

Journal of the Pali Text Society

Pali Text Society

JOURNAL  
OF THE  
PALI TEXT SOCIETY

VOLUME XXX

EDITED BY  
O. VON HINÜBER  
AND  
R.M.L. GETHIN

Published by  
The Pali Text Society  
Oxford  
2009

Published by the Pali Text Society

Registered office :

c/o Critchleys, Greyfriars Court, Paradise Square, Oxford, OX1 1BE

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording or any information storage and retrieval system, without prior permission in writing from the Pali Text Society, c/o CPI Antony Rowe – Melksham, Unit 4 Pegasus Way, Bowerhill Industrial Estate, Melksham, Wilts, SN12 6TR, U.K.

© Pali Text Society 2009

ISBN 0 86013 485 7  
EAN 978 086013 485 5

First published in 2009

Printed in Great Britain by CPI Antony Rowe, Chippenham

**The Journal of the Pali Text Society**  
**Vol. XXX (2009)**

**CONTENTS**

Primoz Pecenko, 1947–2007 by Mark Allon	I
The History of the Nikāya Subcommentaries ( <i>tīkāṣ</i> ) in Pāli Bibliographic Sources by Primoz Pecenko	5
Susīma’s Conversation with the Buddha: A Second Study of the Susīma-sutta by Bhikkhu Bodhi	33
On Translating Literally by K.R. Norman	81
K.R. Norman: Bibliography	99
The Buddha’s Truly Praiseworthy Qualities: According to the Mahāsakuludāyi-sutta and Its Chinese Parallel by Bhikkhu Anālayo	137
A Small Problem of Tense and Person: Dhammapada 306 and Its Parallels by Jonathan Silk	161
Corrigenda et postscriptum for “On the Correspondence of Helmer Smith and Gunnar Jarring” by Siegfried Lienhard	177
An Index to <i>JPTS</i> , Volumes IX–XXX	179
Contributors to this volume	189

## Primoz Pecenko<sup>1</sup> 1947–2007

Dr Primoz Pecenko died suddenly following a heart attack on the evening of the 1 August 2007 while out walking with his family and dog. This was a few days short of his 60th birthday.

Primoz was Senior Lecturer in Eastern Religions and Co-Director of the Centre for Buddhist Studies at the University of Queensland; he was also an Executive committee member of the Australasian Association of Buddhist Studies (AABS), a friend to many of us, and an important contributor to that organization.

Primoz, who completed a Masters degree at Pune in India and a PhD at the Australian National University, was a major figure in Buddhist studies in Australia and his passing represents a great loss to our discipline. He and his wife, Dr Tamara Ditrich, with whom he shared the positions at the University of Queensland, have worked tirelessly to maintain Buddhist Studies at the University of Queensland and to promote Buddhist Studies in Australia.

Primoz's specialization was in Pāli commentarial literature, particularly the sub-commentaries (*ṭīkā*s), a field that has been little researched. One of his major contributions to this field is his edition of the sub-commentary on the Aṅguttara-nikāya (*Aṅguttara-nikāya-ṭīkā*, three volumes to date (Oxford: Pali Text Society, 1996, 1997, 1999)). A fourth volume was in progress. This represents only the second critical edition of a Pāli sub-commentary. Primoz also contributed to our understanding of this class of Pāli literature through several important articles, including "Sāriputta and His Works" (*Journal of the Pali Text Society*, Vol. XXIII (1997), pp. 159–79) and "Linatthapakāsinī and Sāratthamañjusā: The *Purāṇaṭīkā*s and the *ṭīkā*s on the Four Nikāyas" (*Journal of the Pali Text Society*, Vol. XXVII, (2002) pp. 61–113).

---

<sup>1</sup>Adapted from an obituary first posted on H-Buddhism on 6 August 2007.

Primoz presented a stimulating paper in the AABS seminar series on Pāli commentarial literature, entitled “Pali Texts and Their Manuscripts: A Case of ‘Lost’ Manuscripts Mentioned in old Pali Bibliographic Sources,” in April, 2006.

Many of Primoz’s publications are in his native tongue, Slovenian. This includes numerous Slovenian translations of Pāli texts, such as the *Dhammapada* (2001) and *Milindapañha* (1989, 1990), plus translations of individual suttas, such as the *Mahāsatiṭṭhāna-sutta* (1988).

At the time of his death, Primoz was engaged in several important and interesting research projects. One entailed editing a Pāli commentarial text that was previously thought to have been lost, but was discovered by him in Burma.<sup>2</sup> Apart from making this text available to scholars in the form of a critical edition, this work promised to throw light on the creation of commentaries, the nature of the commentarial project, and other hitherto little understood aspects of this field. Another research project entailed the study of the Kuthodaw Pagoda Inscriptional Complex in Burma, which would have helped to establish the relationship between this “edition” of the Pāli canon and other versions current in the Theravada Buddhist world. It further promised to contribute towards our understanding of textual authority in Buddhist communities. Primoz was also working on Buddhist meditation in theory and practice and Pāli bibliographic texts.

Much of Primoz’s research was funded by grants from such prestigious bodies as the Pali Text Society, the Australian Research Council, and ANU and University of Queensland research fellowships.

At the University of Queensland Primoz taught Pāli, Sanskrit, and courses on Buddhism, Hinduism, and World Religion, and supervised numerous postgraduate students including many international students. He was well-respected and liked by his students and will be greatly missed.

---

<sup>2</sup>The Pali Text Society hopes to publish Dr Pecenko’s edition of the *Manorathapūraṇī-purāṇa-ṭīkā* in 2010.

Primoz's premature death robs us of a wonderful colleague, an admired teacher, and a great Pāli scholar, who undoubtedly would have gone on to improve our understanding of Pāli texts, specifically Pāli commentarial literature.

Dr Mark Allon

Department of Indian Sub-continental Studies

University of Sydney

## The History of the Nikāya Subcommentaries (*ṭīkā*s) in Pāli Bibliographic Sources\*

In this article I will discuss the history of Pāli subcommentaries (*ṭīkā*<sup>1</sup>) on the first four *nikāyas* as it is presented in traditional Theravāda bibliographic texts. My investigation will show that there exist two sets of *nikāya* subcommentaries and not just a single set, which we have in printed form published as a part of the Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana edition. The works of modern Pāli scholarship,<sup>2</sup> which in this case agree with the Theravāda tradition, also usually mention only one set of subcommentaries. However, according to some Pāli bibliographic sources and catalogues of Pāli manuscripts<sup>3</sup> held in various libraries in Burma and Sri Lanka, there seems to exist another set of the subcommentaries on the four *nikāyas* which has been ignored or omitted by the Theravāda tradition and considered either “lost” or “non-existent” by modern Pāli scholarship.

My recent discovery of an important Pāli manuscript of one of the “lost” subcommentaries in Burma<sup>4</sup> gives a completely new perspective on the historical development of the two sets of the subcommentaries and, in a wider sense, also on our understanding of the available information about the history of Pāli literature. Here the following important issues which resulted from this discovery will be discussed:

---

\*This article is a continuation of my earlier research of the subcommentaries on the four *nikāyas* (*nikāyaṭīkā*s) (Pecenko 2002), and is part of a larger research of the Pāli *ṭīkā* literature funded by the Australian Research Council.

<sup>1</sup>For the etymology of the word *ṭīkā* see Mayrhofer, 1986, s.v. See also *PLC*, pp. 192–93; Norman, 1983, pp. 148–51; Bollée, 1969; von Hinüber, 1996B, pp. 100–101.

<sup>2</sup>For example, von Hinüber, 1996B.

<sup>3</sup>For bibliographic sources see Table 2.1 below; I mainly used the following two catalogues of Pāli manuscripts: Somadasa, 1959–64, and *Piṭ-sm*, which is both a bibliographic source and a catalogue (see Part 2, 2.6, and Part 3 below).

<sup>4</sup>The manuscript is described in detail in Pecenko, 2002, pp. 82–85.

The existence of the “lost” manuscript proves that the information in some older Pāli bibliographic sources — where such manuscripts are mentioned — is correct and that both the Theravāda tradition as well as modern Pāli scholarship ignored the “lost” texts and the bibliographic information about them.

The analysis of the available printed editions and catalogued manuscripts also indicates that the information about the subcommentaries given in the works of modern Pali scholarship seems to be influenced by the traditional Theravāda scholarship — both mention only one set — although the information about the “lost” texts was easily available.

My discovery of the above mentioned Pāli manuscript, which is listed in the older Pāli bibliographic texts (e.g. *Saddhammasaṅgaha*, *Pagan inscription*), also proves that these bibliographic sources — often considered less reliable by modern Pāli scholarship — seem to be much more reliable than the later bibliographic sources (e.g. *Sāsanavaṃsa*) which have been used as the main sources for the modern history of Pāli literature. Therefore the sources for the available history of Pāli literature need to be re-examined in the light of the information given in the older bibliographic texts, catalogues of Pāli manuscripts, inscriptions, and the texts which — although existing in manuscript form — have not been researched yet.

Considering all this, the history of the traditional Theravāda transmission of Pāli texts will have to be re-examined as well.

### **Part 1. The *aṭṭhakathās* and *ṭīkās* on the four *nikāyas***

Each of the four *nikāyas* has a commentary (*aṭṭhakathā*) compiled by Buddhaghosa in the fifth century C.E. in Sri Lanka (see Table 1.1 below), and the four commentaries have two sets of subcommentaries: the older subcommentaries (*purāṇaṭīkā*), collectively called *Linatthapakāsinī* (see Table 1.2 below), and the later subcommentaries (*ṭīkā*), collectively called *Sāratthamañjūsā* (see Table 1.3 below).

**Table 1.1. Commentaries (*aṭṭhakathā*) on the four *nikāyas***

Pāli canon: four <i>nikāyas</i> First written down first cent. B.C.E. in Sri Lanka	Commentaries ( <i>aṭṭhakathā</i> ) Compiled fifth cent. C.E. by Buddhaghosa
Dīghanikāya (D)	Sumaṅgalavilāsini (Sv)
Majjhimanikāya (M)	Papañcasūdanī (Ps)
Samyuttanikāya (S)	Sāratthapakāsini (Spk)
Aṅguttaranikāya (A)	Manorathapūraṇī (Mp)

**Table 1.2. The old subcommentaries (*purāṇaṭṭikā*) on the four *nikāyas***

<i>nikāyas</i> / <i>aṭṭhakathās</i>	Old subcommentaries ( <i>purāṇaṭṭikā</i> = pt) Compiled sixth–ninth century C.E. by Dhammapāla
Dīghanikāya / Sumaṅgalavilāsini	Sumaṅgalavilāsini-purāṇaṭṭikā (Sv-pt), Pathamā Līnatthapakāsini [I]
Majjhimanikāya / Papañcasūdanī	Papañcasūdanī-purāṇaṭṭikā (Ps-pt), Dutiya Līnatthapakāsini [II]
Samyuttanikāya / Sāratthapakāsini	Sāratthapakāsini-purāṇaṭṭikā (Spk-pt), Tatiya Līnatthapakāsini [III]
Aṅguttaranikāya / Manorathapūraṇī	Manorathapūraṇī-purāṇaṭṭikā (Mp-pt), Catutthā Līnatthapakāsini [IV]

**Table 1.3. The (later) subcommentaries (*ṭṭikā*) on the four *nikāyas***

<i>nikāyas</i> / <i>aṭṭhakathās</i>	(Later) subcommentaries ( <i>ṭṭikā</i> = t) Compiled twelfth century C.E. by Sāriputta
Dīghanikāya / Sumaṅgalavilāsini	Sumaṅgalavilāsini-ṭṭikā (Sv-t), Pathamā Sāratthamañjūsā [I]
Majjhimanikāya / Papañcasūdanī	Papañcasūdanī-ṭṭikā (Ps-t), Dutiya Sāratthamañjūsā [II]
Samyuttanikāya / Sāratthapakāsini	Sāratthapakāsini-ṭṭikā (Spk-t), Tatiya Sāratthamañjūsā [III]
Aṅguttaranikāya / Manorathapūraṇī	Manorathapūraṇī-ṭṭikā (Mp-t), Catutthā Sāratthamañjūsā [IV]

The authorship of the *purāṇaṭṭikās* (Līnatthapakāsini) is usually ascribed to Dhammapāla<sup>5</sup> and that of the later *ṭṭikās* (Sāratthamañjūsā) is

<sup>5</sup>On the date(s) and works of Dhammapāla(s) see von Hinüber, 1996B, pp. 167–70; Buddhadatta, 1957, pp. 189–97; *Bhāratiya Bauddhacāryayō*, pp. 63–68; *Theravādi Bauddhacāryayō*, pp. 54–55; Dhammaratana Thera, 1968, pp. 40–41; Lily de Silva, “Introduction” in Sv-pt, pp. xli–lv; Bangchang, 1981, pp. xxiv–xxxix; H. Saddhatissa, “Introduction” in Upās, pp. 28 ff.; Cousins,

ascribed to Sāriputta of Poḷonnaruva.<sup>6</sup> Although according to some catalogues<sup>7</sup> of Pāli manuscripts held in various libraries in Burma and Sri Lanka, both sets of *ṭikās* exist in manuscript form, only the *ṭikās* belonging to the single combined set (see Table 2.9 below) have been published and the remaining ones (see Tables 2.10–11 below) have not been investigated at all. The only exception is the above mentioned Burmese Pāli manuscript of the old Aṅguttaranikāyaṭṭikā (*Catuttha Līnatthapakāsinī*).<sup>8</sup>

### Part 2. The *ṭikās* in Pāli bibliographic sources

In Part 2, information about the subcommentaries on the first four *nikāyas* given in the following bibliographic sources will be analysed:

**Table 2.1. Pāli Bibliographic Sources**

<i>Bibliographic source</i>	<i>Authorship</i>	<i>Date</i>
Saddhammasaṅgaha <sup>9</sup> (Saddhamma-s)	Dhammakitti Mahāsāmi	fourteenth century
Pagan inscription <sup>10</sup>	————	1442

---

1972; Pieris, 1978, pp. 61–77; *EncBuddh*, Vol. 4, fasc. 4, pp. 501–504; Warder, 1981, pp. 198–207; Jackson, 1990, pp. 209–211.

<sup>6</sup>On Sāriputta of Poḷonnaruva see Pecenko, 1997; von Hinüber, 1996B, pp. 172–73.

<sup>7</sup>Here I mean the following two catalogues: (1) Somadasa, 1959–64, and (2) a very important Burmese bibliographic work which also refers to the manuscripts held in the National Library, Rangoon: *Piṭ-sm*. Of course, these two catalogues, although sufficient for the topic of this article, do not list all the Pāli manuscripts that have not been investigated yet. Further research of old inscriptions and Pāli manuscripts is needed here and some work has already been done, see for example: Than Tun, 1998; Blackburn, 2002; von Hinüber, 1996A; von Hinüber, 1988.

<sup>8</sup>A critical edition of this manuscript will be published by the Pali Text Society. Three selected chapters from the manuscript were published in Pecenko, 2002, pp. 87–103.

<sup>9</sup>Edited by Nedimāle Saddhānanda, *JPTS* 1890, pp. 21–90 (= N<sup>c</sup> 1961)

<sup>10</sup>Edition: G. H. Luce and Tin Htway, “A Fifth Century Inscription and Library at Pagan, Burma” in *Malalasekera Commemoration Volume* (Colombo: The Malalasekera Commemoration Volume Editorial Committee, 1976), pp. 203–17.

Gandhavaṃsa <sup>11</sup> (Gv)	Araññavāsī Nandapaññā	seventeenth century
Sāsanavaṃsa <sup>12</sup> (Sās)	Paññāsāmi	1861
Sāsanavaṃsadīpa <sup>13</sup> (Sās-dīp)	Vimalasāra Thera	1880
<i>Piṭakat samuiṅ</i> <sup>14</sup> (Pit-sm)	Maṅḡ-Krīḡ Mahāsiriyeasū	1888

### 2.1. Saddhammasaṅgaha

In Saddhamma-s two sets of *ṭīkā*s on the four *nikāyas* are mentioned: *Līnatthapakāsīnī* and *Sāratthamañjūsā*. According to Saddhamma-s *Līnatthapakāsīnī* was written by the *porāṇas*<sup>15</sup> and was a sub-commentary (*athavaṇṇanā*) on the *atthakathās* of the entire canon.<sup>16</sup> The second set of *ṭīkā*s on the first four *nikāyas*, called *Sāratthamañjūsā*, was compiled — as a part of the “new” compilation of *ṭīkā*s on the entire canon — during the reign of Parakkamabāhu I (1153–86) by the convocation of “elders” (*therā bhikkhū*)<sup>17</sup> presided over by Dimbulāgala Mahākassapathera, who was the first *saṅgharāja* in Ceylon and the

<sup>11</sup>Edited by I.P. Minayeff, *JPTS*, 1886, pp. 54–79.

<sup>12</sup>Edited by C.S. Upasak (Nālandā: Nava Nālandā Mahāvihāra, 1961).

<sup>13</sup>Colombo: Sattthāloka Press, 1880.

<sup>14</sup>Edition: Rangoon: Tipiṭakanikāya Sāsanaṅ Pru Aphvē, 1989

<sup>15</sup>On *porāṇas* see Adikaram, *EHBC*, pp. 16–18; Lottermoser, 1982, pp. 209–13.

<sup>16</sup>Saddhamma-s 58,28–29: *piṭakattayaṭṭhakathāya līnatthappakāsanatthaṃ athavaṇṇanaṃ purāṇehi* [sic] *katam*. Although in this reference the *ṭīkā*s on the first four *nikāyas* are not listed explicitly, it seems probable that they were called *Līnatthappakāsīnī*. H. Saddhatissa (“Introduction” in *Upās*, p. 47, n. 154) explains: “The *Līnatthavaṇṇanā* is also called *Līnatthappakāsīnī*... The *Saddhammasaṅgaha* has freely used the word *athavaṇṇanā* for *ṭīkā* and further amplified it as the *Atthavaṇṇanā* for the purpose of elucidating the hidden meanings (*Līnatthappakāsanatthaṃ athavaṇṇanaṃ*)”. Cf. the title of Sv-pt, ed. by Lily de Silva: *Dīghanikāyaṭṭhakathāṭīkā Līnatthavaṇṇanā*.

<sup>17</sup>Cf. Saddhamma-s 59,14–18: *atha kho therā bhikkhū ... athavaṇṇanaṃ ṭhapesuṃ*; 62,13: *piṭakattayaṭṭīkā ca ṭīkācariyehi bhāsītā* [v. 7].

The date of the assembly “is tentatively fixed at A.D. 1165” (Panditha, 1973, p. 137). See also Mhv LXXII 2 foll.; LXXXVIII 1–30; W. Geiger, “Introduction” in Mhv Trsl., pp. 28–29; Geiger, § 31 (literature), n. 4.

most senior monk from Udumbaragirivihāra.<sup>18</sup> The entire compilation was accomplished within one year.<sup>19</sup>

While the individual *ṭikās* of the first set are not explicitly mentioned, Saddhamma-s lists the four *ṭikās* of the second set as follows:

Tadanantaraṃ suttantaṭṭhake Dīghanikāyaṭṭhakathāya Sumaṅgalavilāsiniyā atthavaṇṇanaṃ ārabhitvā mūlabhāsāya Māgadhikāya niruttīyā paṭhama-Sāratthamañjūsā nāma atthavaṇṇanaṃ ṭhapesuṃ. tathā Majjhimanikāyaṭṭhakathāya Papañcasūdanīyā ... dutiya-Sāratthamañjūsā nāma atthavaṇṇanaṃ ṭhapesuṃ. tathā Saṃyuttanikāyaṭṭhakathāya Sāratthapakāsaniyā ... tatiya-Sāratthamañjūsā nāma atthavaṇṇanaṃ ṭhapesuṃ. tathā Aṅguttaranikāyaṭṭhakathāya Manorathapūraṇīyā ... catuttha-Sāratthamañjūsā nāma atthavaṇṇanaṃ ṭhapesuṃ.<sup>20</sup>

**Table 2.2. Two complete sets in Saddhammasaṅgaha (fourteenth cent.)**

Canon: Four nikāyas first written in the first century B.C.E.	Commentaries fifth century C.E.	Old sub-comment. ( <i>purāṇaṭṭikā</i> = pt) sixth–ninth century C.E. Authorship: <i>porāṇas</i>	Later subcomment. ( <i>ṭikā</i> = t) twelfth century C.E. Authorship: <i>theras</i>
Dīghanikāya	Sumaṅgalavilāsini	Linatthapakāsini	Sāratthamañjūsā I
Majjhimanikāya	Papañcasūdanī	Linatthapakāsini	Sāratthamañjūsā II
Saṃyuttanikāya	Sāratthapakāsini	Linatthapakāsini	Sāratthamañjūsā III
Aṅguttaranikāya	Manorathapūraṇī	Linatthapakāsini	Sāratthamañjūsā IV

Saddhamma-s explains that the second set of *ṭikās* (*Sāratthamañjūsā*)

<sup>18</sup>Saddhamma-s 59.7: *Mahākassapaṭṭherapamukhaṃ bhikkhusaṅghaṃ*; on Mahākassapaṭṭhera of Udumbaragirivihāra see also P. Pecenko, “Notes” in *Aṅguttaranikāyaṭṭikā* (Mp-ṭ E<sup>c</sup>), Vol. I, pp. 106–107, n. 1.5; *PLC*, pp. 176–77, 192–94; *DPPN* s.v. 2. Mahā Kassapa; Buddhadatta, 1960, pp. 75–77; H. Bechert, *Buddhismus, Staat und Gesellschaft* (Frankfurt: Alfred Metzner Verlag, 1966), Vol. I, p. 265.

<sup>19</sup>Saddhamma-s 60.25–27: *ayaṃ piṭakaṭṭhakathāya atthavaṇṇanā ekasaṃvaccharen’ eva niṭṭhitā*.

<sup>20</sup>Saddhamma-s 59.23–35; cf. Saddhamma-s 61.21–23: *piṭakattayavaṇṇanā ca linatthassa pakāsanaṃ, Sāratthadīpanī nāma Sāratthamañjūsā pi ca* [v. 18], *Paramatthappakāsani mahātherehi bhāsītā, sattānaṃ sabbabhāsānaṃ sā ahoṣi hitāvahā* [v. 19].

was written because the existing set (*Linatthapakāsini*) “did not serve the purpose of bhikkhus residing in different countries”,<sup>21</sup> the reason being that many Gaṇṭhipadas (explanatory works which dealt with difficult expressions and passages) that belonged to the old set were written in Sinhala language and what was written in Māgadhi had been mixed and confused with (Pāli) translations (*bhāsantara*) of the Gaṇṭhipadas.<sup>22</sup> The *Linatthapakāsini* set was nevertheless used as a basis for the new “complete and clear *atthavaṇṇanā*”,<sup>23</sup> the mistakes (*bhāsantara*: “versions, translations”) in the old *ṭīkā*s were removed but their essence was kept in its entirety.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>21</sup>Saddhamma-s 58,30–31: *taṃ sabbaṃ desantarāvāsīnaṃ bhikkhūnaṃ atthaṃ na sādheti*; translation Law, 1941, p. 84. Cf. Saddhamma-s 61,9–10: *piṭakatthakathāyāhaṃ linatthassa pakāsaṇaṃ, na taṃ sabbattha bhikkhūnaṃ atthaṃ sādheti sabbaso* [v. 12]; also von Hinüber, *HPL*, pp. 172–173, § 374: “... older works no longer served the purpose of the monks in the 12th century”.

<sup>22</sup>Saddhamma-s 58,31–59,2: *kattha ci anekesu gaṇṭhipadesu Sihalabhāsāya niruttīyā likhitaṃ ca kattha ci mūlabhāsāya Māgadhikāya bhāsantarena sammissaṃ ākulaṃ ca katvā likhitaṃ ca*. Law’s translation (1941), p. 84: “Some were written in many terse expressions (*gaṇṭhipada*) according to the grammar of the Sinhala language, some were written in the dialect of Magadha, which is the basic language, but they have been confused and twisted by translation”; cf. von Hinüber, *HPL*, p. 173, § 374: “Particularly the Gaṇṭhipadas written in Sinhalese are difficult to understand (Sp-ṭ [B<sup>c</sup> 1960] I 2,5–8) and [were] therefore summarized in Pāli”. On Gaṇṭhipadas, see Lily de Silva, “General Introduction” in Sv-pt, pp. xxxii–xxxviii; von Hinüber, *HPL*, p. 170–71, §§ 367–71.

See also Saddhamma-s 61,9–20 where the details of the *Linatthapakāsini* set are described in more detail. These two passages from Saddhamma-s (fourteenth century), especially Saddhamma-s 61,9–20, are most probably based on a very similar passage from Sp-ṭ B<sup>c</sup> 1960 I 2,5–16 ascribed to Sāriputta of Polonnaruva who lived about two centuries earlier — at the time of the compilation of the Sāratthamañjūsā set.

<sup>23</sup>Saddhamma-s 59,2–3: *mayam bhāsantaraṃ apanetvā paripuṇṇaṃ anākulaṃ atthavaṇṇanaṃ kareyyāmaṃ ti*.

<sup>24</sup>Saddhamma-s 61,19–20 = Sp-ṭ B<sup>c</sup> 1960 I 2,15–16: *bhāsantaraṃ tato hitvā sāraṃ ādāya sabbaso, anākulaṃ karissāmi paripuṇṇavinicchayaṃ*. The intro-

## 2.2. The Pagan inscription

The second important source of information about the *ṭikās* on the four *nikāyas* is the Pagan inscription of 1442 (804 B.E.), inscribed at the beginning of the rule of Narapati (1442–68),<sup>25</sup> less than three centuries after Parakkamabāhu I (1153–86). The inscription gives a list of 299 manuscripts,<sup>26</sup> amongst which the *ṭikās* on the four *nikāyas* are also mentioned.

The titles of the *ṭikās* given in this inscription are very similar to the titles given in the *Piṭakat samuīṇṣ* (see 2.6 below),<sup>27</sup> which in turn are also very similar to the titles of the Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana editions of these *ṭikās*.

In the section on A (List 934b45) two different *ṭikās* are listed: *ṭigā aṅgutuiw krī [mahā]* (no. 75)<sup>28</sup> which is translated by G. H. Luce and

ductory passages in the existing printed editions of Sv-ṭ E<sup>c</sup>, Ps-ṭ B<sup>c</sup> 1961, Spk-ṭ B<sup>c</sup> 1961 and in the recently discovered manuscript of Mp-ṭ (see Part 3, Table 3.2 below), which all belong to the old Linatthapakāsiniṇī set, are, with the exception of minor orthographic differences, practically identical. The introduction in Mp-ṭ E<sup>c</sup> 1996, which is the fourth (*catutthā*) *ṭikā* of the later Sāratthamañjūsā set, is considerably different from Sv-ṭ E<sup>c</sup>, Ps-ṭ B<sup>c</sup> 1961, Spk-ṭ B<sup>c</sup> 1961 and the text in the manuscript of Mp-ṭ is much closer to Sp-ṭ B<sup>c</sup> 1960 and Sv-ṇ B<sup>c</sup> 1961. See P. Pecenko, “Table of Parallel Passages” in Mp-ṭ I; also H. Saddhatissa, “Introduction” in Upās, p. 47, n. 154.

<sup>25</sup>G.H. Luce and Tin Htway, “A 15th Century Inscription and Library at Pagan, Burma” in *Malalasekera Commemoration Volume* (Colombo: The Malalasekera Commemoration Volume Editorial Committee, 1976), pp. 203–17; *PLB*, p. 41. Cf. also U Than Tun, “An Original Inscription Dated 10 September 1223 that King Badon Copied on 27 October 1785”, *Études birmanes* (Paris: EFEO, 1998), pp. 37–55.

<sup>26</sup>Catalogue in G.H. Luce and Tin Htway, *Op. cit.*, pp. 218–248. The *ṭikās* in this article are quoted according to their numbers in the Catalogue with the same transliteration of their titles. Cf. *PLB*, pp. 102–109; Niharranjan Ray, *An Introduction to the Study of Theravāda Buddhism in Burma* (Calcutta: University of Calcutta, 1946), pp. 193–95.

<sup>27</sup>Also *Piṭakat tō samuīṇṣ* or *Piṭakat suṇṣ puṇ cā tamṣ*. I consulted the edition published by Tipiṭakanikāya Sāsanaṇ Pru Aphvè in Rangoon, 1989.

<sup>28</sup>The title written on the first folio of the ms of Mp-ṭ held in the British Library (Or 2089) is very similar: *ṭikā ekkaniṭāt aṅguttra krī*. Cf. *Piṭ-sm* 202–12:

Tin Htway: “Greater Aṅguttara sub-commentary”, and further identified as Sāratthamañjūsā, and *ṭīgā aṅguttuiw ṇay [culla]* (no. 76)<sup>29</sup> which is translated: “Lesser Aṅguttara subcommentary”.

**Table 2.2. The ṭīkās in the Pagan Inscription (1442 C.E.)**

Canon: Four nikāyas first written in the first century B.C.E.	Commentaries fifth century C.E.	Old sub-comment. ( <i>purāṇaṭīkā</i> = pt) sixth–ninth cent. C.E. Authorship: unknown	Later subcomment. ( <i>ṭīkā</i> = t) twelfth century C.E. Authorship: unknown
Dīghanikāya	Sumaṅgala- vilāsini	[Līnatthapakāsini I]: 1. ṭīgā silakkhandhavā dīghanikāy, 2. ṭīgā mahāvā dīghanikāy, 3. ṭīgā pādheyavā dīghanikāy	
Majjhima- nikāya	Papañcasūdani	[Līnatthapakāsini II]: 1. ṭīkā mūlapaṇṇāsa, 2. ṭīkā majjhimaṇṇāsa, 3. ṭīgā upariṇṇāsa	
Saṃyutta-nikāya	Sārattha- pakāsini	[Līnatthapakāsini III]: 1. ṭīgā sagāthavā saṅyut, 2. ṭīgā khandhavaggādi saṅyut	
Aṅguttara-nikāya	Manoratha- pūraṇi	[Līnatthapakāsini IV]: ṭīgā aṅguttuiw ṇay [culla]	[Sāratthamañjūsā IV]: ṭīgā aṅguttuiw krī [mahā]

*Ekaṅguttaraṭīkā-sac*, *Dukaṅguttaraṭīkā-sac*, ..., *Dasāṅguttaraṭīkā-sac*, *Ekādasāṅguttaraṭīkā-sac*; Mp-ṭ B<sup>c</sup> 1961 I–III: *Sāratthamañjūsā nāma Aṅguttaraṭīkā*. In Burmese *sac* means “new, revised”, *ṭīkā-sac* therefore means the “new *ṭīkā*”, i.e. Mp-ṭ, *Catutthā Sāratthamañjūsā*. In *Piṭ-sm* 202 it is also called *Mahāṭīkā*. (All the Burmese words and sentences from *Piṭ-sm* which I quote here were translated into English by Elisabeth Lawrence, Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National University.)

<sup>29</sup>Cf. *Piṭ-sm* 199: *Ekaṅguttaraṭīkā-hoṇ*., 200: *Dukaṅguttaraṭīkā-hoṇ*., 201: *Tikaṅguttaraṭīkā-hoṇ*., *hoṇ*: in Burmese means “old, ancient”, *ṭīkā-hoṇ*: therefore means the “old *ṭīkā*”, i.e. Mp-pt, *Catutthā Līnatthapakāsini*.

The names of the two sets of *ṭikās* (Līnatthapakāsini and Sāratthamañjūsā) are not mentioned in the inscription.

### 2.3. Gandhavaṃsa

Gandhavaṃsa (Gv), a much later work written probably in the seventeenth century,<sup>30</sup> lists both Līnatthapakāsini and Sāratthamañjūsā. The first one is mentioned as:

*Dīghanikāyāṭṭhakathādīnaṃ catunnaṃ aṭṭhakathānaṃ Līnatthapakāsini nāma ṭikā,*<sup>31</sup>

and was according to Gv written by Dhammapālācariya.<sup>32</sup>

Sāratthamañjūsā is mentioned only as *Āṅguttaraṭṭhakathāya Sāratthamañjūsā nāma ṭikā,*<sup>33</sup> a work written by Sāriputta.<sup>34</sup> Further on this work of Sāriputta, which was written at the request of Parakkama-bāhu, king of Lanākā, is also referred to as *Āṅguttaraṭṭhakathāya navā ṭikāgandho.*<sup>35</sup>

According to Gv, the Līnatthapakāsini set consisted of the *ṭikās* on all the four *nikāyas* and Sāratthamañjūsā was the name of the *ṭikā* on A only. To distinguish it from the older *ṭikā* on A (*Catutthā Līnatthapakāsini*), Sāratthamañjūsā was also classified as a “new subcomplementary” (*navā ṭikā*).

<sup>30</sup>*PLB*, p. x. According to Oskar von Hinüber this is “a later systematic survey of unknown date” (von Hinüber, 1996B, p. 3). See also Winternitz, *HIL*, Vol. 2, p. 176, n. 4; Buddhadatta 1962, pp. 410–11; Norman, 1983, pp. 180–81; Hazra 1986, pp. 89–91.

<sup>31</sup>Gv 60, 11–12.

<sup>32</sup>Gv 69, 30–34: *Dīghanikāyāṭṭhakathādīnaṃ catunnaṃ aṭṭhakathānaṃ ṭikā-gandho ... attano matiya Dhammapālācariyena katā.*

<sup>33</sup>Gv 61, 32–33.

<sup>34</sup>Gv 61, 30. Cf. H. Saddhatissa, “Introduction” in Upās, p. 47, n. 154.

<sup>35</sup>Gv 71, 10–14: *Sāratthadīpani nāma ... Āṅguttaraṭṭhakathāya navā ṭikā-gandho ti ime catāro gandhā Parakkamabāhunāmena Lanākādīpissarena raññā āyācītena Sāriputtācariyena katā.* Cf. *Piṭ-sm* 202 where the later *ṭikā* on Mp (Mp-ṭ) is mentioned as “new greater *ṭikā*” (*ṭikā sac krī*).

**Table 2.4. The *ṭikās* in Gandhavaṃsa (seventeenth cent.)**

Canon: 4 nikāyas first written in the first century B.C.E.	Commentaries fifth century C.E.	Old sub-comment. ( <i>purāṇaṭṭikā</i> = pt) sixth–ninth century C.E. Author: Dhammapāla	Later subcomment. ( <i>ṭikā</i> = t) twelfth century C.E. Author: Sāriputta
Dīghanikāya	Sumaṅgalavilāsini	Linatthapakāsini	
Majjhimanikāya	Papañcasūdani	Linatthapakāsini	
Samyuttanikāya	Sāratthapakāsini	Linatthapakāsini	
Aṅguttaranikāya	Manorathapūraṇi	Linatthapakāsini	Sāratthamañjūsā navā ṭikāgandho

#### 2.4. Sāsanaṃsa

Sāsanaṃsa (Sās), a work “written in Burma in 1861 by Paññāsāmi, tutor of King Min-dōn-min who held the fifth council a few years later”,<sup>36</sup> does not give the names of the two sets of *ṭikās* (Linatthapakāsini and Sāratthamañjūsā); it simply states that *Dīghanikāyaṭṭhakathāya ṭikā*, *Majjhimanikāyaṭṭhakathāya ṭikā* and *Samyuttanikāyaṭṭhakathāya ṭikā* were written by Ācariya Dhammapāla,<sup>37</sup> and *Aṅguttara-nikāyaṭṭikā* was written by Sāriputta Thera at the request of the king Parakkamabāhu.<sup>38</sup>

**Table 2.5. The *ṭikās* in Sāsanaṃsa (1861)**

Canon: Four nikāyas first written in the first century B.C.E.	Commentaries fifth century C.E.	Old sub-comment. ( <i>purāṇaṭṭikā</i> = pt) sixth–ninth century C.E. Author: Dhammapāla	Later subcomment. ( <i>ṭikā</i> = t) twelfth century C.E. Author: Sāriputta
Dīghanikāya	Sumaṅgalavilāsini	[Linatthapakāsini ] Dīghanikāyaṭṭhakathāya ṭikā	

<sup>36</sup>Norman, 1983, pp. 181–82. King Min-dōn (1852–77), also called the “Convener of the Fifth Council”, held the council in Mandalay in 1868–71 (*PLB*, pp. 92–94). On Sās see also Buddhadatta 1962, pp. 407–409; Lieberman, 1976; Hazra 1986, pp. 91–94.

<sup>37</sup>Sās N° 1961 31,10–12: *Visuddhimaggassa mahāṭṭikā, Dīghanikāyaṭṭhakathāya ṭikā, Majjhima-nikāyaṭṭhakathāya ṭikā, Samyuttanikāyaṭṭhakathāya ṭikā sāti imāyo ācariya-Dhammapālathero akāsi.*

<sup>38</sup>Sās N° 1961 31,13–14: *Sāratthadīpaniṃ nāma ṭikaṃ, Aṅguttaranikāyaṭṭikāṃ ca Parakkama-bāhuraññā yācito Sāriputtathero akāsi.*

Majjhimanikāya	Papañcasūdanī	[Līnatthapakāsini ] Majjhimanikāyaṭṭha- kathāya tīkā	
Samyuttanikāya	Sāratthapakāsini	[Līnatthapakāsini] Samyuttanikāyaṭṭha- kathāya tīkā	
Aṅguttaranikāya	Manorathapūraṇī		[Sāratthamañjūsā] Aṅguttaranikāya- tīkā

The distinction between the two sets of *tīkās* mentioned in Saddhamma-s, and in the case of A also in the Pagan inscription and Gv, is not made in Sās. The two authors are nevertheless clearly stated and this indicates that in the year 1861, when Sās was compiled, the only known set of *tīkās* on the four *nikāyas* consisted of two kinds of *tīkās* — the older three on D, M, and S written by Dhammapāla, and the later one on A written by Sāriputta.

### 2.5. Sāsanavaṃsadīpa

Sāsanavaṃsadīpa (Sās-dīp) was completed in 1879 by Ācariya Vimalasāra Thera and published in 1880 in Colombo.<sup>39</sup> Sās-dīp covers “the history of Buddhism in Ceylon down to the time of the introduction of the Burmese *upasampadā* in A.D. 1802”.<sup>40</sup> The information about the *tīkās* on the four *nikāyas* in Sās-dīp is the same as in Sās. The names of the two sets of *tīkās* (Līnatthapakāsini and Sāratthamañjūsā) given in Saddhamma-s and Gv are not mentioned at all. Only one set of *tīkās* is listed and it does not have any special name; the *tīkās* on D, M, and S

<sup>39</sup>The book has two title pages: the first one in Sinhala letters and the second in Roman letters. The Sinhala title page reads: *Sakyamunivasse 2423 [1879 C.E.] — Sāsanavaṃsadīpo — ācariya-Vimalasārattherapādena viracito — tassānumatiya Balatāsara Virasīhāmaccena c’ eva tadaññehi ca budhikehi janehi Koḷambaṭhānīyasmim Sattāhalokayantasālāyaṃ muddāpito — Saugate saṃvacchare 2424 [1880 C.E.]*; the second title page reads: *The Sasanavansa dīpo or The History of the Buddhist Church in Pali verse, compiled from Buddhist Holy Scriptures, Commentaries, Histories, &c., &c. by Acariya Vimalasara Thera. AB 2423. — Colombo. Printed at the Sattaloka Press for Balatasara Virasinha Amacca and others — A.B. 2424.*

<sup>40</sup>Norman, 1983, p. 182.

are ascribed to Dhammapāla,<sup>41</sup> and a *ṭikā* on A is ascribed to Sāriputta.<sup>42</sup>

**Table 2.6. The *ṭikās* in Sāsanaṅgaṣṭhāna (1880)**

Canon: Four nikāyas first written in the first century B.C.E.	Commentaries fifth century C.E.	Old sub-comment. ( <i>purāṇaṭṭikā</i> = pt) sixth–ninth century C.E. Author: Dhammapāla	Later subcomment. ( <i>ṭikā</i> = t) twelfth century C.E. Author: Sāriputta
Dighanikāya	Sumaṅgalavilāsinī	[Līnatthapakāsini] Dīghāgamassa <i>ṭikā</i>	
Majjhimanikāya	Papañcasūdanī	[Līnatthapakāsini] Majjhimaṭṭhakathā- <i>ṭikā</i>	
Samyuttanikāya	Sāratthapakāsini	[Līnatthapakāsini] Samyuttaṭṭhakathā- <i>ṭikā</i>	
Aṅguttaranikāya	Manorathapūraṇī		[Sāratthamañjūsā] Aṅguttaranikāyaṭṭhakathā- <i>ṭikā</i>

### 2.6. *Piṭakat samuīṇ:*

The *Piṭakat samuīṇ:* lists the same *ṭikās* on the four *nikāyas* as the Pagan inscription and Gv and, as already mentioned, the titles of the *ṭikās* given in all three sources are very similar.<sup>43</sup> The names of the two sets, Līnatthapakāsini and Sāratthamañjūsā, and the two authors, Dhammapāla and Sāriputta, are mentioned as in Gv.<sup>44</sup>

*Piṭ-sm* lists two *ṭikās* on A: a *ṭikā* written by Dhammapāla and a

<sup>41</sup>Sās-dīp C<sup>e</sup> 1880, vv. 1231–32: ... *ṭikā Dīghāgamassa ca, Majjhimaṭṭhakathāṭṭikā Saṃyuttaṭṭha-kathāya ca, ... Dhammapālena dhīmatā racitā therapādena suttantaṇṇāyadassinā.*

<sup>42</sup>Sās-dīp C<sup>e</sup> 1880, vv. 1201–203: *Aṅguttaranikāyaṭṭhakathāṭṭikā ... therena Sāriputtena katā.*

<sup>43</sup>Cf. 2.2. and 2.3. above.

<sup>44</sup>The reference numbers of all the *ṭikās* on the four *nikāyas* listed in *Piṭ-sm* 187–212 are marked with asterisks which means that, according to the 1989 edition of *Piṭ-sm*, the manuscripts of all these *ṭikās* are held in the National Library, Rangoon.

*ṭikā* written by Sāriputta. The first *ṭikā* is listed as incomplete and has three entries: *Ekaṅguttaraṭṭikā-hoṅṅ*, *Dukaṅguttaraṭṭikā-hoṅṅ*, and *Tikaṅguttaraṭṭikā-hoṅṅ*. Although it is called the “old” (*hoṅṅ*) *ṭikā* the common name *Līnatthapakāsīnī* is not mentioned at all.<sup>45</sup> According to *Piṭ-sm* 199 “the remaining eight parts of the old *ṭikā*, i.e. the *ṭikā* on *Catukaṅguttara*, *Pañcaṅguttara*, ... *Ekādasāṅguttara*, cannot be found anywhere in Burma”.<sup>46</sup>

The second *ṭikā* on A is mentioned as a “new, revised” *ṭikā* (*sac*) and it has the following eleven entries:<sup>47</sup> *Ekaṅguttaraṭṭikā-sac*, *Dukaṅguttaraṭṭikā-sac*, *Tikaṅguttara-ṭikā-sac*, ... *Dasāṅguttaraṭṭikā-sac*, *Ekādasāṅguttaraṭṭikā-sac*.

**Table 2.7. The *ṭikās* in *Piṭakat samuṅṅ*: (1888)**

Canon: Four nikāyas first written in the first century B.C.E.	Commentaries fifth century C.E.	Old sub-comment. ( <i>purāṇaṭṭikā</i> = pt) sixth–ninth century C.E. Author: Dhammapāla	Later subcomment. ( <i>ṭikā</i> = t) twelfth cent. C.E. Author: Sāriputta
Dīghanikāya	Sumaṅgalavilāsīnī	Līnatthapakāsīnī: Sutsīlakkhantīkā hoṅṅ, Sutmahāvāṭīkā, Sutipātheyyaṭṭikā <sup>48</sup>	
Majjhimanikāya	Papañcasūdānī	Līnatthapakāsīnī : Mūlapaṇṇāsāṭīkā, Majjhimapañṇāsa-ṭīkā, Uparipaṇṇāsāṭīkā <sup>49</sup>	
Samyuttanikāya	Sāratthapakāsīnī	Līnatthapakāsīnī : Sagāthavagga-samyuttīkā, Nidānavagga- ... Khandhavagga- ... Saḷāyatanavagga-...	

<sup>45</sup>*Piṭ-sm* 199–201.

<sup>46</sup>*Piṭ-sm* 199 (translated by Elisabeth Lawrence).

<sup>47</sup>*Piṭ-sm* 202–12.

<sup>48</sup>*Piṭ-sm* 187, 189–90. Sīlakkhandhavaggaṭṭikā is listed as the “old”(hoṅṅ) *ṭikā*, i.e. Sv-pt, Paṭhamā Līnatthapakāsīnī, not to distinguish it from Sv-t, Paṭhamā Sāratthamañjūsa, but to distinguish it from Sādhujanavilāsīnīṭīkā (Sv-nt) which is in *Piṭ-sm* 188 listed as the “new”(sac) *ṭikā*.

<sup>49</sup>*Piṭ-sm* 191–93.

		Mahāvaggasam̐yut- ṭīkā <sup>50</sup>	
Aṅguttaranikāya	Manorathapūraṇī	Ekaṅguttaraṭṭīkā-hoṇṇī Dukaṅguttaraṭṭīkā-hoṇṇī Tikaṅguttaraṭṭīkā-hoṇṇī	Sāratthamañjūsā: Ekaṅguttaraṭṭīkā- sac Dukaṅguttaraṭṭīkā- sac Tika- ... Dasa- ... Ekādasaṅguttara- ṭṭīkā-sac

Although *Piṭ-sm* gives essentially the same information about the *ṭīkā*s on the four *nikāyas* as the Pagan inscription and Gv, it is interesting to note that the old *ṭīkā* on A written by Dhammapāla is not mentioned as a part of the Līnatthapakāsinī set. *Piṭ-sm* also does not list any of the first three *ṭīkā*s of the Sāratthamañjūsā set (Sv-ṭ, Ps-ṭ, Spk-ṭ).

### 2.7. Summary

The above analysis of the old and later subcommentaries (*purāṇa-ṭīkā*s and *ṭīkā*s, see Tables 1.2 and 1.3 above) in bibliographical sources can be presented as follows:<sup>51</sup>

**Table 2.8. The subcommentaries in the Pāli bibliographic sources**

Bib. sources	Dīgha- nikāya	Majjhima- nikāya	Sam̐yutta- nikāya	Aṅguttara- nikāya
Saddhammasaṅgaha fourteenth century	old subcom./ later subcom.	old subcom./ later subcom.	old subcom./ later subcom.	old subcom./ later subcom.
Pagan inscription 1442	old subcom.	old subcom.	old subcom.	old subcom./ later subcom.
Gandhavaṃsa seventeenth century	old subcom.	old subcom.	old subcom.	old subcom./ later subcom.
Sāsanavaṃsa 1861	old subcom.	old subcom.	old subcom.	later subcom.
Sāsanavaṃsadīpa 1880	old subcom.	old subcom.	old subcom.	later subcom.
<i>Piṭakat samuīṇī</i> 1888	old subcom.	old subcom.	old subcom.	old subcom./ later subcom.

<sup>50</sup>*Piṭ-sm* 194–98.

<sup>51</sup>Cf. Pecenko, 2002, p. 76 (Table I).

The two sets of subcommentaries on the first four *nikāyas* are mentioned in Pāli bibliographical sources in the following three ways:

(a) as a single set consisting of the first three *ṭīkās* from the old set, called Līnatthapakāsīnī, and the fourth *ṭīkā* from the later set, called Sāratthamañjūsā.

**Table 2.9. One combined set of subcommentaries (Sās, Sās-dīp)**

Pāli Canon: four <i>nikāyas</i>	Commentaries	Old subcomment. ( <i>purāṇaṭṭīkā</i> = pt)	(Later) subcomment. ( <i>ṭīkā</i> = t)
Dīghanikāya	Sumaṅgalavilāsīnī	Līnatthapakāsīnī I	
Majjhimanikāya	Papañcasūdānī	Līnatthapakāsīnī II	
Samyuttanikāya	Sāratthapakāsīnī	Līnatthapakāsīnī III	
Āṅguttaranikāya	Manorathapūraṇī		Sāratthamañjūsā IV

The set in Table 2.9 above was approved and published by the Sixth Council (Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana) and this is the only set existing in printed form.

(b) as one complete set of the old *ṭīkās* with an additional later *ṭīkā* on Āṅguttara-nikāya.

**Table 2.10. A set of old subcommentaries with a later subcommentary (Pagan inscription, Gv and Piṭ-sm)**

Pāli Canon: four <i>nikāyas</i>	Commentaries	Old subcomment. ( <i>purāṇaṭṭīkā</i> = pt)	(Later) subcomment. ( <i>ṭīkā</i> = t)
Dīghanikāya	Sumaṅgalavilāsīnī	Līnatthapakāsīnī I	
Majjhimanikāya	Papañcasūdānī	Līnatthapakāsīnī II	
Samyuttanikāya	Sāratthapakāsīnī	Līnatthapakāsīnī III	
Āṅguttaranikāya	Manorathapūraṇī	Līnatthapakāsīnī IV	Sāratthamañjūsā IV

Here Līnatthapakāsīnī IV, the old subcommentary on Āṅguttara-nikāya, a manuscript of which I discovered in Burma in 1999, is added to the Sixth Council's set.

(c) as two complete different sets:

**Table 2.1.1. The two complete sets of subcommentaries on four nikāyas (Saddhamma-s)**

Pāli Canon: four nikāyas	Commentaries	Old subcomment. ( <i>purāṇaṭṭhā</i> = pt)	(Later) subcomment. ( <i>ṭhā</i> = t)
Dīghanikāya	Sumaṅgalavilāsini	Linatthapakāsini I	Sāratthamañjūsā I
Majjhimanikāya	Papañcasūdanī	Linatthapakāsini II	Sāratthamañjūsā II
Samyuttanikāya	Sāratthapakāsini	Linatthapakāsini III	Sāratthamañjūsā III
Aṅguttaranikāya	Manorathapūraṇī	Linatthapakāsini IV	Sāratthamañjūsā IV

Here three later subcommentaries on Dīgha-nikāya, Majjhima-nikāya and Saṃyutta-nikāya (Sāratthamañjūsā I–III), which are still in manuscript form, are added and thus we have two complete sets, a very different situation from the single set approved by the Sixth Council (see Table 2.9. above). In Part 3 below printed editions and manuscripts of the texts given in the Tables 2.9–11 above will be discussed.

