

Pali Text Society

JOURNAL

OF THE

PALI TEXT SOCIETY

VOLUME XVIII

EDITED BY

K.R. NORMAN

*Published by*  
THE PALI TEXT SOCIETY  
OXFORD

1993

© *Pali Text Society* 1993

ISBN 0 86013 307 9

First published in 1993  
Distributed by Lavis Marketing  
73 Lime Walk  
Oxford OX3 7AD

Printed in Great Britain by Antony Rowe Ltd, Chippenham, Wilts

## CONTENTS

<i>Brah Māleyyadēvattheravatthum</i>	1
Introduction	
By Steven Collins	1
Text	
By †Eugène Denis S.J.	19
<b>The Story of the Elder Māleyyadēva</b>	
By Steven Collins	65
<i>Nibbānasutta</i> : an allegedly non-canonical <i>sutta</i> on <i>Nibbāna</i> as a Great City	
By C. Hallisey	97
<b>Pāli Manuscripts of Sri Lanka in the Cambridge University Library</b>	
By J. Liyanaratne	131
<b>Pāli Lexicographical Studies XI</b>	
By K.R. Norman	149
<b>A Citation from the *Buddhavamsa of the Abhayagiri School</b>	
By P. Skilling	165
<b>Index to JPTS Volumes IX–XVIII</b>	
By K.R. Norman	177

Contributors to this Volume	181
Notice from the Council of the Pali Text Society	183
Editorial Notice	185

# BRAH MĀLEYYADEVATTHERA VATTHU

## I

In 'L'Origine Cinghalaise du P'rah Malay' (*Felicitation volume of Southeast Asian Studies Presented to H.M. Prince Dhaninivat*, Vol. 2, Bangkok, 1965, pp. 329–38), the late Eugène Denis S.J. (1921–86) stated that the École Française d'Extrême-Orient was to publish his 1963 Sorbonne doctoral thesis, which was entitled 'Brah Māleyyadēvattheravatthum, Légende bouddhiste du saint thera Māleyyadēva. Texte établi d'après des manuscrits inédits en caractères cambodgiennes, accompagné d'une introduction et d'une traduction, avec une traduction du P'rah Malay siamois qui en est dérivé'. Unfortunately this did not happen, and the article remains his only publication on the topic to date. Very few primary sources for the story — better, stories — of Māleyya<sup>1</sup> are yet available in the West, and Denis' thesis has proved elusive to a number of scholars who have tried to find it: even those in Paris, including Denis' Directeur de travaux, André Bareau, seem to have had some difficulty in locating a copy. The Pali Text Society has acquired one through Professor O. von Hinüber, itself taken from a copy in the library of the University of Göttingen. It seemed to us that it would be useful to make available here Denis' text, accompanied by a translation of it into English.<sup>2</sup> The story of Māleyyadēva is known to have been very important in the practice of traditional Thai Buddhism; but the text is also relevant to the matters of linguistic and literary history with which the JPTS is more specifically

<sup>1</sup> The Pali form of the name is spelt variously, as Maliya, Malaya, Māleyya, etc., sometimes with one of the suffixes -mahādeva or -deva; sometimes these suffixes are used alone (as in the text p. 58 below). For brevity I shall use Māleyya.

<sup>2</sup> Permission for the present publication has been given by Denis' surviving sister, Mme Marie-Thérèse Saulnier; we are grateful to Jacqueline Filliozat for contacting Mme Saulnier on our behalf.

concerned. Denis' edition was certainly intended as no more than a pioneering first attempt; more work must be done on other manuscripts before anything like a definitive version of this particular Māleyya text can be established. But it can already contribute to the further understanding of Pali in Southeast Asia, and to that of the literary history of the Pali tradition.

Denis' Introduction contains four sections: I — 'The Legend of P'rah Malay'; II — 'The thera Māleyyadeva — Sinhalese sources; III — 'The development of the legend — Southeast Asian texts'; IV — 'The Influence of the legend in Southeast Asian countries'; and two accounts of manuscripts: V — 'Description of the documents' [in Thai and Pali, on which his edition and translations were based]; and VI — 'A list of manuscripts of the P'rah Malay found at Luang Prabang and Vientiane'. There follow translations of the *Māleyyadevattheravatthu* (hereafter Mth-v), of Chapter 10 of the *Rasavāhīnī*, and of the *P'rah Malay* [sometimes transliterated *Phra Malai*], and a Bibliography; and then the text of Mth-v, and of relevant sections of the *Rasavāhīnī* and *Sahassavatthu*, transcribed from Sinhalese editions.<sup>1</sup> Some of the Introduction has been published, in the article mentioned above; for this reason, and also because new information has appeared in the thirty years since the thesis was written, what follows here is a summary (section III below), with additional information. A final section IV gives Denis' description of the manuscripts used, and explains how we have established the text of Mth-v from Denis' typescript.

---

<sup>1</sup> The former has not been edited in a European edition; the latter is forthcoming from the PTS, edited by Jacqueline Filliozat. On these texts, see now T. Rahula, 'The *Rasavāhīnī* and the *Sahassavatthu*: a Comparison', in *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* Vol. 7, 2, 1974, pp. 169-84.

## II

It has become clear in recent years that certain features of Southeast Asian Pali may well not be scribal errors, as had been previously thought, but genuine characteristics of the language as it was used in later Pali literature from that region. As is clear from his comments translated below (p. 15), Denis was aware of this, referring to F. Martini's edition and translation of the *Dasabodhisatta-uddesa* (*Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* 36, 1936, pp. 287–390), and G. Terral's edition and study of the 'Samuddaghosajātaka: conte pali tiré du *Paññāsa-jātaka*' (*Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* 48, 1956, pp. 249–351).<sup>1</sup> Mth-v provides further evidence in support of this hypothesis.

As far as the literary history of Pali is concerned, study of the text will contribute to our knowledge of later Pali materials, and specifically to our assessment of the place of non-canonical texts in Buddhist cultures. In one of the earliest references to the Māleyyadeva story, G. Coedès cited it as an example of 'a certain number of apocryphal *suttas* and *jātakas* which must have been forged in Thailand' ('Note sur les ouvrages Pali composés en pays Thai', *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* 15 (3), 1915, p. 40 and note 3. He was followed in this assessment by A.B. Griswold ('A Warning to Evildoers', *Artibus Asiae* Vol. XX, 1957, p. 18 and note 1) and by H. Saddhātissa ('Pali Literature of Thailand', in L. Cousins et al. (eds.) *Buddhist Studies in Honour of I.B. Horner*, Dordrecht 1974, p. 215). Some manuscripts have the word *sutta* in their title; but neither the Pali version printed here, nor the translation of the Thai *P'rah Malay* given

<sup>1</sup> See also now P.S. Jaini's edition of the *Paññāsa-jātaka* (2 Vols., PTS 1981–83); K.R. Norman, *Pāli Literature* (Wiesbaden, 1983) pp. 144, 178, and the works cited there; and C. Hallisey, 'Nibbānasutta: an allegedly non-canonical *sutta* on Nibbāna as a great city'. (See pp. 97 foll. below).

by Denis in his thesis, nor a translation of the 'royal' Thai version (*Phra Malai Kham Luang*) kindly made available to me by Bonnie Brereton show any sign of attempting to resemble a *sutta*: they are not spoken by the Buddha (indeed they open with an address to him), nor do they begin *evam me sutam*. Further empirical research into different versions is necessary; but also, on a theoretical level, it is by no means clear that the language of 'apocryphal forgeries' is helpful in addressing the issues here. Even in the case of texts which do resemble *sutta*-s formally, it may be that the form should be taken as a sign of literary genre rather than an attempt at historical deception. Moreover, the designation *sutta* for texts not included in the traditional *piṭaka* list cannot pre-judge the issue of whether their contents differ from those of 'the Canon', nor does it indicate whether or not the texts so called have been regarded in practice in the same way as 'the Canon'. For these reasons Charles Hallisey has suggested that we use a phrase of K.D. Somadasa, 'allegedly non-canonical', or perhaps some other such as 'deutero-canonical', to refer to texts of this kind ('*Tuṇḍilovāda*: an allegedly non-canonical *Sutta*', *JPTS* Vol. XV, 1990, pp. 156–58; '*Nibbānasutta*: an allegedly non-canonical *sutta* on *Nibbāna* as a great city', [see pp. 97 foll. below]). In the case of the *Māleyyadevattheravatthu*, the classificatory issue of its 'canonicity' is clear: it is neither in the *sutta* genre nor in the *piṭaka* lists. Whether or not we should regard it as being comparable to the 'canonical' texts in status and/or use is an empirical issue, to be decided — perhaps differently — for specific times and places.<sup>1</sup>

The need for both further empirical research and further discussion of the descriptive concepts we employ is also evident in relation to the question of the origin and development of the story, an issue addressed by Denis in his article and in the Introduction to his

---

<sup>1</sup> See my remarks, and those cited from C. Keyes, in 'On the Very Idea of the Pali Canon', *JPTS* Vol. XV 1990, pp. 103–4.

thesis. I shall discuss empirical data in III below. Here I wish to quote some remarks of A.K. Ramanujan on the *Rāmāyaṇa*, which I think apply very well to the range of stories referred to as those of Māleyya, Vessantara, and 'the' *Anāgatavamsa* (the name not of a text but of a family of texts), three closely associated strands of the Theravāda tradition. Ramanujan writes of the many different 'tellings' of the Rāma story:

Obviously, these hundreds of tellings differ from one another. I have come to prefer the word *tellings* to the usual terms *versions* or *variants* because the latter terms can and typically do imply that there is an invariant, an original or *Ur*-text — usually Vālmīki's Sanskrit *Rāmāyaṇa*, the earliest and most prestigious of them all. But ... it is not always Vālmīki's narrative that is carried from one language to another.

The variety and number of different tellings lead him to suggest that

the cultural area in which the *Rāmāyanas* are endemic has a pool of signifiers (like a gene pool), signifiers that include plots, characters, names, geography, incidents and relationships. Oral, written, and performance traditions, phrases, proverbs ... [all] carry allusions to the Rāma story. These various texts not only relate to prior texts directly, to borrow or refute, but they relate to each other through this common code or common pool. Every author, if one may hazard a metaphor, dips into it and brings out a unique crystallization, a new text with a unique texture and a fresh context.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> 'Three Hundred Rāmāyanas', in P. Richman (ed.), *Many Rāmāyanas: the Diversity of a Narrative Tradition in South Asia* (University of California Press, 1991); quotes from pp. 25, 46.

Although the different tellings of the stories about Māleyya, Vessantara, the Bodhisatta Metteyya and other future Buddhas, are not so varied as those of the characters of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, Ramanujan's choice of language here seems to me helpful in considering the origin and development of the Māleyya stories, as well as the relationships — both textual and contextual — between these stories and those of Metteyya and Vessantara. The particular telling found in this written text of the *Māleyyadevattheravatthu* seems most likely to have occurred first in Thailand; but as Denis shows, the 'pool of signifiers' from which this 'crystallization' was taken began in Sri Lanka.

### III

In the first section of his Introduction Denis cites previous notices of the Māleyya stories: in chronological order these are: E. Burnouf, *Essai sur le pali* (Paris, 1826), pp. 209–12; G. Cœdès (as above); L. Finot, *Recherches sur la littérature laotienne* (*Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* XVII, 1917, pp. 65–66; P. Schweisguth, *Etude sur la littérature siamoise* (Paris, 1951), p. 129; Prince Dhaninivat's review of a Thai re-publication of the 18th century '*Phra Malai*, royal version', in the *Journal of the Siam Society* 1948 (1), pp. 69–72; A.B. Griswold (as above); and finally he refers to three tellings of the story, two in written form from Burma and Sri Lanka, and one oral chant ('une vieille mélopée') provided to him in writing by Ven. Wachissara from Southern Sri Lanka. The Burmese text is from the *Madhurarasavāhīnī Vatthu*; the bibliographical details cited by Denis (as also in his article) can now be supplemented by H. Braun and Daw Tin Tin Myint, *Burmese Manuscripts Part 2 (Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland*, Band XXIII, 2, Stuttgart, 1985), pp. 192–93. Denis cites the Sinhalese text from a manuscript in the British Museum, referred to in D.M. de Z. Wickremasinghe, *Catalogue of the Singhalese manuscripts of the British Museum* (London, 1900);

it consists in verses, in variant form, from the Mth-v, which Denis gave as Appendix D (see p. 63 below).<sup>1</sup> Most of these verses are in fact found in the *Sihalavatthupakarana* (hereafter Sih), a text which Denis consulted in a Sinhalese edition, and which has since been published by J. Ver Eecke (née Filliozat) in *Publications de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* Vol. CXXIII (Paris, 1980). Unfortunately he failed to notice that story III of that collection not only contains the verses, but indeed many of the elements of the Māleyya story as found in Mth-v.<sup>2</sup> In Ver Eecke's edition of Sih III, she cites similar sections from two manuscripts in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, of which the first is entitled *bra māleyyasutra*, with *māleyyadevatheravaṇṇa* (*sic*) in the colophon, and the second *bra māleyyadevatheraatthavannana* (*sic*). In

<sup>1</sup> Denis gives the number wrongly in the first section, and in his article, as 109: it is 129 on pp. 142–43 (as correctly noted in the thesis p. 47 note 109). In Wickremasinghe's catalogue, the text is given as *Sampiṇḍi-mahānidāna*, 'an extract from a Pali text as yet unidentified, accompanied by a Sinhalese commentary'. In C.E. Godakumbara's *Catalogue of Ceylonese Manuscripts* (in the Royal Library) (Copenhagen, 1980), p. 200, what would appear to be the same verses — Godakumbara cites the last in Pali, which is almost identical to Denis' version — are found in a text called by him *Devadūtadharmañdesanāva* and dated at the end of the 17th or beginning of the 18th centuries. In K.D. Somadasa's *Catalogue of the Hugh Nevill Collection of Sinhalese Manuscripts in the British Library*, Vol. 2 (London, 1989) a number of texts with this or similar titles are found, none of which seem to contain the verses; on pp. 3–4, however, they are said to be in a work called *Sampiṇḍimahānidānaya* (*Maitreya-Maliyadeva-sakacchā*), described by Nevill as 'a series of thirteen Pali Gāthās, accompanied by a free enlarged translation in Sinhalese'. W.A. de Silva's *Catalogue of palm-leaf manuscripts in the Colombo Museum* (Colombo, 1938) contains three texts, nos. 1450–52, with this same title. In Saddhātissa's 'Pali Literature in Cambodia' (*JPTS* Vol. IX 1981), p. 181, he refers to a *Sampiṇḍita-mahānidāna*, 'known in Sri Lanka as *Mahāsampiṇḍitanidāna*'. This text does refer to Metteyya, but it seems to have nothing to do with the Māleyya story; it is discussed and translated in part in Saddhātissa's *Birth Stories of the Ten Bodhisattas* (London, 1975), pp. 43–45.

<sup>2</sup> Ver Eecke notes that there seem to have been some unclarities in the Sinhalese edition (op. cit., p. IV), which may perhaps account for the oversight.

her main text, story III ends with the words *metteyyavatthu tatiyam*. The modern Burmese bibliographical work *Pitakattamain* states that *Sīh* was composed in Sri Lanka, but it is likely that its compilers 'had access to materials current in Southeast Asia',<sup>1</sup> and the title may well simply refer to the fact that most of its stories are set in Sri Lanka. This text must have been written before the first half of the 15th century, since it is mentioned in a Burmese inscription of A.D. 1442, but it remains uncertain whether some or all of it can be traced back to Sri Lanka.

It is, however, certain that some elements of the story — the pool of signifiers — can be traced back to Sri Lanka, and this is the subject of Denis' section II, on the Sinhalese sources for the elder Māleyyadeva. The lack of reference to *Sīh* story III renders this section somewhat out-dated. Denis refers to previous discussions of monks called by various similar names, by T.W. Rhys Davids, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1901, pp. 889 foll., and by A.P. Buddhadatta, in the introduction to his Sinhala script edition of the *Sahassavatthu*, concluding that it is impossible to tell whether all the uses of the name concern one and the same person; he thinks that there was an original historical figure to whose name legendary elements were added. The texts which deal with Maliya/Māleyya etc. are, in the order treated<sup>2</sup>: Mp I 38–39, Ps V 101–03, Vism 241–42 (= HOS ed. VIII 49), Ja IV 490, VI 30, Mhv XXXII 49–50, Mhv-ṭ 606. Although it is by no means clear that the similarity of names shows that we are dealing here with a single figure, historical or legendary, it is true that many of the stories concern excellence at preaching, which is one of Māleyya's characteristics in *Mth-v*. Denis discusses only story 41 of *Sīh*, which is quite different from *Mth-v*, although the name Māleyyadeva does appear in it and it does have a generic resemblance to *Mth-v* in so far as it concerns the

<sup>1</sup> K.R. Norman, *Pāli Literature*, p. 154.

<sup>2</sup> Abbreviations used are those of the Critical Pāli Dictionary.

value of giving.<sup>1</sup> He then describes three stories found both in the *Sahassavatthu* and *Rasavāhinī*; the former text is mentioned in the same inscription of 1442 mentioned above, and the latter is dated to the 13th or 14th centuries A.D.<sup>2</sup> The first resembles story 41 of *Sīh*; the second concerns giving, and has *Maliyadeva* (as the name appears there) conversing with *Sakka* on that subject. The faint analogy to the Māleyya story found in these stories is much stronger in the third, *Sah* story 77 and *Ras* Chapter 10, 1. Here *Maliyadeva* visits the *Cūlāmaṇi* shrine in heaven with a layman, sees various gods and explains to the layman the good deeds done by them on earth which resulted in their rebirth there. At the end *Metteyya* appears<sup>3</sup> and gives the layman a celestial robe; the latter returns to earth, and thereafter dies and is reborn in the *Tusita* heaven. (*Ras* is more elaborate than *Sah*, but the essentials of the story are the same.)

The third section, on the development of the legend in Southeast Asia, can be improved on now thanks to the work of Bonnie Brereton: see her article 'Some comments on a Northern Thai *Phra Mala* Text dated C.S. 878 (A.D. 1516)', forthcoming in *Journal of the Siam Society*; and her recent doctorate thesis at the University of Michigan, 'The *Phra Malai* Theme in Thai Buddhist Literature: a study of three texts' (1992). The thesis makes clear that, as mentioned above, there are a number of different 'tellings' of the stories involving Māleyya, Metteyya and Vessantara, in Pali and various vernaculars, some of them closely intertwined. Brereton's article enables us to improve on Denis' dating. The text discussed there, which very closely parallels *Mth-v*, is

<sup>1</sup> Denis says that the title of the story is *Māleyyadevattheravatthu*, which follows one of the titles given by the Sinhalese edition; Ver Eecke (op. cit., pp. V–VI) gives also *vanibbakayāgudāko*.

<sup>2</sup> K.R. Norman, op. cit., p. 155.

<sup>3</sup> The *Ras* version given by Denis contains the very surprising phrase *aneka-satapacceka-buddha-bodhi-sattehi ca parivuto*, used of Metteyya.

in the form of a *nissaya*: that is, what is presented as a Thai 'commentary' on a Pali text. One might conclude that a version of Mth-v in Pali was in existence at that time, but it is by no means clear that the *nissaya* form does not result in fact from a Thai story grouped around Pali phrases invented for the sake of linguistic and religious prestige. But clearly the contents of Mth-v, in whatever linguistic form, were already in existence in the early 16th century in something close to the Mth-v version. Many other aspects of Denis' treatment remain valuable, however. He says that although the story of Māleyya was also known in Burma, the texts through which we can come to know it are primarily preserved in Thailand and Cambodia. (Information on mss. known to Denis can be found in his article, pp. 330–31 note 6. The manuscripts from which Buddhadatta made his Sinhalese edition of Sīh, which Ver Eecke then transliterated in the Ee, were all in Burmese script.) The general structure of the story is, as he says, already present in the Ras and Sah versions. Certain narrative elements and emphases are changed in the Southeast Asian versions, and others added. The principal additions are, (i) in vernacular versions, extensive descriptions of the hells visited by Māleyya (which themselves draw on materials such as the *Nimi-jātaka* and the visits to hell by Moggallāna in the *Mahāvastu*<sup>1</sup>), and in both vernacular and Pali versions; (ii) more elaborate tellings of the previous good deeds done by the inhabitants of heaven and of Metteyya's bodhisatta-career; (iii) the connection between hearing recitations of the *Vessantara-jātaka* and rebirth at the time of Metteyya; (iv) the account by Metteyya of the degeneration and renewal of religion (itself taken, sometimes word-for-word, from the *Cakkavatti-sihanāda Sutta* of the *Dīgha Nikāya*, which Denis curiously fails to mention); and (v) Metteyya's account of the paradisial conditions which will obtain

<sup>1</sup> This is also a feature, Denis remarks, of the *Traibhūmi-kathā*: see now the translations by G. Cœdès and C. Archaimbault, *Les Trois Mondes* (Publications de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient, Vol. LXXXIX, 1973) and F.E. and M.B. Reynolds, *The Three Worlds* (Berkeley, 1982).

when he is reborn on earth. Denis states that many of the developments of the part of the story concerning Metteyya are found in sections of the *Saddharmālankāraya*,<sup>1</sup> a 14th century Sinhala work which is otherwise a translation of Ras. Given that the dating and provenance of these stories are uncertain, it cannot be decided if this Sinhala version is an indigenous creation or taken from texts originating in Southeast Asia.

The association between the Māleyya story and that of Vessantara has been discussed by S.J. Tambiah, *Buddhism and the Spirit Cults of Northeast Thailand* (Cambridge University Press, 1971), and L. McClung, *The Vessantara Jātaka: paradigm for a Buddhist Utopia* (Ph.D. thesis, Princeton University 1975). Denis cites a Burmese author of the early 20th century who states that the two were recited together, and a Burmese inscription from 1201, which Luce interpreted as referring to successive recitations of the two texts.<sup>2</sup> Brereton (1992) further explores the connection; manuscripts often contain the two stories together.

In the short fourth section, on the influence of the story in Southeast Asia, Denis discusses the times and occasions at which Māleyya texts were recited (the end of the Rainy Season Retreat, marriages and funerals, merit-making ceremonies) and adds some information about the manner of reciting the texts which is of interest not only for the social history of these stories, but also for our appreciation of the relation between written text and performance context. He cites K.E. Wells, *Thai Buddhism: its rites and activities* (Bangkok, 1939), p. 233, who reports that normally there were three reciters, one for Māleyya, one for Indra (Sakka) and one for Metteyya;

<sup>1</sup> According to W. Rahula, *History of Buddhism in Ceylon* (Colombo 1956), p. xxxv note 2, called the *Metteyya-vastu*.

<sup>2</sup> Denis cites G.H. Luce, *Inscriptions of Burma* (n.d.), Portfolio I Plate XXII lines 1-7.

and states that skilled reciters of the text could gain a considerable reputation (he cites R. Lingat, 'Le Wat Rajapratistha', *Artibus Asiae* 1961 Vol. XXIV p. 232). Denis made a tape recording of one of the last celebrated reciters of the Māleyya story then living in Bangkok. He was a famous reciter of the 'Liké' form of 'popular comic theatre'. The passages chanted were from the earlier part of the Thai *P'rah Malay*, concerning hells and the tortures endured by their inhabitants: the first two passages were chanted by a monk in an ordinary tone; the next nine by the reciter, 'in the Petchaburi tone. The style is more complex and dramatic'; the last seven passages were chanted by him in a manner resembling that of the 'Liké' theatre. Denis adds that on a number of occasions decrees were passed against this manner of chanting the *P'rah Malay*, and goes on to give examples:

'These recitations led often to excess. The crowd liked reciters who acted the part of their characters and did not hesitate to make use of comic gestures and tones. A decree of 1801 legislated on the subject: 'on the occasion of funerals, the "master of ceremonies" is forbidden to invite monks to recite the *P'rah Malai*; only the *P'rah Aph'ith'amma* [the *Abhidhamma*] is to be recited in an ordinary tone, not in the Indian, Chinese, European or Môn tones . . . . If there are laypeople who want to recite the *P'rah Malay*, they may do so, but should avoid a comic tone [un ton plaisant (drôle)] . . . .'

A law of 1782 had already warned monks against reciting the *P'rah Malay* and similar texts in a theatrical manner. It also throws an interesting light on the popularity of devotion to Metteyya at that time. It stated that "many people endeavour to accomplish all kinds of meritorious acts so as to be able to meet [Metteyya], according to the instructions given to *P'rah Malay* by [Metteyya] himself, who recommended that everyone revere and listen to the *Vessantara-jātaka* in One Thousand Verses in order to meet him in the future . . . . Monks who preach the Law and laity who listen to the [*Vessantara-jātaka*] should

use the Pali [text] and the Commentaries; if they want to meet [Metteyya] in the future, they should not use rhyming texts, and the comical, theatrical manner of representing P'rah Malay, which is an offence against the Vinaya".'

## IV

In the fifth section of his Introduction, Denis describes the Thai and Pali manuscripts he used, and his reasons for making the edition of the Pali Mth-v as he did; his remarks concerning the latter are:

'For the Pali text [of Mth-v] we were able to use five manuscripts:

1. A manuscript in the Bibliothèque Nationale de Bangkok (Mss Pali No. 147), of which we have a photocopy. It is written in 'mūl' characters engraved on ola-leaves. There are 24 ola-leaves, thus 48 pages, with 5 lines per page. The first page contains only the title: 'Brah Māleyyadēvatthera- vatthum, 1 ph'uk (1 bundle). This is without doubt the best preserved manuscript, and we reproduce it as the main text. We refer to it as M1.
2. A manuscript in the Institut Bouddhique de Pnom-Penh [*sic*], given to the Institut in 1930 by the Dañnap monastery in Kampong Chhnang [*sic*] province. It is written in 'mūl' characters on 26 ola-leaves, thus 52 pages, with 5 lines per page. The Ven. Brah Grū Saṅghasatthā P.S. Dharmārāma, of the Lycée Boudhique of Pnom-Penh, has been kind enough to copy this text for us in 'mūl' characters and to send us the copy. We had asked him to transcribe it faithfully without standardising the Pali. He writes that the manuscript cannot be old, as it is easily legible. We have ascertained that the text of this manuscript is very similar to that of the Bangkok manuscript, with only one interpolation [see text p. 26 note 2]. We refer to it as M2.

3. A manuscript in the Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris (cf. A. Cabaton, *Catalogue sommaire des manuscrits Pali de la Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris*. 2e fasc. No. 326) (gift of the Société des Missions Étrangères). It is written in 'mūl' characters on ola-leaves. There are 18 ola-leaves, thus 36 pages, with one line per page, but the last ola leaf is for protection only and the first carries only the title: *Brah Māleyya Sutrah* [sic]. The text is written in a good, regular hand. The title is in different handwriting and seems to have been added afterwards. Notes in Cambodian have been added on the first and second pages. This manuscript contains quite significant variations from M1. We have had to reproduce entire passages at the end of the notes [Appendices A, B, C]. We refer to it as M3.
4. A manuscript in the Bibliothèque de Paris, No. 658 in A. Cabaton's *Catalogue*. It is in 'mūl' script on ola-leaves. There are 12 ola-leaves, thus 24 pages, with 5 lines per page. The first page has the title: *Brah Māleyya devathera* [sic]. The text is incomplete and only covers the first part (the arrival of the 12 Junior Gods) and the beginning of the second part, finishing in the middle of a sentence. We refer to it as M4.
5. A manuscript in the Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris, No. 659 in A. Cabaton's *Catalogue*. It is written in 'mūl' characters on ola-leaves. There are 13 ola-leaves, but five are for protection only at the end, and the first carries only the title: *Brah Māleyya devathera atthavaññanā* [sic]. There are therefore only 7 ola-leaves left, thus 14 pages, with 5 lines per page. It is the shortest text; it is very incomplete, only covering the last part, and even the beginning of this part is missing. It begins in the middle of a sentence. This is not a continuation of No. 658 [i.e. M4], as one might think. The writing is neat and regular, very different from the preceding manuscript. Moreover the texts are not continuous. We refer to it as M5.

None of these manuscripts carries a date. A. Cabaton, in his *Catalogue*, dates manuscript No. 326 [i.e. M3] to the 18th century, and Nos. 658 and 659 [M4 and M5] to the 19th. We do not know on what he based these dates.

