these “ tiresome” repetitions.

Ideally the question of counting the suttas of the Saṁyutta-nikāya should be addressed by going back to representative manuscripts. In the present context I shall confine myself to carrying out a preliminary study on the basis of a selection of modern printed editions: the five

6So Feer at S V v–vi comments, “The tiresome repetitions, peculiar to the buddhist scriptures, abound exceedingly in the Mahā-Vaggo, and form so great a proportion in several of its Saṁyuttas that important abridgments are required. The sinhalese and burmese MSS. differ so much in the manner and quantity of their abbreviation that they seem to have nothing in common, although they are dealing with the same subject.” On the issue of the early European tendency to abbreviate Pāli texts, see also Norman 2006, p. 113.
volumes of Feer’s PTS edition of 1884–1898 (E); the five volumes of the Śyāmaraṭṭha-tepīṭaka of 1927 (BE 2470) (S); the three volumes of the Chaṭṭhasaṅgīti-ṭīṭaka of 1957 (B); the six volumes of the Buddhajayanti-ṭīṭaka of 1960–83 (C). Of course, this is not ideal since all these Asian editions may have been influenced to some extent by Feer’s European edition.

As I have already indicated, Feer gives his count of the total number of suttas in the introductions to each volume of his edition; unfortunately, for the most part S counts paragraphs or sections rather than suttas, so does not make explicit how many suttas it recognizes, though the edition is still useful for comparing the number of repetitions understood in the text. Both B and C give a running count of suttas for each of the five vāggas of Sānyutta-nikāya. Bhikkhu Bodhi also offers a count in the introduction to his translation. The various enumerations of suttas are set out in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>vāgga</th>
<th>E Feer</th>
<th>B CS</th>
<th>Bjt</th>
<th>Bodhi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sāgātha</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nīdiṇā</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khandha</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salāyātana</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>2286</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahā</td>
<td>1208</td>
<td>1210</td>
<td>3977</td>
<td>1197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2889</strong></td>
<td><strong>2854</strong></td>
<td><strong>7656</strong></td>
<td><strong>2904</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have had access to S and B in both the printed editions and also the digital editions in the form of the BUDSIR (Bangkok: Mahidol University, 1994, 1996) and “Chaṭṭha Saṅgīyana” (Igatpuri: Vipassana Research Institute, 1999) CD-ROMs respectively. Unfortunately I have only had direct access to the digital edition of C (Sri Lanka Tripiṭaka Project, Colombo; www.buddhistethics.org/palicanon.html), though I am grateful to Peter Jackson for supplying me with some details directly from the printed edition.

The Śyāmaraṭṭha edition has been reprinted with the addition of at least some variants in 1956 (BE 2499), 1979 (BE 2522), 1995 (BE 2538). I have used the 1995 reprint; how far this differs from the original is unclear.
In each *vagga*, except the *Sagātha-vagga* where the counting of suttas seems unproblematic, there is some variation; particularly in the *Salāyātana- and Mahā-vaggas* the discrepancies are considerable. Tables 2–5 show the differences in detail for each *vagga*. The figures which appear initially discrepant are highlighted in bold. These discrepant figures allow us to identify places where it seems likely different methods of counting are in operation. In tables 2–5 I have added a column giving my own count of suttas.

The discrepancy in the *nidāna-samyutta* turns out to be precisely connected with a repetition section that closes the *samyutta*, the *antarā-peyyāla* (S II 130–33). This *peyyāla* applies a structure based on the four truths to each of eleven links of the formula of dependent arising in turn (*avijjā* is omitted): someone who does not know or see old age and death, etc., their arising, their ceasing, and the path leading to their ceasing as they truly are should seek the Teacher in order to know them as they truly are. This gives eleven suttas.\(^9\) The *peyyāla* section then gives a further eleven alternatives to seeking the Teacher that someone who does not know or see should do in order to know and see. This gives a total of \((11 \times 12 =) 132\) repetitions or suttas acknowledged in the *uddāna*.\(^10\) This gives C^5’s total of 213 for the *samyutta*.\(^11\) In fact, all editions recognize the same number of repetitions, but in B^6 these are counted as just one, and by Feer and Bodhi as 12. In the preceding *samanabrāhamana-vagga* where Feer, C^5 and Bodhi count 11, B^6 treats

\(^9\)S II 130,28–29 makes it clear at the end of the initial treatment of *jarāmarana* that someone at some point in the history of the texts regarded this as a sutta: *suttanto eko. sabbesan evaṃ peyyālo*.

\(^10\)The *uddāna* has a number of variants in the manuscripts and printed editions: S II 133, talks of *suttā dvatiṃsaśatāni*, presumably to be construed as “suttas numbering thirty-two and a hundred”, while the variant Feer records from his Sinhalese manuscripts has *antarā-peyyālassa suttantā ekasatāh ca dvatiṃsa bhavanti*.

\(^11\)Strictly C^5 seems not to recognize a *nidāna-samyutta*, but counts it as part of the *abhisamaya-samyutta*. 
a similar application of a formula to each of the same eleven links as
two and thus reaches a total of only 73 for the nidāna-samāyutta.

In the lābhavakkāra-samāyutta and Rāhula-samāyutta B⁵ in fact
counts the same number of suttas in each of the four \(10 + 10 + 10 + 13\
\(= 43\) and two vaggas \(10 + 12 = 22\) that make up these samāyutas, but
the running total of suttas for the whole Nidāna-vagga anomalously
counts eight abbreviated suttas as one at S (B⁵) I 430,18–19, six as one at
S (B⁵) I 438,1–2, and a further eight as one at S (B⁵) I 443,14–15.

In the khandha-samāyutta Feer’s edition simply omits a sutta which
should have dukkhaṃupassī vihareyya for the aniccānupassī vihareyya
of sutta 147 (S II 179).

The arrangement of the diṭṭhi-samāyutta is problematic; see Feer at
S III ix–x and Bodhi 2000, pp. 1097–98 (n. 264). Since there are in toto
26 views and four different frames, one would expect 104 as the total
number of repetitions, but the initial frame appears to be only applied to
18 views, so we have \(18 + (26 \times 3) = 96\). Feer suggests, somewhat
anomalously, counting 114.

In the salāyatana-samāyutta the main problem is the saṭṭhi-peyyāla
(S IV 148–56). Since this peyyāla seems to upset an implied structure
for the whole samāyutta of four sets of fifty suttas (paññāsaka), each
comprising five vaggas, Feer asked: “Ought not this peyyāla to be
lessened? I thought so.” (S IV viii) Notwithstanding its name, he
suggests reducing this peyyāla to 20 by not treating certain repetitions
as qualifying as suttas.

At S IV 126–28 Feer counts only one sutta, but B⁵, C⁶, and Bodhi
count two: the first with verses, the second precisely the same without
verses. This seems unusual and Feer may well be right in counting only
11 suttas in this vagga rather than 12.12

In the final vagga of the vedanā-samāyutta Feer counts only 9 where
B⁵, C⁶ and Bodhi count 11, understanding new suttas to begin at S IV

---

12The uddāna as given by Feer at S IV 132 reads: agayha dve honti palăsinā,
and Feer presumably takes the dve as applying only to palăsinā.
233,25 and at S IV 235,31. The uddāna at S IV 238 might be construed in either way, but the latter seems more likely to me.

In the two peyāla-vaggas of the mātugāma-samyutta, C\textsuperscript{5} repeats the formula pañcahi kho Anuruddha dhammehi samannāgato ... nirayaṃ upapajjati ti containing kodhano ca hoti (S IV 240,25–241,2) twice, thus creating an extra sutta. And later it counts what is clearly an introductory paragraph (S IV 243,16–24) as a separate sutta. Its count of 36 for this samyutta is thus a clear error.

The Sāmaṇḍaka-samyutta is a straightforward repetition of the 16 suttas of the immediately preceding Jambukhādaka-samyutta substituting Sāmaṇḍako paribbāko for Jambukhādako paribbāko throughout; B\textsuperscript{3} gives only the first and last sutta separated by the comment yathā Jambukhādakasamyuttaṃ tathā vitthāretabbaṃ (S (B\textsuperscript{3}) II 455,20), and counts only 2 suttas although it recognizes the repetition of all 16.

The difference in the count for the Moggallāna-samyutta is more complex and concerns what in E\textsuperscript{2} and B\textsuperscript{3} are counted suttas 10 (S IV 269–280) and 11 (S IV 280). The former initially describes how Sakka accompanied by 500 devas approaches Moggallāna and they both agree that going for refuge in the Buddha, Dhamma and Saṅgha is a good thing since as a result some beings are reborn in heaven (S IV 269,21–270,24). What follows is abbreviated with pe but indicates that the preceding section should be repeated a further four times in full with Sakka approaching with, in turn, 600, 700, 800, and 8,000 devas (S IV 270,25–271,10).\textsuperscript{13} The second section repeats all this — in effect five suttas — in full but this time Sakka and Moggallāna agree that the good thing is having trust in the Buddha, Dhamma and Saṅgha that is based in understanding (avecca-pasāda) (S IV 271,21–274,27). The third section once again provides five further repetitions by returning to the theme of going for refuge as the good thing, but adding that the beings reborn in heaven surpass other devas in ten respects (S IV 274,29–276,31). A fourth section gives five more repetitions by combining the

\textsuperscript{13}As Bodhi 2000, p. 1440 (n. 282) notes, E\textsuperscript{2} in fact has asītīyā devatāsatehi but other editions have asītīyā devatāsahashehi.
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trust based in understanding (section two) with the ten respects in which beings surpass devas (S IV 276,33–280,19). To this point we have thus had twenty repetitions. What is counted as sutta 11 indicates that Sakka is to be replaced by the names of five further devas (Candana, Suyama, Santusita, Sunimmita, Vasavatti) followed by the instruction ime pañca peyyalā yathā Sakko devānam indo tathā vittharetabbāni ti. This gives five further sets of 20 repetitions and a total for this samyutta of 129 suttas — 9 + (20 × 6).