### Part 3. Printed editions and manuscripts of the *ṭhās*

The subcommentaries discussed above can be divided into two groups: those which have been published in printed editions and those which have remained only in manuscript form.<sup>52</sup> The printed editions are shown in Table 3.1 below:

**Table 3.1. Printed editions of the subcommentaries**

Two sets	<i>Dīghanikāya/ Sumaṅgala- vilāsini</i>	<i>Majjhima- nikāya/ Papañca- sūdanī</i>	<i>Samyutta-nikāya/ Sārattha- pakāsini</i>	<i>Aṅguttaranikāya/ Manoratha- pūraṇī</i>
Old subcom. <i>Linattha- pakāsini</i> set	Editions: Burmese: 1904–6, 1912, 1915, 1924, 1961; Sinhala: 1967 Roman script: 1970 Indian: 1993	Editions: Burmese: 1853 1961 Indian: 1995	Editions: Burmese: 1961 Indian: 1994	
Later subcom.: <i>Sārattha- mañjūsā</i> set				Editions: Burmese: 1910, 1961; Sinhala: 1907, 1930; Indian: 1996; Roman: 1996, 1997, 1999

<sup>52</sup>For details, see Pecenko, 2002, pp. 76–86.

The *ṭikās* in Table 3.1 are listed in *Sās* and *Sās-dīp* as the only existing set (Tables 2.4–2.5); this set, which has been also approved by the Theravāda tradition, consists of the three “older” *ṭikās* (Sv-pt, Ps-pt, Spk-pt) ascribed to Dhammapāla and the fourth “later” *ṭikā* (Mp-ṭ) ascribed to Sāriputta. Besides the Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana editions<sup>53</sup> there exist several other editions<sup>54</sup> and manuscripts of these *ṭikās*.<sup>55</sup> Because

<sup>53</sup>Sv-pt B<sup>c</sup> 1961 I–III; Ps-pt B<sup>c</sup> 1961 I–III; Spk-pt B<sup>c</sup> 1961 I–II; Mp-ṭ B<sup>c</sup> 1961 I–III. The Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana editions of these *ṭikās* were transcribed by Vipassana Research Institute, Igatpuri, India, (Sv-pt N<sup>c</sup> 1993 I–III; Ps-pt N<sup>c</sup> 1995 I–IV; Spk-pt N<sup>c</sup> 1994 I–III; Mp-ṭ N<sup>c</sup> 1996 I–III) and are available also on *Chaṭṭha Saṅgāyana CD-ROM* (Versions: 1.1, 2.0, 3.0) published by Vipassana Research Institute (Web site: <www.vri.dhamma.org>).

<sup>54</sup>Sv-pt: E<sup>c</sup> 1970 I–III, ed. by Lily de Silva; B<sup>c</sup> 1904–1906 I–III, ed. by U Hpye; B<sup>c</sup> 1912 I–III, ed. by Hsaya Tin of Nanmadaw; B<sup>c</sup> 1915 I–III, ed. by Hsayas Kyī, Kyaw, Thein and Hba Kyaw (all the B<sup>c</sup> are called *Linatthappakāsana*, see Raper and O’Keefe, 1983, p. 34); B<sup>c</sup> 1924 I–III (see Warder, 1980, p. 529); C<sup>c</sup>, H. Kalyāṇasiri and H. Kalyāṇadhamma, eds., 1967.

Ps-pt: Bangchang, 1981, p. xi, mentions a very old B<sup>c</sup> published in 1853.

Spk-pt: Besides the Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana edition (Spk-pt B<sup>c</sup> 1961 I–II = N<sup>c</sup> 1994 I–III) I am not aware of any other edition of Spk-pt.

Mp-ṭ: E<sup>c</sup> I (1996), II (1998), III (1999) — PTS edition by P. Pecenko, Vols. I–III contain *Eka-* and *Dukanipātaṭṭikā*; B<sup>c</sup> 1910 I–II (see *CPD*, Epilegomena to Vol. I, p. 41\*); C<sup>c</sup> 1907 (see de Silva, 1910–12, p. 150); C<sup>c</sup> 1930 (see *EncBuddh*, Vol. 1, fasc. 4, p. 629, s. v. *Āṅguttara-nava-ṭikā*). Mp-ṭ C<sup>c</sup> 1907 and 1930 contain only *Ekanipātaṭṭikā*. For a detailed description of C<sup>c</sup> 1907, B<sup>c</sup> 1910 and C<sup>c</sup> 1930, see Primoz Pecenko, “Introduction” in Mp-ṭ E<sup>c</sup> (1996) I, pp. xxxvii–xlii.

<sup>55</sup>Mss of Sv-pt are listed in: Lily de Silva, “General Introduction” in Sv-pt E<sup>c</sup>, pp. xi–xii (7 C<sup>c</sup> mss; these mss are listed in *LPP*); *LPP*, Vol. 1, p. 39 (16 C<sup>c</sup> mss); Fausböll 1894–96, p. 28 (1 B ms); Braun et al., 1985, pp. 126–28 (1 B ms); Rhys Davids, 1882, p. 52 (one C ms); *Piṭ-sm* 187, 189–90 (1 B ms).

Mss of Ps-pt are listed in: Bangchang, 1981, p. xi (1 K ms, 4 C mss; these 4 C mss are listed in *LPP*); *LPP*, Vol. 1, p. 71 (8 C mss), Vol. 2, p. 53 (6 C mss); Rhys Davids 1882, p. 51 (1 C ms); Fausböll, 1894–96., pp. 28–29 (1 B ms); Rhys Davids 1883, p. 147 (1 B ms); *Piṭ-sm* 191–93 (1 B ms).

Mss of Spk-pt are listed in: *LPP*, Vol. 1, p. 93 (1 B, 11 C mss), Vol. 2, p. 71 (7 C mss); de Silva, 1938, pp. 36–37 (1 C ms); *Piṭ-sm* 194–198 (1 B ms).

these are the only subcommentaries on the four *nikāyas* that have printed editions they have been often considered to be the only existing *ṭikās* on the four *nikāyas*.<sup>56</sup>

In my earlier research I have also investigated the *ṭikās* on the four *nikāyas* which have never been published in a book form; these texts are listed in some catalogues of Pāli manuscripts and are held in various libraries in Burma and Sri Lanka. According to my research a number of these manuscripts still exist (see Table 3.2 below) and one of them — the old *ṭikā* on Aṅguttaranikāya — was recently discovered in Burma.<sup>57</sup> This discovery shows that the bibliographic information in earlier texts like Saddhammasaṅgaha is very reliable and needs further investigation.

**Table 3.2. The sub-commentaries existing in manuscript form**

Two sets	<i>Dīgha-nikāya/ Sumaṅgala- vilāsini</i>	<i>Majjhima-nikāya/ Papañca-sūdanī</i>	<i>Saṅyutta-nikāya/ Sārattha-pakāsinī</i>	<i>Aṅguttara- nikāya/ Manoratha- pūraṇī</i>
Līnattha- pakāsinī set				Manuscripts: Burm. script: 3 (1 ms microfilmed, Burma 1999)
Sārattha- mañjūsā set	Manuscripts: Sinhala script: 7	Manuscripts: Burm. script: 1 Sinh. script: 7	Manuscripts: Burmese script: 1 Sinhala script: 2	

The information about the available manuscripts given in Table 3.2

---

Mss of Mp-ṭ are listed in: *LPP*, Vol 1, p. 2 (5 C mss), Vol. 2, p. 1 (7 C mss), Vol. 3, p. 164 (1 B ms from British Museum, Or 2089); de Silva, 1938, p. 37 (1 C ms); *Piṭ-sm* 202–212 (1 B ms); Fragile Palm Leaves project, Thailand (4 B mss; Ms ID Nos.: 906, 949, 983, 1645); National Library, Rangoon (3 B mss; Acc. Nos.: 800, 1846, 1937); Universities Central Library, University of Rangoon (2 B Mss; Acc. Nos.: 7691, 9816/10095).

This list is, of course, not exhaustive; it is possible that more manuscripts of the above mentioned *ṭikās* can be found in Burma and perhaps also in Thailand.

<sup>56</sup>See e.g. O.v. Hinüber, *HPL*, pp. 167, 173.

<sup>57</sup>Pecenko, 2002, pp. 78–86 (the Burmese ms of the old Aṅguttaraṭikā is described on pp. 82–85).

above also agrees with some bibliographical texts. In the Pagan inscription, Gv and *Piṭ-sm* (Tables 2.3, 2.4, 2.7) an additional *ṭikā* — not mentioned in *Sās* and *Sās-dīp* — is mentioned: the old *ṭikā* on A (Mp-pt), called *Catutthā Līnatthapakāsini*. *Saddhamma-s* (Table 2.2) mentions two complete sets of *ṭikās*, *Līnatthapakāsini* set (Sv-pt, Ps-pt, Spk-pt, Mp-pt) and *Sāratthamañjūsā* set (Sv-t, Ps-t, Spk-t, Mp-t). Here three later *ṭikās* — not mentioned in any other bibliographic work — are added: a *ṭikā* on D (Sv-t) called *Paṭhamā Sāratthamañjūsā*,<sup>58</sup> a *ṭikā* on M (Ps-t) called *Dutiya Sāratthamañjūsā* and a *ṭikā* on S (Spk-t) called *Tatiya Sāratthamañjūsā*.

If we combine Tables 3.1 and 3.2 above we get Table 3.3 below in which it is clearly evident that two different sets of *nikāyaṭikās* were in fact compiled: the older set called *Līnatthapakāsini* and the later set called *Sāratthamañjūsā*. This leads to important conclusions which will be discussed below.

**Table 3.3. Manuscripts and editions of the two sets of subcommentaries**

Two sets	<i>Dīgha-nikāya/ Samaṅgala- vilāsini</i>	<i>Majjhima-nikāya/ Papañca-sūdanī</i>	<i>Samyutta- nikāya/ Sārattha- pakāsini</i>	<i>Aṅguttara-nikāya/ Manoratha-pūraṇī</i>
Old subcom.: <i>Līnatthapakā- sini</i> set (sixth- ninth century C.E. )	Editions: Burmese: 1904-6, 1912, 1915, 1924, 1961; Sinhala: 1967 Roman script: 1970 Indian: 1993	Editions: Burmese: 1853, 1961 Indian: 1995	Editions: Burmese: 1961 Indian: 1994	Manuscripts: Burmese script: 3 (1 ms discovered and microfilmed in Burma 1999)
Later subcom.: <i>Sārattha- mañjūsā</i> set (twelfth century C.E. )	Manuscripts: Sinhala script: 7	Manuscripts: Burm. script: 1 Sinhala script: 7	Manuscript Burmese script: 1 Sinhala script: 2	Editions: Burmese: 1910, 1961; Sinhala: 1907, 1930; Indian: 1966; Roman: 1996, 1997, 1999

<sup>58</sup>Another manuscript of the later *ṭikā* on D (Sv-t) with the title *Dīgha-nikāya Dvītiya ṭikā* held in Saṃgharāja Pansala in Malvatu Vihāraya is mentioned in Blackburn 2002, p. 22 (ms no. 21).

### Conclusions

From the above analysis of the *nikāyaṭīkāś*, their manuscripts and printed editions we can conclude that two different sets of *nikāyaṭīkāś* were in fact compiled: the older set called *Līnatthapakāsinī* (Sv-pt, Ps-pt, Spk-pt, Mp-pt) and the later set called *Sāratthamañjūsā* (Sv-t, Ps-t, Spk-t, Mp-t). Although the two complete sets are mentioned only in *Saddhamma-s* (see Table 2.2 above), all the eight *ṭīkāś* from the two sets seem to still exist either in printed editions or in manuscript form (see Table 3.3 above). Here it is very interesting to note that the manuscripts in Table 3.2 have never been properly investigated and it also seems that they have been neglected by both the Theravāda tradition<sup>59</sup> as well as modern Pāli scholarship.<sup>60</sup>

---

<sup>59</sup>It is not made explicit why certain *ṭīkāś* (Sv-t, Ps-t, Spk-t, Mp-pt) were ignored by the Theravāda tradition (see e.g. *Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana* editions) and only some (i.e. Sv-pt, Ps-pt, Spk-pt, Mp-t) were published — in spite of the fact that the manuscripts of the unpublished *ṭīkāś* are held in different libraries in Burma and Sri Lanka and according to the introduction in the *Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana* editions “all the existing *ṭīkāś*” were recited. In the *Nidānakathā* of Mp-t B<sup>c</sup> 1961 (p. ca) it is clearly stated that all the existing *ṭīkāś* in Burma and outside Burma were edited and published:

*evaṃ saṅgītim āropitassa pana tepītakassa buddhavacanassa attha-saṃvaṇṇanābhūtā yā ca aṭṭhakathāyo saṃvijjanti yā ca tāsam atthapakāsanavasena pavattā ṭīkāyo saṃvijjanti manoramāya tantinayānucchavikāya bhāsāya ācariy’ Ānanda-ācariya-Dhammapālādīhi theravarehi katā,*

*tāsam pi aṭṭhakathāṭīkānaṃ sadesīyamūlehi c’ eva videsīyamūlehi ca saṃsandītvā tepītakassa viya buddhavacanassa visodhanapaṭivisodhanavasena mahātherā pāvacanadassino saṃvaṇṇanā-kovidā pāṭhasodhanam akaṃsu,*

*icc evam aṭṭhakathāṭīkāyo pamādakhalitādhikaparibhaṭṭhapāṭhānaṃ nirākaraṇavasena visodhitā c’ eva paṭivisodhitā ca hutvā Buddhasāsana-muddaṇayanātilaye samappitā suṭṭhu muddāpaṇāya.*

This contradicts the information about the manuscripts of the *nikāyaṭīkāś* discussed above (see Table 3.3 above). If the *Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana* edited “all the existing *ṭīkāś*” (*yā ca tāsam attha-ppakāsanavasena pavattā ṭīkāyo saṃvijjanti*) “originating from Burma and from outside” (*sadesīyamūlehi c’*

My recent discovery of a manuscript of the old *Āṅguttaraṭīkā*, *Catutthā Līnattha-pakāsīnī*, further proves the existence of two sets of *ṭīkā*s and also throws new light on the development of the *nikāyaṭīkā*s and their Pāli bibliographic information. According to *Saddhamma-s* (see 2.1 above) the old *nikāyaṭīkā*s, called *Līnatthapakāsīnī*, were “incomplete” (*aparipuṇṇa*) and had to be replaced by the later set of *ṭīkā*s, called *Sāratthamañjūsā*, which were “comprehensive” (*paripuṇṇa*) and “clear” (*anākula*). My comparative research of three parallel chapters from the older (Mp-pt) and later (Mp-t) *Āṅguttaraṭīkā*s published in the *Journal of the Pali Text Society*<sup>61</sup> indicates that the description of these two *Āṅguttaraṭīkā*s in *Saddhamma-s* is very accurate. This is a further indication that the information about the two different sets of *nikāyaṭīkā*s in *Saddhamma-s* (see 2.1 above) is most probably correct.

In the light of the above discussion we can further conclude that the information about the *nikāyaṭīkā*s in *Saddhamma-s*, the oldest Pāli bibliographical text, is more accurate than in all the other, later Pāli bibliographic sources. Although some of these sources (Pagan inscription, Gv, *Piṭ-sm*) mention the old *Āṅguttaraṭīkā* (Mp-pt), none of them mentions two complete sets of *nikāyaṭīkā*s (cf. Table 2.9). *Saddhamma-s* seems therefore the most accurate — although it has been usually considered to be one of the least reliable sources.

The information about the *ṭīkā*s on the four *nikāyas* in modern Pāli scholarship is mostly based on the Pāli bibliographical works, on the existing printed editions, and rarely also on the catalogues<sup>62</sup> of Pāli

---

*eva videsīyamūlehi ca saṃsanditvā*), why were the manuscripts of Sv-ṭ, Ps-ṭ, Spk-ṭ and Mp-pt omitted? Further research is needed here.

<sup>60</sup>Modern Pāli scholarship seems to agree to a great extent with the Theravāda tradition (i.e. the Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana editions) that most probably only one set of *nikāyaṭīkā*s (i.e. Sv-pt, Ps-pt, Spk-pt and Mp-t) still exists at present. Cf. Table 1.4 above; Hinüber, *HPL*, p. 167, §357; p. 173, §§375–76; Buddhadatta, 1956, pp. 259–62; Godakumbura, 1980, p. xxvii, n. 1.

<sup>61</sup>Pecenko, 2002, pp. 78–79, 82–105.

<sup>62</sup>For example, in Geiger §31 (literature), nn. 5–6, Fausbøll 1894–96 is cited.

manuscripts. Since we have, as shown above, printed editions of only one “combined” set of *nikāyaṭīkāś* (i.e. Sv-pt, Ps-pt, Spk-pt, Mp-t; see Table 2.9 above), it is often assumed that only one set of *nikāyaṭīkāś* exists at present and that only one complete set was also most probably composed. This approach is also supported by references from the later bibliographic works (e.g. Sās), which are often considered more reliable than the earlier sources (e.g. Saddhamma-s). It also seems clear that this approach has been — perhaps “subconsciously” — influenced by the Theravāda tradition and its Sixth Council (the Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana) which published exactly the same “combined” set of *ṭīkāś*.

In the case of the two sets of *nikāyaṭīkāś* discussed above — especially considering Sv-t, Ps-t, Spk-t and Mp-pt which are, although still existing in manuscript form (see Table 3.2), often mentioned as “lost” or “a fiction”<sup>63</sup> — the information in the oldest bibliographic source (Saddhamma-s) appears to be the most reliable of all (cf. Table 2.2).

The above analysis of the *nikāyaṭīkāś* and their manuscripts and printed editions clearly indicates that further research of Pāli subcommentaries and their bibliographic information needs to be done. It is possible that more manuscripts of the less known *nikāyaṭīkāś* (i.e. Sv-t, Ps-t, Spk-t, Mp-pt) are held in various temple libraries in the Theravāda countries. These *ṭīkāś* are an important link in Pāli textual transmission and their further investigation may give us — among many other things — new information about the development of the *ṭīkā* literature and about the editions/versions of the canonical and post-canonical Pāli texts used at the time of their compilation. And this is very important for the history of Pāli literature.

Primoz Pecenko

---

<sup>63</sup>Hinüber, *HPL*, p. 167 (§ 357), see also p. 173 (§ 376).

## ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations and the quotation system of Pāli sources follow *A Critical Pāli Dictionary* (Epilomena to Vol. 1, 1948, pp. 5\*–36\*, and Vol. 3, 1992, pp. II–VI) and H. Bechert, *Abkürzungsverzeichnis zur buddhistischen Literatur in Indien und Südostasien* (Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990). The only exception are the PTS editions which will be cited – unless required for emphasis – without edition and date, e.g. Sv-pt = Sv-pt<sup>E</sup> 1970 I–III, edited by Lily de Silva. For transliteration of Burmese see “Table of Transliteration” in H. Bechert et al., *Burmese Manuscripts, Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland*, Vol. XXIII, 1 (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1979), p. xxi.

Adikaram, *EHBC* E.W. Adikaram, *Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon*. Colombo: M.D. Gunasena, 1953

A Aṅguttara-nikāya

B (manuscript) text in Burmese script

B<sup>c</sup> Burmese edition

B.E. Burmese era, (Culla-)Sakkarāj, beginning 638 C.E.

*BSOAS* Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies

C (manuscript) text in Sinhala script

C<sup>c</sup> Ceylonese edition

*CPD* *Critical Pāli Dictionary*. V. Trenckner et al., eds. Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, 1924–.

D Dīgha-nikāya

*DPPN* G.P. Malalasekera, *Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names*

ed(s). edition(s)

E<sup>c</sup> European (PTS) edition

*EncBuddh* *Encyclopædia of Buddhism*. G.P. Malalasekera, ed.

Geiger W. Geiger, *Pāli Literature and Language*. Calcutta: Calcutta University Press, 1956.

Gv *Gandhavaṃsa* of *Nandapaññā*. I.P. Minayeff, ed. *JPTS*, 1886, pp. 54–79. (see 2.3)

von Hinüber, HPL Oskar von Hinüber. *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1996.

*JPTS* *Journal of the Pāli Text Society*

K (manuscript) text in Cambodian script

M Majjhima-nikāya

Mhv Mahāvaṃsa of Mahānāma. W. Geiger, ed. London: PTS, 1958; and Cūḷavaṃsa of Dhammakitti. W. Geiger, ed.

	London : PTS, 1980
Mp	Manorathapūraṇī, Aṅguttaranikāya-aṭṭhakathā
Mp-pt	Manorathapūraṇīpurāṇaṭīkā, Līnatthapakāsini IV
Mp-ṭ	Manorathapūraṇīṭīkā, Sāratthamañjūsā IV
ms(s)	manuscript(s)
N <sup>c</sup>	edition in Devanāgarī print
Norman, <i>PL</i>	K.R. Norman, <i>Pāli Literature</i> . Wiesbaden : Otto Harrassowitz, 1983
<i>Piṭ-sm</i>	<i>Piṭakat samuṇṇ</i> . Rangoon : Tipiṭakanikāya Sāsana Pruhvè., 1989. (see 2.6)
PLB	M.H. Bode, <i>The Pāli Literature of Burma</i> . London, 1909.
<i>PLC</i>	G.P. Malalasekera, <i>The Pāli Literature of Ceylon</i> . Colombo : M.D. Gunasena, 1958.
Ps	Papañcasūdanī, Majjhimanikāya-aṭṭhakathā
Ps-pt	Papañcasūdanīpurāṇaṭīkā, Līnatthapakāsini II
Ps-ṭ	Papañcasūdanīṭīkā, Sāratthamañjūsā II
pt	<i>purāṇaṭīkā</i>
PTS	Pali Text Society
S	Samyuttanikāya
Saddhamma-s	<i>Saddhammasaṅgha</i> of <i>Dhammakitti</i> . Nedimāle Saddhānanda, ed. <i>JPTS</i> 1890, pp. 21–90 = N <sup>c</sup> 1961 (see 2.1)
Sās	<i>Sāsanaṅgaṃsa</i> of <i>Paññāsāmi</i> . C.S. Upasak, ed. Nālandā : Nava Nālandā Mahāvihāra, 1961 = E <sup>c</sup> 1897 (see 2.4.)
Sās-dīp	<i>Sāsanaṅgasadīpa</i> of <i>Vimalasārathera</i> . Colombo : Satthāloka Press 1880. (see 2.5)
Sp	Samantapāsādikā, Vinaya-aṭṭhakathā
Sp-ṭ	Sāratthadīpanīṭīkā
Spk	Sāratthapakāsini, Samyuttanikāya-aṭṭhakathā
Spk-pt	Sāratthapakāsiniṭīkā, Līnatthapakāsini III
Spk-ṭ	Sāratthapakāsiniṭīkā, Sāratthamañjūsā III
Sv	Sumaṅgalavilāsini, Dīghanikāya-aṭṭhakathā
Sv-nt <sup>B</sup>	Sumaṅgalavilāsiniṅgaṭīkā, Silakkhandhavagga-abhinavaṭīkā, Sādhujanavilāsini of Ñāṇabhivamsa
Sv-pt	Sumaṅgalavilāsiniṭīkā, Līnatthapakāsini I
Sv-ṭ	Sumaṅgalavilāsiniṭīkā, Sāratthamañjūsā I
ṭ	<i>ṭīkā</i>
Trsl.	Translation
Upās	Upāsakajānālankāra. H. Saddhatissa, ed. London : PTS, 1965.

- Winternitz, HIL M. Winternitz, *A History of Indian Literature*, 3 vols. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1981.
- ZDMG *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bangchang, Supaphan Na. 1981. *A Critical Edition of the Mūlapariyāyavagga of Majjhimanikāya-aṭṭhakathāṭikā*, Ph.D. diss., University of Peradeniya
- Blackburn, Anne M. 2002. "Notes on Sri Lankan Temple Manuscript Collections", *JPTS*, Vol. XXVII, pp. 1–59
- Bhāratīya Bauddhācāryayō*. Colombo: K.M. Ratnasiri, 1949
- Bollée, W.B. 1969. "Die Stellung der Vinayaṭikās in der Pāli-Literatur", *ZDMG*, Suppl. 1, 17, pp. 824–35
- Braun, H., et al. 1985. *Burmese Manuscripts*, Part 2. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag,
- Buddhadatta, A.P. 1956. *Pālisāhityaya*, Vol. I. Ambalamgoḍa: Ānanda Potsamāgama
- . 1957. "The Second Great Commentator" in *Corrections to Geiger Mahāvamsa etc.* Ambalangoda: Ananda Book Company
- . 1960. *Theravādī Bauddhācāryayō*. Ambalamgoḍa: S.K. Candratilaka, 1960
- . 1962. *Pālisāhityaya*, Vol. 2. Ambalamgoḍa: Ānanda Potsamāgama
- Cousins, L.S. 1972. "Dhammapāla and the Ṭikā Literature" (review of Sv-ṭ, ed. by Lily de Silva), *Religion* 2, pt. 1, pp. 159–65
- Dhammaratana Thera, H. 1968. *Buddhism in South India*, The Wheel Publication No. 124/125. Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society
- Fausbøll, V. 1894–96. "Catalogue of the Mandalay MSS. in the India Office Library (Formerly Part of the King's Library at Mandalay)", *JPTS* IV, pp. 1–52
- Godakumbura, C.E. 1980. *Catalogue of Ceylonese Manuscripts* (Copenhagen: The Royal Library,
- Hazra, K.L. 1986. *The Buddhist Annals and Chronicles of South-East Asia*. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal
- Hinüber, Oskar von. 1988. "Remarks on a List of Books Sent to Ceylon from Siam in the 18th Century" *JPTS*, Vol. XII, pp. 175–83
- . 1996A. "Chips from Buddhist Workshops: Scribes and Manuscripts from Northern Thailand", *JPTS*, Vol. XXII, pp. 35–57

- . 1996B. *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*, Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter
- Jackson, P. 1990. “A Note on Dhammapāla(s)”, *JPTS* XV, pp. 209–11
- Kalyāṇasiri, H., and H. Kalyāṇadhamma, 1967. *Dīghanikāyaṭīkā*. Somavaṭṭi Hēvāvītāraṇa Ṭikāganthamālā. Colombo: Anula Press
- Law, B.C. 1941. *A Manual of Buddhist Historical Traditions*, Calcutta: University of Calcutta
- Lieberman, V.B. 1976. “A New Look at the Sāsana-vaṃsa”, *BSOAS* 39, pp. 137–49
- Lottemoser, F. 1982. *Quoted Verse Passages in the Works of Buddhaghosa: Contributions towards the Study of the Lost Sihaḷatthakathā Literature*, Ph.D. diss., University of Göttingen
- Mayrhofer, M. 1986–. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindo-arischen*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter
- Norman, K.R. 1983. *Pāli Literature*, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz
- Panditha, V. 1973. “Buddhism During the Polonnaruva Period” in *The Polonnaruva Period*, Dehiwala: Tisara Prakasakayo
- Pecenko, Primoz. 1997. “Sāriputta and His Works”, *JPTS*, Vol. XXIII, pp. 159–79
- . 2002. “Linatthapakāsini and Sāratthamañjūsā: The Purāṇaṭīkāś and the Ṭīkāś on the Four Nikāyas”, *JPTS* XXVII, pp. 61–113
- Pieris, A. 1978. “The Colophon to the Paramatthamañjūsā and the Discussion on the Date of Ācariya Dhammapāla” in *Buddhism in Ceylon and Studies on Religious Syncretism in Buddhist Countries*, ed. by H. Bechert. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht
- Raper, T.C.H., and M.J.C. O’ Keefe, eds., 1983. *Catalogue of the Pāli Printed Books in the India Office Library*, London: The British Library
- Rhys Davids, T.W. 1882. “List of Pāli, Sinhalese, and Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Colombo Museum”, *JPTS*, Vol. I, pp. 46–58
- . 1883. “List of Pāli Manuscripts in the Copenhagen Royal Library”, *JPTS*, Vol. I, pp. 147–49
- de Silva, W.A. 1910–12. “A List of Pali Books Printed in Ceylon in Sinhalese Characters”, *JPTS*, Vol. X, pp. 133–54
- . 1938. *Catalogue of Palm Leaf Manuscripts in the Library of the Colombo Museum*, Vol. I. Colombo: Ceylon Government Press

- Somadasa, K.D. 1959–64. *Lankāvē Puskoḷa Pot Nāmāvaliya*, Vols. I–III, Colombo: Department of Cultural Affairs
- Than Tun, U. 1998. “An Original Inscription Dated 10 September 1223 That King Badon Copied on 27 October 1785”, *Études birmanes* (Paris: EFEO), pp. 37–55
- Theravādi Baudhācāryayō*. Ambalamgoḍa: S.K. Candratilaka, 1960
- Warder, A.K. 1980. *Indian Buddhism*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas
- . 1981. “Some Problems of the Later Pali Literature”, *JPTS* IX, pp. 198–207

# Susīma's Conversation with the Buddha: A Second Study of the Susīma-sutta\*

## I. Introduction

In my previous paper entitled “The Susīma-sutta and the Wisdom-Liberated Arahant” (*Journal of the Pali Text Society*, XXIX, pp. 51–75), I examined the Pāli Susīma-sutta (S 12:70; S II 119–28) in relation to several parallels preserved in the Chinese Tripiṭaka. This *sutta*, included in the Nidāna-samyutta, records the story of an ascetic named Susīma who entered the Buddhist monastic order as a “thief of Dhamma” (*dharmatthenaka*) intent on learning the secret of the Buddha's success in order to improve the fortunes of his fellow wanderers. After his ordination, he meets a group of monks who had declared “final knowledge” — that is, arahantship — in the Buddha's presence. Susīma asks them about their other attainments and learns that they lack the supernormal powers and formless emancipations, which he apparently had assumed were intrinsic to the state of final liberation. Thereupon Susīma asks them, “Here now, venerable ones, this answer and the non-attainment of those states: how could this be, friends?” And the monks reply, “We are liberated by wisdom, friend Susīma.”<sup>1</sup> Susīma then goes to the Buddha to ask for clarification.

I compared this portion of S 12:70 with three versions preserved in Chinese translation. Of these, one is contained in the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya; the second is found in the Saṃyuktāgama (no. 347); and the

---

\*I am thankful to Bhikkhu Anālayo for his comments on an earlier draft of this paper which compelled me to sharpen my presentation. I also thank Peter Harvey and Ṭhānissaro Bhikkhu for reading and commenting on the more recent version.

<sup>1</sup>S II 123,22–26: *etha dāni āyasmanto idaṅ ca veyyākaraṇaṃ imesaṅ ca dhammānaṃ asamāpatti, idaṃ no āvuso kathaṃ? paññāvimutā kho mayaṃ āvuso Susīma*. Note that in E<sup>c</sup> the line breaks of this passage are faulty.

third is an incomplete version cited in the Abhidharma-vibhāṣā-śāstra.<sup>2</sup> My paper focused in particular on the light the parallel versions could shed on the question regarding the minimum attainment in *samādhi* meditation required to become a *paññāvimutta* or wisdom-liberated arahant. In the Pāli version, the monks consulted only deny possessing the five mundane super-knowledges (commonly known as *abhiññā*, though the word itself does not occur in this *sutta*) and the “peaceful formless emancipations transcending forms”.<sup>3</sup> Nothing is said about their proficiency in the *jhānas* and Susīma does not even question them on this issue. In M-Vin, the monks deny possessing the divine eye, the recollection of past lives, and the peaceful formless emancipations. Again, though some clarification of the role of the *jhānas* in their path seems called for, the question whether or not the monks are *jhāna*-attainers is not raised.

The Nikāyas themselves never explicitly address this question. The texts routinely define the *paññāvimutta* as “one who does not contact with the body and dwell in those peaceful emancipations that are formless, transcending forms, but whose influxes are exhausted by his seeing with wisdom”.<sup>4</sup> This means that the *paññāvimutta* lacks access to the four formless meditative attainments and “the cessation of perception and feeling” (*saññāvedayitanirodha*). Nothing is said, in this definition, about how the wisdom-liberated one fares with regard to the *jhānas*. A number of *suttas* define right concentration of the noble eightfold path with the formula for the four *jhānas*, and thus, if this definition is taken

---

<sup>2</sup>In this paper I will use the same abbreviations for the alternative versions as I used in the earlier paper, that is, respectively M-Vin, SĀ 347, and Vibhāṣā. It is uncertain whether the Vibhāṣā version is a direct quotation from a *sutta* or a paraphrase.

<sup>3</sup>S II 121,13–23,17.

<sup>4</sup>M I 477,33–78,36: *ekacco puggalo ye te santā vimokkhā atikkamma rūpe āruppā te na kāyena phusitvā viharatī, paññāya c’ assa divvā āsavā parikkhīnā honti. ayaṃ vuccati, bhikkhave, puggalo paññāvimutto.*

as categorical, it would seem that even the *paññāvimutta* must possess the four *jhānas*, or at least the first *jhāna*.

The commentaries, however, introduce into the interpretation of the Susīma-sutta a new exegetical concept, that of the *sukkhavipassaka* or “dry-insight” meditator. Such an individual, in the commentarial system, rides to liberation in the vehicle of “bare insight” (*suddhavipassanāyānika*), that is, insight meditation (*vipassanābhāvanā*) without the practice of serenity meditation (*samathabhāvanā*). The insight is called “dry” because it lacks the “moistening influence” of the *jhānas* or even “access concentration” (*upacārasamādhi*) to prepare the mind for insight. The figure of the dry-insight meditator is not explicitly found in the Nikāyas but first appears as such in the commentaries and the Visuddhimagga.

I looked into the Chinese parallels (translated from texts in north Indian languages, probably a Prakrit, Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit, and Sanskrit) with the thought that these versions might shed some light on the position regarding the *jhānas* in the more familiar Pāli recension. Now if we read the Susīma-sutta alongside its commentary and the parallel versions preserved in Chinese translation, we might notice two intriguing facts emerging from the first part of the discourse. The first is that the Sāratthappakāsinī, the classical commentary (*aṭṭhakathā*) on the Saṃyutta-nikāya, interprets the term *paññāvimutta* as used in the Susīma-sutta in the narrower sense of a dry-insight arahant. Even though this is not stated in the *sutta* itself, the commentary does not take the *paññāvimutta* of the Susīma-sutta to be simply an arahant who lacks the formless meditations, as the definition at M I 477–78, cited above, would lead us to believe; rather, it takes him to be one who does not possess any *jhāna* attainment at all.<sup>5</sup> The second fact is that two

---

<sup>5</sup>According to the commentarial system, based on the Abhidhamma, all attainments of the noble path and fruit (*magga-phala*) occur at the level of *jhāna*, and thus any arahant would be an attainer of world-transcending (*lokuttara*) *jhāna*. But what is at issue is their possession of “mundane *jhāna*”, which is the meaning of the term “*jhāna*” in the context of the Nikāyas and Āgamas.

parallels to the *Susīma-sutta* found in the Chinese canon, SĀ 347 and the citation in the *Abhidharma-vibhāṣā-śāstra* (as well as the larger *Abhidharma-mahāvibhāṣā-śāstra*), endorse the idea that the *paññā-vimutta* arahant lacks attainment of the *jhānas*. In these versions, when *Susīma* questions the monks about their meditative skills, he expressly asks whether they based their realization of arahantship on the *jhānas* or formless attainments and they reply in the negative.

These two facts, taken in conjunction, naturally give rise to the question whether the position taken in the *Sāratthappakāsinī* had been adopted under the influence of the schools that preserved the *Samyuktāgama* and the *Abhidharma-vibhāṣā-śāstra*.<sup>6</sup> The question cannot be answered definitively in the affirmative, for there is no evidence of one school influencing the other on this point; it is perfectly conceivable that forces at work independently in both camps gave rise to the concept of an arahant destitute of *jhānic* attainments.<sup>7</sup> However, given the easy contact between representatives of the various Buddhist schools in early Indian Buddhism, it is possible that such contacts did occur and placed subtle pressures on the adherents of the Pāli school to admit an arahant without *jhāna* into their gallery of noble ones. Perhaps because of their textual conservatism, and also due to the weight of the canonical formula defining right concentration as the four *jhānas*, the Theravādins were reluctant to explicitly introduce the dry-insight arahant into their *Sutta-piṭaka*. But taking an indirect route would have allowed them to legitimize such a figure without ruffling feathers (or ochre robes) in more conservative monastic circles. One method was simply to use the idea of a dry-insight arahant as an explanatory concept in their commentaries, an approach that they did in fact adopt. But it is

---

<sup>6</sup>The former is taken to stem from the *Mūlasarvāstivāda* and the latter from the *Vaibhāṣikas* of the main *Sarvāstivāda*.

<sup>7</sup>But we also cannot rule out any influence, for the Pāli commentarial tradition did absorb some important ideas from the *Sarvāstivāda*. The most notable of these is the use of the concept of *svabhāva* (Pāli *sabhāva*) as the defining mark of a truly existent *dhamma*.

also possible that the idea of the arahant without *jhāna* attainments fed back into the canonical texts and subtly shaped their final formulation.

Whereas the schools that preserved the Saṃyuktāgama and the Abhidharma-vibhāṣā-śāstra boldly introduced arahants lacking *jhāna* attainments into their canonical collections, the custodians of the Pāli Nikāyas may have sought to grant canonical authorization to a type of wisdom-liberated arahant who lacked *jhāna* attainments by resorting to new definitions and the subtle revision of older texts. Though we cannot discount the possibility that such texts stem directly from the Buddha himself, it is also conceivable that they derive from a slightly later period when older stipulations in the most archaic discourses were undergoing reevaluation. Several *suttas*, for example, introduce a contrast between two ways of practice: one pleasant (*sukkhapaṭipadā*), which leads to arahantship through the four *jhānas*; the other painful or difficult (*dukkhapaṭipadā*), which promotes attainment of the final goal through meditation subjects such as the unattractiveness of the body, the impermanence of all formations, and the perception of death.<sup>8</sup> The Putta-sutta defines the *puṇḍarīka-samaṇa*, the “white-lotus ascetic”, as an arahant destitute of the eight emancipations (which, it seems, include the four *jhānas* among the first three emancipations).<sup>9</sup> The Mahānidāna-suttanta mentions nothing about meditative attainments but identifies the wisdom-liberated arahant as one who has understood the origin, passing away, gratification, danger, and escape in regard to the nine abodes of beings.<sup>10</sup> The Susīma-sutta, too, I would maintain, belongs to this group of *suttas* that indirectly hint at the existence of arahants without *jhānas*. On the basis of such texts, the transmitters of the Pāli Nikāyas could delicately suggest that liberation by wisdom, without the

---

<sup>8</sup>For citations, see “The Susīma-sutta and the Wisdom-Liberated Arahant”, pp. 60–61.

<sup>9</sup>A 4:87, at A II 87,7–11. See “The Susīma-sutta and the Wisdom-Liberated Arahant”, pp. 70–71.

<sup>10</sup>D II 70–71.

support of *jhānic* attainment, is a valid option in the development of the path.<sup>11</sup>

If these hypotheses are correct — and I must emphasize that the above observations are largely speculative — it then follows that in admitting the dry-insight arahant, the commentaries did not so much introduce a totally new figure into Buddhist soteriological doctrine as merely make explicit an idea lying implicit in texts they regarded as “word of the Buddha”. These texts, in turn, could have taken the form they did for the express purpose of quietly accommodating such a figure. In the absence of any incontrovertible proof for this hypothesis, I can only point to the striking accord between the Pāli commentaries and the Saṃyuktāgama of the Chinese Tripiṭaka as indirect evidence that such a development was not unimaginable even in schools that considered themselves textually conservative. Although, in the Pāli school, this development did not culminate in texts explicitly acknowledging dry-insight arahants, it might still have led to the revision of several archaic *suttas* in ways that made them congenial to the new ideas. Thus when the commentators peered back into the Nikāyas, they were not at a complete loss to support their exegetical concepts. All they had to do was draw out and articulate what the texts themselves implied but did not state openly.

## 2. Susīma Calls on the Buddha

Up to this point I have been mostly recapitulating the main themes of my earlier paper on the Susīma-sutta. I have been doing so, not merely to refresh the reader’s memory, but because I believe that similar processes underlie the development of the second part of the

---

<sup>11</sup>According to the commentarial system, all experiences of the supramundane (*lokuttara*) states occur at the level of *jhāna*, and thus, for the commentators, dry-insight meditators still acquire *jhāna* simultaneously with their attainment of the path and fruit. In this way, even without attaining *jhāna* prior to their realization, they manage to fulfil the standard definition of the noble eightfold path factor of right concentration (*sammā-samādhi*) as the four *jhānas*.

Susīma-sutta. Now I will resume my examination of the discourse. I will first summarize the narrative of S 12:70 as it continues beyond Susīma's encounter with the wisdom-liberated monks. In the next section I will survey the accounts of the same events presented in the Chinese parallels. Finally, I will call attention to problems emerging from the discourse and try to show how insights into the formation of early Buddhist texts can be generated by comparing different versions of a single *sutta*.

When Susīma leaves the monks, he approaches the Buddha, keen to learn how those monks could claim to be fully liberated without possessing the five super-knowledges and the peaceful formless emancipations. The Buddha first offers Susīma a single-sentence explanation: "First, Susīma, there is knowledge of the persistence of principles; afterwards, knowledge of nibbāna."<sup>12</sup> This marks the beginning of what we might consider the second part of the *sutta*, the purpose of which is to elucidate the meaning of "liberated by wisdom" (*paññāvimutta*) and thereby resolve the problem posed by the first part.

When Susīma asks the Buddha to explain this enigmatic statement, he responds simply by repeating his words: "Whether or not you understand, Susīma, first there is knowledge of the persistence of principles; afterwards, knowledge of nibbāna." He next leads Susīma through a catechism on the three characteristics of the five aggregates, exactly as we find it in the well-known Anattalakkhaṇa-sutta, the "Discourse on the Characteristic of Non-Self" (S 22:59). Each of the five aggregates is impermanent; because it is impermanent, it is bound up with suffering; and because it is impermanent, bound up with suffering, and subject to change, it is to be seen as "not mine, not I, not my self". Seeing that the five aggregates are non-self, the noble disciple becomes disenchanted with them; through disenchantment, he becomes dispassionate; and through dispassion, his mind is liberated. With liberation comes the

---

<sup>12</sup>S II 124,10–11: *pubbe kho Susīma dhammaṭṭhitiñāṇaṃ, pacchā nibbāne ñāṇaṇ ti.*

knowledge of liberation and he understands: “Birth is finished; the spiritual life has been lived; what had to be done has been done; there is no more coming back to any state of being.”<sup>13</sup>

Then the Buddha questions Susīma about the links of dependent origination (*paṭicca-samuppāda*), first with respect to arising, taken in reverse order from “because of birth, there is aging-and-death” back to “because of ignorance, there are volitional activities”; then with respect to cessation, again in reverse order from “with the cessation of birth, aging-and-death ceases” back to “with the cessation of ignorance, volitional activities cease”. At each step, the Buddha asks Susīma whether he sees (*Susīma passasi*) the relationship between the two factors, and the monk always replies, “Yes, lord” (*evaṃ bhante*).<sup>14</sup>

At this point the Buddha asks Susīma whether “knowing and seeing thus” (*evaṃ jānanto evaṃ passanto*), he possesses the five super-knowledges and the peaceful formless emancipations, and Susīma replies, “Not so.” The Buddha then asks Susīma, “Here now, Susīma, this answer and the non-attainment of those states: how could this be, Susīma?”<sup>15</sup> This was the same question that Susīma had earlier asked the group of monks, which elicited the reply: “We are liberated by wisdom.” Susīma does not answer the question. Instead, he prostrates himself at the Buddha’s feet, confesses that he entered the Buddhist order as a “thief of Dhamma”, and asks the Exalted One to pardon him for his offense. The Buddha tells him that what he did was indeed foolish and unskillful. To underscore the danger, he relates a simile about a criminal who is arrested by the king’s men and beheaded out-

---

<sup>13</sup>S II 124,18–25,29: *evaṃ passaṃ, susīma, sutavā ariyasāvako rūpasmim pi nibbindati, vedanāyapi nibbindati, saññāyapi nibbindati, saikhāresu pi nibbindati, viññānasmimpi nibbindati. nibbindaṃ virajjati, virāgā vimuccati. vimuttasmim vimuttamiti nāṇaṃ hoti. “khīṇā jāti, vusitaṃ brahmacariyaṃ, kataṃ karaṇiyaṃ, nāparaṃ ithattāyā” ti pajānāti.*

<sup>14</sup>S II 125,29–26,18.

<sup>15</sup>S II 127,22–23: *etha dāni Susīma idaṃ ca veyyākaraṇaṃ imesaṃ ca dhammānaṃ asamāpatti, idaṃ no Susīma kathaṃ?* E<sup>c</sup> mistakenly reads the last word here as *kataṃ* when *kathaṃ* is required.

side the city. Though the consequences of “going forth as a thief in the well-expounded Dhamma and discipline” are far graver than the punishment suffered by the criminal, the Buddha pardons Susīma because he has seen his transgression for what it is and pledges to exercise future restraint. With this the *sutta* ends.<sup>16</sup> It should be noted that, in contrast to the Chinese parallels, this version mentions nothing about Susīma obtaining any transcendent realization, neither the dust-free, stainless eye of Dhamma (*virajam vītamalaṃ dhammacakkhuṃ*) nor the exhaustion of the influxes (*āsavakkhaya*).

Nevertheless, though nothing is said about any attainment on the part of Susīma, it seems to me that the discussion about the two kinds of knowledge must serve to clarify the status of the arahant liberated by wisdom. And as I read it, the intent is to suggest that deep attainment in concentration, even the attainment of the first *jhāna*, is not indispensable. This point is made implicitly rather than explicitly, but I believe a keen reader would still detect it. Of course, a critic might object that the *sutta* does not mention the need for maintaining precepts, or sense restraint, or mindfulness and clear comprehension, as prerequisites for liberation, yet we certainly cannot bypass these steps of the path; and, it might be said, if these steps can be implicitly included, certainly the *jhānas* could too. I won't deny that one can read the Susīma-sutta as simply reaffirming, by silence, the need for the *jhānas*. But if that were the case, I would ask, why didn't the Buddha simply say so instead of drawing upon these two kinds of knowledge to clarify the status of the *paññāvimutta*? I don't think the place of the *jhānas* in the path is so obvious that the point would need no explanation. After all, Susīma is not a doctrinal expert who could be expected to know the intricacies of the path; he even seems ignorant of its broad outlines. Thus a reference to a stock doctrinal formula would not have been inappropriate in his case. If the Buddha wanted to stress the need for the *jhānas*, it would have been fitting for him to explain the *paññāvimutta* arahant in the way

---

<sup>16</sup>S II 127,25–28,26.

done elsewhere, as one who has reached the extinction of the influxes without attainment of the formless emancipations. Instead, by calling attention to “knowledge of the persistence of principles” followed by “knowledge of nibbāna” as the requirements for becoming an arahant liberated by wisdom, the text seems to be putting these kinds of knowledge in the place normally occupied by the *jhānas*.

### 3. The Chinese Parallels

I now want to take a brief look at how the Chinese parallels to S 12:70 treat the story of Susīma’s meeting with the Buddha. Since the citation in the Abhidharma-vibhāṣā-śāstra is short and incomplete, I will consider this version first. Here, when Susīma tells the Buddha about his discussion with the monks, the Buddha declares, as in the Pāli version, “Susīma, you should know that first there is knowledge of the persistence of principles; afterwards, knowledge of nibbāna.”<sup>17</sup> Perplexed, Susīma asks for clarification and the Buddha repeats his statement, again as in the Pāli version. The statement that follows makes use of Sarvāstivādin technical terminology and thus may be, not part of the citation, but a commentator’s elaboration in the idiom of their exegetical system. However, it may also be intended as a quotation being ascribed anachronistically to the Buddha, as is sometimes done in the Pāli commentaries as well: “Those monks, by earlier relying on threshold *dhyāna* concentration, exhausted the influxes and afterwards aroused the fundamental *dhyāna*. In this way one can understand that knowledge of the persistence of principles is an ancillary knowledge; knowledge of nibbāna, the fundamental knowledge.”<sup>18</sup> The text here is suggesting that

<sup>17</sup>T XXVIII 408b6 : 蘇尸摩當知先有法住智後有涅槃智。As in my previous article, for the sake of consistency I will generally use the Pāli forms of Buddhist technical terms, even though the original text may have been composed in another Indian language.

<sup>18</sup>T XXVIII 408b8-11: 彼諸比丘。先依未至禪盡漏。後起根本禪。以是事故。知諸邊中智是法住智。根本中智是涅槃智。The version at T XXVII 572c24-27 reads: 然彼五百 應真苾芻依未至定得漏盡已後。方能起根本等至。由此故知近分地智是法住智。根本地智是涅槃智。

the monks first attained “threshold *dhyāna*”,<sup>19</sup> on the basis of which they aroused the wisdom that understands the causation of the saṃsāric process. This wisdom eliminated the influxes and enabled them to attain the wisdom that realizes nibbāna; the latter, apparently, occurs in a state spoken of as “the fundamental meditative absorption” (根本等至 = Skt *mauladhyāna*). This account of attainment roughly corresponds to the process laid out in the Theravāda Abhidhamma system, according to which all path and fruition attainments (*magga-phala*) occur at the level of jhānic concentration and thus can be called “world-transcending *jhānas*”.<sup>20</sup> At this point the citation of the discourse in Vibhāṣā ends.

In its treatment of the two kinds of knowledge, the Susīma story in the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya turns out to be the dissident version among the parallels. Here the Buddha replies to Susīma's plea for clarification with the words: “First [comes] knowledge of the principle, afterwards inferential knowledge.”<sup>21</sup> The Chinese terms for these two knowledges, 法智 and 比智, are the equivalent of Pāli *dhamme ñāṇa* and *anvaye ñāṇa*. In the Nikāyas, these two knowledges also play a prominent role in relation to dependent origination. They are explained in S 12:33, which makes it clear that *dhamme ñāṇa* and *anvaye ñāṇa* are not synonymous with *dhamaṭṭhitiñāṇa* and *nibbāne ñāṇa* of S 12:70. S 12:33 identifies “knowledge of the principle” with the understanding of the chain of dependent origination by way of the “four-truth pattern”. One understands each factor itself, its origination through the preceding factor in the series, its cessation through the ceasing of the preceding factor, and the noble eightfold path as the way to its cessation. Thus, using “aging-and-death” as an example, with knowledge of the principle

<sup>19</sup>未至禪, 或 未至定 = Skt *anāgamyadhyāna*. This type of concentration seems to correspond to “access concentration” (*upacārasamādhi*) of the Visuddhi-magga system. As the Skt name indicates, it is a state that has not yet arrived at *dhyāna* or full concentration, not a full *dhyāna* that functions as a threshold.

<sup>20</sup>See Bhikkhu Bodhi, *A Comprehensive Manual of Abhidhamma*, 3rd ed. (Kandy, Sri Lanka: Buddhist Publication Society, 2006), pp. 71–75.

<sup>21</sup>T 22 363a20–21: 先法智後比智。

one knows what is meant by aging-and-death; one knows that birth is the cause of aging-and-death; one knows that when birth ceases, aging-and-death ceases; and one knows that the noble eightfold path is the way to the cessation of aging-and-death.