One can apply to the Pali of our manuscripts the remarks made by G. Terral (op. cit., pp. 263-64) on the *Samuddaghosajātaka*, and by F. Martini (op. cit., pp. 370 foll.) on the *Dasa-Bodhisatta-Uddesa*. Firstly, there are many copying errors. One constantly finds short *i* and *u* instead of long *ī* and *ū*, dentals instead of cerebrals and vice-versa, aspirates instead of non-aspirates and vice-versa, etc. Moreover, syllables are often omitted, words miscopied (*karonto* in place of *kathento*), etc. In addition, it seems that the Pali of our texts has been strongly influenced by the Indo-Chinese languages spoken by copyists fairly ignorant of Pali, and perhaps even by the authors of our texts. We have not undertaken a systematic survey of all the grammatical anomalies, which would only repeat the studies of F. Martini and G. Terral. As far as possible we have transcribed the texts, with all their anomalies, such as we have found them in the manuscripts, restricting ourselves to adding occasionally, in parentheses, certain syllables which had evidently been omitted through negligence. We thought that these texts were sufficiently comprehensible transcribed as they are, without being standardised, and could thus contribute to future comparisons or studies carried out by qualified philologists.'

\*\*\*\*\*

The text given here — which has been prepared for publication by K.R. Norman and myself — follows Denis' edition as closely as possible, for the same reasons. On some occasions we have corrected what seemed in our judgement to be obviously typographical errors: for example, on p. 26 line 6 his typescript had *uppapajjati* in place of

*upapajjati*. It seems unlikely that all his mss. would have had the same mis-spelling, so we have assumed it is a typographical error by Denis. Similarly on p. 36 we have given *samattam* on line 8 for (for his *samatam*) and on line 12 *-candamandalō* (for his *-candamandalō*, since he gives *-mandalo* elsewhere). Obviously we may not have made the right decision in every case. Where we found unusual spellings used consistently, e.g. *Tāmbapanñi* (for *Tambapanñi*) we have left them as they were. Denis' method of making an edition was perhaps a little unusual, since he transcribed M1 throughout, even where other mss. contained clearly what would usually be thought to be better readings: for example, on p. 21 line 9 he gives *eva sammacintesi* where M2 and M4 have *evam samacintesi*, which would be correct in standard Pali. In this particular case one might decide that the forms in M1 and M3 are simply errors; in other cases it might be better to assume that we have genuinely variant forms. In the present state of our knowledge, both of this text (and the family of texts from which it comes) and of Southeast Asian Pali more generally, it seems more prudent to present what is clearly not a critical edition, and hope that future scholarship will be able to clarify the usages involved so that — when more manuscripts are consulted — the making of a critical edition may become feasible. (There has been, of course, much debate about the very notion of a 'critical edition' in relation to South and Southeast Asian materials.) In my translation I have noted on the few occasions where it seemed necessary that I have adopted a different reading from that in M1; for the most part the issues involved in the variant readings will be obvious to those who know Pali, and irrelevant to those who do not.

May this publication honour the memory of Father Denis, and add to the scholarly reputation already acquired by his *La Lokapaññatti et*

*les idées cosmologiques de Bouddhisme ancien* (Atelier Reproduction des Thèses, Université de Lille, 1977)

Chicago

Steven Collins



# BRAH MĀLEYYADEVATTHERAVATTHUM

namo tassa bhagavato arahato sammāsambuddhassa.<sup>1</sup>

suranaramahiṇiyam<sup>2</sup> buddhaseṭṭham namitvā<sup>3</sup>  
sugatappabhavam dhammam<sup>4</sup> sādhum saṅghañ ca namitvā<sup>5</sup>  
sakalajanappasādañ Māleyyam<sup>6</sup> nāma vatthum  
paramanayavicitram sāmāsā ārabhissan ti.<sup>7</sup>

atite<sup>8</sup> kira<sup>9</sup> ratanapatiṭṭhānabhūte Laṅkādipasāñkhāte<sup>10</sup> Tāmbapanṇidipe<sup>11</sup>  
paramiddhiñāñena pākaṭo<sup>12</sup> Māleyyadevatthero nāma eko thero<sup>13</sup>  
Kambojagāmañ nissāya Rohanajanapade vihāsi.<sup>14</sup> so pana<sup>15</sup> thero  
punappunam niraye paccamānānam<sup>16</sup> nārakānam<sup>17</sup> pavuttim āharitvā  
tesam nātakānam kathetvā dānādīni puññāni kārāpetvā tesam uddissa  
puññānumodanena laddhappuññaphalena<sup>18</sup> devalokaparāyane karonto  
tath' eva vihāsi. so pi iddhibalena devalokañ ca yamalokañ ca gacchati.  
devaloke ratanattaye pasannānam upāsakānam upāsikānam mahantam

<sup>1</sup> M4: *om.*

<sup>2</sup> M4: suranamahiṇiyam

<sup>3</sup> M2: buddhaseṭṭhañ ca namitvā

<sup>4</sup> M2: sugatappabhāvañ dhammam

<sup>5</sup> M2: sādhukam saṅghañ ca natvā; M4: sādhum saṅghañ ca namitvā

<sup>6</sup> M2 & M4: Māleyyam

<sup>7</sup> M2: ārabbhissan ti; M3: *om. four preceding lines and replaces by namathu;*  
M4: ārebhissam

<sup>8</sup> M3 & M4: atite

<sup>9</sup> M3: *om. kira*

<sup>10</sup> M3 & M4: *om. these two words*

<sup>11</sup> M2: Tāmbapanṇiya dipe; M3: Tāmbapanṇadipe; M4: Tāmbapanṇiyam dipe

<sup>12</sup> M3 & M4: *om. these two words*

<sup>13</sup> M3: *om. eko thero; M4: om. thero*

<sup>14</sup> M3 & M4: pavisi

<sup>15</sup> M3: *om. all of the passage between so pana thero and tasmiñ gāme; M4: om.*  
*all of the passage between so pana thero and so thero pubbanhasamaye*

<sup>16</sup> M2: paccamānam

<sup>17</sup> M2: nārakānam

<sup>18</sup> M2: puññāphalena

isiriyaṁ<sup>1</sup> disvā āgantvā “asuko ca upāsako asukā ca upāsikā asukasmiṁ<sup>2</sup> nāma devaloke nibbattetvā mahāsampattim anubhavanti” ti manussānaṁ kathesi. yamaloke pāpamanussānaṁ mahantaṁ dukkhaṁ disvā āgantvā “asuko ca asukā ca asukasmiṁ niraye nibbattetvā mahantaṁ dukkham anubhavanti” ti manussānaṁ kathesi. manussā sāsane pasidanti pāpāni na karonti dānādīni puññāni nātakānaṁ kālakatānaṁ uddissiṁsu te uddissa puññānumodanena laddhappuññaphalena devalokaparāyanā honti. ath’ ekadivasam so therō pubbañhasamaye utthāy’ āsanā<sup>3</sup> patacīvaram ādāya piṇḍapātam gahanatthāya gāmaṁ pāvisi. tasmiṁ gāme<sup>4</sup> eko daliddakapuriso<sup>5</sup> mātu-upaṭṭhānaṁ<sup>6</sup> karoti. tasmiṁ kāle so gāmato nikkhāmitvā<sup>7</sup> nahāpanatthāya<sup>8</sup> ekaṁ saram patvā tattha nikātā<sup>9</sup> atthānīluppalapupphāni disvā tāni gahetvā<sup>10</sup> sarā uttaritvā<sup>11</sup> maggām paṭipajji.<sup>12</sup> tadā so theram āgacchantaṁ<sup>13</sup> santam dantam suguttam<sup>14</sup> jitindriyam uttamarūpadharam patahattham disvā samuppanna-pītipāmojjo yena therō ten’ upasaṅkami<sup>15</sup> upasaṅkamitvā dasanakhasamodhānakarapuṭakamalo<sup>16</sup> theram vanditvā<sup>17</sup> saddhāya

<sup>1</sup> M2: issariyaṁ

<sup>2</sup> M2: asuko ca asukā ca asukasmiṁ nāma

<sup>3</sup> M4: *om.* utthāy’ āsanā

<sup>4</sup> M2: pāvisi; M3: tadā tasmiṁ gāmaṁ

<sup>5</sup> M2: dalikapuriso; M3: dalidakapuriso; M4: daliddhapuriso

<sup>6</sup> M3: māta-upathākam; M4: mātu-upaṭṭhānaṁ

<sup>7</sup> M3: *om.* gamāto nikkhāmitvā and adds dalikapuriso

<sup>8</sup> M2: nahāpanatthāya

<sup>9</sup> M2: nikātā

<sup>10</sup> M3: replaces tāni gahetvā by tattha niluppalapupphāni gahetvā

<sup>11</sup> M3: sara-utarityvā; M4: sarāni utarityvā

<sup>12</sup> M3: pataipajji

<sup>13</sup> M3: āgacchante

<sup>14</sup> M3: sugatajitiindriyam; M4: sugutam

<sup>15</sup> M3: ten’ upasaṅkamitvā

<sup>16</sup> M3: *om.* upasaṅkamitvā dasa ... kamalo and replaces it by pana; M4: *om.* dasa ... kamalo and replaces it by ca pana

<sup>17</sup> M3: vandhitvā

bahulatāya<sup>1</sup> aṭṭhaniluppupalupphāni therassa hatthe datvā pañidhānam<sup>2</sup> karonto imam gātham āha<sup>3</sup>:

iminā pupphadānena yattha yatha<sup>4</sup> bhavāmi 'ham  
jatisatasahassesu mā daliddo<sup>5</sup> bhavāmi 'han ti.<sup>6</sup>

thero aṭṭhaniluppupalupphāni<sup>7</sup> gahetvā anumodanaṁ karonto imam gātham āha<sup>8</sup>:

yam yam lūkham pañitam<sup>9</sup> vā deti pasannamānasō<sup>10</sup>  
vipākam tassa dānassa<sup>11</sup> yathā-icchā samijjhati ti.<sup>12</sup>

thero anumodanaṁ katvā<sup>13</sup> eva sammacintesi<sup>14</sup> “imāni aṭṭhaniluppala-pupphāni kuhim āropessāmi<sup>15</sup> cetiyam vā udāhu upari pabbate vā parinibbutē vā<sup>16</sup> mahābodhiyam<sup>17</sup> vā bhagavato anuttaradhamma-cakkapavattanāṭṭhāne vā” ti.<sup>18</sup> puna cintesi “etāni ṭhānāni sattakkhattum eva pūjesim<sup>19</sup> yan nūnāham devaloke Cūlāmañicetiyam pūjessamī” ti.

<sup>1</sup> M3 & M4: bahūlatāya

<sup>2</sup> M4: (pa)nidhānam

<sup>3</sup> M3: therassa adāsi adiṭṭhānakaronto āha *instead of* therassa ... imam gātham āha

<sup>4</sup> M4: yattha tattha

<sup>5</sup> M3 & M4: daliddho

<sup>6</sup> M3: bhavāmi 'ham

<sup>7</sup> M3: niluppalapupphāni

<sup>8</sup> M3: *om.* imam gātham

<sup>9</sup> M3: sukham panitam

<sup>10</sup> M3: pasananāpi dentiya

<sup>11</sup> M3: tena puññavipākena

<sup>12</sup> M3: samijjhatu

<sup>13</sup> M3: karonto

<sup>14</sup> M2 & M4: evam samacintesi; M3: eva samacintesi

<sup>15</sup> M3: ā(ro)pessāmi *and adds here* udāhu

<sup>16</sup> M3: *om.* parinibbutē vā; M4: *om.* uparipabbate vā parinibbutē vā

<sup>17</sup> M4: mahā(bo)dhiyam vā

<sup>18</sup> M3: pavattitāṭṭhāne vā *and* *om.* ti

<sup>19</sup> M2: pūjesi; M3: satam eva pūjessāmi; M4: pūjjesi

thero<sup>1</sup> attanā cintitasamanantaram eva abhiññāpādakam̄ catutthajjhānam̄ samāpajjītvā tato vutthāya anilapathatalam̄<sup>2</sup> ullañghitvā accharā-sañghātamattam̄ eva sattaratanavicittatalabhūmibhāgapatiñmañditavilasitatidasadevanagaramajjhe Sakkena devaraññā bhagavato attanā kappāsapicutulasadisamudtalajälavicitkaragahitena asinā chinditaparamamoñim “sac’ āham<sup>3</sup> imāya pabbajjāya paramasambodhiñ patvā buddho bhavissāmi mama moñim bhūmiyam̄<sup>4</sup> mā patatū” ti<sup>5</sup> adhiññānena bhūmiyam apatamānam̄<sup>6</sup> ākāse yeva pakkhipitvā sakasirasā vahatena suvaññacañgoñkavarena sampañcchitvā sakalasuragañānam̄ pūjanatthāya sasādarapatiññāpitam̄ manorammam̄ indanīlamanāyimayañ<sup>7</sup> Cūlāmanicetiyañganam̄ patvā añthanīluppalapupphēhi pujetvā<sup>8</sup> padakkhiñam̄ katvā añthadisāsu vanditvā pañcapatiññhitena<sup>9</sup> vanditvā pācīnādisābhāge<sup>10</sup> nisidi.

tena vuttam̄:

abhiññāpādakam̄ jhānam̄ samāpajjītvā jhānato  
vutthāya hemahām̄seva<sup>11</sup> nabham̄ uttamma tāvade<sup>12</sup>

<sup>1</sup> M3: *replaces the passage between thero and tasmiñ Sakko devarājā by thero tadahe yeva vēhāsam̄ abhūgantvā apurasam̄ghātamattam̄ pi Vejayantapāsādassa purato aññāsi thero cetiyam̄ disvā somanassapatto cetiyam̄ vandhitvā niluppalapupphēhi pujetvā padakkhiñam̄ katvā añthadisāsu vandhitvā ekamantam̄ aññāsi Sakko devarājā; M4: replaces the same passage by thero tadahe va vēhāsam̄ abbhuggantvā accharāsam̄ghātamantāppi ... (then as M3) ... aññāsi tasmiñ khañe Sakko devarājā*

<sup>2</sup> M2: anilapathitalam̄

<sup>3</sup> M2: saccāham̄

<sup>4</sup> M2: *om. bhūmiyam̄*

<sup>5</sup> M2: mā pattatū ti

<sup>6</sup> M2: appattamānam̄

<sup>7</sup> M2: *om. mayam̄*

<sup>8</sup> M2: pūjītvā

<sup>9</sup> M2: pañcañgapatiññhitena

<sup>10</sup> M2: bhāgena

<sup>11</sup> M2: ham̄so va

<sup>12</sup> M2: uggama tāvad eva

accharāsaṅghāṭamattam̄ va Vejayantassa purato<sup>1</sup>  
cetiyam upagantvāna pūjītvā va avandi so ti.

tasmiṁ khaṇe Sakko devarājā saha parivārehi āgantvā bhagavato dakkhiṇadāṭhañ ca Cūlāmaṇicetiyañ ca nānāvidhehi mālāgandhavilepanādīhi pūjētvā<sup>2</sup> tam̄ theram̄ nisinnam̄ disvā upasaṅkamitvā vanditvā<sup>3</sup> ekamantam̄ nisidi.<sup>4</sup> sabbā devaparisā ca cetiyam̄ vanditvā padakkhiṇam̄ katvā<sup>5</sup> theram̄ vanditvā samantato nisidiṁsu. sabbā pi devaccharā<sup>6</sup> cetiyam̄ pūjētvā vanditvā padakkhiṇam̄ katvā pañcapatiṭṭhitena<sup>7</sup> theram̄ vanditvā samantato nisidiṁsu. Sakko devarājā theram̄ pucchi<sup>8</sup> “bhante, kuto agacchathā” ti.<sup>9</sup> “mahārāja, aham̄ Jambūdīpāgato ’mhi cetiyam̄ vandanaththāyā” ti.<sup>10</sup> puna thero Sakkam̄ devārājānam̄ pucchi “kiṁ tayā Cūlāmaṇicetiyañ patiṭṭhāpitam̄,<sup>11</sup> mahārāja” ti.<sup>12</sup> “āma, bhante, mayā devānam̄ pūjanatthāya patiṭṭhāpitam̄” ti.<sup>13</sup> thero “devarāja, ime devā manussaloke kusalakammañ katvā dibbasukham̄ anubhavitum̄<sup>14</sup> idha nibbattā<sup>15</sup> idāni kasmā puññam̄ karontī” ti pucchi.<sup>16</sup> “bhante, ime devā kusalakammañ katvā upari devalokam̄ gantukāmā va honti.<sup>17</sup> bhante, ye keci devā appapuññā te<sup>18</sup> na ciram̄

<sup>1</sup> M2: pūrato

<sup>2</sup> M2: pūjītvā

<sup>3</sup> M4: vandhitvā

<sup>4</sup> M3 & M4: aṭṭhāsi

<sup>5</sup> M2: adds pañcaṅgapatitthitena; M3: adds pacchā

<sup>6</sup> M2: deva-acchāra; M3 & M4: om. the passage between sabbā pi devaccharā and Sakko devarājā

<sup>7</sup> M2: pañcaṅgapatitthitena

<sup>8</sup> M3: Sakko theram̄ samapucchi

<sup>9</sup> M3: āgato 'sī ti

<sup>10</sup> M3: vandanaththāya

<sup>11</sup> M3: kiṁ tayā tidañca ṭhāpitam̄; M4: ṭhāpitam̄

<sup>12</sup> M2: om. mahārājā ti

<sup>13</sup> M3: āma bhante ti aham̄ ṭhāpetvā devānam̄ pūjanatthāya; M4: ṭhāpitam̄ ti

<sup>14</sup> M2: anubhavanti

<sup>15</sup> M3 & M4: icchantā

<sup>16</sup> M3: om. pucchi

<sup>17</sup> M3: gantikāmā and om. va hontī ti

sagge ṭhitā<sup>1</sup> yathā appadhaññā done ṭhapitā<sup>2</sup> khippam eva khiyanti.<sup>3</sup> bhante, ye keci devā bahūpuññā te<sup>4</sup> ciram sagge<sup>5</sup> ṭhitā yathā bahūdhaññā<sup>6</sup> koṭṭhe ṭhapitā ciram ṭhatvā na khiyanti.<sup>7</sup> bhante, yathā appadhaññā janā bahūsippā bahuñāṇino<sup>8</sup> kasivanijjādini karontā jīvantā na dukkarā<sup>9</sup> honti<sup>10</sup> tathā appapuññā devā phalam<sup>11</sup> bhuñjivtā puna param puññam<sup>12</sup> katvā pacchā saggasampattim<sup>13</sup> anubhavanti. bhante, yathā bahūdhaññā janā asippā<sup>14</sup> aññāṇino<sup>15</sup> kasivanijjādini akarontā<sup>16</sup> khīḍhaññā<sup>17</sup> pacchā<sup>18</sup> daliddakatarā<sup>19</sup> honti evam pi bahūpuññā<sup>20</sup> devā<sup>21</sup> phalam anubhavantā param puññam akatvā<sup>22</sup> pacchā daliddakappattā<sup>23</sup> jātā. bhante, yathā appadhaññā janā asippā aññāṇino kasivanijjādini akarontā daliddakatarā honti evam pi appapuññā devā<sup>24</sup> phalam anubhavantā param puññam akatvā daliddakatarā honti. bhante, yathā

<sup>18</sup> M3 & M4: *om. te*; M3: apuññā

<sup>1</sup> M2: sagge ṭhitā and *om. text as far as* yathā bahūdhaññā koṭṭhe ṭhapitā

<sup>2</sup> M3: yathā dhaññāno thapitā; M4: yatha dhaññā done thapitā

<sup>3</sup> M3: khippam eva khayyanti

<sup>4</sup> M3 & M4: *om. te*

<sup>5</sup> M3: sage

<sup>6</sup> M3: yathā dhaññā

<sup>7</sup> M3: na khayyanti

<sup>8</sup> M3: *adds* honti

<sup>9</sup> M3: dukarā

<sup>10</sup> M3 & M4: *om. honti*

<sup>11</sup> M3: appapuññā janā phalam; M4: appapuññā phalam

<sup>12</sup> M3: (pu)ññam

<sup>13</sup> M2: saggam sampattim; M3: sukham sampattim

<sup>14</sup> M3: appasippā aññāṇino

<sup>15</sup> M3: *adds* honti

<sup>16</sup> M3: karontā

<sup>17</sup> M3: *om. text as far as* bhiyyoso mattāya vad̄hanti

<sup>18</sup> M2 & M4: *om. pacchā*

<sup>19</sup> M2: daliddakā; M4: daliddhakā

<sup>20</sup> M4: bahū(pu)ññā

<sup>21</sup> M4: *om. devā*

<sup>22</sup> M4: na puññam katvā

<sup>23</sup> M4: daliddhakappattā

<sup>24</sup> M4: *om. devā*

bahūdhaññā janā<sup>1</sup> bahūsippā bahuññino kasivanijjādīni karontā bhiyyoso mattāya vadāhanti<sup>2</sup> evam̄ pi bahūpuññā devā<sup>3</sup> dānasilādīni karontā uddharisotā vadāhanti<sup>4</sup> yāva nibbānan” ti.<sup>5</sup> tam̄ sutvā therō pasiditvā Sujampatiṁ<sup>6</sup> pucchi “mahārāja, sabbe devā bhagavato<sup>7</sup> cetiyam̄ vanditum̄ āgatā; kim Ariyametteyyo bodhisatto āgamissatī” ti.<sup>8</sup> “āma, bhante” ti. “kadā āgamissatī” ti.<sup>9</sup> “bhante, atthamiyam̄ vā cātuddasiyam̄ vā<sup>10</sup> paññarasiyam̄ vā Metteyyo cetiyam̄ vanditum̄<sup>11</sup> āgato” ti. “tena hi ajja atthamiyam̄ kim̄ so āgamissatī” ti.<sup>12</sup> “āma, bhante” ti.<sup>13</sup> evam̄<sup>14</sup> there Sakkena saddhiṁ kathente yeva<sup>15</sup> eko devaputto sataparivārehi saddhiṁ cetiyam̄ vandanatthāya āgato. therō tam̄ devaputtam̄ āgatam̄<sup>16</sup> disvā Sujampatiṁ pucchi<sup>17</sup> “devarāja, ayam̄ kim̄ Metteyyo bodhisatto” ti.<sup>18</sup> “n’ eso, bhante” ti. “katamo, mahārājā” ti. “aññataro, bhante” ti. “devarāja,

<sup>1</sup> M2: *om. janā*

<sup>2</sup> M3: bhiññoso mattāya vadanti

<sup>3</sup> M3: *janā*; M4: *om. devā*

<sup>4</sup> M2: vadāhanti; M3: vadanti

<sup>5</sup> M4: yā(va) nibbāni

<sup>6</sup> M4: Sujappatiṁ (M4 *almost always uses this form, which will no longer be noted*)

<sup>7</sup> M3: bhavagato (*sic*)

<sup>8</sup> M3: āgamisatī ti

<sup>9</sup> M2: kadāgamissatī ti; M3: kadāgamisatī ti; M4: kadāci āgamissatī ti

<sup>10</sup> M3 & M4: cātudasiyam̄

<sup>11</sup> M3: vanditu; M4: vandhitum̄

<sup>12</sup> M3: atthamiyam̄ va so āgato ti

<sup>13</sup> M3: *om. āma bhante* ti

<sup>14</sup> M2: evam̄ theram̄ Sakkena saddhiṁ kathente; M3: therō Sakkena saddhiṁ kathento; M4: therena Sakkena saddhiṁ kathente

<sup>15</sup> M3: tam̄ khaññā ñeva eko devaputto sataparivāro cetiyam̄ ...

<sup>16</sup> M3: āgattam̄; M4: ā(ga)tam̄

<sup>17</sup> M3: *om. Sujampatiṁ and puts pucchi at the end of the sentence*; M4: *om. Sujampatiṁ*

<sup>18</sup> M2: kim ayam̄ devaputto Ariyametteyyo bodhisatto ti; M3: ayam̄ Metteyyo bodhisato ti; M4: ayam̄ so Metteyo bodhisatto ti

ayam devaputto pubbe manussaloke kim akasi puññan" ti. Sakko tassa puññakammam ācikkhanto<sup>1</sup> imam gātham āha:

bhante<sup>2</sup> so mānuse jāto<sup>3</sup> daliddo<sup>4</sup> tiññahārako<sup>5</sup>  
 bhattapūtañ ca<sup>6</sup> bhuñjītvā kāke daj' ekapiñḍikam<sup>7</sup>  
 ettakam puññakammam pi katvā so mānuse pana<sup>8</sup>  
 maraṇante saritvā tam<sup>9</sup> tena so upapajjati ti.

tena vuttam:

kākādike tiracchāne dānam datvāna koci pi  
 tass' eva dānassa phalam satam labhati dāyako ti.

so devaputto āgantvā cetiyam padakkhiṇam katvā aṭṭhadisāsu vanditvā gandhamālādīhi pūjetvā pācīnādisābhāge nisidi.<sup>10</sup> tadanantare eko devaputto sahassaparivārehi<sup>11</sup> saddhim āgantvā bhagavato cetiyam pūjanatthāya sarīrothasena sabbā disā obhāseti.<sup>12</sup> therō tam disvā Sujampati pucchi<sup>13</sup> "devarāja, ayam kiñ<sup>14</sup> Metteyyo bodhisatto" ti. "n' eso, bhante" ti. "katamo, mahārājā" ti. "aññataro, bhante" ti. "devarāja, ayam devaputto pubbe manussaloke kim akasi puññan" ti. Sakko tassa puññakammam ācikkhanto<sup>15</sup> imam gātham āha:

bhante so mānuse jāto Gopālo nāma māṇavo<sup>16</sup>

<sup>1</sup> M2: pakāsetvā; M3: āvikaronto

<sup>2</sup> M2: *puts here a part of the text which appears later in the other manuscripts*

<sup>3</sup> M2 & M4: manussajāto; M3: mānaso jāto

<sup>4</sup> M3: dalido; M4: daliddho

<sup>5</sup> M4: tiññahārako

<sup>6</sup> M3: bhatañ pūtañ ca

<sup>7</sup> M4: daj' ekapiñḍikam

<sup>8</sup> M2: so mānusse pana; M3: so manuso puna; M4: so manusso (pu)na

<sup>9</sup> M3: saritvāna

<sup>10</sup> M3: aṭṭhāsi tadanantare nisidi

<sup>11</sup> M3: sahassaparivāre

<sup>12</sup> M3: sabbadisā obhāsanti

<sup>13</sup> M3: Sujampati pucchi

<sup>14</sup> M3: *om. kiñ*

<sup>15</sup> M3: āvikāronto

<sup>16</sup> M3 & M4: māṇavo

bhuñjanto attano bhāgam<sup>1</sup> deti gopālakassa ca<sup>2</sup>  
 tena dānena so jāto sahassaparivārito<sup>3</sup>  
 cetiyam vandanatthāya sahassen' eva<sup>4</sup> āgato ti.

tena vuttam:

asīle appapuññesu<sup>5</sup> dānam datvāna koci pi  
 tass' eva dānassa phalam sahassam pañilabhati ti.

so āgantvā cetiyam padakkhiṇam katvā atthadisāsu vanditvā<sup>6</sup>  
 gandhamālādīhi pujetvā pacchimadisābhāge nisidi.<sup>6</sup> aparo devaputto  
 dasasahassaparivārehi<sup>7</sup> āgantvā mahantena sarīrobhāsenā<sup>8</sup> sakala-  
 cetiyamañḍalam obhāseti.<sup>9</sup> thero tam<sup>10</sup> āgatam disvā Sujampatiñ pucchi  
 “devarāja, ayam kim devaputto<sup>11</sup> Metteyyo bodhisatto” ti. “n’ eso,  
 bhante” ti. “katamo,<sup>12</sup> mahārājā” ti. “aññataro, bhante” ti. “mahārāja,  
 ayam devaputto pubbe manussaloke kim akāsi puññan” ti. Sakko tassa<sup>13</sup>  
 puññakammam kathento<sup>14</sup> imam gātham āha:

bhikkham<sup>15</sup> datvā pure bhante sāmañerassa sīlino<sup>16</sup>  
 tena puññavipākena cavitvā saggam āgato ti.<sup>17</sup>

tena vuttam:

<sup>1</sup> M2: bhaggam; M3: bhattam; M4: bhagam

<sup>2</sup> M4: gopalassa ca

<sup>3</sup> M4: sahassaparivāro

<sup>4</sup> M3: sahasen' eva

<sup>5</sup> M3: asilesu apuññesu

<sup>6</sup> M3: atthāsi

<sup>7</sup> M2: adds saddhim; M3: dasasahassaparivāro

<sup>8</sup> M2: tisarīrobhāsenā; M3: sarirobhāsenā

<sup>9</sup> M3: obhāsetvā

<sup>10</sup> M[number omitted in Denis' ms.]: om. tam

<sup>11</sup> M2: om. kim; M3 & M4: om. kim devaputto

<sup>12</sup> M3 & M4: kattamo

<sup>13</sup> M2: adds vacanam sutvā

<sup>14</sup> M2: ācikkhanto

<sup>15</sup> M3: bhattam

<sup>16</sup> M3: silavanto

<sup>17</sup> M3: idha-m-āgato

puthujane<sup>1</sup> sīlavante dānam datvāna koci pi  
tass' eva dasasahassam̄ phalam̄ labhati dāyako ti.<sup>2</sup>

so āgantvā<sup>3</sup> cetiyam̄ padakkhiṇam̄ katvā atthadisāsu vanditvā gandhamālādīhi pūjetvā<sup>4</sup> dakkhiṇadisābhāge nisidi.<sup>5</sup> aparo devaputto vīsatisahassaparivārehi<sup>6</sup> āgantvā mahantena sarīrobhāsenā ābharaṇena<sup>7</sup> ca ākāsamaṇḍalam obhāseti.<sup>8</sup> therō tam̄ āgataṁ disvā Sujampatiṁ pucchi “devarāja,<sup>9</sup> ayam̄ devaputto Ariyametteyyo<sup>10</sup> bodhisatto” ti. “n’ eso, bhante” ti. “katamo,<sup>11</sup> mahārājā” ti. “aññataro, bhante” ti. “devarāja, ayam̄ devaputto pubbe manussaloke kim akāsi puññan” ti. Sakko tassa puññakammarā pakāsento<sup>12</sup> imam̄ gātham̄ āha:

bhikkham̄ datvā tadā eso piñḍapātikabhikkhuno<sup>13</sup>  
ten' eva puññakammaṇa cavitvā saggam̄ āgato ti.<sup>14</sup>

tena vuttam̄:

bhikkhuno sīlavantassa<sup>15</sup> dānam̄ datvāna koci pi  
tass' eva vīsatisahassam̄ phalam̄ labhati dāyako ti.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>1</sup> M2 & M4: puthujane

<sup>2</sup> M3: tass' eva dānaphalam̄ dasasahassam̄ labhati

<sup>3</sup> M2: gantvā

<sup>4</sup> M4: adds ca

<sup>5</sup> M3: atthāsi

<sup>6</sup> M3: parivā(re)hi

<sup>7</sup> M3: om. ābharaṇena

<sup>8</sup> M3: obhāsetvā; M4: obhāsentī ti

<sup>9</sup> M2: devarājā

<sup>10</sup> M3: om. devaputto Ariya-; M4: om. devaputto

<sup>11</sup> M3: kattamo

<sup>12</sup> M3: kathento; M4: pa(sam̄)sento

<sup>13</sup> M2, M3 & M4: piñḍipātikabhikkhuno

<sup>14</sup> M3: idha-m-āgato; M4: saggam̄ āgato 'sī ti

<sup>15</sup> M4: sillavantassa

<sup>16</sup> M4: adds parivāro

<sup>17</sup> M3: visatipañcasahassam̄ pi phalam̄ labbhati dāyako

so āgantvā<sup>1</sup> cetiyam padakkhiṇam katvā aṭṭhadisāsu vanditvā uttaradisābhage nisīdi.<sup>2</sup> tadā eko devaputto tiṁsasahassaparivārehi<sup>3</sup> cetiyam vandanatthāya āgato. therō tam āgataṁ disvā Sujampatiṁ pucchi “devarāja, ayaṁ devaputto Ariyametteyyo<sup>4</sup> bodhisatto” ti. “n’ eso, bhante” ti. “katamo, mahārājā” ti. “aññataro, bhante” ti.<sup>5</sup> “devarāja, ayaṁ devaputto pubbe manussaloke kim akāsi puññan” ti. Sakko tassa<sup>6</sup> puññakammaṁ kathento āha<sup>7</sup>:

Anurādhapure pubbe sucikammaṇa jīvati  
bahūpuññakaro<sup>8</sup> eso tantavāyo ti vissuto.<sup>9</sup>  
matakānaṁ sarīrāni<sup>10</sup> jhāpetvāna tahiṁ tahiṁ  
tam uddissa dakkhiṇaṁ ca sīlavantesu deti so<sup>11</sup>  
bhesajjaṁ piṇḍipātañ ca<sup>12</sup> cīvaraṁ sayanāsanam.<sup>13</sup>  
ten’ eva puññakammaṇa<sup>14</sup> uppajji tidase pure ti.<sup>15</sup>

so āgantvā<sup>16</sup> cetiyam padakkhiṇam katvā aṭṭhadisāsu vanditvā gandhamālādīhi pūjetvā tadanantare nisīdi. atha<sup>17</sup> aparo devaputto cattālisa-

<sup>1</sup> M2: gantvā

<sup>2</sup> M3: aṭṭhāsi

<sup>3</sup> M3: adds āgantvā and om. āgato at the end of the phrase

<sup>4</sup> M3: om. devaputto Ariya-; M4: om. devaputto

<sup>5</sup> M3: bhante

<sup>6</sup> M3: devaputtassa

<sup>7</sup> M3: puts here the verses Haritālo mahāseṭṭhī ... etc. which, in the other manuscripts, appear on page 30

<sup>8</sup> M3: bahūpuññam karo

<sup>9</sup> M3: visutto

<sup>10</sup> M3: sarire; M4: sarīrañ ca

<sup>11</sup> M3: tam uddissa yathā puññam silavante yajeti so; M4: tam uddissa yathā yaññam silante yajeti so

<sup>12</sup> M3: piṇḍipātañ ca yajitvā; M4: piṇḍipātañ ca datvā

<sup>13</sup> M3: sayanānam

<sup>14</sup> M3: bhikkhunaṁ silavantānam; M4: bhikkhunam sillavantānam

<sup>15</sup> M3: uppaja tidase pure; M4: uppaja tidase pure ti

<sup>16</sup> M3 & M4: add bhagavato

<sup>17</sup> M3: om. atha; M4: athako

sahassaparivārehi<sup>1</sup> cetiyam vandanatthāya āgato.<sup>2</sup> therō tam āgatam disvā Sujampatim pucchi “devarāja, ayam devaputto<sup>3</sup> Metteyyo bodhisatto” ti. “n’ eso, bhante” ti. “katamo,<sup>4</sup> mahārājā” ti. “aññataro, bhante” ti.<sup>5</sup> “devarāja, ayam devaputto pubbe manussaloke kim akāsi puññan” ti. Sakko tassa<sup>6</sup> puññakammaṁ kathento<sup>7</sup> āha:

Haritālo<sup>8</sup> mahāsetthī Haritāle ca gāmake  
cāgavā<sup>9</sup> sīlasampanno siddhājivena<sup>10</sup> jīvati.  
sīlavantesu bhesajjam cīvaram pānabhojanam  
datvā kammavipākena uppajji tidase pure ti.<sup>11</sup>

so āgantvā bhagavato cetiyam padakkhiṇam katvā aṭṭhadisāsu vanditvā gandhamālādīhi pūjetvā tadanantare<sup>12</sup> nisidi. aparo<sup>13</sup> devaputto<sup>14</sup> paññāsa-sahassaparivārehi cetiyam vandanatthāya āgato.<sup>15</sup> therō tam āgatam disvā Sujampatim pucchi “devarāja, ayam devaputto<sup>16</sup> Metteyyo bodhisatto” ti. “n’ eso, bhante” ti. “katamo,<sup>17</sup> mahārājā” ti. “aññataro, bhante” ti. “devarāja, ayam devaputto pubbe manussaloke<sup>18</sup> kim akāsi puññan” ti. Sakko tassa puññakammaṁ kathento āha:

<sup>1</sup> M4: caṭisa; M2, M3 & M4: *add* āgantvā

<sup>2</sup> M3: *om.* āgato

<sup>3</sup> M3 & M4: *om.* devaputto

<sup>4</sup> M3: kattamo

<sup>5</sup> M3: bhante

<sup>6</sup> M3: devaputtassa

<sup>7</sup> M2: karonto

<sup>8</sup> M4: Harittālo

<sup>9</sup> M2: cātūrā; M4: pātavā

<sup>10</sup> M2 & M4: saddhājivena

<sup>11</sup> M2: uppaji va tidase pure ti; M3: upaja tidase pure; M4: uppajja tidase pure ti

<sup>12</sup> M4: tadantare nisidi

<sup>13</sup> M3: apparo

<sup>14</sup> M2: *om. the following passage as far as* Metteyyo bodhisatto ti

<sup>15</sup> M3: paññāsa-sahashehi āgantvā cetiyam vandanatthāya; M4: paññāsa-sahashehi cetiyam vandanatthāya āgato

<sup>16</sup> M3 & M4: *om.* devaputto

<sup>17</sup> M4: kattamo

<sup>18</sup> M2: manussaloke ti

Tāmbapanñiyā dīpasmiṁ<sup>1</sup> uppajjītvā narādhipo<sup>2</sup>  
 Abhayaduṭṭhassa bhātā<sup>3</sup> Saddhātisso ti nāmako<sup>4</sup>  
 cittappasādo buddhe<sup>5</sup> ca dhamme saṅghe sagāravo  
 pañcasilam uposatham<sup>6</sup> katvā aṭṭhaṅg' uposatham  
 sīlavantesu<sup>7</sup> dādānam yācayogo amaccharā.<sup>8</sup>  
 tena kammavipākena uppajji tidasālaye ti.<sup>9</sup>

so āgantvā<sup>10</sup> cetiyam padakkhiṇam katvā aṭṭhadisāsu vanditvā gandhamālādīhi pūjetvā tadanantare nisīdi. aparo devaputto<sup>11</sup> saṭṭhi-sahassaparivārehi<sup>12</sup> cetiyam vandanatthāya āgato. therō tam āgatam disvā devarājānam pucchi “mahārāja, ayam devaputto<sup>13</sup> Metteyyo bodhisatto” ti. “n’ eso, bhante” ti. “katamo, mahārājā” ti. “aññataro, bhante” ti. “devarāja, ayam devaputto pubbe manussaloke kim akāsi puññan” ti. Sakko tassa puññakammaṁ kathento āha:

Abhayaduṭṭho ti nāmena catupaccayadāyako<sup>14</sup>  
 buddhe ca dhamme ca saṅghe ca sakkaccaṁ<sup>15</sup> payirupāsati.<sup>16</sup>  
 tathāgatassa<sup>17</sup> so thūpaṁ<sup>18</sup> kārayi bodhiropanam

<sup>1</sup> M2: Tāmbapanñidīpasmiṁ

<sup>2</sup> M3: upajitvā narādipo; M4: uppajitā narodipo

<sup>3</sup> M3: adds ca

<sup>4</sup> M4: nā(ma)ko

<sup>5</sup> M3: cittapasādena buddhe

<sup>6</sup> M2: uposathe; M3: pañcasile sayyamo niccaṁ; M4: pañcasile saññamo niccaṁ

<sup>7</sup> M3: sillavantesu

<sup>8</sup> M3: yācayogam amaccharam

<sup>9</sup> M3: uppajja tidase pure

<sup>10</sup> M3: adds bhagavato

<sup>11</sup> M3: apparo and om. devaputto

<sup>12</sup> M3: adds āgantvā and om. āgato at the end of the sentence

<sup>13</sup> M3 & M4: om. devaputto

<sup>14</sup> M3: catupaccayako

<sup>15</sup> M3: sakaccaṁ

<sup>16</sup> M2: payirūpāsati; M4: om. the line buddhe ca ... payirupāsati

<sup>17</sup> M4: tathāgatassā

<sup>18</sup> M3: thūpam so

mātāpitūnam atthāya bhikkhūnam deti dakkhiṇam<sup>1</sup>  
 sīlavantesu<sup>2</sup> dādānam yācakānam anappakam<sup>3</sup>  
 sādarena<sup>4</sup> cuto<sup>5</sup> tamhā uppajji tidasālaye ti.<sup>6</sup>

so āgantvā cetiyam padakkhiṇam katvā aṭṭhadisāsu<sup>7</sup> vanditvā gandhamālādīhi pūjetvā<sup>8</sup> tadanantare nisīdi. tadā eko devaputto<sup>9</sup> sattasahassaparivārehi<sup>10</sup> cetiyam vandanathāya āgato. thero tam āgataṁ disvā Sujampatiṁ pucchi “devarāja, ayaṁ devaputto<sup>11</sup> Metteyyo bodhisatto” ti. “n’ eso, bhante” ti. “katamo, mahārajā” ti. “aññataro, bhante” ti. “devarāja, ayaṁ devaputto pubbe<sup>12</sup> manussaloke kim akāsi puññan” ti. Sakko tassa puññakammaṁ kathento āha:

sāmañero pure<sup>13</sup> āsi appamatto vicakkhaṇo<sup>14</sup>  
 buddhe dhamme ca saṅghe ca sakkaccaṁ payirupāsati.  
 unhodakena sītena rattindivam atandito<sup>15</sup>  
 sammajjanīpadīpena<sup>16</sup> sadā saṅgham upaṭṭhahi.<sup>17</sup>  
 tena kammavipākena<sup>18</sup> uppajji tidase pure ti.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>1</sup> M3: bhikkhuyaññam yajeti so

<sup>2</sup> M3 & M4: sillavantesu

<sup>3</sup> M3: yācakānam vanibbake

<sup>4</sup> M3: sādharena

<sup>5</sup> M3: cutto

<sup>6</sup> M3: uppaja tidase pure; M4: uppajja tidasā(la)ye ti

<sup>7</sup> M2: aṭṭha(di)sāsu

<sup>8</sup> M3: *om. gandhamālādīhi pūjetvā*

<sup>9</sup> M3: *om. devaputto*

<sup>10</sup> M4: sattatisahasse(na); M3: *adds āgantvā and om. āgato at the end of the sentence*

<sup>11</sup> M2 & M4: *om. devaputto*

<sup>12</sup> M3: *om. devaputto pubbe; M2 & M4: om. devaputto*

<sup>13</sup> M2: *om. pure*

<sup>14</sup> M3: appamattā pur’ āsi paṭṭhigā

<sup>15</sup> M2: attandito

<sup>16</sup> M3: samajanīpadiyena; M4: samajanīpena

<sup>17</sup> M3: udakaseyyanāsanam

<sup>18</sup> M3: tena vipākena

<sup>19</sup> M3: uppaja tidase pure; M4: uppajja tidase pure ti

so āgantvā<sup>1</sup> cetiyam padakkhiṇam katvā aṭṭhadisāsu vanditvā gandhamālādīhi pūjetvā<sup>2</sup> tadanantare nisīdi. tadā aparo<sup>3</sup> devaputto asītisahassaparivārehi cetiyam vandanathāya āgato.<sup>4</sup> thero tam āgatam<sup>5</sup> disvā Sujampatim pucchi “devarāja, ayam devaputto<sup>6</sup> Metteyyo bodhisatto” ti. “n’ eso, bhante” ti. “katamo, mahārājā” ti. “aññataro, bhante” ti. “devarāja ayam<sup>7</sup> pubbe manussaloke kim akāsi puññan” ti. Sakko tassa puññakammaṁ kathento<sup>8</sup> āha:

duggatassa<sup>9</sup> kule jāto parādhinena<sup>10</sup> jīvati.  
gocare ca bhikkhum disvā<sup>11</sup> paragehesu tiṭṭhati<sup>12</sup>  
gehasāmim ajānantam<sup>13</sup> pabodhetvā subhāsitā<sup>14</sup>:  
sīlavanto ayyo sāmi<sup>15</sup> gharadvāresu<sup>16</sup> tiṭṭhati.  
yathāladdham piṇḍapātam<sup>17</sup> sādhukam dehi tādino.<sup>18</sup>  
sutvāna gharasāmiko<sup>19</sup> piyen’ eva tam abravi:  
sādhu tāta subhāsitam<sup>20</sup> piṇḍapātam<sup>21</sup> dadāmi ’ham;

<sup>1</sup> M2: so gantvā

<sup>2</sup> M3: *adds* bhagavato; M3: *om. gandhamālādīhi pūjetvā*

<sup>3</sup> M3: *om. tadā*; M3: *apparo*

<sup>4</sup> M3 & M4: asītisahassehi; M3: *adds āgantvā and om. āgato at the end of the sentence*

<sup>5</sup> M4: *om. āgatam*

<sup>6</sup> M3 & M4: *om. devaputto*

<sup>7</sup> M2: *adds devaputto*

<sup>8</sup> M2: karonto

<sup>9</sup> M2: duttasa; M3: dugatassa

<sup>10</sup> M2 & M4: paradinnena

<sup>11</sup> M2: gocaram bhikkhum disvā; M3 & M4: bhikkhussa gocaram disvā

<sup>12</sup> M2: tiṭṭhakam

<sup>13</sup> M3: gehasāmi na jānti

<sup>14</sup> M2: subhāsito; M3: subāsitā

<sup>15</sup> M3 & M4: ayyassa sīlavanto so

<sup>16</sup> M2: gharadhāresu

<sup>17</sup> M3 & M4: piṇḍipātam

<sup>18</sup> M2 & M3: tādisam; M4: tādise

<sup>19</sup> M3: sutvā gharassa sāmica

<sup>20</sup> M3 & M4: subhāsehi

<sup>21</sup> M3 & M4: piṇḍipātam

piṇḍapātam<sup>271</sup> gahetvāna therassa upanāmayi.

etena vacībhedenā<sup>1</sup> uppajji tidase pure ti.<sup>2</sup>

so āgantvā cetiyam<sup>3</sup> padakkhiṇam katvā atīhadisāsu vanditvā gandhamālādīhi pūjetvā<sup>4</sup> tadanantare nisīdi. tadā eko devaputto navuttisahassaparivārehi<sup>5</sup> cetiyam vandanatthāya āgato. therō tam āgataṁ<sup>6</sup> disvā Sujampatiṁ pucchi “devarāja, ayam devaputto<sup>7</sup> Metteyyo bodhisatto” ti.<sup>8</sup> “katamo, mahārajā” ti. “aññataro, bhante” ti. “devarāja, ayam devaputto<sup>9</sup> pubbe manussaloke kim akāsi puññan” ti. Sakko tassa puññakammam kathento āha:

Tāmbapanṇiyā dīpe so<sup>10</sup> Kaṇṇikārikagāmake<sup>11</sup>  
disvā tathāgataṁ thūpam<sup>12</sup> kaṇṇikārena pūjayi  
cakkhudvayapadipena<sup>13</sup> sirasā<sup>14</sup> pupphitena ca  
vacasā dhūpakārena<sup>15</sup> manasā va sugandhitā.<sup>16</sup>  
tena kammavipākena uppajji tidase pure ti.<sup>17</sup>

so āgantvā cetiyam padakkhiṇam katvā atīhadisāsu vanditvā gandhamālādīhi pūjetvā<sup>18</sup> tadanantare nisīdi. tadā eko devaputto

<sup>1</sup> M3: piyavādena

<sup>2</sup> M3: uppappajja tidase pure; M4: upajja tidase pure ti

<sup>3</sup> M3: *om. cetiyam*

<sup>4</sup> M3: *om. gandhamālādīhi pūjetvā*

<sup>5</sup> M3 & M4: navuttisahashehi; M3: *adds āgantvā and om. āgato at the end of the sentence*

<sup>6</sup> M4: *om. āgataṁ*

<sup>7</sup> M3 & M4: *om. devaputto*

<sup>8</sup> M2, M3 & M4: *add n' eso bhante ti*

<sup>9</sup> M3: *om. ayam devaputto; M4: om. devaputto*

<sup>10</sup> M3: Tāmbapanṇadīpe ca so

<sup>11</sup> M2: Kaṇṇikārikagāmake; M3: Kaṇṇikāre gāmake; M4: Kaṇṇikāre ca gāmake

<sup>12</sup> M2 & M4: tathāgatathūpam

<sup>13</sup> M2: cakkhudvayam; M3: nayanajalapadipena

<sup>14</sup> M2: sirisā; M3: sirisā dipena ca

<sup>15</sup> M3: *adds ca*

<sup>16</sup> M4: sugandhakā

<sup>17</sup> M3: uppajja tidase pure; M4: uppajja tidase pure ti

<sup>18</sup> M3: *om. gandhamālādīhi pūjetvā*

satasahassaparivārehi<sup>1</sup> cetiyam vandanatthāya āgato. therō tam āgatam disvā Sujampatim pucchi “devarāja, ayam devaputto<sup>2</sup> Metteyyo bodhisatto” ti. “n’ eso, bhante” ti. “katamo, mahārājā” ti. “aññataro, bhante” ti.<sup>3</sup> “devarāja ayam devaputto<sup>4</sup> pubbe manussaloke kim akāsi puññan” ti. Sakko tassa puññakammañ kathento<sup>5</sup> āha:

Anurādhapure pubbe daliddo<sup>6</sup> tiñhārako<sup>7</sup>  
 pāññatipātā virato<sup>8</sup> kalyāño sarañe tñhito.  
 tiñnakattham haritvāna<sup>9</sup> sammājīvena<sup>10</sup> jīvati.  
 aparena samayena<sup>11</sup> nadīm gacchati ekako  
 rajatañ vālukam<sup>12</sup> disvā viyūhitvāna so tadā<sup>13</sup>  
 cetiyam pi karitvāna sumano etad abravi<sup>14</sup>:  
 aho subham<sup>15</sup> vata cetiyam me<sup>16</sup> veduriyavaññaruciram  
 pabhassaram<sup>17</sup> aggi yathā pajjalitena<sup>18</sup> susubham  
 hadayañgamam<sup>19</sup> vicittakam ulāram.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>1</sup> M3 & M4: satasahassehi; M3: adds āgantvā and om. āgato at the end of the sentence

<sup>2</sup> M3 & M4: om. devaputto

<sup>3</sup> M3: om. aññataro bhante ti

<sup>4</sup> M3 & M4: om. devaputto

<sup>5</sup> M3: om. kathento

<sup>6</sup> M4: dalido

<sup>7</sup> M3: paradukkhamukule āhu

<sup>8</sup> M3: viratto

<sup>9</sup> M3: tiñnakattham gahetvāna

<sup>10</sup> M3: samā jīvena

<sup>11</sup> M3: tadāprena samayena; M4: tadā aprena samayena

<sup>12</sup> M3: bāhukam; M4: bālukam

<sup>13</sup> M4: om. viyūhitvāna so tadā

<sup>14</sup> M2: etam abravi; M3: eta bravi

<sup>15</sup> M3: surūpam

<sup>16</sup> M4: om. me

<sup>17</sup> M2: pabhassavaram

<sup>18</sup> M2: ambaggi yathā pajjalittena

<sup>19</sup> M3: lobham hadayamam

<sup>20</sup> M4: (vi)cittakam olaram

vandāmi<sup>1</sup> cetiyam varam bālukā<sup>2</sup> pakaṭam mayā.  
 kāyena vacā manasā saha puppehi pūjayi.  
 sīlavante bharitvāna<sup>3</sup> yathāladdham dadāti<sup>4</sup> so.  
 tena kammavipākena uppajji tidasālaye ti.<sup>5</sup>  
 so pi<sup>6</sup> āgantvā cetiyam padakkhiṇam katvā atthadisāsu vanditvā<sup>7</sup>  
 gandhamālādīhi pūjetvā<sup>8</sup> tadanantare nisīdi.

evam dvādasahi devaputtehi upalakkhitam<sup>9</sup> pathamam Māleyyavatthum  
 samattam.

tadā Ariyametteyyo<sup>10</sup> bodhisatto dasasatakiraṇanisākarapabhātireka-  
 pabhāvirājitehi koṭisatasahassasurayuvatisuraputtehi parivārito tārā-  
 ganehi parivārito<sup>11</sup> jaladharapatalavirahitasaradasamayākāsasamuggato  
 paripuṇṇacandamaṇḍalo viya virocamāno<sup>12</sup> dipadhūpagandhamālādīhi<sup>13</sup>  
 gāhāpetvā Tusitabhavanato otaritvā<sup>14</sup> cetiyam vandanatthāya sakala-  
 tidasapuram<sup>15</sup> dibboghāsenā obhāsento<sup>16</sup> dibbagandhehi pavāyanto<sup>17</sup>

<sup>1</sup> M3 & M4: vandhāmi

<sup>2</sup> M2, M3 & M4: bālukam

<sup>3</sup> M2: bharitvā; M3: sillavante; M4: silavantam

<sup>4</sup> M3: dadāmi

<sup>5</sup> M2: uppajji tidase pure ti; M3: uppajja tidase pure; M4: uppaje tidasālaye ti

<sup>6</sup> M3: om. pi

<sup>7</sup> M2: vanditvāna; M4: vandhitvā

<sup>8</sup> M3: om. gandhamālādīhi pūjetvā

<sup>9</sup> M2: upallikkhitum

<sup>10</sup> M3: om. aria

<sup>11</sup> M4: om. tārāganehi parivārito; M3: koṭisatasahassehi devagaṇehi parivārito *in place of* dasasatakiraṇa ... tārāganehi parivārito

<sup>12</sup> M3: om. jaladharapatala ... virocamāno

<sup>13</sup> M2, M3 & M4: ... mālādīni

<sup>14</sup> M2: ottaritvā; M3: *replaces* cetiyam vandanatthāya ... koṭīhi parivārito *by* parivārādasento āha

<sup>15</sup> M4: sākalatida(sa)puram

<sup>16</sup> M2: dibboghāsantā

<sup>17</sup> M2: vāyanto

anopamāya sakapakatililāya anopamena sakapakatisirivilāsenā cetiyaṅganam āgantvā padakkhiṇam katvā<sup>1</sup> atthadisāsu vanditvā pūjetvā pācinadisābhāge<sup>2</sup> nisīdi.

tena vuttam:

tadā Ariyametteyyo koṭīhi parivārito.<sup>3</sup>  
 purato ca satam kaññā pacchato accharā satam  
 dakkhiṇato satam kaññā vāmato<sup>4</sup> accharā satam.  
 tāsam majhe ca<sup>5</sup> Metteyyo tārā majhe va candimā.<sup>6</sup>  
 dibbaccharānam rāmīhi tāsam ābharaṇassa<sup>7</sup> ca  
 jotayanti disā sabbā<sup>8</sup> koṭicandappabhā viyā ti.<sup>9</sup>

thero bodhisattam dūrato<sup>10</sup> āgatam disvā Sujampatiṁ pucchi “devarāja,<sup>11</sup> ayam Metteyyo bodhisatto” ti. “āma, bhante” ti. “devarāja, etā<sup>12</sup> devakaññā Metteyyassa purato āgatā<sup>13</sup> setaramsā<sup>14</sup> setavatthā setābharaṇā pubbe manussaloke kim akāmsu<sup>15</sup> puññan” ti. Sakko tāsam puññakammam kathento āha:

bhante devaccharā sabbā pubbe jātā mānusake<sup>16</sup>  
 uposathamhi divase puññam dānādikam<sup>17</sup> karā  
 setavattham setamālam setagandhavilepanam

<sup>1</sup> M4: *om. padakkhiṇam* katvā

<sup>2</sup> M2: bhāgena

<sup>3</sup> M2: koṭīh' imo satasahassaparivārehi

<sup>4</sup> M3: bāto

<sup>5</sup> M4: va

<sup>6</sup> M4: candhimā

<sup>7</sup> M2 & M4: ābharaṇa

<sup>8</sup> M4: jotayanti sabbā disā

<sup>9</sup> M2: koṭicandappaā viyā ti [*thus in Denis' ms.*]; M4: koṭicandhappabha viyā ti

<sup>10</sup> M3: duratam

<sup>11</sup> M3: *om. rāja*

<sup>12</sup> M3: ayan̄ etā

<sup>13</sup> M2: āgato; M3: gatā

<sup>14</sup> M4: setaramsī

<sup>15</sup> M2: akiṁsu; M3 & M4: akāsi

<sup>16</sup> M2 & M4: manussake; M3: manussaloke

<sup>17</sup> M2: puññadānādikam; M4: puññam dhanādikam

setam āhārakam<sup>1</sup> datvā buddhaseṭṭhassa bhikkhuno.<sup>2</sup>

ten' eva puññakammēna<sup>3</sup> Metteyyapūrato gatā ti.<sup>4</sup>

thero tam sutvā<sup>5</sup> tāsam puññakammaṁ pasāṁsanto<sup>6</sup> puna Sujampatiṁ pucchi “devarāja, etā<sup>7</sup> devakaññā Metteyyassa dakkhiṇapassena āgatā<sup>8</sup> pītarāṁsā pītabharaṇalañkatā<sup>9</sup> pubbe manussaloke kim akāṁsu<sup>10</sup> puññan” ti. Sakko tāsam puññakammāṁ kathento āha:

bhante devaccharā sabbā pubbe jātā manusake<sup>11</sup>

uposathamhi divase puññām sīlādikam<sup>12</sup> karā

pītavattham<sup>13</sup> pītamālam pītagandhavilepanam

pītam āhārakam datvā buddhaseṭṭhassa bhikkhuno.

ten' eva<sup>14</sup> puññakammēna Metteyyadakkhiñā gatā ti.<sup>15</sup>

thero tam sutvā tāsam puññakammaṁ pasāṁsanto<sup>16</sup> puna devarājānam<sup>17</sup> pucchi “devarāja, etā<sup>18</sup> devakaññā vāmapassena āgatā rattaraṁsā<sup>19</sup>

<sup>1</sup> M3: seta-āhārakam; M4: setāhārakam

<sup>2</sup> M3: bhikkhūno

<sup>3</sup> M2: tena puññavipākena

<sup>4</sup> M3: Metteyyapūrato gatā

<sup>5</sup> M4: (sut)vā

<sup>6</sup> M3: pasāṁsati; M4: pa(sam)santo

<sup>7</sup> M3: ayam etā

<sup>8</sup> M2: gatā

<sup>9</sup> M2 & M4: pītābharaṇālañkatā; M3: pitābharaṇāni pitakarā devānam

<sup>10</sup> M2: akāsu; M3 & M4: akāsi

<sup>11</sup> M2 & M3: mānussaloke; M4: mānusake

<sup>12</sup> M2: mālādikam

<sup>13</sup> M3 & M4: pīta is always written with short i in this passage

<sup>14</sup> M2: tena

<sup>15</sup> M3: Metteyyassa dakkhiṇāgatā

<sup>16</sup> M3: pasāṁsati; M4: karonto (= kathento ?)