The asankhata-samyutta (S IV 359–73) begins with a sutta setting out the “unconditioned” (asankhata) and “the path leading to the unconditioned” (asankhata-gāmi-magga). The latter is explained as kāya-gatā-sati. This is followed by a second sutta identical in every respect expect that the path is this time explained as samathā and vipassanā. The same structure is then repeated with a further nine explanations of the path, and thus a total of eleven suttas (S IV 359–61). This concludes the first vagga. Explanations 2–11 are in the form of numerically increasing sets of items: samathā and vipassanā; three kinds of samādhi, a further three kinds of samādhi, four saṭipaṭṭhānas, four sammappadhānas, four iddhipādas, five indriyas, five balas, seven bojjhāgas, the eightfold path. The second vagga now proceeds by using the same framework but explaining “the path leading to the unconditioned” as each individual item from each of these ten sets in turn, giving a total of 45 suttas (2 + 3 + 3 + 4 + 4 + 4 + 5 + 5 + 7 + 8). We have now had a total of 56 (11 + 45) suttas, although Feer arbitrarily counts the second vagga as only a single sutta. The third vagga replaces asankhata and asankhata-gāmi-magga with anta and antagāmi-magga. Feer’s PTS edition gives — or rather suggests — in radically abbreviated form a further set of 45 suttas. These are followed by 31 further sets of 45 suttas achieved by replacing the original asankhata by 31 different terms. Feer’s edition thus implicitly recognizes a total of 1,496 suttas for the samyutta — 11 + (45 × 33) —
although he himself prefers to count only 44 \((11 + 33)\).\(^\text{14}\) The oriental editions of this *samyutta* seem to understand things differently. The Siamese Royal Edition states of *anta* and the final term *parāyana: yathā asanākhatam viṁśatītāṃ tathā viṁśatītām*\(^\text{15}\) This suggests that we should in fact understand the *samyutta* as containing a total of 1,848 suttas: \((11 + 45) \times 33\). The Burmese Chaṭṭhasaṅgīti and Sinhalese Buddha-jayanti-triṇīṭaka seem to understand the text similarly.\(^\text{16}\)

The largest number of discrepancies in the counting of suttas in the different editions is found in the Mahā-vagga. The first *samyutta* — the *magga-samyutta* — ends with a series of nine *vaggas*, five of which are explicitly referred to in the manuscripts as *peyyālas*, that almost entirely consist of repetitions once more indicated by the term *pe* or *la* in the manuscripts.

The *aññatiṭṭhiya-peyyāla* gives a series of eight items for the sake of which the spiritual life is lived. In each case it is further explained that the way or path to reach the aim of the spiritual life is the noble eightfold path. This gives a total of eight radically abbreviated suttas. 

The *suriya-peyyāla* gives a series of seven items which prelude the arising of the noble eightfold path just as the dawn preludes the arising of the sun. In each case it is further explained that it is to be expected of a *bhikkhu* who is accomplished in the particular item that he will

---

\(^\text{14}\)Woodward 1927 and Bodhi 2000 follow Feer in counting 44. Feer, however, then seems to get misled by his own method of counting and so at S IV x–xi claims the second *vagga* comprises only 44 alternative “paths leading to the unconditioned” instead of the actual 45, which leads him to conclude that the total number of suttas can be counted as either 44 or 1,463 \((11 + (44 \times 33))\). This error is repeated by Wynne (2004, p. 107, n. 24). Collins (1998, pp. 199–200) suggests a different enumeration for this *samyutta: 1,485 (45 \times 33* — although he states 32) or 1518 \((46 \times 33)\).

\(^\text{15}\)S (Ś’s) IV 450, 453.

\(^\text{16}\)S (B’s) II 541, 543; (C’s) IV 656, 666: *yathā asanākhatam tathā viṁśatītām*. The numbering in C’s also makes explicit that the editors understood the repetition of a full set of 56 suttas for each of 33 items. Skilling (1994, pp. 79–81) also concludes that this *samyutta* comprises 1,848 suttas.
develop the noble eightfold path. This is followed by a statement of
how the bhikkhu develops the eightfold path: he develops each
constituent of the path with reference to two different formulas: the
vivekanissita and rāgavinaya formulas. This then gives us a total of
fourteen (7 × 2) abbreviated suttas.

The ekadhamma-peyyāla I and ekadhamma-peyyāla II take the
same seven items used in the previous vagga and state how each
represents one quality in particular suited to the arising of the noble
eightfold path (ekadhamma-peyyāla I) or how the Buddha sees no other
single quality which leads to the arising and full development of the
noble eightfold path (ekadhamma-peyyāla II). The two vaggas then
follow the pattern of the suriya-peyyāla. This gives two further sets of
fourteen suttas.

The Gaṅgā-peyyāla describes how just as five separate rivers and
then all five rivers together flow (1) to the east and (2) to the great
ocean so the bhikkhu who develops the noble eightfold path flows to
the nibbāna. This gives an initial set of twelve suttas. But as in the Suriya-
and ekadhamma-peyyālas, each sutta incorporates a statement of how
the bhikkhu develops the eightfold path: but here he develops each
constituent of the path with reference to four (not two) different
formulas: the vivekanissita, rāgavinaya, amatogadha and nibbānaninna
formulas. This then gives the peyyāla a total of 48 suttas (6 × 2 × 4).

The appamāda-vagga gives a set of ten different similes for the
way in which wholesome qualities are rooted in heedfulness
(appamāda). In each case it is further explained that it is to be expected
of a bhikkhu who is heedful that he will develop the noble eightfold
path. This is followed by a statement of how the bhikkhu develops the
eightfold path: he develops each constituent of the path with reference
to four (not two) different formulas: the vivekanissita, rāgavinaya,
amatogadha and nibbānaninna formulas. This then gives the vagga a
total of 40 suttas (10 × 4).

The balakarantiya-vagga gives a set of twelve different similes
relating to the way in a bhikkhu develops the noble eightfold path. As in
the appamāda-vagga, this is followed by a statement of how the bhikkhu develops the eightfold path: he develops each constituent of the path with reference to the same four formulas: the vivekanissita, rāgavinaya, amatogadha and nibbānaninna formulas, though Feer, mistakenly in my view, questions whether all four formulas should apply here. So on the assumption that they should, this gives the vagga a total of 48 suttas (12 x 4).

The esana-vagga gives 10 — or 11 if the final repetition based on tasinā is treated as a distinct repetition from that based on the preceding taṇhā, which I suspect it should not be — items for the direct knowledge (abhiññā) of which the eightfold path is developed. Once

17At the end of the first sutta of this vagga Feer’s PTS edition states para-gangāpajjāvilavāyiya paripuṇṇasattan ti viṭṭhāramaggi. Feer notes (p. 46, n. 3): “This phrase is to be found in the burmese MSS. which add, according to the preceding case, the three statements referring to 1. rāga-dosa-mohā; 2. amata; 3. nibbāna. — Nothing of this appears in the singhalese MSS. Therefore I bound myself to this note upon this matter.” However the same phrase appears in the Syāmaraṭṭha edition at S (S9) V 68, which then proceeds to repeat the sutta with the additional three formulas: the Chatthasāṅgiti does the same at S (B9) III 42–43, while BJṬ simply gives all four formulas in full. Woodward (1930) does not translate the concluding phrase and simply passes over the question of whether the sutta is to be repeated with all four formulas; Bhikkhu Bodhi (2000, p. 1553), however, notes that each of the twelve suttas of the vagga is to be expanded by way of the four formulas, though he does not count each as a separate sutta in his numbering.

18This explains the extra sutta counted by B9 for the magga-saṃyutta when compared with E9 and Bodhi’s translation; while both the latter include the tasinā repetition they do not number it separately (see Bodhi 2000, p. 1898, n. 46). It also explains similar discrepancies in some of the other saṃyuttas of the Mahā-vagga. The word tasinā (or tasinā) is, of course, simply another Prakrit form, alongside taṇhā, of Sanskrit trṣṇā, showing svarabhakti rather than assimilation of the consonant group (cf. Geiger & Norman 1994, § 30.3). This alternative form is extremely rare, however, such that it would seem appropriate to regard it as anomalous in Pāli. In the present context tasinā is not included in S9 and C9, while E9 (S V 58, n. 1) notes that it is not found in the Sinhalese manuscripts. Electronic searches of E9, C9, S9 and B9 give no other occurrences of the form tasinā, while the form tasiṇā appears at Dhp 342–43, Nidd I 488 (v.1. and other editions, tasiṭā), and Nidd II 221.
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again it is explained that the bhikkhu develops each constituent of the path with reference to the vivekanissita, rāgavinaya, amatogadha and nibbānaniṁna formulas. A further set of repetitions is then obtained by substituting thorough knowledge (pariññā), destruction (parikkhaya) and abandoning (pahāna) for abhiññā. This gives the vagga a total of 160 suttas (10 × 4 × 4).

The ogha-vagga exactly repeats the pattern of the esana-vagga by giving a further set of 10 items for the direct knowledge, thorough knowledge, destruction, and abandoning of which the eightfold path is developed. The vagga thus again contains a total of 160 suttas (10 × 4 × 4).

These nine peyyālas/vaggas of the magga-samyutta thus contain a total of 506 suttas. The figure of 506 repetitions is not in doubt (apart from the issues with the esana- and balakaranīya-vaggas noted above): it is simply that Feer and the Mahā-vagga’s two English translators have chosen somewhat arbitrarily not to count each repetition as a sutta in its own right. The BJT C° edition, however, makes its total number of suttas for the magga-samyutta explicit: 546. And while the Śyāmaratṭha edition does not give a running total for suttas, it indicates the beginning of repetitions with the expression Sāvatthīnīdānam,19 making clear that it is treating each as a sutta. Moreover, as we shall discuss presently, it is only by counting such repetitions as suttas in their own right that we can arrive at something like the figure Buddhaghosa gives for the number of suttas contained in the Saṁyutta-nikāya. In other words, there must be a long tradition of treating such formulaic repetitions as suttas.

The last five of the above nine peyyālas/vaggas (comprising 456 repetitions in the magga-samyutta) occur again in a further seven samyuttas of the Mahā-vagga, substituting in each case for the eightfold path the set of items that constitute the subject of the samyutta: the seven bojjhaṅgas, the four satipaṭṭhānas, the five indriyas, the four

19Although this expression itself gets lost in the abbreviations and does not occur 506 times.
sammappadhānas, the five balas, the four iddhipādas, and the four jhānas. In the case of the sammappadhānas, the balas and the jhānas, this set of five pavyālas/vaggas in fact constitutes the entire saṃyutta.

However, rather than allowing a full set of 456 repetitions in the contexts of these seven saṃyuttas, Feer’s edition (followed by the English translations) seems to suggest a reduction in the number of repetitions. That Feer wants to limit the number of repetitions is clear from the figures he gives in the table in the introduction to his edition (S V v). Yet it is not clear from the text presented by Feer himself that such a reduction in repetitions is warranted.

Feer’s edition is based on rather limited materials, just four manuscripts, two in Sinhala script and two in Burmese; one of the Sinhala manuscripts had three missing sheets, while one of the Burmese he describes as “unfortunately very deficient in this part, as many sheets are wanting” (S V vii). It is also difficult to follow in the abbreviated sections, perhaps reflecting inconsistencies in the manner of presentation of the abbreviations in his manuscripts.

In the case of the bojjhaṅgas, indriyas and balas, Feer concludes that only the vivekanissita and rāgavinaya formulas apply (omitting the amatogadha and nibbānaninna formulas), which effectively reduces the number of repetitions by half from 456 to 228. Feer’s conclusion is apparently based on the fact that his manuscripts only make explicit that these two formulas apply. In the case of the satipaṭṭhānas, sammappadhānas, iddhipādas, and jhānas, Feer’s text omits all four formulas (vivekanissita, rāgavinaya, amatogadha and nibbānaninna), which effectively reduces the number of repetitions by three quarters to 114. Feer’s conclusion is apparently based on the fact that his manuscripts fail to make explicit that any of these formulas apply — if they do apply they are lost in abbreviation.