“Knowledge of the principle” (*dhamme ñāṇa*), the *sutta* makes clear, pertains to the present life and involves the grasp of principles that are directly visible. “Inferential knowledge” (*anvaye ñāṇa*), in contrast, is the extension of this knowledge to the past and future:

By means of this principle that is seen, understood, immediately attained, and fathomed, one applies the method by way of the past and the future thus: “Whatever ascetics and brahmans in the past directly knew aging-and-death, its origin, its cessation, and the way leading to its cessation, all these directly knew it in the very same way that I do now. Whatever ascetics and brahmans in the future will directly know aging-and-death, its origin, its cessation, and the way leading to its cessation, all these will directly know it in the very same way that I do now.” This is one’s inferential knowledge.<sup>22</sup>

The same is said about each factor, back to volitional activities, which originate from ignorance and cease with the cessation of ignorance. The Buddha declares that a disciple who has purified these two kinds of knowledge — knowledge of the principle and inferential knowledge — is “accomplished in view, accomplished in vision, one who has arrived at this good Dhamma, who sees this good Dhamma, who possesses a trainee’s knowledge, a trainee’s understanding, who has

---

<sup>22</sup>S II 58,3–16: *so iminā dhammena diṭṭhena viditena akālikena pattena pari-yogāḷhena atītānāgatena yaṃ neti: “ye kho keci atītamaddhānaṃ samaṇā vā brāhmaṇā vā jarāmaraṇaṃ abbhāññaṃsu, jarāmaraṇasamudayaṃ abbhāññaṃsu, jarāmaraṇanirodhaṃ abbhāññaṃsu, jarāmaraṇanirodhagāminiṃ paṭipadaṃ abbhāññaṃsu, sabbe te evameva abbhāññaṃsu, seyyathāpāhaṃ etarahi. ye pi hi keci anāgatamaddhānaṃ samaṇā vā brāhmaṇā vā jarāmaraṇaṃ abhijānissanti, jarāmaraṇasamudayaṃ abhijānissanti, jarāmaraṇanirodhaṃ abhijānissanti, jarāmaraṇanirodhagāminiṃ paṭipadaṃ abhijānissanti, sabbe te evameva abhijānissanti, seyyathāpāhaṃ etarahi” ti. idamassa anvaye ñāṇaṃ.*

entered the stream of the Dhamma, a noble one with penetrative wisdom who stands squarely before the door to the Deathless”.<sup>23</sup>

M-Vin may have adopted the use of these two knowledges in the present passage from a parallel discourse in the Mahāsāṅghikas' own Sūtra-piṭaka, a discourse that has not survived. On the other hand, it is also possible that the alteration was made only in the Vinaya version of the discourse and that the corresponding *sūtra*, if there was one contained in the Mahāsāṅghika Sūtra-piṭaka, may have designated the two knowledges in ways that match the Pāli discourse. We should bear in mind that the Susīma story in M-Vin belongs to a Vinaya text, not to a *sūtra*, and it is not impossible that in the course of oral transmission the Vinaya account was altered while the Sūtra-piṭaka version (if there was one) preserved a pair of knowledges that correspond to those of S 12:70.

Nevertheless, there are good grounds for insisting that the two knowledges of M-Vin, 法智 and 比智, are intended to correspond to *dhamme ñāṇa* and *anvaye ñāṇa* of S 12:33, and are not an alternative Chinese translation for the two knowledges of S 12:70, *dhammaññhiti-ñāṇa* and *nibbāne ñāṇa*. One reason is that the two terms 法智 and 比智 occur in an exact Chinese parallel of S 12:33. The parallel to S 12:33 in the Saṃyuktāgama (SĀ 356, T II 99c19–26) does not say anything about these two types of knowledge; the corresponding paragraphs are strangely missing just where we would expect them. But an Abhidharma treatise, the \*Śāriputrābhidharma-śāstra (舍利弗阿毘曇論), cites a *sūtra* almost identical with S 12:33, where the terms 法智 and 比智 are used with the same meanings that *dhamme ñāṇa* and

---

<sup>23</sup>S II 58,17–25: *ayaṃ vuccati, bhikkhave, ariyasāvako diṭṭhisampanno iti pi, dassanasampanno iti pi, āgato imaṃ saddhammaṃ iti pi, passati imaṃ saddhammaṃ iti pi, sekhena ñāṇena samannāgato iti pi, sekhāya vijjāya samannāgato iti pi, dhammasotaṃ samāpanno iti pi, ariyo nibbedhikapaṇṇo iti pi, amatadvāraṃ āhacca tiṭṭhati iti pi ti.*

*anvaye ñāṇa* bear in the Pāli *sutta*.<sup>24</sup> A second reason is that a later work with Mahāsāṅghika affiliations, the \*Satyasiddhi-śāstra, also explains these two terms in a way that corresponds with the two knowledges of S 12:33 (see n. 26).

It is particularly important to emphasize that 法智 and 比智 probably mean the same thing as *dhamme ñāṇa* and *anvaye ñāṇa* do in S12:33, because the Sarvāstivāda Abhidharma adopted the two equivalent Sanskrit terms often translated as 法智 and 比智 — *dharmajñāna* and *anvayajñāna* — and assigned them new meanings determined by the parameters of their own system. These meanings were quite different from those the two terms bear in the Pāli Nikāyas (and presumably in the Āgamas of other early Buddhist schools).<sup>25</sup> In the Sarvāstivāda Abhidharma, direct knowledge of the four noble truths occurs as a series of steps in which each truth is individually penetrated in two main phases. In the first phase, which the Sarvāstivādins designated *dharmajñāna*, the meditator penetrates the noble truth as it applies to the sense-desire realm (*kāmadhātu*). In close succession, the meditator penetrates the truth as it applies to the form and formless realms (*rūpa-arūpadhātu*); this phase the Sarvāstivādins called *anvayajñāna*.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup>At T XXVIII 605b12–606a1. The Śāriputrābhidharma-śāstra is believed to have been the Abhidharma treatise of the Dharmaguptakas, a school doctrinally close to the Theravāda. If the *sūtra* it cites came from the Dharmaguptaka Sūtraṭṭhaka, it is quite reasonable to expect that it would closely resemble its Pāli parallel.

<sup>25</sup>Perhaps this explains why the paragraphs on 法智 and 比智 are missing in the SĀ counterpart of S 12:33. As SĀ belonged to a school with Sarvāstivāda affiliations, its scribes may have removed these paragraphs because they cast doubt on the new definitions of the two knowledges that had emerged in the Sarvāstivāda Abhidharma.

<sup>26</sup>For a summary of this scheme, see Louis de La Vallé Poussin's Foreword to his *Abhidharmakośabhāṣyam*, English translation by Leo Pruden (Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press, 1991), Vol. 3, pp. xiv–xxii. See too Erich Frauwallner, *Studies in the Abhidharma Literature and the Origins of Buddhist Philosophical Systems*, English translation by Sophie Francis Kidd (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995), pp. 167–68. Whereas some

It would have been tempting for the Sarvāstivādins to insert these two terms into their version of the Susīma-sutta as representing the two kinds of knowledge constitutive of the wisdom-liberated arahant's attainment. However, in the two accounts of the Susīma story regarded as stemming from schools with Sarvāstivāda affiliation — SĀ 347 and Vibhāṣā — these two knowledges have no place. Like their Pāli counterpart, these versions take the two knowledges to be knowledge of the persistence of principles (法住智) and knowledge of nibbāna (涅槃智). Nevertheless, we cannot discount the possibility that during the classical age of Abhidharma Buddhism in India, when the Sarvāstivāda presentation of the path was widely accepted among the Buddhist schools, scribes or reciters of the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya, impressed by the prestige of this system, either mistakenly or deliberately replaced the original two knowledges (corresponding to those of S 12:70) with the other pair, which they could support in relation to dependent origination by a *sūtra* in their own collection that was a parallel to S 12:33.<sup>27</sup>

To return to the M-Vin account: When Susīma tells the Buddha that he does not understand what is meant by the two knowledges, the

---

Chinese translators of Abhidharma texts, such as the translators of the Zhong shi fen a bi tan lun ([Abhidharma]prakaraṇapāda[śāstra]) and the Abhidharma-vibhāṣā-śāstra, render the two knowledges 法智 and 比智, the great translator Xuan Zang (Hsuan Tsang), in his translations of the Abhidharma-mahāvibhāṣā and the Abhidharmakośa, replaced 比智 with 類智 as a rendering for *anvayaññāna*. Peter Harvey suggests that where the Theravāda sees the inference as about other time periods, the Sarvāstivāda sees it as about other realms (private communication).

<sup>27</sup>It is perhaps testimony to the dominance of the Sarvāstivāda presentation of the path that the \*Mahāprajñāpāramitopadeśa (大智度論, at T XXV 232c19–23), the large commentary on the Mahāprajñāpāramitā-sūtra, in commenting on 法智 and 比智 in the *sūtra*, explains the two knowledges very much as they are explained in the Sarvāstivāda system: as the undefiled knowledge of the dharmas, their cause, their cessation, and the path of dharma in relation respectively to the desire realm and to the form and formless realms. The \*Satyasiddhi-śāstra too partly accepts this interpretation of the two knowledges, though it also argues in favor of preserving the meanings propounded in the *sūtras* (see T XXXII 372a7–28).

Buddha repeats his words and then begins to elucidate his meaning. In contrast to S 12:70, M-Vin shows the Buddha directly question Susīma about his understanding of dependent origination without first drilling him on the three characteristics. His questions occur in two stages, which I call respectively “the doctrinal questionnaire” and “the experiential questionnaire”. In the doctrinal questionnaire, the Buddha asks Susīma about the links of dependent origination simply as bare facts: “Does aging-and-death occur with birth as condition?” And so on, abridged, back to: “Do volitional activities occur with ignorance as condition?” To each question Susīma answers, “Yes.” Then the Buddha guides Susīma through the cessation of the chain of conditions, from “with the cessation of birth, aging-and-death ceases” to “with the cessation of ignorance, volitional activities cease”. The text does not correlate the chain of conditions with the two knowledges, knowledge of the principle and inferential knowledge, and we thus have to draw our own conclusions about their relationship.

Following this doctrinal questionnaire, the Buddha asks Susīma, “If a monk rightly contemplates and knows this Dhamma (此法 = *imaṃ dhammaṃ*), wouldn’t he attain everything that should be attained?”<sup>28</sup> Again, Susīma answers, “Yes”, apparently signifying that a monk can attain arahantship, the goal of the Buddha’s teaching, by properly understanding dependent origination.

Next, the Buddha takes Susīma through the chain of conditions again, first with regard to arising and then with regard to cessation. This time, however, in each case he asks Susīma, “Have you understood (汝知) [the link between each pair of factors]?” This is what I call the *experiential* questionnaire. As expected, Susīma answers affirmatively. Next, the Buddha asks, “When you know the Dhamma thus, do you attain the divine eye, the knowledge of past lives, or the peaceful emancipations?” And Susīma replies, “I do not attain them.” The Buddha then challenges him: “You say that you know things thus but do not

---

<sup>28</sup> T XXII 363b<sub>1-2</sub>: 若比丘於此法中正觀正知。所應得者。盡皆得不？

attain those excellent qualities: who will believe you?”<sup>29</sup> This sentence corresponds to the sentence of the Pāli version: *ettha dāni Susīma idaṅ ca veyyākaraṇaṃ imesaṅ ca dhammānaṃ asamāpatti, idaṃ no Susīma kathaṃ?*<sup>30</sup> It echoes the question that Susīma himself had posed to the monks when they claimed arahantship without the super-knowledges and formless emancipations. Susīma then admits that his mind had been enveloped by ignorance and wrong views; but, he says, now that he has heard the Dhamma in detail his evil views have vanished. He further states, “I have gained the pure eye of the Dhamma”,<sup>31</sup> which is a claim to the realization of, at minimum, the state of stream-entry, the first of the four stages of liberation. Finally, Susīma confesses his transgression in entering the Saṅgha as a thief. After telling him how much suffering he might have brought upon himself by such a foolish deed, the Buddha pardons him.

In the version of the Saṃyuktāgama, SĀ 347, as in M-Vin, the Buddha moves directly into the questionnaire on dependent origination without any intervening catechism on the three characteristics. The two knowledges here, 法住智 and 涅槃智, are the same as those of Vibhāṣā and correspond exactly to the Pāli version, not to M-Vin. When the Buddha mentions these two kinds of knowledge, Susīma entreats him: “Please let the Exalted One teach me the Dhamma so that I can come to know knowledge of the persistence of principles, to see knowledge of the persistence of principles.”<sup>32</sup> The Buddha then guides Susīma through the series on dependent origination, using a somewhat more complex pattern than is used in S 12:70 and M-Vin. I will exemplify this with the first member in each of the two series, on arising and on cessation. The Buddha asks, “Isn’t it true that there is aging-and-death because there is birth, that aging-and-death does not occur in the

<sup>29</sup>T XXII 363b8-9: 汝自言知如是諸法而復言不得。是諸功德誰當信者。

<sup>30</sup>S II 127,22-23: I translate literally: “Here now, Susīma, this answer and the non-attainment of these states: how could this be, Susīma?”

<sup>31</sup>T XXII 363b11-12: 廣聞正法滅惡邪見。得法眼淨。

<sup>32</sup>T II 97b14-15: 唯願世尊為我說法。令我得知法住智。得見法住智。

absence of birth? ... Isn't it true that when there is no birth, there is no aging-and-death, that aging-and-death ceases only when birth ceases?"<sup>33</sup> Susīma, of course, answers all these questions in the affirmative.

The questionnaire being over, the Buddha asks Susīma about the relationship between his insights and his meditative attainments. The Chinese text is drastically abbreviated: "When you know and see thus, do you, secluded from sensual desires and bad unwholesome states ... realize with the body, possess, and dwell in [them]?"<sup>34</sup> To all these questions, Susīma answers, "No, Exalted One." Note how the questions here differ markedly from those in both S 12:70 and M-Vin. Despite the abridgment, we can see that the text mentions the first and last phrases of the questions Susīma had earlier asked the group of monks.<sup>35</sup> The first is the opening clause of the formula for the first *jhāna*, the last is the final clause of the question on the formless emancipations. Thus, when we fill out the abridgment, we see that the Buddha is actually asking Susīma whether he attains each of the four *jhānas* and the formless emancipations. The monk's negative reply means that he does not attain them.

The Buddha then applies what Susīma has understood to the case of the monks who claimed to be arahants liberated by wisdom: "This is what is meant by saying first one knows the persistence of principles, afterwards one knows nibbāna. Those good men — dwelling alone in a quiet place, earnest, reflective, and heedful — eliminated the view of a self and did not arouse any influxes; their minds were well liberated."<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup>T II 97b<sub>17-22</sub>: 有生故有老死。不離生有老死耶? ... 無生故無老死。不離生滅而老死滅耶?

<sup>34</sup>T II 97b<sub>28</sub>: 作如是知·如是見者。為有離欲·惡不善法。乃至身作證具足住不?

<sup>35</sup>At T II 97a<sub>6-17</sub>. See "The Susīma-sutta and the Wisdom-Liberated Arahant", pp. 66–67.

<sup>36</sup>T II 97c<sub>1-4</sub>: 是名先知法住。後知涅槃。彼諸善男子獨一靜處。專精思惟。不放逸住。離於我見。不起諸漏。心善解脫。

The narrator then tells us that when the Buddha spoke this *sutta*, “Venerable Susīma gained the pure eye of the Dhamma, dust free and without stain. He saw the Dhamma, attained the Dhamma, awakened to the Dhamma, and crossed over doubt; without depending on faith in others, without needing the aid of others, his mind obtained confidence in the true Dhamma.”<sup>37</sup> SĀ 347 thus concurs with M-Vin that Susīma's discussion with the Buddha transformed him from a “Dhamma-thief” into a seer of the Dhamma, one standing at minimum on the level of a stream-enterer.

Following this narrative report, Susīma confesses to the Buddha, relating the whole background story about how he became a monk at the request of his fellow wanderers with the intention of stealing the Dhamma. The Buddha then instructs him how to confess for the sake of future restraint, which he does. Next the Buddha speaks the simile, which corresponds to the simile of S 12:63 rather than to the one in S 12:70, about a thief arrested by the king and punished by being struck by a hundred spears three times in a day. From this, the Buddha draws a lesson: “If one goes forth secretly as a thief in this proper Dhamma and discipline with the intention of stealing it, and one takes the Dhamma and expounds it to people, one will undergo pain and suffering vastly exceeding that [of the man struck by the three hundred spears].”<sup>38</sup> The text ends with the announcement: “At the time the Buddha spoke this Dhamma, the outside-ascetic Susīma's influxes were exhausted and his mind was liberated”,<sup>39</sup> which means that at the end of the discourse Susīma reached arahantship.

---

<sup>37</sup>T II 97c4-7: 尊者須深遠塵離垢。得法眼淨。爾時。須深見法得法。覺法度疑。不由他信。不由他度。於正法中心得無畏。

<sup>38</sup>T II 98a9-10: 若於正法·律盜密出家。盜受持法。為人宣說。當受苦痛倍過於彼。Note that the Buddha's closing admonitions in S 12:70 and M-Vin have nothing corresponding to the phrase “expounds it to people” (為人宣說). These versions make the mere act of “stealing the Dhamma” a terrible crime in itself.

<sup>39</sup>T II 98a10-11: 佛說是法時。外道須深漏盡意解。

#### 4. The Two Knowledges

We have seen that in the different versions of the Susīma story the Buddha refers to two different pairs of knowledge. In M-Vin, the pair is 法智 and 比智, which correspond to Pāli *dhamme ñāṇa* and *anvaye ñāṇa*; I translate these terms as “knowledge of the principle” and “inferential knowledge”. In S 12:70, the pair is *dhammaṭṭhitiñāṇa* and *nibbāne ñāṇa*, reflected in the Chinese translations of SĀ 347 and Vibhāṣā as 法住智 and 涅槃智; the Pāli and the Chinese can both be translated as “knowledge of the persistence of principles” and “knowledge of nibbāna”.<sup>40</sup> Both pairs are related to dependent origination, and in each pair the two knowledges occur in sequence.

Although the two pairs are unlikely to be identical, the fact that they are both concerned with dependent origination suggests that it may be possible to establish some correlation between them. The only other place in the Nikāyas where the pair, *dhamme ñāṇa* and *anvaye ñāṇa*, occurs is in the Saṅgīti-sutta of the Dīgha-nikāya, as two members of a group of four knowledges that do not occur as a group elsewhere in the Nikāyas.<sup>41</sup> The terms are not explained in the Saṅgīti-sutta itself, but the Abhidhamma treatise, Vibhaṅga, defines *dhamme ñāṇa* as the wisdom in the four paths and fruits (concepts drawn from the mature Theravāda Abhidhamma system) and *anvaye ñāṇa* simply by quoting S 12:33. Thus an attempt to establish the relationship between the two pairs by

---

<sup>40</sup>It is difficult, indeed impossible, to determine from the expression *dhamma-ṭṭhitiñāṇa* alone whether *dhamma-* here should be understood as the singular “the Dhamma” or as a suppressed plural, *dhammā*. In my translation of the Saṃyutta-nikāya, *The Connected Discourses of the Buddha*, I rendered the expression “knowledge of the stability of the Dhamma.” The commentary takes *dhamma-* as the plural *dhammā* with the meaning “[saṃsāric] phenomena.” I understand the word, in this context, as signifying the principles or laws that underlie the arising of saṃsāric phenomena.

<sup>41</sup>D III 226,33–34. The other two are “encompassing knowledge” (*pariye ñāṇa*, knowledge of the minds of others) and “knowledge of what is conventional” (*sammutiye ñāṇa*).

using *dhamme ñāṇa* and *anvaye ñāṇa* as a starting point leads to a blind alley.

It might be more fruitful to begin at the opposite end, by seeking other occurrences in the Nikāyas of the terms *dhammaṭṭhitiñāṇa* and *nibbāne ñāṇa* and then try to work out the relationship from there. In the Nidāna-samyutta, the Paccaya-sutta (S 12:20) speaks of the conditional relationship between each pair of factors in dependent origination as “the persistence of the principles” (*dhammaṭṭhitatā*), which remains valid whether or not Buddhas arise in the world. Since there is no essential difference in meaning between *dhammaṭṭhitatā* and *dhammaṭṭhiti*, it would thus follow that *dhammaṭṭhitiñāṇa* is the knowledge of this conditional relationship.

We explicitly encounter the term *dhammaṭṭhitiñāṇa* in S 12:34 (at S II 60,7, 23). In this *sutta* it is shown how seven kinds of knowledge arise in relation to each of the eleven links of dependent origination. The first six are constituted by three pairs. The fundamental pair is knowing the relationship established by the link to hold positively (“with X as condition, Y comes to be”) and negatively (“in the absence of X, there is no Y”) in the present. Knowing this pair with respect to the other two time periods — the past and the future — gives us the six knowledges. Thus, with respect to the three time periods, one knows that birth is the condition for aging-and-death, and that in the absence of birth there is no aging-and-death; and so on back to: with respect to the three time periods, one knows that ignorance is the condition for volitional activities and that, in the absence of ignorance, there are no volitional activities. The seventh knowledge occurring with respect to each link is “knowledge that this ‘*knowledge of the persistence of principles*’, too, is subject to destruction, vanishing, fading away, and cessation”.<sup>42</sup> Thus, as a working hypothesis, we might propose that “knowledge of the persistence of principles” (*dhammaṭṭhitiñāṇa*)

---

<sup>42</sup>S II 60,7, 23: *yam pi 'ssa taṃ dhammaṭṭhitiñāṇaṃ tampi khayadhammaṃ vayadhammaṃ virāgadhammaṃ nirodhadhammanti ñāṇaṃ.*

signifies the above-mentioned six types of knowledge regarding each link.

The Sāratthappakāsinī, in commenting on S 12:34, seems to support this with its gloss on “knowledge of the persistence of principles”:

Knowledge of the persistence of principles is knowledge of the principle of conditionality. The principle of conditionality is called “the persistence of principles” because it is the cause for the occurrence [or] persistence of principles. The knowledge of this, [namely] “knowledge of the persistence of principles”, is a designation for these same six kinds of knowledge.<sup>43</sup>

Since, of the six types of knowledge, one pair refers to the present, one to the past, and one to the future, then according to the explanations of these terms in 12:33, the first should constitute “knowledge of the principle” (*dhamme ñāṇa*) and the other two pairs referring to the past and the future should constitute “inferential knowledge” (*anvaye ñāṇa*). This gives to “knowledge of the persistence of principles” (*dhammaṭṭhitīñāṇa*) a wider scope than either of the two types of knowledge mentioned in 12:33 — “knowledge of the principle” (*dhamme ñāṇa*) and “inferential knowledge” (*anvaye ñāṇa*); for the former embraces the latter two as subordinate branches of itself. The knowledge of a principle indeterminate with respect to time must include instances of that knowledge pegged to specific periods of time.

The question remains of how *nibbāne ñāṇa*, “knowledge of nibbāna”, is related to these other knowledges. The knowledge of nibbāna is not defined in the Susīma-sutta itself and the expression does not occur elsewhere in the Nikāyas. Thus, while many discourses make it plain that nibbāna is something to be known and experienced, none explicitly and unambiguously enables us to assign “knowledge of nibbāna” to a definite place in the broader doctrinal blueprint of the Nikāyas. Nevertheless, we can still make the attempt.

---

<sup>43</sup>Spk II 68: *dhammaṭṭhitīñāṇan ti paccayākāre ñāṇaṃ. paccayākāro hi dhammānaṃ pavatīṭṭhitikāraṇattā dhammaṭṭhīti ti vuccati. ettha ñāṇaṃ dhammaṭṭhitīñāṇaṃ etass’ eva chabbidhassa ñāṇass’ etaṃ adhvacaṇaṃ.*

A feasible solution is to hold that knowledge of nibbāna is expressed by the negative side of each pair of knowledges in S 12:34, that is, the knowledge “when there is no X, there is no Y”. It should be noted that both the positive and negative sides of the formulation used in S 12:34 are contractions of a fuller formula used elsewhere, for instance, in S 12:4. Here we find the positive aspect of dependent origination expressed, with respect to each link, in two ways: “When there is X, Y comes to be; with X as condition, Y [arises/occurs].” For example: “When there is birth, there is aging-and-death; with birth as condition, aging-and-death occurs.”<sup>44</sup> Similarly, the negative side is expressed in two ways: “When there is no X, Y does not come to be; with the cessation of X, Y ceases.” Using the same example: “When there is no birth, there is no aging-and-death; with the cessation of birth, aging-and-death ceases.”<sup>45</sup> From this we can infer that the formulations used in S 12:34 are contractions of the full formulae: the positive portion omits the clause “When there is X, Y comes to be”, retaining only the clause “With X as condition, Y [arises/occurs]”; and the negative portion omits the clause “With the cessation of X, Y ceases”, retaining only the clause “When there is no X, there is no Y”. Whenever we encounter the abridged formulation we can then feel justified in assuming that the full formula is intended. Thus, if the *sutta* were to be fully expressed, each link would be stated, both with respect to arising and with respect to ceasing, in terms of both manners of expression, as we find in S 12:4 and elsewhere. Knowledge of nibbāna would then be the knowledge: “When there is no X, there is no Y; with the cessation of X, Y ceases.”

It might seem that, because this knowledge occurs both in regard to present phenomena (the domain of *dhamme ñāṇa*, knowledge of the principle) and in regard to the past and future (the domain of *anvaye*

---

<sup>44</sup>S II 4,19–20: “*jātiyā kho satī jarāmaraṇaṃ hotī, jātipaccayā jarāmaraṇaṃ*” *ti*.

<sup>45</sup>S II 7,17–18: “*jātiyā kho asatī jarāmaraṇaṃ na hotī, jātinirodhā jarāmaraṇa-nirodho*” *ti*.

*ñāṇa*, inferential knowledge), the knowledge of nibbāna has been subordinated to both knowledge of the principle and inferential knowledge, and thereby subordinated to knowledge of the persistence of principles, which includes both. To me, this would be an undesirable conclusion, but it is not inescapable. Instead of supposing that knowledge of the Dhamma and inferential knowledge are fully nested within knowledge of the persistence of principles, we might instead stipulate that knowledge of the persistence of principles comprehends only the positive or originative aspect of dependent origination.<sup>46</sup> We can then hold that knowledge of nibbāna comprehends the negative or cessation aspect of dependent origination. In such a case, “knowledge of the persistence of principles” and “knowledge of nibbāna” become symmetrical. The former comprises the side of knowledge of the principle and inferential knowledge concerned with the origination of saṃsāric phenomena from their conditions; the latter comprises the side of knowledge of the principle and inferential knowledge concerned with the cessation of saṃsāric phenomena through the cessation of their conditions. Despite the manner of expression, we should understand that knowledge of nibbāna is not merely knowledge of a fact, but knowledge by acquaintance. It is, that is to say, present knowledge of nibbāna *as the cessation* of each term in the chain of dependent origination, knowledge born of a direct experience of nibbāna.

The above hypothesis seems confirmed by both S 12:70 and SĀ 347, the two versions of the Susīma story available to us that refer to these two types of knowledge. Although the Buddha does not formally define “knowledge of the persistence of principles” and “knowledge of nibbāna”, when Susīma expresses his lack of understanding of the Buddha’s statement, “First there is knowledge of the persistence of principles, afterwards knowledge of nibbāna”, the Buddha guides him through the formula of dependent origination first with respect to aris-

---

<sup>46</sup>This seems to be the way the Paṭisambhidāmagga treats *dhammaññhitināṇa*, which is formulated only in terms of the originative and supportive role of the conditions.

ing and thereafter with respect to cessation. This manner of presentation thus indirectly supports the interpretation of these two knowledges by way of the two sides of dependent origination.

We saw above that S 12:34 treats knowledge of the persistence of principles as knowledge of the principle of conditionality *with respect to both arising and cessation*, a meaning made explicit by the commentary on the *sutta* in the Sāratthappakāsinī with its gloss: “‘knowledge of the persistence of principles’ is a designation for these same six kinds of knowledge”. On this basis, one might protest that the distinction I make between “knowledge of the persistence of principles” and “knowledge of nibbāna” in the Susīma-sutta unreasonably cuts S 12:34’s definition of the former knowledge into two halves. One might then argue that if knowledge of the cessation side of dependent origination is assigned to “knowledge of the persistence of principles”, “knowledge of nibbāna” cannot be identified with it but must have some other meaning.

The expression *nibbāne ñāṇa* is problematic in that it does not occur elsewhere in the four Nikāyas or the oldest parts of the Khuddaka-nikāya; it is found uniquely in the Susīma-sutta. In attempting to understand it, we thus have no alternative but to rely on inference and conjecture. Apart from the interpretation I proposed, I can see two alternative ways that this knowledge might be understood. Both, however, are difficult to reconcile with its function in the Susīma-sutta.

The first is to understand *nibbāne ñāṇa* in terms of a passage on the destruction of the *āsavas* that occurs at A 9:36:

Here, bhikkhus, secluded from sensual pleasures ... a bhikkhu enters and dwells in the first *jhāna*.... He considers whatever phenomena exist there pertaining to form, feeling, perception, volitional formations, and consciousness as impermanent, suffering, an illness, a tumor, a dart, misery, affliction, alien, disintegrating, empty, and non-self. He turns his mind away from those phenomena and directs it to the deathless element thus: “This is peaceful, this is sublime, that is, the stilling of all formations, the relinquishing of all acquisitions, the destruction of craving, dispassion, cessation, nibbāna.” If he is firm in this, he attains the destruction of the influxes. But if he does not attain the destruction of the influxes, then,

because of that same passion for the Dhamma, delight in the Dhamma, with the utter destruction of five fetters, he is spontaneously reborn and attains final nibbāna there, not subject to return from that world.<sup>47</sup>

Here it is shown that insight into the three characteristics (expanded into eleven items) comes first, followed by the fixing of the mind on the “deathless element”, nibbāna. Thus, the knowledge of phenomena as impermanent, suffering, and selfless could be identified as *dhamma-ṭṭhitiñāṇa* and the fixing of the mind on nibbāna as *nibbāne ñāṇa*. While this interpretation is appealing, its disadvantage, at least with regard to the *Susīma-sutta*, is that these two knowledges here have no clear connection to dependent origination, the theme of the *Susīma-sutta* and the reason for its inclusion in the *Nidāna-samyutta*.

The second interpretation would take *nibbāne ñāṇa* to be identical with *aññā*, the final knowledge that the *paññāvimutta* monks declare in the presence of the Buddha: “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.”<sup>48</sup> This certainly has the advantage of relating *nibbāne ñāṇa* to the opening problem of the *Susīma-sutta*, the meaning of *paññāvimutta* arahantship. A drawback to this interpretation, however, is that this knowledge has its own distinct name, *aññā*, which had already been used earlier in the *sutta*. Thus it would have

---

<sup>47</sup>A IV 422,22–23,10: *idha bhikkhave bhikkhu vivicc’ eva kāmehi vivicca akusalehi dhammehi savitakkaṃ savicāraṃ vivekajaṃ pītisukhaṃ paṭhamaṃ jhānaṃ upasampajja viharati. so yadeva tattha hoti rūpagataṃ vedanāgataṃ saññāgataṃ saṅkhāragataṃ viññāgataṃ te dhamme aniccato dukkhato rogato gaṇḍato sallato aghato ābādhato parato palokato suññato anattato samanupassati. so tehi dhammehi cittaṃ paṭivāpeti so tehi dhammehi cittaṃ paṭivāpetvā amatāya dhātuyā cittaṃ upasaṃharati. “etaṃ santaṃ etaṃ paṇītaṃ yadidaṃ sabbasaṅkhārasamatho sabbūpadhipaṭinissaggo taṇhakkhayo virāgo nirodho nibbānan” ti. so tattha ṭhito āsavānaṃ khayaṃ pāpuṇāti. no ce āsavānaṃ khayaṃ pāpuṇāti ten’ eva dhammarāgena tāya dhammanandiyā pañcannaṃ orambhāgiyānaṃ saññōjanānaṃ parikkhayā opapātiko hoti tattha parinibbāyī anāvattidhammo tasmā lokā.*

<sup>48</sup>S II 120,30–32: *khīṇā jāti vusitaṃ brahmacariyaṃ kataṃ karaṇīyaṃ nāparaṃ iṭṭhattāyā ti pajānāma.*

been more economical for the Buddha, in this second part of the *sutta*, to have said, “First comes *dhammaṭṭhitiñāṇa*, afterwards *aññā*,” without having to introduce still another type of knowledge determining the status of the *paññāvimutta* arahant.

Thus I believe the interpretation of *nibbāne ñāṇa* that I originally proposed remains the most cogent. While there is some degree of tension between S 12:34, which subsumes knowledge of the cessation side of dependent origination under *dhammaṭṭhitiñāṇa*, and S 12:70, which appears to identify this knowledge with *nibbāne ñāṇa*, the two are not inherently contradictory. The tension could be resolved by holding that, despite S 12:34, the origination side of *paṭicca-samuppāda* has a more legitimate claim to represent *dhammaṭṭhitiñāṇa* than the cessation side. This assertion can marshal support from S 12:20, which uses the expression *dhammaṭṭhitatā* solely in relation to the origination side.<sup>49</sup> The commentary to S 12:34, too, with its words, “the principle of conditionality is called ‘the persistence of principles’ because it is the cause for the occurrence [or] persistence of principles”, conjoins *pavatti* and *ṭhiti*, suggesting this knowledge relates to the forward movement of *samsāra*. The canonical exegetical work, the *Paṭisambhidāmagga*, though stemming from a later period than the old *Nikāyas*, explains *dhammaṭṭhitiñāṇa* only in terms of the origination series.<sup>50</sup> These sources can thus justify restricting “knowledge of the persistence of principles” to knowledge of the principle of conditionality *with respect to arising*. This would then allow us to interpret “knowledge of *nibbāna*” as knowledge of the cessation side of dependent origination, especially when this knowledge is taken as experiential rather than deductive. In this way, both knowledge of the persistence of principles and knowledge of *nibbāna* intersect with the other two types of

---

<sup>49</sup>S II 25. It seems that this form of the expression is used here in preference to *dhammaṭṭhiti* simply in order to cast each technical term with the abstract -*tā* termination: *dhammaṭṭhitatā dhammaniyāmatā idappaccayatā*.

<sup>50</sup>*Paṭis* I 49–52.

knowledge: knowledge of the principle and inferential knowledge. The following table illustrates these relationships:

PRIMARY TYPE OF KNOWLEDGE	APPLIED TO PRESENT TIME	APPLIED TO PAST AND FUTURE
dharmatthitiñāṇa	dhamme ñāṇa	anvaye ñāṇa
nibbāne ñāṇa	dhamme ñāṇa	anvaye ñāṇa

The Abhidharma-vibhāṣā-śāstra, the treatise of the Sarvāstivādins, comments on the two knowledges of the Susīma-sutta in a way that confirms the interpretation that I have proposed here:

*Question:* Herein, what is knowledge of the persistence of principles? What is knowledge of nibbāna?

*Reply:* Knowledge of the persistence of principles is the knowledge that knows the process of birth and death. Knowledge of nibbāna is the knowledge that knows the cessation of the process of birth and death. Further, knowledge of the persistence of principles is the knowledge that knows twelfold dependent origination. Knowledge of nibbāna is the knowledge that knows the cessation of twelfold dependent origination. Knowledge of the persistence of principles is the knowledge that knows [the truths of] suffering and its origin. Knowledge of nibbāna is the knowledge that knows [the truths of] cessation and the path. If one speaks thus, one has well understood [the saying] “First there is knowledge of the persistence of principles; afterwards, knowledge of nibbāna.” There are some who say that knowledge of the persistence of principles is the knowledge of [the truths of] suffering, its origin, and the path. Knowledge of nibbāna is the knowledge of [the truth of] cessation.... Knowledge of the persistence of principles is an ancillary knowledge; knowledge of nibbāna is the fundamental knowledge.<sup>51</sup>

Both pairs of knowledge connected with the Susīma-sutta are said to be cognitions of a *sekha*, a trainee, one who has reached the stage of

<sup>51</sup>T XXVIII 407c17-26: 此中何者是法住智。何者是涅槃智耶。答曰。知生死增長智是法住智。知生死增長滅智是涅槃智。復次知十二緣起是法住智。知十二緣起滅是涅槃智。知苦集智是法住智。知滅道智是涅槃智。若作是說則為善通。先有法住智後有涅槃智。復有說者。苦集道智是法住智。滅智是涅槃智。... 復次諸邊中智是法住智。根本中智是涅槃智。

stream-entry or higher but has not yet attained arahantship. This is clear from those *suttas* in the Nidāna-saṃyutta which state that one with direct knowledge of dependent origination in its aspects of arising and cessation has “a trainee’s knowledge, a trainee’s true knowledge”.<sup>52</sup> In the methodology of archaic Buddhism, even knowledge of nibbāna does not mark the disciple as an arahant. This knowledge, taken as knowledge of the cessation side of dependent origination, is already realized by the stream-enterer, who, with his first breakthrough to the Dhamma (*dhammābhisamaya*), gains the Dhamma-eye by which he sees the four noble truths.<sup>53</sup> By seeing the four noble truths, the disciple sees nibbāna as the cessation of aging-and-death, as the cessation of birth, and as the cessation of all the other causal factors of dependent origination back to ignorance. Though such disciples still have to train further to attain realization of nibbāna, they have eliminated the three fetters rooted in cognitive distortions. Their remaining task is to cultivate the path acquired with this breakthrough until they reach the extinction of the influxes, which marks the attainment of arahantship.

### 5. What Did Susīma Attain?

As I mentioned earlier, when we compare the second part of S 12:70 with its counterparts in M-Vin and SĀ 347, two important differences stand out. (1) In S 12:70, when the Buddha sets out to clarify his statement, “First there is knowledge of the persistence of principles; afterwards, knowledge of nibbāna”, he does so by drawing Susīma into the stock catechism on the three characteristics: the impermanence, suffering, and selflessness of the five aggregates, culminating in disenchantment, dispassion, and liberation. Only when the Buddha completes this exposition does he begin the questionnaire on dependent origination. The other two versions, in contrast, lack this catechism on the three

---

<sup>52</sup>*sekhena nāṇena samannāgato itipi, sekhāya vijjāya samannāgato itipi*, at e.g. S II 43,20–21, 45,6–7.

<sup>53</sup>See S 13:1–11, S 56:51–60.

characteristics and depict the Buddha as moving directly into the questionnaire on dependent origination. (2) In S 12:70 Susīma does not gain any transcendent attainment, whereas in M-Vin he gains the eye of Dhamma and in SĀ he first gains the eye of Dhamma and finally becomes an arahant.

In my previous paper on the Susīma-sutta I stipulated that when a text in one school of the Sthavira camp concurs with its Mahāsāṅghika parallel but the version in another Sthavira school differs from both, we can suspect that the dissident version has undergone modification. While this is a convenient working principle to generate hypotheses, it should not be adopted inflexibly, for other explanations might account for the difference in the dissident Sthavira version. Applying this principle to the present case, in which S 12:70 and SĀ 347 are rooted in schools with a Sthavira orientation, we might suspect S 12:70 to have been altered in both respects: first, by having the “three-characteristics catechism” spliced in; and second, by having any reference to Susīma’s obtaining the Dhamma-eye excised. However, though such suspicions may be defended, I believe that the two discrepancies in S 12:70 have different grades of credibility. I think that we are on fairly solid ground in supposing that the discussion on the three characteristics in S 12:70 is an interpolation. At the same time, I also believe that there is little reason to suppose that all mention of a transcendent attainment by Susīma has been removed.

In support of my first point I would contend that the discussion on the three characteristics does not fit in comfortably with the logical progression of the *sutta*, but has the net effect of depriving the discussion of dependent origination of a meaningful role in the discourse. In support of my second contention I would point out that M-Vin and SĀ 347 differ between themselves over Susīma’s attainment: the former sees him emerge from his discussion with the Buddha only as one who has gained the Dhamma-eye, which makes him a trainee on the path (*sekha*); the latter sees him ending up as an arahant.

With respect to attainments we can thus posit three possibilities regarding the most archaic form of the *Susīma* story:

- (1) The original version did not mention any attainment (as in S 12:70) and the statements about attainments in M-Vin and SĀ 347 were inserted later.
- (2) The original version mentioned the gain of the Dhamma-eye, and only this; S 12:70 removed this ascription while SĀ 347 boosted *Susīma*'s stature by also attributing arahantship to him.
- (3) The original version mentioned *Susīma*'s successive attainment of both the Dhamma-eye and arahantship; S 12:70 removed both attainments, whereas M-Vin removed the attainment of arahantship but left the gain of the Dhamma-eye.

To help resolve this issue we might note that later Buddhist literature displays a marked tendency to increase the number and status of attainments resulting from the Buddha's preaching. We find, for example, that at the end of many stories from the *Dhammapada* commentary and the *Jātaka* commentary, stories with little or no doctrinal content, many people, numbering even in the thousands, attain the fruit of stream-entry and hundreds of monks attain arahantship. This should arouse our suspicion that the ascription of arahantship to *Susīma* at the end of SĀ 347 is one more instance of this tendency to boost attainments, especially when the attainment takes place not after a formal exposition of Dhamma but after the Buddha describes the suffering that awaits a Dhamma-thief. By eliminating the third of the three alternatives mentioned above, we narrow our options to the first two. Between them, however, it is hard to determine which has a better claim to be the original or more archaic version.

Once we have taken note of these differences, we can also raise the question, "Are these differences merely fortuitous, the by-product of chance variations in the oral process of transmission, or do they result from conscious choices within the schools responsible for the preservation and transmission of the text, choices that might have been governed by underlying doctrinal perceptions?" Although we have no way to

answer this question with any certainty, I submit the opinion that in the case of the Susīma story, these differences resulted from conscious choices in part governed by doctrinal perceptions.

The commentary on the Pāli Susīma-sutta in the Sāratthappakāsinī, the authorized Saṃyutta commentary, can give us an instructive insight into the motivations that might have resulted in such alterations in S 12:70. Where the *sutta* itself is silent about any transcendent attainment by Susīma, the commentary states that at the conclusion of the Buddha's exposition of the three characteristics, Susīma attained arahantship:

[The Buddha] began the teaching with its three turns, [saying:] "What do you think, Susīma, is form permanent or impermanent?" and so forth, because he knew that [Susīma] was capable of penetration.... Then, at the conclusion of the teaching with its three turns, the elder attained arahantship.<sup>54</sup>

It is well known that in writing the Sāratthappakāsinī, Ācariya Buddhaghosa did not compose an original work of exegesis but, rather, primarily collated and translated into Pāli material from the ancient Sinhala commentary, no longer extant. On the basis of this fact, we can be almost certain that the view that Susīma became an arahant derives from the old commentary, which must have pre-dated Buddhaghosa's work by several centuries. Now it seems to me that the interpolation of the passage on the three characteristics into S 12:70, which originally lacked this catechism (as in the Susīma story in M-Vin and SĀ 347), is closely connected with the commentarial ascription of arahantship to Susīma. So close is this connection, in fact, that I would venture the hypothesis that the reciters charged with maintaining the Saṃyuttanikāya added this passage to the discourse precisely because they

---

<sup>54</sup>Spk 2:127: *idāni' ssa paṭivedhabhabbatam nātvā teparivaṭṭam dhamma-desanam desento ... teparivaṭṭadesanāvasāne pana thero arahattam patto*. By "penetration" (*paṭivedha*) is meant the attainment of a world-transcending (*lokuttara*) path and fruition. By "three turns" (*teparivaṭṭam*) is meant the three characteristics.

inclined to the opinion that, during the discourse, Susīma did actually attain arahantship. On the one hand, due to textual conservatism and some degree of uncertainty, they might have been reluctant to insert a line of text ascribing arahantship (or even stream-entry) to Susīma; on the other hand, they might have believed that the coherence of the discourse required that Susīma end as an arahant and were willing to relax their conservatism by inserting what they considered a mere standard trope on the three characteristics into the *sutta* to help substantiate this belief.

In support of this conviction, they might well have had a suggestive reason in the archaic text itself. It will be remembered that when Susīma queried the monks who had announced their attainment of arahantship to the Buddha, they denied possessing the super-knowledges and formless emancipations. Susīma thereupon asked them, “Here now, venerable ones, this answer and the non-attainment of those states: how could this be, friends?”<sup>55</sup> By way of explanation, the monks answered: “We are liberated by wisdom.” Now later in the discourse, Susīma winds up in a position parallel to the monks of this group. The Buddha has questioned Susīma about the arising and cessation aspects of dependent origination and gotten him to affirm that he sees all these links. To see all the links, “to know and see them thus” (*evaṃ jānanto evaṃ passanto*), is the mark of one who has made the breakthrough to the Dhamma, who is at least a stream-enterer. The Buddha then asks Susīma whether he possesses the super-knowledges and formless emancipations. When Susīma denies having attained them, the Buddha asks him, “Here now, Susīma, this answer and the non-attainment of those states: how could this be, Susīma?”<sup>56</sup> Based on the analogy between Susīma and the monks in the first part of the *sutta*, we might well expect Susīma to say, “I am liberated by wisdom.” To our disappointment, however, Susīma does not answer; rather, as we have

---

<sup>55</sup>See n. 1.

<sup>56</sup>See n. 13.

seen, he prostrates himself before the Buddha and confesses his transgression in taking ordination as a thief of Dhamma.

Despite the silence on this point, the parallelism the text draws between Susīma and the group of wisdom-liberated monks might readily be understood to imply that Susīma himself had become a wisdom-liberated arahant. Nevertheless, this is not stated explicitly, and that is what leaves the stamp of mystery on the discourse. Did Susīma attain anything at all, and if so, what did he attain? Generally, whenever the Nikāyas want to assign the attainment of arahantship to a monk listening to a discourse, they do not hesitate to state, “While this discourse was being expounded, that bhikkhu’s mind was liberated from the influxes by non-clinging.”<sup>57</sup> Or, in the case of a lower attainment, it is said, “While this discourse was being expounded, in that bhikkhu the dust-free, stainless Dhamma-eye arose.”<sup>58</sup> Since the Susīma-sutta places Susīma in a position analogous to the wisdom-liberated monks, but makes no assertion about him realizing any attainment, his final status is unclear. On the one hand, if nothing is said about an attainment, the general rule would prescribe that we understand the listener had not achieved anything. On the other, if Susīma affirms that *he sees* the connections between all the links of dependent origination, this suggests that he is at least a stream-enterer. And if, further, he is placed in a position parallel to the wisdom-liberated monks, a position from which

---

<sup>57</sup>e.g., at S IV 20,26 28, it is said of the thousand bhikkhus who heard the Ādittapariyāya-sutta: *imasmiñ ca pana veyyākaraṇasmim̐ bhaññamāne tassa bhikkhusahassassa anupādāya āsavehi cittāni vimuccim̐su.*

<sup>58</sup>e.g., at S V 423,13 16, it is said of Koṇḍañña during the Buddha’s first sermon: *imasmiñ ca pana veyyākaraṇasmim̐ bhaññamāne āyasmato Koṇḍaññassa virajaṃ vītamalaṃ dhammacakkuṃ udapādi: “yaṃ kiñci samudaya-dhammaṃ, sabbaṃ taṃ nirodhadhammaṃ” ti.* It is interesting to note that in all the Chinese Āgamas as well as independent *suttas* stemming from the early Buddhist schools, no text on the “eye of Dhamma” has a line corresponding to Pāli *yaṃ kiñci samudayadhammaṃ, sabbaṃ taṃ nirodhadhammaṃ*. This strongly suggests that this line was added by the redactors of the Pāli school after the schools had gone their separate ways.

he can be expected to understand how arahantship is possible without the super-knowledges and formless meditations (and if we follow the commentary, even without the *jhānas*), this seems to suggest that he himself had reached nothing short of arahantship.

It was thus natural that teachers and commentators, probably already in the age of oral transmission, should attempt to resolve the ambiguity by assigning to Susīma some transcendent stature, either the gain of the Dhamma-eye or the realization of arahantship. In the school that preserved its texts in the language we call Pāli, this originally oral opinion would then have been set down in writing in the ancient commentary preserved in Sri Lanka. When Buddhaghosa accepted the opinion found in this commentary, that Susīma attained arahantship, and planted it into the Pāli commentary that he wrote on the *Samyutta-nikāya*, the opinion became hallowed Theravādin orthodoxy.

Now, in my understanding (which, I admit, is purely speculative), while the transmitters of the Pāli discourse may have been reluctant to state explicitly, in the text itself, that Susīma had attained arahantship, they did subtly alter the *sutta* in a way intended to buttress this ascription in its commentary. They did so by inserting into the text the passage on insight into the three characteristics with its concluding “disenchantment–dispassion–liberation sequence”: “Seeing thus, the noble disciple becomes disenchanted with form, feeling, perception, volitional activities, and consciousness. Through disenchantment, he becomes dispassionate. Through dispassion his mind is liberated.”<sup>59</sup>

The question might be raised: “How does the inclusion of this passage support the ascription of arahantship to Susīma?” By way of an answer, we should note an important difference, in the Nikāyas (and presumably the Āgamas), between the respective roles that dependent origination and the three characteristics play in the spiritual evolution of the disciple. Both are domains of “wisdom” (*paññā*), but they are not interchangeable. Direct knowledge of dependent origination is the

---

<sup>59</sup>S II 125,24–27. For the Pāli, see n. 11 above.

wisdom specifically assigned to one with the status of a *sekha*, a disciple at one of the lower stages of awakening who must still train further to reach the final stage of arahantship. In contrast, the knowledge of the three characteristics, especially when culminating in the disenchantment-dispassion-liberation sequence, is often presented as a prelude to the realization of arahantship.

If we peruse the Nikāyas, we would not find a single *sutta* in which the wisdom that perceives dependent origination becomes the triggering event for the attainment of arahantship. One might think this happened in the case of the Buddha's own attainment of enlightenment, as described at S 12:4–10 (S II 5–11). However, the Dīgha-nikāya account of the Buddha Vipassī's enlightenment makes a subtle but important distinction. Vipassī first attains “the eye, the knowledge, the wisdom, the true knowledge, the light” by which he sees dependent origination, first with respect to arising and then with respect to cessation.<sup>60</sup> Even after contemplating the cessation series, however, he is still a *bodhisatta*. He has discovered the path to enlightenment, but he has not yet walked the path to its goal; his mind is not yet liberated from the influxes and thus he cannot claim to have reached supreme enlightenment. The *sutta* continues: “Some time later the *bodhisatta* Vipassī dwelled contemplating rise and vanishing in the five clinging aggregates.... As he dwelled thus, before long, by non-clinging, his mind was liberated from the influxes.”<sup>61</sup> This passage thus makes Vipassī's

---

<sup>60</sup>At D II 33,5–8, 35,10–13.

<sup>61</sup>D II 35,14 24: *atha kho, bhikkhave, Vipassī bodhisatto aparena samayena pañcasu upādānakkhandhesu udayabbayānupassī vihāsi ... tassa pañcasu upādānakkhandhesu udayabbayānupassino viharato na cirass' eva anupādāya āsavehi cittaṃ vimucchi ti*. It is interesting to see that the Chinese Tripiṭaka has a parallel to this passage in an independent translation, the Vipāśyin Buddha Sūtra (毘婆尸佛經). Here, the bodhisattva Vipāśyin first contemplates dependent origination by way of arising and cessation. Then, at T I 156b<sub>19</sub> 22, it is said that he contemplates the five aggregates by way of their arising, cessation, and evanescence, as a result of which “through direct

attainment of complete enlightenment (and by implication the complete enlightenment of all Buddhas) consequent upon insight into the arising and vanishing of the five aggregates; in other words, upon the insight into impermanence, the first of the three characteristics.