<sup>17</sup> M2: Sujampatiṁ pucchi; M3: sudevarājānam pucchi

<sup>18</sup> M3: ayam etā

<sup>19</sup> M3: ratarasā

rattavatthā rattābharaṇā<sup>1</sup> pubbe manussaloke kim akāmsu<sup>2</sup> puññan” ti.  
Sakko tāsam puññakammam<sup>3</sup> kathento āha:

bhante devaccharā<sup>4</sup> sabbā pubbe<sup>5</sup> jatā manusake<sup>6</sup>  
uposathamhi divase sutvā dhammam supūjitatā<sup>7</sup>  
rattavattham rattamālam rattagandhavilepanam  
rattam āhārakam datvā buddhaseṭṭhassa bhikkhuno<sup>8</sup>  
ratanatthayam<sup>9</sup> pūjesum Metteyyavāmato gatā ti<sup>10</sup>

thero tam sutvā tāsam<sup>11</sup> puññakammam pasāmsanto<sup>12</sup> puna Sujampatim  
pucchi<sup>13</sup> “devarāja, etā<sup>14</sup> devakaññā<sup>15</sup> pacchimapassena āgatā sāmarāmsā  
sāmavatthā sāmabharaṇā<sup>16</sup> pubbe manussaloke kim akāmsu<sup>17</sup> puññan” ti.  
Sakko tāsam puññakammam kathento āha:

bhante devaccharā sabbā pubbe jatā manusake<sup>18</sup>  
uposathamhi divase sutvā dhammam supūjitatā<sup>19</sup>  
sāmavattham sāmamālam<sup>20</sup> sāmagandhavilepanam

<sup>1</sup> M3: rattabhabraṇāni ratikarā devānam

<sup>2</sup> M3: akāsi

<sup>3</sup> M4: karonto (= kathento ?)

<sup>4</sup> M3: devapurā

<sup>5</sup> M2: *om. pubbe*

<sup>6</sup> M2: mānussake; M3: manussaloke; M4: mānusake

<sup>7</sup> M2: supūjetvā; M3: supūjitatā

<sup>8</sup> M3: *om. this verse*

<sup>9</sup> M2, M3 & M4: rattanatthayam

<sup>10</sup> M3: Metteyyavāmato āgatā

<sup>11</sup> M2: *om. tāsam*

<sup>12</sup> M3: pasāmsati; M4: pa(sam)santo

<sup>13</sup> M2: *om. pucchi*

<sup>14</sup> M3: ayam etā

<sup>15</sup> M4: devakaññāyo

<sup>16</sup> M3: sāmabharaṇāni sāmapitikarā devānam

<sup>17</sup> M3: akāsi

<sup>18</sup> M2 & M3: manussaloke; M4: manussake

<sup>19</sup> M2: supūjito

<sup>20</sup> M3: sāmavatthā sāmamālā sāmagandhavilepanam; M4: sāmavatthā sāma-mālam, *and om. sāmagandhavilepanam*

sāmam āhārakam datvā buddhaseṭṭhassa bhikkhuno.<sup>1</sup>

saṃyamā saṃvibhātā ca<sup>2</sup> Metteyyapacchato gatā ti.<sup>3</sup>

thero tam sutvā tāsam<sup>4</sup> puññakammam pasāṃsanto<sup>5</sup> puna Sujampati<sup>6</sup> pucchi “devarāja,<sup>7</sup> Metteyyo īdisam<sup>8</sup> sampatti<sup>9</sup> labhati. kiṃ pana puññam akāsī” ti.<sup>9</sup> Sakko Metteyyassa<sup>10</sup> puññam saṃkhepena sāgarātikkamanasopamāya<sup>11</sup> pabbatārohanandhopamāya<sup>12</sup> ca<sup>13</sup> paññāya pakāsetvā puna saddhādhikapaññādhikaviriyādhikasamkhātānam tiṇṇam anappakappopacitakāyavacimāno<sup>14</sup> paññihatatividhasucaritacadhanapariccāga<sup>15</sup>-puttapanariccāga<sup>16</sup>-bhariyāpariccāga-aṅgapanariccāga-jīvitapanariccāga-samkhātādānapāramī<sup>17</sup> tadanurūpasilanekkhamma-paññāviriyakhantiśaccādiṭṭhānamettapekkhā ti dasapāramī<sup>18</sup> dasa<sup>19</sup>-upapāramī<sup>20</sup> dasaparamatthapāramī ti sama<sup>21</sup>-tiṃsapāramiyo puritānam

<sup>1</sup> M3: *om. this verse*

<sup>2</sup> M3: sayamālavibhātāya; M4: saññamā saṃvibhātā ca

<sup>3</sup> M2: Metteyyassa pacchato gatā ti; M3: Metteyyapacchato gatā

<sup>4</sup> M2: *om. tāsam*

<sup>5</sup> M3: pasāṃsati

<sup>6</sup> M2: *adds ca*

<sup>7</sup> M3: *the following passage as far as aham jambūdīpāgato 'mhi mahārājā ti is quite different. It is hard to read and what I have been able to decipher is added at the end of the variant readings. See Appendix A.*

<sup>8</sup> M2: tadiśam

<sup>9</sup> M2 & M4: akāsi

<sup>10</sup> M[*number omitted in Denis' ms.*]: *adds va*

<sup>11</sup> M2: sāgarattikkamana- ; M4: sāgaratikkamana-

<sup>12</sup> M2: pabbatārohandhopamāya

<sup>13</sup> M2 & M4: *add attano*

<sup>14</sup> M2: vacimanto

<sup>15</sup> M2: pañcamahāpariccāga *instead of dhanapariccāga which is included in the list lower down; M4: always writes paricāga*

<sup>16</sup> M2: *adds dhanapariccāga*

<sup>17</sup> M2: pāramita: M4: samkhātāni dānapāramī

<sup>18</sup> M2: mettapekkhātidasapāramī; M4: metta-upekkhātidasapāramī

<sup>19</sup> M4: *om. dasa*

<sup>20</sup> M4: u(pa)pāramī

<sup>21</sup> M2: *om. sama*

bodhisattānam viriyādhikabodhisatto ariyaMetteyyo bodhisatto ti  
pakāsento imā gāthayo āha:

Metteyyo bodhisatto hi<sup>1</sup> katvā puññāni nekadhā  
seṭṭhasabbaññūbuddhehi na sakkā tāni vanṇitum<sup>2</sup>  
ekadese na vuttāni saso<sup>3</sup> sāgaratikkamo  
andho va pabbatāroho patiṭṭham na labhissati.<sup>4</sup>  
tathā Metteyyo puññāni<sup>5</sup> anantāparimāṇakā  
anappakappe sambhāre sambhārityvāna sabbaso.  
tayo hi bodhisattāsum<sup>6</sup> eko thāmādiko mato<sup>7</sup>  
kappasatasahassāni asaṅkheyāni solasa<sup>8</sup>  
pūretvā paramī sabbā patto sambodhim uttamam;  
eko saddhādhiko mato pākaṭo idha mānuse<sup>9</sup>  
kappasatasahassāni asaṅkheyāni aṭṭha pi<sup>10</sup>  
pūretvā pāramī sabbā patto sambodhim uttamam;  
eko paññādhiko mato pākaṭo idha mānuse<sup>11</sup>  
kappasatasahassāni cattāri ca<sup>12</sup> asaṅkheyāni  
pūretvā paramī sabbā patto sambodhim uttamam.  
Metteyyo bodhisatto hi<sup>13</sup> tesam thāmādhiko mato<sup>14</sup>  
kappasatasahassāni asaṅkheyāni solasa

<sup>1</sup> M4: pi

<sup>2</sup> M4: vannetum

<sup>3</sup> M2: adds va

<sup>4</sup> M4: labhissamī ti

<sup>5</sup> M2: Metteyyapuññāni; M4: Metteyyassa puññāni

<sup>6</sup> M2: bodhisattesu

<sup>7</sup> M2: eko ca viriyādhiko matto (*always written thus in M2*); M4: om. the  
passage up to eko saddhādhiko mato

<sup>8</sup> M2: solasi

<sup>9</sup> M2: mānusse; M4: mānuse

<sup>10</sup> M2: asaṅkheyāni aṭṭhi pi

<sup>11</sup> M2: mānusse; M4: manu(se)

<sup>12</sup> M2 & M4: om. ca

<sup>13</sup> M2: tu

<sup>14</sup> M2: tesahaviriyādhiko matto; M4: replaces this verse with viriyādhika-  
Metteyyo tesu thāmādiko mato

pūretvā pāramī sabbā<sup>1</sup> Tusite upapajjati.<sup>2</sup>

cavītvāna tato kāyā sambodhiṃ pāpuṇissatī ti.

evan̄i Sakkena<sup>3</sup> saddhiṃ there kathente yeva Metteyyo cetiyaṅganam<sup>4</sup> āgantvā padakkhiṇam̄ katvā aṭṭhadisāsu vanditvā gandhamālādīhi pūjetvā pañcaṅgapatiṭṭhitena vanditvā pācīnadiśabhāge<sup>5</sup> nisidi. bodhisatto tattha nisinnam̄ theram̄ vanditvā pucchi “kuto āgato si, bhante” ti.<sup>6</sup> “aham̄ Jambūdipāyato ’mhi,<sup>7</sup> mahārājā” ti. “bhante, Jambūdipamanussānam̄ kiṃ vattamān” ti.<sup>8</sup> thero bodhisattassa pañhaṇam̄ kathento āha:

sabbe te manussā tattha sakakammaṇa<sup>9</sup> jīvitā<sup>10</sup>  
 samiddhā ca daliddā ca<sup>11</sup> sukhitā dukkhitā pi<sup>12</sup> ca  
 abhirūpā virūpā ca<sup>13</sup> dīghāyukā appāyukā.<sup>14</sup>  
 samiddhā appakā honti daliddā<sup>15</sup> ca bahūjanā;  
 sukhitā appakā honti<sup>16</sup> dukkhitā ca<sup>17</sup> bahūjanā;  
 surūpā appakā<sup>18</sup> honti virūpā ca<sup>19</sup> bahūjanā;  
 dīghāyukā appakā honti appāyukā ca<sup>20</sup> bahūjanā.

<sup>1</sup> M2: sambodhiṃ

<sup>2</sup> M2: Tussitam̄ uppapajji; M4: Tussitam̄ uppapajjati

<sup>3</sup> M2: Sakena

<sup>4</sup> M2: cetiyaṅgane; M4: *omits this passage up to and including nisinnam̄*

<sup>5</sup> M2: bhāgena

<sup>6</sup> M3: bhante kūto āgato ti

<sup>7</sup> M4: Jambūgato ’mhi

<sup>8</sup> M4: vattamān ti

<sup>9</sup> M2: sakammaṇa

<sup>10</sup> M2 & M4: jīvanti; M3: jīvatā

<sup>11</sup> M4: samiddhā ca daliddhā ca

<sup>12</sup> M3: sukkhitā pi ca (*om. dukkhitā*)

<sup>13</sup> M3: abhirūpā pi ca (*om. virūpā*)

<sup>14</sup> M2: appayukā; M3: dīghāyu(kā) appakāyukā

<sup>15</sup> M3: dalidā; M4: daliddhā

<sup>16</sup> M3: sukkhitā a(ppa)kā honti

<sup>17</sup> M2: *om. ca*

<sup>18</sup> M3: appa(kā)

<sup>19</sup> M2: *om. ca*

<sup>20</sup> M4: *om. ca*; M3: appā(yukā)

manussā appakā honti tiracchānā bahūtarā<sup>1</sup>;  
tasmā vadāmi 'ham sabbe sakakamma<sup>2</sup> jīvitā ti.<sup>3</sup>

bodhisatto therassa vacanam sutvā “bhante, Jambūdīpamanussā kiṁ bahūpuññāni<sup>4</sup> karonti udāhu pāpāni” ti. “mahārāja,<sup>5</sup> puññam karontā appakā honti<sup>6</sup> pāpam karontā bahutarā honti” ti.<sup>7</sup> “kiṁ puññam karontā,<sup>8</sup> bhante” ti. “mahārāja, Jambūdīpamānussā keci dānam denti keci sīlam rakkhanti keci dhammadānam denti keci uposathaṁ karonti keci buddhapatimam karonti keci vihāram karonti keci āvāsam<sup>9</sup> karonti keci vassāvāsam denti<sup>10</sup> keci cīvaraṁ denti keci piñḍapātam<sup>11</sup> denti keci bhesajjam denti<sup>12</sup> keci bodhirukkhaṁ ropenti<sup>13</sup> keci thūpaṁ karonti<sup>14</sup> keci cetiyam karonti<sup>15</sup> keci ārāmam karonti<sup>16</sup> keci setum karonti keci cañkamam karonti keci kūpam khananti keci taṭākam khananti<sup>17</sup> keci parikkhāram denti keci dasavidhaṁ dānam denti<sup>18</sup> keci mātupitupatthānam karonti<sup>19</sup> keci kālakatānam nātakānam attaya yaññam<sup>20</sup>

<sup>1</sup> M3: *om. this verse*

<sup>2</sup> M2: sakamena; M4: sakamma

<sup>3</sup> M2 & M3: jīvantī ti

<sup>4</sup> M3: *om. bahū*

<sup>5</sup> M4: *om. this phrase up to the second* mahārāja

<sup>6</sup> M3: *om. honti*

<sup>7</sup> M2 & M3: honti

<sup>8</sup> M3: *om. karontā*

<sup>9</sup> M3: ārāmam; M4: *om. this phrase*

<sup>10</sup> M3: keci sālam karonti

<sup>11</sup> M3 & M4: piñḍipātam

<sup>12</sup> M3: *om. this phrase*

<sup>13</sup> M3: keci bodharopenti

<sup>14</sup> M3: *om. this phrase*

<sup>15</sup> M3: *om. the verbs of this phrase and the eight following phrases*; M4: *om. this phrase and the six following phrases*

<sup>16</sup> M3: āvāsam

<sup>17</sup> M2: tanākam

<sup>18</sup> M3: dasavidadānam

<sup>19</sup> M3: mātāpitu-upatthānam

<sup>20</sup> M4: nātinam atthāya yaññam; M3: *om. this phrase*

karonti<sup>1</sup> keci ratanattayaṁ pūjenti keci puttāṁ pabbājenti keci dhammaputtāṁ pabbājenti<sup>2</sup> keci buddhapatimāṁ pūjenti evam<sup>3</sup> sabbāni kusalakkammāni Jambūdīpamanussā yathāsatiyathābalāṁ yathā-ajjhāsayāṁ karontī” ti kathesi.<sup>4</sup> “bhante, Jambūdīpamanussā evarūpāni puññāni katvā<sup>5</sup> kiṁ paṭṭhanāṁ karontī” ti.<sup>6</sup> therō tassa manussānam panidhānam karonto<sup>7</sup> āha:

deva te puññamattāṁ pi katvā kārenti vā pana  
paresāṁ vā anumodanti tuyham̄ patthenti<sup>8</sup> bodhiyā:  
imīnā katapuññena dānasilādinā pana<sup>9</sup>  
Metteyyass’ eva buddhassa dassanañ ca<sup>10</sup> labhāmhase<sup>11</sup>;  
yāvānupajjate buddho Metteyyo devapūjito  
samsāre samsarantā pi<sup>12</sup> apāye na gamāmhase.<sup>13</sup>  
Jambūdīpamanussā te puññāṁ katvā tadā pana  
evam̄ kariṁsu pañidhīm<sup>14</sup> sabbaṭṭhānesu sabbadā ti.

bodhisatto Jambūdīpamanussānam pavattim sutvā somanassam patto<sup>15</sup> hutvā<sup>16</sup> evam āha “bhante, sabbe janā maṁ sabbaññutām pattam daṭṭhum<sup>17</sup> patthento<sup>18</sup> Mahāvessantarajātakam ekadivase yeva

<sup>1</sup> M4: *adds two phrases here*: keci cetiyam karonti keci ārāmaṁ karonti; M4 *ends here*

<sup>2</sup> M2: *om. this phrase*

<sup>3</sup> M3: *om. evam*

<sup>4</sup> M2: katheti; M3: *om. kathesi*

<sup>5</sup> M3: bhante manussā evarupāni karontā

<sup>6</sup> M3: kiṁ patthitam kiṁ panidhānam dakkhinodakam pātetvā

<sup>7</sup> M2: kathento; M3: panidhikathento evam āha

<sup>8</sup> M2: paṭṭhenti; M3: pattheti

<sup>9</sup> M3: dānam silānam pana

<sup>10</sup> M2: dassanam ca

<sup>11</sup> M3: labhāmhasa

<sup>12</sup> M3: samsaranto pi

<sup>13</sup> M2: gamhāmhase

<sup>14</sup> M2 & M3: panidhi

<sup>15</sup> M2: somanussapatto; M3: somanassapatto

<sup>16</sup> M3: *om. hutvā*

<sup>17</sup> M2: sabbaññutappattam daṭṭham; M3: sabbaññutadaṭṭhum

pariniṭṭhitam<sup>1</sup> suṇantu; sahassapadipena vā pūjetvā sahassapadumena vā sahassaniluppalena vā sahassa-indivarena<sup>2</sup> vā sahassa-maṇḍārapupphena<sup>3</sup> vā sahassa-ummārapupphena<sup>4</sup> vā sahassadhajena vā sahassachattena vā sahassapaṭākena<sup>5</sup> vā sahassayāññena vā sabbam āharitvā dhammam pūjetvā mama bodhikāle mama sammukhā<sup>6</sup> saha paṭisambhidhāhi<sup>7</sup> arahattam paṭilabhisantī” ti. iti vatvā puna<sup>8</sup> pāpamanussānam attano buddhattadassanam alabhamānabhāvam kathento gātham āha:

paṭighāṭam bhikkhunīdūsam<sup>9</sup> karonti saṃghabhedakam  
pañcānantariyakammam<sup>10</sup> thūpam bodhissa chedakam<sup>11</sup>  
bodhisattañ ca mārenti<sup>12</sup> santarñ saṃghassa hārakā<sup>13</sup>

<sup>18</sup> M2: patthento; M3: patthentā (*From this point onwards, the text of M3, although having virtually the same meaning, is set out slightly differently. We have transcribed the whole of it here as far as the verses: ... bhikkhu vā bhikkhunī vā upāsako vā upāsikā vā mahāvessantaram puppehi vā jātake ekadivase yeva suṇanti sahassayaññena sahassadhupena sahassadipena vā sahassaniluppalapuppehi vā sahassapadumapuppehi vā sahassa-umārapuppehi vā cetiyassa pujenti vā buddhapatimam pujenti vā sabbe te kālam karitvā sattasampattim yathā paribhuñjītvā mama bodhikāle mama samukhā sahassasambhidhāhi arahattam pattim labhanti vatvā te dassento gātham āha ... )*

<sup>1</sup> M2: parinithitam

<sup>2</sup> M2: *om. this phrase*

<sup>3</sup> M2: maṇḍālapupphena

<sup>4</sup> M2: unmārapupphena

<sup>5</sup> M2: *om. this phrase*

<sup>6</sup> M2: samukhā

<sup>7</sup> M5 starts here. (*The beginning of the text is quite different; we have transcribed up to the verses as far as we have been able to decipher them: ... hi arahattam paṭilabhisantī ti āpariyo pokado vadeyya ekacce kappanā dubbalā kiñ karissantī ti parihāro tam vadeyya thapetvā samiddhā c’ eva mahaddanā ca kareyyanti evañ ca pana vatvā bodhisatto puna manussānam attano buddhattam dassanam alabha(mā)nabhāvam kathento āha*)

<sup>8</sup> M2: *om. puna*

<sup>9</sup> M3: patighabhikkhunidūsam

<sup>10</sup> M2: pañcānantariyakammam; M5: pañcānantariyakam kammam

<sup>11</sup> M3: bodhiñ ca chedakam; M5: bodhiñ ca chedakā

<sup>12</sup> M2: bodhisantakam; M3: bodhisattassa māreti

maccherā ca pamādā ca na honti mama santike ti.<sup>1</sup>

thero tassa vacanam sutvā evam ahā<sup>2</sup> “mahārāja,<sup>3</sup> sādu te<sup>4</sup> vacanam. aham<sup>5</sup> Jambūdīpamanussānam kathessāmi. tvam<sup>6</sup> pana kadā buddho bhavissasi” ti.<sup>7</sup> “bhante, Gotamabuddhassa sāsanaṁ pañcavassa-sahassāni ṭhātvā<sup>8</sup> antaradhāyissati. tasmim antarahite<sup>9</sup> loke akusalussannam<sup>10</sup> bhavissati.<sup>11</sup> kusalan ti nāma mattam pi<sup>12</sup> na bhavissati pageva kusaluppatti.<sup>13</sup> tadā anukkamena<sup>14</sup> manussā virahita-hirottappābhinnamariyādā<sup>15</sup> ayam me<sup>16</sup> mātādhītābhaginīnattātisaññam anuppādetvā ajelakakukkuṭasūkarasimgāla soñādayo viya nillajjā<sup>17</sup> bhavissanti.<sup>18</sup> tadā te anukkamena<sup>19</sup> ussanna-akusalappayogena<sup>20</sup> vassasataparicchinnāyukato<sup>21</sup> manussā parihāyitā dasavassāyukā

<sup>13</sup> M2: samghahārakam; M5: santam samghassa hārikam

<sup>1</sup> M3: māma santi ti

<sup>2</sup> M2 & M3: om. evam

<sup>3</sup> M5: devasantusita

<sup>4</sup> M3: sodha te (*In M3 the following passage, up to the verses, is quite different. What we have been able to decipher is added at the end of the variant readings). See Appendix B.*

<sup>5</sup> M5: om. aham

<sup>6</sup> M5: adds kho

<sup>7</sup> M2: bhavissati ti; M5: bhavitum gamissati ti

<sup>8</sup> M5: thatvā

<sup>9</sup> M5: antaradhāhite

<sup>10</sup> M5: akusalāni usannāni

<sup>11</sup> M5: bhavissanti

<sup>12</sup> M2: kusalan ti nāmam mattam pi; M5: kusalam puññan ti nāma mattam na honti

<sup>13</sup> M5: paggeva kusalapuññāni karonti

<sup>14</sup> M2: anukammena; M5: om. tadā anukkamena

<sup>15</sup> M5: manussā ahirikā anotappā bhinnamariyādā

<sup>16</sup> M5: sabbe janā

<sup>17</sup> M2: nilajjā; M5: nilajā

<sup>18</sup> M2: bhavissati

<sup>19</sup> M2: anukammena; M5: atha anukkammena

<sup>20</sup> M2: ussanna-akusalam piyogena; M5: akusalā usannātehi kusalapāpehi payogehi

<sup>21</sup> M2: yukāto; M5: yukā

bhavissanti. yadā pañcavassikadārakassa pañcavassikāya dārikāya<sup>1</sup> āvāho vivāho<sup>2</sup> bhavissati tadā satthantarākappo bhavissati. manussā aññamaññām migasaññikā<sup>3</sup> bhavissanti. tesam danḍādi upakaraṇam hi<sup>4</sup> hatthena gahitagahitam yam kiñci<sup>5</sup> ubhatodhārākhuradhadhārasadisam<sup>6</sup> āvudham bhavissati. te aññamaññām ghātessanti.<sup>7</sup> tesu ye manussā<sup>8</sup> pañditā<sup>9</sup> pañthamam eva<sup>10</sup> tam vināsam sutvā<sup>11</sup> pabbatantarādisu<sup>12</sup> pavisitvā<sup>13</sup> ekikā niliyissanti.<sup>14</sup> te ḥapetvā<sup>15</sup> avasesā sattāham aññamaññām paharitvā<sup>16</sup> vinassissanti. atha<sup>17</sup> sattame divase atikkante attano attano niliyatthānā<sup>18</sup> nikhamitvā aññamaññām āliṅgitvā samaggasamvāsam<sup>19</sup> paṭilabhitvā yan nūna<sup>20</sup> mayam<sup>21</sup> kusalakammam kareyyāma pāñatipātā virameyyāma<sup>22</sup> adinnādānā kāmesu micchācārā

<sup>1</sup> M5: pañcavassikadarikāya ca

<sup>2</sup> M5: āvāhavivaho

<sup>3</sup> M2: miggasaññikā; M5: migasaññino

<sup>4</sup> M2: *om. hi*

<sup>5</sup> M5: *has* yam yam hatthena gahitam tan tam *in place of* tesam danḍādi ... yam kiñci ...