Nevertheless, apparently following Burmese manuscripts, the bojjhaṅga-saṃyutta ends in his edition with yad api maggasamuyuttam vithāretabbaṁ tād api bojjhaṅgasamuyuttam vithāretabbaṁ (S V 140), the satipaṭṭhāna-saṃyutta with yathā maggasamuyuttam vithāritam
evan satipatthanasamyutta viththarettaban (S V 192), and the jhāna-samyutta with yathā maggasamyyutta evan jhāna samyuttan viththarettaban (S V 310). The Gangā-peyyala of the indriya-samyutta concluded again in his Burmese manuscripts with yathā maggasamyutto evan bhavati indriyasamyutte (S V 240, cf. n. 1). Notes at the end of the indriya- and bala-samyutts (S V 243, n. 1; 253, n. 3) record that in fact his two Sinhalese manuscripts included a reference to the two additional formulas (amatogadha and nibbānaninna), while the oghavagga of the bala-samyutta in his Sinhalese manuscripts also had yathā pi maggasamyutto tathā pi indriyasamyutto viththarettaban (S V 251, n. 3). In the case of the remaining samyuttas, which Feer presents as limited to the vivekanissita formula, we have only phrases such as Gangapeyyala [sic] satipatthanasamavasena viththarettaban (S V 190), sammappadhānasamyuttassa Gangapeyyali sammappadhānasamavasena viththarettabā (S V 245), Gangapeyyali iddhipādavāsena viththarettabban (S V 291) — phrases which would seem to leave the question of whether or not all four formulas apply at least open. These various phrases are, incidentally, omitted by the Mahā-vagga’s English translators.

In sum, the manuscript evidence as presented by Feer would seem in fact capable of being interpreted differently, and might be taken as suggesting that in every case the full 456 repetitions are to be understood. Moreover, as a general rule in Pāli texts, where we find abbreviations, we would expect to refer back to the place where the unabbreviated text first occurred in full, in this case the relevant peyyālas/vaggas of the magga-samyutta.

Turning to the modern Asian editions, however, there is some confusion and inconsistency on this issue. Like Feer, both S² and B² generally make only the application of the vivekanissita and rāgavinaya sets of repetitions explicit in the case of the bojjhangas, indriyas and balas. Yet they both contain anomalies. At the equivalent of S (E⁵) V 137-8, both S² and B² seem to indicate that all four formulas should
apply to the *bojjañgas*. The numbering of suttas in BJT C⁶ makes clear that it understands all four formulas should apply in all cases.

It is also worth noting that the *amatogadha* formula is anyway applied to the *indriyas* at S V 220–23, 232–33, while the *nibbānaninna-nibbānapabhāra* formula is already in effect applied in each of these *samyuttas* since it is imbedded in the *Gāndā-peyyāla* frame. This makes clear that we should not think in terms of there being some sort of a priori doctrinal objection to applying these formulas to items other than the eightfold path.

None the less, although BJT C⁶ wants to apply all four formulas in all cases, it is not entirely clear how to apply any of the four formulas. Usually they are inserted after *bhāveti*, but the exposition of the *satipaṭṭhānas*, *sammappadhānas* and *jhānas* does not follow the same pattern; the main verb is *viharati* or *padahati* rather than *bhāveti*, and it is not clear how the formulas would fit into such sentences. In other

---

20 S (S) V 187,10–188,6 = (B) III 120,18-25: idha, bhikkhave, bhikkhu sambojjañga bhāveti vivekanissitaṃ virāganissitaṃ nirodhaniṣitaṃ vossaggappariṇāmin  || pa  || upekkhāsambojjañga bhāveti rāgavinayapariyosāṇaṃ dosavinayapariyosānaṃ mohavinayapariyosānaṃ  || amatogadhaṃ amataparāyanaṃ amatapariyosānaṃ  || nibbānaninnaṃ nibbānapabhāraṃ. imeṣaṃ kho, bhikkhave, bhikkhu pañcannan uddham-bhāgijānanaṃ samyojanānaṃ abhiññāya pariññāya parikkhayāya pahānaṃ āne satta bojjañga bhāvetabbā. The above occurs at the conclusion of the first rehearsal of the *oghavagga*, which begins by applying only the *vivekanissita* formula and is followed by further rehearsals of the *Gāndā-, appamāda-, balakaraṇiya-, esanā- and Ṙgha-vaggas* applying the rāga-vinaya formula.

21 Thus, for example, S (C) V 340 states with reference to the *Gāndāpeyyāla* in the *satipaṭṭhānasamyutta*: vivekanissitādīvasesa rāgavinayapariyosānādi-vasesa amatogadhādīvasesa nibbānaninnaṃdīvasesa ca ekekāṃhitā cattāro cattāro katvā athacatāllāsasattutā vithāreṇabbā.

22 bhikkhu sammādītthiṁ bhāveti vivekanissitaṃ virāganissitaṃ nirodhaniṣitaṃ vossaggappariṇāmin, etc.

23 To apply the *vivekanissita* formula to the sentence idha bhikkhave bhikkhu kāye kāyānapassā viharati atāpi sampaṭṭhā satimā vineyya loke abhijjhā-domanassaṃ, the only option would seem to be to make *vivekanissita* qualify bhikkhu which is hardly possible.
contexts in the Nikāyas we find the vivekanissita formula only applied to the magga, indriyas, balas and bojjanagas, though in the Nettippakarana and some Buddhist Sanskrit sources it is applied to the iddhipādas/iddhipādas (Gethin 1992A, pp. 92, 162–68). On balance I think Feer was probably right to exclude the application of all four formulas from the satipaṭṭhāna-, sammappadhāna-, iddhipāda- and jhāna-samyuttas, but wrong to limit the application of these to the vivekanissita and rāgavinayaka formulas in the case of the bojjanaga-, indriya- and balasamyuttas.

Finally in the sacca-samyutta, Cī counts 15 instead of the 11 of the other editions. The 4 extra suttas are found by taking the terms in the compounds tulākātu-kaṁsakātu-mānakātu (S V 473,15–16) and ukkotana-vaṁcana-nikatti (S V 473,20–21) as the basis of six separate suttas rather than just two. This is possible though somewhat arbitrary given the occurrence of dvandva compounds in other suttas of this vagga which are not so treated.

3. Conclusions

1. Buddhaghosa’s total of 7,762 suttas for the Samyutta-nikāya suggests that the Pāli tradition itself has long opted for the maximum number of repetitions in considering this text. Moreover, in contrast to the text’s European editors and translators, it has wanted to count these repetitions as “suttas” in their own right.

2. But even taking the option of the maximum number of repetitions, I have not succeeded in reaching Buddhaghosa’s total. The figure I reach is 6,696, a figure which is still 1,066 short of his total. This suggests that either I have made a mistake and overlooked some section of repetitions or that the text of the Samyutta-nikāya that has

---

24We might add 342 to the total for the iddhipāda-samyutta on the grounds that the vivekanissita, etc., formulas could conceivably be applied, but that still leaves us 724 short, and if, against reason, we attempt to apply the vivekanissita, etc., formulas and add 342 also in the case of the satipaṭṭhāna-, sammappadhāna-, and jhāna-samyuttas we have 8,064 — 302 over.
come down to us is not as Buddhaghosa himself (or at least his source for the figure 7,762) had it.

3. What then are we to make of these repetition sections of the Samyutta-nikāya? Mark Allon (1997, pp. 360–63) has summed up some of the suggestions that have been made concerning the significance and function of repetitions generally in Buddhist texts. To paraphrase, these include aiding memorization, getting the message across, cultivating mindfulness, and enhancing the aesthetic appeal of the texts.

4. It is difficult to see how the structural repetitions of the kind we have been considering have a straightforward mnemonic function in so far as they themselves are what is to be remembered rather than an aid to remembering it. But certainly we might see these kinds of repetition as functioning as a way of getting the message across, cultivating mindfulness, and enhancing the aesthetic appeal of the texts. The doctrinal and practical importance of the items that are the subject of the most repetitions — the unconditioned, and the seven sets of items that come to be termed “dhammas that contribute to awakening” (bodhipakkhiya-dhamma) — is clearly highlighted and enhanced by the repetitions. Moreover this kind of structural repetition involving as it does the substitution of various items in turn must require and develop a certain mental alertness and agility that goes beyond mere rote repetition, such that it might be considered a practice for developing the Buddhist meditative virtues of mindfulness and concentration. But we can perhaps go a little further in considering this function of repetition.

5. Although the items that are the subject of structural repetition may be doctrinally important, it is hard to see how it could be doctrinal considerations that are driving the repetitions. That is, in the Gaṅgā- peyyāla, it would seem it does not matter doctrinally whether it is the river Ganges or the Yamunā; or whether they are flowing to the “east” or the “great ocean”. What is driving the repetition seems to be the very requirement to repeat. This gives this kind of repetition something of the quality of the kind of repetitive recitation that is found in various religious traditions and often associated with the use of a rosary as a
means of counting off the repetitions. Of course, I am not suggesting that a rosary was actually used in the recitation of the Saṃyutta-nikāya, merely that consideration of broader religious practices can help us understand the possible functions of repetition in early Buddhist texts.

6. Given that what matters is not whether we are talking of the Ganges or the Yamunā, but repetition for its own sake, why in the Gaṅgā-peyyāla stop at six rivers? Why not throw in a few more? Why in the asamkhata-saṃyutta not add a few more substitute terms for the unconditioned? One response to such questions might be to say that one cannot add any more rivers because this is buddhavacana and this is the text and it cannot be changed. But such a response seems to me to miss the point. Certainly the modern editions and the manuscripts on which they are based each provide a fixed text, but when these different fixed texts are considered collectively, although we can move some considerable way towards determining a textual consensus, we are confronted by the fact that in certain places the editions and manuscripts indicate patterns of repetition that are by their very nature at least to some extent open ended. My suggestion is that, although over time these repetition sections have become more or less fixed, they originally seem to have been composed in a manner that invites addition and expansion — within certain parameters.25

7. The term peyyāla itself is rather curious. It appears to represent Sanskrit paryāya in the sense of “repetition”: paryāya > payyāya >

25I made somewhat similar observations in Gethin 1992A (p. 252) and 1992B (pp. 157–58) which have recently been the subject of criticism by Alexander Wynne (2004, pp. 104–108): while I would wish to tighten the use of the term “improvisation” and exclude the implication of composition in performance, on grounds that I hope are apparent in the present paper, I would wish to stand by the claim that there are good reasons for thinking of different recensions of Buddhist texts crystallizing after a period of somewhat freer composition and adaptation. These are extremely complex issues and it seems to me that we still lack a convincing model for the oral composition and transmission of early Buddhist texts that can explain the kinds of difference and correspondence that we find between versions of material in Pāli, Sanskrit, and Chinese and Tibetan translations.
peyyāya > peyyāla (cf. Geiger 1994, §§ 52.5, 52.9, 46.3; Trenckner 1908, p. 117). But the technical sense of “repetition” seems to be reserved for this particular form, which occurs alongside Pāli pariyāya, used in other senses. Similar Middle Indic forms such as peyyāla and piyāla are found used in the same way in Buddhist Sanskrit texts (q.v. BHSD). Thus the term peyyāla in the sense of “repetition” seems to have become frozen and is left unchanged when Buddhist texts are transposed from one Middle Indian dialect to another. K.R. Norman (2006, p. 114) has drawn attention to the fact that peyyāla seems to represent an eastern dialect form. If we assume that peyyāla, pe, and la were only used in abbreviating written texts, then as Norman points out, the eastern form of the word might indicate that the texts began to be written down before they were transposed into a western dialect; alternatively peyyāla in its technical usage is borrowed from some other source at some later date. Another alternative, however, might be that peyyāla was already used to abbreviate texts in oral recitation. It does not seem to me implausible — pace Wynne 2004, p.107 — that reciters and teachers of the texts might have resorted to the use of peyyāla to establish the framework for patterns of repetition of the kind we have been considering in the Saṃyutta-nikāya; these specific repetitions might then have been recited in full as a religious exercise.