In the Nikāyas and Āgamas, dependent origination serves as the portal to the *first breakthrough* to the Dhamma. We see, for example, that in the story of the enlightenment of the seven Buddhas each makes his initial discovery of the Dhamma through careful consideration (*yoniso manasikāra*) of dependent origination.<sup>62</sup> Again, the wanderer Upatissa, better known as Sāriputta, gained the eye of Dhamma when he heard from the arahant Assaji the famous four-line stanza which states in abstract terms the principle of causal origination.<sup>63</sup> Several *suttas* in the Nidāna-saṃyutta assert that direct perception of dependent origination is the distinctive knowledge and vision of the trainee (*sekha*), of one “who has entered the stream of the Dhamma ... who stands squarely before the door to the Deathless”.<sup>64</sup>

In the original version of the Susīma-sutta, as I would reconstruct it, the Buddha's catechism is intended to show how deep understanding of dependent origination in its sequence of arising — “the knowledge of the persistence of principles” — precedes “the knowledge of nibbāna”. This latter is the world-transcending breakthrough to a vision of the cessation of dependent origination which bestows upon the disciple a trainee's right view of the essential Dhamma, the four noble truths. From this platform of experientially knowing all four truths, the trainee has to develop insight further until he or she reaches “the exhaustion of the influxes”, namely, arahantship. This comes about, not simply by

---

realization, all his karma, habits, and defilements no longer arose. He attained great liberation and accomplished supreme perfect enlightenment”.

<sup>62</sup>S II 5–11; see too D II 31–34.

<sup>63</sup>Vin I 40,28–29.

<sup>64</sup>S II 58,24–25: *dhammasotaṃ samāpanno itipi ... amatadvāraṃ āhacca tiṭṭhati iti pi*.

reviewing dependent origination, but by stopping the process of origination through disenchantment (*nibbidā*) and dispassion (*virāga*).

Whereas teachings on dependent origination generally culminate in gaining the eye of Dhamma, that is, in one of the three lower stages of awakening, contemplation of the three characteristics leads more incisively to disenchantment and dispassion and thence to the full liberation of arahantship. While a discourse including the sequence of disenchantment, dispassion, and liberation is occasionally shown to terminate in the mere gaining of the Dhamma-eye, more typically it is followed by the attainment of arahantship. Conversely, the attainment of arahantship is generally shown to follow from an exposition of the three characteristics, particularly when this leads into the disenchantment-dispassion-liberation sequence.<sup>65</sup> The disciple at the stage of trainee (*sekha*) contemplates all dependently arisen phenomena as impermanent, bound up with suffering, and non-self. He then pursues this insight until it brings disenchantment (*nibbidā*) and dispassion (*virāga*), as a consequence of which the mind abandons clinging and is liberated from the influxes (*anupādāya cittaṃ āsavehi vimuccati*).

I would conjecture that the custodians of the Saṃyutta-nikāya, probably during the age of oral transmission, interpolated the catechism on the three characteristics specifically to support the case for imputing the attainment of arahantship to Susīma. In contrast, the versions of the Susīma story in M-Vin and in the earlier part of SĀ 347, up to the final sentence, remain faithful to the exegetical principle underlying the archaic teaching, that direct knowledge of dependent origination is the

---

<sup>65</sup>Using the Chaṭṭha Saṅgāyana CD, I have done a global search through the Nikāyas on the expressions *anupādāya āsavehi cittaṇi vimucc\** and *anupādāya āsavehi cittaṃ vimucc\**, seeking to find out how they correlate with the attainments reached by listeners to a discourse. A tabulation of my results might be the subject for a separate paper, but I can state briefly that whereas these expressions never occur in conjunction with discourses on dependent origination, they do occur quite often following discourses on the three characteristics, or one of the three characteristics, especially when the teaching culminates in the sequence of *nibbidā*, *virāga*, and *vimutti*.

special domain of a trainee. Hence these two versions, up to the conclusion of SĀ 347, hold that as a result of the Buddha's questionnaire on dependent origination, Susīma gained the eye of Dhamma, the wisdom of a trainee.

These two versions, moreover, seem to uphold the two aspects of dependent origination, the aspects of arising and of cessation, as the key for understanding the two types of knowledge mentioned by the Buddha, no matter whether those knowledges are designated with M Vin as "knowledge of the principle" and "inferential knowledge" or with SĀ 347 as "knowledge of the persistence of principles" and "knowledge of nibbāna". The Sāratthappakāsini, the Saṃyutta commentary, further falls in line with this interpretation when, in commenting on the expression *dhammaṭṭhitiñāṇa* as it occurs in S 12:34, it calls this knowledge of the principle of conditionality.<sup>66</sup>

When, however, the Sāratthappakāsini comes to S 12:70, the Susīma-sutta itself, it proposes an alternative interpretation of these two knowledges that differs markedly from the other versions. The commentary states, "Knowledge of the persistence of principles' is insight knowledge, which arises first. 'Knowledge of nibbāna' is path knowledge, which arises at the end of the course of insight."<sup>67</sup> The Saṃyutta-ṭīkā, or subcommentary, clarifies the meaning of this: "The 'persistence of principles' is the nature of phenomena as impermanent, suffering, and non-self. The knowledge of this is 'knowledge of the persistence of principles.' This is what he [the commentator] calls 'insight knowledge'."<sup>68</sup>

---

<sup>66</sup>See above, p. 23.

<sup>67</sup>Spk II 127: *dhammaṭṭhitiñāṇan ti vipassanāñāṇaṃ, taṃ paṭhamataraṃ uppajjati. nibbāne ñāṇan ti vipassanāya ciññante pavattamaggañāṇaṃ, taṃ pacchā uppajjati.*

<sup>68</sup>Spk-pt II 106 (VRI ed.): *dhammānaṃ ṭhitatā taṃsabhāvataṃ dhammaṭṭhiti, aniccadukkhanattatā, tatha ñāṇaṃ dhammaṭṭhitiñāṇan ti āha "vipassanāñāṇan" ti.* The author may have based this explanation on A I 286, which applies the term *dhammaṭṭhitatā* to each of the three characteristics.

When the *Susīma-sutta* states that “the knowledge of the persistence of principles” precedes “the knowledge of nibbāna”, the intention may well have been the same as that of the other versions, namely, that knowledge of the arising sequence of dependent origination precedes knowledge of the cessation sequence. Its commentary, however, takes this to be a statement to the effect that insight knowledge precedes the arising of the transcendent path. In the exegetical scheme of the Pāli commentaries, insight knowledge means direct insight into the five aggregates (or twelve sense bases, or eighteen elements) by way of the three characteristics; path knowledge supervenes on this and takes nibbāna as its object. From the commentarial standpoint, therefore, “the knowledge of the persistence of principles” is to be situated in the catechism on the three characteristics of the five aggregates; the knowledge of nibbāna, presumably, is referred to by the statement about the disciple gaining dispassion (*virāga*) and liberation (*vimutti*).<sup>69</sup>

On account of the interpolation of the catechism on the three characteristics, the exact meaning of *dhammaṭṭhitiñāṇa* in the original text has become obscure. When we read the text in the light of its commentary, which identifies “knowledge of the persistence of principles” with insight into the three characteristics and (presumably) “knowledge of nibbāna” with the culminating events of dispassion (*virāga*) and liberation (*vimutti*), the questionnaire on dependent origination seems to be left hanging in limbo. Since the discussion on the three characteristics, culminating in dispassion and liberation, brings the noble disciple to arahantship, the questionnaire becomes almost superfluous, without a determinate purpose. In fact, the *Sāratthappakāsinī*, in

---

<sup>69</sup>Elsewhere the commentaries identify dispassion (*virāga*) with the world-transcending path, and liberation (*vimutti*) with fruition; both are types of knowledge taking nibbāna as object. For example, Ps II 115: *ettha virāgo ti maggo virāgā vimuccatī ti ettha virāgena maggena vimuccatī ti phalaṃ kathitaṃ*. Spk II 53, commenting on *virāga* and *vimutti*, says: **vimutti** ti arahattaphalavimutti.... **virāgo** ti maggo.

glossing the passage on dependent origination, says that this is brought in as a way of interrogating Susīma about his attainment.<sup>70</sup>

If, however, the three-characteristics catechism is deleted, the questionnaire on dependent origination serves a clear purpose, elucidating the meaning of the two knowledges: the series on dependent origination in its aspect of arising brings out the meaning of *dhammaṭṭhitiñāṇa*; the series on dependent origination in its aspect of cessation brings out the meaning of *nibbāṇe ñāṇa*. One *first* (*pubbe*) arrives at the knowledge of how saṃsāric phenomena originate from their respective conditions. One follows the chain of conditions back to ignorance, just as the Buddha did on the night of his enlightenment, and then *afterwards* (*pacchā*), when this knowledge comes to maturity, one makes the breakthrough to the knowledge of nibbāna. As a consequence of this one sees how, with the cessation of ignorance, all the phenomena linked together in the series are made to cease. This is the dual knowledge of the trainee, which enables him to understand how arahantship is possible without attainment of the super-knowledges and formless emancipations (in S 12:70 and M-Vin) or even without the four *jhānas* (in SĀ 347, Vibhāṣā, and the Saṃyutta commentary).

## 6. Conclusion

Some of the more speculative views I have advanced in this paper (and its predecessor) are admittedly conjectural and cannot be supported with “hard evidence”. Their appeal is necessarily to intuition, but I believe I have presented enough cogent reasoning to show that these intuitions merit serious consideration. By proffering such views, I do not intend in any way to suggest that all differences between the variant versions of a discourse among the early Buddhist schools reflect differences in doctrine. Many of their differences, probably the great majority, were probably due simply to chance variations in the process

---

<sup>70</sup>Spk II 127: *idāni 'ssa anuyogaṃ āropento jātipaccayā jarāmarañan ti, Susīma, passasī ti ādim āha.*

of oral transmission. However, there are several important instances in which the variations in the parallel versions of a discourse preserved by different schools are too pointed to be put down to chance. In my opinion, it makes better sense to see them as reflecting doctrinal pressures — differences in points of emphasis and understanding — that shaped the formulation of the text in the course of its transmission in different early Buddhist communities. To advance our understanding of early Buddhism, particularly in the transitional phase from archaic to

SOURCE	WHAT THE PAÑÑĀVIMUTTA ARAHANT LACKS	TWO KNOWLEDGES MENTIONED BY THE BUDDHA	DOCTRINES IN DISCUSSION WITH THE BUDDHA	SUSĪMA'S ATTAINMENTS
S 12:70 (S II 119–28)	Five mundane <i>abhiññās</i> ; formless emancipations	<i>Dhammaṭṭhiti</i> knowledge; knowledge of nibbāna	(i) Three universal characteristics; (ii) dependent origination, by way of arising and cessation	None mentioned
Sāratthappakāsinī (Saṃyutta Commentary) (Spk II 124–127)	Besides the above, the four <i>jhānas</i>	<i>Dhammaṭṭhiti</i> knowledge = insight into three characteristics; knowledge of nibbāna = path knowledge	(i) Three characteristics; (ii) dependent origination, by way of arising and cessation	Arahantship
M-Vin (T XXII 362 b25–363b21)	Divine eye, recollecting past lives; formless emancipations	Knowledge of Dhamma; inferential knowledge	Dependent origination, by way of arising and cessation	The eye of Dhamma
SĀ 347 (T II 96b25–98a10)	Four <i>jhānas</i> ; formless emancipations	<i>Dhammaṭṭhiti</i> knowledge; knowledge of nibbāna	Dependent origination, by way of arising and cessation	(i) The eye of Dhamma; (ii) arahantship
Vibhāṣā (T XXVIII 407c26–408b11)	Four <i>jhānas</i> ; formless emancipations	<i>Dhammaṭṭhiti</i> knowledge; knowledge of nibbāna	Various explanations of the two kinds of knowledge	Passage ends before this point is reached

sectarian Buddhism, it is fruitful to peruse the texts closely for examples of variant versions that reflect different viewpoints shaping the doctrinal agendas of the schools. I believe that the *Susīma-sutta*, read against its counterparts in the other schools, provides a fertile example of this.

To summarize my comparative study of the *Susīma-sutta* and its parallels in both my earlier paper (“The *Susīma-sutta* and the Wisdom-Liberated Arahant”) and this one, I have prepared a table (p, 42) that highlights the differences between the several versions, which are listed in the first column.

The second column refers back to my earlier paper. It lists the attainments that the *paññāvimutta* arahant lacks, as revealed in the different versions by the questions that *Susīma* asks the monks who declared arahantship to the Buddha. In the Pāli version, S 12:70, *Susīma* asks about the five “mundane” super-knowledges and the peaceful formless emancipations, which the monks deny possessing. M-Vin closely resembles the Pāli version, except that here *Susīma* asks the monks only about the knowledge of the passing away and rebirth of beings, the recollection of their own past lives, and the formless emancipations; again, the monks deny possessing these. In both these versions, *Susīma* does not inquire from these monks whether or not they possess the four *jhānas*, and it remains perplexing why the *sutta* does not touch on this question. This is particularly curious in view of several canonical texts (in the Pāli *Nikāyas*) that contrast a practitioner who takes the “pleasant route” of the four *jhānas* with one who takes the “painful (or strenuous) route” of such meditations as the unattractive nature of the body, the inevitability of death, discontent with the entire world, and so forth.

---

The version of the *Susīma* story in SĀ 347, the Chinese translation of the *Saṃyuktāgama*, at once catches our attention with the difference in the questions *Susīma* asks the monks. Here, and in the partial replication of this account in *Vibhāṣā*, *Susīma* asks the monks whether they

attained the exhaustion of the influxes on the basis of the four *jhānas* and the formless emancipations, which they all deny attaining. They still claim to be “liberated by wisdom”, and thus in this system to be “liberated by wisdom” means to attain arahantship without achievement of the *jhānas*. The Mahāvibhāṣā admits the old canonical definition of a wisdom-liberated arahant as one who attains liberation without possessing the formless attainments, but it sees possession of the *jhānas* by a wisdom-liberated arahant to “dilute” the completeness of his liberation by wisdom. The most complete kind of wisdom-liberated arahant is the one who does not achieve any *jhānas* but gains comprehension of the Dhamma based on a state of concentration called “threshold meditation” (*sāmantaka-dhyāna*), closely corresponding to the “access concentration” (*upacāra-samādhi*) of the Theravāda commentarial system.<sup>71</sup>

If the relationship between the texts merely remained as I have just described it, we could simply dismiss this as a difference between the Theravāda and Mahāsāṅghika systems on the one hand, and the Sarvāstivāda (and possibly Mūlasarvāstivāda) system on the other. However, the relationship between the positions of these schools becomes thorny and convoluted when we discover that the Visuddhimagga and the Pāli commentaries admit a kind of arahant who attains the goal without any attainment of the *jhānas*. This type is called the *sukkhavipassaka*, the “dry-insight meditator”. To increase the complexity of the inter-relations among the texts, the Sāratthappakāsinī, the authorized commentary to the Saṃyutta-nikāya, explains the wisdom-liberated arahants of S 12:70 in a way that resembles SĀ 347 and Vibhāṣā. It declares that these monks were dry-insight meditators, as is clear from its gloss on the term *paññāvimutta* as it occurs in the *sutta*: “We are without *jhāna*, dry-insight meditators, liberated simply by wisdom.”<sup>72</sup>

---

<sup>71</sup>See “The Susīma-sutta and the Wisdom-Liberated Arahant”, p. 71.

<sup>72</sup>Spk II 126–27: *mayam nijjhānakā sukkhavipassakā paññāmatteva vimuttā*.

The fact that the Pāli commentary endorses a position that is closer to SĀ 347 and Vibhāṣā than to the actual text of S 12:70 raises the question whether the views circulating in the Sarvāstivāda camp might not have influenced the interpretation proposed in the Theravāda commentary. We cannot answer this question with a definite affirmative, for it is perfectly possible that the two similar interpretations arose independently; but the fact that the Pāli *sutta* and M-Vin never touch on the issue of whether or not the wisdom-liberated monks possess the *jhānas* raises a suspicion that the underlying intent of the *sutta* in all versions is precisely to suggest this possibility. Thus, as I construe it, in its final formulation the *sutta* is intended to convey the idea that achievement of the *jhānas* is not indispensable to the attainment of the final goal, arahantship. In the texts with Sarvāstivāda affiliation, which probably achieved their final literary form somewhat later than the Pāli version, this idea was admitted into the *sutta* itself. In the Pāli version, due perhaps to textual conservatism, this idea was not stated explicitly but was hinted at by silence regarding the *jhāna* attainments of the monks questioned by Susīma. Explicit expression of this view was reserved for the early commentators, whose opinion eventually passed into the Sāratthappakāsinī, the official Mahāvihāra commentary on the Saṃyutta-nikāya composed by Buddhaghosa.

The third column lists the two kinds of knowledge with which the Buddha answers Susīma when the latter questions him about the possibility of *paññāvimutta* arahantship. From this list we can see that all the versions except M-Vin agree that the names of the two knowledges are “knowledge of the persistence of principles” (*dhammaṭṭhitiñāṇa*, 法住智) and “knowledge of nibbāna” (*nibbāne ñāṇa*, 涅槃智). M-Vin has instead two knowledges, 法智 and 比智, that correspond to Pāli *dhamme ñāṇa* and *anvaye ñāṇa*. These two knowledges also occur in relation to dependent origination at S 12:33, where they are respectively defined as knowledge of the conditional relationships with regard to the present time (= *dhamme ñāṇa*) and knowledge of the conditional relationships with regard to the past and future (= *anvaye ñāṇa*). It is quite

likely that the reading of the two knowledges in S 12:70 and SĀ 347 is the more original one. The preservers of the Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya might have borrowed the alternative pair of knowledges from a *sūtra* in their own collection corresponding to S 12:33. It is possible this change came about through a Sarvāstivādin influence; for in the Sarvāstivāda presentation of the path of realization, the two knowledges, *dharmajñāna* and *anvayajñāna*, play a major role. Though the names are the Sanskrit equivalents of those found in S 12:33, they were given new meanings as determined by the Sarvāstivāda account of the path. This system had been adopted by other schools, and it is possible that the Mahāsāṅghikas, either through accidental copyists' error or by deliberate choice, adopted the names of those knowledges for their Vinaya version of the Susīma story, dropping the names of the older pair of knowledges.

To understand the two knowledges shared by S 12:70 and SĀ 347 — “knowledge of the persistence of principles” (*dharmatthitīnāṇa*) and “knowledge of nibbāna” (*nibbāne nāṇa*) — I collated the different versions of the Susīma story and also consulted the explanations of them found in Vibhāṣā. Read together, these texts give us firm ground for identifying the two knowledges as direct knowledge respectively of the arising and cessation aspects of dependent origination. However, in the discussion that occurs between Susīma and the Buddha, S 12:70 includes a passage not found in the other versions. This is a catechism on the three characteristics of the five aggregates — impermanence, suffering, and selflessness — which culminates in the disciple becoming disenchanted, gaining dispassion, and becoming liberated. The Sāratthappakāsinī dissents from the apparent meaning of all versions (a meaning made explicit in Vibhāṣā) by interpreting “knowledge of the persistence of principles” as knowledge of the three characteristics and “knowledge of nibbāna” as the world-transcending path, which (based on a standard commentarial gloss) is presumably to be identified with the occasion of dispassion (*virāga*) in the “disenchantment-dispassion-liberation” sequence.

I noted that because this catechism on the three characteristics is not found in any of the other versions of the Susīma story, it is almost certainly an interpolation. I also pointed out that because it appropriates the “knowledge of the persistence of principles” for knowledge of the three characteristics, the commentary leaves the questionnaire on dependent origination hanging in suspension almost like a vestigial organ. These considerations lead us to believe the versions that omit the “three-characteristics catechism” are more archaic in this respect.

The last column lists the attainments reached by Susīma in the different versions of the story. Such a comparison, I held, may give us some insight into the motivation of the Pāli transmitters in incorporating the discussion on the three characteristics into their version of the *sutta*. We saw that S 12:70 does not ascribe any transcendent attainment to Susīma. In contrast, M-Vin shows him gaining the “eye of Dhamma”, which would make him a noble disciple at one of the three lower stages of awakening. SĀ 347 shows him first gain the eye of Dhamma and then, at the end of the discourse, attain arahantship.

Now even though the Pāli *sutta* does not assign any transcendent attainment to Susīma, the Sāratthappakāsinī, commenting on the *sutta*, states that he attained arahantship during the catechism on the three characteristics. We thus find here another remarkable convergence between SĀ 347 and the position taken in the Pāli commentary. Just above, we saw that SĀ 347 explicitly states that the wisdom-liberated arahants questioned by Susīma claimed to have attained arahantship without the *jhānas*, a position adopted by the Saṃyutta commentary though not evident in the text of S 12:70 itself. Similarly, we see here that both SĀ 347 and the Saṃyutta commentary attribute to Susīma the attainment of arahantship, while the Pāli *sutta* itself remains silent about such an attainment. I surmise that the passage on the three characteristics was spliced in precisely to justify commentators and teachers (probably during the early formative stage of the commentaries) in their opinion that Susīma attained arahantship. This was done because the “three-characteristics” catechism, especially when it culminates in the

“disenchantment-dispassion-liberation” sequence, is typically connected in the *suttas* with the attainment of arahantship, while insight into dependent origination does not play such a role.

If my suppositions and speculations are correct, the several versions of this Susīma story available to us illustrate how chance variations due to oral transmission (mostly in the narrative) and subtle pressures imposed by emerging doctrinal interpretations (at key points in the dialogues) worked in unison to transform a text constructed from a simple plot and a simple script in different directions among the early Buddhist schools. Far more work is still needed in comparative study of the *suttas* to see how these texts may reveal traces of subtle doctrinal tendencies that came to clear articulation only in the early Abhidharma, the commentaries, and the mature philosophical systems. But comparison between the Susīma-sutta and its parallels serves as an example of how such studies can be fruitful.

Bhikkhu Bodhi

## On Translating Literally

Of the making of translations of the Dhammapada there seems to be no end.

Some years ago, in a review of two translations of the Dhammapada,<sup>1</sup> I guessed that there were forty translations into English. My guess was based on someone else's earlier guess plus a few more. Gil Fronsdal, the author of the most recent translation of the Dhammapada I have seen,<sup>2</sup> says there are now well over fifty.<sup>3</sup>

Why do people make new translations of the Dhammapada? Presumably because they don't like the existing ones and think they can do better. Very often it is merely the translations of basic words, e.g. *samsāra* or *nibbāna*, to which they object, and they sometimes believe that they have made a better translation because they have thought of a different translation of a particular word, without considering whether they have obtained a better grasp of the meaning of the phrase or the sentence as a whole.

What should the aim of a translation be? Clearly the prime aim is to give the meaning of a text in one language in another language, keeping as far as possible in the second language the peculiarities of the first, with poetry appearing as poetry, or verse as verse. Word play, e.g. puns, should be replicated. It would seem that this aim can only be realised by someone who is fully at home in both languages and is, in fact, bilingual. As far as Pāli is concerned, however, there are very few persons, in the West at least, who can claim to be bilingual in English and Pāli, so we must recognise that this ideal is not likely to be attainable.

For anyone proposing to make a translation of a Pāli text, it is, therefore, a simple matter of deciding whether to make a literal

---

<sup>1</sup>Norman, 1989B.

<sup>2</sup>Fronsdal, 2005.

<sup>3</sup>Fronsdal, 2005, p. xi.

translation, or a free one, bearing in mind that one danger about the latter is that the elaboration associated with a free translation can be carried to the point where it is not a translation but an interpretation.

An obituary for the Cambridge classicist Guy Lee<sup>4</sup> gave that eminent translator's views on the subject of translation. It reported that, by the time his English version of Ovid's *Amores* was reprinted as *Ovid in Love*, thirty-two years after its first publication, his ideas on translation had turned round, and he had decided to reject his early free translation. Over the years he had worked round to an exactly opposite view of what translation should be. It had become clear to him that Greek and Latin would eventually have to be taught in translation, as the Hebrew Bible had been taught since the sixteenth century. So what was needed, he believed, was close translation, as literal as possible, and Greek and Latin poetry should be treated by the translator as sacred text.

The parallel with Pāli is not hard to see.

Faced with the possibilities of making a free or a literal translation, in my own translations of the Theragāthā, Therīgāthā, Sutta-nipāta, and Dhammapada I have aimed to produce a literal, almost word-for-word, prose translation because this seemed to me to be the best way in which to convey my understanding of the Pāli. I stated<sup>5</sup> that my decision to make prose translations of verse texts arose from my feeling that the verse form in English is properly the province of poets, and no-one should try to write poetry unless he is a poet. A translation made into poor poetry may well persuade the reader that the original text is equally bad poetry.

In some places, however, my decision resulted in a starkness and austerity of words which bordered upon the ungrammatical in English, but my aim was to make clear to readers, if they considered my translation alongside the original, the way in which I understood the authors' words.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup>*The Times*, Wednesday, 10 August 2005, p. 54.

<sup>5</sup>*EV I*, Introduction § 23, *EV II*, Introduction § 45.

<sup>6</sup>Norman, *EV I* § 23, p. xxxvii.

My aim has been in the main overlooked by critics, with the result that they have concentrated their criticism on the literalness of my works. One web site, for example, states of *The Elders' Verses I and II*: “Both this translation and the preceding one are so literal as to lose the poetic flavor of the original, but no reliable alternative translations are available.”<sup>7</sup> The reference to poetic flavour suggests that the author of the assessment had not noted my comment.

Of *The Rhinoceros Horn and Other Early Buddhist Poems (Sutta-Nipāta)* it states, “Again, extremely literal, but there are no other reliable (and plenty of unreliable) translations available.” Of *The Word of the Doctrine* it states, “[This] is not recommended, as it takes the principle of literalness to ludicrous extremes.” It is interesting to note that, despite this condemnation, no better translation is suggested. A Google search shows how common this combination of the words “literal” and “ludicrous” is in reviews and assessments — probably helped by the alliteration.

One reviewer, however, has possibly realised what I was trying to do. He wrote of my translation of the Sutta-nipāta (*The Group of Discourses*): “Probably, however, what Norman provides is not so much a translation as a resource for scholars and future translators. For this purpose it is excellent.”<sup>8</sup> I welcome this assessment, and I am very happy to think that my efforts are in fact thought capable of serving this purpose. I am reminded of the sub-title which Alfred Edward Housman, the poet and Latin scholar, added to his edition of the work of the Roman author Lucan: *in usum editorum* “For the use of editors”, and I am very proud that my work has been judged worthy of being put in a similar category to his, although I would hesitate to print “For the use of translators” on the title page of any of my translations.

---

<sup>7</sup>[here-and-now.org/buddrel/netbiblio.html](http://here-and-now.org/buddrel/netbiblio.html).

<sup>8</sup>Cousins, 1994, pp. 291–92.

We should, however, not lose sight of comments about literal translations which have been made by two scholars whose views are not to be disregarded:

I noted Professor Gombrich's stricture about literal translations in an article on the subject of the translation of Pāli texts into English,<sup>9</sup> which I wrote more than twenty years ago.

He wrote: "The so-called literal translation — an intellectual fallacy and an aesthetic monstrosity — is still widespread; and in our examining we demand good style in Sanskrit prose but rarely in English. Yet in translation there is no clear dividing line between form and content. If our published translations from Sanskrit literature are little read, that may be because few of them deserve to be. Accuracy is a *sine qua non*, but so is taste."<sup>10</sup> Despite this attractive mingling of two clichés (see Google for the prevalence of both), Gombrich did not in fact define "literal", and gave no examples of the type of translation he was condemning.

Elsewhere he was more explicit, and describing Bailey's "translation" from the Khotanese he commented,<sup>11</sup> "[It is] alas so literal and so full of foreign words that it hardly reads as English." He also drew attention to Conze's use of the word "non-attainmentness" and stated, "The work of these great scholars, who would surely castigate any lapse from Tibetan or Sanskrit idiom in others or in themselves, makes me wonder yet again why it is that in our field *English* style is held of no account."

Dr Margaret Cone has written, "Another inheritance [from our predecessors] 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 in all contexts." She gave an example of the type of translation she was

---

<sup>9</sup>Norman, 1984A, p. 83.

<sup>10</sup>Gombrich, 1978, p. 27.

<sup>11</sup>Gombrich, 1977, p. 132.

condemning: “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?’”<sup>12</sup>

In view of such comments about literalness, it is interesting to note that a great deal is made of the literalness of Gil Fronsdal’s translation of the Dhammapada.<sup>13</sup>

In his Preface (pp. xii–xiii) the author states, “A translator often has to strike a balance between literal but clumsy language and elegant but inaccurate language. I have tried to be as literal as possible while keeping the text both readable and enjoyable. Still, no one can make a completely literal translation, completely free of bias, of a text from a distant culture and a very different language. . . . In this translation I have tried to put aside my own interpretations and preferences, insofar as possible, in favor of accuracy. In attempting a literal translation, I am trying to understand early Buddhism in its own terms so I can better evaluate our modern versions of Buddhism.”

In the Foreword to this new translation Jack Kornfield states, “This new translation is both carefully and honorably literal and beautifully modern.”<sup>14</sup> The blurb on the dust jacket claims: “It is the first truly accurate and highly readable translation of this text to be published in English.” It would be interesting to know who read all the fifty translations which Fronsdal says have been made of the Dhammapada, and was able to state that this one is the first truly accurate one, while “highly readable” is so subjective as to be unprovable.

We might note, in passing, the way in which such terms as “accurate” and “readable” are used elsewhere of translations of other

---

<sup>12</sup>Cone, 2007, pp. 101–102.

<sup>13</sup>Fronsdal, 2005.

<sup>14</sup>Fronsdal, 2005, Foreword, p. ix.

texts. For example, we might compare the blurb on the ninth impression (1983) of the paperback edition of *The New International Version of the Holy Bible*: “So elegantly stated, so faithfully accurate” and “a balanced scholarly, eminently readable bible, providing the most exact, illuminating rendering of the original languages into English”. Once again, one can only wonder at the use of the phrases “faithfully accurate” and “most exact”. One begins to get the impression that the words “readable” and “accurate” are essential features in any description of a translation.

In view of the rather lavish praise bestowed upon it, it might be useful to discuss a few points in Fronsdal’s translation, to see how far it is justified. We should, perhaps, start with two points on which he challenges his own aim of literalness: the use of the masculine and feminine, and the translation of the word *dhamma*.

(a) He does not always observe a distinction between genders. It is obvious that if we have a third person verb, e.g. *gacchati*, with no subject expressed, then it can mean “he/she/it goes”. Fronsdal makes much of such potential masculine/feminine mixing. He states (p. xiv) that not only does he use the plural person to make the text a little more gender neutral than the original, but he also uses male and female pronouns more or less randomly. He justifies this by saying (p. 139) that the term *bhikkhu* includes both male and female. He gives no canonical authority for this statement, but says, without references, “The ancient Theravāda commentaries state that anyone engaged in Buddhist meditation practice, whether man or woman, can be called a *bhikkhu*.” Consequently he arbitrarily inserts “her/she” where there is no suggestion of a feminine gender in the text (“she” vv. 3–4, 17–18; “her” v. 63; “herself” vv. 103, 106). It is particularly disconcerting when there is a juxtaposition or dichotomy, and he translates “he” in v. 3 when hatred does not end and “she” in v. 4 when it does, giving the impression that the ending or non-ending of hatred depends upon gender. Scarcely less confusing is the way the sage (*paṇḍito*) will watch over herself in v. 157, but will establish himself in what is proper in v. 158.

My own feeling is that in general statements “he” is gender inclusive, e.g. “he who hesitates is lost” is not restricted to male persons. It is one of the deficiencies of the English language that there is no common all-gender third person pronoun for the singular, as there is “they/them” for the plural, so to emphasise that something refers to male or female we have to say “he or she”, but it is possible to overcome this to a large extent by using “one”, “anyone”, or “someone”, e.g. “one” or “anyone” who hesitates is lost, followed (if necessary) by “they”: “if someone hesitates, then they are lost”, or “Whoever hesitates is lost”. On the other hand, I regard “she” as gender exclusive and I would suppose that any general statement including a feminine noun or pronoun was restricted to female persons. To find that, as the reverse of this, Fronsdal actually translates *itthiyā* in v. 242 as “people”, with a note on p. 132 justifying this, is disconcerting, since I know of no support for the view that Pāli *itthi* or Skt *strī* ever means anything other than “woman”.

(b) In his treatment of the Pāli word *Dhamma*, Fronsdal is inconsistent in a number of ways, which makes for confusion for the reader. He leaves *Dhamma* untranslated in v. 217, but translates it into Skt *Dharma* in vv. 44–45, 79, 82, 86, 102, 168–69, 205, which he justifies (p. xiv) on the grounds that in that form the term has begun to take its place in the lexicon of the English-speaking world and because untranslated it better retains the multivalent meanings of the original — which is unlikely to make the meaning any clearer to readers who do not have access to the dictionary to which he refers and cannot therefore see how it is defined there. On p. 115 (ad vv. 1–2) and on p. 122 (ad vv. 84, 87) he writes *dhamma*. Of the title *Dhammaṭṭha* of section 19 he uses *Dharma* in the note on p. 132, and translates “The Just”, while giving “established in the Dharma”, “firm in the Dharma”, and “righteous” as alternatives.

On p. 122 (ad v. 84) he states, “Because *dhamma* has a broader meaning than just ‘truth’, perhaps the term should be left untranslated.” One might have thought that a multiplicity of meanings would have

more than justified a multiplicity of translations for all the different usages. He touches on the problem in the Preface (p. xiii): “Dhamma can mean, among other things, religious teachings, religious truth, justice and virtue.” He comments: “Probably the most debatable choice [of translation] will be my translation of dhamma as ‘experience’ in the opening two verses”, but more often than not he does not give a translation of the word, although there would be no difficulty in doing so. In *EV I* in the note ad Th 2, I explained the various translations I had adopted for what I considered to be the nine different meanings of *dhamma* found in that text.<sup>15</sup> I did the same for my own translation of the *Dhammapada* in the note ad Dhp 20.<sup>16</sup> Not surprisingly, the most common meaning in the *Dhammapada* is “doctrine” (teachings, law, rule), because the majority of verses containing the word have been selected as being appropriate to the title *Dhammapada*.

It is not always clear what exactly Fronsdal has in mind when he writes about “literal” meanings. I assume that he means the etymological meaning. If we look at the word *dharma* from an etymological point of view, then we can say that since the basic meanings of the root *dhṛ* are “bear, hold, carry” the literal meaning of *dharma* is “the thing that bears, holds, carries”. This is seen in the older form of the word *dharman* “bearer, supporter, arranger” and the adjective *dhara* “bearing, supporting, carrying”, cf. *dharaṇī* “the bearing thing”, i.e. “earth”. *Dharma* is therefore something like “support, foundation”, and we can see the various developments of this, depending on the field in which it is used. Thus when used of religion or government it means “doctrine, law, teachings, rules”, and of a philosophical system “characteristics, [mental] phenomena, states, things”.

Fronsdal draws attention to the literalness of his translation and yet in more than twenty-five places he gives in the notes an alternative translation which he states is literal or more literal than the one he has given. It is worthwhile looking at some of these and also at some of his

---

<sup>15</sup>Norman, 2007A, p. 130.

<sup>16</sup>Norman, 1997, pp. 66–67.

other notes on his translations.

p. 115 (title of Chapter 1): he translates *Yamaka* as “dichotomics” rather than the expected “pairs”. This seems rather strange. We don’t normally talk of husband and wife as a dichotomy. If we want to emphasise the particular nature of the pairs then we could translate as “pairs of opposites”.

p. 116 (ad v. 6): he comments on the word *yamāmase*, “Or, if read *yama-amase*, it may ...”. If he is suggesting that we are to understand that there is reference to the god Yama here, then the word could be divided up as *Yam’* (or *Yamaṃ*) *āmase*, but *āmase* would be meaningless and we should have to postulate something like *emase* “we go”, for which there is no manuscript support. It is perhaps worth pointing out that the parallel verse in the Patna Dharmapada (254) reads *jayāmatha* and that in the Udānavarga (14.8) reads *udyamāmahe*, where a similar word division is, of course, not possible.

p. 117 (ad vv. 17–18): he states that *duggatiṃ/sugatiṃ gato* “literally means gone to a bad/good destination”. He translates *duggatiṃ* as “realms of woe” in v. 17, and “states of woe” in v. 240, but “bad rebirth” in vv. 316–18. He translates *sugatiṃ gato* as “reborn in realms of bliss” in v. 18, but as “goes to a good rebirth” in v. 319. These and other variations in translation may well prove confusing to readers. To explain *duggati* and *sugati* it might have been helpful to have given the list of five *gatis* listed at Dhp-a IV 226,5–7: *niraya*, *tiracchānayani*, *pettivisaya*, *manussaloka* and *devaloka* (hell, birth as an animal, the realm of spirits, the world of men, and the world of gods). Of these the first three are *duggati* and the last two *sugati*. This makes it clear that some of his translations are what might be called “poetic elaborations”. We may deduce that *sugata* is someone who has attained a *sugati*, and the translations “well-gone one” in v. 285 and “well-gone” in v. 419 rather obscure this.

p. 117 (ad v. 21): he translates *amata* as “The Deathless”. He makes no comment on my translations of the various epithets of *nibbāna*, but translates as follows: p. 117 (ad vv. 21, 114): *amata*

“deathless”; p. 123 (ad vv. 97, 153–54): *akata* “unmade”; p. 137 (ad v. 323): *agata* “not gone to”. His translation of *agata* follows the commentary but it is a debatable explanation, since it seems to imply a passive sense of *gata*. I have suggested that it means “without *gati*” (cf. *agati* as an epithet of *nibbāna*), i.e. (a place) where there is no rebirth in one of the *gatis*, just as the other negatives applied to *nibbāna*, e.g. *ajara*, *amata*, *ajāta*, *abhūta*, *akata*, *akālika*, etc., mean “without old age, i.e. where there is no old age”, etc.<sup>17</sup>

p. 118 (ad v. 23): he does not mention the fact that *yogakkhema* can also be a *dvandva* compound,<sup>18</sup> and can mean “toil and rest”.

p. 122 (ad v. 83): as he says, the editions vary between *cajanti* and *vajanti*. This represents a *c/v* variation in the Pāli tradition, which is very ancient. The commentary explains by *vijahanti*,<sup>19</sup> showing that the tradition which Buddhaghosa was following read *cajanti*. In Hinüber and Norman, 1994, we read *vajanti*, being influenced in our choice of reading by Udāna-v 30.52 *vrajanti*, GDhp 226 *vivedi*, and PDhp 80 *bhavanti*, of which the second is some centuries older than Dhp-a, although we recognised that Buddhaghosa made use of commentarial material inherited from his predecessors.

p. 122 (ad v. 89): *āsava* is translated “toxin” with the note that originally it “meant both the intoxicating juice of a plant and the discharge from a sore”. Etymologically the word means “inflowing (< *ā-sru*) and can be translated as “influx”. The Jains use it in what was probably its original psychological sense of “that by which *karman* flows in and takes an effect on the soul” but this does not suit the changed Buddhist use of the word.<sup>20</sup>

p. 123 (ad vv. 92–93): confusingly, he translates both *gati* in v. 92 and *padam* in v. 93 as “path”, which masks the fact that in v. 92 there is a pun upon the word *gati*. When used of birds it means “track”, which

<sup>17</sup>Norman, 1994, p. 220 (*CP VI*, pp. 22f.).

<sup>18</sup>See Norman, 2007A, p. 142 (ad Th 32).

<sup>19</sup>Dhp-a II 156.

<sup>20</sup>See Norman, 2007A, p. 148 (ad Th 47).

birds do not leave in the sky. Of those who have gained *nibbāna* it means “rebirth”, which cannot be known, since they have not gone to any place of rebirth. Consequently the skull-tapper Vaṅgīsa was unable to say in which *gati* someone who was *parinibbuta* was reborn at death in the story at Dhṛp-a IV 226,5–7 mentioned above in the note on *sugati* and *duggati* (p. 117 (ad vv. 17–18)).

p. 123 (ad v. 95): in the Preface (p. xiii) he states that he has chosen to translate *saṃsāra* as “wandering”. In this note he states that literally it means “faring on” but, strangely, in his literal translation of the line he leaves it untranslated.

p. 123 (ad vv. 97, 153–54): he translates *akata* as “unmade”. See the note on p. 117 (ad v. 21) above.

p. 124 (ad v. 114): he states that *amataṃ padaṃ* literally means “the deathless state” or “the path to the deathless.” For the meaning “where there is no death” for *amata* see the note on p. 117 (ad v. 21) above.

p. 127 (ad v. 173): *kusala*: he gives the translation “wholesome” for *kusala*, with the comment “[it] is more literally translated as ‘skilful’”. The etymology is by no means certain<sup>21</sup> and if MW is a reliable guide it would seem that the earliest attested meaning in Sanskrit is something nearer “good”. This in any case makes a better opposite to “evil” in the context.<sup>22</sup>

p. 128 (ad v. 184): he translates *samaṇa* as “contemplative”. He does not consider the possibility of a word play on *śamana* and *śramaṇa* (cf. p. 132 (ad v. 254)).

p. 130 (title of Chapter 16): “The Dear”. When discussing the meaning of the title (*piya* < Skt *priya*) he states that it is derived from the verbal root *pr̥*, instead of *prī*, which suggests that his ideas about etymology are somewhat suspect.

p. 131 (ad v. 235): he states that “door of death” (*uyyoga-mukha*) is literally “door of departure”. Perhaps “undertaking” would be more

<sup>21</sup>See Mayrhofer, 1976, s.v. *kuśala*.

<sup>22</sup>Cf. Cone, 2007, p. 102, n. 7.

literal. See MW, s.v. *udyoga*.

p. 131 (ad v. 240): for *duggati*, translated “states of woe”, see remarks about p. 117 (ad vv. 17–18) above.

p. 132 (ad v. 246): his note on *paradāraṃ gacchati* seems unnecessarily complicated. He translates “Goes to another’s spouse”, which seems to be a perfectly satisfactory literal translation, although he says that it means literally “goes with another’s wife”. I can see no justification for believing that *-dāraṃ* is anything other than the accusative case, and can only assume that “goes with” is an Americanism. He adds, “It is possible that *dāraṃ* here refers to any woman who is under the protection of a man (e.g., a daughter living with her father).” The verse is a straightforward condemnation of an adulterous act, and in fact in Skt *paradāra* has the sense “adultery”,<sup>23</sup> and *paradāragamana* means “committing adultery”. For the *vṛddhi* formation *pāra-dārika* PED has: “an adulterer, lit. one of another’s wife”, where a word seems to have been omitted. Strangely enough, in his comment on p. 136 (ad vv. 309–10) Fronsdal states: “I have taken the liberty of translating *para dārā* as “the spouse of another”. It is not clear why translating correctly should be regarded as “taking the liberty”.

p. 133 (ad vv. 268–69): he translates *muni* as “silent one”, and *mona* as “silence”. He states, without comment, that *munāti* means “one weighs”. This statement is doubtless based on the commentarial gloss *mināti* “measures”. I know of no evidence for this equivalence, but as I have pointed out,<sup>24</sup> the cty was probably referring to the idea of *tula* in v. 268. If we want to preserve the word play on *muni* and *mona*, we might think of “a man is not a sage (thinker?)”<sup>25</sup> because he is/stays silent as a sage (thinker?)” or “keeps the silence of a sage (thinker?)”.

p. 133 (ad vv. 273–75): he explains that his translation “Gods and humans” is a rendering of *dipadānaṃ* (two-footed beings), but does not

---

<sup>23</sup>See MW s.v.

<sup>24</sup>Norman, 1997, p. 136 ad Dhṛ 269.

<sup>25</sup>For the derivation of *muni* from *munā-* < *mnā-* < *man-* “to think, know”, see Norman, 1961, p. 350 (= CP I, pp. 26–28).

say that, rather than his own translation, he is giving the cty's explanation of the word, which is certainly not a literal rendering.

p. 133 (ad vv. 273–75): readers might well wish for some explanation of the nature of the arrows which have been pulled out and it might have been helpful to quote the commentarial explanation “passion (*rāga*), etc.”

p. 134 (ad v. 283): there are word plays on *vana* in this verse, but I doubt that there is one on *nibbana* and *nibbāṇa*, which would entail taking and translating *nibbāṇa* as an adjective. The cty gives no hint of such a word play.

p. 135 (ad v. 285): he translates *Sugata* as “Well-Gone-One” here and as “well-gone” at p. 144 (ad v. 419). See also p. 117 (ad vv. 17–18) above.

p. 135 (ad v. 290): he states that *mattā* means “‘lesser’; more literally ‘measured’ or ‘moderate’”, although it is not clear how a noun could have these three adjectival meanings. He says, “K.R. Norman believes that the original meaning of *mattā* was ‘material things,’ and he translates it so.” This might give the impression that I was the first person to give this translation, but anyone consulting MW, to which I refer in my note in *WD*,<sup>26</sup> will find that “materials, property, goods, household, furniture, money, wealth, substance, livelihood” are widely attested meanings for Sanskrit *mātrā*.

p. 137 (ad v. 316): he translates *duggatiṃ* as “bad rebirth”, and states that more literally it means “bad destination” or “bad existence”. See remarks about p. 117 (ad vv. 17–18) above.

p. 137 (ad v. 323): for his translation *agata* “not gone to”, see the note about p. 117 (ad v. 21) above.

p. 137 (ad v. 326): he states that *aṇukusa*(sic)-*ggaho* literally means “one who handles the goad (of an) elephant driver”, although there seems to be no obvious reason for not translating it simply as “goad-holder”.

p. 138 (ad v. 334): he translates *hurāhuraṃ* as “ever onward” and

---

<sup>26</sup>Norman, 1997, p. 142 ad Dhṛp 290.

states that it could perhaps be more literally translated as “onward and onward again”. Since, however, it is used of a monkey seeking fruit in a forest it is more likely to mean something like “to and fro” and be derived from Skt *huras* which is a weak grade formation from the root *hvy-* “to go crookedly”.

p. 139 (title of Chapter 25): he leaves *bhikkhu* untranslated as the title of this chapter and also when it occurs in the verses of the chapter, except in v. 365 where he translates it as “mendicant”, which is, as he says, the literal translation. In vv. 31–32 and elsewhere, however, he translates *bhikkhu* as “monastic”, and in vv. 75, 272 as “monk”. He states that he sometimes translates it as “monastic” “so it can refer to monastics of any gender”. I have already commented on his desire to make the terminology gender neutral but, as far as I understand its usage, “mendicant” is as gender neutral as “monastic”, and I can see no reason for changing from one to the other.

p. 141 (ad v. 388): he notes that in this verse there is a word play between *pabbājeti* and *pabbajīto* and suggests that it is likely that there is also a play on *samacariyā* and *samaṇa*, but he does not note that there is also a play on *bāhītapāpo* and *brāhmaṇo*, suggesting that in an earlier version of this verse the latter word was in the form *bāhaṇo*.

p. 141 (ad v. 392): he states that *sammāsambuddha* means “fully self-awakened” and explains why the Buddha was self-awakened, but I can see no part of the compound which might mean “self”. I wonder if he is confusing *sam-* and *sayam*.

p. 142 (ad v. 405): *tasesu thāvaresu* he translates “timid and strong” but states that the phrase might be more literally translated as “frightened and firm, or moving and unmoving, or perturbed and unperturbed”. The concept of three meanings all said to be more literal can only raise doubts about his interpretation of the word “literal”.

p. 142 (ad v. 411): he translates *amata* as “deathless”. See remarks about p. 117 (ad v. 21) above.

p. 144 (ad v. 419): he translates *sugata* as “well-gone” here and as “Well-Gone-One” at p. 135 (ad v. 285). See also p. 117 (ad vv. 17–18) above.

It is not always easy to see what principle Fronsdal is following for the inclusion or omission of diacritical marks. In the translation and in the preface and introduction he puts Pāli words into italics, with diacritical marks, but in the notes he usually does neither, e.g. p. 136 ad v. 302: *samsara*, but *saṃsāra* on p. xiii. He also has a slightly cavalier attitude towards the quotation of Pāli compounds. On p. 132 (ad v. 246) he prints *para dārā* instead of *paradārā*, and on p. 143 (ad v. 415) he writes *kāma bhavaparikkhīṇaṃ* for *kāmabhavaparikkhīṇaṃ*.

He refers (p. xviii) to English translations and studies which he has found useful, lists them, including my translation, on pp. 145–46, and encourages anyone interested in further study of the Dhammapada to read them. He mentions me by name in the notes to three verses (ad v. 167 *lokavaddhano*; ad vv. 266–67 *vissaṃ*; ad v. 290 *mattā*), and in a number of cases he gives in his notes my translation (without naming me) with a number of translations by others, only to reject them, e.g. p. 128 (ad *papañca* vv. 195–96 254); p. 129 (ad *ussuka* v. 199); p. 142 (ad *tasa thāvara* v. 405); p. 143 (ad *nibbuta* v. 414).

There is no doubt that Fronsdal’s translation reads very easily, and can justifiably be described as “highly readable”. To claim, however, that it is “the first truly accurate translation” is much more debatable. Since Fronsdal from time to time justifies himself by reference to *PED*, but never to *CPD* or *DOP*, one suspects that he was rather reliant on out-of-date lexicographical aids. He refers to *MW* only once (on p. 121 ad v. 70), and yet to try to interpret Pāli terms without reference to up-to-date dictionaries and Sanskrit parallels is not entirely commendable for anyone aiming at accuracy.