<sup>6</sup> M5: ubhatodhārākhuradhadhārādi

<sup>7</sup> M5: vadhiṣanti

<sup>8</sup> M5: *adds ca and om. manussā*

<sup>9</sup> M5: *adds* kalyānā sattāhabbhantare

<sup>10</sup> M5: pathameva *and om. tam*

<sup>11</sup> M5: *adds* sattāham yāpanamattam gahetvā

<sup>12</sup> M2: pabbantarādiṁsu; M5: pabbatantarādiṁsu

<sup>13</sup> M2: pavisutvā

<sup>14</sup> M5: tāni ekekaṭṭhāne nilayanti

<sup>15</sup> M2: taṭṭhapetvā; M5: teva ḥapetvā

<sup>16</sup> M5: vadhitvā

<sup>17</sup> M5: *om. atha and adds* sakalapathavi ekamamsam lohitā bhavissati

<sup>18</sup> M5: *has te ca attano niliyatthānato in place of* attano attano niliyatthānā

<sup>19</sup> M5: *the text is different up to* yan nūna ... : samaggacittā hutvā ambho usannākusalakammanimitta amhākam nātakāvinatthā honti sujjhapāyena mayam jīvitam labhimhā

<sup>20</sup> M5: yan nuna

<sup>21</sup> M5: *adds* pi

<sup>22</sup> M5: *om. virameyyāma*

musāvādā surāmerayā<sup>1</sup> pisuññāvācā<sup>2</sup> pharussāvācā samphappalāvācā abhijjhā byāpādā micchādiṭṭhiyā pativirameyyāma puññāni karissāmā ti puññāni karissanti.<sup>3</sup> atha dasavassāyukamanussānam vīsativassāyukā dārakā bhavissanti<sup>4</sup>; bhiyyo puññāni karontānam manussānam dārakā<sup>5</sup> anukkamena<sup>6</sup> tiṁsacattālīsapaññāsasaṭṭhi<sup>7</sup> sattati-asītinavuti<sup>8</sup>-sata-vassāyukā<sup>9</sup> bhavissanti. anukkamena<sup>10</sup> dvivassasatāyukā puttā<sup>11</sup> ticatupañcachasatta-aṭṭhanavasatāyukā sahassāyukā.<sup>12</sup> bhavissanti anukkamena<sup>13</sup> sahassāyukānam dvisahassāyukā puttā bhavissanti<sup>14</sup>; ticatupañcachasatta-aṭṭhanavadasasahassāyukā<sup>15</sup> bhavissanti. atha manussā atirekataram dhammaṁ caritvā vassasatasahassāyukā bhavissanti.<sup>16</sup> atirekataram dhammaṁ carantesu anukkamena<sup>17</sup> vassasatasahassākoṭi-āyukā<sup>18</sup> bhavissanti. tato param atirekataram dhammaṁ caritvā<sup>19</sup> asaṁkheyāyukā bhavissanti. tadā sattānam jarāmaraṇāni<sup>20</sup> na paññāyissanti<sup>21</sup>; puna pi pamādām āpajjissanti<sup>22</sup>; tesam

<sup>1</sup> M5: surāmerayamajjhapamādaṭṭhānā

<sup>2</sup> M5: pesuññāvācā

<sup>3</sup> M5: pativicikiccā virameyyāmā ti puññāni karissanti

<sup>4</sup> M5: atha dasavassāyukānam manussānam puttā vīsativassāyukā bhavissanti

<sup>5</sup> M5: has puttā in place of manussānam dārakā

<sup>6</sup> M2: anukammena

<sup>7</sup> M2 & M5: saṭṭhī

<sup>8</sup> M2: navutti

<sup>9</sup> M5: om. vassā

<sup>10</sup> M2: anukammena

<sup>11</sup> M5: om. vassasatāyukā puttā

<sup>12</sup> M5: adds ca

<sup>13</sup> M2: anukammena

<sup>14</sup> M5: om. sahassāyukānam dvisahassāyukā puttā bhavissanti

<sup>15</sup> M5: adds dasasahassāyukā ca

<sup>16</sup> M5: atha manusse su atirekataram dhammaṁ carantesu anukkamena sata-sahassāyukā bhavissanti

<sup>17</sup> M2: anukammena; M5: om. anukammena

<sup>18</sup> M2: yukā; M5: koṭisatasahassāyukā

<sup>19</sup> M5: om. atirekataram dhammaṁ caritvā

<sup>20</sup> M5: jarāmaraṇam

<sup>21</sup> M5: paññāyanti

āyuparihāyissanti.<sup>1</sup> asaṁkheyāyukato sattā<sup>2</sup> parihāyitvā vassakoṭi-  
vassasahassāyukā bhavissanti; tato pi parihāyitvā anukkamena<sup>3</sup>  
navutikoṭivassasahassāyukā bhavissanti.<sup>4</sup> tato pi anukkamena<sup>5</sup>  
parihāyitvā asītivassasahassāyukā bhavissanti. tasmiṁ samaye<sup>6</sup> devo  
anvaḍhamāsaṁ anudasāhaṁ anupañcāhañ ca<sup>7</sup> majjhimayāme  
paṭhavirasam vaḍhento vassissati.<sup>8</sup> tadā<sup>9</sup> Jambūdīpo samiddho hoti<sup>10</sup>  
sabbakālaṁ pupphaphalalatāgumbapādabharito<sup>11</sup> kukkūṭasampātika-  
gāmanigamasamākiṇṇo<sup>12</sup> corakanṭakavirahito<sup>13</sup> appagatadiṭṭhigahano<sup>14</sup>  
rājadhānīsamujjalito<sup>15</sup> sabbaratanasampanno sukhito<sup>16</sup> subhikkho  
khemo<sup>17</sup> bahu-annapānakkhajjabhojanasampanno<sup>18</sup> macchamāṁsādi  
upabhogaparibhogasamiddho.<sup>19</sup> taṭākā sumadhurodakaparipuṇṇā  
sabbattha bhavissanti.<sup>20</sup> tadā bhante<sup>21</sup> jāyapatikā avivādakā akodhanā

<sup>22</sup> M2: puna pi pamādapajissanti; M5: puna pamādaṁ āpajanti

<sup>1</sup> M2: ayupariyāpāyissanti; M5: *attaches this phrase to the following phrase: tesam ayusaṁkheyato parihāyissati vassakoṭi ...*

<sup>2</sup> M2: *om.* sattā

<sup>3</sup> M2: anukammena

<sup>4</sup> M5: *om. this phrase*

<sup>5</sup> M2: anukammena

<sup>6</sup> M5: tadā

<sup>7</sup> M5: anupañcāhaṁ

<sup>8</sup> M2: vassissanti; M5: majjhimayāme rattim pathavi(yā)rasam (saṁ)vaḍhento  
vassanti

<sup>9</sup> M5: tadāyam

<sup>10</sup> M5: samiddho ahosi; *The following text is slightly different:* tadā  
dummālatāgumbhavānicakālameva pupphaphaladharāpādapatatabharito

<sup>11</sup> M2: pādapatibharito

<sup>12</sup> M5: kukkūṭasampattagāmanigamasamākiṇṇo

<sup>13</sup> M2: corakanṭakavirahito; M5: *adds ca*

<sup>14</sup> M2: appagatadiṭṭhitagahano

<sup>15</sup> M5: *adds ca*

<sup>16</sup> M5: *om.* sukhito

<sup>17</sup> M5: *adds ca*

<sup>18</sup> M5: *adds ca*

<sup>19</sup> M5: *om.*

<sup>20</sup> M2: taṭākāsu madhurodakaparipuṇṇo sabbattha bhavissati; M5: taṭākādīṁsu  
sabathamaduropakasampuṇṇo ca bhavissati

pañcakāmaguṇasukham<sup>1</sup> anubhavantā kasivaṇijjādi kammavirahitā<sup>2</sup> sukhena jīvissanti.<sup>3</sup> itthī purisā na suttam kantissanti<sup>4</sup> na tantam vāyissanti<sup>5</sup> dibbavatthāni nivāsissanti. purisā sadārehi santuṭṭhā<sup>6</sup> itthīyo<sup>7</sup> sasāmikehi santuṭṭhā; saṃyamā<sup>8</sup> purisā paradāram na karonti na itthīyo param purisam karonti te piyā manāpā aññamaññam bhavissanti. sabbe te gāmanigamadhanadhaññakhettavatthupamṣuhetu na vivādam karissanti<sup>9</sup>; sabbe manussā surūpā uttamarūpadharā aññamaññam piyā manāpā honti.<sup>10</sup> kākā<sup>11</sup> ulukehi saddhiṃ mettacittā majjārī ca undurehi<sup>12</sup> saddhiṃ mettacittā migā migindehi saddhiṃ mettacittā nañkulā sappehi saddhiṃ mettacittā bhavissanti sīhādayo migehi saddhiṃ mettacittā honti evam aññamaññam paṭisattatiracchānā<sup>13</sup> sabbe<sup>14</sup> mettacittam labhissanti.<sup>15</sup> yadā<sup>16</sup> sālī ekabījā<sup>17</sup> sañjātā āropitā; dve sakatasahassāni dve

<sup>21</sup> M5: *adds* pañcavassasatithīm purisānam āvāho ca vivaho ca bhavissati

<sup>1</sup> M5: *om. guna*

<sup>2</sup> M5: *adds* ca

<sup>3</sup> M2: jīvanti; M5: *puts here the text about the spontaneous growth of rice. We reproduce it in note 16 below.*

<sup>4</sup> M2: na suttakantissanti; M5: tadā iṭṭhīyo suttam na kantissanti

<sup>5</sup> M5: vayissanti

<sup>6</sup> M5: sadārasantuṭṭhā

<sup>7</sup> M5: *adds* ca

<sup>8</sup> M5: *om. the passage between saṃyamā and aññamaññam* piyāmanāpā bhavissanti

<sup>9</sup> M5: tadā gāmanigamakhettavatthupamṣudhanadhaññādi hetu vivā na karissanti

<sup>10</sup> M5: *om. this phrase and adds* khattiyā macchā ca sabbe sanāpati-ādayo ca pañcasilāni rakkhissanti

<sup>11</sup> M5: *the text is different between kākā and aññamaññam*: tadā kākā ca ulukā ca majjhā ca undurā ca miggā ca miggindā ca nañkulā ca sappāpāti sabbe aññamaññam ...

<sup>12</sup> M2: majjhāri

<sup>13</sup> M5: *adds* hi

<sup>14</sup> M5: *om. sabbe and adds aññamaññam*

<sup>15</sup> M5: patilabhissanti

<sup>16</sup> This passage is placed earlier in M5 (see note 3 above), and is slightly different: tadāhi sayamjātasālino ekabījjāya taṇḍula-phalāni dvesakaṭasahassāni dve ca sakaṭasatāni sattati ca sakaṭāni solasa ambānāni dve ca tumbādhikā bhavissanti

sakatasatāni ca dve sakatasattati c' eva ambaṇam soḷasam pi ca atho pi dve ca tumbāni<sup>1</sup> tandulāni pajāyareti.<sup>2</sup> tadāhaṇ bhante dasa-sahassacakkavāḷavāśinam devabrahmānam āyācanam sutvā kāladesadīpakulamātāyusamkhātāni pañcavilokanāni<sup>3</sup> viloketvā buddho<sup>4</sup> manussalokam gamissāmī" ti vatvā attano pāramīvaṇṇam<sup>5</sup> vanṇento āha:

haṇ hi<sup>6</sup> paripūretvā pāramiyo anekadhā  
kappasatasahassāni<sup>7</sup> asamkheyāni soḷasa  
viriyādhiko<sup>8</sup> bodhisatto racitvā<sup>9</sup> demi dānakam  
yadā sabbaññutam patto vikalāngā na honti te.<sup>10</sup>  
sīsam me racitam<sup>11</sup> katvā añjanam akkhiyugalam  
yācakānam adādānam kappakotisatehi pi<sup>12</sup>  
yadā sabbaññutam patto andhā na honti mānusā.<sup>13</sup>  
racitvā aṅgapaccaṅge<sup>14</sup> dānam datvā asesakam<sup>15</sup>  
yadā sabbaññutam patto vikalāngā na honti te.<sup>16</sup>  
na vadāmi musāvādam yācakānam avañcano<sup>17</sup>  
yadā sabbaññutam patto na mūgā honti mānusā.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>17</sup> M2: ekasāli-ekabijā sayamjatā

<sup>1</sup> M2: tumbhāni

<sup>2</sup> M2: ca jāyareti

<sup>3</sup> M5: pañcamahāvilocanāni

<sup>4</sup> M5: *om.* buddho

<sup>5</sup> M5: *om.* vanṇam

<sup>6</sup> M3: pi; M5: *om.* hi and writes paripuretvāna

<sup>7</sup> M2: kappāsattasahassāhi

<sup>8</sup> M3: saddhādhiko

<sup>9</sup> M2: caritvā

<sup>10</sup> M2: me; M3: ca; M5: patto surūpā honti

<sup>11</sup> M3: sisameracitam

<sup>12</sup> M3 & M4: ca

<sup>13</sup> M2 & M5: na andhā honti manusā; M3: vikalāngā na honti ca

<sup>14</sup> M2: caritvā aṅgapañcaṅgam; M5: aṅgapañcaṅge

<sup>15</sup> M5: demi dānam asesatto

<sup>16</sup> M2 & M5: me; M3: ca

<sup>17</sup> M3: na vañcanam; M5: avañcanam

<sup>18</sup> M2 & M5: muggā; M3: muggā honti tadā pana

dhammar̄u sutvā pasīditvā yācakānār̄u kathār̄u suni<sup>1</sup>  
 yadā sabbaññutār̄u patto na badhirā honti mānusā.<sup>2</sup>  
 piyacakkhūhi passāmi silavante ca<sup>3</sup> yācakē  
 yadā sabbaññutār̄u patto na andhā honti mānusā.  
 ujār̄u kāyār̄u<sup>4</sup> karitvā 'ham kālē dānādike pana  
 yadā sabbaññutār̄u patto na khujjā honti mānusā.<sup>5</sup>  
 osadham<sup>6</sup> demi sattānār̄u bhayār̄u tesār̄u pi no kare<sup>7</sup>  
 yadā sabbaññutār̄u patto tadā sattā arogino.<sup>8</sup>  
 mettam karomi<sup>9</sup> sattānār̄u bhayasantāsanāsanār̄u<sup>10</sup>  
 yadā sabbaññutār̄u patto tadā Mārā na honti te.<sup>11</sup>  
 manāpā annapānāni manāpena<sup>12</sup> dadāmi 'ham  
 yadā sabbaññutār̄u patto samiddhā honti mānusā.  
 manāpāni ca vatthāni<sup>13</sup> manāpena dadāmi 'ham<sup>14</sup>  
 yadā sabbaññutār̄u patto surūpā honti mānusā.<sup>15</sup>  
 manāpāni ca yānāni<sup>16</sup> hatthī-assarathāni ca<sup>17</sup>

<sup>1</sup> M2, M3 & M5: suni

<sup>2</sup> M3 & M5: na honti badhirā tadā

<sup>3</sup> M3 & M5: silavante; M2 & M3: om. ca

<sup>4</sup> M2 & M3: ujukāyār̄u; M5: ujum khāyār̄u

<sup>5</sup> M3: khujjā honti tadā pana

<sup>6</sup> M2 & M5: osatham; M3: osattham

<sup>7</sup> M5: bhayār̄u tesār̄u vinodayi

<sup>8</sup> M3: arogino

<sup>9</sup> M3: mettikaromi

<sup>10</sup> M2: bhayār̄u santāsavināsanār̄u; M3: bhayār̄u santākasakār̄u pana (?); M5: bhayasantāsār̄u na kare

<sup>11</sup> M2, M3 & M5: me

<sup>12</sup> M2: manāpehi; M3: yācakānār̄u

<sup>13</sup> M3: om. this half verse

<sup>14</sup> M5: adds here a half verse yācakānār̄u yathākāmār̄u (?), which is unmetrical and seems to be a scribal error

<sup>15</sup> M3: om. this verse

<sup>16</sup> M2: yānāni

<sup>17</sup> M2: hatthī assarūpāni ca; M3: hatthī assā ratthāni ca

dolā ca sivikā cāpi yācakānām dadāmī 'ham<sup>1</sup>  
 yadā sabbaññutam patto sukhitā honti mānusā.<sup>2</sup>  
 mocemi bandhanā satte<sup>3</sup> dosato dukkhato<sup>4</sup> pi ca  
 yadā sabbaññutam patto bhujissā honti pānino.<sup>5</sup>  
 samam̄ mettam̄<sup>6</sup> karitvā 'ham̄ piyesu apiyesu ca<sup>7</sup>  
 yadā sabbaññutam patto samā honti mahītalā.<sup>8</sup>  
 tosemi yācake sabbe bhojanehi dhanehi ca<sup>9</sup>  
 yadā sabbaññutam patto sītodakāpuṇṇā nadī.<sup>10</sup>  
 yam̄ kiñci kusalam̄ katvā<sup>11</sup> mamañ patthenti mānusā<sup>12</sup>  
 sam̄sārabhayabhītā te bhavissam̄<sup>13</sup> bhavamocako.<sup>14</sup>  
 avijjāghorapabhavam̄<sup>15</sup> mohajālasamākulam̄<sup>16</sup>  
 vuyhantam̄ caturoghesu lokam̄ santārayiss' āham̄.<sup>17</sup>  
 kilesapañkamakkhite tañhātakkārasevite  
 sam̄sāradisasamulhe mokkhamaggam̄ adesayim̄.<sup>18</sup>  
 Sañjive Kālañutte ca<sup>19</sup> Tāpane ca Patāpane<sup>20</sup>

<sup>1</sup> M3: yācakānām puna punam̄

<sup>2</sup> M2: manussā; M3: sattā yanti ca nibbattim̄

<sup>3</sup> M3: bandhanā sa(tte)

<sup>4</sup> M2: dukkhito

<sup>5</sup> M3: tadā puññāni pānino; M5: bhujissā

<sup>6</sup> M2: samamettam̄; M3: samamettā; M5: samam̄ mettim̄

<sup>7</sup> M2 & M3: apiyesu; M2: *om. ca*

<sup>8</sup> M5: patibalā

<sup>9</sup> M3: icchitehi dhanehi ca

<sup>10</sup> M3: tadā pūre cindanādiyo ti; M5: sātodakena puṇṇā nadī; M3: *adds* athā metteyo tam̄ evam̄ āha

<sup>11</sup> M5: kusalakammam̄ katvā

<sup>12</sup> M2: mamañ paññenti; M3: mamañ pattenti; M5: mama paññenti

<sup>13</sup> M3 & M5: bhavāmi

<sup>14</sup> M2: bhave mocako; M5: bhavamocaye

<sup>15</sup> M3: avijjhāpabhavaghoram̄

<sup>16</sup> M3: mohajālam̄ samam̄ kulam̄

<sup>17</sup> M3: lokam̄ santārayi aham̄

<sup>18</sup> M2, M3 & M5: adesayi

<sup>19</sup> M3: kālam̄ sutte ca; M2: *adds* samghāteroruve tadā mahāroruve c'eva

<sup>20</sup> M2: tāpanapamahātāpane; M3: tāpane ca (pa)tāpane; M5: patāpēna

Aviciniraye satte<sup>1</sup> saggamaggam adesayim.<sup>2</sup>  
 aññāñabandhanā bandhe tañhājālavasamgate<sup>3</sup>  
 chetvāna bandhanā satte sampāpessāmi<sup>4</sup> nibbuttiṁ.<sup>5</sup>  
 micchādiññikavātena dvāsatññiditñhi-aggalam  
 atthañgikamaggatālena<sup>6</sup> vivarissāmi pāñinam<sup>7</sup>  
 nibbānanagaradvāram visālam ajarāmaram.<sup>8</sup>  
 rāgadosatamonaddha<sup>9</sup>-hatanettānam jantūnam<sup>10</sup>  
 paññāsallākam<sup>11</sup> datvāna nayanaṁ<sup>12</sup> sodhayiss' āham.<sup>13</sup>  
 sokātūram sudukkhitaṁ<sup>14</sup> jarāmaraṇapīlitam  
 ñāñosadhavaram<sup>15</sup> datvā tīkicchissāmi pāñinam.<sup>16</sup>  
 mohandhakārasamulhe<sup>17</sup> sadevāsuramānusā<sup>18</sup>  
 ñāñālokam<sup>19</sup> pharitvāna nīharissāmi tam tamam.  
 apāyesu ca patante<sup>20</sup> atāne aparāyane<sup>21</sup>

<sup>1</sup> M3: *om.*

<sup>2</sup> M2, M3 & M5: adesayi

<sup>3</sup> M2: jalavassamgate; M3 & M5: māsavasamgate

<sup>4</sup> M5: sampasomi

<sup>5</sup> M2, M3 & M5: nibbuttiṁ

<sup>6</sup> M3: atthañgamaggatāle

<sup>7</sup> M3: vivaritvā mokkhadhārakam; M5: pāñinā

<sup>8</sup> M3: *om. this verse*

<sup>9</sup> M3: rāgamohatamonaddam; M5: rāgadosatamonuddam

<sup>10</sup> M3: hantam renattā ca jantunam; M5: hatanettānajjantūnam

<sup>11</sup> M2, M3 & M5: salākam

<sup>12</sup> M5: nayyanam

<sup>13</sup> M3: *adds* apāyesu pavattantam atānam aparāyanam

<sup>14</sup> M2: sokātūrassa dukkhittam; M3: sokāturasudakkitam; M5: sokāturdūkkitam

<sup>15</sup> M2: saññavaram; M3: saññham varam; M5: satham varam

<sup>16</sup> M2: tīkicchāmi pāñinam

<sup>17</sup> M2: sammulhe; M5: mohajandhakārasamulhe

<sup>18</sup> M2: mānussa; M5: sadovāsuramanusse

<sup>19</sup> M2: ñāñālokam; M3: yāñālokam

<sup>20</sup> M2: apāyesu pattantam; M3: *places this verse earlier (see note 13 above)*; M5: apāyesu ca pattantam

<sup>21</sup> M2: attānapparāyanam; M5: attanam aparāyanam

apāyā uddharitvāna<sup>1</sup> dassessāmi parāyanan ti.<sup>2</sup>

evañ ca<sup>3</sup> pana vatvā bodhisatto “yathā ’ham, bhante, vadāmi tathā manussānam kathetā” ti<sup>4</sup> sāsanam datvā dasanakkhasamodhāna-samujjalakarapūtamakūlo<sup>5</sup> sudhotakanakaphalakasadisanalāṭantara-supatiṭṭhāpitamasamujjalitañjalikarapūṭo manoramāy<sup>6</sup> indanilamañimayam Cūlāmañicetiyam padakkhiṇam katvā aṭṭhadisāsu vanditvā pañcaṅga-patiṭṭhitena<sup>7</sup> vanditvā theram āpucchitvā koṭisatasahassa<sup>8</sup>-saṅkhāy<sup>9</sup> surayuvati<sup>10</sup>-suraputtaparisāya<sup>11</sup> parivutto tārāganaparivārito<sup>12</sup> bahala-jaladharapāṭalavirahitakkhaggatalasamudito paripuṇṇacandamañḍalo viya virocāmāno Tusita<sup>13</sup>-puram eva gato.

tena vuttam:

evam anomavaṇṇo so Metteyyo cetiyam varam  
pūjetvā puna<sup>14</sup> vanditvā piṭṭhito va patikkami.  
sabbā devaccharā pi ca<sup>15</sup> pūjetvā cetiyam varam

<sup>1</sup> M2: apāya udaritvāna

<sup>2</sup> M2: dassissāmi; M3: desessāmi parāyanti

<sup>3</sup> M3: *the text differs from here up to punnamāyam yathā cando ... : bhante manusse lokam gantvā yathā mayā kathitam tatheva katheyyāsīti so theram vanditvā āpucchitvā cetiyam padakkhiṇam katvā aṭṭhadisāsu vanditvā tusitabhavānañ gato sabbā devaparisā pubbapacchimadakkhinatare thitā bodhisattassa parivārayiñsu tārāganaparivutto viya gagalātalapuṇṇacando devata vuttam pi c' etam devakañño pi tādisā Metteyyam ārivāritvā ...*

<sup>4</sup> M2: kathekatha cā ti

<sup>5</sup> M2: dasana(kkha)samodānasamujjalakaramakulo; M5: dasanakhasamodāna-samūjalam jalakaramalakaramakulo

<sup>6</sup> M5: ... samujalitakarapuṭañjalimanoramamm

<sup>7</sup> M5: pañcapatiṭṭhitena

<sup>8</sup> M2: koṭisattasahassa

<sup>9</sup> M2 & M5: saṅkhātāya

<sup>10</sup> M2 & M5: suravati ...

<sup>11</sup> M5: suraputtehi parisāya

<sup>12</sup> M2: *om.*; M5: tārāganaparivutto

<sup>13</sup> M2 & M5: Tussita

<sup>14</sup> M5: pi

<sup>15</sup> M5: sabbe devaganā cāpi

atthadisāsu vanditvā piṭṭhito ca patikkamum.<sup>1</sup>  
 puṇṇamāyam<sup>2</sup> yathā cando sarade va virocati<sup>3</sup>  
 tathā aryaMetteyyo<sup>4</sup> devamajjhe virocati.  
 migamajjhe yathā sīho<sup>5</sup> gavamajjhe yath' usabho<sup>6</sup>  
 pakkhimajjhe yathā garuddho<sup>7</sup> devamajjhe tathā ayam.<sup>8</sup>  
 nagamajjhe yathā Meru<sup>9</sup> sattaratanamaṇḍito<sup>10</sup>  
 naramajjhe cakkavatti<sup>11</sup> devamajjhe tathā ayam.  
 tarumajjhe pāricchattako pupphamajjhe kokanado<sup>12</sup>  
 manimajjhe veduriyo devamajjhe yathā ayam.<sup>13</sup>  
 pabbatagge yathā aggi suddhantakanakam yathā<sup>14</sup>  
 sabbe deve atikkamma vanṇatejena rocati.<sup>15</sup>  
 Tusitabhavanam yanto<sup>16</sup> devehi parivārito<sup>17</sup>  
 dibbasukham anubhutvā<sup>18</sup> ciram satte pamodatī ti.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>1</sup> M2: piṭṭhito va ca patikkamum

<sup>2</sup> M2 & M5: ulumajjhe; M3: pumamāya

<sup>3</sup> M3: saradeti virocati

<sup>4</sup> M3: evam hi Metteyyo nātho

<sup>5</sup> M2, M3 & M5: siho

<sup>6</sup> M2: gavamajjhe yathā usabho; M3: gavamajjhe 'va usabho; M5: gavamajjhe yathāsabho

<sup>7</sup> M5: varagaruddho

<sup>8</sup> M3: naddimajjheva sāgaro

<sup>9</sup> M3: *contains the same verses, but in a slightly different order*; M5: nāgamajjhe

<sup>10</sup> M3: devamajjhe tathā ayam

<sup>11</sup> M2 & M5: cakkavati

<sup>12</sup> M2 & M3: kokanudo; M5: *om. this verse*

<sup>13</sup> M2: *om. this half verse*

<sup>14</sup> M3: sudantī kaṇṇikā yathā; M5: *om. this verse*

<sup>15</sup> M2: virocati; M3: dicchati; M5: *om. this verse*

<sup>16</sup> M2: Tussitabhavanam yanto; M5: Tussitapabhavayanto

<sup>17</sup> M3: *om. this verse*

<sup>18</sup> M5: dibbasukhānubhutvāna

<sup>19</sup> M3: *om. this verse, and adds evam anomavaṇṇo so Metteyyo devapūjito devadevagaṇāmajjhe puṇṇacando va gacchatī*

tasmīm khaṇe yeva<sup>1</sup> thero paramapātimokkhasaṁvarasīlaṁ indriya-  
 saṁvarasīlaṁ<sup>2</sup> sammā jīvapārisuddhasīlaṁ<sup>3</sup> paccayasannissitasīlañ cā ti  
 catupārisuddhasīlañ aparimita<sup>4</sup>-gunagaṇābharaṇasamalañkato indanīla-  
 maṇimayam Cūlāmaṇicetiyaṁ<sup>5</sup> vanditvā Sakkam devarājanam  
 āpucchitvā<sup>6</sup> ativiyadāruṇarāgatañhā<sup>7</sup>-micchādiñthādi vividha<sup>8</sup>-rukkha-  
 vanalatākiñnaputhuvanagumbālayajā ti<sup>9</sup> jarāmaraṇādi<sup>10</sup> dukkhappabhava-  
 saṁsāram addhānam<sup>11</sup> atikkanto<sup>12</sup> paramaseṭṭhativijjāpāla<sup>13</sup>-sīsaca-  
 tutthajhānavicittapakkhavilāsitavirājitaṁ iddhipāda<sup>14</sup>-varapāda<sup>15</sup>-  
 dvayasubhaggam aṭṭha-vimokkhapaṭisambhidāñāṇa<sup>16</sup>-lokiya-  
 lokuttarasaddhā<sup>17</sup>-pāla<sup>18</sup>-sakalalomālañkata-deho suvaṇṇahañso viya  
 sobhamāno tāvatiṁsabhanato otaritvā Jambūdīpam āgantvā<sup>19</sup>  
 anopamāya sāvakapakatililāya gāmanigamarājadhāniṣu piṇḍāya pāvī.  
 tena vuttam<sup>20</sup>:

<sup>1</sup> M3: *finishes with a short paragraph which differs a little from the other texts. We reproduce it at the end of the variants. See Appendix C; M5: tam khaṇe  
 ñeva*

<sup>2</sup> M2: *om.*

<sup>3</sup> M2 & M5: *om. sammā-*

<sup>4</sup> M5: *dharaparamita-*

<sup>5</sup> M5: *om. cūlāmaṇi*

<sup>6</sup> M2: *pabhāpucchitvā*

<sup>7</sup> M2 & M5: *add kilesā*

<sup>8</sup> M5: *vicita-*

<sup>9</sup> M5: *jana-*

<sup>10</sup> M2: *adds saṁsā(r)a-*; M5: *adds samsāra-*

<sup>11</sup> M5: *om. saṁsāram addhānam*

<sup>12</sup> M2: *atikkamanto*

<sup>13</sup> M2 & M5: *pala-*

<sup>14</sup> M5: *dvipāda-*

<sup>15</sup> M2: *om. varapāda-*

<sup>16</sup> M5: *yāṇa-*

<sup>17</sup> M2: *suddhā-*

<sup>18</sup> M2 & M5: *pala-*

<sup>19</sup> M5: *Jambūdīpāgantvā*

<sup>20</sup> M5: *yathāha*

tadā so devathero pi āpucchitvā surindakam<sup>1</sup>  
 cetiyam puna vanditvā otaritvāna saggato<sup>2</sup>  
 sobhati hemahaṁso va<sup>3</sup> pun' āgacchati mānusam.<sup>4</sup>  
 nigama<sup>5</sup>rājadhānīsu bhikkham piṇḍaya pāvisī ti.

so<sup>6</sup> piṇḍapātapaṭikkanto Metteyyassa pavattim Jambūdipamanussānam ārocesi. manussā therassa vacanam sutvā pasannacittā dānādīni puññāni katvā āyuhapariyosāne devaloke pūrayiṁsu. so daliddakapuriso<sup>7</sup> aṭṭhanīluppaladāyako yāvajīvam<sup>8</sup> uppaladānam anussaritvā manussa-lokato cavitvā tāvatiṁsabhadvane<sup>9</sup> devaccharāhi parikīṇne<sup>10</sup> naccagīta-pañcaṅgikaturiyasamṛghuṭhe<sup>11</sup> sattaratanakhacitte niluppalapāsāde nibbatti.<sup>12</sup> tassa akkanta-akkanta<sup>13</sup>-kāle pañcavaṇṇāni uppalāni pade pade sampaṭicchim̄su. tassa mukhagandho uppalagandho<sup>14</sup> viya sakaladeva-nagaram pavāyi.<sup>15</sup> devā devitthiyo uppalagandham ghāyitvā<sup>16</sup> tam sevanti. sabbe devā tassa pade pade sampaṭicchannam<sup>17</sup> uppalam disvā Sakkassa devarañño ārocesum.<sup>18</sup> Sacco tam<sup>19</sup> tesam kathaṁ sutvā tutṭhacitto hutvā tattha gantvā pucchi “devate, manussaloke kim akāsi

<sup>1</sup> M5: āpucchitvam purindhadam

<sup>2</sup> M5: saggato ti

<sup>3</sup> M5: ca

<sup>4</sup> M2 & M5: mānussam

<sup>5</sup> M2: adds vā

<sup>6</sup> M5: *om. the following passage up to aṭṭhanīluppaladāyako*

<sup>7</sup> M2 & M5: *om.*

<sup>8</sup> M5: *om.*

<sup>9</sup> M5: adds niluppalapāsāde

<sup>10</sup> M5: paripuṇne and adds dibbatitvā

<sup>11</sup> M5: saṅkhecumve (?)