Table 2. Numbers of suttas counted in S II (Nidāna-vagga)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>samyutta</th>
<th>E° Feer</th>
<th>B° CS</th>
<th>C° BJT</th>
<th>Bodhi</th>
<th>RMLG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nidāna</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abhisamaya</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dhātu</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anamatagga</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kassapa</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lābhassakāra</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāhula</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lakkhaṇa</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opamma</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhikkhu</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>286</strong></td>
<td><strong>246</strong></td>
<td><strong>406</strong></td>
<td><strong>286</strong></td>
<td><strong>406</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3. Numbers of suttas counted in S III (Khandha-vagga)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sanyutta</th>
<th>E² Feer</th>
<th>B³ CS</th>
<th>C⁴ BJT</th>
<th>Bodhi</th>
<th>RMLG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>khandha</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rādha</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diṃṭhi</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>okkantika</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uppāda</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kilesa</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāriputta</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nāga</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supānna</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gandhabba</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valāhaka</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacchagotta</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jhāna/samādhi</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>733</strong></td>
<td><strong>716</strong></td>
<td><strong>716</strong></td>
<td><strong>716</strong></td>
<td><strong>716</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4. Numbers of suttas counted in S IV (Salāyatana-vagga)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sanyutta</th>
<th>E² Feer</th>
<th>B³ CS</th>
<th>C⁴ BJT</th>
<th>Bodhi</th>
<th>RMLG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>salāyatana²⁷</td>
<td>207 (247)</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vedanā</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mātugāma</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jambukhādaka</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sāmāṇḍaka</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moggallāna</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>citta</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gāmanī</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asaṅkhata</td>
<td>44 (1453)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avyākata</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>391</strong></td>
<td><strong>420</strong></td>
<td><strong>2286</strong></td>
<td><strong>434</strong></td>
<td><strong>2356</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²⁶Table at S III xi has “13” but this must be an error.
²⁷C⁴ counts with next.
Table 5. Numbers of suttas counted in S V (Mahā-vagga)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sanyutta</th>
<th>E Feer</th>
<th>B CS</th>
<th>C BJT</th>
<th>Bodhi</th>
<th>RMLG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>magga</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bojjhanga</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satipatthāna</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indriya</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sammappadhāna</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bala</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iddhipāda</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anuruddha</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jhāna</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ānāpāna</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sotāpatti</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sacca</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1208</strong></td>
<td><strong>1201</strong></td>
<td><strong>3977</strong></td>
<td><strong>1197</strong></td>
<td><strong>2951</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The Career of Women Disciple Bodhisattas*

The whole purpose of conditioned existence is the attaining of awakening, Nibbâna, according to the Theravâda Buddhist view of the world. Eventually, individuals who develop their minds correctly will all attain the state of being Noble Ones, arahats. The Pâli Canon and commentaries can be seen as being based on this concept. The teachings and stories, the rules of conduct, and even the explanation of the meaning of words all revolve around awakening. In the Canon, the awakening of Buddha Gotama is the key event because he was able to discover how to reach awakening and then teach others to do the same.

Like the Vinaya-piṭaka, many of the commentaries begin by describing the career of the Great Bodhisatta (mahâ-bodhisatta), or Great Being (mahâ-satta) as he is also called, who became the Teaching Buddha Gotama (Sammâ-sambuddha). The Vinaya-piṭaka account leads up to the rules for the monks and nuns, the Pâtimokkha. The introduction to the Jåtaka commentary (SGB) leads up to Anâthapiṇḍika’s gift of the Jetavana monastery to the Buddha and the Order of Monks, presumably because this place was used by former Buddhas and was the place most of the Jåtaka stories were told. The Therågåthå commentary leads up to the founding of the Order of Nuns.

The details of how an individual becomes a Teaching Buddha or a Pacceka Buddha are readily available in translations into English.¹ There is less information about what an individual does to become an awakened disciple of a Teaching Buddha, so I would like to give an overview of the career of those intent on awakening as women disciples, taking most of my information from the Apadåna verses (many of

*It is a privilege to make a contribution to this celebration of the hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of the Pali Text Society and the eightieth birthday of K.R. Norman.

¹Besides SGB, see also CSM, the commentary on the Buddhavamsa ascribed to Buddhaddatta, and TP, from Dhammapâla’s commentary on the Cariyåpiṭaka.

which are included in Thī-a), Buddhaghosa’s commentary on the Aṅguttara-nikāya (Mp), and Dhammapāla’s commentaries on the Cariyāpiṭaka and the Therīgāthā as well as his introduction and conclusion to his commentary on the Theragāthā. This is mainly limited to women disciples and should not be considered to be a comprehensive view of the subject.

The teachings found in the Canon concentrate on attaining arahatship, or at least one of the three lower states of awakening that mean an individual is assured of becoming an arahat. The commentaries tell of the countless number of human beings, Devas, and Brahmās who have done the necessary preparation in the past to encounter a Teaching Buddha, hear the Doctrine, practise it, and attain the highest goal. There are, however, some indications of people who are merely started on the path. For some lay people, the Buddha only taught the beginning steps of generosity and moral conduct. Much more information about the disciple’s path is found in the commentaries. This could be seen as reflecting the view that after the Buddha’s demise, fewer and fewer people are born who have made the necessary preparations in past lives to attain Nibbāna in this life. It is seen as crucial for these people, who are unready to attain the final goal, to make a maximum effort to be generous and live moral lives. These actions lead to good lives in the future, lives in which they can begin to put the Buddha’s Doctrine into practice. If possible, a person in this life should also study the Buddha’s Doctrine and practise training the mind and training in insight.

First, let us look at a few details of what must be done to become a Teaching Buddha or a Pacceka Buddha. An individual (not necessarily a human being) must encounter a Teaching Buddha, one of his disciples, or a Pacceka Buddha and have faith in them. This faith profoundly stirs that individual’s mind. That leads to doing a good deed, and eventually, the individual is able to hear the Doctrine taught by the Buddhas and make an aspiration to attain awakening. Then the individual begins to

---

2 The passage on the foremost bhikkhus is found in WL.
3 See his discourses to two pairs of old brahmans, for example (A I 156).
put the Doctrine into practice. Over a number of lifetimes, the ten perfections are cultivated, until the individual is ready to experience Nibbāna for himself or herself. At this point, certain individuals aspire to something higher: either becoming a Pacceka Buddha or a Teaching Buddha. From this point on, the individual will never be born on a plane lower than the animal world and will never be female. Pacceka Buddhas develop the ten perfections on another level, spoken of as the twenty perfections. Teaching Buddhas develop a third level, or the thirty perfections. The length of time is longer for Teaching Buddhas than for Pacceka Buddhas, and even Teaching Buddhas can develop them for three differing lengths of time. There are many events and characteristics of Teaching Buddhas that are true for all of them and others that vary from Buddha to Buddha.

Dhammapāla speaks of three categories of Buddhas: Sammā-Sambuddhas (Teaching Buddhas), Pacceka Buddhas, and Sāvaka Buddhas (Disciple Buddhas) (Th-a I 10). Canonical texts use the title arahat (or arahant) for all three types of Buddhas, and their parinibbāna is said to be equal. Dhammapāla also uses the terms sammā-sambodhi, pacceka-sambodhi, and sāvaka-sambodhi (Th-a I 8, III 205f.). Disciple Buddhas are divided into three categories: chief disciples (agga-sāvaka), leading disciples (mahā-sāvaka), and ordinary disciples (pakati-sāvaka) (Th-a III 206).

4 A Burmese Buddhist explained to me once that an action done while aspiring to the attainment of Nibbāna would come under the category of the perfections and would continue to give results until a person became an arahat. An action done while aspiring to something lower, such as wealth, would only work for that effect and would be exhausted once the goal was reached.
5 On the eight qualities that must be present for this aspiration to be effective, see TP 262.
6 See TP 312f. Dhammapāla gives several different explanations that have been handed down concerning the interpretation of the ten, twenty, and thirty perfections. One explanation is that ten perfections are necessary for awakening for a disciple, twenty for a Pacceka Buddha, and thirty for a Teaching Buddha.
7 See TP 324.
For Teaching Buddhas, the amount of time they must prepare themselves as individuals intent on awakening (bodhisatta) falls into three categories: (1) the minimum (four incalculables [asankheyya] and 100,000 æons⁸), (2) the middle figure (eight incalculables and 100,000 æons), and (3) the maximum (sixteen incalculables and 100,000 æons) (TP 325f.). Pacceka Buddhas must develop the perfections for two incalculables and 100,000 æons (Th-a I 111).⁹ The three types of disciples who attain awakening must prepare themselves for the following periods: (1) chief disciples, one incalculable and 100,000 æons; (2) leading disciples, 100,000 æons (Th-a I 111); (3) ordinary disciples, 100 to 1,000 æons (?).

For the last category of ordinary disciples, no specific number seems to be given. In the Visuddhimagga (XIII ¶ 16) Buddhaghosa says other sectarians remember back 40 æons; ordinary disciples remember as far back as 100 to 1,000 æons (because their understanding is strong); the eighty great disciples remember as far back as 100,000 æons; the chief disciples remember as far back as an incalculable and 100,000 æons; Pacceka Buddhas remember as far back as two incalculables and 100,000 æons; but there is no limit to how far back Teaching Buddhas can remember. In his commentary on the list of the foremost bhikkhunis (Mp I 376–77), Buddhaghosa says that Therī Bhaddå-Kaccånå, whom he identifies with the wife of the Buddha, was one of four disciples who possessed great supernatural knowledge (mahā-bhiññå). The other three were the two Chief Disciples (Sāriputta and Mahå-Moggallåna) and Thera Bakkula. These four could remember further back than any of the other disciples: “The rest of the disciples can recall a hundred thousand æons, but, on the other hand, these four, after attaining to great supernatural knowledge, can remember an

⁸TP 325 has “great æons” (mahåkappa), but “æon” (kappa) seems to be used elsewhere. See the note on TP 325 concerning the length of time involved in an asankheyya and a mahåkappa.