There is a small number of misprints:

p. iv: *Suttapṭaka for -pīṭaka*

p. xvii: *Viggo (not Victor) Fausbøll was Danish not Dutch*

p. 119 (ad v. 23): *Dhīgha for Dīgha*

- p. 130 (ad v. 209): *insert period after* “task”  
 p. 136 (ad v. 298): *sangha for saṅgha*  
 p. 136 (ad v. 308): *raṭṭa for raṭṭha*  
 p. 137 (ad v. 312): *literarily for literally*  
 p. 137 (ad v. 326): *aṇukusa for aṃkusa*  
 p. 143 (ad v. 416): *tañhā for taṇhā*  
 p. 147: *Anguttara for Aṅguttara*  
 p. 151: *Mālunkyāputta for Mālunkyāputta*  
 p. 152: *Jñāna- for Jñāna-*  
 p. 152: *-bhāsiyāim for -bhāsiyāim*  
 p. 152: *Khuddaka-patha for -pāṭha*

## REFERENCES

- Cone, M., 2001, *A Dictionary of Pāli*, Vol. I (A–Kh), Oxford: PTS  
 ———, 2007, “caveat lector”, *JPTS* XXIX, pp. 95–106  
 Cousins, L.S., et al., (eds) 1974, *Buddhist Studies in Honour of I.B. Horner*, Dordrecht  
 ———, 1994, rev. of *GD*, *JRAS* 4.2, pp. 291–92  
 Fronsdal, Gil, tr., 2005, *The Dhammapada*, Boston & London: Shambala  
 Gombrich, R.F., 1977, rev. of Cousins et al. 1974, *JRAS* 1977, 1, pp. 132–33  
 ———, 1978, *On Being Sanskritic* (An inaugural lecture), Oxford  
 Hinüber, O. von and Norman, K.R., eds, 1994, *Dhammapada*, Oxford: PTS  
 Mayrhofer, M., 1976, *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*, Heidelberg, Vol. III  
 Monier-Williams, M., 1899, *A Sanskrit–English Dictionary*, Oxford  
 Norman, H.C., ed., 1906–1914, *The Commentary on the Dhammapada*, London: PTS  
 Norman, K.R., 1961, “Middle Indo-Aryan Studies II”, *JOI(B)*, X, pp. 348–52 (= *CP* I, pp. 25–29)  
 ———. 1984A, “On Translating from Pāli”, *One Vehicle*, Singapore, pp. 77–87 (= *CP* III pp. 60–81)  
 ———, 1989B, “On translating the Dhammapada”, *BSR* 6, 2, pp. 153–65 (=

- CP VI, pp. 156–70)
- , 1990–2001, *Collected Papers I–VII*, Oxford: PTS
- , 1994, “Mistaken ideas about *nibbāna*”, in *Buddhist Forum* III, London: School of Oriental and African Studies, pp. 211–25 (= CP VI, pp. 9–30)
- , 1997, *The Word of the Doctrine* (Dhammapada), Oxford: PTS
- , 2001, *The Group of Discourses* (Sutta-nipāta), 2nd edition, Oxford: PTS
- , 2007A, *Elders’ Verses I* (Theragāthā), 2nd edition, Lancaster: PTS
- , 2007B, *Elders’ Verses II* (Therīgāthā), 2nd edition, Lancaster: PTS

#### ABBREVIATIONS

The titles of Pāli texts are as in *CPD*.

<i>BSR</i>	= <i>Buddhist Studies Review</i>
<i>CP</i>	= <i>Collected Papers I–VII</i> (= Norman 1990–2001)
<i>CPD</i>	= <i>A Critical Pāli Dictionary</i>
<i>DOP</i>	= Cone 2001
<i>EV I/II</i>	= <i>Elders’ Verses I and II</i> (= Norman 2007A, 2007B)
<i>GD</i>	= <i>Group of Discourses</i> (= Norman 2001)
<i>JOI(B)</i>	= <i>Journal of the Oriental Institute (Baroda)</i>
<i>JPTS</i>	= <i>Journal of the Pali Text Society</i>
<i>JRAS</i>	= <i>Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society</i>
<i>MW</i>	= Monier-Williams 1899
<i>PED</i>	= Rhys Davids & Stede 1925
<i>PTS</i>	= Pali Text Society
rev.	+ review
Skt	= Sanskrit
<i>WD</i>	= <i>Word of the Doctrine</i> (= Norman 1997)



## K.R. Norman : Bibliography

### Abbreviations

AO	<i>Acta Orientalia</i> (Copenhagen)
AS	<i>Asiatische Studien</i>
BSOAS	<i>Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies</i>
BSR	<i>Buddhist Studies Review</i>
IJ	<i>Indo-Iranian Journal</i>
IL	<i>Indian Linguistics</i>
IT	<i>Indologica Taurinensia</i>
JOI(B)	<i>Journal of the Oriental Institute</i> (Baroda)
JPTS	<i>Journal of the Pali Text Society</i>
JRAS	<i>Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society</i>
MAS	<i>Modern Asian Studies</i>
MLBD	Motilal Banarsidass
OLZ	<i>Orientalistische Literaturzeitung</i>
PBR	<i>Pali Buddhist Review</i>
PTS	Pali Text Society
REB	<i>Revista de Estudios Budistas</i>
SAS	<i>South Asian Studies</i>
SIJ	<i>Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik</i>
TPS	<i>Transactions of the Philological Society</i>
WZKS	<i>Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes</i>
ZDMG	<i>Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft</i>

### A. Translations from Pāli into English

1. *Elders' Verses*, Vol. I. Translation of the Theragāthā. First published PTS, 1969; reprinted 1990, 1995. Second edition 2007. Paperback publication of a revised translation of the verses without the notes: *Poems of Early Buddhist Monks*, 1997.
2. *Elders' Verses*, Vol. II. Translation of the Therīgāthā. First published PTS, 1971; reprinted 1992, 1995. Second edition 2007. Paperback publication of a revised translation of the verses without the notes, together with the revised version of Mrs C.A.F. Rhys Davids' translation, *Psalms of the Sisters*, under the title *Poems of Early Buddhist Nuns*, 1989,

- reprinted 1997 and 2009 (using the second edition of *Elders' Verses*, Vol. II).
3. *The Group of Discourses*. Translation of the Sutta-nipāta. Published as Vol. I with alternative translations by I.B. Horner and Walpola Rahula, PTS, 1984. Paperback publication under the title *The Rhinoceros Horn and Other Early Buddhist Poems*, 1984, reprinted 1985. Revised translation with introduction and notes published as Vol. II, 1992, reprinted 1995. Second edition (not called Vol. II) printed 2001.
  4. *The Word of the Doctrine*. Translation of the Dhammapada. First published PTS, 1997; reprinted with corrections 2000. Paperback publication under the same title, 1997; reprinted 2000.
  5. *The Pātimokkha*. K.R. Norman, tr.; W. Pruitt, ed. First published PTS, 2001; reprinted with corrections 2003; reprinted 2008. Paperback publication under the same title, 2001.
  6. Sussondi-jātaka, pp. 118f. in G. Azarpay, "A Jataka Tale on a Sasanian Silver Plate", *Bulletin of the Asia Institute*, New Series IX (1995), pp. 99–125.

### B. Other Books

7. *Pāli Literature: Including the Canonical Literature in Prakrit and Sanskrit of all the Hīnayāna Schools of Buddhism (A History of Indian Literature, Vol. VII, fascicle 2)*, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1983
8. *A Philological Approach to Buddhism*, London: School of Oriental and African Studies, 1997; Second corrected edition, Lancaster: PTS, 2006
9. *Collected Papers*, Vol. I, Oxford: PTS, 1990
10. *Collected Papers*, Vol. II, Oxford: PTS, 1991
11. *Collected Papers*, Vol. III, Oxford: PTS, 1992
12. *Collected Papers*, Vol. IV, Oxford: PTS 1993
13. *Collected Papers*, Vol. V, Oxford: PTS, 1994
14. *Collected Papers*, Vol. VI, Oxford: PTS, 1996
15. *Collected Papers*, Vol. VII, Oxford: PTS, 2001
16. *Collected Papers*, Vol. VIII, Lancaster: PTS, 2007

### C. Articles

17. "Samprasāraṇa in Middle Indo-Aryan", *JRAS* 1958, 44–50 (*Collected Papers I*, no. 1, pp. 1–8)
18. "Some Absolute Forms in Ardha-Māgadhī", *IJJ* II (1958), pp. 311–15 (*Collected Papers I*, no. 2, pp. 9–14)
19. "Middle Indo-Aryan Studies (I)", *JOI(B)* IX (1960), pp. 268–73 (*Collected Papers I*, no. 3, pp. 15–20)

20. "Some Vowel Values in Middle Indo-Aryan", *IL* XXI (1960), pp. 104–107 (*Collected Papers* I, no. 4, pp. 21–24)
21. "Middle Indo-Aryan Studies II", *JOI(B)* X (1961), pp. 348–52 (*Collected Papers* I, no. 5, pp. 25–29)
22. "Middle Indo-Aryan Studies III", *JOI(B)* XI (1962), pp. 322–27 (*Collected Papers* I, no. 6, pp. 30–35)
23. "Middle Indo-Aryan Studies IV", *JOI(B)* XIII (1964), pp. 208–13 (*Collected Papers* I, no. 7, pp. 36–41)
24. "Prakrit Literature", *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 1964
25. Appendix I to the second edition of the *Thera-Therigāthā*, PTS, 1966
26. "Middle Indo-Aryan Studies V", *JOI(B)* XV (1965), pp. 113–17 (*Collected Papers* I, no. 8, pp. 42–46)
27. "Voicing and Unvoicing of Consonants in Pāli", *IL* XXVI (1965), pp. 132–36 (*Collected Papers* I, no. 10, pp. 59–62)
28. "Notes on Some *deṣī* Words", *IL* XXVII (1966), pp. 74–78 (*Collected Papers* I, no. 11, pp. 63–67)
29. "Middle Indo-Aryan Studies VI", *JOI(B)* XVI (1966), pp. 113–19 (*Collected Papers* I, no. 13, pp. 77–84)
30. "Notes on the Aśokan Rock Edicts", *IJJ* X (1967), pp. 160–70 (*Collected Papers* I, no. 9, pp. 47–58)
31. "Notes on Aśoka's Fifth Pillar Edict", *JRAS* 1967, pp. 26–32 (*Collected Papers* I, no. 12, pp. 68–76)
32. "Middle Indo-Aryan Studies VII", *JOI(B)* XVIII (1969), pp. 225–31 (*Collected Papers* I, no. 14, pp. 85–92)
33. "Some Aspects of the Phonology of the Prakrit Underlying the Aśokan Inscriptions", *BSOAS* XXXIII (1970), pp. 132–43 (*Collected Papers* I, no. 15, pp. 93–107)
34. "Lexical Variation in the Aśokan Inscriptions", *TPS* LXIX (1970), pp. 121–36 (*Collected Papers* I, no. 19, pp. 130–43)
35. "Notes on the Bahapur Version of Aśoka's Minor Rock Edict", *JRAS* 1971, pp. 41–43 (*Collected Papers* I, no. 16, pp. 108–12)
36. "Notes on the Gāndhārī Dharmapada", *IL* XXXII (1971), pp. 13–20 (*Collected Papers* I, no. 17, pp. 113–21)
37. "Middle Indo-Aryan Studies VIII", *JOI(B)* XX (1971), pp. 329–36 (*Collected Papers* I, no. 18, pp. 122–29)
38. "Notes on the Greek Version of Aśoka's Twelfth and Thirteenth Rock Edicts", *JRAS* 1972, pp. 111–18 (*Collected Papers* I, no. 20, pp. 144–55)
39. "Middle Indo-Aryan Studies IX", *JOI(B)* XXI (1972), pp. 331–35 (*Collected Papers* I, no. 21, pp. 156–60)

40. "Middle Indo-Aryan Studies X", *JOI(B)* XXIII (1973), pp. 64–71 (*Collected Papers* I, no. 22, pp. 161–69)
41. "The Gāndhārī Version of the Dharmapada", in L. Cousins et al., eds., *Buddhist Studies in Honour of I.B. Horner*, Dordrecht, The Netherlands, 1974, pp. 171–80 (*Collected Papers* I, no. 23, pp. 170–80)
42. "Middle Indo-Aryan Studies XI", *JOI(B)* XXIV (1974), pp. 139–44 (*Collected Papers* I, no. 24, pp. 181–86)
43. "Causaraṇa-Paiṇṇaya: An Edition and Translation", *Adyar Library Bulletin*, XXXVIII (1974), pp. 44–59 (*Collected Papers* I, no. 25, pp. 187–99)
44. "Aśoka and Capital Punishment", *JRAS* 1975, 16–24 (*Collected Papers* I, no. 26, pp. 200–13)
45. "Studies in the Epigraphy of the Aśokan Inscriptions", *Studies in Indian Epigraphy*, II (1975), pp. 36–41 (*Collected Papers* I, no. 27, pp. 214–19)
46. "Middle Indo-Aryan Studies XIII", *JOI(B)* XXV (1976), pp. 328–42 (*Collected Papers* I, no. 28, pp. 220–37)
47. "Pāli and the Language of the Heretics", *AO* XXXVII (1976), pp. 117–26 (*Collected Papers* I, no. 29, pp. 238–46)
48. "The Labialisation of Vowels in Middle Indo-Aryan", *StII* II (1976), pp. 41–58 (*Collected Papers* I, no. 30, pp. 247–61)
49. "Notes on the So-called 'Queen's Edict' of Aśoka", *Studies in Indian Epigraphy*, III (1976), pp. 35–42 (*Collected Papers* II, no. 35, pp. 52–58)
50. "The Language in Which the Buddha Taught", in Harish Chandra Das et al., eds., *Buddhism and Jainism*, I, (1976), pp. 15–23 (*Collected Papers* II, no. 38, pp. 84–98)
51. "Kriyāvāda and the Existence of the Soul", in Harish Chandra Das et al., eds., *Buddhism and Jainism*, II (1976), pp. 4–12 (*Collected Papers* II, no. 39, pp. 99–112)
52. "The Buddha's View of Devas", *Beiträge zur Indieforschung* (Ernst Waldschmidt zum 80. Geburtstag gewidmet), Berlin, 1977, pp. 329–36 (*Collected Papers* II, no. 31, pp. 1–8)
53. "Kāvīlyam: A Metrical Analysis of Uttarādhyayana-sūtra 8", *Mahavira and His Teachings*, Bombay, 1977, pp. 9–19 (*Collected Papers* II, no. 32, pp. 9–19)
54. "Middle Indo-Aryan Studies XII", *JOI(B)* XXVIII (1978), pp. 78–85 (*Collected Papers* II, no. 33, pp. 20–29)
55. "The Role of Pāli in Early Sinhalese Buddhism", in Heinz Bechert, ed., *Buddhism in Ceylon*, Göttingen, 1978, pp. 28–47 (*Collected Papers* II, no. 34, pp. 30–51)

56. "Māgadhisms in the Kathāvattu", in A.K. Narain, ed., *Studies in Pali and Buddhism*, Delhi, 1979, pp. 279–87 (*Collected Papers* II, no. 36, pp. 59–70)
57. "Two Pali Etymologies", *BSOAS* XLII, 1979, 321–28 (*Collected Papers* II, no. 37, pp. 71–83)
58. "Middle Indo-Aryan Studies XIV", *JOI(B)* XXIX (1979) pp. 37–41 (*Collected Papers* II, no. 40, pp. 113–18)
59. "Middle Indo-Aryan Studies XV", *JOI(B)* XXIX (1979), pp. 42–49 (*Collected Papers* II, no. 41, pp. 119–27)
60. "Dhammapada 97: A Misunderstood Paradox", *IT* VII (1979), pp. 325–31 (*Collected Papers* II, no. 46, pp. 187–93)
61. "The Dialects in Which the Buddha Preached", in Heinz Bechert, ed., *The Language of the Earliest Buddhist Tradition*, Göttingen, 1980, pp. 61–77 (*Collected Papers* II, no. 42, pp. 128–47)
62. "Four Etymologies from the Sabhiya-sutta", in Somaratna Balasooriya, et al., eds., *Buddhist Studies in Honour of Walpola Rahula*, London, 1980, pp. 173–84 (*Collected Papers* II, no. 43, pp. 148–61)
63. "Uttarajjhayāna Studies: An Edition and Translation of the Fourth *ajjhayāna*, with a Metrical Analysis and Notes", in Babula Jain Phagula, ed., *Pt K.C. Shastri Felicitation Volume*, Rewa, India, 1980, pp. 564–72 (*Collected Papers* III, no. 53, pp. 1–11)
64. "Devas and Adhidevas in Buddhism", *JPTS* IX (1981), pp. 145–55 (*Collected Papers* II, no. 44, pp. 162–71)
65. "Notes on the Vessantara-jātaka", in Klaus Bruhn and Albrecht Wezler, eds., *Studien zum Jainismus und Buddhismus (Gedenkschrift für Ludwig Alsdorf)*, Wiesbaden, 1981, pp. 163–74 (*Collected Papers* II, no. 45, pp. 172–86)
66. "The Pali Text Society: 1881–1981", *The Middle Way*, LVI, 2 (1981), pp. 71–75 (*Collected Papers* II, no. 47, pp. 194–199)
67. "A Note on *attā* in the Alagaddūpama-sutta", *Studies in Indian Philosophy (Memorial Volume for Pandit Sukhlalji Sanghvi)*, Ahmedabad, 1981, pp. 19–29 (*Collected Papers* II, no. 48, pp. 200–209)
68. "The Four Noble Truths", *Indological and Buddhist Studies* (for J.W. de Jong), Canberra, 1982, pp. 377–91 (*Collected Papers* II, no. 49, pp. 210–23)
69. "Aśokan *silā-thaṃbhas* and *dhaṃma-thaṃbhas*", in Samaresh Bandhopadhyay, ed., *Ācārya-vandanā: D.R. Bhandarkar Centenary Volume*, Calcutta, 1982, pp. 311–18 (*Collected Papers* II, no. 50, pp. 224–32)

70. "The Pratyeka-Buddha in Buddhism and Jainism", in P. Denwood and A. Piatigorsky, ed., *Buddhist Studies (Ancient and Modern)*, London, 1983, pp. 92–106 (*Collected Papers II*, no. 51, pp. 233–49)
71. "Notes on the Ahaurā Version of Aśoka's First Minor Rock Edict", *III XXVI* (1983), pp. 277–92 (*Collected Papers II*, no. 52, pp. 250–68)
72. "Middle Indo-Aryan Studies XVI", *JOI(B) XXXII* (1983), pp. 275–79 (*Collected Papers III*, no. 54, pp. 12–18)
73. "The Nine Treasures of a Cakravartin", *IT XI* (1983), pp. 183–93 (*Collected Papers III*, no. 55, pp. 19–31)
74. "The Value of the Pāli Tradition", *Jagajjyoti*, 1984, pp. 1–9 (*Collected Papers III*, no. 56, pp. 33–44)
75. "The Metres of the Lakkhaṇa-suttanta", in Gatare Dhammapala, et al., eds., *Buddhist Studies in Honour of Hammalava Saddhatissa*, Nugegoda, 1984, pp. 176–88 (*Collected Papers III*, no. 57, pp. 45–59)
76. "On Translating from Pāli", *One Vehicle*, Singapore, 1984, pp. 77–87 (*Collected Papers III*, no. 58, pp. 60–81)
77. (In collaboration with F.R. Allchin) "Guide to the Aśokan Inscriptions", *South Asian Studies I* (1985), pp. 43–50
78. "Pāli Lexicographical Studies III", *JPTS X* (1985), pp. 23–36 (*Collected Papers III*, no. 60, pp. 83–94)
79. "The Influence of the Pāli Commentators and Grammarians upon the Theravādin Tradition", *Buddhist Studies (Bukkyō Kenkyū)*, XV (December 1985), pp. 109–23 (*Collected Papers III*, no. 61, pp. 95–107)
80. "The Pali Text Society: 1981–86", *Jagajjyoti*, 1986, pp. 4–8 (*Collected Papers III*, no. 62, pp. 108–14)
81. "The Dialectal Variety of Middle Indo-Aryan", in Wolfgang Morgenroth, ed., *Sanskrit and World Culture*, Berlin, 1986, pp. 389–96 (*Collected Papers III*, no. 63, pp. 115–25)
82. "A Dialect Variation in Aśoka's Minor Rock Edict I", *Journal of Ancient Indian History XV*, pp. 1–2, 1984–85 [1986], pp. 1–14 (*Collected Papers III*, no. 64, pp. 126–36)
83. "Notes on the Sutta-nipāta", *Sri Lanka Journal of Buddhist Studies I* (1987), pp. 100–16 (*Collected Papers III*, no. 65, pp. 137–56)
84. "Pāli Lexicographical Studies IV", *JPTS XI* (1987), pp. 33–49 (*Collected Papers III*, no. 66, pp. 157–72)
85. "The Inscribing of Aśoka's Pillar Edicts", in G. Pollet, ed., *India and the Ancient World: History, Trade and Culture before A.D. 650 (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 25)*, Leuven, 1987 (Prof. P.H.L. Eggermont Jubilee Volume), pp. 131–39 (*Collected Papers III*, no. 67, pp. 173–82)

86. "An Epithet of Nibbāna", in N.H. Samtani, ed., *Śramaṇa Vidyā: Studies in Buddhism* (Prof. Jagannath Upadhyaya Commemoration Volume), Sarnath, 1987, pp. 23–31 (*Collected Papers* III, no. 68, pp. 183–190)
87. "Pāri seiten kyōkai no gyōseki to mokuteki (The Pali Text Society: Achievements and Aims)", *Memoirs of the Chūō Academic Research Institute* XVI (1987), pp. 4–32
88. "Aśoka's 'Schism' Edict", *Bukkyōgaku seminā* (Buddhist Seminar [Otani]), XLVI (1987), pp. 1–34 (*Collected Papers* III, no. 70, pp. 191–218)
89. "The Origin of Pāli and Its Position among the Indo-European Languages", *Journal of Pali and Buddhist Studies* I (1988), pp. 1–27 (*Collected Papers* III, no. 72, pp. 225–43)
90. "The Orthography of the Gīrnār Version of the Aśokan Rock Edicts", *Bulletin d'études indiennes*, V (1987), pp. 273–85 (*Collected Papers* III, no. 76, pp. 274–84)
91. "The Origins of the āryā Metre", in D.J. Kalupahana and W.G. Weeratne, eds., *Buddhist Philosophy and Culture (Essays in Honour of N.A. Jayawickrema)*, Colombo, 1987, pp. 203–14 (*Collected Papers* IV, no. 79, pp. 20–35)
92. "The Metres of the Lakkhaṇa-suttanta (II)", *IT*, XIV (1987–88), pp. 285–94 (*Collected Papers* IV, no. 80, pp. 36–45)
93. "The Dhāniya-Sutta of the Sutta-nipāta", *Journal of the Department of Pali*, University of Calcutta, IV (1987–88), pp. 10–18 (*Collected Papers* IV, no. 87, pp. 146–54)
94. "Uttarajjhayaṇa-sutta XIV: Usuyārijjam", in *Aspects of Jainology*, III (Pt. Dalsukh Bhai Malvania Felicitation Volume), Varanasi, 1988, pp. 16–26 (*Collected Papers* III, no. 73, pp. 244–56)
95. "An Aspect of External Sandhi in Pāli", *Buddhist Studies (Bukkyō Kenkyū)* XVII (1988), pp. 89–95 (*Collected Papers* III, no. 71, pp. 219–24)
96. "Pāli Lexicographical Studies V", *JPTS* XII (1988), pp. 49–61 (*Collected Papers* III, no. 74, pp. 257–68)
97. "A Newly-Found Fragment of an Aśokan Inscription", *South Asian Studies* IV (1988), pp. 99–102 (*Collected Papers* III, no. 75, pp. 269–73)
98. "Mitsu no Pāriḡo jiten (Three Pāli Dictionaries)", (with bibliographical notes by M. Yamazaki), in *Memoirs of the Chūō Academic Research Institute* XVII (1988), pp. 90–116
99. "Symposium on the Date of the Buddha", *BSR* V 5 (1988), pp. 149–54
100. "Nibbāna: The Place of *amata*", in *Kalpa*, I (1988), pp. 15–17

101. "Common Terminology in Early Buddhist and Jain Texts", *Jainology: Manifold Facets* (Pt. Jaganmohanlal Shastri Sadhuvad Grantha), Rewa, 1989, pp. 393–97 (*Collected Papers IV*, no. 98, pp. 264–70)
102. "Notes on the Patna Dharmapada", N.H. Samtani and H.S. Prasad, eds., *Amalā Prajñā: Aspects of Buddhist Studies* (Professor P.V. Bapat Felicitation Volume), Delhi, 1989, pp. 431–44 (*Collected Papers IV*, no. 78, pp. 1–19)
103. "Dialect Forms in Pāli", in C. Caillat, ed., *Dialectes dans les littératures indo-aryennes*, Paris 1989, pp. 369–92 (*Collected Papers IV*, no. 81, pp. 46–71)
104. "Pāli Lexicographical Studies VI", *JPTS XIII* (1989), pp. 219–27 (*Collected Papers IV*, no. 82, pp. 72–79)
105. "The Pāli Language and Scriptures", *The Buddhist Heritage*, School of Oriental and African Studies, 1989, pp. 29–53 (*Collected Papers IV*, no. 84, pp. 92–123)
106. "Pāli Philology and the Study of Buddhism", *The Buddhist Forum*, I, 1990, pp. 31–39 (*Collected Papers IV*, no. 83, pp. 80–91)
107. "Aspects of Early Buddhism", in D.S. Ruegg and L. Schmithausen, eds., *Earliest Buddhism and Madhyamaka*, 1990, pp. 24–35 (*Collected Papers IV*, no. 85, pp. 124–138)
108. "Pāli Lexicographical Studies VII", *JPTS XIV* (1990), pp. 219–25 (*Collected Papers IV*, no. 86, pp. 139–145)
109. "Pāli Lexicographical Studies VIII", *JPTS XV* (1990), pp. 145–54 (*Collected Papers IV*, no. 88, pp. 155–63)
110. "New Aśokan Inscriptions from Sannati", *Jagajjyoti*, 1990, pp. 46–50 (*Collected Papers IV*, no. 89, pp. 164–70)
111. "Why Are the Four Noble Truths Called 'Noble'?", in Y. Karunadasa, ed., *Ānanda: Essays in Honour of Ananda W.P. Guruge*, Colombo, 1990, pp. 11–13 (*Collected Papers IV*, no. 90, pp. 171–74)
112. "Orthographical Problems in the Aśokan Inscriptions", in K.V. Ramesh, et al., eds., *Indian History and Epigraphy (Dr. G.S. Gai Felicitation Volume)*, Delhi, 1990, pp. 100–105 (*Collected Papers V*, no. 108, pp. 132–45)
113. "The Role of the Layman According to the Jain Canon", in M. Carrithers and C. Humphrey, eds., *The Assembly of Listeners: Jains in Society*, Cambridge, U.K., 1991, pp. 31–39 (*Collected Papers IV*, no. 91, pp. 175–84)

114. "Observations on the Dates of the Jina and the Buddha", in H. Bechert, ed., *The Dating of the Historical Buddha*, Göttingen, 1991, pp. 300–12 (*Collected Papers IV*, no. 92, pp. 185–201)
115. "The Literary Works of the Abhayagirivihārins", in V.N. Jha, ed., *Kalyāṇa-mitta (Prof. Hajime Nakamura Felicitation Volume)*, Delhi, 1991, pp. 41–50 (*Collected Papers IV*, no. 93, pp. 202–17)
116. "Syntactical Compounds in Middle Indo-Aryan", in C. Caillat, ed., *Middle Indo-Aryan and Jain Studies*, Leiden, 1991, pp. 3–9 (*Collected Papers IV*, no. 94, pp. 218–25)
117. "Aśokan Inscriptions from Sannati", *South Asian Studies VII* (1991), pp. 101–10 (*Collected Papers IV*, no. 95, pp. 226–44)
118. "As Rare as Fig-Flowers", *Perspectives on Indo-European Language* (Studies in Honor of Edgar C. Polomé), Vol. I, McLean, Virginia, 1991, pp. 216–20 (*Collected Papers IV*, no. 96, pp. 245–50)
119. "Death and the Tathāgata", *Studies in Buddhism and Culture* (In Honour of Professor Dr. Egaku Mayeda), Tokyo, 1991, pp. 1–11 (*Collected Papers IV*, no. 97, pp. 251–63)
120. "Gāndhārī", in Li Zheng et al., eds., *Papers in Honour of Prof. Dr. Ji Xianlin on the Occasion of his 80th Birthday*, I, Peking, 1991, 133–43 (*Collected Papers V*, no. 101, pp. 58–70)
121. "Theravāda Buddhism and Brahmanical Hinduism: Brahmanical Terms in a Buddhist Guise", in Tadeusz Skorupski, ed., *The Buddhist Forum II* (1991), pp. 193–200 (*Collected Papers IV*, no. 99, pp. 271–80)
122. "Middle Indo-Aryan Numerals", in Jadranka Gvozdanović, ed., *Indo-European Numerals*, Berlin, 1992, pp. 199–241 (*Collected Papers V*, no. 100, pp. 1–57)
123. "Pāli Lexicographical Studies IX", *JPTS XVI* (1992), pp. 77–85 (*Collected Papers V*, no. 102, pp. 71–79)
124. "Pāli Lexicographical Studies X", *JPTS XVII* (1992), pp. 215–18 (*Collected Papers V*, no. 103, pp. 80–83)
125. "The Milk-Drinking Heron in Pāli Literature", in H.B. Chowdury, ed., *Hundred Years of the Bauddha Dharmankur Sabha*, Calcutta, 1992, pp. 192–96 (*Collected Papers V*, no. 105, pp. 100–106)
126. "The Nasalisation of Vowels in Middle Indo-Aryan", in H.S. Prasad, ed., *Philosophy, Grammar and Indology (Essays in Honour of Prof. Gustav Roth)*, Delhi, 1992, pp. 331–38 (*Collected Papers V*, no. 106, pp. 107–18)
127. "Pāli", *Oxford International Encyclopædia of Linguistics*, 1992, reprinted with minor updates in 2003

128. "Pāli Lexicographical Studies XI", *JPTS* XVIII (1993), pp. 149–64 (*Collected Papers* V, no. 104, pp. 84–99)
129. "The Metres of the Lakkhaṇa-suttanta (III)", *Encounter of Wisdom between Buddhism and Science (Essays in Honour of Professor Keishō Tsukamoto)*, Tokyo, 1993, pp. 79–91 (*Collected Papers* V, no. 107, pp. 119–31)
130. "The Languages of Early Buddhism", *Premier Colloque Étienne Lamotte*, Louvain, 1993, pp. 83–99 (*Collected Papers* V, no. 109, pp. 146–68)
131. "External Sandhi in Pāli", *JPTS* XIX (1993), pp. 203–13 (*Collected Papers* V, no. 110, pp. 169–79)
132. "Uttarajjhayāna-sutta I", in R. Smet and K. Watanabe, eds., *Jain Studies in Honour of Jozef Deleu*, Tokyo, 1993, pp. 375–94 (*Collected Papers* V, no. 111, pp. 180–206)
133. "Aśoka and Saṅghabheda", in E. Mayeda, ed., *Studies in Original Buddhism and Mahāyāna Buddhism in Commemoration of Late Professor Dr Fumimaro Watanabe I*, pp. 9–29, Kyoto, 1993, (*Collected Papers* V, no. 112, pp. 207–29)
134. "The Metre of the Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Upāli-sūtra", in N.K. Wagle and F. Watanabe, eds., *Studies on Buddhism in Honour of Professor A.K. Warder*, Toronto, 1993, pp. 113–23 (*Collected Papers* V, no. 113, pp. 230–46)
135. "The Development of Writing in India and Its Effect upon the Pāli Canon", *WZKS* XXXVI, Supplement 1992 [1993], pp. 239–49 (*Collected Papers* V, no. 114, pp. 247–61)
136. "Pāli" *Encyclopaedia of Language and Linguistics*, 1993, reprinted with minor updates in *Concise Encyclopedia of Language and Religion*, Pergamon, 2001
137. "Pali Literature: Appendix I (Additions and Corrections)", *Journal of Pali and Buddhist Studies*, 7 (1994), pp. 1–22 (*Collected Papers* V, no. 115, pp. 262–84)
138. "The Aśokan Inscriptions and Prakrit Regional Geography", *Jainism and Prakrit in Ancient and Medieval India: Essays for Professor Jagdish Chandra Jain*, New Delhi, 1994, pp. 51–57 (*Collected Papers* VI, no. 116, pp. 1–8)
139. "Pāli Studies in the West: Present State and Future Tasks", *Religion*, 1994, 24, pp. 165–72
140. "Mistaken ideas about Nibbāna", *The Buddhist Forum* III (1994), pp. 211–25 (*Collected Papers* VI, no. 117, pp. 9–30)

141. "A Note on *silāvigaḍabhicā* in Aśoka's Rummindei Inscription", *The Buddhist Forum* III, 1994, pp. 227–37 (*Collected Papers* VI, no. 118, pp. 31–47)
142. "Pāli Lexicographical Studies XII", *JPTS* XX (1994), pp. 211–30 (*Collected Papers* VI, no. 119, pp. 47–67)
143. "The Present State of Pāli Studies, and Future Tasks", *Memoirs of the Chūō Academic Research Institute* XXIII (1994), pp. 1–19 (*Collected Papers* VI, no. 120, pp. 68–88)
144. "The Development of the Middle Indo-Aryan Dialects", *Memoirs of the Chūō Academic Research Institute* XXIII (1994), pp. 21–50 (*Collected Papers* VI, no. 121, pp. 88–121)
145. "An Aśokan Miscellany", in N. Balbir and J.K. Bautze, eds., *Festschrift Klaus Bruhn*, Reinbek, 1994, pp. 455–73 (*Collected Papers* VI, no. 122, pp. 122–145)
146. "Dialect Variation in Old and Middle Indo-Aryan" in George Erdosy, ed., *The Indo-Aryans of Ancient South Asia*, Berlin 1995, pp. 278–92 (*Collected Papers* VII, no. 123, pp. 1–22)
147. "Masculine Vocatives in *-e* in Pāli", *The Maha Bodhi Journal* C (1992), pp. 45–48 (*Collected Papers* VII, no. 124, pp. 23–32)
148. "A Report on Two Pāli Dictionaries", *International Journal of Lexicography* VIII (1995), pp. 115–25
149. "Why Buddhism?", *Dharma World* XXII (May/June 1995), pp. 13–16
150. "Translation Problems with Buddhist Texts", *Dharma World* XXII (July/August 1995), pp. 40–43
151. "Changing Meanings in Indian Religious Terminology", *Dharma World* XXII (Nov./Dec. 1995), pp. 10–13
152. "Personal Impressions in Translating Buddhist Texts", *Dharma World* XXIII (Mar./Apr. 1996), pp. 14–16
153. "Solitary as a Rhinoceros Horn", *BSR* XIII (1996), pp. 133–42 (*Collected Papers* VII, no. 125, pp. 33–41)
154. "A Comparative Study of Aśoka's Second Separate Edict", *Bulletin of the Deccan College Post-graduate and Research Institute*, LIV–LV (1994–1995), 1996, pp. 255–67 (*Collected Papers* VII, no. 126, pp. 42–62)
155. "Aśoka's Debt to His People", *Aśoka 2300 (Jagajjyoti: Aśoka Commemoration Volume)*, 1997, pp. 81–88 (*Collected Papers* VII, no. 127, pp. 63–80)
156. "Adopting the Domestic Way of Life", in P. Kieffer-Pülz and J. Uwe Hartmann, eds., *Bauddhavidyāsudhākaraḥ (Studies in Honour of Heinz*

- Bechert on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*), Swisttal-Odendorf, 1997, pp. 465–72 (*Collected Papers* VII, no. 128, pp. 81–91)
157. “The Metres of the Lakkhaṇa-suttanta (IV)”, in Kuala Lumpur Dhammajoti, et al., eds., *Recent Researches in Buddhist Studies (Essays in Honour of Professor Y. Karunadasa)*, Colombo, 1997, pp. 482–92 (*Collected Papers* VII, no. 129, pp. 92–103)
158. “Traces of the Subjunctive in Middle Indo-Aryan”, in C.P. Sinha, et al., eds., *Facets of Indian Culture (Gustav Roth Felicitation Volume)*, Patna, 1998, pp. 97–108 (*Collected Papers* VII, no. 130, pp. 104–19)
159. “Does Māra Have Flower-Tipped Arrows?” in P. Harrison and G. Schopen, eds., *Sūryacandrāya (Essays in Honour of Akira Yuyama on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday)*, Swisttal-Odendorf, 1998, pp. 135–42 (*Collected Papers* VII, no. 131, pp. 120–29)
160. “When Did the Buddha and the Jina Die?”, S. Bandhyopadhyay, ed., *Prācyasikṣāsuhāsini* (75th Anniversary Volume of Department of Ancient History and Culture, Calcutta), 1999, pp. 460–70 (*Collected Papers* VII, no. 132, pp. 130–44)
161. “Early Buddhism and Jainism: A Comparison”, *Memoirs of the Chūō Academic Research Institute* XXVIII (1999), pp. 3–30 (*Collected Papers* VIII, no. 133, pp. 1–29)
162. “Aśoka’s Thirteenth Rock Edict”, *IT* XXIII–XXIV (1997–98 [1999]), pp. 459–84 (*Collected Papers* VIII, no. 135, pp. 45–69)
163. “Notes on the Metres of the Sagātha-vagga of the Saṃyutta-nikāya”, *Buddhist Studies (Bukkyō Kenkyū)*, XXIX (2000), pp. 115–28 (*Collected Papers* VIII, no. 134, pp. 30–44)
164. “The Pali Text Society: Its Contribution to Buddhist Literature”, *Jagajjyoti* (Sanghanayak Dharmapal Mahathera Felicitation Volume), 2000, pp. 89–94
165. “The Metres of the Lakkhaṇa-suttanta (V)”, *IT* XVII–XVIII ([1991–92] 2000), pp. 273–82 (*Collected Papers* VIII, no. 136, pp. 70–79)
166. “Pāli *anaṇa* — ‘Free from Debt’”, in A. Wezler, et al., eds., *Harānandalahārī* (Volume in Honour of Minoru Hara), Reinbek, 2000, pp. 161–74 (*Collected Papers* VIII, no. 137, pp. 80–95)
167. Grammatical index to *Elders’ Verses*, Vol. I, *JPTS* XXVI (2000), pp. 165–68
168. “Notes on the Vocabulary of Leumann’s *Āvaśyaka-Erzählungen*”, *Ṛṣikalpa* (Dr. H.L. Jain Memorial Volume), Jabalpur, 2001, pp. 140–44 (*Collected Papers* VIII, no. 141, pp. 157–66)

169. “Vuṭṭhāpeti, vuṭṭhāna, and Related Matters”, *IT XXVII* (2001), pp. 121–37 (*Collected Papers VIII*, no. 144, pp. 199–215)
170. “Pāli and the Languages of Early Buddhism”, in N. Sims-Williams, ed., *Indo-Iranian Languages and Peoples* (Sir Harold Bailey Centennial Volume), London, 2002, pp. 135–50 (*Collected Papers VIII*, no. 138, pp. 96–121)
171. “The Metres of the Lakkhaṇa-suttanta (VI)”, in M. Dias and K.B.A. Edmund, eds., *Buddhist and Indian Studies* (In Honour of Professor Sodo Mori), Hamamatsu, 2002, pp. 1–20 (*Collected Papers VIII*, no. 139, pp. 120–41)
172. “The Transmission of the Aśokan Edicts”, *Saddhamangala Karunaratne Felicitation Volume*, Sri Lanka: Archaeological Survey Department, 2002, pp. 241–49 (*Collected Papers VIII*, no. 140, pp. 142–56)
173. “The Aṭṭhakavagga and Early Buddhism”, in Olle Qvarnström, ed., *Jainism and Early Buddhism: Essays in Honor of Padmanabh S. Jaini*, Fremont, California, 2003, pp. 511–22 (*Collected Papers VIII*, no. 142, pp. 167–82)
174. “The Structure of the Sādhu-sutta”, in Vidyaniivāsa Miśra, ed., *Śemuṣī* (Padmabhūṣaṇa Professor Baladeva Upādhyāya Birth Centenary Volume), Varanasi, 2004, pp. 660–63 (*Collected Papers VIII*, no. 145, pp. 216–23)
175. “Aśokan Envoys and Buddhist Missionaries”, in H.W. Bodeqitz and M. Hara, eds., *Gedenkschrift J.W. de Jong*, Tokyo, 2004, pp. 69–81 (*Collected Papers VIII*, no. 143, pp. 183–98)
176. “The Anāgatavaṃsa Revisited”, *JPTS XXVIII* (2006), pp. 1–37 (*Collected Papers VIII*, no. 146, pp. 224–60)
177. “Translation Problems in Early Buddhist Literature”, in V. Hücken, et al., eds., *Jaina-Itihāsa-ratna*, (Festschrift für Gustav Roth zu seinem 90. Geburtstag), Marburg, 2006, pp. 363–77 (*Collected Papers VIII*, no. 147, pp. 261–80)
178. “On Translating Literally”, *JPTS XXX* (2009), pp. 77–93

#### D-I. Editor

179. *Pāli Tipiṭakam Concordance II*, fascicles 4–9, London: PTS, 1963–67
180. Centenary Volume (Vol. IX) of the *Journal of the Pali Text Society*, London, 1981
181. *Critical Pāli Dictionary II*, fascicle 11, Copenhagen, 1981
182. *Critical Pāli Dictionary II*, fascicle 12, Copenhagen, 1982
183. *Pāli Tipiṭakam Concordance III*, fascicle 6, London, 1984
184. *Journal of the Pali Text Society X*, London, 1985

185. *Critical Pāli Dictionary* II, fascicle 13, Copenhagen, 1985
186. *Journal of the Pali Text Society* XI, London, 1987
187. *Critical Pāli Dictionary* II, fascicle 14, Copenhagen, 1987
188. *Journal of the Pali Text Society* XII, London, 1988
189. *A Critical Pāli Dictionary* II, fascicle 15, Copenhagen, 1988
190. *Journal of the Pali Text Society* XIII, Oxford, 1989
191. *A Critical Pāli Dictionary* Vol. II, fascicle 16, Copenhagen, 1989
192. *Journal of the Pali Text Society* XIV, Oxford, 1990
193. *A Critical Pāli Dictionary* Vol. II, fascicle 17, Copenhagen, 1990
194. *Journal of the Pali Text Society* XV, Oxford, 1990
195. *Journal of the Pali Text Society* XVI, Oxford, 1992
196. *Journal of the Pali Text Society* XVII, Oxford, 1992
197. *Journal of the Pali Text Society* XVIII, Oxford, 1993
198. *Journal of the Pali Text Society* XIX, Oxford, 1993
199. Wilhelm Geiger, *A Pāli Grammar*, Oxford, 1994
200. *Journal of the Pali Text Society* XX, Oxford, 1994

#### D-2. Co-editor

201. *Buddhist Studies in Honour of I.B. Horner*, Dordrecht, The Netherlands, 1974 (with L. Cousins, A. Kunst)
202. *A Critical Pāli Dictionary* II fascicle 10, Copenhagen, 1979 (with L. Alsdorf)
203. *Buddhist Studies in Honour of Hammalava Saddhātissa*, Nugegoda, Sri Lanka, 1984 (with G. Dhammapala, R. Gombrich)
204. *Dhammapada*, Oxford, 1994 (with Oskar von Hinüber)
205. *Index to the Dīgha-nikāya*, Oxford, 1997 (with M. Yamazaki and Y. Ousaka)
206. *Index to the Vinaya-piṭaka*, Oxford, 1996 (with M. Yamazaki and Y. Ousaka)
207. *Kaṅkhāvitaranī*, Oxford, 2003 (with W. Pruitt)

#### E. Translation from French

208. *Jain Cosmology* (French text by C. Caillat), Paris 1981; New York: Ravi Kumar Harmony Book, 1981

#### F. Reviews

209. C. Krause, *Ancient Jaina Hymns*, Ujjain: Scindia Oriental Institute, 1952; reviewed in *BSOAS* XVII (1955), pp. 188–89

210. K. Bruhn, *Śīlāṅka's Cauppaṇamahāpurīṣacarīya: Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der Jaina-Universalgeschichte*, Hamburg, 1954; reviewed in *BSOAS* XIX (1957), p. 184
211. K. Bruhn, *Śīlāṅka's Cauppaṇamahāpurīṣacarīya: Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der Jaina-Universalgeschichte*, Hamburg, 1954; reviewed in *JRAS* 1956, pp. 243–44
212. G. Morgenstierne, *Indo-Iranian Frontier Languages* III, *The Pashai Language*, (3) *Vocabulary*, Oslo, 1956; reviewed in *JRAS* 1957, p. 260
213. S.B. Deo, *History of Jaina Monachism from Inscriptions and Literature*, Poona, 1956; reviewed in *JRAS* 1958, pp. 213–14
214. P. Jain, ed., *Jīvandhara-Campū* (by Mahākavi Haricandra, edited with Sanskrit and Hindi translation), Varanasi, 1958; reviewed in *JRAS* 1959, pp. 179–80
215. R. Williams, ed., *The Prakrit Versions of the Mañipati-carita*, London, 1959; reviewed in *JRAS* 1960, pp. 91–92
216. H. Johnson, *Triṣaṣṭīśalākāpuruṣacaritra, or the Lives of Sixty-three Illustrious Persons, by Hemacandra*. Vol. V (Gaekwad's Oriental Series, No. 139), Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1962; reviewed in *BSOAS* XXVI (1963), p. 437
217. A.N. Upadhye and H.L. Jain, *Padmanandī's Pañcaviṃśati (a collection of 26 prakaraṇas dealing with religio-didactic themes), with an anonymous Sanskrit commentary. With the Hindi anuvāda of Balachandra, Jivarāja Jaina Granthamālā, No. 10, Sholapur: Jaina Saṃskṛti Saṃrakṣaka Sangha, 1962; reviewed in BSOAS XXVII (1964), p. 180*
218. W.N. Brown, *The Vasanta Vilāsa*, New Haven, 1962; reviewed in *JRAS* 1964, p. 67
219. H.C. Bhayani, *Paumacariu of Kavirāja Svayambhūdeva (a pre-tenth-century Jainistic Rāma epic in Apabhraṃśa)*, Third part: *Yuddha-kāṇḍa and Uttara-kāṇḍa*, Singhi Jain Series, No. 36, Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1960; reviewed in *BSOAS* XXVII (1964), p. 180
220. H.D. Velankar, *Chando'nuśāsana of Hemachandrasūri: A comprehensive treatise of Sanskrit, Prakrit and Apabhraṃśa prosody*, Singhi Jain Series, No. 49, Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1961; reviewed in *BSOAS* XXVII (1964), p. 229
221. A.N. Upadhye, H.L. Jain, and Balachandra, eds. *Guṇabhadra's Ātmānuśāsana, with the commentary of Prabhācandra, critically edited with introductions, appendices, etc.*, Jivarāja Jaina Granthamālā, No. 11, Sholapur: Jaina Saṃskṛti Saṃrakṣaka Sangha, 1961; reviewed in *BSOAS* XXVII (1964), p. 499

222. J. Deleu and W. Schubring, *Studien zum Mahānīsiha, Kapitel 1–5*, Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien herausgegeben vom Seminar für Kultur und Geschichte Indiens an der universität Hamburg, 10, Hamburg: Cram, de Gruyter & Co., 1963; reviewed in *BSOAS* XXVII (1964), p. 631
223. R. Williams, *Jaina Yoga: A Survey of the Mediaeval Śrāvakācāras*, London, 1963; reviewed in *JRAS* 1965, p. 78
224. A.C. Mittal, *Early History of Orissa: From earliest times up to first century B.C.*, Sanmati Publication No. 16, [Banaras]: Jain Cultural Research Society, 1962; reviewed in *BSOAS* XXVIII (1965), p. 457
225. G.C. Choudhary, *Political History of Northern India from Jain sources (c. 650 A.D. to 1300 A.D.)*, Amritsar: Sohanlal Jaindharma Pracharak Samiti, [1964]; reviewed in *BSOAS* XXIX (1966), p. 170
226. H. Saddhatissa, ed., *Upāsakajanālaṅkāra: A Critical Edition and Study*, London, 1965; reviewed in *JRAS* 1966, pp. 154–55
227. W. Schubring and C. Caillat, *Drei Chedasūtras des Jaina-Kanons*, Hamburg, 1966; reviewed in *JRAS* 1967, pp. 165–66
228. A.K. Warder, *Pali Metre: A Contribution to the History of Indian Literature*, London, 1967; reviewed in *JRAS* 1968, pp. 191–92
229. N.A. Jayawickrama, *The Sheaf of Garlands of the Epochs of the Conqueror: Being a translation of Jinakālamālipakaraṇaṃ of Ratana-pañña Thera of Thailand*, PTS, Translation Series, no. 36, London: Luzac and Co., 1968; reviewed in *BSOAS* XXXII (1969), pp. 171–72
230. V.P. Jain, ed. and tr. *Jambūsāmicariu of Virakavi, Jñānapīṭha Mūrtidevī Jaina Granthamālā: Apabhraṃśa Grantha*, Varanasi: Bharatiya Jnanpitha, 1968; reviewed in *BSOAS* XXXIII (1970), pp. 409–10
231. U Nārada and Thein Nyun, trs., *Conditional Relations*, PTS, Translation Series, No. 37, London: Luzac and Co., 1969; reviewed in *BSOAS* XXXIII, 1970, pp. 410–11
232. R.E. Emmerick, tr., *The Sūtra of Golden Light: Being a Translation of the Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra*, London, 1970; reviewed in *JRAS*, 1971, pp. 197–98
233. J. Deleu, *Viyāhapannatti (Bhagavāi): The fifth aṅga of the Jain canon*, Rijksuniversiteit te Gent, Werken uitgegeven door de Faculteit van de Letteren en Wijsbegeerte, 151<sup>e</sup> Afl., Brugge: 'De Tempel', 1970; reviewed in *BSOAS* XXXIV (1971), pp. 612–14
234. N.A. Jayawickrama, *The Chronicle of the Thūpa and the Thūpavaṃsa: Being a translation and edition of Vācissaratthera's Thūpavaṃsa*, Sacred Books of the Buddhists XXVIII, London: Luzac., 1971; reviewed in *BSOAS* XXXV (1972), pp. 638–39

235. Nyānaponika, *Pathways of Buddhist Thought*, London, 1971; reviewed in *MAS* VII (1973), pp. 125–27
236. S. Kant, *Hāthigumphā Inscription of Khāravela and the Bhabru edict of Aśoka: A critical study*, Delhi: Prints of India, 1971; reviewed in *BSOAS* XXXVI (1973), pp. 472–73
237. N.H. Santani, *Arthaviniścayasūtra and Its Commentary (Nibadhana)*, Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series XIII, Patna, 1971; reviewed in *BSOAS* XXXVI (1973), pp. 677–78
238. R. Kloppenborg, tr., *The Sūtra on the Foundation of the Buddhist Order (Catuspariśatsūtra)*, Leiden, 1973; reviewed in *JRAS* 1974, pp. 183–85
239. K.L. Janert, *Abstände und Schlussvokalverzeichnungen in Aśoka-Inschriften*, Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1972; reviewed in *AO* XXXVI (1974), pp. 486–90 (*Collected Papers* VI, R7, pp. 200–203)
240. H.-D. Evers, *Monks, Priests and Peasants: A Study of Buddhism and Social Structure in Central Ceylon*, Monographs in Social Anthropology and Theoretical Studies in Honour of Nels Anderson, Publication I, Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1972; reviewed in *MAS* X (1976), pp. 466–69
241. A. Wayman, *The Buddhist Tantras: Light on Indo-Tibetan Esotericism*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd, 197; reviewed in *MAS* X (1976), pp. 469–71
242. A. and H. Wayman, trs., *The Lion's Roar of Queen Śrīmālā*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1974; reviewed in *MAS* X (1976), pp. 472–73
243. E. Wray, Clare Rosenfeld, and Dorothy Bailey, *Ten Lives of the Buddha: Siamese Temple Paintings and Jataka Tales*, New York: Weatherhill, 1972; reviewed in *MAS* X (1976), pp. 473–75
244. W. Geiger, *Kleine Schriften zur Indologie und Buddhismuskunde*, Wiesbaden, 1973; reviewed in *JRAS* 1976, p. 80
245. P.L. Vaidya, ed.; revised edition with Hindi translation by H. Jain, *Jasaharacariu of Puśpadanta*, Benares, 1972; reviewed in *JRAS* 1976, pp. 80–81
246. H.-W. Köhler, edited by K.L. Janert, *Śrad-dhā- in der vedischen und altbuddhistischen Literatur*, Wiesbaden, 1973; reviewed in *JRAS* 1976, p. 81
247. G. Cœdès, *Catalogue des manuscrits en pâli, laotien et siamois provenant de la Thaïlande*, Copenhagen, 1966; reviewed in *JRAS* 1976, p. 89
248. G.L. Hart, *The Poems of Ancient Tamil: Their Milieu and Their Sanskrit Counterparts*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975; reviewed in *MAS* XI (1977), pp. 302–305