<sup>12</sup> M5: *om.*

<sup>13</sup> M5: atikkanta atikkanta

<sup>14</sup> M5: mukho uppalagandho

<sup>15</sup> M5: vayāsi

<sup>16</sup> M5: gāyitvā and *om.* tam

<sup>17</sup> M2: sampaticchinnam; M5: *om.*

<sup>18</sup> M5: ārocayiṁsu

<sup>19</sup> M5: *om.* tam

puññam<sup>1</sup> evarūpam sampattiṁ labhasī” ti.<sup>2</sup> yo<sup>3</sup> Sakkassa vacanam sutvā evam āha “devarāja, aham pubbe manussaloke Mithilavāsi Piñguttaro nāma māñavo<sup>4</sup> mātaram posento<sup>5</sup> ekadivasamhi ḥāpanathāya<sup>6</sup> ekam saram gantvā tattha<sup>7</sup> ḥātvā<sup>8</sup> aṭṭhaniluppupalupphāni disvā tāni gahetvā ekassa bhikkhuno datvā tena<sup>9</sup> nīluppaldānena nīluppalapāsāde jāto ‘mhi<sup>10</sup>; mama akkanta<sup>11</sup>-akkantakāle pade pade uppalauppham<sup>12</sup> jāyati mama cakkhudvāyaṁ uppadaladasadisam<sup>13</sup> uppalaṁgandho viya me kāyo tena Uppalo nāma devaputto jāto ‘mhi” ti. Sacco tassa vacanam<sup>14</sup> sutvā pamuditacitto pasannamānaso hutvā<sup>15</sup> tato pi<sup>16</sup> nīluppalapupphāni gahetvā<sup>17</sup> buddhassa cetiyam<sup>18</sup> pūjesi so Uppaladevaputto<sup>19</sup> yāvajjattanā yeva<sup>20</sup> hoti.

tena vuttam:

puna bhave pi tam puññam Metteyyass’ eva santike<sup>21</sup>  
dibbasukhañ ca bhuñjītvā pupphadānass’ idam phalam.

<sup>1</sup> M5: so kim katvā

<sup>2</sup> M2: labhati ti

<sup>3</sup> M2 & M5: so

<sup>4</sup> M2 & M5: om. Mithilavāsi Piñguttaro nāma māñavo

<sup>5</sup> M5: posesi

<sup>6</sup> M2: nahānatthāya

<sup>7</sup> M5: om. tathā

<sup>8</sup> M2: nahātvā; M5: adds pana

<sup>9</sup> M5: te ten’ eva uppaldānena

<sup>10</sup> M5: aṭṭhaniluppalapāsāde jāto; M2: jatehi

<sup>11</sup> M5: atikkanta

<sup>12</sup> M5: niluppalam

<sup>13</sup> M2: uppadaladasadisam; M5: cakkha-uppalasadisam

<sup>14</sup> M5: katham

<sup>15</sup> M5: om.

<sup>16</sup> M2: om.; M5: so

<sup>17</sup> M5: niluppalam gahetvā

<sup>18</sup> M5: buddhapatimam

<sup>19</sup> M5: om. uppala

<sup>20</sup> M5: yāvajjhattameva

<sup>21</sup> M5: Metteyyassa va santike

tasmā hi paññito poso Metteyyabuddhasantike<sup>1</sup>  
 pāpunitum paññidhāya dānasilādikam kare.  
 yo yo yam yam bodhisattam vacanassānusārino  
 puññam karoti so so ca Metteyyadassanam varam<sup>2</sup>  
 labhissati dukkhass' antam karissati anāgate.  
 saṃsāre saṃsaranto pi apāye<sup>3</sup> na gamissatī ti.

iti Mālayyadetherassa<sup>4</sup> vanṇanā nitthitā.  
 nibbānapaccayo hotu anāgate bhavissanti<sup>5</sup>

† E. Denis

<sup>1</sup> M2: buddhassa

<sup>2</sup> M5: Metteyyadassanavaram

<sup>3</sup> M5: apāyam

<sup>4</sup> M2: *om. deva*; M5: *ends Māleyyadetherassu*

<sup>5</sup> M2 & M5: *om. this final phrase*

## Appendix A (see note 7 on page 40)

M3: devarāja Meteyyo kim kammam (= puñña-kammam ?) katvā idam sampatiṁ labhati bhante aham kathaṁ jānitabbam sabbaññabuddho pana sakā (= sakkā ?) tassa sampatiṁ vannetuṁ Meteyyo budhassapadam pathetvā loka-bhavāmopanatthāya me dhanisambhāram karonto dānadācini (= dānādini ?) manussasampatidento anekakoṭikappadānapārami katvā silarakkhitum satta-sampatidento jhānam kārinam brahmasampatidento anekakoṭikappa-nekkhamapārami katvā dukkhadassanam sotāpattimaggaphalam dento anekakoṭikappapaññāpārami katvā aniccadassanam sakkhidāgāmamaggam (= sakadāgāmamaggam ?) dento anekakoṭikappavirayapārami katvā anattānā-dassanam (= anattadassanam ?) anāgāmimaggam dento anekakoṭikappa-khantipārami katvā tisakkhanam upkekhanam arahattam dento anekakoṭikappasaccapārami katvā pāṇavadvahivajitam atthaṅgikam dento anekakoṭikappa-adhiṭṭhānapārami katvā dukkhadassanam saṃsāranibbānam dento anekakoṭikappamettupekkham katvā anantañānam paṭṭhayano sabbe sattānam upanatthāya samaṭho anatta (= ananta ?)-bodhisambhāre katvā anantakappe yeva anantasilāṅkāre dento anantabodhisambhāre katvā anantakappe yeva kilesasocanam samādhidento anantabodhisambhāram katvā anantakappe yeva pāpachedanam paññāsatṭham dento anantabodhisambhāram katvā anantakappe yeva saṃsārannavattikam vimuttidento anantabodhisambhāram karonto anantakappe yeva mokkhapatham ñātukāmo ñānam dento ananta-bodhisambhāram karonto kappa yeva tayo bodhisattā eko bodhisatto eko paññādhiko eko virayādhiko eko saddhādhiko tesu paññādhiko nāma kappasatasahassādhikāni koṭicattāri asaṃkheyāni pāramiyo akāsi viriyādhiko kappasatasahassādhikāni aṭṭha asaṃkheyāni pāramiyo akāsi saddhādhiko pana kappasatasahassādhikāni soṭasa asaṃkheyāni pāramiyo akāsi Metteyyo pana saddhādhiko nāma Metteyyasambhāro (= sambhārā ?) samuddoya (= samuddo yathā ?) pāramiyo hoti ekadesena vuttam pi saso samuddo (?) vattati andho yathā pabatārohe yeva tasmā bhante na sakkomi tassa sambhāram pakāsetum tathā Ariyametteyyo anekasahassaparivārehi āgantvā yojanaparimāṇḍalam Culāmuṇicetiyañ ca ākāparimāṇḍalañ ca dibböhäsena pharitvā cetiyam padakkhiṇam katvā anekasahassasuriyamaṇḍalam viya sinerapadakkhinam katvā aṭṭhadisāsu vanditvā gandhamālādīhi pūjetvā sattaratanamayaṁ mālāvicittam candamaṇḍalam sadisam sisato otāretvā cetiyam pūjetvā pācīnadvāre nisidi tadā cetiyaṅgamālāvicitra(sic)-paripuṇṇa osadhitārakarasi viya ahosi sakala-indanagaram ekaganda ahosi bodhisatto yena therō ten' upasaṅkami upasaṅkamitvā theram vanditvā ekamantam nisidi theram etad avoca bhante kuto āgato ti ... ?

## Appendix B (see note 4 on page 46)

M3: ... mahārāja sodha te vacanam Jambudipamanussā kathessāmi tvam pana kadā buddho bhavissasī ti bhante Gotamabuddhassa sāsanam pañcavassasahassāni thatvā antaradhāyissanti tasmiñ antarahite loke akusalappanam kusalan ti na jānāti paggeva kusaluppatti tadā manussā virahita-hirotappābhinnamariyādā mā(tā)pitābhaginisaññam anuppā ajjelakukkara-sigālāsonādayo viya nilajjā bhavissanti usannākusalena āyuvassasatañ hinam hinā anukammen' eva dasavassāyukā maggedārakā pañcavassā ca pañcavassā va dārakā āvāho vivāho ca tesam dvinnam bhavissati tividho sattantararakappo dubbhikkantarakappo rogantarakappo satthantararakappo idha sattantararakappo vedigañño (= veditabbo ?) tadā manussā aññamaññam miggasaññam patilabhissanti hattena gahita ubhato dhārākhurasadisam āvudhā bhavissati te aññamaññam paharitvā vinassanti tesu ye manussā paññitā pathamam eva tam vināsam sutvā sattāham yāpadāhāram gahetvā pabbatakandarādisu pavisitvā niliyissan ti tesu thapetvā avasesā sattāham aññamaññam paharitvā vinassanti sakalapathavī ekamañgakalikā bhavissati atha sattāham divase atikante attano attano niliyitathānā nikkhomitvā aññamaññam visālam labhitvā āliñgitvā samaggam patilabhitvā yanuna mayam kusalakammam kareyyāma paññatipātā virameyyāma adinnādānā kāmesu micchācarā musāvādā pisuññāvācā pharusavācā sampapphalāvācā abhijjā byāpādā micchādiññiyā pa(ti)virameyyāmā ti ime dasakusalakammam paññisamodhānetvā te puretum ārabhisu athā dasavassāyukānam manussānam visativassāyukā dārakā bhavissanti atha bhiyyo tesu dhammam parentesu timsacattālisapaññāsā ti anukammena dve vassasatāyukā bhavissanti tinicattāripañcachasatta-āññanavavassasahassā dvetinicattāripañcadasavisi-timsacattālisapaññasātthisattati-asitivassasahassāni vadanti navatiṁsavassasahassā aññamanussesu atirekataram dhammam carantesu vassasatasahassa āya (= āyukā ?) bhavissanti atirekataram dhammam carantesu vassakotisahassā āyu(kā) bhavissanti tathā sattānam jarāmarañam na paññayanti puna pi pamādañ āpajjanti tesam āyam parihāyissanti asamkheyya ayam pa(rī)hāyitvā vassakotisahassā tato satasahassam parihāyitvā navutti-vassasahassā asitivassasahassam vathassanti tasmi samaye devo aghamāsam anuddasāham anupañcahañ ca majjhimayāme paññavirasam vadento vassati tadā jambudipam sabbattha samiddho hoti yadā padamāniccakālam thulā-latāgumbapādapattalabharitā kukkuṭasāpātikagāmaniggamarājadhāni samākinno corakañḍakavirahito appaggatadiññighahano rājadhāni samujjalito sabbaratana-sampanno subhikkho khemo bahu-annapānakajabhojanam seyya meyya macchamāñsādi upabhogaparibhogasamiddho bhante yadayañāpatikā avivādakā ako(dha)nā honti pañcakāmasukham anubhavanti tadā manussaloke gamissāmi yadā sabbaparisā kasinabijā akarontā sabbabhogañ anubhavantā tadā manussaloke gantvā tadā ittiyo na suttam kantikam pi rukkhe dibbavatthei

nivāsento tadā m(an)ussalokam gantvā yadā manussalokhattiyā amacchā senā patādayo rakkhanti pañca silāni tadā manussalokam gantvā yadā ittisāmikena santutthā purisā paradāram na karonti ittiyo aññehi kāmam na karonti te manussalokam gantvā idāni attano pāramivaññento āha ...

*Appendix C (see note 1 on page 57)*

M3: thero Meteyyassa gamanam varam pasitvā devarajānam āpucchitvā cetiyam vandhitvā Jambudipam sampatto Kambujagāmam pindāya pavisi piññipātam gahetvā pattikanto tato patthāya Meteyyassa va pavuttim Jambudipamanussānam ārocesi manussā therassa vacanam sutvā dānādini puññāni katvā āyuhapariyosāne devaloke puriyiñsu so upaladāyako tena tāvatiñsabhavane pupphapāsāde devapuriñne nibbatti naccagitañcañgikaturiyasamghutte akkantakale pañcavañña-upalāni pade pade jātā tassa upalagando viya mukkho sakaladevanagare vāyati Sakko pagevā tassa pade upalam disvā tutthacitto ahesuñ Sakko āha devate pubbe kiñ akāsi puññam evam rūpam sampattilabhasi ti Upaladevaputto yathā tathā visajjhesi Sakko tam vacanam sutvā pamuditacitto upalapupphāni gahetvā cetiyam pujesi sakālayam tato vassatī ti tena pathamasāñgitikācariyājinadesitam dhammam saddhāya pasādajanathāya kathento āha ye sunantiñ sa sakkaccañ Vessantaram jinadesitam ye ca karonti puññāni silādini padāyakā te subhanti passayyam Mettayyasugatam varanti Māleyyadevatheravāññanā nitthitā

brah Māleyyayavalelāchapappabissantā ( ? )

buddham saranam gacchāmi

dhammam saranam gacchāmi

sañgham saranam gacchāmi

iti pi so bhaggavā a(ra)ham sammāsambuddho vijā

*Appendix D (see Introduction page 7)*

anekadevaputtā pi

devakaññā pi tādisā

Metteyyam parivāretvā

gacchanti tathāmbare

puññamāyam yathā cando

sarade kāle va bhānumā

vanññarūpena ten' eva

devamajjhe virocati

evam anomavañño so

Metteyyo lokapuññago

devamajjhe gato santo

pajjalanto pi āgato

so āgantvā Cūlāmanicetiyam vanditvā padakkhiñam katvā Maliyadevathera upasañkamitvā vanditvā ekamante tītho theram pucchi bhante āgacchathā ti Jambudipā mahārājā ti kiñ bhante Jambudipāmanussā mamam sambhaventi sambhaneti (= sambhaventi) mahārājā ti

yadā hi kusalam katvā

tuyham bhāventi bodhiyam

Metteyyass' eva buddhassa

dassanam bhavatu sabbadā ti

Metteyyo bodhissato evam āha  
 yan̄ kiñci kusalam̄ katvā  
 samsārabhayabhitānam̄  
 avijjāya mahāghoram̄  
 vuyhantam̄ caturoghehi  
 kilesapañkamakkhite  
 samsāradisammūlhe  
 sañjive kālasutte ca  
 aññānabandhanābaddhe  
 chetvāna bhandanam satte  
 micchadiñthikavātēhi  
 aṭṭhangamaggatalehi  
 rāgadosatamonaddham̄  
 paññāsalākam̄ datvāna  
 sokāturānam̄ dukkhinam̄  
 ñanosadhavaram̄ datvā  
 mohandhakārasammūlhe  
 ñānālokañ karitvāna  
 lokam̄ apāyabandhantam (baddham̄ tam̄) attānam̄ tamparayanañ  
 apāyā uddharitvāna

mama patienti mānusā  
 bhavāmi bhayamocako  
 mohajālasamajalam̄  
 lokass' antam̄karō aham̄  
 tanhātakkarasevitē  
 dhammam̄ sudesayiss' aham̄  
 tāpane pune tāpane  
 tanhāsāsavasamgate  
 sampāpessāmi nibbutim̄  
 dvāsatthīhi hanaram̄ gatam̄  
 vivarissāmi pāñinam̄  
 pāvetvā nantajantūnam̄  
 nayanañ sodhayiss' aham̄  
 jarāmaranapīlitam̄  
 tikichissāmi pāñinam̄  
 sadevāsuramānuse  
 vidhamissāmi tam̄ tamam̄  
 dassayissāmi parāyanam̄

# THE STORY OF THE ELDER MĀLEYYADEVA

Translated by Steven Collins

Honour to the Blessed One, the Worthy One, the Fully Enlightened One ! Bowing to the excellent Buddha, (who is) to be revered by gods and men, to the Teaching which originates from the Happy One,<sup>1</sup> and to the virtuous Monastic Order, I will undertake (to tell) in brief the story of Māleyya, replete with supreme(ly good) advice<sup>2</sup> and edifying for all.

In the past, the story goes, in the island of Tambapaññi, (also) called the isle of Lankā, where the (Three) Jewels were established, a certain elder by the name of Māleyyadeva, famous for the excellence of his supernatural power and knowledge, lived in Rohana province supported by (alms given in) the village of Kamboja. The elder repeatedly brought back news of the beings roasting in hell: recounting (this news) to their relatives he inspired them to make merit by alms-giving and the like, and he made them aim for heaven as the result of the merit they acquired and by transferring merit to those (hell-beings). By the force of his supernatural power he travelled to both heaven(s) and hell(s): after seeing the great majesty of laymen and women in heaven who had faith in the Three Jewels, he went to people (on earth) and recounted how such-and-such a layman or woman had been reborn in such-and-such a heaven and experienced great happiness; after seeing the great suffering of miscreants in hell, he went to people (on earth) and recounted how such-and-such a man or woman had been reborn in such-and-such a hell and experienced great suffering. People gained faith in the

<sup>1</sup> On *sugata* as an epithet of the Buddha see Norman (90: 154), who renders it 'one who is) in a (particularly) good way'.

<sup>2</sup> For *naya* as 'advice' see Nāṇamoli (62: xli–xlivi), who translates more literally as 'guide-line'.

teaching and did no evil; they dedicated merit (acquired through) almsgiving and the like to their dead relatives, and aimed for heaven as the result of the merit they acquired and by transferring merit to those (dead relatives).

One day the elder got up in the morning, took his robe and bowl and went to the village to collect alms. In the village (lived) a poor man (who) looked after his mother. At the (same) time he went out from the village to bathe; he came to a pond, took his bath, and saw eight blue lotus flowers. He picked them, got out of the pond, and started on his way (back). Then he saw the elder coming (towards him) bowl in hand, (looking) calm, restrained, well-controlled, his senses mastered, with perfect bearing. Joy and delight arose in him, and he went up to the elder and greeted him respectfully with his hands in the form of a hollow lotus-bud (made) by putting his ten finger-nails together. With great faith he gave the flowers to the elder, and made an aspiration in this verse:

By this gift of flowers, wherever I am (reborn) in a hundred thousand births, may I not be poor !

The elder took the eight blue lotus flowers, and gave thanks in this verse:

Whatever (a person) gives with a faithful mind, whether coarse or choice,<sup>1</sup> has a successful result according to (the donor's) wish.

---

<sup>1</sup> This rendering of *lukham pañitam vā* is taken from Masefield's (89: 91) translation of the phrase at Vv-a 64.

After giving thanks (thus) the elder (first) reflected<sup>1</sup>: 'Where shall I place these eight blue lotus flowers on a shrine — on top of a mountain, at (the place of the Buddha's) final nirvāṇa, at (the foot of) the Great Bodhi-tree or at the place where the Blessed One set in motion the Wheel of the Supreme Law<sup>2</sup> ?' Then he thought: 'I have worshipped (at) these places seven times (each); what if I were to worship at the Cūlāmaṇi-shrine in heaven ?'

Immediately after thinking this, the elder attained the fourth meditation level, which is the basis for supernatural knowledge; emerging from it he flew along the path of the wind and in the time it takes to snap one's fingers reached the terrace around the Culāmaṇi-shrine in the city of the Thirty-three gods, made beautiful by the (surrounding) land's being adorned with seven precious things<sup>3</sup>; Sakka,

<sup>1</sup> Reading *evam samacintesi* with M3.

<sup>2</sup> 'Shrine' translates *cetiya*; the translation omits the first *vā*, and takes *udāhu* as an interrogative introducing the list of alternative sites in the locative. (Sih III p. 5 has *kuhim āropessāmi mahācetiye udāhu cetiyagiripabbate udāhu mahābodhimhīti punassa etad ahosi.)* Denis translated here 'Ou déposerai-je ces huits fleurs de lotus ? aux pieds du cetiya, situé sur la Montagne, ou à celui situé a l'endroit du Parinirvāṇa, ou a celui situé près du grand arbre de la Bodhi, ou a celui situé à l'endroit de la mise on route de la roue de la Loi incomparable ?' In a note he refers to the fact that four 'shrines' commonly grouped together in this way are the sites of the Buddha's birth at Lumbinī, his Enlightenment, First Sermon and final Nirvāṇa. He remarks that the order is different here, and that the site of his birth is 'curiously replaced by the cetiya "placed on the mountain"', speculating that this might refer to the Culāmaṇi cetiya on Mt. Meru, in the heaven of the Thirty-three. He notes that manuscript M4 omits both this and the Parinirvāṇa cetiya, while M3 omits the latter; and states that 'the Siamese translation of the *Tikā Māleyyadevathera*' (sic) mentions only three cetiya-s: those at the top of a mountain, at the place of the Parinirvāṇa and of the First Sermon, while 'the Siamese text of the Pra Malay' mentions only the cetiya at the Bodhi-tree.

<sup>3</sup> The long compound is difficult to analyse satisfactorily. The seven 'precious things' (literally 'jewels') are: gold, silver, pearl, gems, beryl, diamonds, and coral.

king of the gods, had reverently caused (this) delightful sapphire (shrine) to be set up, so that all the gods could worship (there). The Blessed One himself had cut off his top-knot (of hair) with a sword grasped in his cotton-soft, webbed hand, and had thrown it into the air with the aspiration 'if I am to attain enlightenment and become a Buddha may my top-knot not fall to the ground'; it did not fall to the ground, and (Sakka) caught it in a splendid gold casket which he carried on his own head (and then made the shrine for it). (The elder) worshipped (at the shrine) with the eight lotus flowers, walked around it keeping it to his right, paying reverence to the eight directions and with a five-fold prostration,<sup>1</sup> and sat down on the eastern side. Thus it is said:

He attained the fourth meditation level, the basis for supernatural knowledge, and emerging from it rose up instantly<sup>2</sup> into the sky like a golden swan; in the time it takes to snap one's fingers he arrived at the shrine in front of (the) Vejayanta palace, (where he) worshipped and paid reverence.<sup>3</sup>

At that moment Sakka, king of the gods, came with his retinue and worshipped the right tooth of the Blessed One and the Cūlāmani-shrine with various kinds of garlands, perfumes, ointments and the like;

<sup>1</sup> This has been taken to refer to (i) 'touching the ground with forehead, waist, elbows, knees and feet' (PED citing Childers, s.v. *pañca-patiṭṭhita*), (ii) a 'kneeling añjali salute in which the forehead, edges of the hands and the knees touch the ground' (Masefield 89: 32 note 22), or (iii) touching the ground with forehead, elbows and knees (Bureau 62: 251).

<sup>2</sup> Reading *uggamma* with M2.

<sup>3</sup> M3 and M4 omit this paragraph and read more simply: 'The elder rose up into the sky on that very day and in the time it takes to snap one's fingers stood in front of the Vejayanta palace [reading *thero tadahe va vehāsañ abbhuggantvā acchārasamghātamattam pi* ... ; for *tadahe va* see CPD s.v. *aha*]. He saw the shrine and feeling joy paid reverence to it; he worshipped with the eight blue lotus flowers, walked around (it) keeping it to his right, paid reverence to the eight directions and stood at one side'.

seeing the elder sitting down he went up to him, paid reverence and sat down to one side. All the groups of gods paid reverence to the shrine, walking around it keeping it to the right, (and then) paid reverence to the elder and sat down all around (him); so too did all the divine maidens, who paid reverence to the elder with a five-fold prostration. Sakka, king of the gods, asked the elder: 'Sir, where have you come from ?' 'Great king, I have come from the Rose-Apple island<sup>1</sup> to pay reverence to the shrine.' Then the elder asked Sakka: 'Did you have the Cūlāmaṇi-shrine set up ?' 'Yes, venerable sir, I had it set up to be worshipped by the gods.' The elder asked: 'King of the gods, these gods did good deeds in the human world and were reborn here to enjoy divine happiness; why do they make merit now ?' 'Venerable sir, these gods make merit in the desire to go beyond the world of the gods.<sup>2</sup> Sir, gods who are of little merit do not remain long in heaven, just as a few grains put in a wooden trough are quickly used up; whereas gods who are of much merit remain long in heaven, just as a lot of grain put in a granary remains (there) for a long time and is not used up. Similarly, sir, just as people with little wealth (but) with a lot of skill and knowledge, if they engage in farming, trade and the like make a living without difficulty, gods of little merit who enjoy (its) result (but) then make further merit experience heavenly happiness afterwards. Venerable sir, wealthy people with no skill or knowledge who do not engage in farming, trade or the like, (soon) use up their wealth and afterwards become quite poor: in just the same way gods of much merit who experience (its) result without making further merit afterwards are born in a poor state. Just as poor people with no

---

<sup>1</sup> *Jambudipa*, the continent south of the cosmic centre Mt. Meru, corresponding (at least) to what are now India and Sri Lanka.

<sup>2</sup> I have previously rendered *devaloka* simply as 'heaven'. In this context there is, perhaps, some ambiguity as to whether *upari* means 'above', in the sense that the gods of the heaven of the Thirty-three wish to be reborn higher in the cosmic scale, in one of the Brahma-worlds, or whether it means 'beyond' in the non-spatial sense of transcending heavenly rebirth in *nirvāṇa* (perhaps by means of rebirth on earth at the time of Metteyya). See text below.

skill and knowledge who do not engage in farming, trade or the like become (even) poorer, so too gods of little merit who experience (its) fruit without making further merit become (even) poorer; (conversely) just as rich people with a lot of skill and knowledge who engage in farming, trade or the like prosper even more, so too gods of much merit who give alms, practise morality, and so on, go upstream (in the stream of life) and prosper, (even) as far as *nirvāna*.'