⁹According to Buddhadatta, it takes them one incalculable and more than 100,000 æons (CSM 88).
The wife of the Buddha is exceptional in that she is said to have first been associated with the future Buddha when he made his first resolve to become a Teaching Buddha. In the Apadāna her name is given as Yasodharā, who says she gave eight handfuls of lotuses to the Bodhisatta Sumedha, and he offered these to Buddha Dīpākara. She does not make an aspiration to become awakened in that life, however.

Dhammapāla says there are distinct differences between a Great Bodhisatta and Pacceka and disciple bodhisattas. These differences are seen in their faculties (indriyata), ways of practice (patipatittha), and skilfulness (kosallata). The Great Bodhisatta has lucid faculties and lucid knowledge, and he practises not for his own welfare, but for the welfare of others. The other two types of bodhisattas do not. The Great Bodhisatta applies skilfulness to his practice through his ingenuity in creating opportunities (to benefit others) and his skill in distinguishing what is possible from what is not possible (TP 266f.). But for all of them, the perfection of virtue is the foundation of their awakening (TP 276), with the difference that compassion and skilful means are the forerunners for a Great Bodhisatta (TP 303). Dhammapāla points out that the first chapter of the Visuddhimagga discusses virtue as it should be practised by those who seek to become awakened as disciples (TP 303).

We can also see how individuals aspiring to become Pacceka Buddhas or disciples have lower aspirations than a future Teaching Buddha. The Great Bodhisatta, Dhammapāla says, does not dedicate the merits from his practice of virtue to his own release from affliction in the unfortunate destinations or to his own achievement of kingship in the fortunate destinations or to becoming a Universal Monarch, a Deva, Sakka, Māra, or Brahmā, and he does not dedicate it to his own attainment of the threefold knowledge, the six types of higher knowledge, the

---

10Ap II 592–96. For details of the different names used for her, see Bareau 1995. At the time of Dīpākara, her name was Sumittā.
four discriminations, the awakening of a disciple, or the awakening of a Pacceka Buddha. He only dedicates it to becoming an omniscient Buddha (TP 303). We can deduce that disciple bodhisattas aspire to these lesser attainments.

Now let us look at the stories given in the Apadāna and the commentaries about the past lives of the group of women who became arahats and whose poems are included in the Therīgāthā. Tables 2 and 3 provide an overview.

A good story is one of the most useful teaching devices. A story not only gets across a message in an entertaining way, it can also give us information that does not appear in a general discussion of a topic. The stories of the careers of women who attained awakening at the time of Buddha Gotama or shortly after give us many details of the steps leading up to arahatship. For an individual who will become a Teaching Buddha, it is at that point that he defers the attainment of arahatship and resolves to work for the more difficult goal of becoming an omniscient Buddha. Here, we will only look at the career for the disciples.

For many of the women there are two versions of their story in the Therīgāthā commentary. One is in the prose text of the commentary proper. The other is in the Apadāna verses that may have been included in the commentary by Dhammapāla but were perhaps added later. There are some problems as to whether the right verses are associated with the right women. Since the names given with the Apadāna verses sometimes refer to the action done in a past life and are not the names of the women at the time of Buddha Gotama, it is understandable that some confusion could arise. I will not go into all the variants here, but the tables show how the Apadāna verses tend to give more details; when “Ap” is given, the information is only found in those verses. It is also possible that some of the stories in the prose text are associated with the wrong nuns, but that is not crucial to our discussion.

The first step involves being born in a plane of existence where one is sufficiently intelligent and where one can perform meritorious deeds. In the stories of the women elders, they were either human beings —
all of them but one being women in past lives — or they were kinnari, depicted as half-human, half-bird. Such an existence assumes good deeds through generosity and moral restraint in prior lives, but we will begin the disciples’ careers with the life during which they first had faith in either a Teaching Buddha, a Pacceka Buddha, or a disciple of a Teaching Buddha (a chief disciple, an arahat monk, or an arahat nun). They are usually said to have been impressed with the demeanour of the arahat they saw. In one case, an old woman visits a Bodhi tree and thinks to herself, “If the Buddha, the Blessed One, is incomparable, without equal, unrivalled, then may this [tree] of awakening show me a marvel.” The tree shines forth, its limbs looking like gold, and the woman is so impressed she sits there under the tree for seven days and seven nights, then honours it with lighted lamps.  

At the very least, the believing individual pays respects to the arahat, but she usually makes a gift of flowers, food, robes, etc. Table 1 includes a list of the various gifts given by the women in past lives. The stories emphasize the material good results of such gifts, telling us about the women’s lives in Deva worlds and the human world, about their being beautiful and having large retinues, being wealthy, being the chief queen of Deva kings, Universal Monarchs, or kings ruling over large realms, etc. And this confirms the remark made above about the motivation of disciples not being as lofty as that of future Teaching Buddhas.  

Other examples of such limited aspirations are found in the stories when women wish for such things as many children or beauty. Uppalavannā, for example, gave a gift of five hundred grains of fried rice and a lotus flower to a Pacceka Buddha who had just come out of the cessation state. She wished for as many children as there were grains of

---

11Thi-ä 60 (CVT 83).
12All of the foremost Bhikkhunis mentioned in Mp I 337–81 are included in Thi-ä except for Bhaddā Kaccānā and Sigālakamātā. No details are given concerning their good deeds in past lives aside from aspiring under Buddha Padumuttara to a foremost position.
rice and for lotus flowers to spring up at every footstep. In a later life, she gave birth to five hundred sons, all of whom become Pacceka Buddhas. And lotuses sprang up with every footstep she took. These lesser aspirations are not frequent in the stories, however.

The women who became chief disciples or great disciples under Buddha Gotama saw Buddha Padumuttara praise a nun who was foremost in a specific quality. This inspired them to make a gift, pay respects, and aspire to become foremost in that same quality. Buddha Padumuttara then looked into the future to see if their wish will come to fruition and makes a prediction. They all make their aspiration under the same Buddha because he lived one hundred thousand æons ago, and that is the time required to become a leading disciple. This also seems to be the period of time for the two chief disciples among the nuns (Khemā and Uppalavannā), as only one of the nuns is said to have encountered a Buddha earlier that Padumuttara. The exception is found in the Apadāna (no. 28) under the name Yasodharā, one of several names for the former wife of the Buddha. At the time of Buddha Dipāṅkara, four incalculables and 100,000 æons ago, she gave eight handfuls of lotuses to the Bodhisatta Sumedha, the future Buddha Gotama, who offered them to Buddha Dipāṅkara. This was the lifetime during which the Bodhisatta received his first prediction of Buddhahood.

For the chief disciples among the monks (Sāriputta and Mahā-Moggallāna), preparations took one incalculable and one hundred thousand æons. They made their aspiration under Buddha Anomadasī. We only find mentioned eleven women in the Therīgāthā commentary as aspiring to be foremost in some particular quality, thus becoming leading disciples. Dhammapāla, in his concluding remarks, simply says that the leading disciples among the nuns were Mahā-Pājāpatī Gotami, etc. (Thā 271, CVT 382). For the leading disciples

---

13Thā 177, 179, 181 (CVI 233, 236, 239).
14For a discussion of the information found on the Buddha’s former wife, See Bareau 1995.
15See Th-a III 90ff., CSM 255 (and the references in the note there).
among the monks, however, he gives all eighty names (Th-a III 205f.).

Ten laywomen who were foremost in some quality are listed in the Aṅguttara-nikāya (A I). The commentary (Mp I 401–404) says that each of them made an aspiration to attain the quality in the presence of Buddha Padumuttara, just as the foremost THERS had done. They are then said to have had many lives among devas and men up to the time of Buddha Gotama. Only one is mentioned as having encountered Buddha Kassapa, and that was the laywoman Visākhā, who was one of the seven sisters who were King Kiki’s daughters and sisters of Buddha Kassapa.

There is great variety in how the various women developed the qualities necessary to attain arahatship. A few did bad deeds that led to lives in hell. Two insulted an arahat nun, one committed adultery. Others did mixed deeds that led to mixed results. One nun filled a Pacceka Buddha’s bowl with mud, but she repented when a crowd of people criticized her. She cleaned the bowl and filled it with food. As a result, she had very bad breath in future lives, but was able to cure it. Another woman gave a Pacceka Buddha a lotus, took it back because she thought that he would have no use for a flower, then decided it would be useful as a cover to his bowl and gave it again. She too experienced pain for having taken back the flower, but eventually overcame her problems in future lives. It is important to note the fact that the mental attitude of the person doing an action is the main factor in what the results will be. Also, the message is clearly that you cannot wipe out a bad deed, but you can do a good deed to help mitigate the results.

These stories, of course, were meant to serve as an inspiration to Buddhists. The suffering caused by bad deeds should be a deterrent. The rewards for good deeds should be encouraging. Even the smallest deed done for an arahat — especially one who has just come out of the cessation state — is of great reward in many lives. Large gifts give even better results. The message here is that even a poor person can do meritorious deeds that will establish him or her on the path to liberation.
There is also the idea that being wealthy means one is able to make large gifts, that possessing wealth carries the responsibility of being generous (assuming one wishes to be happy in the future).

The standard phrase for women disciples for whom details of past actions are not given is: she did meritorious deed(s) under previous Buddhas and accumulated good (actions) as her basis for various lives (ayam pi purimabuddhesu katādhikārā tattha tattha bhave vivaṭṭāpa-nissayaṃ kusalam upacinanti). In the stories given, the good actions most frequently mentioned are paying respects, giving, and leading virtuous lives. Exceptionally, some women ordained under former Buddhas. Only one woman (Bhaddā Kāpiḷāṇī) is said to have developed the ability to go into absorption states (jhāna) in a past life. As a result, she is the only woman said to have had a life in a Brahmā world.

Another important aspect of the disciples’ mental attitude is being profoundly stirred (samvega). In his introductory remarks to his commentary on the Therigāthā, Dhammapāla says,

Women of good family, daughters-in-law of good family, and young women of good family heard of the full awakening of the Buddha, of the Doctrine in accord with the [true] Doctrine, and of the proper establishment of the Order. They had faith in the teaching and a profound stirring concerning continued existence. Then they had their own husbands, mothers and fathers, and relatives give them permission, and devoting themselves to the teaching, they went forth. Having gone forth, they were of good and virtuous conduct. They received instruction in the presence of the Teacher and all the various theras. Then, striving and making effort, they realized arahatship after a very short time.

Thī-a 4 (CVT 8)

In the individual stories, the women are usually said to be profoundly stirred after listening to a discourse on the Doctrine, and then they are ordained. The only women for whom being profoundly stirred is mentioned in past lives are those who ordained as nuns under former Buddhas. So samvega is a reaction to the conditioned world that

---

16Venerable Ēṇāmoli (Path) translates as “sense of urgency”. Mr Norman uses “religious excitement”.
motivates the individual to make a maximum effort to transcend the misery (dukkha) that results from constant change (anicca) and the lack of a permanent, controlling self (anattā). The usual order of events in the attainment of arahatship during the time of Buddha Gotama is (1) hearing the Doctrine, (2) being profoundly stirred, (3) ordaining in the Community of Nuns, and (4) developing insight. For a number of women, the Buddha, while seated in his PerfumeD Chamber, sends forth a luminous image of himself that appears before the woman as she is meditating. The image pronounces a verse that gives the woman just what she needs to hear in order to understand correctly and attain arahatship.