249. M.M.J. Marasinghe, *Gods in Early Buddhism: A Study in their Social and Mythological Milieu as Depicted in the Nikāyas of the Pāli Canon*, Vidyānkara: University of Sri Lanka (Ceylon), 1974; reviewed in *JRAS* 1976, pp. 164–65
250. G. Cœdès and C. Archambault, *Les Trois mondes (Traibhūmi Braḥ R'van)*, Paris, 1973; reviewed in *JRAS* 1976, p. 177
251. A. Mette, *Piṇḍ'esaṇā: Das Kapitel der Oha-nijjuttī über den Bettelgang*, Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz, Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse Jahrgang 1973. Nr. 11, Mainz, 1974; reviewed in *ZDMG* CXXVII (1977), p. 435
252. L. Alsdorf, *Kleine Schriften*, Wiesbaden, 1974; reviewed in *JRAS* 1977, pp. 125–26
253. R.L. Turner, *Collected Papers 1912–1973*, London, 1975; reviewed in *JRAS* 1977, p. 126
254. *A Critical Pāli Dictionary* II, Fasc. 9, Copenhagen, 1975; reviewed in *JRAS* 1977, pp. 127–28
255. A. Yuyama, ed., *Prajñā-pāramitā-ratna-guṇa-saṃcaya-gāthā* (Sanskrit Recension A), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976; reviewed in *MAS* XII (1978), pp. 174–76
256. M. Cone and R. Gombrich, *The Perfect Generosity of Prince Vessantara: A Buddhist epic, translated from the Pali and illustrated by unpublished paintings from Sinhalese temples*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977; reviewed in *BSOAS* XLI (1978), pp. 387–88
257. K. Okuda, *Eine Digambara-Dogmatik: Das fünfte Kapitel von Vattākeras Mūlācāra*, Wiesbaden, 1975; reviewed in *JRAS* 1978, pp. 181–82
258. J. Ver Eecke, ed. and tr., *Le Dasavatthupparāṇa*, Paris, 1976; reviewed in *JRAS* 1978, p. 183
259. M.W.S. de Silva and G.D. Wijayawardhana, *Essentials of Sanskrit Grammar*, York Monographs on South Asian Languages 2, Department of Language, University of York, 1977; and *Popular Sanskrit Texts*, York Monographs on South Asian Languages 3, Department of Language, University of York, 1977; reviewed in *Lingua* XLIV (1978) pp. 309–10
260. E. Denis, *La Lokapaññatti et les idées cosmologiques du bouddhisme ancien*, Lille: Atelier Reproduction des Thèses, Université de Lille III; Paris: Honoré Champion, 1977; reviewed in *BSOAS* XLII (1979), pp. 155–56
261. C.P. Masica, *Defining a Linguistic Area: South Asia*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976; reviewed in *MAS* XIII (1979), pp. 336–39 (*Collected Papers* VIII, R22, pp. 281–85)

262. R.E.A. Johansson, *Pali Buddhist Texts Explained to the Beginner*, 2nd ed., London, 1977; reviewed in *JRAS* 1979, pp. 74–75
263. L. Prematilleke, K. Indrapala, and J.E. van Lohuizen-de Leeuw, *Senarat Paranavitarne Commemoration Volume*, Leiden, 1978; reviewed in *JRAS* 1979, pp. 76–77
264. M. and J. Stutley, *A Dictionary of Hinduism: Its Mythology, Folklore and Development, 1500 B.C.–A.D. 1500*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1977; reviewed in *MAS* XIII (1979), pp. 519–21
265. W.D. O’Flaherty, *Origins of Evil in Hindu Mythology*, Hermeneutics: Studies in the History of Religion 6, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976; reviewed in *MAS* XIII (1979), pp. 521–23
266. W. Howard, *Sāmavedic Chant*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1977; reviewed in *MAS* XIII (1976), pp. 524–26
267. G.H. Schokker, *The Pādarāḍitaka of Śyāmilaka*, Part I, Indo-Iranian Monographs Volume IX, The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1976; reviewed in *MAS* XIII (1976), pp. 526–27
268. Th. Damsteegt, *Epigraphical Hybrid Sanskrit: Its Rise, Spread, Characteristics and Relationship to Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit*, Leiden: Brill, 1978; reviewed in *Lingua* XLVIII (1979), pp. 291–94 (*Collected Papers* VIII, R25, pp. 297–302)
269. *A Critical Pāli Dictionary*, II.7–8, Copenhagen, 1971, 1973; reviewed in *OLZ* LXXIV (1979), pp. 391–94 (*Collected Papers* VI, R1, pp. 146–48)
270. T. Rahula, *A Critical Study of the Mahāvastu*, Delhi, 1978; reviewed in *JRAS* 1979, pp. 172–73
271. H. Bechert, ed., *Buddhism in Ceylon and Studies on Religious Syncretism in Buddhist Countries*, Göttingen, 1978; reviewed in *JRAS* 1979, pp. 175–76
272. *A Critical Pāli Dictionary*, II.9, Copenhagen, 1975; reviewed in *OLZ* LXXIV (1979), pp. 493–95 (*Collected Papers* VI, R2, pp. 149–52)
273. W. Schubring, *Kleine Schriften*, Glasenapp-Stiftung Band 13, Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1977; reviewed in *AO* XL (1979), pp. 342–44
274. R.O. Franke, *Kleine Schriften*, Glasenapp-Stiftung Band 17, Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1978; reviewed in *AO* XL (1979), pp. 344–46
275. U. Schneider, *Die grossen Felsen-edikte Aśokas: Kritische Ausgabe, Übersetzung und Analyse der Texte*, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1978; reviewed in *AO* XL (1979), pp. 346–53 (*Collected Papers* VI, R8, pp. 204–13)
276. P.S. Jaini, *The Jaina Path of Purification*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979; reviewed in *MAS* XIV (1980), pp. 695–98

277. Potter, K.H., ed., *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies, Indian Metaphysics and Epistemology: The Tradition of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika up to Gaṅgeśa*, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1977; reviewed in *MAS XIV* (1980), pp. 698–700
278. H.V. Guenther, *Philosophy and Psychology in the Abhidharma*, Berkeley: Shambhala, 1974; reviewed in *MAS XIV* (1980), pp. 698–700.
279. A. Wayman, tr. *Calming the Mind and Discerning the Real: Buddhist Meditation and the Middle View, from the Lam rim chen mo of Tsoṅ-kha-pa*, Berkeley: Shambhala, 1978; reviewed in *MAS XIV* (1980), pp. 698–700.
280. H.W. Bailey, *Dictionary of Khotan Saka*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979; reviewed in *MAS XIV* (1980), pp. 700–703
281. R. Lipsey, *Coomaraswamy*, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1977; reviewed in *MAS XV* (1981), pp. 339–41
282. Per Kvaerne, *An Anthology of Buddhist Tantric Songs: A Study of the Caryāgīti*, Columbia University Press, 1977; reviewed in *AO XLI* (1980), pp. 105–109
283. W. Schubring, *Nāyādhammakahāo: Des Sechste Aṅga des Jaina Siddhānta; Einführung, kritische Nacherzählung mit Ausgabe der wichtigeren Textpartien, Kommentar, und Glossar*, Wiesbaden, 1978; reviewed in *JRAS* 1981, pp. 89–90
284. H. Falk, *Quellen des Pañcatantra*, Wiesbaden, 1978; reviewed in *JRAS* 1981, pp. 94–95
285. A.K. Narain, ed., *Studies in Pāli and Buddhism: A Memorial Volume in Honour of Bhikkhu Jagdish Kashyap*, Delhi: B.R. Publishing Corporation, 1979; reviewed in *The Middle Way LVI* (1981), pp. 96–97
286. L.R. Lancaster, *The Korean Buddhist Canon: A Descriptive Catalogue*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979; reviewed in *MAS XV* (1981), p. 896
287. M. Aris, *Bhutan: The Early History of a Himalayan Kingdom*, Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1979; reviewed in *MAS XV* (1981), pp. 896–98
288. W.B. Bollée, *Studien zum Sūyagaḍa: die Jainas und die anderen Weltanschauungen vor der Zeitwende. Textteile, Nijjuti, Übersetzung und Anmerkungen*, Part I, Wiesbaden: Schriftenreihe des Südasien-Instituts der Universität Heidelberg, Band 24, 1977; reviewed in *WZKS XXV* (1981), 195–203 (*Collected Papers VI*, R5, pp. 171–82)
289. J. Ver Eecke, ed. and tr., *Le Siḥaḷavattthupakaraṇa: Texte pāli et traduction*, Paris, 1980; reviewed in *JRAS* 1981, p. 220

290. E. Hofstetter, *Der Herr der Tiere in alten Indien*, Wiesbaden, 1980; reviewed in *JRAS* 1981, pp. 221–22
291. I.Y. Junghare, *Topics in Pāli Historical Phonology*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1979; reviewed in *Lingua* LIV (1981), pp. 93–99
292. J.T. Ergardt, *Faith and Knowledge in Early Buddhism: An analysis of the contextual structures of an arahant-formula in the Majjhima-Nikāya*, Leiden: Brill 1977; reviewed in *OLZ* LXXVI (1981), p. 594
293. S. Gaulier et al., *Buddhism in Afghanistan and Central Asia*, I. *Introduction, Buddha, Bodhisattva*; II. *Minor Divinities and Assimilated Divinities, Monks and Ascetics, Maṇḍalas*, Leiden: Brill 1976; reviewed in *OLZ* LXXVI (1981), pp. 594–95
294. M.B. Emeneau, *Language and Linguistic Area*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1980; reviewed in *Lingua* LVI (1982), pp. 93–96 (*Collected Papers* VIII, R23, pp. 286–91)
295. M. Aris and Aung San Suu Kyi, eds., *Tibetan Studies in Honour of H. Richardson: Proceedings of the International Seminar on Tibetan Studies, Oxford 1979*, Warminster: Aris and Phillips, 1980; reviewed in *MAS* XVI (1982), p. 170
296. M. Stutley, *Ancient Indian Magic and Folklore: An Introduction*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1980; reviewed in *MAS* XVI (1982), pp. 170–72
297. Lu Gwei-Djen and J. Needham, *Celestial Lancets: A History and Rationale of Acupuncture and Moxa*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980; reviewed in *MAS* XVI (1982), pp. 172–74
298. A.L. Dallapiccola and S. Z.-A. Lallemand, eds., *The Stūpa: Its Religious, Historical and Architectural Significance*, Beiträge zur Südasienforschung, Bd. 55, Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1980; reviewed in *MAS* XVI (1982), pp. 174–76
299. H. Nakamura, *Indian Buddhism: A survey with bibliographical notes*, Inter-cultural Research Institute Monograph No. 9, Hirakata City, Osaka: Kansai University of Foreign Studies, 1980; reviewed in *BSOAS* XLV (1982), pp. 182–83
300. L. Sternbach, *Aphorisms and Proverbs in the Kathā-sarit-sāgara* I, Lucknow, 1980; reviewed in *JRAS* 1982, p. 69
301. J.C. Jain, *The Vasudevahiṇḍī: An authentic Jain version of the Bṛhat-kathā*, L. D. Series 59, L.D. Institute of Indology, Ahmedabad, 1977; reviewed in *AO* XLII (1981), pp. 157–62
302. C.E. Godakumbura, *Catalogue of Ceylonese Manuscripts: Catalogue of Oriental manuscripts, xylographs, etc. in Danish collections* I,

- Copenhagen: The Royal Danish Library, 1980; reviewed in *The Middle Way* LVII (1982), pp. 108–109
303. P.S. Jaini, ed., *Paññāsa-Jātaka or Zimmē Paññāsa (in the Burmese recension)* II [Jātakas 26–50], London: PTS, 1983; reviewed in *BSOAS* XLV (1982), p. 371
304. H. Bechert and H. Braun, *Pāli Nīti Texts from Burma: Dhammanīti, Lokanīti, Mahārahanīti, Rājanīti*, London: PTS, 1981; reviewed in *BSOAS* XLV (1982), pp. 371–72
305. *A Critical Pāli Dictionary*, II.10, 1979; reviewed in *OLZ* LXXVII (1982), pp. 402–404 (*Collected Papers* VI, R3, pp. 153–55)
306. G. Azarpay et al., *Sogdian Painting: The Pictorial Epic in Oriental Art*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981; reviewed in *MAS* XVI (1982), pp. 700–702
307. K.H. Potter, ed., *Encyclopaedia of Indian Philosophies: Advaita Vedānta up to Śaṅkara and His Pupils*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981; reviewed in *MAS* XVI (1982), p. 702
308. C.H.B. Reynolds, ed., *Catalogue of the Sinhalese manuscripts in the India Office Library*, compiled by D.J. Wijayaratne in collaboration with A.S. Kulasuriya, London: India Office Library and Records, 1981; reviewed in *BSOAS* XLV (1982), p. 647
309. H. Bechert, ed., *Die Sprache der ältesten buddhistischen Überlieferung, The Language of the Earliest Buddhist Tradition*, Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung, II, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980; reviewed in *Kratylos* XXIX (1984), pp. 85–88
310. Suryakanta, *A Practical Vedic Dictionary*, Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1981; reviewed in *MAS* XVII (1983), pp. 351–52
311. N. Balbir, ed. and tr., *Dānāṣṭakakathā: Recueil jaina de huit histoires sur le don*, Paris, 1982; reviewed in *JRAS* 1983, p. 124
312. J.C. Jain, *Prakrit Narrative Literature: Origin and Growth*, New Delhi, 1981; reviewed in *JRAS* 1983, p. 125
313. M.M. Deshpande and P.E. Hook, eds., *Aryan and Non-Aryan in India*, Michigan Papers on South and Southeast Asia, No. 14, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1979; reviewed in *AO* XLIII (1982), pp. 133–37
314. M.G. Dhadphale, *Synonymic Collocations: A Study*, Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1980; reviewed in *PBR* VI (1981), pp. 122–23
315. R. Siddhartha, ed. and tr., *Saṅgharakkhita's Vuttodaya: A Study of Pāli Metre*, Sri Satguru Publications, 1981; reviewed in *PBR* VI (1981), pp. 123–25

316. Austin Hale, *Research on Tibeto-Burman Languages*, Trends in Linguistics, State-of-the-Art Report 14. Berlin: Mouton Publishers, 1982; reviewed in *MAS* XVII (1983), pp. 697–98
317. W. D. O'Flaherty, ed., *Karma and Rebirth in Classical Indian Traditions*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980; reviewed in *MAS* XVII (1983), pp. 698–700
318. A.K. Ramanujan, tr., *Hymns for the Drowning: Poems for Viṣṇu by Nammālvār*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981; reviewed in *MAS* XVII (1983), pp. 700–701
319. G.A. Zograph, *Languages of South Asia: A Guide*, Languages of Asia and Africa 3, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982; reviewed in *MAS* XVII (1983), pp. 701–702
320. Nāṇamoli, tr., *The Path of Discrimination (Paṭisambhidāmagga)*, London, 1982; reviewed in *JRAS* 1983, pp. 314–15
321. R.W. Lariviere, ed. and tr., *The Divyatattva of Raghunandana Bhaṭṭācārya: Ordeals of Classical Hindu Law*, New Delhi, 1981; reviewed in *JRAS* 1983, pp. 317–18
322. J.E. Mitchiner, *Traditions of the Seven Ṛṣis*, Delhi, 1982; reviewed in *JRAS* 1983, pp. 318–19
323. S. Kramrisch, *Presence of Śiva*: Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981; reviewed in *MAS* XVIII (1984), pp. 170–71
324. J.V. Mitchiner, *Studies in the Indus Valley Inscriptions*, New Delhi: Oxford and IBH Publishing Co., 1978; M.V.N. Krishna Rao, *Indus Script Deciphered*, Delhi: Agam Kala Prakashan, 1982; S.R. Rao, *The Decipherment of the Indus script*, Bombay: Asia Publishing House, 1982; reviewed in *Lingua* LXIII (1984), pp. 313–24 (*Collected Papers* VI, R10, pp. 233–48)
325. P.S. Jaini, ed., *Paññāsa-Jātaka or Zimmè Paññāsa (in the Burmese recension) II* [Jātakas 26–50], London: PTS, 1983; reviewed in *BSOAS* XLVII (1984), pp. 574–75
326. T.C.H. Raper, ed., revised by M.J.C. O'Keefe, *Catalogue of Pāli Printed Books in the India Office Library*, London, 1983; reviewed in *JRAS* 1984, pp. 293–94
327. C.F. Keyes and E.V. Daniel, eds., *Karma: An Anthropological Inquiry*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983; reviewed in *MAS* XIX (1985), pp. 163–65
328. J.S. Hawley, *Krishna, the Butter Thief*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983; reviewed in *MAS* XIX (1985), pp. 165–66

329. B. Allchin, ed., *South Asian Archaeology, 1981: Proceedings of the Sixth Conference of the Association of South Asian Archaeologists in Western Europe*, University of Cambridge Oriental Publications No. 34, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984; reviewed in *MAS XIX* (1985), pp. 173–75
330. C.E. Godakumbura et al., *Catalogue of Cambodian and Burmese Pāli Manuscripts*, Catalogue of Oriental Manuscripts, Xylographs, etc., in Danish Collections II, part 1, Copenhagen: The Royal Library, 1983; reviewed in *BSR I* (1983), pp. 183–84
331. T. Burrow and M.B. Emeneau, *Dravidian Etymological Dictionary*, 2nd ed., Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984; reviewed in *Lingua LXVI* (1985), pp. 272–73
332. R.L. Turner, *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages: Addenda and Corrigenda*, London, 1985; reviewed in *JRAS* 1985, pp. 207–208
333. V. Stache-Rosen, *Upāliparipṛcchāsūtra: Ein Text zur buddhistischen Ordensdisziplin. Aus dem Chinesischen Übersetzt und den Pāli-Parallelen Gegenübergestellt*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984; reviewed in *JRAS* 1985, pp. 215–18 (*Collected Papers VIII*, R26, pp. 303–308)
334. K. Röhrborn and W. Veenker, eds., *Sprachen des Buddhismus in Zentralasien*, Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica 16, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1983; reviewed in *BSR II* (1985), pp. 98–101
335. N.M. Kansara, ed., *Tilakamañjarīkathoddhāraḥ of Paṇḍita Padmasāgara*, Borado, 1984; reviewed in *JRAS* 1986, p. 124
336. H. Bechert and R. Gombrich, eds., *The World of Buddhism: Buddhist Monks and Nuns in Society and Culture*, London: Thames and Hudson, 1984; reviewed in *MAS XX* (1986), pp. 601–606
337. H.W. Bailey, *Indo-Scythian Studies: Being Khotanese Texts VII*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985; reviewed in *MAS XX* (1986), pp. 607–608
338. R. Burghart and A. Cantlie, eds., *Indian Religion*, Collected Papers on South Asia No. 7, London: Curzon Press, 1985; reviewed in *MAS XX* (1986), pp. 608–10
339. W.D. O'Flaherty, *Tales of Sex and Violence: Folklore, Sacrifice, and Danger in the Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985; reviewed in *MAS XX* (1986), pp. 610–11

340. K.M. de Silva, *A History of Sri Lanka*, London: C. Hurst & Co., 1981; reviewed in *MAS* XX (1986), pp. 622–23
341. B. Dutt, *Gilgit Manuscripts*, Vols. I–IV repr. in 9 parts, Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica Nos. 13–19, 22–24, Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications, 1984; reviewed in *BSR* III (1986), pp. 60–65
342. H. Saddhatissa, tr., *The Sutta-nipāta*, London 1985; reviewed in *JRAS* 1986, pp. 285–87
343. G. Roth, *Mallī-Jñāta: Das achte Kapitel des Nāyādhammakahāo im sechsten Aṅga des Śvetāmbara Jainakanons, herausgegeben, übersetzt und erläutert*, Monographien zur indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie, Band 4, Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1983; reviewed in *AO* XLVII (1981), pp. 230–33
344. S. Anacker, tr., *Seven Works of Vasubandhu, the Buddhist Psychological Doctor*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1984; reviewed in *AO* XLVII (1981), pp. 233–36
345. R.S.Y. Chi, *Buddhist Formal Logic, Part I, A Study of Dignāga's Hetucakra and K'uei-chi's Great Commentary on the Nyāyapraveśa*, Dr. B.C. Law Trust Fund Vol. I, repr. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1984; reviewed in *AO* XLVII (1981), pp. 236–38
346. S. Lienhard, *A History of Classical Poetry: Sanskrit, Pāli, Prakrit, A History of Indian Literature III*, fasc. 1, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1984; reviewed in *BSR* IV (1987), pp. 84–88
347. S. de La Loubère, *The Kingdom of Siam*, Oxford in Asia Hardback Reprints, Singapore: Oxford University Press, 1986; reviewed in *MAS* XXI (1987), pp. 827–28
348. W. Siegling, *Ein Glossar zu Aśvaghoṣas Buddhacarita*, Göttingen, 1985; reviewed in *JRAS* 1987, pp. 368–69
349. A. Parpola, *The Sky-Garment: A Study of the Harappan Religion and Its Relation to the Mesopotamian and Later Indian Religions*, *Studia Orientalia* 57, Helsinki, 1985; reviewed in *AO* XLVIII (1987), pp. 194–98 (*Collected Papers* VI, R11, pp. 249–53)
350. I.B. Horner and P.S. Jaini, trs., *Apocryphal Birth Stories (Paññāsa-jātaka)* I, tr. I.B. Horner and P.S. Jaini; Vol. II, tr. P.S. Jaini, London: PTS, 1985–86; reviewed in *BSR* IV (1987), pp. 146–47
351. P.S. Jaini, ed., *Lokaneyyappakaraṇaṃ*, London 1986; reviewed in *BSR* IV (1987), pp. 147–50
352. A.A. Hazelwood, tr., *In Praise of Mount Samanta*, London 1986; reviewed in *BSR* IV (1987), pp. 150–51

353. H. Bechert, ed., *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hinayāna-Literatur* I, Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung, III, 2, Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse Dritte Folge Nr. 154, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987; reviewed in *BSR* IV (1987), pp. 156–59
354. S. Kumoi, *Buddhism and Its Relation to Other Religions*; reviewed in *BSR* IV (1987), pp. 180–82
355. O. von Hinüber, *Das ältere Mittelindisch im Überblick*, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Südasiens, Ht. 20, Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1986; reviewed in *BSOAS* LI (1988), pp. 358–59
356. W.B. Bollée, *Reverse Index of the Dhammapada, Suttanipāta, Thera- and Therīgāthā Pādas with Parallels from the Āyāraṅga, Sūyagaḍa, Utarajjhāyā, Dasaveyāliya and Isibhāsiyāim*, Reinbek: Wezler 1983; reviewed in *OLZ* LXXXIII (1988), pp. 341–44
357. G.J. Larson and R.S. Bhattacharya, eds., *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies, Sāṃkhya: A Dualistic Tradition in Indian Philosophy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press: 1987; reviewed in *MAS* XXII (1989), pp. 869–70
358. C. Renfrew, *Archaeology and Language: The Puzzle of Indo-European Origins*, London 1987; reviewed in *Lingua* LXXXVI (1988), pp. 91–99 (*Collected Papers* VII, R17, pp. 179–92)
359. B.C. Law, tr., *History of the Buddha's Religion*, London: Luzac, 1952; reviewed in *BSR* V (1988), pp. 164–65
360. G.H. Sasaki, *Linguistic Approach to Buddhist Thought*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1986; reviewed in *BSR* V (1988), pp. 174–75
361. K.R. Norman, ed., *Journal of the Pali Text Society*, Vols. X–XI; reviewed in *BSR* V (1988), pp. 187–88
362. S. Dietz, ed., *Fragmente des Dharmaskandha: Ein Abhidharma-Text in Sanskrit aus Gilgit*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984; reviewed in *OLZ* LXXXIII (1988), pp. 466–68
363. G. Roth, *Indian Studies: Selected Papers by Gustav Roth*, H. Bechert and P. Kieffer-Pülz, eds., Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica, No. 32. Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications, 1986; reviewed in *AO* XLIX (1988), pp. 169–71
364. J.P. Joshi and A. Parpola, eds., *Corpus of Indus Seal, I. Collections in India*, Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae Tom. 239, Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India, No. 86, Helsinki, 1987; reviewed in *AO* XLIX (1988), pp. 171–75

365. Ñāṇamoli, tr., *Dispeller of Delusion I*, London: PTS, 1987; reviewed in *BSR VI* (1989), pp. 81–82
366. C.A.F. Rhys Davids, ed., *Yamaka and Paṭṭhāna*, repr., London: PTS, 1987; reviewed in *BSR VI* (1989), pp. 82–84
367. T. Tabata et al., *Index to the Dhammasaṅgaṇi*, London: PTS, 1987; reviewed in *BSR VI* (1989), pp. 84–86
368. K. Meisig, *Das Sūtra von den vier Ständen: Das Aggañña-Sutta im Licht seiner chinesischen Parallelen*, Wiesbaden, 1988; reviewed in *JRAS* 1989, pp. 351–52
369. D.J. Kalupahana, *A Path of Righteousness: Dhammapada: An Introductory Essay, Together with the Pali Text, English Translation and Commentary*, Lanham, NY: University Press of America, 1986; and J.R. Carter and M. Palihawadana: *The Dhammapada: A New English Translation with the Pali Text and the First English Translation of the Commentary's Explanation of the Verses, with Notes Translated from Sinhala Sources and Critical Textual Comments*, Oxford University Press, 1987; reviewed in *BSR VI* (1989), pp. 153–65 (*Collected Papers VI*, R4, pp. 156–70)
370. T. Tabata et al.: *Index to the Dhammasaṅgaṇi*, Oxford: PTS, 1987; reviewed in *BSR VI* (1989), pp. 84–86
371. J.P. Mallory, *In Search of the Indo-Europeans: Language, Archaeology and Myth*. London: Thames & Hudson Ltd., 1989; reviewed in *SAS VI*, (1990), pp. 262–65 (*Collected Papers VII*, R18, pp. 193–200)
372. L.O. Gómez and J.A. Silk, eds., *Studies in the Literature of the Great Vehicle: Three Mahāyāna Buddhist Texts*, Michigan Studies in Buddhist Literature, 1, Ann Arbor, Michigan: Collegiate Institute for the Study of Buddhist Literature and Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies, University of Michigan, 1989; reviewed in *JRAS* 1990, pp. 408–10
373. H. Bechert and K. Wille, *Sanskrihandschriften aus den Turfanfunden*, Teil 6, Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Bd. x, 6, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1989; reviewed in *AO LI* (1990), pp. 287–88
374. A. Parpola, “The Coming of the Aryans to Iran and India and the Cultural and Ethnic Identity of the Dāsas”, *Studia Orientalia* 64, Helsinki: The Finnish Oriental Society, 1988, pp. 195–302; reviewed in *AO LI* (1990), pp. 288–96 (*Collected Papers VII*, R19, pp. 201–11)
375. G. von Simson, *Prātimokṣasūtra der Sarvāstivādins*, Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden XI, Teil 1, Göttingen, 1986; reviewed in *BSR VII* (1990), p. 124

376. K.T. Schmidt, *Der Schlussteil des Prātimokṣasūtra der Sarvāstivādins*, Göttingen, 1989; reviewed in *BSR* VII (1990), pp. 125–26
377. H. Bechert, ed., *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hinayāna-Literatur* II, Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung, III, 2, Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse Dritte Folge, Nr. 154, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987; reviewed in *BSR* VII (1990), pp. 126–29
378. O. von Hinüber, *Die Sprachgeschichte des Pāli im Spiegel der südostasiatischen Handschriftenüberlieferung*, Untersuchungen zur Sprachgeschichte und Handschriftenkunde des Pāli I, 1988; reviewed in *IJ XXXIV* (1991), pp. 203–209 (*Collected Papers* VII, R15, pp. 159–67)
379. P.K. Andersen, *Studies in the Minor Rock Edicts of Aśoka I: Critical Edition*, Freiburg, 1990; reviewed in *JRAS* I (1991), 243–53 (*Collected Papers* VI, R9, pp. 214–32)
380. Tsongkapa, *The Principal Teachings of Buddhism*, G.L. Tharchin and M. Roach, trs., *Classics of Middle Asia Pocketbook*, 1988; reviewed in *AO LII* (1991), pp. 216–17
381. P. Harvey, *An Introduction to Buddhism: Teachings, History and Practices*, Cambridge University Press, 1990; reviewed in *BSOAS* LV (1992), pp. 142–43
382. M.G. Wiltshire, *Ascetic Figures: The Emergence of Gautama as the Buddha*, *Religion and Reason* 30, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1990; reviewed in *BSOAS* LV (1992), pp. 144–45
383. K. Meisig, tr., *Das Śrāmaṇyaphala-sūtra*, *Freiburger Beiträge zur Indologie*, Band 19, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1987; reviewed in *BSR* VIII (1991), pp. 165–67
384. G. MacQueen, *A Study of the Śrāmaṇyaphala-sūtra*, *Freiburger Beiträge zur Indologie*, Band 21, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1988; reviewed in *BSR* VIII (1991), pp. 168–72
385. Bhikkhu Bodhi, *The Discourse on the Fruits of Recluseship: The Sāmaññaphala Sutta and its Commentaries*, Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society, 1989; reviewed in *BSR* VIII (1991), pp. 172–75.
386. G.P. Malalasekera, ed., *Extended Mahāvamsa*, Oxford: PTS, 1988; reviewed in *BSR* VIII (1991), pp. 178–79
387. H. Matsumura, *Mahāsudarśanāvādāna and Mahāsudarśanasūtra*, *Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica*, No. 47, Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications, 1988; reviewed in *BSR* VIII (1991), pp. 179–81
388. K.R. Norman, ed., *Journal of the Pali Text Society* XII, Oxford: PTS, 1988; reviewed in *BSR* VIII (1991), pp. 181–83

389. J. Stargardt, *The Ancient Pyu of Burma I, Early Pyu Cities in a Man-made Landscape*, Singapore, 1990; reviewed in *JRAS* II (1992), pp. 114–17
390. F. Enomoto, J.-U. Hartmann, and H. Matsumura, *Sanskrit-Texte aus dem buddhistischen Kanon*, Göttingen, 1989; reviewed in *OLZ* LXXXVI (1991), pp. 565–67
391. C.A.F. Rhys Davids and K.R. Norman, trs., *Poems of Early Buddhist Nuns*, Oxford: PTS, 1989; reviewed in *BSR* IX (1992), pp. 79–81
392. P. Masfield, tr., *Elucidation of the Intrinsic Meaning so named The Commentary on the Vināna Stories*, Oxford: PTS, 1989; reviewed in *BSR* IX (1992), pp. 81–83
393. H. Saddhatissa, ed., *Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha and Abhidhammattha-vibhāvinī-ṭīkā*, Oxford: PTS, 1989; reviewed in *BSR* IX (1992), pp. 83–84
394. K.D. Somadasa, *Catalogue of the Hugh Nevill Collection of Sinhalese Manuscripts in the British Library I*, PTS and the British Library, 1987; K.D. Somadasa, *Catalogue of the Hugh Nevill Collection of Sinhalese Manuscripts in the British Library II*, PTS and the British Library, 1989; reviewed in *BSR* IX (1992), pp. 85–88
395. K.R. Norman, ed., *Journal of the Pali Text Society XIII*, Oxford: PTS, 1989; reviewed in *BSR* IX (1992), pp. 88–90
396. E. Steinkellner, ed., *Studies in the Buddhist Epistemology Tradition: Proceedings of the Second International Dharmakīrti Conference, Vienna, June 11–16, 1989*, Vienna, 1991; reviewed in *JRAS* II (1992), pp. 306–307
397. R.E. Emmerick, tr., *Sūtra of Golden Light*, rev. ed., Oxford: PTS, 1990; reviewed in *BSR* IX (1992), pp. 199–200
398. N.A. Jayawickrama, tr., *Story of Gotama Buddha*, Oxford: PTS, 1990; reviewed in *BSR* IX (1992), pp. 200–201
399. C. Shackle and R. Snell, *Hindi and Urdu since 1800: A Common Reader*, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, 1990; C.P. Masica, *Indo-Aryan Languages*, Cambridge University Press, 1991; reviewed in *MAS* XXVI (1992), pp. 855–59
400. D. Sinor, ed., *The Cambridge History of Early Inner Asia*, Cambridge University Press, 1990; D. Waller, *The Pandits: British Exploration of Tibet and Central Asia*, Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1990; reviewed in *MAS* XXVI (1992), pp. 859–61
401. Sayid Ghulam Mustafa Shah and A. Parpola, eds., *Corpus of Indus Seals, 2. Collections in Pakistan*, *Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae*, Series B 240, *Memoirs of the Department of Archaeology and Museums*,

- Government of Pakistan 5, Helsinki, 1991; reviewed in *AO* LIII (1992), pp. 193–96
402. K.R. Norman, ed., *Journal of the Pali Text Society*, Vols. XIV–XVIII (1990–93); reviewed in *BSR* X (1993), pp. 109–12
403. W.B. Bollée, *Studien zum Sūyagāḍa: Textteile, Nijjutti, Übersetzung und Anmerkungen*, Part II, Wiesbaden: Schriftreihe des Südasien-Instituts der Universität Heidelberg, Band 31, 1988; reviewed in *WZKS* XXXVI (1992), pp. 23–33 (*Collected Papers* VI, R6, pp. 183–199)
404. O. von Hinüber, *Der Beginn des Schrift und frühe Schriftlichkeit in Indien*, Mainz: Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, 1990; reviewed in *JRAS* III (1993), pp. 277–81 (*Collected Papers* VII, R13, pp. 145–51)
405. O. von Hinüber, *The Oldest Pāli Manuscript: Four Folios of the Vinaya-piṭaka from the National Archives, Kathmandu*, Mainz: Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, 1991; reviewed in *JRAS* III (1993), pp. 281–84 (*Collected Papers* VII, R14, pp. 152–58)
406. M. Wijayaratna, *Buddhist Monastic Life According to the Texts of the Theravāda Tradition*, tr. by C. Grangier and S. Collins, Cambridge University Press, 1990; D.S. Lopez, ed., *Buddhist Hermeneutics*, Kuroda Institute, Studies in East Asian Buddhism 6, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1988; A. Spensberg and H. Hardacre, eds., *Maitreya, the Future Buddha*; P.C. Almond, *British Discovery of Buddhism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988; reviewed in *MAS* XXVII (1993), pp. 458–62
407. H.G. Coward and K. Kunjuni Raja, eds., *Encyclopedia of Indian Philosophies: The Philosophy of the Grammarians*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990; reviewed in *MAS* XXVII (1993), pp. 462–64
408. H. Bechert, ed., *The Dating of the Historical Buddha (Die Datierung des historischen Buddha)*, Part 1, Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung, IV, 1, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991; reviewed in *BSR* X (1993), pp. 237–44
409. W.B. Bollée, *Materials for an Edition and Study of the Piṇḍa and Oha-nijjuttis of the Śvetāmbara Jain Tradition*, Stuttgart, 1991; reviewed in *JRAS* III (1993), pp. 470–71
410. C. Bendall, *Catalogue of the Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts in the University Library, Cambridge*, Stuttgart, 1992; reviewed in *JRAS* III (1993), pp. 473–74
411. W.A. Fairservis, Jr, *The Harappan Civilization and Its Writing: A Model for the Decipherment of the Indus Script*, Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1992;

- reviewed in *Lingua* XCIV (1994), pp. 61–67 (*Collected Papers* VI, R12, pp. 254–266)
412. O. von Hinüber and K.R. Norman, eds., *Dhammapada*, Oxford: PTS, 1994; reviewed in *BSR* XI (1994), pp. 187–88
413. G.H. Sasaki, ed., *Sārasaṅgaha*, Oxford: PTS, 1992; reviewed in *BSR* XI (1994), pp. 188–90
414. P. Dundas, *The Jains*, London: Routledge, 1992s; reviewed in *MAS* XXIX (1995), pp. 439–41
415. P. Masefield, tr., *Udāna and Udāna Commentary*, Vols. I and II, Oxford: PTS, 1994, 1994, 1995; reviewed in *BSR* XII (1995), pp. 71–72
416. R.M.L. Gethin, *The Buddhist Path to Awakening: A Study of the Bodhi-Pakkhiyā Dhammā*, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992; reviewed in *Religion* XXIV (1994), 194–95
417. N. Balbir, *Āvaśyaka-Studien: Introduction générale et traduction*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1993; and Th. Oberlies, *Glossar ausgewählter Wörter zu E. Leumanns "Die Āvaśyaka-Erzählungen"*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1993; reviewed in *JRAS* V (1995), pp. 315–19 (*Collected Papers* VII, R21, pp. 247–56)
418. M.M. Deshpande, *Sanskrit and Prakrit: Sociolinguistic Issues*, MLBD Series in Linguistics, VI, Delhi, 1993; reviewed in *Lingua* XCVII (1995), pp. 94–99
419. N. Balbir, ed., *Genres littéraires en Inde*, Paris: Presses de la Sorbonne Nouvelle, 1994; reviewed in *JRAS* V (1995), pp. 445–46
420. Sodo Mori et al., *The Pāli Aṭṭhakathā Correspondence Table*, Oxford: PTS, 1994; reviewed in *BSR* XII (1995), pp. 190–91
421. W. Geiger, *Pāli Grammar*, tr. by B. Ghosh, revised and ed. by K.R. Norman, Oxford: PTS, 1994; reviewed in *BSR* XII (1995), pp. 210–11
422. A. Parpola, *Deciphering the Indus Script*, Cambridge University Press, 1994; reviewed in *AO* LVI (1995), pp. 297–302 (*Collected Papers* VIII, R31, pp. 366–73)
423. O. von Hinüber, *Untersuchungen zur Mündlichkeit früher mittelindischer Texte der Buddhisten*, Mainz/Stuttgart: Untersuchungen zur Sprachgeschichte und Handschriften-Kunde des Pāli III, 1994; reviewed in *AO* LVI (1995), pp. 302–11 (*Collected Papers* VII, R16, pp. 168–78)
424. M. Juntunen et al., eds., *Suhṛdyamaṅalam: Studies in Honour of Siegfried Lienhard on His 70th Birthday*, 1995; reviewed in *JRAS* VI (1996), pp. 445–47
425. W.B. Bollée, *Materials for an Edition and Study of the Piṇḍa- and Oha-Nijjutis of the Śvetāmbara Jain Tradition II. Text and Glossary*, Beiträge

- zur Südasien-forschung, Südasien-Institut, Universität Heidelberg, Band 162, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1994; *The Nijjuttis on the Seniors of the Śvetāmbara Siddhānta: Āyāraṅga, Dasaveyāliya, Uttarajjhāyā and Sūyagaḍa, Text and selective glossary*, Beiträge zur Südasien-forschung, Südasien-Institut, Universität Heidelberg, Band 169, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1995; reviewed in *AO* LVIII (1997), “*The Jain nijjuttis*”, pp. 52–74
426. H. Penth, *Jinakālamālī Index: An Annotated Index to the Thailand Part of Ratanapañña’s Chronicle Jinakālamālī*, Oxford: PTS, 1994; reviewed in *BSR* XIII (1996), pp. 187–88
427. Haiyan Hu-von Hinüber, *Das Poṣadhavastu: Vorschriften für die buddhistische Beichtfeier im Vinaya der Mūlasarvāstivādins*, Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik Vol. 13, Reinbek, 1994; reviewed in *AO* LVII (1996), pp. 224–26
428. E. Frauwallner, tr. by S.F. Kidd under the supervision of E. Steinkellner, *Studies in Abhidharma Literature and the Origins of Buddhist Philosophical Systems*, Albany, NY, 1995; reviewed in *JRAS* VII (1997), pp. 157–58
429. F. Bandurski et al., *Untersuchungen zur buddhistischen Literatur*, Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden, Beiheft 5, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994; reviewed in *III* XL (1997), pp. 157–62
430. *Catalogue of the Otani Library Palm Leaf Manuscripts*, Kyoto: Otani University Library, 1995; reviewed in *BSR* XIV (1997), pp. 63–64
431. *Dīgha-nikāya and Its Commentaries*, Dhammagiri-Pāli-Ganthamālā, Vols. I–XI, Igatpuri: Vipassana Research Institute, 1993–95; reviewed in *BSR* XIV (1997), pp. 65–66
432. L.S. Cousins, *Index to the Mahāniddeśa*, Oxford: PTS, 1995; reviewed in *BSR* XIV (1997), pp. 68–70
433. K.R. Norman, ed., *Journal of the Pali Text Society*, Vols. XIX–XX (1993–94), and O. von Hinüber, ed., *Journal of the Pali Text Society* XXI (1995); reviewed in *BSR* XIV (1997), pp. 70–72
434. Y. Ousaka et al., *Index to the Vinaya-piṭaka*, Oxford: PTS, 1996; reviewed in *BSR* XIV (1997), pp. 188–89
435. Y. Ousaka et al., *Indexes to the Dhammapada*, Oxford: PTS, 1995; reviewed in *BSR* XIV (1997), pp. 189–90
436. F.J. Hoffman and M. Deegalle, eds., *Pāli Buddhism*, Richmond, Surrey, 1996; reviewed in *JRAS* VII (1997), pp. 474–78

437. O. von Hinüber, *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*, Indian Philology and South Asian Studies 2, Berlin, 1996.; reviewed in *AO* LVIII (1997), pp. 267–72
438. P. Pecenko, ed., *Āṅuttaranikāyaṭīkā* I, Oxford: PTS, 1996; reviewed in *BSR* XV (1998), pp. 100–101
439. M. Allon, *Style and Function: A Study of the Dominant Stylistic Features of the Prose Portions of Pāli Canonical Sutta Texts and Their Mnemonic Function*, Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 1997; reviewed in *BSR* XV (1998), pp. 101–105
440. J. Liyanaratne, ed., *Bhesajjamañjūsā*, Chapters 1–18, Oxford: PTS, 1996; reviewed in *BSR* XV (1998), pp. 106–107
441. W. Pruitt, ed., *Therīgāthā-aṭṭhakathā*, Oxford: PTS, 1997; reviewed in *BSR* XV (1998), pp. 223–24
442. M. Yamazaki et al., *Index to the Dīgha-nikāya*, Oxford: PTS, 1997; reviewed in *BSR* XV (1998), pp. 224–25
443. P. Pecenko, ed., *Āṅuttaranikāyaṭīkā* II, Oxford: PTS, 1997; reviewed in *BSR* XVI (1999), p. 87
444. W. Pruitt, tr., *The Commentary on the Verses of the Therīs* (Therīgāthā-aṭṭhakathā: Paramatthadīpanī VI), Oxford: PTS, 1998; reviewed in *BSR* XVI (1999), pp. 231–32
445. O. von Hinüber and R.F. Gombrich, eds., *Journal of the Pali Text Society*, Vols. XXII–XXIV (1996–98); reviewed in *BSR* XVI (1999), pp. 232–35
446. K.R. Blackstone, *Women in the Footsteps of the Buddha: Struggle for Liberation in the Therīgāthā*, Richmond: Curzon Press, 1998; reviewed in *AO* LX (1999), pp. 191–205
447. O. von Hinüber, *Entstehung und Aufbau der Jātaka-Sammlung*, Studien zur Literatur des Theravāda-Buddhismus I, Mainz/Stuttgart, 1998; reviewed in *AO* LX (1999), pp. 257–62
448. Ute Hüsken, *Die Vorschriften für die buddhistische Nonnengemeinde im Vinaya-Piṭaka der Theravādin*. Berlin: Reimer, 1997; reviewed in *OLZ* XCV (2000), pp. 321–24 (*Collected Papers* VIII, R28, pp. 321–25)
449. P. Pecenko, ed., *Āṅuttaranikāyaṭīkā* III, Oxford: PTS, 1999; reviewed in *BSR* XVII (2000), p.71
450. W. Pruitt and R. Bischoff, *Catalogue of the Burmese-Pāli and Burmese Manuscripts in the Library of The Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine*, London: The Wellcome Trust, 1998; reviewed in *JPTS* XXVI (2000), pp. 161–64

451. O. von Hinüber, *Das Pātimokkhasutta der Theravādin*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984; reviewed in *AO LXI* (2000), pp. 286–96 (*Collected Papers VIII*, R27, pp. 309–20)
452. O. von Hinüber and R.F. Gombrich, eds., *Journal of the Pali Text Society XXV* (1998); reviewed in *BSR 17.2* (2000), pp. 221–22
453. P. Masefield, tr., *The Itivuttaka*; reviewed in *BSR XVIII* (2001), pp. 249–50
454. O. von Hinüber and R.F. Gombrich, eds., *Journal of the Pali Text Society XXVI* (2000); reviewed in *BSR XVIII* (2001), pp. 250–52
455. M. Cone, *A Dictionary of Pāli*, Part I, *A-Kh*, Oxford: PTS, 2001; reviewed in *BSR XVIII* (2001), pp. 252–53
456. T. Vetter, *The 'Khandha Passages' in the Vinayaṭīka and the Four Main Nikāyas*, Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2000; reviewed in *AO LXII* (2001), pp. 248–54
457. W.B. Bollée, *Bhadrabāhu, Bṛhat-Kalpa-Niryukti and Saṅghadāsa, Bṛhat-Kalpa-Bhāṣya*, 3 vols., Beiträge zur Südasiensforschung, Band 181,1–3, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1998; reviewed in *AO LXII* (2001), pp. 255–59
458. S. Kant, *The Hāthīgumphā Inscription of Khāvela and the Bhabru Edict of Aśoka: A Critical Study*, Delhi: D.K. Printworld, 2000; reviewed in *AO LXII* (2001), pp. 260–63
459. J. Liyanaratne, tr., *The Casket of Medicine* (Bhesajjamañjūsā, Chapters 1–18), Oxford: PTS, 2002; reviewed in *BSR XIX* (2002), p. 189
460. Th. Oberlies, *Pāli: A Grammar of the Language of the Theravāda Tipiṭaka with a Concordance to Pischel's Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen*, Berlin: de Gruyter, 2001; reviewed in *OLZ XCVII* (2002), pp. 623–28 (*Collected Papers VIII*, R29, pp. 326–33)
461. O. von Hinüber, *Das ältere Mittelindisch im Überblick*, 2nd ed., Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2001; reviewed in *AO LXIII* (2002), pp. 221–48 (*Collected Papers VIII*, R30, pp. 334–65)
462. R.P. Wijeratne and R. Gethin, trs., *Summary of the Topics of Abhidhamma (Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha) by Anuruddha and Exposition of the Topics of Abhidhamma (Abhidhammatthasaṅgahavibhāvinī) by Sumaṅgala, Being a Commentary to Anuruddha's Summary of the Topics of Abhidhamma*, Oxford: PTS, 2002; reviewed in *BSR XX* (2003), pp. 83–84
463. O. von Hinüber and R.F. Gombrich, eds., *Journal of the Pali Text Society XXVII* (2002); reviewed in *BSR XX* (2003), pp. 84–85

464. N.A. Jayawickrama, *Suttanipāta: Pali Text with Translation into English and Notes*, Post-graduate Institute of Pali and Buddhist Studies, University of Kelaniya, 2001; reviewed in *BSR XXI* (2004), pp. 69–84
465. M Yamazaki et al., *Index to the Jātaka*, Oxford: PTS, 2003; reviewed in *BSR XXI* (2004), pp. 87–89
466. K. Mylius, *Wörterbuch Ardhamāgadhi–Deutsch*, Wichtrach: Institut für Indologie, 2003; reviewed in *AS LVIII* (2004), pp. 264–66
467. M. Yamazaki et al., *Index to the Visuddhimagga*, Oxford: PTS, 2004; reviewed in *BSR XXI* (2004), pp. 242–43
468. T. Lenz, with contributions by Andrew Glass and Bhikkhu Dharmamitra, *A New Version of the Gāndhāri Dharmapada and a Collection of Previous-Birth Stories: British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragments 16 + 25*. Gandhāran Buddhist Texts 3, Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2003; reviewed in *AO LXV* (2004), pp. 113–33
469. E.B. Findly, *Dāna: Giving and Getting in Pali Buddhism*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 2003; reviewed in *Nagoya Studies in Indian Culture and Buddhism: Saṃbhāṣā XXV* (2006), pp. 125–29
470. O. von Hinüber and R.M.L. Gethin, eds., *Journal of the Pali Text Society XXVIII* (2006); reviewed in *BSR XXIII* (2006), p. 20
471. O. von Hinüber, *Beiträge zur Erklärung der Senavarma-Inschrift*, Akademie der Wissenschaften und Literatur, Mainz, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2003; reviewed in *IJ XLVIII* (2005), pp. 124–27
472. M. Yamazaki and Y. Ousaka, *Index to the Majjhima-nikāya*, Oxford: PTS, 2006; reviewed in *BSR XXIII* (2006), pp. 264–65

### G. Obituaries and Assessments

473. B.C. Law in *JRAS* 1969
474. I.B. Horner in *Newnham College Roll Letter*, 1982, pp. 53–55
475. I.B. Horner in *JIAS V* (1982), pp. 145–49
476. L. Alsdorf in *CPD II* (1981), pp. xv–xvii
477. J. Brough in *IJ XXVII* (1984), pp. 167–70
478. J. Brough in *Proceedings of the British Academy LXXV*, 1989, pp. 329–39
479. V. Saddhātissa, “Ven. Dr Hammalava Saddhātissa’s Contribution to Pāli Studies”, in *In memoriam Ven. Dr. Hammalava Saddhātissa*, 1990, pp. 11–14
480. J. Mascaró, “Juan Mascaró and the Dhammapada”, in *Juan Mascaró in Fornés* (1897–1987), 1997, pp. 175–79

**H. Translations and Reprints of K.R. Norman's Texts****India**

481. "The Pali Text Society: 1881–1981", *Journal of the Department of Pali*, University of Calcutta, III (1985–86), pp. 79–85

**Spain**

482. "The Pali Text Society: 1881–1981" (Spanish translation): *REB* II (1992), 160–67

**China**

483. "The Pali Text Society: 1881–1981" (Chinese translation), *Dharmaghoṣa* V (1983), 22–24, 48
484. Tsai, Chilin (rewriting), "'Da mingsheng' (vighuṣṭa-śabda) yu 'li fuzhang' (vivatta-chadda): Jian tan zhushijia yu wenfajia dui bali wenxian de yingxiang", *Zhengguan zazhi*, No.17, Nantou, Taiwan, June 2001, pp. 105–37

This is an introductory article about the problem of "the influence of the Pāli commentators and grammarians upon the Theravādin tradition"; it combines (and rewrites) the material in the following three articles:

- (1) K.R. Norman, "The influence of the Pāli commentators and grammarians upon the Theravādin tradition", *Collected Papers* III, Oxford: PTS, 1992, no. 61, pp. 93–107
- (2) K.R. Norman, "Two Pāli Etymologies", *Collected Papers* II, PTS, Oxford, 1991, no. 37, pp. 71–83
- (3) O. von Hinüber, "The Development of the Clusters *-tm-*, *-dm-* and *-sm-* in Middle and New Indo-Aryan", *Selected Papers on Pāli Studies*, Oxford: PTS, 1994, no. 14, pp. 163–65
485. Tsai, Chilin (tr. with supplemental notes), "Balixue de xiankuang yu weilai renwu", *Zhengguan zazhi*, No.18, Nantou, Taiwan, Sep., 2001, pp. 171–209

A translation of K.R. Norman's "The present state of Pāli studies, and future tasks", *Collected Papers* VI, PTS, Oxford, 1996, pp. 68–87. There are two kinds of supplemental notes added to the translation: (1) some brief introduction to the Pāli texts edited in south Asia, and (2) some new publication information after 1994. There is also a brief introduction to the original author, Prof. K.R. Norman, at the very beginning of the translated article.