When the elder heard this he was pleased, and asked Sujā's husband (i.e. Sakka): 'Great king, all the gods have come to pay reverence at the shrine of the Blessed One; is the future Buddha Metteyya coming?' 'Yes, venerable sir.' 'When will he come?' 'Sir, he has come (in the past) on the eighth, fourteenth or fifteenth days (of the lunar month).' 'So — today being the eighth — is he coming (today)?' 'Yes, sir.' While the elder was thus conversing with Sakka, a junior god came with a hundred-fold retinue to worship at the shrine. The elder saw the junior god arrive and asked Sakka: 'King of the gods, is this Metteyya?' 'No, sir.' 'Who is it?' 'Someone else, sir.' 'King of the gods, what merit did this junior god make previously in the human world?' Sakka related his meritorious deed in this verse:

Sir, when born in the human (world) he was a poor grass-cutter who (once) when eating a leaf used for wrapping food<sup>1</sup> gave one piece as an offering to a crow; after doing even so small a meritorious deed he moved on (through life) in the human

---

<sup>1</sup> If *bhāttapūtañ* is correct, it is the direct object of *bhuñjitvā*; the word usually refers to a leaf used for wrapping cooked rice, and I assume the point is that the man is so poor this is all he has to eat. The word *ekapīṇḍika* then refers not to one ball of rice but to one piece of the leaf given as 'alms-food' to the crow. Denis renders more simply 'comme il mangeait un sachet de riz bouilli, il en donna une portion à un corbeau'.

(realm) which ends in death, and was then reborn (here) because of it.<sup>1</sup>

Therefore it is said:

Whoever gives a gift to an animal such as a crow, as a result of even that gift the giver receives a hundred(-fold).

The junior god came, walked around the shrine keeping it to his right, paid reverence to the eight directions, worshipped with garlands, perfumes, etc., and sat down on the eastern side.

Immediately afterwards another junior god came to worship at the shrine of the Blessed One with a thousand-fold retinue, illuminating all the regions with the splendour of his body. The elder saw him and asked Sakka 'King of the gods, is this Metteyya ?' 'No, sir.' 'Who is it ?' 'Someone else.' 'King of the gods, what merit did this junior god make previously in the human world ?' Sakka related his meritorious deed in this verse:

Sir, when born in the human (world) he was a young brahmin by the name of Gopāla; (once) when eating he gave a portion to a cowherd, and through that gift he has been born (here) with a retinue of a thousand. He has come with (his) thousand(-fold retinue) to worship at the shrine.

Therefore it is said:

---

<sup>1</sup> I derive *saritvā* from *sar*, to move, flow (as in *samsāra*); Denis seems to have taken it as being from *sar*, to remember, since he translates the last line 's'en étant souvenu au moment de la mort, il a transmigré et est re-né ici', although it is unclear whether his last two verbs gloss *upapajjati* (mss. *upapajjati*) or he was taking *saritvā* in both the senses mentioned here.

Whoever gives a gift to those who are without virtue and of little merit, as a result of even that gift receives a thousand(-fold).

He arrived, walked around the shrine keeping it to his right, paid reverence to the eight directions, worshipped with garlands, perfumes, etc., and sat down on the western side.

Another junior god came, with a retinue of ten thousand, illuminating the whole shrine area with the splendour of his body. The elder saw him [and asked the same questions as before, with the same replies]. Sakka recounted his meritorious deed in this verse:

Sir, (once) in a former life he gave alms to a virtuous novice, and through the maturation of that (deed of) merit he has died and come to heaven.

Therefore it is said:

Whoever gives a gift to an ordinary person<sup>1</sup> who is virtuous, as a result of even that gift the giver receives ten thousand(-fold).

He came, walked around the shrine keeping it to his right, paid reverence to the eight directions, worshipped with garlands, perfumes, etc., and sat down on the southern side.

---

<sup>1</sup> Reading *puthujane* with M2 and M4; i.e. someone who has not advanced to any of the stages of the Buddhist spiritual path.

Another junior god came, with a retinue of twenty thousand, illuminating the whole area of space<sup>1</sup> with the splendour of his body and his ornamentation. The elder saw him [and asked the same questions as before, with the same answers]. Sakka explained his meritorious deed in this verse:

This one gave alms to a monk on his alms-round at (one) time (in the past); because of that (deed of) merit he has died and come to heaven.

Therefore it is said:

Whoever gives a gift to a virtuous monk, as a result of that same (gift) the giver receives twenty thousand(-fold).

He came, walked around the shrine keeping it to his right, paid reverence to the eight directions, worshipped with garlands, perfumes, etc., and sat down on the northern side.

Then another junior god came to worship, with a retinue of thirty thousand. The elder saw him [and asked the same questions as before, with the same answers]. Sakka recounted his meritorious deed in this verse:

He was formerly a weaver in Anurādhapura, who lived a life of purity (and was) well-known as (a person) of great merit; at various places he cremated the bodies of the dead, and transferred to (each dead person) the merit acquired through

---

<sup>1</sup> *Ākāsa-mandala*, lit. 'circle of space'; for the term in meditative visualisation see Vism 175 (PTS ed., = HOS V 26).

giving<sup>1</sup> to the virtuous gifts (such as) medicine, almsfood, robes and lodgings. Because of this meritorious action he was reborn in the city of the Thirty-three (gods).

He came, walked around the shrine keeping it to his right, paid reverence to the eight directions, worshipped with garlands, perfumes, etc., and sat down there and then.

Then another junior god came to worship, with a retinue of forty thousand. The elder saw him [and asked the same questions as before, with the same answers]. Sakka recounted his meritorious deed in this verse:

He was a very wealthy man<sup>2</sup> (called) Haritāla, generous and virtuous, who lived a life of faith<sup>3</sup> in the village of Haritāla; he gave medicine, robes, food and drink to the virtuous, and by the maturation of these deeds was reborn in the city of the Thirty-three (gods).

---

<sup>1</sup> Literally 'having cremated the bodies of dead people here and there and dedicating (to them) the (merit acquired through) gift(s), he gave ...'. The verb *uddissati*, 'to point out' or 'refer to', also has the specialised meanings of designating the recipient of a gift or of the transferred merit acquired from a gift (see CPD s.v.); *dakkhinā* simply means 'gift', but is common, in the *Petavatthu* for example, as a term for what PED calls (s.v. *dakkhinā*) 'a donation given to a "holy" person with ref. to unhappy beings in the Peta existence, intended to induce the alleviation of their sufferings; an intercessional, expiatory offering'. I assume therefore that the weaver is being said to have transferred merit to the dead he cremated by giving gifts to 'the virtuous'. As Denis points out in a note, the force of *tahim* *tahim* is probably that these were either abandoned corpses or those of people who had no relatives to bury them.

<sup>2</sup> *Mahāsetthi*, a 'great' banker or merchant.

<sup>3</sup> Reading *saddhājivena* with M2 and M4.

He came, walked around the shrine keeping it to his right, paid reverence to the eight directions, worshipped with garlands, perfumes, etc., and sat down there and then.

Then another junior god came to worship, with fifty<sup>1</sup> thousand. The elder saw him [and asked the same questions as before, with the same answers]. Sakka recounted his meritorious deed in this verse:

He was (re)born as king Saddhātissa in the island of Tāmbapāṇi, the brother of Abhayaduttha<sup>2</sup>; serene in mind and respectful to the Buddha, the Teaching and the Monastic Order, permanently restrained in the five (rules of) virtue and observing the eight Precepts on Uposatha day(s),<sup>3</sup> giving to the virtuous, devoted to liberality, not stingy<sup>4</sup>; by the maturation of these deeds he was reborn in the home of the Thirty-three.

He came, walked around the shrine keeping it to his right, paid reverence to the eight directions, worshipped with garlands, perfumes, etc., and sat down there and then.

Then another junior god came to worship, with a retinue of sixty thousand. The elder saw him [and asked the same questions as before, with the same answers]. Sakka recounted his meritorious deed in this verse:

<sup>1</sup> Reading *paññāsa-sahassehi* with M3 and M4.

<sup>2</sup> i.e. Dutthagāmani, destined to be at the right side of Metteyya as his first chief disciple; Saddhātissa was destined to be at Metteyya's left, as his second chief disciple; see DPPN s.v.

<sup>3</sup> Reading *pañcasile* [for -sile] *saññamo niccam*, with *saññamo* (= *samyamo*) as an adjective: cp. text p. 40 line 2 and p. 50 line 4, translation p. 81 and note 3, p. 88 and note 2.

<sup>4</sup> Reading *dadānam* ... *amaccharo*, and taking *dadānam* as a present participle.

Abhayaduṭṭha by name, a provider of the four requisites (to monks), he paid due homage to the Buddha, the Teaching and the Monastic Order; he had a relic-shrine built for the Tathāgata and (a sprig of) the Bodhi-tree planted, gave gifts to monks for the sake of (transferring merit to) his mother and father,<sup>1</sup> giving lavishly to the virtuous and beggars. He died a reverent death<sup>2</sup> and was reborn in the home of the Thirty-three (gods).

He came, walked around the shrine keeping it to his right, paid reverence to the eight directions, worshipped with garlands, perfumes, etc., and sat down there and then.

Then another junior god came to worship, with a retinue of seventy<sup>3</sup> thousand. The elder saw him [and asked the same questions as before, with the same answers]. Sakka recounted his meritorious deed in this verse:

In a former life he was a novice (monk), diligent and wise, who paid due homage to the Buddha, the Teaching and the Monastic Order; untiringly night and day he constantly provided the Order with hot and cold water, brooms and lamps. By the maturation of these deeds he was reborn in the city of the Thirty-three (gods).

---

<sup>1</sup> See note 1 on p. 74 on *dakkhiṇā*.

<sup>2</sup> The story of Duttthagāmani's death and entrance into the Tusita heaven, which he delayed in order to listen to monks reciting, is told in the *Mahāvāriṣa* Chap. 32.

<sup>3</sup> Reading *sattati-*.

He came, walked around the shrine keeping it to his right, paid reverence to the eight directions, worshipped with garlands, perfumes, etc., and sat down there and then.

Then another junior god came to worship, with a retinue of eighty thousand. The elder saw him [and asked the same questions as before, with the same answers]. Sakka recounted his meritorious deed in this verse:

Born into a family of poor (people), he lived on what was given (to him) by others. (Whenever) he saw a monk on his alms-round he would stand (in front of) other people's houses and alert (any) house-owner who was unaware (that a monk was there) with elegant words (such as): 'master, a venerable virtuous (monk) is standing at the doors of (your) house, give generously whatever alms-food you have to this excellent (person)'. On hearing this the house-owner would say to him kindly 'Well spoken, my friend, I will give almsfood; take almsfood and present it to the elder'. By speaking in this way he was reborn in the city of the Thirty-three (gods).

He came, walked around the shrine keeping it to his right, paid reverence to the eight directions, worshipped with garlands, perfumes, etc., and sat down there and then.

Then another junior god came to worship, with a retinue of ninety thousand. The elder saw him [and asked the same questions as before, with the same answers].<sup>1</sup> Sakka recounted his meritorious deed in this verse:

---

<sup>1</sup> Denis' text, based on M1, omits Sakka's reply *n' eso bhante ti* here, but this is a scribal error: it is found in M2, M3 and M4.

In Tambapanni Island, in Kaṇṇikārika village, he saw a stūpa of the Tathāgata<sup>1</sup> and worshipped it with a Kaṇṇikāra (flower), and with his eyes as a lamp, his head as (a bunch of) flowers, his voice as incense and his mind as perfume<sup>2</sup>; by the maturation of this deed he was reborn in the city of the Thirty-three (gods).

He came, walked around the shrine keeping it to his right, paid reverence to the eight directions, worshipped with garlands, perfumes, etc., and sat down there and then.

Then another junior god came to worship, with a retinue of a hundred thousand. The elder saw him [and asked the same questions as before, with the same answers]. Sakka recounted his meritorious deed in this verse:

Formerly he was a poor grass-cutter in Anurādhapura who refrained from killing, was good and established in the (Three) Refuge(s); he followed a proper livelihood by cutting grass and fire-wood. On one occasion when he had gone alone to the river he saw (some) silver sand; he carried it away, built a shrine and said happily: 'Oh, my shrine is beautiful ! It sparkles like a beryl, (it) shines and blazes like a fire; (it is so) beautiful it stirs the heart, (it is) lovely, glorious: I worship the excellent shrine I made with sand, I honour it with body, speech and mind, (as well as ) with flowers'. He fed virtuous (monks) and gave (them) what he had. By the maturation of this deed he was reborn in the home of the Thirty-three (gods).

---

<sup>1</sup> Reading *tathāgatathūpam* with M2 and M4.

<sup>2</sup> Assuming *sugandhinā*.

He came, walked around the shrine keeping it to his right, paid reverence to the eight directions, worshipped with garlands, perfumes, etc., and sat down there and then.

End of the first (section of the) story of Māleyya, dealing with the twelve junior gods.

\*\*\*\*\*

Then the noble Metteyya, the future Buddha, came down from the Tusita realm to worship at the shrine. He was attended by millions upon millions<sup>1</sup> of junior gods and goddesses, who shone with a light brighter than that of the moon with its thousand rays; he (himself) shone like a full moon in a cloudless autumn sky, surrounded by clusters of stars. They were (all) holding lamps, incense, perfumes and garlands.<sup>2</sup> His celestial radiance filled the whole city of the Thirty-three (gods) with light, gave off a celestial smell, and with his characteristic incomparable grace and charm he came to the shrine-terrace, walked around it keeping it to his right, paid reverence to and worshipped the eight directions, and sat down on the western side. Therefore it is said:

Then the noble Metteyya (came), attended by tens of millions, with a hundred divine young maidens in front, a hundred behind, a hundred to his right and to his left. Metteyya in their midst was like the moon in the midst of stars; everywhere was illuminated by the rays of the divine maidens and of their jewels, like the light from ten million moons.

<sup>1</sup> *Koṭisatasahassa*, 'one hundred thousand crores'; a crore is usually taken to be ten million.

<sup>2</sup> Reading *-ādīni* with M2, M3 and M4. I have not followed the exact order of the Pali here, for the sake of smooth English.

The elder saw the future Buddha from afar, and asked Sakka 'King of the gods, is this Metteyya the future Buddha ?' 'Yes, sir.' 'King of the gods, these divine young girls coming in front of Metteyya, with their (shining) white rays, clothes and jewels — what merit did they make in former lives in the human world ?' Sakka recounted their deeds of merit:

Venerable sir, all these celestial maidens, when formerly born in the human (world), made merit by giving gifts and the like on Uposatha day; they gave white clothes, white garlands, white perfumes and ointments, and white food to the excellent Buddha's monks. Because of these deeds of merit they are coming in front of Metteyya.

On hearing this the elder praised their deeds of merit and again questioned Sakka: 'King of the gods, these divine young girls coming on the right of Metteyya, with (golden-)yellow rays, (golden-)yellow clothes and wearing golden jewels — what merit did they make in former lives in the human (world) ?' Sakka recounted their deeds of merit:

Sir, all these celestial maidens, when formerly born in the human (world), made merit by keeping the (moral) precepts and the like on Uposatha day; they gave yellow clothes, yellow garlands, yellow perfumes and ointments, and yellow food to the excellent Buddha's monks. Because of these deeds of merit they are coming in front of Metteyya.

On hearing this the elder praised their deeds of merit, and again questioned Sakka [in a similar way, about the divine young girls to Metteyya's left, with red rays, clothes and jewels]. Sakka recounted their deeds of merit:

Sir, all these divine maidens, when formerly born in the human (world), heard and rightly honoured the Teaching<sup>1</sup> on Uposatha day, and gave red clothes, garlands, perfumes and ointments, and red food to the excellent Buddha's monks; they honoured the Three Jewels and (so) are coming on Metteyya's left.

[Again the elder praised their deeds and then questioned Sakka about the divine girls behind Metteyya, with dark-coloured rays,<sup>2</sup> etc.] Sakka recounted their deeds of merit:

Sir, all these divine maidens, when formerly born in the human (world), heard and rightly honoured the Teaching on Uposatha day, and gave dark-coloured clothes, garlands, perfumes and ointments, and dark food to the excellent Buddha's monks; with restraint, shining,<sup>3</sup> they are coming behind Metteyya.

On hearing this the elder praised their deeds of merit, and again asked Sakka 'What merit did Metteyya make that he should have attained such happiness ?' Sakka's capacity to elucidate<sup>4</sup> Metteyya's merit can be

<sup>1</sup> Either taking *supūjītā* in an active sense, as Denis suggests, or reading *supūjetvā* with M3 (here and in next verses). See note 3 below.

<sup>2</sup> *Sāma*, Skt. *śyāma* can refer to a number of dark colours. Denis chooses 'blue', perhaps because, as K.R. Norman writes (personal communication) 'other references to groups of people with different clooured robes, etc., usually have blue, yellow, red, white, which would suggest that *sāma* might be taken as = *nīla* "blue"'.

<sup>3</sup> As Denis remarks, *samyamā* must be taken as an adjective here. He derives *saṃvibhātā* from *vi-bhaj*, to give a share (of), and says that this, like *supūjītā* in the previous verses, is a past participle used actively. The past participle passive from *vi-bhaj* is usually *vibhatta*, however, and I prefer to derive the form from *vi-bhā*, to shine. K.R. Norman suggests (personal communication) that *supūjītā* may be *metri causa* for the absolute *supūjītvā*.

<sup>4</sup> *-opamāya ca paññāya pakāsetvā*, literally 'elucidating it with an understanding comparable to ...'. I have broken up the long Pali sentence, which is not without linguistic problems, into more manageable English.

compared to a hare (trying to) cross the ocean, or a blind man (trying to) climb a mountain, but he elucidated it briefly (as follows): there are three (types of future Buddha), called those who excel in faith, those who excel in wisdom, and those who excel in energy; Metteyya is one who excels in energy.<sup>1</sup> (All) future Buddhas, by means of the three-fold good conduct (consisting in) control of body, speech and mind, accumulated over many ages,<sup>2</sup> fulfil thirty perfections altogether: ten (ordinary) perfections, ten higher perfections, and ten perfections in the ultimate sense. The perfection of generosity comprises the sacrifice of wealth, children and wife [= ordinary perfection], the sacrifice of (one's own) limbs [= higher perfection] and the sacrifice of (one's) life [= perfection in the ultimate sense]<sup>3</sup>; and correspondingly (there are three levels of) the perfections of morality, renunciation, wisdom, energy, patience, truth, resolution, loving-kindness and equanimity. He spoke these verses:

The merit which Metteyya the future Buddha made over and over again — not (even) the excellent omniscient Buddhas could describe it (all) — cannot be told (even) partially, just as a hare crossing the ocean or a blind man climbing a mountain would

<sup>1</sup> This classification of bodhisattvas would seem to be a Southeast Asian invention, found elsewhere in published Pali texts only at the very end of the *Dasabodhisattuddesa* (Martini (36): text p. 335, transl. pp. 367–68), where it is associated with three kinds of person, from a group of four, found in earlier literature (A II 135, Pp 41, Nett 7). The alternative version of this section cited in Appendix A from M3 says that Metteyya was 'one who excels in faith', although Denis gives no alternative for *thāmādhiko* in the following verses from that ms.

<sup>2</sup> Reading *anappakappopacita-kāyavācimānopanīhita-tividhasucaritena*.

<sup>3</sup> There is a certain amount of confusion in different texts as to which actions constitute which level of the perfections. This doubtless arises because the prefix *upa-* often denotes a 'minor' level of what it is prefixed to, whereas the term *upapāramī* occurs second in the list: compare Ja I 25 and Bv-a 59 with Bv-a 113, and cf. Cp-a 272. I follow Horner (78: 89 and note 1, 162–63) in taking *upa-* in the sense of 'superior' (cf. CPD s.v.) or 'higher'.

not attain (their) goal<sup>1</sup>: in the same way Metteyya's merit is infinite, boundless, (since) he accumulated the necessary conditions (for enlightenment) completely, during many aeons. There are three (kinds of) future Buddhas: one is known as he who excels in energy,<sup>2</sup> who fulfils all perfections during (a period of time lasting) a hundred thousand aeons and sixteen uncountable aeons and (then) attains supreme Full Enlightenment; (the second) is renowned in this human (world) as he who excels in faith, who fulfils all the perfections during (a period of time lasting) a hundred thousand aeons and eight uncountable aeons and (then) attains supreme Full Enlightenment; (the third) is renowned in this human (world) as he who excels in wisdom, who fulfils all the perfections during (a period of time lasting) a hundred thousand aeons and four uncountable aeons and (then) attains supreme Full Enlightenment. The future Buddha Metteyya is known as one who excels in energy; he has fulfilled all the perfections during a hundred thousand aeons and sixteen uncountable aeons and has been reborn in the Tusita (heaven): when he dies from that body (and is reborn on earth) he will attain Full Enlightenment.

While the elder was conversing thus with Sakka, Metteyya came, walked around the shrine keeping it to his right, paid reverence to the eight directions, worshipped with garlands, perfumes, etc., paid reverence with the five-fold prostration, and sat down on the eastern side. The future Buddha saw the elder sitting down there, paid reverence to him and asked 'Where have you come from, venerable Sir ?' 'I have

---

<sup>1</sup> This is clearly the sense of *patiṭṭhā* here, although it is an unusual use of the word. Similarly, the general sense is quite clear in the sentence as a whole, despite the inelegant syntax of the Pali.

<sup>2</sup> In the prose version *viriya* appears here in place of *thāma*; they can be regarded as synonyms.

come from the Rose-Apple Island, great king.' 'Venerable Sir, what is happening among the human beings in Rose-Apple Island ?' The elder answered his question by saying:

Everyone there lives according to their (past) deeds, rich and poor, happy and unhappy, attractive and unattractive, long-lived and short-lived. The rich are few, the poor are many; the happy are few, the unhappy many; the attractive are few, the unattractive many; the long-lived are few, the short-lived many. Human beings are few, there are more animals; that is why I say that everyone lives according to their (past) deeds.

The future Buddha heard what the elder said (and asked) 'Sir, do the human beings in Rose-Apple Island make much merit or demerit ?' 'Great king, those who make merit are few, there are more who do evil.' 'Sir, how do they make merit ?' He explained 'Great king, some human beings in Rose-Apple Island give alms, some preserve morality, (or) give the gift of The Truth, keep the Uposatha day(s), make images of the Buddha, build monasteries or residences (for the Order), give rains-residences, robes, almsfood (or) medicine, tend the Bodhi-tree, build stūpas, shrines, parks (for the Order), causeways (or) walkways (for meditation), dig wells (or) canals, give (the monastic) requisites (or) the ten-fold gift,<sup>1</sup> look after their mother and father, offer sacrifice for the sake of dead relatives, worship the Three Jewels, have their son enter the Monastic Order (as a novice),<sup>2</sup> or worship the Buddha-image: the

<sup>1</sup> Lists of gifts, varying in number, are found in the texts (e.g. A IV 239, Nidd I 373, Nidd II 233; the number ten is given at Pv-a 7); without citing a source Denis gives food, drink, lodging, clothes, vehicles, garlands, ointments, perfumes, seats and lamps.

<sup>2</sup> All mss. apart from M2 add here *keci dhammaputtam pabbājenti*, 'some have a son in the Teaching [?] enter the Monastic Order (as a novice)', which I do not understand. Perhaps *dhammaputta* refers to a novice, and the verb is repeated in

human beings in Rose-Apple Island do all these deeds of merit, according to their capacity, their strength and their inclination'. 'Sir, when the human beings in Rose-Apple Island make merit in these ways, what wishes do they make ?' The elder recounted<sup>1</sup> their aspirations in these words:

Your Highness,<sup>2</sup> when they make even a (small) measure of merit, or cause others to make merit, or transfer their merit to others, they make an aspiration for enlightenment (in relation) to you: 'by the merit acquired through giving, morality and the like, may we gain sight of the Buddha Metteyya himself, (and) while the Buddha Metteyya is not reborn (on earth, but remains in heaven) worshipped by the gods, may we, moving through rebirths, never go to a hell'. In this way the human beings in Rose-Apple Island, everywhere and always, make merit and then make an aspiration with regard to you.

The future Buddha, joyful to hear (this) news of human beings in Rose-Apple Island, said 'Sir, let everyone who wishes to see me when I have attained Omniscience listen to a complete recitation in one day of the Great Vessantara Birth-Story; if they worship with a thousand lamps or a thousand lotuses, a thousand blue lotuses, blue water-lilies, Mandāra-flowers, flax-flowers, a thousand banners, parasols, flags or vehicles, and bring everything to worship the Teaching, they will attain arahantship along with the analytical insights at the time of my Enlightenment (and) in my presence'. Then he

---

error for *upasampādenti*; the phrase would then refer to monks ordaining their novices in the second and higher Ordination.

<sup>1</sup> Reading *kathento* with M2 and M3.

<sup>2</sup> The vocative *deva*, literally 'god' applies directly to Metteyya in his present birth in the Tusita heaven; since it is also regularly used as a form of address to kings, in the light of Māleyya's having previously called him 'great king' (*mahārāja*) I adopt this rendering here.

recounted how evil humans would not attain the sight of his Buddhahood, in these verses:

(Those who) violently mistreat nuns, make a schism in the Order, commit the five actions which bring immediate retribution,<sup>1</sup> destroy a stūpa or Bodhi-tree,<sup>2</sup> murder a future Buddha or take away the peace of the Order: (these) wicked and negligent beings will not be in my presence.

The elder listened to these words and said 'Great king, what you said was good ! I will recount (it) to the human beings in Rose-Apple Island. But when will you become Buddha ?' 'Sir, the dispensation of Gotama Buddha will last five thousand years and (then) disappear. When it has disappeared there will be an abundance of bad actions in the world. Even the word 'good' will not exist — how much less the occurrence of good (actions) ! Gradually human beings will lose (all) conscience and (sense of) shame, breaking (all) rules: they will not consider 'this is my mother, my daughter, my sister or grand-daughter', and will be (as) shameless as goats, sheep, chickens, pigs, jackals, dogs, and the like. Then gradually, because of their abundant bad actions, from (having) a lifetime fixed at a hundred years, human beings will deteriorate and (come to) have a lifetime of ten years. When there is taking and giving in marriage<sup>3</sup> between five year old boy(s) and girl(s), then will occur an 'intervening period of the sword'. Men will regard each other as animals; whatever they (can) grasp in their hands<sup>4</sup> will become a weapon like a two-edged (sword) or a single-edged razor, (and) they will kill each other. The wise among them, as soon as they hear of

<sup>1</sup> These are: matricide, parricide, killing an Arahant, causing a Buddha to shed blood, and creating schism in the Order.

<sup>2</sup> Reading *bodhiñ ca chedakā* with M5.

<sup>3</sup> Reading *āvāhavivāho* with M5.

<sup>4</sup> Reading with M5 *yam̄ yam̄ hathena gahitam̄ tan tam̄ . . .*

the destruction, will go to the mountains and hide by themselves; all the rest apart from them will attack and destroy each other within seven days. When the seventh day has passed, they will come out, each one from his hiding-place, embrace each other and come into harmony with each other, (saying) 'let us do good, and abstain from killing, from theft, sexual misdeeds, lying, intoxicating drink, speech which is malicious, harsh or frivolous, from envy, ill-will and wrong views — let us make merit !' (And so) they will make merit. Those who live ten years will have children who live for twenty; and as human beings make more and more merit, their children will gradually live for thirty, forty, fifty, sixty, seventy, eighty, ninety and a hundred years. Children will gradually live for two hundred years, (then) three, four, five, six, seven, eight and nine hundred years, (and then finally) a thousand. Gradually, the children of those who live a thousand years will live for two thousand; (then) for three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine and ten thousand. Then human beings will practice religion still more, and will live for a hundred thousand years; as they practice religion still more, there will be those who live for millions and millions of years<sup>1</sup>; practising religion still further than this, they will live for an incalculable amount of time. Then old age and death will not be known among (these) beings; but again they will become negligent, and their length of life will diminish.<sup>2</sup> From (having) an incalculable length of life, men will deteriorate and (come to) have a lifetime of millions and millions of years<sup>3</sup>; from then they will gradually deteriorate (until) they have a lifetime of ninety thousand years; from then they will gradually deteriorate (until) they have a lifetime of eighty thousand years. At that time it will rain (only) in the middle of the night, every fortnight, ten

<sup>1</sup> Reading *koti*satasahassāyukā with M5; literally a hundred thousand crores; on *koti* see p. 79 note 1.