This brief look at the careers of the women elders does not give a complete picture for the disciple arahats, of course. Other details or variants in versions of stories are found in other commentaries, and there are especially the number of occasions found in the Jātaka commentary when various women were born at the same time as the Great Bodhisatta. As we saw, the women chief disciples do not prepare as long as the men chief disciples. Other differences are to be expected, so this essay should be seen as only a first step in examining this subject.

William Pruitt
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Table I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gd dds</th>
<th>Gd dds/Bd</th>
<th>Padu</th>
<th>Pac Bu</th>
<th>Ord</th>
<th>Bad dd</th>
<th>Verse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Therikā</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Muttā</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pranā</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Tissā 1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Tissā 2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Dhīrā 1, = 5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Dhīrā 2, ≠ 5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Mittā, = 5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Bhadrā, = 5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Upasamā, = 5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Muttā</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Dhammadinnā</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Visākkā, = 6</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Sumanā, = 4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Uttarā, = 4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Sumanā 2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Dhammā</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Sahghā</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Nandā</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Jentī, ≠ 19</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Unknown 1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Addhakāsī</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Cittā</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Mettikā</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Mittā</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Abbayathātā</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Abbayathēri</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Sāmā</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Sāmā 2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Umatā</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Umatā 2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Dantikā</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Ubbirī</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Sukkā</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Selā</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Sonā, ≠ 27</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Bhaddā Kāpilānī</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Unknown 2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Vimalā</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Silhā</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Nandā, ≠ 19</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Nanduttarā</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Mittākālī</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Sakulā</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Soṇā</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Bhaddā, former Jain</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Patācarā</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Thirty nuns</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Candā</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gifts, good acts:


B. Good deeds:
Paid respects (2, 69), ordained (22, 34 [expert in Doctrine], 52, 65, 66), kept Observance Days (30), went forth as female ascetic and developed absorption states (37), learned a discourse by heart (52), outstanding merit with regard to the Triple Gem (73)
Gave two gifts when told to give one (12), great gift (41), good deeds like giving (55)

C. Food:
Gift (Ap: food) to a chief disciple after he rose from the state of cessation (12), food (25, 33), ladle full of food (26), three cakes (31, 52), invited Buddha and Sangha for seven days (47, 52, 55 Ap, 64), cakes (67), spoonful of food (69 Ap)

D. Food and flower(s):
Fried rice (500 grains) and lotus (64)

E. Flowers
Flowers & perfumes (1), garland of reeds/reeds and flowers (3, 23), seven lotuses (27, 36), sala flowers (29), säl branches (32 Ap), flowers (32), seven flowers (64 Ap), lotus

---
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F. Robes:
Set of three robes (1, 47, 55, 64 Ap), two robes (25), yellow cloth (64 Ap)

G. Lodgings:
Pavilion of branches (1), built monastery (46, 47, 52, 64), park (73)

H. Requisites:
Requisites (45 Ap), huts, requisites (couches, seats, drink, food, bowls, etc.) (56)

J. Made or honored a shrine:
Honored shrine (19, 20), jewelled belt (given to shrine) (24), made a shrine (24 Ap),
honored Bodhi tree with lamps (5 lamps, Ap) after sitting there seven days and nights
(35), golden umbrella with gems (19, 20), golden tile for shrine (37), honored shrine
with oil (44)

K. Participated in great offering:
Presumably joined citizens in the following event: "When the teacher approached, all
the citizens, happy, pleased, went to meet him and strewed sand [for the festivities].
They swept the road and prepared banners and pots full of plantains. The teacher was
honoured with smoke (of incense), powder, and flowers. A hall was prepared, the guide
was invited. A great offering was given in hope of full awakening." (11)

L. Shared in other's merit:
Rejoiced at husband's gift (37): (a) robe, (b) meal, jewelled pavilion, bowl of gold, (c)
7,000 bowls with 7 jewels, filled with ghee; lamp wicks by thousands, lit, (d) shawl, (e)
supported Pacceka Buddhas for 3 months; gave sets of three robes

M. Gift of hair:
Let hair fall down and gave it as a gift (52)

Bad deeds done in past

A. Insulted a nun (22, 66)
B. Unspecified (led to children dying) (50)
C. Adultery (72)

Mixed deed (partly bad)

A. Filled a Pacceka Buddha's bowl with mud but repented and cleaned it (37)
B. Gave a lotus, took it back, then gave it again (64)

Gifts to: Teaching Buddha, Pacceka Buddha, Chief disciple, disciple (arahat), nun
(arahat), shrine to the Buddha, Bodhi tree (which showed her a marvel [35])
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pa</th>
<th>Si</th>
<th>Ti</th>
<th>Ph</th>
<th>Vi</th>
<th>Si</th>
<th>Ve</th>
<th>Kak</th>
<th>Kon</th>
<th>Kass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Therikā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Muttā 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Muttā 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Dhammadinnā*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Nandā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Addhakāsi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Mettikā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Mītā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Abbayamatā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Abbayatherī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Sāñā 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Uttamā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Uttamā 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Ubbirī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Sukkā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Selā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Sonā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Bhaddā Kāpilānī*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Nandā*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Sakulā*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Sonā*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Bhaddā, former Jain*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Paṭacārā*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Khamā*, **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Mahā-Pajāpatī Gotami*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Kisaṅgottamī*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Uppalavanā*, **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Punikā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Ambapālī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Rohini</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Sundari</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Sumedhā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Bhaddā Kaccanā*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Pa††ācārā*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Sigalakamātā*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aForemost in some quality.  **Two chief women disciples of Buddhas: Pa = Padumuttara (100,000 æons ago), Si = Siddhattha (94 æons ago), Ti = Tissa (92 æons ago), Ph = Pussa (92 æons ago), Vi = Vipassā (91 æons ago), Si = Sīkhi (91 æons ago), Ve = Vessabhū (91 æons ago), Kak = Kakasandha (the present æon), Kon = Konāgama (the present æon), Kass = Kassaya (the present æon)

*bOne of seven sisters, daughters of King Kikā. At Ja IV 481, The Buddha’s mother, Mahāmāyā, is given as one of the seven in place of Bhaddā the former Jain. The seventh sister is the laywoman Visākhā

*bOrdained.
Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hell</th>
<th>Deva worlds</th>
<th>Specific Deva worlds</th>
<th>Chief queen of Deva kings</th>
<th>Univ. kings Mon.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Therikāa</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Muttā</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Punā</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Muttā</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Dhammadinnā</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>2 (twice)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Nandā</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Advayakāsi</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Cittā</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Meitikā</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Mitiyā</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>2 (Ap)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Abbayamātā</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>2 (Ap)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Abbayattheri</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Uttamā</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Uttamā 2</td>
<td>x^b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Dantikā</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>2 (Ap)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Ubbirī</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Sukkā</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>2, 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Selā</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Bhaddā Kāpilāni</td>
<td>× Ap</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Nandā</td>
<td>2–6</td>
<td>many</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Sakulā</td>
<td>x^c</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Sonā</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>2 (Ap)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Bhaddā, former Jain</td>
<td>x^d</td>
<td>2, 2–6 (Ap)</td>
<td>many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Pañjācārā</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>2 (Ap, twice)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>Khemā</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>2, 4, 2–6 (Ap)</td>
<td>many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>Mahā-Pajāpati Gotamī</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>2 (Ap)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>Guttā</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>Kāsagotamī</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>2 (Ap, twice)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>Uppalaṇṇāṇā</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>2 (Ap, twice)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>Ambapālī</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>2 (Ap)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>Rohinī</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>2 (Ap)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>Sundarī</td>
<td>2 (Ap)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>Isdāsi</td>
<td>x^e</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>Śunacakāh</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>2, 2–6</td>
<td>many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP Bhaddā Kaccānā</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aAlso only in Deva worlds for a Buddha interval.
bNo lower births for 91 æons.
cDeva worlds only.
dGood lives for a Buddha interval.
eBecause she committed adultery when she was a man, she cooked in hell for hundreds of years, was born three times as an animal, then as a hermaphrodite, and finally as a woman in a poor family.
On the Correspondence of Helmer Smith
and Gunnar Jarring

During the years 1988 and 2000, when I was acting as the delegate of the Royal Swedish Academy of Literature, History, and Antiquities at the Union Académique Internationale, it was one of my regular duties to give an annual report on the latest meeting of the Academic Union. Whenever I did so, I frequently had the occasion of mentioning A Critical Pāli Dictionary, which, being one of the oldest projects, had been placed under the auspices of the International Academic Union at an early stage. After one of my autumnal reports at the Plenary Session of our Academy in Stockholm, Gunnar Jarring1 remarked to me that my presentation had interested him, particularly my comments on the progress of A Critical Pāli Dictionary, since he had kept up a long-lasting correspondence with Helmer Smith.2

Gunnar Jarring (1907–2002) was born in southern Sweden (Skåne). He received his Ph.D. from Lund. In the very beginning he went in for German and Scandinavian languages, but soon took up Sanskrit and comparative Indo-European philology, with Helmer Smith as one of his teachers, and made profound studies in Slavic languages, above all Russian, which finally led him to his chief subject, Turkology. A very industrious and competent lecturer, Gustaf Raquette (1871–1945),3 taught Turkish at that time at the University of Lund. Before his academic career docent Raquette had spent twenty-five years (1896–

3Cf. S. Rosén, 2003, p.35. Raquette is often mentioned in Helmer Smith’s letters to Gunnar Jarring.

1921) as a missionary in Kashgar in East Turkestan (today’s Xingjiang). He was fluent in Turkish, especially East Turkish, and, naturally, had a decisive influence on the young Jarring. In the same year in which Jarring obtained his doctor’s degree (1933), he was employed as “docent” and examiner in Turkish linguistics at Lund University. In 1940 Jarring’s lectureship expired, but thanks to his excellent knowledge of Russian and Turkish, he was now placed in the Swedish Security Service, first in Ankara and in 1941 in Teheran. From this year onward he followed a diplomatic career.


4After his return from Kashgar, Raquette taught two years at the Mission School of the Swedish Missionsförbund (1922–1924) in Lidingö, a suburb of Stockholm. He worked in Lund from 1924–1937. Here he was given the degree of a doctor honoris causa in 1937, an honour probably suggested by Jarring. “You awarded Raquette a doctorate; this was well done” (“Ni promoverade Raquette, det var bra gjort”) remarks Smith in a letter dated 2 June 1937. Raquette published a series of fundamental works on East Turkish, as, for example, Eastern Turki Grammar, 3 vols., 1912–1914; English–Turki Dictionary, 1927; The Accent Problem in Turkish, 1927: and edited East Turkish literature.

Helmer Smith (1882–1956), born in Stockholm, studied at the University of Uppsala, where he took the degree of Fil.lic. (M.A.) in the year 1908. In 1925 he received the honorary doctorate from the University of Lund. After having spent many years abroad, mainly in Berlin, Paris and Copenhagen, he obtained a lectureship (“docentur”) at Lund (1921–1935). Thus both Jarring and Smith lived many years in this old university town at times which partially coincided.