486. Tsai, Chilin (tr.), "Baliyu yu yijiao yuyan", *Zhengguan zazhi*, No. 19, Nantou, Taiwan, Dec. 2001, pp. 95–114
- A translation of K.R. Norman's article "Pāli and the Languages of the Heretics" (*Collected Papers* I, pp. 238–46)

**Japan**

487. “Report on Dictionaries”, in *Buddhist Studies (Bukkyō Kenkyū)* XV (1985), pp. 153–58
488. “(Summary of) Buddhism and its Origins”, *Journal of Pali and Buddhist Studies* VIII (May 1995), pp. 109–21
489. “Aśoka and Buddhism”, *Journal of Pali and Buddhist Studies* X (May 1997), pp. 1–24
490. “Early Buddhism and Jainism Compared”, *Memoirs of the Chūō Academic Research Institute* XXIX (2000), pp. 16–51
- See also numbers 87 and 98 above.



# The Buddha's Truly Praiseworthy Qualities According to the *Mahāsakuludāyi-sutta* and Its Chinese Parallel

## Abstract

With the present article, I intend to explore the potential of comparative studies between discourses from the Pāli Nikāyas and their parallels in the Chinese Āgamas, taking up the Madhyama-āgama counterpart to the *Mahāsakuludāyi-sutta* of the Majjhima-nikāya as an example. An annotated translation of the Madhyama-āgama discourse is followed by a comparative study of some differences between the two versions.

## Introduction

The central theme of the *Mahāsakuludāyi-sutta* is the praiseworthiness of the Buddha, a topic the discourse approaches from two perspectives by first delineating those qualities that a contemporary *paribbājaka* like Sakuludāyī would consider praiseworthy, followed by contrasting these to those qualities of the Buddha that truly deserve praise.

The *Mahāsakuludāyi-sutta*, found as the seventy-seventh discourse in the Majjhima-nikāya, has a counterpart in the two hundred and seventh discourse in the Madhyama-āgama preserved in Chinese translation,<sup>1</sup> a translation undertaken by Gautama Saṅghadeva during the period A.D. 397–398, based on a written original read out to him by Saṅgharakṣa. Daoci (道慈) acted as the scribe, assisted by Libao (李寶) and Kanghua (康化).<sup>2</sup> The original used for the translation appears to

---

<sup>1</sup>M 77 at M II 1–22 and MĀ 207 at T I 781b–783c. In order to facilitate comparison between the two versions, in my translation of MĀ 207 I adopt the paragraph numbering used in Ñāṇamoli (1995: 629–47). For the same reason, I employ Pāli terminology throughout, without thereby intending to take a position on the original language of the Madhyama-āgama.

<sup>2</sup>T I 809b26.

have been in a Prakrit and with considerable probability stems from a Sarvāstivāda tradition.<sup>3</sup>

## Translation

### Discourse to Sakuludāyī<sup>4</sup>

1. Thus have I heard. At one time the Blessed One was dwelling at Rājagaha, staying in the Bamboo Grove, the Squirrels' Feeding Place, in the company of a great congregation of one thousand two hundred and fifty monks who were observing the rains retreat.<sup>5</sup>

3. When the night was over, at dawn, the Blessed One put on his robes, took his bowl and entered Rājagaha to collect alms.<sup>6</sup> Having collected alms [and partaken of them], he put away his [outer] robe and bowl, washed his hands and feet, put the sitting mat over his shoulder and went into the Peacocks' Grove,<sup>7</sup> a park [frequented by] heterodox practitioners.

<sup>3</sup>On the original language of the Madhyama-āgama cf. Bapat (1969: 5), Enomoto (1986: 20) and von Hinüber (1982: 250). On its school affiliation, cf. Enomoto (1984), Lü (1963: 242), Mayeda (1985: 98), Minh Chau (1991: 27), Waldschmidt (1980: 136), and Yinshun (1962: 703).

<sup>4</sup>MĀ 207 at T I 781b27: 箭毛經, literally “discourse to Arrow Hair”. According to note 18 in the Taishō edition, 箭毛 corresponds to Sakuludāyī; cf. also Minh Chau (1991: 378). In SĀ<sup>2</sup> 323 at T II 481c15, the expression 箭毛 recurs as a rendering of \*Sūciloma (another version of the same discourse, SĀ 1324 at T II 363c1, uses the more precise rendering 針毛, “Needle Hair”). The name used by the Buddha to address Sakuludāyī in MA 207 is 優陀夷, *ṭuwa da ji* (Pulleyblank 1991), thus rendering the name \*Udāyī, the form of address used by the Buddha in the M 77. The reasons for the translator's choice of 箭毛 remain unclear to me.

<sup>5</sup>Instead of describing the company of monks that dwelt with the Buddha, M 77 at M II 1,4 lists different well-known leaders of *paribbājakas* who were dwelling at the Peacocks' Feeding Place, Sakuludāyī being one of them (corresponding to paragraph 2 in Nāṇamoli (1995: 629)).

<sup>6</sup>In M 77 at M II 1,8, the Buddha reflects that it is too early to collect alms and thereon decides to approach the Peacocks' Feeding Place to visit Sakuludāyī.

<sup>7</sup>MĀ 207 at T I 781c4: 孔雀林, “peacocks' forest”, whereas M 77 at M II 1,3 speaks of the *morānīvāpa*, the “peacocks' feeding place”. Ps III 235,12

4. At that time there was a heterodox practitioner in the Peacocks' Grove called Sakuludāyī, a renowned leader and teacher of a congregation, very famous and esteemed by the people, head of a great congregation of disciples [comprising] five hundred heterodox practitioners who honoured him.<sup>8</sup>

He was staying with a great congregation that was noisy, agitated and disorderly, giving free rein to a great clamour, discussing various types of animal talk,<sup>9</sup> namely talk about kings, talk about thieves, talk about battles, talk about food, talk about clothes, talk about married women, talk about girls, talk about adulterous women, talk about the world, talk about spacious districts, talk about the contents of the ocean, talk about country people — they were seated together talking these kinds of animal talk.<sup>10</sup>

Seeing the Buddha coming from afar, the heterodox practitioner Sakuludāyī admonished the congregation, “Keep silent! The recluse

---

explains that peacocks in this place were under protection and were provided with food, *tasmim̐ thāne morānaṃ abhayaṃ ghoṣetvā bhojanaṃ paṭṭhapesuṃ*.

<sup>8</sup>M 77 at M II 1,12 does not specify the size of Sakuludāyī's company, nor does it report that he was esteemed by the people.

<sup>9</sup>MĀ 207 at T I 781c8: 畜生之論; equivalent to *tiracchānakathā* in M 77 at M II 1,15. Bodhi in *Nāṇamolī* (1995: 1282 note 748) explains that “*tiracchāna* means literally ‘going horizontally’, and though this term is used as a designation for animals ... in the present context it means talk that goes ‘horizontally’ or ‘perpendicularly’ to the path leading to heaven and liberation”. Norman 1994: 91 suggests that “*tiracchāna-kathā* was at one time one example of ... gossip, ‘talk about animals’, on the same lines as ‘talk about kings’, etc., and it then became used in a generic sense, to stand for all such talk”.

<sup>10</sup>The listings in the two versions differ. Both mention talk about: kings, thieves, battles, food, clothes, women, the world, and the ocean. MĀ 207 treats the theme of “women” in more detail by distinguishing between married women, girls, and adulterous women. Besides these, MĀ 207 also mentions spacious districts and country people. M 77 additionally lists great ministers, armies, fears, drink, beds, garlands, perfumes, relatives, vehicles, villages, towns, cities, countries, heroes, streets, wells, the dead, trifles, and becoming this or that.

Gotama is coming. His congregation is silent; they always delight in silence and praise silence. If he sees that this congregation is silent, perhaps he will come to join us.” Having silenced the congregation, the heterodox practitioner Sakuludāyī remained silent himself.

5. [When] the Blessed One had approached the heterodox practitioner Sakuludāyī, the heterodox practitioner Sakuludāyī promptly rose up from his seat, arranged his robes on one shoulder and, holding his hands [folded in respect] towards the Buddha,<sup>11</sup> [respectfully] said, “Welcome, recluse Gotama,<sup>12</sup> it is a long time that the recluse Gotama has not come here. Please be seated on this seat.”

The Blessed One sat on the seat prepared by the heterodox practitioner Sakuludāyī. Having exchanged greetings with the Blessed One, the heterodox practitioner Sakuludāyī sat down at one side. The Blessed One asked, “Udāyī, what have you been talking about, for what matter have you been seated together?”

6. The heterodox practitioner Sakuludāyī replied, “Gotama, [let us] just leave that talk; that talk was not profound. If the recluse Gotama wishes to hear such talk, it will not be difficult to hear about it on a later occasion.” The Blessed One asked like this three times, “Udāyī, what have you been talking about, for what matter have you been seated together?”<sup>13</sup> The heterodox practitioner Sakuludāyī replied three times, “Gotama, [let us] just leave that talk, that talk was not profound, if the recluse Gotama wishes to hear such talk, it would not be difficult to hear about it on a later occasion.” [Then he said], “But since the recluse

---

<sup>11</sup>M 77 at M II 2,<sup>13</sup> only reports that Sakuludāyī invited the Buddha to a seat, without mentioning that he expressed his respect by getting up from his seat, arranging his robe on one side, and greeting the Buddha with folded hands.

<sup>12</sup>MĀ 207 at T I 781c17: 沙門瞿曇, whereas in M 77 at M II 2,<sup>11</sup> Sakuludāyī employs the address *bhante*, “venerable sir”, and refers to the Buddha as *bhagavā*, “Blessed One”.

<sup>13</sup>In M 77 at M II 2,<sup>19</sup> the Buddha does not inquire three times after the topic of the conversation that had been going on when he arrived.

Gotama has three times expressed his wish to hear it, I shall now report it.<sup>14</sup>

“Gotama, we were seated together with many Brahmins from the country of Kosala in a study hall of [these] Kosalans,<sup>15</sup> having the following discussion: ‘It is of great profit for the people of Aṅga and Magadha, it is of great profit for the people of Aṅga and Magadha, that a congregation that is such a great field of merit is spending the rains retreat in Rājagaha, namely [the congregation led by] Pūraṇa Kassapa. Why is that?’

“Gotama, Pūraṇa Kassapa is a renowned leader and teacher of a congregation, very famous and esteemed by the people, head of a great congregation of disciples [comprising] five hundred heterodox practitioners who honour him, and he is spending the rains retreat here in Rājagaha.<sup>16</sup>

“[Likewise for] [the congregation led by] Makkhali Goṣāla ... Sañjaya Belaṭṭhiputta ... Nigaṇṭha Nāṭaputta ... Pakudha Kaccāyana ... Ajita Kesakambalī ...

“Gotama, Ajita Kesakambalī is a renowned leader and teacher of a congregation, very famous and esteemed by the people, head of a great congregation of disciples [comprising] five hundred heterodox practitioners who honour him, and he is spending the rains retreat in this Rājagaha.

“Continuing like this we also talked about the recluse Gotama, [saying], ‘This recluse Gotama is a renowned leader and teacher of a congregation, very famous and esteemed by the people, head of a great congregation of monks [comprising] one thousand two hundred and

---

<sup>14</sup>In M 77 at M II 2,21 the talk about the *paribbājakas* who were staying at Rājagaha constitutes a change of topic from what the wanderers had been discussing when the Buddha arrived.

<sup>15</sup>M 77 does not indicate that the discussion happened with Kosalan Brahmins, who in MĀ 207 appear to be visiting Magadha.

<sup>16</sup>M 77 does not specify the number of disciples of Pūraṇa Kassapa, etc., or of the Buddha.

fifty men who honour him, and he is spending the rains retreat in this Rājagaha.’

“Gotama, then we had the following thought: ‘Now, out of these honourable recluses and Brahmins, who is respected by his disciples, honoured, worshipped, and treated with respect, not being abused by his disciples with abuse in regard to the teaching, having no disciples who challenge their teacher [saying], “This is entirely impossible, it is not proper, it does not fit”, and saying this they abandon him and go away?’

“Gotama, then we had the following thought: ‘Pūraṇa Kassapa is not respected by his disciples, he is not honoured, worshipped, and treated with respect by them, he is abused by his disciples with abuse in regard to the teaching, with many disciples who challenge their teacher [saying], “This is not possible, it is not proper, it does not fit”, and saying this they abandon him and go away.’

“Gotama, on a former occasion Pūraṇa Kassapa, while being with a congregation of disciples, repeatedly raised his hand and called out, ‘You should stop! People have not come to ask you about this matter, they have come to ask me about this matter. You are not able to settle this matter, I am able to settle this matter.’ Yet the disciples continued to talk among themselves [even] more on that matter, without waiting for the teacher to complete his exposition on that matter.

“Gotama, then we had the following thought: ‘In this way, Pūraṇa Kassapa is not respected by his disciples, he is not honoured, worshipped and treated with respect by them, he is abused by his disciples with abuse in regard to the teaching, with many disciples who challenge their teacher [saying], “This is not possible, it is not proper, it does not fit”, and saying this they abandon him and go away.’

“[Likewise for] Makkhali Gosāla ... Sañjaya Belatṭhiputta ... Niḡaṇṭha Nāṭaputta ... Pakudha Kaccāyana ... Ajita Kesakambalī ...

“Gotama, we had the following thought: ‘Ajita Kesakambalī is not respected by his disciples, he is not honoured, worshipped and treated with respect by them, he is abused by his disciples with abuse in regard to the teaching, with many disciples who challenge their teacher

[saying], “This is not possible, it is not proper, it does not fit”, and saying this they abandon him and go away.’

“Gotama, on a former occasion Ajita Kesakambalī, while being with a congregation of disciples, repeatedly raised his hand and called out, ‘You should stop! People have not come to ask you about this matter, they have come to ask me about this matter. You are not able to settle this matter, I am able to settle this matter.’ Yet the disciples continued to talk among themselves [even] more on that matter, without waiting for the teacher to complete his exposition on that matter.

“Gotama, then we had the following thought: ‘In this way, Ajita Kesakambalī is not respected by his disciples, he is not honoured, worshipped and treated with respect by them, he is abused by his disciples with abuse in regard to the teaching, with many disciples who challenge their teacher [saying], “This is not possible, it is not proper, it does not fit”, and saying this they abandon him and go away.’

“Gotama, then we had the following thought: ‘The recluse Gotama is respected by his disciples, he is honoured, worshipped and treated with respect by them, he is not abused by his disciples with abuse in regard to the teaching, having no disciples who challenge their teacher [saying], “This is not possible, it is not proper, it does not fit”, and who, saying so, would abandon him and go away.

“Gotama, on a former occasion the recluse Gotama was giving teachings surrounded by an immeasurable congregation of hundreds of thousands.<sup>17</sup> Among them there was one man who had nodded off and was making a noise by snoring.<sup>18</sup> Another man then addressed this man,

---

<sup>17</sup>MĀ 207 at T I 782b17: 無量百千眾; whereas M 77 at M II 4,34 just speaks of a company of several hundred, *anekasatāya parisāya*.

<sup>18</sup>MĀ 207 at T I 782b18: 鼾眠作聲; whereas in M 77 at M II 4,35 a disciple merely clears his throat, *ukkāsi*. According to a description of the conduct of ancient Indian *śramaṇas* attributed to Megasthenes, during the delivery of a discourse the hearers are not allowed to speak or to cough, and someone who does so is sent away for being a person who lacks self-restraint, cf. McCrindle (1877: 99) or else Majumdar (1960A: 273); on the reliability of the information attributed to Megasthenes, cf. also the discussion between Majumdar

saying, ‘Don’t make a noise by snoring while nodding off! Don’t you want to hear the sublime teachings taught by the Blessed One, which are like the deathless?’ That other man immediately became quiet and made no [more] noise.<sup>19</sup>

“Gotama, then we had the following thought: ‘In this way this recluse Gotama is respected by his disciples, he is honoured, worshipped and treated with respect by them, he is not abused by his disciples with abuse in regard to the teaching, having no disciples who challenge their teacher [saying], “This is not possible, it is not proper, it does not fit”, and who, saying so, would abandon him and go away.’”

7. Having heard this, the Blessed One asked the heterodox practitioner Sakuludāyī, “Udāyī, how many qualities do you see in me, owing to which my disciples respect, honour, worship, and treat me with respect, always following me without breaking away?”

8. The heterodox practitioner Sakuludāyī said, “Gotama, I see five qualities in Gotama owing to which his disciples respect, honour, worship, and treat him with respect, always following him without breaking off. What are the five?<sup>20</sup>

“The recluse Gotama is contented with coarse robes and praises contentment with coarse robes. That the recluse Gotama is contented

(1958) and Sethna (1960), with a rejoinder in Majumdar (1960B). The description of a disciple who is admonished for clearing his throat recurs in M 89 at M II 122,10, where the parallel MĀ 213 at T I 797a18 again indicates that the disciple was actually snoring, while a parallel to the same discourse in the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda Vinaya, T 1451 at T XXIV 238a26, agrees with the Pāli version that he merely cleared his throat.

<sup>19</sup>M 77 at M II 5,2 continues at this point by describing that whenever the Buddha would give teachings, his disciples would be absolutely quiet and intent on what their teacher was saying, comparable to a crowd that watches a man pressing out honey at a crossroads. M 77 also indicates that even disciples who disrobe continue speaking in praise of the Buddha, the *Dhamma*, and the monastic community, and maintain the five precepts as lay followers.

<sup>20</sup>The two versions list these five qualities in different sequences, cf. Table 1, p. 149.

with coarse robes and praises contentment with coarse robes, this is the first quality I see in the recluse Gotama owing to which his disciples respect, honour, worship, and treat him with respect, always following him without breaking away.

“Again, the recluse Gotama is contented with coarse food and praises contentment with coarse food. That the recluse Gotama is contented with coarse food and praises contentment with coarse food, this is the second quality I see in the recluse Gotama owing to which his disciples respect, honour, worship, and treat him with respect, always following him without breaking away.

“Again, the recluse Gotama takes little food and praises taking little food. That the recluse Gotama takes little food and praises taking little food, this is the third quality I see in the recluse Gotama owing to which his disciples respect, honour, worship, and treat him with respect, always following him without breaking away.

“Again, the recluse Gotama is contented with coarse dwellings, beds, and seats, and praises contentment with coarse dwellings, beds, and seats. That the recluse Gotama is contented with coarse dwellings, beds, and seats, and praises contentment with coarse dwellings, beds, and seats, this is the fourth quality I see in the recluse Gotama owing to which his disciples respect, honour, worship, and treat him with respect, always following him without breaking away.

“Again, the recluse Gotama dwells in seclusion and praises dwelling in seclusion. That the recluse Gotama dwells in seclusion and praises dwelling in seclusion, this is the fifth quality I see in the recluse Gotama owing to which his disciples respect, honour, worship, and treat him with respect, always following him without breaking away.

“These are the five qualities I see in the recluse Gotama owing to which his disciples respect, honour, worship, and treat him with respect, always following him without breaking away.”

9. The Blessed One replied, “Udāyī, it is not on account of these five qualities in me that my disciples respect, honour, worship, and treat me with respect, always following me without breaking away.

“Udāyī, the robes worn by me have been suitably and perfectly cut with a knife,<sup>21</sup> and [then] dyed with an unattractive colour.<sup>22</sup> Thus [I wear] perfect robes [that are just] dyed with an unattractive colour. Udāyī, some disciples of mine might be wearers of robes made of discarded rags for their whole life. Even [if], saying, ‘Our Blessed One is contented with coarse robes and praises contentment with coarse robes’,<sup>23</sup> my disciples were to praise me because of contentment with coarse robes, Udāyī, [merely] because of that they will not respect, honour, worship, and treat me with respect, or follow me.

“Again, Udāyī, I [at times] eat cooked rice and grains, without husks, and with a limitless variety of tastes. Udāyī, some disciples of mine might go begging alms food for their whole life, eating what has been left over.<sup>24</sup> Even [if], saying, ‘Our Blessed One is contented with coarse food and praises contentment with coarse food’, my disciples were to praise me because of contentment with coarse food, Udāyī, [merely] because of that they will not respect, honour, worship, and treat me with respect, or follow me.

---

<sup>21</sup>Adopting the 元, 明, and 聖 variant 刀 instead of 力.

<sup>22</sup>M 77 at M II 7,16 does not refer to the colour of the robes, only indicating that the Buddha would at times wear robes given by householders of finer texture than pumpkin down, *gahapatāni cīvarāni dhāremi da-hāni yattha lūkhāni alābulomasāni* (B<sup>c</sup>, C<sup>c</sup> *gahapatīcīvarāni*; B<sup>c</sup> *satthalūkhāni* and S<sup>c</sup> *suttalūkhāni*; C<sup>c</sup> *alāpulomasāni* and S<sup>c</sup> *alāvulomasāni*).

<sup>23</sup>Instead of the address “our Blessed One”, 我世尊, used by the Buddha’s disciples in MĀ 207 at T I 783a, according to M 77 at M II 7,2 they refer to their own teacher as “recluse Gotama”, *samaṇo Gotamo*. Here the Pāli version appears to have suffered from some transmission error, as in the discourses the expression “recluse Gotama” is used by those who do not consider themselves disciples of the Buddha. According to Wagle (1966: 56), the address “*samaṇa*, although a term of respect, denotes a certain indifference”.

<sup>24</sup>M 77 at M II 7,30 additionally mentions that they go on uninterrupted alms round and that they will not even consent to sitting down when being among the houses, *sapadānacārino ... antaragharaṃ pavīṭṭhā samānā āsanena pi nimantiyamānā na sādīyanti*.

“Again, Udāyī, I [at times] take food equal to a single *bilva* fruit or equal to half a *bilva* fruit.<sup>25</sup> Udāyī, some disciples of mine might [at times] take food equal to a cupful or equal to half a cupful. Even [if], saying, ‘Our Blessed One takes little food and praises taking little food’, my disciples were to praise me because of taking little food, Udāyī, [merely] because of that they will not respect, honour, worship, and treat me with respect, or follow me.

“Again, Udāyī, I [at times] might stay in tall buildings, or in pavilions.<sup>26</sup> Udāyī, some disciples of mine might for nine or ten months stay every night out in the open.<sup>27</sup> Even [if], saying, ‘Our Blessed One is contented with coarse dwellings, beds, and seats, and praises contentment with coarse dwellings, beds, and seats’, my disciples were to praise me because of contentment with coarse dwellings, beds, and seats, Udāyī, [merely] because of that they will not respect, honour, worship, and treat me with respect, or follow me.

“Again, Udāyī, I am constantly crowded in by monks, nuns, male lay followers, and female lay followers. Some disciples of mine might join the community only once every fortnight, just for the sake of the *Dhamma* and [to declare their] purity [at the *pātimokkha* recital]. Even

---

<sup>25</sup>MĀ 207 at T I 783a4: 我食如一鞞羅食, 或如半鞞羅. This seems to be a textual corruption, since in keeping with the general trend of the exposition one would expect some example of partaking of plenty of food to provide a contrast to the cupful of food taken by the disciples. M 77 at M II 7,1 provides such a contrast by describing that at times the Buddha would eat the full contents of his bowl, or even more, *iminā pattena samatittikam pi bhujjāmi, bhiiyo pi bhujjāmi*.

<sup>26</sup>M 77 at M II 8,16 describes how the Buddha would at times stay in gabled mansions that are completely plastered and sheltered from the wind by having bolted doors and shuttered windows, *kūṭāgāresu pi viharāmi ullitāvalittesu nivātesu phussitagga<sup>ṅ</sup>esu pihitavātapānesu* (B<sup>c</sup>, S<sup>c</sup>: *phusitagga<sup>ṅ</sup>esu*).

<sup>27</sup>Adopting the 宋, 元, 明, and 聖 variant 露 instead of 覆. In addition to the practice of dwelling in the open, *abbhokāsika*, M 77 at M II 8,14 also mentions living at the root of a tree, *rukkhamūlika*. These are two out of the standard set of ascetic practices, on which see also Bapat (1937), Dantinne (1991), and Nanayakkara (1989).

[if], saying, ‘Our Blessed One dwells in seclusion and praises dwelling in seclusion’, my disciples were to praise me because of dwelling in seclusion, Udāyī, [merely] because of that they will not respect, honour, worship, and treat me with respect, or follow me.

“Udāyī, it is not due to these five qualities in me that my disciples respect, honour, worship, and treat me with respect, always following me without breaking off.

10. “Udāyī, there are five other qualities in me, owing to which my disciples respect, honour, worship, and treat me with respect, always following me without breaking off. What are the five?<sup>28</sup>

11. “Udāyī, there are disciples of mine who praise me for supreme virtue, saying, ‘The Blessed One practices virtue and is of great virtue, he does what he says and he says what he does’.<sup>29</sup>

“Udāyī, in this way my disciples praise me for supreme virtue, and it is because of this that they respect, honour, worship, and treat me with respect, always following me without breaking off.

13. “Again, Udāyī, there are disciples of mine who praise me for supreme wisdom, saying, ‘The Blessed One dwells in wisdom and is of supremely great wisdom. If a disputant comes with counterarguments, [the Blessed One] will certainly be able to defeat him, that is to say, [the disputant] will be unable to give [satisfactory] explanations in regard to the right teaching and discipline, and will [even] be unable to [satisfactorily] explain his own proclamations.’<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup>The two versions list these five qualities in different sequences, cf. Talbe 1, p. 151.

<sup>29</sup>MĀ 207 at T I 783a25: 如所說所作亦然, 如所作所說亦然. M 77 at M II 9,16 instead mentions the Buddha’s endowment with the supreme aggregate of virtue, *paramena silakkhandhena samannāgato*. A counterpart to the statement in MĀ 207 can, however, be found in other Pāli discourses, e.g. D 19 at D II 224,3 (repeated at D II 229,25): *yathāvādī kho pana so bhagavā tathākārī, yathākārī tathāvādī*, cf. also D 29 at D III 135,16 and A 4.23 at A II 24,7, who formulate the same principle with the Tathāgata as their subject.

<sup>30</sup>M 77 at M II 10,5 only treats the abilities of the Buddha in a debate situation, not the inabilities of the opponent.

“Udāyī, in this way my disciples praise me for supreme wisdom, and it is because of this that they respect, honour, worship, and treat me with respect, always following me without breaking off.<sup>31</sup>

12. “Again, Udāyī, there are disciples of mine who praise me for supreme knowledge and vision, saying, ‘The Blessed One dwells knowing, not without knowing, he dwells seeing, not without seeing. The *Dhamma* he teaches to his disciples is with causes, not without causes; it is with conditions, not without conditions; it is able to [offer] replies [to questions], not unable to [offer] replies [to questions]; it is endowed with [the potential for reaching] deliverance, not bereft of [the potential for reaching] deliverance.<sup>32</sup>

“Udāyī, in this way my disciples praise me for supreme knowledge and vision, and it is because of this that they respect, honour, worship, and treat me with respect, always following me without breaking off.

14. “Again, Udāyī, there are disciples of mine who feel repugnance towards the arrow of craving and who come and ask me about [the nature] of *dukkha*, its arising, its cessation, and the path [to its cessation].<sup>33</sup> I promptly answer them about [the nature] of *dukkha*, its arising, its cessation, and the path [to its cessation].

“Udāyī, in this way my disciples come and ask me, and I satisfy their minds with my answers and arouse their delight, and it is because of this that they respect, honour, worship, and treat me with respect, always following me without breaking off.

---

<sup>31</sup>M 77 at M II 10,8 reports that at this point the Buddha asked Udāyī if he thought that the Buddha's disciples would nevertheless interrupt their teacher, which Udāyī denies, followed by the Buddha indicating that he did not expect to be instructed by his disciples; on the contrary, his disciples expected to be instructed by him.

<sup>32</sup>M 77 at M II 9,25 notes that the Buddha teaches the *Dhamma* through direct knowledge, *abhiññāya*, with a causal basis, *sanidāna*, and in a convincing manner, *sappāṭihāriya*.

<sup>33</sup>MĀ 207 at T I 783b11: 苦是苦, 習是習, 滅是滅, 道是道, literally: “\**dukkha* is \**dukkha*, arising is arising, cessation is cessation, path is path”.

34–36. “Again, Udāyī, I explain to my disciples how to attain realization of the higher knowledge of recollection of past lives or how to attain realization of the higher knowledge of the destruction of the influxes.<sup>34</sup>

37. “Udāyī, in this way my disciples gain experience and deliverance in this right teaching and discipline and are able to reach the other shore, having become free from doubt and confusion, without vacillation in regard to this wholesome teaching, and it is because of this that they respect, honour, worship, and treat me with respect, always following me without breaking off.

38. “Udāyī, these are the other five qualities in me, owing to which my disciples respect, honour, worship, and treat me with respect, always following me without breaking off.”

Then the heterodox practitioner Sakuludāyī promptly rose up from his seat, arranged his robes on one shoulder, and holding his hands [with palms together in respect] towards the Buddha, [respectfully] said, “Gotama this is very exceptional, this is very special! You have explained a profound matter well and nourished my innermost being as if with ambrosia. Gotama, just as a great rain nourishes the whole earth, above and below, in the same way the recluse Gotama has explained a profound matter well to us and nourished my innermost being as if with ambrosia. Blessed One, I have understood, Well-gone One, I have comprehended. Blessed One, from now on I go for refuge to the Buddha, the *Dhamma*, and the community of monks. May the Blessed One accept

---

<sup>34</sup>At this point a rather substantial difference becomes apparent, as instead of the two higher knowledges mentioned in MĀ 207, M 77 from M II 11,3 to M II 22,15 lists a range of different aspects of the path to liberation, covering the four *satipaṭṭhānas*, the five *indriyas*, the five *balas*, the seven *bojjhaṅgas*, the noble eightfold path, the eight *vimokkhas*, the eight *abhibhāyatanas*, the ten *kaṣiṇas*, the four *jhānas*, insight into the nature of body and consciousness, production of a mind-made body, supernormal powers, the divine ear, telepathic knowledge of the mind of others, recollection of past lives, the divine eye, and the destruction of the influxes.

me as a lay follower who has taken refuge for life from now on until life ends.”<sup>35</sup>

The Buddha spoke like this. The heterodox practitioner Sakuludāyī listened to what the Buddha said, was delighted, and put it into practice.

### **Comparison**

Given the fact that the praiseworthy qualities of the Buddha are the main theme of the *Mahāsakuludāyī-sutta* and its parallel, it is not surprising if the tendency to elevate the Buddha's status would to some degree also have influenced the reciters responsible for transmitting the discourse. A comparison of the two versions in fact reveals several instances where this tendency is at work in one or the other out of the two versions.

Thus whereas the Pāli version does not count the number of disciples of the Buddha or the other teachers, the Madhyama-āgama account depicts the Buddha as surrounded by “one thousand two hundred and fifty” disciples, whereas the other teachers only command a following of “five hundred” each.<sup>36</sup> Its presentation thus implicitly indicates that Sakuludāyī and the six well-known contemporary teachers were far less influential than the Buddha.<sup>37</sup> In the Madhyama-āgama account, the Buddha's influential status manifests not only in regard to his monk disciples, but also when it comes to an audience in general. Thus, according to this version, on a former occasion the Buddha was teaching an “immeasurable congregation of hundreds of thousands”.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup>M 77 does not record that Sakuludāyī expressed his respect or that he took refuge.

<sup>36</sup>MĀ 207 at T I 782a13 (the Buddha's disciples), T I 781c6 (Sakuludāyī's disciples), and T I 782a4+9 (the disciples of the other teachers).

<sup>37</sup>Manné (1990: 49) explains that in discourses that have a debate character and feature a meeting with an opponent “the description of the size of the following around each of the opponents ... serves to enhance, or otherwise, the importance of each adversary”.

<sup>38</sup>MĀ 207 at T I 782b17.

The corresponding section in the Pāli version only speaks of an audience of “several hundreds”.<sup>39</sup>

Another facet of the same tendency in the Madhyama-āgama is its depiction of Sakuludāyī’s behaviour when the Buddha arrives. Even though Sakuludāyī is introduced as a famous and well-known teacher, seated amidst his disciples, according to the Madhyama-āgama report he rises from his seat, arranges his robe over one shoulder and greets the Buddha with hands together in respect,<sup>40</sup> a behaviour expressing the kind of deep respect a Buddhist lay disciple might show when the Buddha arrives. In the Pāli version, Sakuludāyī only welcomes the Buddha verbally and offers him a seat, a more realistic depiction of how a famous and well-known *paribbājaka* would have welcomed the leader of another group.

The tendency to present Sakuludāyī as if he were a Buddhist lay disciple manifests again towards the end of the Madhyama-āgama discourse. Whereas the Pāli version merely reports Sakuludāyī’s delight in the exposition he had just heard, according to the Madhyama-āgama version he takes refuge and asks to be accepted as a lay disciple.<sup>41</sup> This is rather surprising, since Sakuludāyī was a *paribbājaka*, so that one would expect him to rather request ordination instead of becoming a lay disciple.<sup>42</sup> Thus the depiction of Sakuludāyī’s reaction at the conclusion of the discourse may be yet another instance of the tendency to enhance the status of the Buddha, manifesting in the present case by relying on a standard formula for discourse conclusions applied to the present case without sufficient consideration of its appropriateness to the context.

---

<sup>39</sup>M 77 at M II 4,34.

<sup>40</sup>MĀ 207 at T I 781c16.

<sup>41</sup>MĀ 207 at T I 783b28.

<sup>42</sup>As I already noted in relation to a similar variation occurring between M 80 and MĀ 209 (Anālayo 2007: 104 note 35); the articles by Freiburger (1997: 128) and Karunaratne (2004: 318) indicate that for someone who has already gone forth as a wanderer and who becomes a Buddhist, the most natural thing to do would be to join the Buddhist order of monks.

The tendency to enhance the status of the Buddha is not confined to the Madhyama-āgama version. Thus whereas in the Madhyama-āgama account Sakuludāyī addresses the Buddha with the expression “recluse Gotama”,<sup>43</sup> in the Pāli version he uses the respectful address *bhante* and, instead of using the Buddha's name, refers to him as *bhagavā*.<sup>44</sup> In this way, the Pāli version also presents him acting in a way suitable for a disciple of the Buddha, though it employs means that differ from those used in the Madhyama-āgama discourse.

Another facet of the same tendency occurs in relation to the Pāli version's portrayal of the disciples of other teachers, which serves as a contrast to the way the Buddha's followers behave. Although the two versions agree that the other teachers were not able to silence their disciples, according to the Pāli version these disciples would go so far as to openly tell visitors that their teacher does not know how to reply, proclaiming that they should be asked instead of their teacher.<sup>45</sup> Had these disciples indeed been so outrageously disrespectful towards their teacher in public, one would not have expected these teachers to command the esteem and respect among the populace that both versions attribute to them.

The Pāli version also provides a sharper contrast to the poor impression cut by the disciples of other teachers, as it portrays the disciples of the Buddha in a more favourable light than the Madhyama-āgama discourse. When reporting a former occasion during which a particular disciple made some noise during the delivery of a discourse, the Pāli version merely records that he cleared his throat, whereas according to the Madhyama-āgama version he had fallen asleep and was

---

<sup>43</sup>c.g. MĀ 207 at T I 781c17.

<sup>44</sup>c.g. M 77 at M II 2,11: *bhante bhagavā*. In relation to another similar instance, Allon (1997: 121) comments that “the use of *bhante* ‘venerable sir’ is particularly unusual as a form of address used by an ascetic towards the Buddha, as is the ascetic referring to the Buddha as *Bhagavā*.”

<sup>45</sup>M 77 at M II 3,17.

snoring, a not too flattering description of what could happen when the Buddha was giving a discourse.<sup>46</sup>

According to the Pāli account, whenever the Buddha gives a teaching his disciples will be poised in silent expectancy comparable to a crowd of people at a crossroads that observes a man who is pressing out honey. This description seems to some degree to conflict with other discourses, which indicate that the disciples of the Buddha were not invariably paying attention during a talk given by their teacher. An example would be the *Bhaddāli-sutta* and its Chinese parallel, according to which the Buddha had to rebuke one of his monk disciples for recurrently paying no attention when his teacher was delivering a discourse.<sup>47</sup>

The Pāli version also stands alone in indicating that disciples who disrobe will nevertheless continue to speak in praise of the Buddha, the *Dhamma* and the monastic community.<sup>48</sup> Other discourses give a less impressive account of former Buddhist monks, suggesting that they did not always speak in praise of their former teacher and his teaching. Thus a discourse in the *Aṅguttara-nikāya* reports the disparaging remarks made by the former Buddhist monk Sarabha, and according to the *Mahāsīhanāda-sutta* the former Buddhist monk Sunakkhatta's denigration of his earlier teacher caused the Buddha to deliver a rather long discourse in order to reveal his qualities and abilities.<sup>49</sup>

In sum, it seems as if the theme of the praiseworthiness of the Buddha did exert some influence on the reciters of the discourse, causing an enhancing of the status of the Buddha that manifests in different ways in the Pāli and Chinese versions.

---

<sup>46</sup>M 77 at M II 4,35 and MĀ 207 at T I 782b18.

<sup>47</sup>M 65 at M I 445,32 and MĀ 194 at T I 749b3.

<sup>48</sup>M 77 at M II 5,14.

<sup>49</sup>A 3.64 at A I 185,8 and M 12 at M I 68,8.

The influence of oral transmission can also be seen in regard to the sequence in which listings are preserved. Variations in the sequence of listings are in fact one of the most prominent features noticeable in comparative studies, often involving differences that are of little doctrinal import. In the present case, such variations manifest in regard to both of the sets of five qualities of the Buddha: those described by Sakuludāyī and those described by the Buddha as what make him truly praiseworthy (see Tables 1 and 2 below).

Table 1 : Sakuludāyī's Listing of Five Qualities of the Buddha<sup>50</sup>

M 77	MĀ 207
takes little food (1)	content with robes (2)
content with robes (2)	content with food (3)
content with food (3)	takes little food (1)
content with dwelling place (4)	content with dwelling place (4)
lives in seclusion (5)	lives in seclusion (5)

Table 2: The Buddha's Listing of His Five Qualities

M 77	MĀ 207
higher virtue (1)	supreme virtue (1)
knowledge and vision (2)	supreme wisdom (3)
higher wisdom (3)	supreme knowledge and vision (2)
teaching of four noble truths (4)	teaching of four noble truths (4)
teaching ways of development (5)	teaching higher knowledge (5)

Another and considerably more significant difference occurs in regard to the last quality in the second of these two groups of five, the Buddha's quality as a teacher of meditative development. The Madhyama-āgama version lists merely recollection of past lives and the eradication of the influxes. Though this is rather brief, as one would have expected at least a reference to the divine eye to complete the standard set of three higher knowledges, the Pāli version in contrast is

---

<sup>50</sup>To facilitate comparison, corresponding qualities in the two versions are provided with numbers in brackets which reflect the sequence of their occurrence in the Pāli version.

unexpectedly long, as it presents a detailed exposition of various aspects of the path (see Table 3).<sup>51</sup> Notably, the first part of this listing follows a numerical ascending order up to the ten *kaṣiṇsas*, while the items listed later instead come in the same sequence as found in the *Sāmaññaphala-sutta*.<sup>52</sup> This gives the impression that two originally independent listings may have been combined in the present instance.

Table 3: The Buddha's Fifth Quality in M 77

Teaching the development of  
 the four establishments of mindfulness,  
 the five faculties,  
 the five powers,  
 the seven factors of awakening,  
 the noble eightfold path,  
 the eight liberations,  
 the eight spheres of transcendence,  
 the ten *kaṣiṇas*,  
 the four *jhānas*,  
 insight into the nature of body and consciousness,  
 production of a mind-made body,  
 supernormal powers,  
 the divine ear,  
 telepathic knowledge of the mind of others,  
 recollection of past lives,  
 the divine eye,  
 the destruction of the influxes.

In a passage repeated after each of these items, the Pāli version indicates that with every one of these practices many disciples of the Buddha have been able to attain accomplishment and perfection of direct knowledge.<sup>53</sup> According to the commentary, this description

---

<sup>51</sup>M 77 from M II 11,3 to M II 22,15.

<sup>52</sup>D 2 from D I 73,23 to D I 84,12; this has been highlighted by Eimer (1976: 53).

<sup>53</sup>M 77 e.g. at M II 11,8: *tatra ca pana me sāvakaḥ bahū abhiññāvosaṇa-pāramippattā viharanti*.

intends full liberation.<sup>54</sup> Such a potential is somewhat unexpected in regard to the development of such practices as the spheres of transcendence (*abhibhāyatana*), the ten *kaṣiṇas*, the production of a mind-made body, supernatural powers, or the divine ear, etc. This specification thus does to some extent read as if an earlier listing may have only had qualities the discourses generally reckon as capable of leading to consummation and perfection through direct knowledge, a listing that might subsequently have been expanded.

In fact, the rather long exposition of all these practices is somewhat out of proportion in comparison with the space allotted to the other four truly praiseworthy qualities of the Buddha. Owing to this long treatment of the fifth quality, the *Mahāsakuludāyī-sutta* has become an unusually long discourse in the Majjhima-nikāya collection, one that, had this long treatment already been part of the discourse at the time of the collection of the Nikāyas, might have earned it a placing in the Dīgha-nikāya instead.

Though a comparative study of the two versions thus brings to light a number of differences that testify to the vicissitudes of oral transmission and its influence on the actual shape of the discourses in the canonical collections of different Buddhist schools, the main message given by both versions remains the same:

What makes the Buddha truly worthy of praise, what causes his disciples to follow him and practise in accordance with his instructions, is not external aspects of behaviour that were held in high esteem in ancient India. Though frugality, a secluded life style and detachment in regard to the requisites of life are key aspects of the path of development in early Buddhism, they are not an end in themselves. What really makes the Buddha worthy of praise is his teaching of how to develop the mind, his disclosure of the path to liberation.

Bhikkhu Anālayo

---

<sup>54</sup>Ps III 243,5.

### Abbreviations

A	Aṅguttara-nikāya
B <sup>c</sup>	Burmese edition
C <sup>c</sup>	Ceylonese edition
D	Dīgha-nikāya
M	Majjhima-nikāya
MĀ	Madhyama-āgama (T 26)
Ps	Papañcasūdanī
SĀ	<i>Samyukta-āgama</i> (T 99)
SĀ <sup>2</sup>	“other” <i>Samyukta-āgama</i> (T 100)
S <sup>c</sup>	Siamese edition
T	Taishō (CBETA)

### References

- Allon, Mark 1997. *Style and Function: A Study of the Dominant Stylistic Features of the Prose Portions of Pāli Canonical Sutta Texts and Their Mnemonic Function*, Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies of the International College for Advanced Buddhist Studies.
- Anālayo 2007. “The Vekhanassa-sutta and Its Madhyama-āgama Parallel: A Case Study in the Transmission of the Pāli Discourses”, *Journal of the Centre for Buddhist Studies, Sri Lanka*, Vol. 5, pp. 89–104.
- Bapat, P.V. 1937. “Dhutaṅgas”, *Indian Historical Quarterly*, Vol. 13, pp. 44–51.
- 1969. “Chinese Madhyamāgama and the Language of Its Basic Text”, in *Dr. Satkari Mookerji Felicitation Volume*, B.P. Sinha, ed., Varanasi: Chowkhamba Publications, pp. 1–6.
- Dantinnc, Jean 1991. *Les qualités de l’ascète (Dhutaṅga): Etude sémantique et doctrinale*, Bruxelles: Thanh-Long.
- Eimer, H. 1976. *Skizzen des Erlösungsweges in buddhistischen Begriffsreihen*, Bonn: Religionswissenschaftliches Seminar der Universität Bonn.
- Enomoto, Fumio 1984. “The Formation and Development of the Sarvāstivāda Scriptures”, in *Proceedings of the Thirty-First International Congress of Human Sciences in Asia and North Africa*, Y. Tatsuro, ed., Tokyo: Tōhō Gakkai, pp. 197–98.
- 1986. “On the Formation of the Original Texts of the Chinese Āgamas”, *Buddhist Studies Review*, Vol. 3, pp. 19–30.

- Freiberger, Oliver 1997. "Zur Verwendungsweise der Bezeichnung paribbājaka im Pāli-Kanon", in *Untersuchungen zur buddhistischen Literatur II*, H. Bechert, ed., Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, pp. 121–30.
- Karunaratna, S. 2004. "Paribbājaka", in *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism*, W.G. Weeraratne, ed., Sri Lanka: Department of Buddhist Affairs, Vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 317–20.
- Lü, Cheng 1963. "Āgama", in *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism*, G.P. Malalasekera, ed., Sri Lanka: Department of Buddhist Affairs, Vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 241–44.
- Majumdar, R.C. 1958. "The Indica of Megasthenes", *Journal of the Oriental Society*, Vol. 78, no. 4, pp. 273–76
- Majumdar, R.C. 1960A. *The Classical Accounts of India*. Calcutta: Mukhpadhyay.
- Majumdar, R.C. 1960B. "The Surrejoinder to K.D. Sethna", *Journal of the Oriental Society*, Vol. 80, no. 3, pp. 248–50.
- Manné, Joy 1990. "Categories of Sutta in the Pāli Nikāyas and their Implications for our Appreciation of the Buddhist Teaching and Literature", *Journal of the Pali Text Society*, Vol. 15, pp. 30–87.
- Mayeda [=Maeda], Egaku 1985. "Japanese Studies on the Schools of the Chinese Āgamas", in *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hīnayāna-Literatur, Erster Teil*, H. Bechert, ed., Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Vol. 1, pp. 94–103.
- McCrimble, J.W., trsl. 1877. *Ancient India as Described by Megasthenes and Arrian: Being a Translation of the Fragments of the Indika of Megasthenes Collected by Dr. Schwanbeck, and of the First Part of the Indika of Arrian*, Bombay: Thacker & Co.
- Minh Chau, Thich 1991. *The Chinese Madhyama Āgama and the Pāli Majjhima Nikāya*, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Ñāṇamoli, Bhikkhu, trsl., 1995. *The Middle Length Discourses of the Buddha*, Bhikkhu Bodhi, ed., Boston, Mass.: Wisdom (references are to the reprint, 2005).
- Nanayakkara, S.K. 1989. "Dhutaṅga", in *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism*, W.G. Weeraratne, ed., Sri Lanka: Department of Buddhist Affairs, Vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 580–85.
- Norman, K. R. 1994. "Pāli Lexicographical Studies XI", in *Collected Papers*, K.R. Norman, ed., Oxford: Pali Text Society, Vol. V, pp. 84–99; orig. publ. 1993, *Journal of the Pali Text Society*, Vol. XVIII, pp. 149–64.

- Pulleyblank, Edwin G. 1991. *Lexicon of Reconstructed Pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese and Early Mandarin*, Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Sethna, K.D. 1960. “Rejoinder to R.C. Majumdar”, *Journal of the Oriental Society*, Vol. 80, no. 3, pp. 243–48.
- von Hinüber, Oskar 1982. “Upāli’s Verses in the Majjhimanikāya and the Madhyamāgama”, in *Indological and Buddhist Studies*, L.A. Hercus, ed., Canberra: Faculty of Asian Studies, pp. 243–51.
- Wagle, Narendra 1966. *Society at the Time of the Buddha*, Bombay: Popular Prakashan.
- Waldschmidt, Ernst 1980. “Central Asian Sūtra Fragments and Their Relation to the Chinese Āgamas”, in H. Bechert, ed., *The Language of the Earliest Buddhist Tradition*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, pp. 136–74.
- Yinshun 1962. 原始佛教聖典之集成 [The Compilation of the Early Buddhist Canon], Taipei: 正聞出版社; (references are to the reprint, 1983).

Acknowledgement: I am indebted to Rod Bucknell and Ken Su for comments on an earlier draft of this article

## **A Small Problem of Tense and Person: Dhammapada 306 and Its Parallels**

Considerable attention has been given over the years to the verses of the Dhammapada corpus. Numerous small problems, however, continue to lurk here and there. Sometimes these problems are obvious, in that a verse as we have it seems to make little sense, while at other times the issues are more subtle. It is always helpful, if not essential, to compare parallel texts, first of all the Pāli Dhammapada, Gāndhārī (Khotan) and Prakrit (Patna) Dharmapadas, Sanskrit Udānavarga(s), and not rarely Chinese translations, quotations (keeping in mind that the relation between quoter and quoted is often unclear), other occurrences (including in non-Buddhist literature) and commentaries. Moreover, we should remain aware that evidence may also be found farther afield. Finally, while paying careful attention to the details of each verse, we must not in the process lose sight of our ultimate goal. Just what this goal may or should be is a question to which I will return at the close of these remarks.

The present contribution concerns a single foot of Dhammapada 306. In the edition of von Hinüber and Norman (1994) the Pāli verse is printed thus:

*abhūtavādī nirayaṃ upeti yo vāpi<sup>1</sup> katvā na karomi cāha  
ubho pi te pecca samā bhavanti nīhīnakammā manujā parattha*

While this may represent a more-or-less readable version of the verse as transmitted in the Pāli tradition(s), some difficulties persist. K.R. Norman's translation (1997) helps us understand this:

---

<sup>1</sup>The editors chose this over the more logical, and in many scripts graphically virtually identical, *cāpi* without stating the reason for their preference. As Oskar von Hinüber tells me (email 7 March 2008), however, they followed the commentary which, with its *vā* with long vowel outside sandhi, clearly indicates this reading. In this regard, it is worth noting that the reasons for preferring any given reading are rarely made explicit by most editors of Buddhist texts.