In a recently published article Olle Kvarnström narrates how Gunnar Jarring met Helmer Smith the very first time. Kvarnström writes, “The diplomat and orientalist Gunnar Jarring mentioned that during his years as a student in Lund a man was living in the house opposite (his own flat) in Nygatan. The gentleman in question seemed to devote the greater part of the day to something that looked like playing at patience. A fact that particularly struck Jarring was, however, that at regular intervals a lady entered the room and collected the cards which were then kept in an adjacent room. By and by, Jarring was introduced to the gentleman on the other side of the road and got to know that what had looked like patience cards were, as a matter of fact, excerpt cards for the A Critical Pāli Dictionary founded by Helmer Smith and Dines Andersen.”

In 1936, at the age of fifty-five, Helmer Smith was called to occupy the professorship of Sanskrit and Comparative Indo-European Linguistics at the University of Uppsala, a chair he had applied for

---

somewhat hesitatingly. He held it until 1947. Though mainly devoted to Pāli and Sinhalese studies, he shared many interests with Gunnar Jarring. His predecessor in Uppsala was Jarl Charpentier (1884–1935).

Both Smith and Jarring were ordinary members\(^8\) of the Royal Swedish Academy of Literature, History, and Antiquities in Stockholm. Smith was elected in 1940, Jarring in 1969. In his inaugural lecture Smith discussed “En detalj i den indiska metriken” (“a detail in Indian metrics”), while Jarring devoted his lecture to “Poltava och karolinskt kulturarbete i Turkiet och Sibirien”.\(^9\) Jarring’s lecture was published in the Academy’s yearbook, but Helmer Smith’s — due to the ongoing World War II — unfortunately not. Only a handout of seven pages with verses in Sanskrit, Persian, Greek, and Latin as well as metrical patterns is supposed to be left of this inaugural lecture.\(^10\) Interestingly, a minor incident occurred while Smith delivered his paper on Indian metrics, a subject which certainly was of no great interest to most of his colleagues in the learned audience. At that time His Royal Highness Gustav Adolf, later King Gustav VI. Adolf (1950–1973), was the Patron of the Academy and liked to act as chairman at the Academy meetings. As he was only moderately attracted by the subject dealt with by Smith, the Crown Prince nodded off for a while. Helmer Smith, who, as it seems, was easily offended, felt so distressed by this lack of interest on the part of His Royal Highness that he never attended another meeting of the Academy.

The two gentlemen were rather different with regard to birth, temperament, work, and lifestyle. Smith was the proud specialist of Pāli grammar and prosody which he had mastered brilliantly, while Jarring stood out as the indefatigable explorer of Turkish and Central Asian languages. Whereas Smith was one of those scholars who had neither visited the Indian subcontinent nor any of the various countries where Pāli is still spoken and studied, Jarring made many journeys, sometimes

---

\(^8\)In Swedish called “arbetande ledamöter”, that is to say, “working members”.

\(^9\)“Poltava and Carolingian cultural work in Turkey and Siberia”.

\(^10\)B. Collinder, p. 58.
even painstaking land travels on horseback. On his paternal side Smith was of British descent.\textsuperscript{11} His great-grandfather had been a sea captain from Belfast. Jarring, however, came from the countryside. He was the son of a couple of farmers from Brunnby in Malmöhus län named Gottfrid Jónsson and Betty Svensson, but changed his family name in early adulthood to Jarring. Already before he obtained his doctor’s degree with a thesis on “Studien zu einer osttürkischen Lautlehre”, he undertook research trips to Central Asia and East Turkestan, particularly Kashgar, where his teacher Gustaf Raquette had spent so many years.

Some time after his death Gunnar Jarring’s personal library and other documents of his legacy — among them also the letters written to him by Helmer Smith — were transferred to the Institute of Oriental Languages in Stockholm on the initiative of Staffan Rosén, professor of Korean language and literature at Stockholm University. His books are still kept in Stockholm; his letters and papers, however, have been deposited in Lund. I was, of course, curious about the letters and postcards which Helmer Smith, twenty-five years older than Jarring, had sent to his young colleague and, therefore, some time ago requested the authorities in charge of Jarring’s legacy to kindly grant me access to Smith’s letters, which are now preserved at the Manuscript Department (“Handskriftsavdelning”) of the Library of the University of Lund.\textsuperscript{12}

The “Collection Gunnar Jarring” contains altogether 181 letters, letter-cards and postcards from Helmer Smith, most of which were sent to Jarring during the first five years of the two scholars’ acquaintance—

\begin{itemize}
\item 1934: 26 letters, 1 letter-card, and 1 postcard,
\item 1935: 50 letters and 7 letter-cards,
\item 1936: 43 letters, 6 letter-cards, and 1 postcard,
\item 1937: 22 letters and 2 postcards, and
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{11}B. Collinder, p. 56.

\textsuperscript{12} I would like to record my gratitude to Birgitta Lindholm, Chief Librarian at the Manuscript Department of the University Library in Lund, for all the generous help I received from her during a short stay in Lund in March 2007. In this article Helmer Smith’s letters and other Swedish documents have been translated into English. The Swedish originals are quoted in the footnotes.
while during the following seven years Jarring received relatively little mail from his correspondent, namely—

1939: 4 letters,
1940: 1 letter,
1947: 1 letter,
1949: 4 letters,
1950: 8 letters,
1951: 7 letters, and
1952, four years before Helmer Smith’s death, again only 1 letter.

All the letters are handwritten, in an even and easily readable dactus litterarum. Smith addresses Jarring always as “Broder”, that is to say, “brother”, a formal address still used, particularly in academic circles. Every single letter is fully signed with “Helmer Smith”, never with simply “Helmer”, although the pronoun used is the familiar “du” and the verb form that of the second person singular. The letters were generally sent from Lund or Uppsala, some also from Stockholm. Most of them were, however, posted in Kummelnäs, his favourite abode, which he, being an only child, inherited from his well-to-do father’s wife and was beautifully situated in the inner Archipelago of Stockholm, at about fifteen kilometres distance from the centre and opposite Vaxholm.

As can be seen from the table given above, between 1949 and 1951 Helmer Smith sent again a few more letters to his former disciple. It was during these years that Jarring was Swedish ambassador in New Delhi, a position that evidently made quite an impression on Helmer Smith. Moreover, Smith was interested in certain books published in India.

Before I started going through his correspondence, I had hoped

---

13 Though Jarring was not yet ambassador when he stayed in Teheran, Smith addressed his letter of the 27 November 1951 to “His Exc. Dr Gunnar Jarring, Royal Swedish Legation, Teheran”.
14 A name that occurs several times is Suniti Kumar Chatterji.
above all to find in his letters many passages in which he discussed problems connected with Pāli and Sinhalese. To my great disappointment, however, this is rarely the case. Most letters deal with events in his daily academic life, his contacts with colleagues, their ability and behaviour, their applications for university posts, their successes and, more frequently, shortcomings and failures. Almost all Scandinavian scholars of Sanskrit, Iranian and related studies of the time pass review, in his correspondence, but need not be mentioned by name in this paper. In particular, Smith often refers to Hannes Sköld (1886–1930), then one of the most outstanding linguists of the University of Lund, in whose edition of the “Materialien zu den iranischen Pamiirsprachen” (1936) Helmer Smith was deeply involved.\(^5\)

“I have now been acting under the strict supervision of my Danish employer,\(^6\) and thus ‘Sköld’ has rested…”,\(^7\) writes Smith on 8 August 1935. He also assisted Wilhelm Geiger in Munich in his A Dictionary of the Sinhalese Language, which appeared in Colombo in 1941.\(^8\)

Smith’s correspondence shows naturally a clear predilection for lexicography and etymology. Almost every letter abounds in words or phrases from the numerous languages he knew (in addition to Sanskrit, Pāli, and Prakrit especially Sinhalese, Khotanese, Hindi, Tamil, Burmese, Tibetan, Persian, Urdu, Turkish, and other idioms). While reading his letters, we must bear in mind that Smith’s correspondent

---

\(^{5}\) An internationally especially renowned work of this untimely deceased scholar — “docent” at the University of Lund — is, of course, his “The Nirukta, Its Place in Old Indian Literature, Its Etymologies” (1926); cf. O. Kvarnström, p. 47.

\(^{6}\) This was, of course, Dines Andersen, with whom Helmer Smith together with Hans Hendriksen had edited Vol. I of A Critical Pāli Dictionary (1924–1948). Hans Hendriksen (1913–1989) was Smith’s successor in Uppsala (1947–1951). Dines Andersen (1861–1940) held the chair of Indian Philology at the University of Copenhagen from 1903 to 1927.

\(^{7}\) Jag har nu i sex veckor stått under omedelbar uppsikt av min danske arbetsgivare, så ‘Sköld’ har vilat’.

was a specialist in Turkish and that, therefore, Central Asian languages are in the foreground. Once, when Jarring was abroad on his first journey to East Turkestan and, while undertaking various trips, he had not given a more detailed indication of his whereabouts than just “next address Kashgar”, Smith sent a letter to Mrs Jarring, dated 2 June 1935, requesting her, “as a deputy guide for Turkish studies”, to inform him about useful manuals of Osman Turkish presenting the new writing system. “I shall never learn it,” he confesses, “but I need putting my nose into one thing and the other”. He took a great interest also in Khotanese, the ancient south-east Iranian language of the Sakas. This got him in touch with Sir Harold Bailey (1899–1996) in Cambridge, though Smith’s letters to Jarring do not reveal which of the two contacted the other first.

Helmer Smith liked to associate with his friends. In a letter sent on 2 June 1937, he gladly informs his addressee of the good news that his wife “Ellen has succeeded in getting a little housemaid for the summer which means that it will be easier for us to receive our friends this summer”. Colleagues with whom he entertained especially close relations were his French “friends from the twenties”, such as Jules Bloch, Louis Renou, Armand Minard, Pierre Meile, and Jean Filliozat, who are all mentioned in his letter of 22 August 1937. There he also reports to Gunnar Jarring that “Ellen and I could spend almost the whole month of July in Paris (more correctly in Sèvres as parasites at Jules Bloch’s), amidst a bustle of orientalism and orientals”. But already in a much earlier letter, dated 14 September 1936, he records that “two Parisians (Jules Bloch and Mrs Foucher) came from

---

19. “I er egenskap av vikarierande turkologisk vägledare.”
20. “Ellen har lyckats få en liten jungfru för sommaren, vilket betyder att vi nog får det lättare att ta emot våra vänner den här sommaren.”
22. The wife of Alfred Foucher.
Copenhagen and stayed with us”.  

Smith speaks little of his university teaching. On 21 November (probably 1937) he tells Jarring that “during the Spring seminar we will deal with ‘style and metre in the Upaniṣads’ and accept with gratitude all parallels and contributions to the world’s art of verse from the Turk” in Lund himself”. In a letter dated 18 April 1937 Smith comments with enthusiasm on Jarring’s suggestion of holding a series of joint seminars on the Sakas, “Your proposal of joint seminars on the Sakas is genial, … it should, however, be called ‘Every third (fourth) week H.S. Nyberg and Helmer Smith will hold sem(inar) ex(ercises) on Central Asiatic texts together with doc(ent) G. Jarring.’”