One who speaks of things that never were goes to hell; or the one who having done something says he did not do it [goes too]: both of these, when passed away, become the same — men with contemptible deeds in the next world.

The philological accuracy of Norman's translations is well known. Nevertheless, here he appears to render neither the tense nor person of the verb in the second pāda strictly. For the text does not have "says he did not do it", but rather something like "says I do not do [it]". Norman's change of first to third person may be attributed simply to the ease of expression in English, in that he wishes to avoid direct speech. The tense appears, at least at first glance, to be more of a problem. Carter and Palihawadana (1987: 332) in their strict literalness illustrate this, translating the second line: "And the one who having done says, 'I don't do this.'"<sup>2</sup> They go on to translate from the commentary (Dhp-a III 477,9-11), which does not help much, other than providing an explicit patient for the gerund along with a corresponding anaphoric pronominal patient for the quoted finite verb: *katvā ti yo vā pana pāpakammaṃ katvā nāhaṃ etaṃ karomī ti āha*, "Or one who, having done a wrong deed, says, 'I do not do this.'"

Von Hinüber and Norman print pāda b as *yo vāpi katvā na karomī cāha*. The editors cite a northern Thai manuscript (of 1786), the Sinhala script "Buddha Jayanti" edition, and the commentary as printed in H.C. Norman's 1912 edition as having the unmetrical (or at the very least, hypermetrical) cadence *karomī ti cāha*. No doubt a more expansive consideration of the (surely voluminous) manuscript evidence would reveal further variant readings, though whether these would be of much value is another question. The same reading, even if not in each case accepted into the main text by the respective editors, is reported for the same verse when it appears in the Itivuttaka, Udāna, Suttanipāta, and

---

<sup>2</sup>They do not, however, quite translate the text they print, which has not the variant *cāpi* but rather *vāpi*. Moreover, their use of quotation marks is interpretive; as we will see, the absence of quotative (*i*)*ti* is a problem here.

Jātaka commentary.<sup>3</sup> Fausbøll's 1855 *editio princeps*, in fact, printed pāda b in this hypermetrical form. In his second edition of 1900 (in which he professed to have corrected the meter), he printed instead *yo vāpi katvā na karomi-cāha* (without explaining the change from the first edition).<sup>4</sup> It is this second edition which forms the basis of the edition of von Hinüber and Norman, although whether their claim to have undone Fausbøll's metrical "corrections" is relevant in this verse I do not know.<sup>5</sup> Another Thai manuscript of the Dhammapada von Hinüber and Norman report as having *karomi ccāha*, a reading likewise found in other just-cited sources for the same verse. Regarding these configurations of pāda b, Fausbøll himself (1855: 394) hypothesized that "*ti* is a gloss, which the ignorance of the scribes introduced into the text; maybe first it had been written as *karomicāha*, either for *karomiccāha* or with pleonastic *ca* (*va*), or with *c* inserted for the sake of euphony."<sup>6</sup> This hypothesis has been noted, directly or indirectly, by subsequent scholars.<sup>7</sup> But what would have been the background behind such a reading?

---

<sup>3</sup>It 42, verse in §48, Ud 45.10 (IV.8), Sn 127, § 661, Ja II 416.31.

<sup>4</sup>I cannot resist quoting from a footnote to the Preface of the 1900 edition (p. ix), which is written in English, although the translation printed in the volume is, as it was in the first edition, in Latin. Having decried the printing of Pāli texts in Siamese script, and having stated that "There can be no doubt about the Roman (Latin) character triumphing at last over all others", Fausbøll wrote: "As certain as the Roman character will be universal, the English language will in time likewise be the universal language of the world, for it is a well known fact that in the beginning the Lord took all languages, boiled them in a pot, and forthwith extracted the English language as the essence of them all." It is a pity that scholars these days rarely dare to write like this.

<sup>5</sup>This rather appears to concern cases of *svrabhakti* vowels for the most part.

<sup>6</sup>*ti* glossa est, quae scribarum inscitia in textum irrepsit, fortasse principio scriptum erat *karomicāha*, sive pro *karomiccāha*, sive cum *ca* (*va*) pleonast., sive cum *c* euphoniae causa inserto. For the translation from the Latin I am indebted to Marieke Meelen.

<sup>7</sup>Brough 1962: 258: "Fausbøll suggested that *ti* was an interpolation, and that *c*- might be the remnant of an original (*i*)*t*i, so that the intended phrase might have been *na karomicchāha* (< *ty āha*).... Although this is unmetrical, it

Parallels in languages other than Pāli might not — at first glance — appear to help much, but in fact they preserve important clues.<sup>8</sup> The so-called Patna Dharmapada (Cone 1989) 114 reads:

*abhūtavādī nirayaṃ upeti yo cāpi kattā na karomī ti āha |  
ubho pi te precca samā bhavanti nihīnakammā manuḥā paratra ||*

This text here is rather close to the Pāli, and in the phrase of interest to us preserves the same tense and person. Moreover, as written pāda b has the same unmetrical (or hypermetrical) reading as do some Pāli sources. To make the pāda metrical, one must read *\*karomī āha*. Removal of the *c* of *cāha* would likewise seem to make the Pāli marginally more understandable, although it would not improve the meter and would introduce an anomalous hiatus. Moreover, a reading *\*karomī āha* is at best awkward in omitting any formal notice of direct speech. Evidently the scribe felt that the hypermeter was preferable to total omission of quotative *iti*. This is not the form found everywhere, however. A Gāndhārī equivalent to this verse (Brough 1962 § 269) reads as follows:

---

seems very probable that it should be re-established as the older Pali reading; for *na karomī ti cāha* is metrically even worse, and *na karomī cāha* is ungrammatical.” Norman 1992 (in notes to Sn 661) and 1997 (in notes to DhP 306), referring to Brough though not to Fausbøll, agrees in taking *karomī cāha* to be a sandhi from *karomī (i)ti āha* with shortening of the the third syllable m.c.: *karomī (i)ti āha* > *karomī ty āha* > *karomī cc āha* > *karomī c āha*; Mascfield 1994: 85, n. 112, simply refers to Norman 1992.

<sup>8</sup>Less help is afforded by the Chinese translations: T. 210 (IV) 570a7-8 (*juan xia*) = T. 212 (IV) 663c29-664a1 (*juan 10*) = T. 213 (IV) 781b3-4 (*juan 1*) = T. 1464 (XXIV) 878c26-27 (*juan 7*): 妄語地獄近 作之言不作 二罪後俱受 是行自牽往. Here T. 213 has for pāda a 妄語入地獄, and T. 213 and 1464 read pāda d as 是行自牽去, both perhaps merely stylistic variants, while for T. 210 some editions have the reading 自作自牽去 for 是行自牽去. This I do not understand, in part because *xíng* 行 evidently translates *karma*. What *zì* 自 might represent I do not know and, likewise, the sense of *qiānwǎng* 牽往 / *qiānqù* 牽去 is not clear to me. One possibility is that the translators understood *\*nihita* for what Indic texts seem to have always as *nihīna*.

*abhūda-vadi naraka uvedi yo yavi*<sup>9</sup> *kitva na karodī āha*  
*uvha'i ami preca sama bhavadi nihiṇa-kama maṇuṇya paratri*

Close to this is the reading in the old *Udānavarga*, preserved (except for a lacuna in pāda d) in the so-called Subaṣi manuscript, (Nakatani 1987) 8.1:

*abhūtavādīr narakām upaiti yaś cāpi kṛtvā na karoti āha* <sup>10</sup>  
*ubhāv atau pretya samau bhavanti*<sup>11</sup> *nihīnakarmau ...* ||

To this we may compare the Tibetan translation of the *Udānavarga* (Zongtse 1990):

*gang dag gis byas bzhin ma byas zer ba dang* ||  
*brdzun du smra ba* [v.l. *la*] *dmyal bar 'gro bar 'gyur* ||  
*mi de gnyis ka 'dra ba pha rol tu* ||  
*song nas dman pa'i chos dang ldan par 'gyur* ||

In Tibetan, pādas a and b are inverted, the portion in question being rendered *gang dag gis byas bzhin ma byas zer ba*. Two things are peculiar. First, *gang dag* probably points to a plural. It might, however, indicate a dual, for which the correlative is *mi de gnyis ka* in pāda c. Neither formulation is supported in any Indic version. Second, *byas*

<sup>9</sup>Regarding my writing *yavi* for Brough's *ya vi*, see below.

<sup>10</sup>The newer recension has for pāda b: *yaś cānyad apy ācaratīha karma*. I cannot account for this reading in relation to any other sources of the verse.

<sup>11</sup>Nakatani inexplicably prints *ubhā va tau*, which would seem to make of *ubhā* a form parallel to Pāli/Patna *ubho*, but then what of *va*? I think his division of the text unlikely. It does have the merit, however, of avoiding the odd form *atau*, which may, as Brough (1962: 258) thinks, be a miswriting for *etau* — or is it possible that there has been some confusion from *adas*? (To this correspond Gāndhārī *ami* [Sanskrit *amī*] and Pāli and Patna *te*.) The recensionally later *Udānavarga* text reads this pāda: *ubhau hi tau pretya samau niruktau*. This demonstrates the redactor's efforts to make the verse better Sanskrit. It was impossible for the Subaṣi redactor to retain Middle Indic *pi* as Sanskrit *api*, since this would have resulted in unmetrical *\*ubhāv api*, a problem the later redactor solves with *ubhau hi*. However, even though he is basically writing Sanskrit, the Subaṣi redactor seems to have been happy with *bhavanti* (also in the Middle Indic versions) with a dual subject, which the later *Udānavarga* redactor found unacceptable, replacing the finite verb with *niruktau*, as again Brough pointed out.

suggests a preterite. Note that the use of *bzhin* probably indicates a sense of duration, such that the two actions of doing (something) and saying (“I didn’t do it”) are simultaneous. We will return to this below. Let us see what we can make of the Gāndhārī and Sanskrit texts of pāda b.

Both the Gāndhārī and the Sanskrit agree in having, like the Pāli, a present tense finite verb. But whereas the Pāli and Patna Dharmapada have a first person form, *karomi*, Gāndhārī and Sanskrit present the third person *karoti*. This is hard to understand; who is the agent of *karoti*, if not the speaker of *āha*? But if so, the form should be *karomi*. However, it may be that these questions of tense and person are connected. Concerning this problem, Brough (1962: 258) wrote as follows:

Although the precise form can only be guessed, there need be no doubt that the verse started its career with a verb in a past tense. There is thus no occasion to consider *karomi* here as a “timeless” present — and still less justification to render it as an English present; for why should a man go to hell for telling the truth?<sup>12</sup> Most probable would be an aorist, *na karaṃ ti āha*; or perhaps we should spell it *n’akaraṃ*, since this aorist normally preserves its augment. After the aorist has come to be felt archaic, *karomi*, first as an explanation, and then as a replacement, leads directly to the Pali readings. In the Prakrit, the same original would be expected to appear as *n=akaru* (or *n=akaro*) *di āha*, inevitably to be misunderstood as in the U[dānavarga], *na karoti*. For the Prakrit, an imperfect *\*akaraṃ* < *akaraṃ* would have given the same result. There is of course no means of deciding, in the absence of other examples, whether the Prakrit was still correctly understood when our manuscript was written, and it is possible that the transcription here should be *karo di*.

Brough appears to suggest that pāda b as initially composed had as its finite verb an aorist: *akaraṃ*. This was then negated: *na + akaraṃ*, whence *nākaraṃ* before (*i*)*ti āha*. Written in or transmitted through a script such as Kharoṣṭhī in which vowel length is generally not

---

<sup>12</sup>I confess that Brough’s point here is obscure to me.

marked,<sup>13</sup> this would produce *nakaraṃ ti āha*, then understood as *na karaṃ ti āha*. With final °aṃ expressed as °o (through °u),<sup>14</sup> and voicing of intervocalic -t-, this would lead to *na karo di āha* > *na karodi āha* = *na karoti āha*, when *karo* was no longer understood as preserving a first person aorist. As an alternative hypothesis, Brough suggests the imperfect *akaravaṃ*, which written with Middle Indic -o- for -ava- would appear as *akarom*.

Carter and Palihawadana (1987: 491) express their unhappiness with Brough's approach in the following terms:

[T]he ancientness of the present tense form is proved by [the Patna *Dharmapada*] 114, which too has *na karomīti āha*, and the old MSS of [Udānavarga] (viii, I), which have *na karomīti prāha*<sup>15</sup> and *na karoti āha* (see Bernhard [1965] p. 161). Obviously, what prompts [Brough] to suspect the reading and suggest complex alternatives to it is the idea that the present tense does not make good sense here. This is an assumption that can be questioned. Perhaps the composer of the verse had in mind the offender who defensively says that he “does not do” (present tense) that kind of thing?

Why might Brough have felt the need of a preterite finite verb, and is such a sense justified? Carter and Palihawadana's suggestion that “the composer of the verse had in mind the offender who defensively says that he ‘does not do’ (present tense) that kind of thing” is hardly convincing. There are, however, grammatical grounds for doubting the need for a past tense verb form.

In the expression *yo cāpi katvā na karomi cāha*, the action of saying (*āha*) “*na karomi*” seems to follow the action indicated by the gerund *katvā*. According to Speyer (1886 § 380), “in its most common employment the gerund may be said to do duty as a past participle of the active. . . . As a rule, it denotes the prior of two actions, performed by

<sup>13</sup>It seems that the long *ā* in this verse is the only instance in the Gāndhārī (Khotan) *Dharmapada*. See Glass 2000 § 1.1.1.

<sup>14</sup>See Brough 1962 §§ 21, 75.

<sup>15</sup>In fact all that the ms in question LB279 preserves is *///[rom]īti prāha*; see Bernhard 1965.

the same subject.” The same is true in Middle Indic; as Hendriksen (1944: 112-16, §41) has detailed, the Pāli gerund may indicate “that the action expressed by the gerund in time precedes that of the principal verb”, this being its ordinary usage. However, this is not always and necessarily the case. Hendriksen goes on to explain that “[s]ometimes the gerund indicates what is simultaneous with the principal verb”, and indeed the same holds true of Sanskrit (Speyer 1886 §381). If we understand the relation of gerund and finite verb *āha* to be one of simultaneity, it would be possible to understand the present tense of the quoted “*na karomi*”, and to translate the phrase “while doing something, one says/claims, [‘I am not doing [it. ’]” With this extremely awkward bracketing of the quotation marks I seek to emphasize that the text as we have it here has, in fact, no formal indication of quotation, that being one of its difficult points. Regarding the other feature of this translation, we recall here that the simultaneity of the verbs appears also to have been intended by the Tibetan translation quoted above by its use of *bzhin*. Despite this possibility, however, such gymnastics may not be necessary.

As Speyer (1886: 244, §325) points out with reference to Pāṇini 3.2.120, 121, a present tense may indicate a “near past”. He refers to the example cited in the *Kāśikāvṛtti* as follows:<sup>16</sup> “If one asks ‘have you made the mat?’, the answer may be, when using *na*, *na karomi* or *nākārṣam* ‘no, I have not’, or if an interrogation, ‘have I not?’” This suggests that there can be no formal grammatical objection against the use of the present *karomi*, understood as conveying a recently completed action; it would make good sense in our sentence, and be acceptable even by the norms of Pāṇinian Sanskrit.<sup>17</sup> This could explain either why the sentence could have been composed using a present finite verb in the first place, or why once the verb was rewritten in a present finite

---

<sup>16</sup>*naśabde nuśabde copapade pṛṣṭaprativacane vibhāṣā laṭpratyayo bhavati bhūte | akārṣiḥś kaṭaṃ devadatta | na karomi bhoḥ | nākārṣam | ahaṃ nu karomi | ahaṃ nu akārṣam ||*

<sup>17</sup>See also Bechert 1958.

form it was not judged objectionable. In spite of the seeming elegance of this proposed solution, it is merely partial. The third person *karoti* in the Gāndhārī and Sanskrit versions remains unexplained, as does the employment of *na karomi āha* without any quotative *iti*. Brough's hypothesis hints at a relation between these two problems.

In looking for an original first person past verb form, Brough postulated an original first person aorist *akaram*, from which he judged *akaro* to be a phonetic development. While this is not entirely impossible, such an aorist in Gāndhārī would probably have developed into *\*akare*.<sup>18</sup> More problematic, however, is his suggestion that *akaro* represents the imperfect *akaravaṃ* > *\*akarom* > *\*akaro*. In the first place, as discussed by Oskar von Hinüber (2001: §479), the imperfect is almost totally vanished from Middle Indic. Secondly, *-ava-* is not known to become *-o-* before *-ṃ* in either Old or Middle Indic (email from Oskar von Hinüber 7 March 2008). This suggests that the former possibility of an aorist is considerably more likely than the latter explanation, although neither is supported by strong evidence.

However we might account for the form of the verb, much can be explained by postulating a form *(a)karo(ṃ)*, which would have been followed by an *iti*, written *ti* as is normal in Middle Indic. When this *ti* was attached to the preceding *(a)karo*, it was not recognized as an independent phonological unit. Hence the *-t-* which came after a now lost word boundary was voiced, yielding *(a)karodi*. Since the tendency to voice intervocalic stops is responsible for the development *-t- > -d-*, we would ordinarily expect that *aka-* would have become *aga-*. It seems that *\*agarom* would also have been possible, but at least with *-k-* this voicing does not always take place.<sup>19</sup>

What of the augment prefixed to the hypothesized *akaraṃ* > *akaro*? The resulting sequence *\*nāka-* in the pāda *yo yavi kitva nakarodi āha* creates an unusual scansion. The pāda would most

<sup>18</sup>According to a personal communication from Stefan Baums, aorists in Gāndhārī mostly develop *-aṃ > e*, although *-aṃ > o* cannot be ruled out.

<sup>19</sup>See Brough 1962, §38.



light of these usages, it would be possible to imagine a situation in which the metrical fault caused by the long  $\bar{a}$  of  $n\bar{a}ka^\circ$  could have been avoided through the use of an original augmentless aorist,  $karom$ . Either because of accidental omission of the anusvāra, or because it was felt to be erroneous when  $ti$  (for  $iti$ ) was understood to be  $-ti$  as the third person singular ending of  $karoti$ , the text came to be transmitted in the form  $na karoti$ . Subsequently, the third person form was felt anomalous, because of its position as quoted speech, and replaced easily by the metrically equivalent first person  $karomi$ . Moreover, the juxtaposition of two finite verbs, the quoted  $karomi$  and the following  $\bar{a}ha$  was also felt irregular, and ‘corrected’ by insertion of (according to this scenario, secondary)  $iti$ . Through normal phonological development this came to be reduced as follows:  $iti > ti > ty$  (preceding  $\bar{a}ha$ )  $> cc > c$ , various stages of this process being evidenced in different versions of pāda b, or in different readings within the Pāli tradition itself.

There is currently no direct evidence that would positively confirm the postulation of an original preterite in the phrase in question. But I believe that such a hypothesis best accounts for the variously attested forms of the pāda.

A passage in the Abhidharmakośabhāṣya may shed further light on the problem. It is important to notice that the context of the expression to be quoted below is precisely the same as that in the Dhammapada, namely in forming part of a discussion of the problem of lies. We find the following stated in regard to the issue of stipulations regarding acceptable speech (Pradhan 1975: 218.9–14):

*atha kasmāt mṣāvādād viratir evopāsakasaṃvaraśikṣāpadaṃ na paśūnyādiviratīḥ | ...*

*mṣāvādaprasaṅgāc ca sarvaśikṣāvīyatikrame | (34ab)*

*sarvatra hi śikṣātikrame samanuyujyamānasyopasthitam idaṃ bhavati nāham evaṃ akārṣam<sup>22</sup> iti mṣāvādasya prasaṅgo bhavati |*

<sup>22</sup>Pradhan prints *ahārṣam*, which is corrected here with Funahashi 1987: 192, n. 1, who refers to Tib. *ma byas so* and Chinese 不作. Without access to the manuscript, I do not know whether *ahārṣam* is a genuine reading or a misprint

Why is only the abstention from lying speech [listed as] a rule of behavior of the layman's vows, not the abstention from slander and the rest? ...

And because if he violated all [the other] rules of behavior, he would necessarily lie about it. [34ab]

For whenever he has violated a rule of behavior, it would occur that, being questioned about it, [he would respond]: "I didn't act like that!" inevitably resulting in lying speech.

Here the phrase *nāham evam akārṣam iti* parallels precisely the expression of interest to us. The verb here is a first person aorist. This cannot prove the speculation that the original form of the Dharmapada verse contained a preterite, much less an aorist. It does, however, illustrate that at least the author of the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* felt that an appropriate expression of precisely this sentiment in precisely this context would be expressed in the aorist. Almost needless to say, the denial of responsibility for the action, this denial constituting the lie in question, must have been expressed in the first person as direct speech. It is correspondingly likely that Brough's explanation for the development of the present forms, in both persons, is correct. Originally in first person, they came to be (mis)understood as in third person, then reconfigured to first person to account for the circumstance that they are quoted in direct speech. The employment of the first person present form is thus tertiary. The verse as originally conceived is likely to have had a first person unaugmented aorist, recast through error as a third person present. The *Gāndhārī* (Khotan) Dharmapada and the *Subaṣi Udānavarga* preserve, in different forms or phases, this secondary stage. This uncomfortable reading was ultimately reformulated, this time through conscious and intentional revision, into the first person present found in the *Pāli Dhammapada* and *Patna Dharmapada*.

What can we learn from all of this? Or put another way, what might be the goal to which I referred at the beginning of this essay?

---

in Pradhan's edition. However, in some North Indian scripts *k* and *h* can be confused. I am grateful to Harunaga Isaacson for discussion on this point.

There is no doubt that the task the modern editors of the Gāndhāri, Patna and Subaṣi texts set for themselves was, quite appropriately, merely the establishment of the most reliable diplomatic edition of the single available manuscript of their respective texts. Any remarks about the history of the text or suggested better readings were to be relegated to notes. In an ideal world, the task of editors of “the” Pāli Dhammapada is — or should be — different. In this case, assuming that such an editor believes in the unity of the text, a first task is to determine what sort of edition is to be produced. Since there is no one traditional and “canonical” version of the text, but rather manuscript evidence containing, *inter alia*, variant readings, the first task of an editor is to decide what he or she wishes the edition to (re)present. As far as I know, few editors of Indian Buddhist texts so far have explicitly discussed this question in a scientific manner. As far as the Dhammapada is concerned, however, we are in a somewhat better situation than usual. In the notes to his translation, which in some sense can be seen as also constituting his notes to the edition he published together with von Hinüber, Norman has given extensive discussions of text critical problems. However, while he renounced any idea of recreating, reconstructing or discovering an Ur-Dhammapada, he did not correspondingly explicitly address the question of what sort of edition of the Dhammapada he did aim for. And this may be because this is a question very difficult to answer. If what one seeks is not some proto-text, what criteria guide the choice of one reading over another? If, as in the case of the verse under discussion here, it can well be argued that the metrically correct (or more common, or less idiosyncratic) reading chosen by the editors reflects (nothing more than?) a late attempt to salvage something from an even worse situation, should the editors merely go ahead and print this attested but otherwise problematic reading? Or should the editors attempt to restore a historically more justified text, even if they know that they cannot reach far enough back to create something “original”? If they conclude that competing but equally faulty “traditional” readings are found in their sources, how are

they to choose what to print? In fact, editors may well conclude, as I would suggest is in fact the case in our verse, that the early and meaningful shape of the verse was lost already by the time the text was (re)cast in Pāli. In such a case, is an editor justified in printing any reading at all? Or should the conclusion rather be that the best that can be achieved is the compilation of a set of materials, with explanatory annotation, pointing to the solution or possible solutions of a crux which the materials at hand do not permit one to resolve? Would this not better be seen as renunciation of the task of editor than as demonstrating scientific restraint? These questions and more cannot be avoided by a serious student of this literature. Seen in this light, the long history of attention to the Dharmapada literature should surely not be understood as signaling that all fundamental questions, much less small difficulties, have been addressed. Rather, I suspect that the more we dig, the more we will find quite the opposite to be true.

Jonathan A. Silk

#### REFERENCES

The titles of Pāli texts are as in *CPD*.

- Andersen, Dines, and Helmer Smith, eds., 1913, *Sutta-Nipāta*. Reprint, London: Pali Text Society, 1965
- Bechert, Heinz, 1958, "Über den Gebrauch der indikativischen Tempora im Pāli", *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 3 (1953), pp. 55–72
- Bernhard, Franz, ed., 1965, *Udānavarga* (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Phil.-hist. Klasse. Dritte Folge 54/ Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden 10.1), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Brough, John, ed., 1962, *The Gāndhāri Dharmapada* (London Oriental Series 7), London: Oxford University Press
- Carter, John Ross and Mahinda Palihawadana, trs., 1987, *The Dhammapada: A New English Translation with the Pali Text and the First English Translation of the Commentary's Explanation of the Verses with Notes Translated from Sinhala Sources and Critical Textual Comments*, New

York: Oxford University Press

Cone, Margaret, ed., 1989, "Patna Dharmapada", *Journal of the Pali Text Society* Vol. XIII, pp. 101–217.

Fausbøll, [Michael] V[iggo], ed., 1855, *Dhammapadam: Ex tribus codicibus Hauniensibus Palice editū, Latine vertit, excerptis ex commentario Palico notisque illustravit*, Copenhagen: Haeredes Reitzelii

———, ed., 1879, *The Jātaka together with Its Commentary*, Vol. II, Trübner, reprint, London: Pali Text Society, 1990

———, ed., tr., 1900, *The Dhammapada: Being a Collection of Moral Verses in Pāli*, London: Luzac

Funahashi Issai 舟橋一哉, 1987, *Kusharon no Genten Kaimei Gobon 俱舍論の原典解明 業品*, Kyoto: Hōzōkan 法藏館

Geiger, Wilhelm [Ludwig], 1994, *A Pāli Grammar*, trans. by Batakrishna Ghosh; rev. and ed., K.R. Norman, Oxford: Pali Text Society (German original 1916)

Glass, Andrew. 2000. "A Preliminary Study of Kharoṣṭhī Manuscript Palaeography", Master's Thesis, University of Washington

———, 2001, "A Preliminary Study of Gāndhārī Meter: The Meter of the Khotan Dharmapada", unpublished paper

Hendriksen, Hans, 1944, *Syntax of the Infinite Verb-Forms of Pāli*, Copenhagen: Einar Munksgaard

von Hinüber, Oskar, 2001, *Das ältere Mittelindisch im Überblick*, 2nd rev. ed. (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte 467; Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Südasiens 20), Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften

——— and K[enneth] R[oy] Norman, eds., 1994, *Dhammapada*, Oxford: Pali Text Society

Masefield, Peter, tr., 1994, *The Udāna*, Oxford: Pali Text Society

Nakatani, H[ideaki], ed., 1987, *Udānavarga de Subaṣi* (Publications de l'Institut de Civilisation indienne, série in-8° 53), Paris: Collège de France, Institut de Civilisation indienne

Norman, H[arry] C[ampbell], ed., 1912, *The Commentary on the Dhammapada*. Volume III, London: Pali Text Society/Henry Frowde

Norman, K[enneth] R[oy], tr., 1992, *The Group of Discourses (Sutta-Nipāta)*,

- Vol. II: *Revised Translation with Introduction and Notes* (Pali Text Society Translation Series 45), Oxford: Pali Text Society
- , tr., 1997, *The Word of the Doctrine (Dhammapada)* (Pali Text Society Translation Series 46), Oxford: Pali Text Society
- Pradhan, Prahlad, ed., 1975, *Abhidharmakośabhāṣyam of Vasubandhu* (Tibetan Sanskrit Works 8), Patna: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute
- Renou, Louis, 1975, *Grammaire sanscrite*, 2nd corrected ed., Paris: Adrien Maisonneuve
- Speyer, Jacob Samuel, 1886, *Sanskrit Syntax*, Leiden, reprint, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1988
- Steinthal, Paul, ed., 1885, *Udāna*, London: Pali Text Society, reprint 1982
- Windisch, Ernst, ed., 1889, *Iti-vuttaka*, London: Pali Text Society, reprint 1975
- Zongtse, Champa Thupten, with Siglinde Dietz, 1990, *Udānavarga*, Vol. 3: Der tibetische Text (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Dritte Folge 187 / Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden 10.3), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

**Corrigenda et postscriptum for “On the  
Correspondence of Helmer Smith and Gunnar Jarring”,  
*Journal of the Pali Text Society*, Vol. XXIX (2007),  
pp. 407–20**

Page 412, lines 19–20: *Read father for father’s wife*

Page 414, line 5: *Read 8 August for 2 June*

Page 414, line 21: *Read 1951 for 1937*

Page 415, line 15: *Read 1951 for 1935*

Page 415, note 23, line 1: *Read två for tv*

Page 416, note 29, line 4: *Read ansåg for ansjg*

Page 418, note 32, lines 4–5: *Read rkh assimilert, ū förkortat [framför] gruppen for > rkh assimilert, ū förkortat [framför] gruppen*

Page 418, note 32, line 13: *Read mürkha for murkha*

Page 418, note 32, line 20: *Read tjockskalle for tjurskalle*

Page 418, note 32, line 22: *Read Turuška, som lär for Turaska, som*

Page 419, note 35, line 4: *Read förvaras for férvaras*

Page 419, note 36, lines 1–13: *Read “Kommentaren vet i allmänhet bra besked ... men jag blir mer och mer övertygad om att det finns två sorters pali: en sort som talades av Buddha och skrevs av Buddhaghosa, tikakāraerna, Aggavaṃsa, Moggalāna och andra therac och förstods och lästes av Fausböll och Trenckner mfl. detta är första sortens pali; den andra sortens pali är smidigare och mer 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.”*

Page 419, note 36, lines 2–5 (“Käre Per, ... Din tillgivne Gunnar.”) are to be deleted.

Postscriptum: Page 420, immediately after line 1: Having re-read Smith’s letter to Nils Simonsson again and again and discussed it with several colleagues, I have become sure that Helmer Smith, one of the

most outstanding scholars of Pāli, cannot have been serious in this letter addressed to N. Simonsson. It had probably nothing to do with local patriotism. Smith simply tried to make fun of Jarring, Simonsson, and certain historians of religion in Lund by making these extremely odd statements.

Siegfried Lienhard

## An Index to *JPTS* Volumes IX–XXX

An Index to the Journals of the Pāli Text Society (1882–1927 = Volumes I–VIII), compiled by P.D. Ratnatunga (Mudaliyar) and revised with an Appendix and arranged by S.S. Davidson, was published by the Society in 1973. This index lists, by author, the articles published in the Journals since it was revived in 1981. The years of publication are: IX (1981), X (1985), XI (1987), XII (1988), XIII (1989), XIV (1990), XV (1990), XVI (1992), XVII (1992), XVIII (1993), XIX (1993), XX (1994), XXI (1995), XXII (1996), XXIII (1997), XXIV (1998), XXV (1999), XXVI (2000), XXVII (2002), XXVIII (2006), XXIX (2007), XXX (2009).

Allon, Mark. A Gāndhārī Version of the Simile of the Turtle and the Hole in the Yoke	XXIX.229–62
———. Primoz Pecenko, 1947–2007	XXX.1–3
Anālayo, Bhikkhu. The Buddha’s Truly Praiseworthy Qualities : According to the Mahāsakuludāyi-sutta and Its Chinese Parallel	XXX.137–60
Balbir, Nalini. The I.B. Horner Lecture 1997: Jain– Buddhist Dialogue: Material from the Pāli Scriptures	XXVI.1–42
———. Three Pāli Works Revisited	XXIX.331–65
Bangchang, Supaphan na. A Pāli Letter Sent by the Aggamahāsenāpati of Siam to the Royal Court at Kandy in 1756	XII.185–212
Bareau, André. The Theravādins and East India According to the Canonical Texts	IX.1–9
Baums, Stefan, <i>see</i> Salomon, Richard	
Bechert, Heinz. The Bauddhayāna of Indonesia: A Syncretistic Form of Theravāda	IX.10–21
Blackburn, Anne M. Notes on Sri Lankan Temple Manuscript Collections	XXVII.1–59
Bodhi, Bhikkhu. The Susīma-sutta and the Wisdom– Liberated Arahant	XXIX.51–75
———. Susīma’s Conversation with the Buddha: A Second Study of the Susīma-sutta	XXX.33–80
Braun, Heinz. The Colophons of Burmese Manuscripts	XXVII.147–53

- Buddhadatta, Aggamahāpaṇḍita Polvatte. XI.155–226  
 Paramatthavinicchaya by Anuruddha
- Collins, Steven. *Kalyāṇamitta* and *Kalyāṇamittatā* XI.51–72  
 ———. On the Very Idea of the Pāli Canon XV.89–126  
 ———. The Story of the Elder Māleyyadeva XVIII.65–96  
 ———. *See also* Denis, Eugène
- . Remarks on the Third Precept: Adultery and XXIX.263–84  
 Prostitution in Pāli Texts
- Cone, Margaret. Patna Dharmapada. Part I: Text XIII.101–217  
 ———. The I.B. Horner Lecture 1995: Lexicography, XXII.1–34  
 Pāli, and Pāli Lexicography  
 ———. *caveat lector* XXIX.95–106
- Cousins, Lance S. The Paṭṭhāna and the Development IX.22–46  
 of the Theravādin Abhidhamma
- Crosby, Kate. Sāriputta’s Three Works on the XVIII.49–59  
*Samantapāsādikā*  
 ———. *Saṅkhepasārasaṅgaha*: Abbreviation in Pāli XXIX.169–74
- Denis, Eugène, and Steven Collins. Braḥ XVIII.1–64  
 Māleyyadevatthera-vatthu
- Dundas, Paul. A Note on the Heterodox Calendar and XXIX.76–92  
 a Disputed Reading in the Kālakācāryakathā
- Exell, R.H.B. Rūpārūpavibhāga by Buddhadatta XVI.1–12
- Filliozat, Jacqueline. Documents Useful for the XVI.13–54  
 Identification of Pāli Manuscripts of Cambodia,  
 Laos and Thailand  
 ———. A Survey of Burmese and Siamese Pāli XIX.1–41  
 Manuscript Collections in the Wellcome Institute  
 ———. The Commentaries to the Anāgatavaṃsa in the XIX.43–63  
 Pāli Manuscripts of the Paris Collections  
 ———. Catalogue of the Pāli Manuscript Collections in XXI.135–191  
 Burmese and Siamese Characters Kept in the Library of  
 Vijayasundarārāmaya, Asgiriya  
 ———. Survey of the Pāli Manuscript Collection in the XXIV. 1–80  
 Bodleian Library, Oxford  
 ———. Nine Pāli Manuscripts in the Vatican Library XXVI.139–60
- Gethin, R.M.L. Mythology as Meditation: From the XXVIII. 63–112

- Mahāsudassana Sutta to the Sukhāvativyūha Sūtra  
 ———. What’s in a Repetition? On Counting the Suttas of the Saṃyutta-nikāya XXIX.367–89
- Gombrich, Richard F. A New Theravādin Liturgy IX.47–73  
 ———. Old Bodies like Carts XI.1–3  
 ———. Three Souls, One or None: The Vagaries of a Pāli Pericope XI.73–78  
 ———. Two Notes on Visuddhimagga IX:1. The Etymology of *Puggala*; 2. An Imperfect Form in Pāli XII.169–71  
 ———. A Note on Ambapālī’s Wit XV.139–40  
 ———. Making Mountains Without Molehills: The Case of the Missing Stūpa XV.141–43  
 ———. Why Is a *Khattiya* Called a *Khattiya*? The Aggañña Sutta Revisited XVII.213–14  
 ———. The Monk in the Pāli Vinaya: Priest or Wedding Guest? XXI.193–213  
 ———. Report of the Pāli Text Society for 1994 XXI.215–17
- Grey, Leslie. Supplement to the *Concordance of Buddhist Birth Stories* XXIV.103–47
- Hallisey, Charles. Tuṇḍilovāda: An Allegedly Non-Canonical *Sutta* XV.155–95  
 ———. A Propos the Pāli Vinaya as a Historical Document: A Reply to Gregory Schopen XV.197–208  
 ———. Nibbānasutta: An Allegedly Non-Canonical *Sutta* on *Nibbāna* as a Great City XVIII.97–130
- Hara, Minoru. A Note on *vinaya* XXIX.285–311
- Hazlewood, Ann Appleby. A Translation of Pañcagatidīpanī XI.133–59  
 ———. *Saddhammopāyana*: The Gift Offering of the True Dhamma XII.65–68
- Hinüber, Oskar von. The Ghost Word *Dvīhitika* and the Description of Famines in Early Buddhist Literature IX.74–86  
 ———. Two Jātaka Manuscripts from the National Library in Bangkok X.1–22  
 ———. The Oldest Dated Manuscript of the Milindapañha XI.111–19

- . An Additional Note on the Oldest Dated Manuscript of the Milindapañha XII.173–74
- . Remarks on a List of Books Sent to Ceylon from Siam in the Eighteenth Century XII.175–83
- . Khandhakavatta: Loss of Text in the Pāli Vinaya-piṭaka? XV.127–38
- . The Arising of an Offence: *Āpattisamuṭṭhāna* XVI.55–69
- . The *Nigamanas* of the Sumaṅgalavilāsinī and the Kaṅkhāvitaranī XXI.129–33
- . Chips from Buddhist Workshops: Scribes and Manuscripts from Northern Thailand XXII.35–57
- . The Paramatthajotikādīpanī, a Fragment of the Sub-commentary to the Paramatthajotikā II on the Suttanipāta XXIII.27–41
- . *Tuvaṭṭati/tuvaṭṭeti* Again XXVI.71–75
- . Lān<sup>2</sup> Nā as a Centre of Pāli Literature during the Late 15th Century XXVI.119–37
- . Preface XXIX.ix–xiv
- . *See also* Mettanando Bhikkhu.
- Horner, Isaline Blew. *Keci* “Some” in the Pāli Commentaries X.87–95
- Hundius, Harald. The Colophons of Thirty Pāli Manuscripts from Northern Thailand XIV.1–173
- Hüsken, Ute. The Legend of the Establishment of the Order of Nuns in the Theravāda Vinaya-piṭaka XXVI.43–69
- Jackson, P. A Note on Dhammapāla(s) XV.209–11
- . The Canonicity of the Netti and Other Works XXVIII. 61–62
- Jaini, Padmanabh S. *Tirthaṅkara-prakṛti* and the Bodhisattva Path IX.96–104
- . A Note on *micchādīṭṭhi* in Mahāvamsa XXIX.153–68
- Jong, Jan Willem de. Fa-Hsien and Buddhist Texts in Ceylon IX.105–15
- Jurewicz, Joanna. Playing with Fire: The *Pratītya-samutpāda* from the Perspective of Vedic Thought XXVI.77–103
- Kahrs, Eivind G. Exploring the Saddanīti XVII.1–212

- . Commentaries, Translations, and Lexica: Some Further Reflections on Buddhism and Philology XXIX.137–51
- Kalupahana, D.J. The Philosophy of History in Early Buddhism IX.117–26
- Khantipālo, Bhikkhu. Where’s That *sutta*? A Guide to the Discourses in the Numerical Collection (Aṅguttara-nikāya) X.37–153
- . See also Laurence C.R. Mills
- Kieffer-Pülz, Petra. Stretching the Vinaya Rules and Getting Away with It XXIX.1–49
- Lamotte, Étienne. The Gāravasutta of the Saṃyutta-nikāya and Its Mahāyānist Developments IX.127–44
- Lienhard, Siegfried. On the Correspondance of Helmer Smith and Gunnar Jarring XXIX.409–22
- . Corrigenda et postscriptum for “On the Correspondence of Helmer Smith and Gunnar Jarring” XXX.177–78
- Liyanaratne, Jinadasa. Pāli Manuscripts of Sri Lanka in the Cambridge University Library XVIII.131–47
- . South Asian Flora as Reflected in the Twelfth-Century Pāli Lexicon Abhidhānappadīpikā XX.43–161
- . A Pāli Canonical Passage of Importance for the History of Indian Medicine XXII.59–72
- . Sri Lankan Manuscriptology XXVIII.39–48
- Lottermoser, Friedgard. Minor Pāli Grammar Texts: the Saddabindu and Its “New” Subcommentary XI.79–109
- Manné, Joy. Categories of *Sutta* in the Pāli Nikāyas and Their Implications for Our Appreciation of the Buddhist Teaching and Literature XV.29–87
- . Case Histories from the Pāli Canon I: The Sāmaññaphala Sutta Hypothetical Case History or How to Be Sure to Win a Debate XXI.1–34
- . Case Histories from the Pāli Canon II: *Sotāpanna*, *Sakadāgāmin*, *Anāgāmin*, *Arahat* – the Four Stages Case History or Spiritual Materialism and the Need for Tangible Results XXI.35–28
- Matsumura, Junko. Remarks on the Rasavāhīni and the Related Literature XXV.153–70

- Mellick Cutler, Sally. The Pāli *Apadāna* Collection XX.1–42
- Mettanando Bhikkhu & O. von Hinüber. The Cause of the Buddha's Death XXVI.105–17
- Mills, Laurence C.R. The Case of the Murdered Monks XVI.71–75  
 ———. *See also* Bhikkhu Khantipālo
- Mori, Sodo. *Uttaravihāraṭṭhakathā* and *Sārasamāsa* XII.1–47  
 ———. Recent Japanese Studies in the Pāli Commentarial Literature XXIX.175–90
- Nihom, Max. *Kāmaloka*: A Rare Pāli Loan Word in Old Javanese XX.163–70
- Nolot, Édith. Studies in Vinaya Technical Terms I–III (1. *saṃgha-kamma*; 2. *adhikaraṇa*; 3. *mānatta, parivāsa, abbhāna*) XXII.73–150  
 ———. Studies in Vinaya Technical Terms IV–X XXV.1–111  
 (4. The disciplinary procedures of *tajjanī ya-*<sup>o</sup>, *nissaya-*<sup>o</sup>, *pabbājanī ya-*<sup>o</sup>, *paṭisāraṇī ya-*<sup>o</sup>, and threefold *ukkhepanī ya-kamma* (n.);  
 5. *Nissāraṇā* (f.)/*nissāraṇī ya* (n.), *osāraṇā* (f.)/*osāraṇī ya* (n.); 6. *Nāsanā* (n.f.), “expulsion”;  
 7. *Daṇḍa-kamma* (n.), “punishment”;  
 8. *Pakāsānī ya-kamma* (n.), “procedure of proclamation”; 9. *Patta-nikkujjanā*<sup>o</sup>/*-ukkujjanā* (n. f.), “turning down/up the alms-bowls”)
- Norman, Kenneth Roy. Devas and Adhidevas in Buddhism IX.145–55  
 ———. Pāli Lexicographical Studies III: Ten Pāli Etymologies X.23–36  
 ———. Pāli Lexicographical Studies IV: Eleven Pāli Etymologies XI.33–49  
 ———. Pāli Lexicographical Studies V: Twelve Pāli Etymologies XII.49–63  
 ———. Pāli Lexicographical Studies VI: Six Pāli Etymologies XIII.219–27  
 ———. Pāli Lexicographical Studies VII: Five Pāli Etymologies XIV.219–25  
 ———. Index to JPTS Volumes IX–XIV XIV.227f.  
 ———. Pāli Lexicographical Studies VIII: Seven Pāli XV.145–54

Etymologies	
———. Index to JPTS Volumes IX–XV	XV.213f.
———. Pāli Lexicographical Studies IX: Four Pāli Etymologies	XXVI.77–85
———. Pāli Lexicographical Studies X: Two Pāli Etymologies	XVII.215–18
———. Pāli Lexicographical Studies XI: Six Pāli Etymologies	XVIII.149–64
———. Index to JPTS Volumes IX–XVIII	XVIII.177–80
———. External Sandhi in Pāli (with Special Reference to the Suttanipāta)	XIX.203–13
———. Pāli Lexicographical Studies XII: Ten Pāli Etymologies	XX.211–30
———. Book Review ( <i>Catalogue of the Burmese–Pāli and Burmese Manuscripts in the Library of the Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine</i> )	XXVI.161–64
———. Index of Grammatical Points Discussed in the Notes to <i>Elders’ Verses</i> I	XXVI.165–68
———. The Anāgatavaṃsa Revisited	XXVIII. 1–37
———. On Translating Literally	XXX.81–97
———. Bibliography	XXX.99–135
Oberlies, Thomas. Pāli, Pāṇini and “Popular” Sanskrit	XXIII.1–26
———. A Study of the Campeyya Jātaka, Including Remarks on the Text of the Saṅkhapāla Jātaka	XXVII.115–46
Pecenko, Primoz. Sāriputta and his Works	XXIII.159–79
———. Līnatthapakāsīnī and Sāratthamañjūsā: The <i>Purāṇaṭīkāś</i> and the <i>Ṭīkāś</i> on the Four Nikāyas	XXVII.61–113
———. The History of the Nikāya Subcommentaries ( <i>ṭīkāś</i> ) in Pāli Bibliographic Sources	XXX. 5–32
Penth, Hans. Buddhist Literature of Lān Nā on the History of Lān Nā’s Buddhism	XXIII.43–81
Pind, Ole Holten. Studies in Pāli Grammarians I: Buddhaghosa’s References to Grammar and Grammarians	XIII.33–81
———. Studies in Pāli Grammarians II. I	XIV.175–218

- Pruitt, William. References to Pāli in Seventeenth-Century French Books XI.119–31
- . Burmese Manuscripts in the Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. XIII.1–31
- . Additions to the Burmese Manuscripts in the Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. XXIV.171–83
- . The Career of Women Disciple Bodhisattas XXIX.391–407
- Rahula, Walpola. Humour in Pali Literature IX.156–74
- Roock, A. Index of K.R. Norman's *Collected Papers* I–VII XXVI.169–231
- Ruegg, David Seyfort. A Further Note on Pāli *Gotrabhū* IX.175–77
- Saddhatissa, Hammalava. Pāli Literature in Cambodia IX.178–97
- . *Nāmarūpasamāso*: The Summary of Mind and Matter XI.5–31
- . *Nāmacāradīpikā* XV.1–28
- Salomon, Richard, and Stefan Baums. Sanskrit *Ikṣvāku*, Pāli *Okkāka*, and Gāndhārī *Ismaho* XXIX.201–27
- Schmithausen, Lambert. On Mahāyānasūtrālaṅkāra VII.1 XXIX.199–200
- Schopen, Gregory. The *Stūpa* Cult and the Extant Pāli Vinaya XIII.83–100
- . The Ritual Obligations and the Donor Roles of Monks XVI.87–107
- . The Buddhist *Bhikṣu*'s Obligation to Support His Parents in Two Vinaya Traditions XXIX.107–36
- Silk, Jonathan. A Small Problem of Tense and Person: Dhammapada 306 and Its Parallels XXX.161–76
- Skilling, Peter. The Rakṣā Literature of the Śrāvakayāna XVI.109–82
- . A Citation from the \*Buddhavaṃsa of the Abhayagiri School XVIII.165–75
- . Theravādin Literature in Tibetan Translation XIX.69–201
- . Vimuttimagga and Abhayagiri: The Form-Aggregate According to the Saṃskṛtāsaṃskṛtaviniścaya XX.171–210
- . The *Sambuddhe* verses and Later Theravāda Buddhism XXII.150–83
- . On the School-Affiliation of the "Patna Dhammapada" XXIII.83–122

- . New Pāli Inscriptions from South-East Asia XXIII.123–57
- . A Note on King Milinda in the  
Abhidharmakośabhāṣya XXIV.81–101
- . A Note on Dhammapada 60 and the Length of  
the *Yojana* XXIV.149–70
- . Praises of the Buddha Beyond Praise XXIV.195–200
- . The Sixty-Four Destructions According to the  
Saṃskṛtāsaṃskṛtaviniścaya XXV.112–18
- . On a New Edition of the Syāmaratṭhassa  
Tepiṭakaṭṭhakathā XXVII.155–58
- . Some Citation Inscriptions from South-East  
Asia XXVII.159–75
- . Jātaka and Paññāsa-jātaka in Southeast Asia XXVIII. 113–73
- . Zombies and Half-Zombies: Mahāsūtras  
and Other Protective Measures XXIX.313–30
- Somaratne, G.A. Intermediate Existence and the  
Higher Fetters in the Pāli Nikāyas XXV.119–52
- Stargardt, Janice. The Oldest Known Pāli Texts,  
Fifth–Sixth Century. Results of the Cambridge  
Symposium on the Pyu Golden Pāli Text from  
Śrī Kṣetra, 18–19 April 1995 XXI.199–213
- Thiradhammo Bhikkhu. Corrections to *The Book  
of the Discipline* XIX.65–68
- Warder, A.K. Some Problems of the Later Pāli  
Literature IX.198–207

## CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS VOLUME

Dr Mark Allon  
Department of Indian  
Subcontinental Studies  
MacCallum Brennan Building A18  
University of Sydney  
Sydney, NSW 2006  
Australia

Mr K.R. Norman  
6 Huttles Green  
Shepreth, Herts.  
SG8 6PR  
U.K.

Venerable Bhikkhu Anālayo  
Center for Buddhist Studies  
University of Hamburg  
Alsterterrasse 1  
20354 Hamburg  
Germany

Dr Jonathan Silk  
Instituut Kern / Universiteit Leiden  
Postbus 9515  
2300 RA Leiden  
The Netherlands

*And*  
Dharma Drum Buddhist College  
2-6 Xishishu, Jinshan 20842  
Taiwan, R.O.C.

Professor Siegfried Lienhard  
August Wahlströms väg 1, 8 tr  
S-18231 Danderyd  
Sweden

Venerable Bhikkhu Bodhi  
Chuang Yen Monastery  
2020 Route 301  
Carmel NY 10512  
U.S.A.

## **PTS Research Grants**

In keeping with the aim of the Pali Text Society to foster and promote the study of Pali texts, the Council of the PTS invites applications for PTS Research Grants from suitably qualified persons working in the field of Pāli studies. Applicants' research will normally be expected to lead towards material suitable for publication by the PTS, and conditions of any grant awarded will be that the PTS has first option on the publication rights of the research and holds the copyright of any material it publishes.

Applications should be submitted by 28 February and 31 August of each year for consideration by the Council of the PTS in March and September respectively. Applicants are asked to submit (1) a statement briefly outlining their research project (two A4 pages with an appendix if necessary) clearly stating the purpose of their research, indicating a timetable for its completion, and stating whether they will be working on the project full-time or part-time, (2) a CV, (3) the names of two academic referees, (4) a statement of their financial circumstances. Grants will not normally be awarded to those in full-time academic employment.

Grants may be awarded to cover a period of research (full-time or part-time) up to a maximum of one year, but with a possibility of renewal. Applications should be sent either by email ([pts@palitext.com](mailto:pts@palitext.com)) or by post to the President of the Pali Text Society, c/o CPI Antony Rowe — Melksham, Unit 4 Pegasus Way, Bowerhill Industrial Estate, Melksham, Wilts, SN 12 6 TR, U.K.