As can be seen from many remarks already quoted, Smith was not only a loyal friend but also had a good sense of humour as well as a wise and subtle irony which could concern also himself. He begins his letter of the 29 August 1935 with the words: “Thus my metrical follies have found you in the heart of Asia! — in Pakistan …”.  

Although he was very hard working, he did not despise festive occasions, even when they tended to be somewhat excessive as, for example, the celebration of “Dines Andersen’s last day in Sweden” (letter dated 19 August 1935) which caused “fatigue and a nosebleed”. On 25 July 1937 Smith recounts, “We work joyfully: two cigars and five fillings of the pipe are the time-measure of a working day for Dines — then I have seventeen hours for airing our study. We shall see if it will end on the 10th of August.” On 25 May 1938 he communicated humorously to Jarring: “You have thus seen [in the newspapers] that I have been considered

---

23 “Det kom tv parisare (Jules Bloch och fru Foucher) från Ki(ö)b(en)h(a)vn och stannade en vecka hos oss —.”

24 “I vår behandlar vi ‘stil och metrum i upaniṣaderna’ och alla paralleler och bidrag till världsväsendets teori mottas med tacksamhet … från själveste lundturken” (that is to say, Gunnar Jarring).

25 “Så har mina metriska tokerier funnit dig i hjärtat av Asien! — i Pakistan…”

26 “Så vi arbetar gladeligen: två cigarrer och fem pipstopningar är tidsmåttet på Dines’ arbetdag — sen har jag 17 timmar att vädra arbetsrummet på. Vi får se, om det slutar tade augusti.”
decrepid enough to enter the Academy of Antiquities….”27 He also makes fun of Charpentier and his name, when in one of his earliest letters written on 17 March 1936, he requests Jarring to carefully proofread some newly edited, unspecified text:28 “Well, this is what it looks like. Would you kindly take the trouble of seeing to it that the corrections are not misunderstood, then it can be printed. But we must have a third proof of sheet 16, likewise of the remaining sheets. Otherwise the whole thing will become Charpentier (the blessed man considered that proofreading belonged to the lower classes — including some German case- and number-endings). — And I am still far from being appointed a Charpentier.”29

Some letters refer to his outdoor work in Kummelnäs which he did willingly, although it often prevented him from studying. “Again Kummelnäs,” he writes on 6 May 1937, “and this means Sakish, as well as it may go, but the day after tomorrow we shall plant potatoes the whole day.”30 And after a few days, on 9 May 1937: “Now the potatoes are in the ground and I have started presenting the meaning of one of our Sakish pages (§§ 18–29 of a tractate which speaks of bodhisattvas such as Kṣitigarbha and Mañjuśrī), unfortunately, the correct understanding must be established from a Chinese source. But we can look at it, can’t we?” And twelve years later, on 23 August 1949, Smith writes, “Shortly my farm servant will come, and we shall fell three firs with dry tops to get firewood for the winter. Farming takes at least six

27 “Du har således sett att jag befunnit skröplig nog att komma i Antikvitets akademien....”

28 Probably Sköld’s Materialien zu den iranischen Pamirsprachen.

29 “Ja, så här ser det ut. Vill Du ha besväret att övervaka att rättelserna inte missförstås, så kan det sedan tryckas. Men av ark 16 måste vi ha ett 3dje korr(ektur) och så av de övriga arken. Annars blir det Charpentier av det hela. (Salig människan ansjg att korrekturläsning hörde hemma i underklassen — inklusive en del tyska casus- och numerusänder. — Och jag är ju ännu inte utnämnd till Charpentier på långa tag.”

30 “Kummelnäs igen, och det betyder sakiska, så gott det går, men i övermorgon skall vi lägga potatis hela dagen.”
hours every day, and also other pleasant things can get in the way [to keep me] from reading modern Hindi and Pali."

But what about Pāli and Middle Indian? May we guess that Smith did not consider Jarring to be a correspondent sufficiently versed in this field? The letter dated (Uppsala) 11 April 1938 would perhaps not corroborate this hypothesis, though it deals, on the other hand, more or less exclusively with Middle Indian forms for “Turkish”:

I have had trouble with a sporadic sound-law in Middle Indian — that is to say, a sound-rule which seems to be valid for the adaptation of learned Sanskrit words (respectively loan words) to Pāli–Prakrit habits of pronunciation, the clearest examples of which are:

Sanskrit mūrkha “idiot”, which in the regular way develops into Pkt mukkha (rkḥ assimilated, u shortened before the [consonant] group) but which (Pischel, *Grammatik der Prakritsprachen* § 139) also appears as murukka, whilst kh is geminated (a well-known rule in Sanskrit school pronunciation) and anaptyctic u is developed.

Sanskrit pūrv “first”, etc., normally puvva (like above, but sometimes puruvva parallel with above).

If, while this rule functioned, one had borrowed the word turk, it would have necessarily become an -a stem, hence *turka*, and from it (parallel with mūrkha) turukka. The form exists and is noted by Pischel (op. cit. § 302), but as an example of loss of aspiration, as one normally said Turukka which comes from Sanskrit Turuskha.

From this I draw a conclusion which is sure: that turukka never had a kkh but came directly from < turk. Secondly, I believe in the possibility that the same turk > turukka could become turukkha in conformity with the similar — and excuse me — therewith associated murukka “thick-skull” and milukku (“khh sporadic in Pāli) “barbarian (as concerns language)”. Thirdly, if the Sanskrit form Turuskha is not older than that, it could be a learned transformation of Turukkha. (The form Turaka, which is said to exist, is without phonological value.)

---

31.”Nu kommer min gårdskarl, och vi skall fälla tre tallar med torrtopp till vid för vintern. ‘Lantbruket’ tar minst 6 timmar var dag; och även andra angenäma saker kommer i vägen för läsningen av nyindiska och pali.”
The very last document of the “Collection Gunnar Jarring” is not a letter from Helmer Smith addressed to Gunnar Jarring but the photocopy of an undated letter Smith addressed to Nils Simonsson. In a few added lines dated 30 November 1989 Jarring comments upon it as follows: “Dear Per, This photocopy of a letter from Smith to Simonsson shows Lund in a glorified light. May I suggest that you put it at the end of Helmer Smith’s “dossier” in my collection of letters. By the way,
Helmer Smith’s letters to me need not be kept in a closed envelope any more but should be preserved in the same manner as the other letters. Yours faithfully, Gunnar.”

Smith’s letter (or a part of the letter) runs as follows:

The commentary is in general well informed … but I am becoming more and more convinced that there exist two kinds of Pāli: one which was spoken by Buddha and was written by Buddhaghosa [and] the Tikākāras, Aṅgavamsa, Moggalāna and other theras and was understood and read by Fausbøll and Trenckner and others. This is the first kind of Pāli; the other kind of Pāli is more flexible and more suited to express the fundamental doctrines of Christianity and the philosophy of Epicurus. This is the Pāli of Comparative History of Religions, it is spoken inter alia in Lund; it is a fortunate language, because its vocabulary is small and it is not troubled by any grammar.

The contents of this document are unfortunately disappointing and would not be accepted by any of today’s scholars of Pāli. The statement that Pāli is “spoken in Lund” and thus “shows Lund in a glorified light” is absurd and tinged by strongly local patriotism. It is rather strange that Jarring wished this message to be incorporated into his letter

35 “Käre Per, denna fotokopia av ett brev från Smith till Simonsson kastar ett förklarat ljus över Lund. Får jag föreslå att Du lägger den i slutet på Helmer Smiths “dossier” i min brevsamling. Helmer Smiths brev till mig behöver f.ö. inte längre ligga i slutet kuvert utan förvaras på samma sätt som andra brev. Din tillgivne Gunnar.”

36 “Kommentaren vet i allmänhet väl besked … men jag blir mer och mer övertygad om att det finns tv “Käre Per, denna fotokopia av ett brev från Smith till Simonsson kastar ett förklarat ljus över Lund. Får jag föreslå att Du lägger den i slutet på Helmer Smiths “dossier” i min brevsamling. Helmer Smiths brev till mig behöver f.ö. inte längre ligga i slutet kuvert utan förvaras på samma sätt som andra brev. Din tillgivne Gunnar.” sorters pali: en sort som talades av Buddha och skrevs av Buddhaghosa [och] tikākārarna, Aṅgavamsa, Moggalāna och andra therar och förstods och lästes av Fausbøll och Trenckner mfl. detta är första sortens pali; den andra sortens pali är smidigare och mera ägnat att uttrycka kristendomens grundläror och Epikuros filosofi — det är den komparativa religionsforskningens pali, det talas bl.a. i Lund; det är ett lyckligt språk, för dess ordförråd är ringa och det besväras icke av någon grammatik.”
collection.\textsuperscript{37}

On the whole, the “Collection Gunnar Jarring” gives us a rather good picture, perhaps not so much of the work on Pāli, but of the personality and the various activities of Helmer Smith. It remains, however, surprising that Smith, in the period between 1934 and 1938, sent somewhat more than 150 letters to Gunnar Jarring, who was not an Indologist, though he had numerous interests in common with Smith. A field of intense interest shared by both of them was above all lexicography. Jarring was undoubtedly an ambitious and extremely talented young man, to whom Helmer Smith could easily take a liking, and Smith was probably sincere, when he in his letter dated 19 August 1935 praised Jarring by jokingly quoting two lines from a students’ theatrical parody, a “spex”:\textsuperscript{38}

For you know languages which no tongue speaks,  
and you can interpret what nobody thought.\textsuperscript{39}

Siegfried Lienhard

\textsuperscript{37}A contemporary of Helmer Smith who mastered the Pāli language with unparalleled ease was, however, Wilhelm Geiger (1856–1943) from the University of Munich. In his book *Wilhelm Geiger: His Life and Works* (Colombo: Tübingen 1977 (2nd ed.), p. 135), H. Bechert mentions “a famous Sinhalese scholar who had corresponded with Geiger since 1928… This was Aggamanahapāṇḍita Polvattē Buddhadatta Mahānāyaka Thera (1887–1962). Buddhadatta Thera gives a detailed account of his acquaintance with Geiger in his autobiography, “Sri Buddhadattacaritaya”, in which he also gave the text of several of Geiger’s letters. The first letter from Geiger to Buddhadatta was written in Pāli, and was later included as a reading-exercise in Buddhadatta’s text-book of Pāli (see ibid., note 52: A.P. Buddhadatta, *Aids to Pali Conversation and Translation* (Ambalangoda 1951), pp. 130f. and the plate between 80 and 81: “First page of a Letter written by Wilhelm Geiger to Ven. Sri Subhuti Thera”).

\textsuperscript{38}From Latin *spectaculum*. “Spexes” had become popular since about 1850, especially at the University of Lund.

\textsuperscript{39}”För du kan språk som ingen tunga talar, och du kan tyda det som ingen tänkt.”
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