<sup>2</sup> Assuming *āyu* *parihāyissati*.

<sup>3</sup> Assuming (*vassa-*)*koti*satasahassāyukā, as at M5 above; see note 1 above.

days or five days, increasing the fertility of the earth.<sup>1</sup> The Rose-Apple Island will be prosperous (and) continuously filled with flowers, fruits, thickly-clustered garlands, and trees; (it will be) crowded with villages and towns (only) a cock's-flight (apart), free from thieves and robbers, without (any) grasping at (wrong) views, (and) blazing with royal cities; (it will be) replete with all treasures, happy, with abundant alms-food and at peace, replete with great amounts of food and drink, hard and soft food, fish, meat and the like, prospering with wealth and possessions. The reservoirs will be everywhere filled with beautifully soft water. Then, sir, husbands and wives will enjoy the pleasures of the five senses without arguments or anger; farmers, traders, and the like will live happily without (needing to) work; men and women will not (need to) spin thread or weave the loom, (but) will wear celestial clothes. Men will be content with their wives, and women with their husbands; restrained,<sup>2</sup> men will not commit adultery nor women make another man their husband, (but) they will be loving and pleasant to one another. No-one will stir up quarrels because of villages, towns, wealth, crops, fields, property or soil; all human beings will be handsome, with beautiful bodies, (and will be) loving and pleasant to each other. Crows will become friendly with owls, cats with mice, deer with lions, mongooses with snakes, lions with deer, and so on: in this way all animals which are (usually) enemies will be friendly to each other. Then, from one grain of self-growing rice (will come already-)husked grains: two thousand two hundred and seventy cartloads will be (for them as easily had as) sixteen *ambana*-measures and two *tumba*-s.<sup>3</sup> Then I will

<sup>1</sup> Literally 'the nutritive essence of the earth', *pathavirasa* (spelt thus in text); it is said that seeds take up this 'earth-essence', along with liquid, or 'the nutritive essence of water' (*sineha, aporasa*) to produce growth: S I 134, A I 32, V 213, Spk I 250, Pj II 5–6, etc.

<sup>2</sup> Again, assuming *saṃyamā* is being used adjectively.

<sup>3</sup> I translate the text of M5, cited here by Denis but occurring in that ms. after the sentence 'farmers ... will live happily without (the need to) work'. Similar sentiments are expressed at *Anāg* vv. 27–29, and for the interpretation here see

listen to the entreaty of the gods and Brahma living in the ten thousand-fold world system; I will make the Five Considerations, as to time, place, continent, family, and age-limit of the mother; (and) I will come as Buddha to the human world.' When he had said this, in order to praise his own perfections he said:

During a hundred thousand aeons and sixteen incalculable aeons I fulfilled the perfections variously, acting<sup>1</sup> as a future Buddha excelling in energy, and gave gifts<sup>2</sup>: when I attain omniscience no-one will be deformed. Putting ornaments on my head and ointment on my eyes I gave to beggars for millions and millions of years: when I attain omniscience no human being will be blind. Ornamenting all parts (of my body) I gave a complete gift: when I attain omniscience, no-one will be deformed. I told no lies and did not deceive anyone who asked (me for something): when I attain omniscience, no human being will be dumb. When I heard the Teaching I was glad, and I listened to what supplicants said: when I attain omniscience, no human being will be deaf. I looked at virtuous supplicants with loving eyes: when I attain omniscience, no human being will be blind. With upright body I gave gifts and the like at the proper time: when I attain omniscience no human being will be humpbacked. I gave beings medicine(s) and got rid of<sup>3</sup> the danger (from disease): when I attain omniscience, then beings will be in good health. I practised loving-kindness, destroying beings' fear and

---

Leumann (19) ad loc. The Anāg reads *ambanam solasam*, 'one sixteenth of an ambana'.

<sup>1</sup> Reading *caritvā* with M2.

<sup>2</sup> As Denis notes, the forms and tenses of the verbs in these verses are odd. The translation assumes all Metteyya's assertions about himself refer to the past, and all predictions about others refer to the future.

<sup>3</sup> Reading *vinodayi* with M5.

terror: when I attain omniscience, then there will be no Māras.<sup>1</sup> In a pleasant way I gave pleasing food and drink: when I attain omniscience human beings will be prosperous. In a pleasant way I gave pleasing clothes: when I attain omniscience human beings will be handsome. I gave to supplicants pleasing vehicles, elephants, horses, chariots, palanquins and litters: when I attain omniscience human beings will be happy. I freed beings from bondage, from hatred and suffering: when I attain omniscience, living beings will be free. I practised loving-kindness equally to friend and foe: when I attain omniscience, the ground will be even. I made supplicants happy with food and wealth: when I attain omniscience rivers will be full of cool water.

(Then Metteyya said this:)<sup>2</sup>

When they have done any (act of) merit human beings, full of fear of rebirth, aspire to (see) me; I will free them from existence. I will cause (them) to cross to the further shore of the world, (this world) whose fearful origin is ignorance, which is entangled in the net of delusion and carried away by the four floods. I (will) teach<sup>3</sup> the way to liberation to those who are smeared with the dirt of defilement, who follow after the thief (which is) craving, and have gone astray in (all) the regions of rebirth; I will teach the way to heaven to beings in the hells (called) Sañjiva, Kālasutta, Tāpana, Patāpana and Avīci. I will cut from (their) bondage beings who are bound by the ties of ignorance and caught in the net of craving, and make them

<sup>1</sup> *Māra*, literally death, is a name given to various phenomena and gods, all of which/whom are malevolent in some way; see DPPN s.v.

<sup>2</sup> This is found only in M3, but marks a natural break in the verses.

<sup>3</sup> The verbs in this sentence and the next are in the aorist.

attain *nirvāṇa*. The city of *nirvāṇa*, without old age or death, has a fence of wrong views and a door bolted by the sixty-two views: with the key of the Eight-fold Path I will open up (this door) for beings. I will give the medicinal stick of wisdom to beings whose sight is spoilt through being covered with the darkness of lust and hatred, and clean their eyes. I will give the excellent medicine of understanding to beings who are sick with grief, who suffer much, and who are oppressed by old age and death,<sup>1</sup> and (so) cure (them). I will suffuse with the light of understanding (the world) with its gods, asuras and humans, gone astray in the darkness of delusion,<sup>2</sup> and take away the darkness. I will raise from hell those who are falling, helpless and without refuge, into the hells, and show them the way to the further shore.

When he had said this the future Buddha told (the elder): 'Sir, recount to human beings what I have said'. With his shining hands in the form of a hollow lotus-bud (made) by putting his ten finger-nails together, and putting the shining añjali-greeting (thus made) firmly to his forehead, (itself) like a well-washed plate of gold, he walked around the delightful sapphire Cūlāmaṇi-shrine, paid reverence to the eight directions and made a fivefold prostration, and took leave of the elder; escorted by millions and millions of junior gods and goddesses, shining like a full moon, risen to the top of the sky freed from masses of dense cloud (and) surrounded by clusters of stars, he went to the Tusita city. So it is said:

Thus the supremely beautiful Metteyya worshipped at the excellent shrine, again paid reverence, and left keeping his face

<sup>1</sup> The epithets here must be taken to refer to 'beings', although they are in the accusative singular and not genitive (used for dative) plural.

<sup>2</sup> Again, the grammar is faulty here, although the sense is clear.

towards (the shrine).<sup>1</sup> And all the celestial maidens worshipped at the excellent shrine, paid reverence to the eight directions and left (likewise). Just as the moon shines on an autumn full moon night, so the noble Metteyya shone among the gods. Like a lion among deer, a bull among cows, a Garuda among birds, so was he among the gods. Like Meru among mountains, adorned with the seven jewels, a Universal Emperor among men, so was he among the gods. The Pāricchattaka<sup>2</sup> among trees, the lotus among flowers, beryl among gems, so was he among the gods. Like fire at the top of a mountain, like refined gold, surpassing all the gods he shone with the fire of his beauty. Going to the Tusita realm, surrounded by gods, he experienced divine happiness and caused beings to rejoice<sup>3</sup> for a long time.

The elder<sup>4</sup> (possessed, as if he) was adorned with a multitude of ornaments, unlimited good qualities, such as the four perfect virtues — the supreme virtue of restraint by the Monastic Rule, the virtue of sense-restraint, the perfect virtue of right livelihood and the virtue of dependence (only) on the four requisites (of the Monastic Life). At the same moment (as Metteyya left) he paid reverence to the Cūlāmani-

<sup>1</sup> *Pitthito*, lit. 'backwards'.

<sup>2</sup> A tree in the Tāvatīṣṭha heaven.

<sup>3</sup> Taking *pamodati* in the sense of the causative *pamodeti*; perhaps the text should be emended.

<sup>4</sup> The Pali has a single long sentence here, beginning with 'at the same moment (as Metteyya left)'; I have changed the long string of epithets applied to Māleyyadeva and to the golden swan into separate sentences. M3 has a different and shorter ending section, reproduced in Appendix C. The sense is much the same, but it adds in the last sentence of the prose: 'whoever listens attentively [assuming *sunanti sakkaccam*] to the Vessantara (Jātaka), taught by the Conqueror, and whatever benefactors make merit and (practise) morality and the like, (they will all) hear [assuming *sunanti*, used for the future tense] the excellent Happy One Metteyya, (their) support [taking *passayam* as equivalent to *apassayam*].'

shrine and took leave of Sakka, king of the gods. He travelled along the path of rebirth<sup>1</sup> which is the origin of sufferings such as birth, old age and death, which have their home in numerous forest thickets crowded with various trees and forest creepers such as the extremely strong (trees and creepers of) lust, craving and wrong views.<sup>2</sup> He shone like a golden swan whose supreme, outstanding body had a head guarding the threefold knowledge, wings of the fourth meditation level, two excellent lucky feet of the beautiful, shining bases of supernatural power, and the entire plumage guarding the eight liberations, the analytical knowledges and the worldly and super-worldly confidences. He descended from the realm of the Thirty-three, came to Rose-Apple Island, and with the incomparable grace natural to a disciple (of the Buddha)<sup>3</sup> went for alms in villages, towns and royal cities. So it is said:

Then the elder (Māleyya-)deva took leave of the king of the gods, paid reverence again at the shrine and came down from heaven. He shone like a golden swan as he came again to the human (world) and went for alms in towns and royal cities.

As he returned for alms he announced to the people of Rose-Apple Island the news of Metteyya. When they heard what the elder said people were glad and made merit through giving and the like: at the end of their lives they filled up the divine worlds. The poor man who had given the eight blue lotus flowers remembered that gift of lotuses all his life; when he died (he went) from the human world and was reborn in the realm of the Thirty-three, in a blue-lotus palace inlaid with seven jewels,

<sup>1</sup> i.e. he returned to earth from heaven.

<sup>2</sup> There is probably a pun intended here between *vana*- as 'forest' and *vana* as a synonym for *tañhā*, 'craving'. The image is of Māleyyadeva returning from heaven like a swan through a forest, both of which are metaphorically elaborated.

<sup>3</sup> i.e. not the same as the 'grace' or 'charm' of a Buddha, *Buddha-lilhā*.

crowded with celestial maidens and ringing with the sound of dancing, singing and the five kinds of musical instrument. As he walked lotuses of five colours (appeared to) receive each foot; the odour from his mouth pervaded the entire city of the gods like the perfume of a lotus. The gods and goddesses smelt the lotus-perfume and followed after him; they all saw a lotus receiving each foot, and told Sakka, king of the gods. When he heard their tale he was delighted, and went there (to him) and asked 'God, what deed of merit did you do in the human world to obtain such happiness ?' He listened to what Sakka said and replied 'King of the gods, formerly in the human world I lived in Mithilā supporting my mother; I was a young man called Piñguttara.<sup>1</sup> One day I went to a certain pond to bathe. When I had bathed there I saw eight blue lotus flowers; I took them and gave them to a certain elder. Because of that gift of blue lotuses I have been born in a blue-lotus palace; as I walk lotus flowers come into existence at each step, my eyes are like blue-lotus petals, my body has an odour like that of a blue lotus, and I am born (here) as the junior god named Blue-lotus'. When Sakka heard this he became joyful and glad; he took blue-lotus flowers and worshipped at the shrine of the Buddha. The junior god Blue Lotus is still there today. So it is said:

To enjoy (the result of) that merit, and divine happiness, in a future birth in the presence of Metteyya — this is the result of a gift of flowers. Therefore the wise man who aspires to be in the presence of Metteyya should practice alms-giving, morality and the like. Whoever remembers the future Buddha's words and does any act of merit, will gain the advantage of seeing Metteyya, and will in the future make an end of suffering;

---

<sup>1</sup> J VI 347–49 tells a different story of a young man from Mithilā, in north India, with this name; perhaps the Māleyyadēvattheravatthu has borrowed the names, although this is clearly the same person as at the start of the story, in Kamboja village, Rohana, Sri Lanka.

(before then,) moving on through rebirth, that person will not go to hell.

End of the expository account of the Elder Māleyyadeva.

(This) will be a cause of (attaining) *nirvāṇa* in the future !<sup>1</sup>

#### ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations for titles of Pāli texts are those of the Critical Pāli Dictionary

Childers = R.C. Childers' Dictionary of the Pāli Language

CPD = Critical Pāli Dictionary

DPPN = Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names

HOS = Harvard Oriental Series

PED = The Pali Text Society's Pali-English Dictionary

PTS = Pali Text Society

---

<sup>1</sup> Denis states that in M1, the only ms. in which it occurs, the word *bhavissanti* [for *bhavissati*] seems to have been written later, to complete the verse. Presumably the 'cause' for attaining *nirvāṇa* here is copying the manuscript and/or listening to its being recited.

## WORKS CITED

- Bareau, A. (62) 'La construction et le culte des stūpa d'après les *Vinaya-piṭaka*', *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*, Tome L, Fasc. 2, pp. 229-74
- Leumann, E. (19) *Maitreya-samiti, das Zukunftsideal der Buddhisten* (Trübner, Strassburg)
- Martini, F. (36) 'Dasa-bodhisatta-uddesa', *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*, Tome XXXVI, Fasc. 2, pp. 287-413
- Masefield, P. (89) *Vimāna-Stories* (Pali Text Society, London)
- Ñāṇamoli, Bhikkhu (62) *The Guide* (Pali Text Society, London)
- Norman, K.R. (90) 'Pāli Lexicographical Studies VIII', *Journal of the Pali Text Society*, Vol. XV, pp. 145-54

# **NIBBĀNASUTTA: AN ALLEGEDLY NON-CANONICAL SUTTA ON NIBBĀNA AS A GREAT CITY<sup>1</sup>**

The pages that follow carry a preliminary edition and translation of the *Nibbānasutta*, an “allegedly non-canonical”<sup>2</sup> Pali text

---

<sup>1</sup> This is a corrected and revised version of the edition and translation of the *Nibbānasutta* that was published as “The Sutta on Nibbāna as a Great City” in the commemorative volume for the Ven. Hammalava Saddhatissa, *Buddhist Essays: A Miscellany*, edited by Pollamure Sorata Thera, Laksman Perera, and Karl Goonasena (London: Sri Saddhatissa International Buddhist Centre, 1992), pp. 38–67.

I would like to acknowledge the assistance I received from Professor G.D. Wijayawardhana, Steven Collins, Jacqueline Filliozat, and P.B. Meegaskumbura in the preparation of this edition and translation. All read over a preliminary transcription of the manuscript and each made many suggestions for improving the text. Professor Wijayawardhana’s and Steven Collins’ comments also aided me in translating the text. P.B. Meegaskumbura made many helpful comments on the introduction. It was, however, only through the generosity and kindness of Jacqueline Filliozat that this edition was even possible. She made a copy of the original manuscript available to me and also made it possible for me to learn how to read *mūl* script. Finally, she compared my initial transcription with the original manuscript and made a number of improvements in the reading of the manuscript itself.

<sup>2</sup> I use this appellation to refer to texts which begin with the standard phrases of a sutta — “*Evam me sutam. Ekam samayam ...*” — but are not found in standard editions of the Pali canon. The term comes from K.D. Somadasa, who uses it in his *Catalogue of the Hugh Nevill Collection of Sinhalese Manuscripts in the British Library* (London: The British Library, and Henley-on-Thames: Pali Text Society, 1987), Vol. I, p. 27. I prefer this label to the alternative designations “apocryphal” or “counterfeit”, since it is less likely to pre-judge the whole issue of the status of such texts; see Charles Hallisey, “*Tuṇḍilovāda: An Allegedly Non-Canonical Sutta*,” *Journal of the Pali Text Society*, XV (1990), pp. 156–58. The use of the term “apocryphal” for texts whose inclusion in the Canon might be contested has been popularized by Padmanabh S. Jaini; see especially “*Ākāravattārasutta: An ‘Apocryphal’ Sutta from Thailand*,” *Indo-Iranian Journal*, 35 (1992), p. 193. The label “counterfeit Sutta” has been applied to the *Dasabodhisattuppattikathā* by the Ven. H. Saddhatissa (*The Birth*

probably of Southeast Asian origin. This edition is preliminary in two important ways. First, as will be discussed below, it is based on a single manuscript and it must be frankly admitted that no textual criticism which uses only a single exemplar can be taken as more than provisional. Second, the readings suggested for establishing an acceptable text must also be taken as strictly provisional, given the limitations of our knowledge of Pali language and literature in Southeast Asia.<sup>1</sup> While I hope that in the future the discovery of other manuscripts and the further study of Southeast Asian Pali will make it possible to improve on this provisional edition, I think that in the meantime the *Nibbānasutta* can make a contribution to our understanding of both the literary history and the conceptual patterns of the Theravāda Buddhist traditions.

---

*Stories of the Ten Bodhisattvas and the Dasabodhisattuppattikathā* [London: Pali Text Society, 1975], p. 16).

<sup>1</sup> One example will suffice to emphasize how limited knowledge of later Pali as a language may encourage us to jump to wrong conclusions when editing texts. In the manuscript of the *Nibbānasutta*, the letter “ñ” is usually not doubled; thus we consistently find ‘arañe’ for ‘araññe’, ‘pañā’ for ‘paññā’, ‘añata’ for ‘aññata’, etc. In each case I have given the latter spelling as a suggested reading in the footnotes. This might suggest that the spellings with the single “ñ” are mistakes in the manuscript, but Jacqueline Filliozat has pointed out (personal communication) that “ñ” is rarely doubled in Southeast Asian manuscripts. Others have noticed a more generalised orthographic convention of manuscripts written in the *mūl* script to suppress geminates; see François Martini, “Dasabodhisatta-uddesa”, *Bulletin de l’École Française d’Extrême Orient*, 36 (1936), p. 371 and G. Terral, “Samuddaghosajātaka — Conte Pāli tiré du Paññāsa-jātaka”, *Bulletin de l’École Française d’Extrême Orient* 48 (1956), pp. 312–13. Thus we need at least to consider that what might be taken as a fault is better taken as an example of Southeast Asian usage. I hope that this one example makes it clear that textual criticism of Southeast Asian Pali, indeed of any of the Pali of the late Theravāda, is conditioned by our limited knowledge of the linguistic variety permissible in later Pali literature.

The *Nibbānasutta*, as an allegedly non-canonical sutta, belongs to a class of Theravādin literature which has been unduly neglected by scholars. Such literature, however, was apparently known to and accepted as authoritative by Buddhaghosa. In *Atthasālinī*, he makes a point by referring to "a sutta which was not composed at a council."<sup>1</sup>

We can begin to have a more accurate estimation of the significance of such texts by carefully considering their role as instructional aids and vehicles for the transmission of the "Way of the Elders." When we do so, we see that the production of allegedly non-canonical suttas in the Theravāda is not always analogous to the creation of the Mahāyāna sūtras, superficial similarities notwithstanding, in so far as they frequently did not formulate new teachings.<sup>2</sup> Such compositions were apparently one response to a fundamental problem continually faced by the Theravāda, a problem which was recognized by Louis Finot seventy-five years ago: "The Buddhist Canon is not an easy study: it discourages by its mass and its difficulties the enthusiasm of the most fearless . . . It was necessary to be concerned about making this *rudis indigestaque moles* accessible, either by condensing it in the form of a summary, or by combining scattered elements from this or that part of the doctrine, or finally by simply detaching from this immense book (i.e. the *tipiṭaka*) some leaves which interested more particularly the

---

<sup>1</sup> ASL 65.

<sup>2</sup> Of course, some allegedly non-canonical texts include notions which appear novel when compared with norms accepted in the Pali Canon. See Ven. H. Saddhatissa, *The Birth Stories of the Ten Bodhisattas*, pp. 7–14, and P.S. Jaini, *Ākāravattārasutta*, pp. 197–98. A more extreme example of novelty in an allegedly non-canonical *sutta* is found in the Sinhala-language *Sumana Sūtraya*, a work dating to the colonial period of Sri Lanka's history and described by Kitsiri Malalgoda in his article on Buddhist Millennialism (Kitsiri Malalgoda, "Millennialism in Relation to Buddhism", *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 42 [1970], pp. 424–41).

spiritual life or the practice of the community.”<sup>1</sup> These different responses, however, are not easily distinguished. The *Nibbānasutta* appears to be a combination of the first two types of response specified by Finot: it is a summary, although it gathers together in a significant way material scattered in the Pāli canon and commentaries. Moreover, allegedly non-canonical suttas like the *Nibbānasutta*, circulated individually, as did even those texts which we might somewhat ironically call “uncontestedly canonical suttas”; but they also circulated in a variety of *ad hoc* anthologies.<sup>2</sup> The co-existence of summaries and anthologies

<sup>1</sup> Louis Finot, “Recherches sur la littérature Laotienne”, *Bulletin de l’École Française d’Extrême Orient* 17 (1917), p. 71.

<sup>2</sup> Some idea of the range and variety of *ad hoc* anthologies, Finot’s third type of response, can be gained from K.D. Somadasa’s catalogue of the Nevill Collection in the British Library; see note 2 on p. 97 above. Some anthologies, like the very large *Suttajātakanidānānisamsa* and the *Suttasaṅgaha* (see Ven H. Saddhatissa, “Literature in Pāli from Laos”, *Studies in Pali and Buddhism: A Memorial Volume in Honor of Bhikkhu Jagdish Kashyap*, edited by A.K. Narain [Delhi: B.R. Publishing Corporation, 1979], pp. 327–28), became relatively stable texts in their own right, and thus have had more enduring identities than other more ephemeral, and titleless, anthologies. They, like all of the anthologies, await sustained study, although a unique portion of the *Suttajātakanidānānisamsa* has been edited by George Cœdès; see “Dhammadāya”, *Adyar Library Bulletin*, 20 (1956), pp. 248–86; the *Suttasaṅgaha* is available in an edition prepared by B. Dhirānanda Mahāthero (n.p. Vījāśāgarākhyā Yantrālaya, 1903). For a description of the *Piṭaka dan sām*, a smaller anthology, “very widespread in Laos, Thailand, and Cambodia”, see George Cœdès, *Catalogue des manuscrits en Pāli, Laotien, et Siamois provenant de la Thailande* (Copenhagen: Royal Library, 1966), pp. 70–76. In each anthology, the excerpted portions from the canon remain Pāli (i.e. canonical), which helps to explain the confusion over whether or not the *Suttasaṅgaha* was added to the canon in Burma; see H. Oldenberg, “List of Manuscripts in the India Office Library”, *Journal of the Pali Text Society* I (1882), p. 80, and V. Fausbøll, “Catalogue of the Mandalay Manuscripts in the India Office Library”, *Journal of the Pali Text Society* IV (1896), p. 31 [cited at Collins, “On the Very Idea of the Pali Canon,” p. 108, note 11]. See also on the *Suttasaṅgaha*, K.R. Norman, *Pāli Literature* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1983), pp. 31, 172.

with collections of the more diffuse canonical literature parallels the analogous tension in the Theravādin tradition between the actual diversity of thought and practice noted by historians and observers of the contemporary Theravāda and an assumption of doctrinal systematicity idealized by Theravādin intellectuals and by scholars of the Theravāda.

Recognizing that the canon was generally transmitted in condensed parts and in summaries is of course relevant for reconstructing the range of Buddhist thought and practice operative in any given historical context. But although we are now beginning to appreciate better the importance of such texts for our understanding of "Buddhism on the ground," we still have little idea of the actual numbers of such texts, the extent of their originality, or the processes of their composition. The *Nibbānasutta* makes a valuable contribution to the pool of information that will be necessary for answering the latter questions.

The *Nibbānasutta* displays, at least in part, the processes through which summaries and new suttas were created in the Theravāda tradition. As a discourse, the *Nibbānasutta* is organized around a narrative about a man journeying to a great city. This short narrative is subsequently used to order a series of metaphors about Buddhist practice, salvation, *samsāra*, and *nibbāna* in a coherent, if loose, fashion. It is striking that a similar metaphorical reinterpretation of a narrative is used to provide a summary of doctrine and practice in the *Ānguttara Nikāya* and its commentary. The canonical passage, which is part of a conversation between the Buddha and the Sakyan prince Vappa, reads:

Just as, O Vappa, a shadow of a tree (*thūṇam*) is seen, and a man might come there, bringing a hoe and basket, and he might cut the tree at the root, and having cut the root, he might dig it up, and digging, he might lift up the roots, even as much as a

tube holds of the fragrant *usīra* root. He might break up that tree piece by piece, and destroying it piece by piece he might chop it, and chopping it, he might splinter it, and then dry it in the wind and heat, and having dried it in the wind and heat, he might burn it with fire and turn it into ashes. Having turned it into ashes, he might scatter it in a strong wind or wash it away in a river with a swift current. Thus the broken roots of that tree whose shadow appeared are uprooted and completely destroyed and in the future will be things that do not arise again. Just exactly so the six *satatavīhāra* are attained by the monk whose mind is completely freed.<sup>1</sup>

The commentary, the *Manorathapūrāṇī*, finds in the connecting adverb *evam* an opportunity to explain the metaphorical significance of this narrative:

---

<sup>1</sup> A II 199: *seyyathāpi Vappa thūṇam paṭicca chāyā paññāyati, atha puriso āgaccheyya kudālapiṭakam ādāya, so tam thūṇam mūle chindeyya, mūle chetvā palikhaneyya, palikhanetvā mūlāni uddhareyya antamaso usīranālimattāni pi. so tam thūṇam khanḍākhanḍikam chindeyya, khanḍākhanḍikam chetvā phāleyya, phāletvā sakalikam sakalikam kareyya, sakalikam sakalikam karitvā vātātpe visoseyya, vātātpe visosetvā agginā daheyya, agginā dahitvā masīm kareyya, masīm katvā, mahāvāte vā opuneyya nadiyā vā sighasotāya pavāheyya. evam hi 'ssa Vappa yā thūṇam paṭicca chāyā sā ucchinnamūlā tālāvatthukatā anabhāvākatā āyatim anuppādādhammā. evam eva kho Vappa evam sammāvīmutticittassa bhikkhuno cha satatavīhāra adhigatā honti.*

PTSD defines *satatavīhāra* as “a chronic state of life”; PTSD s.v. *satata*, p. 672. They are modes of life limited to those who have destroyed the *āsavas*. It should be noted that although this narrative resonates with the imagery of the great tree of *kilesas* in the *Nibbānasutta*, its imagery of uprooting roots is in fact more prominent throughout Theravādin literature; for a *locus classicus* of this metaphor, see Dhp 338.

*Just exactly so*<sup>1</sup> this is the application of the simile here: individual life is to be known as like the tree (*rukko*), the *kamma* of good and bad deeds is like the shadow of the tree, the *yogāvacaro* is like the person desiring to put a stop to the shadow, wisdom is like the hoe (*kuddāla*, i.e. mammary), concentration is like the basket, insight meditation is like the tool for uprooting (*khanitti*), the opportunity for destroying ignorance with the path of the *arahant* is like the digging up of the roots with the spade, the opportunity for seeing the influence of the sensory elements is like the opportunity for breaking up (the whole tree) piece by piece, the opportunity for seeing the influence of the elements of sense-perception is like the opportunity for chopping (the tree), the opportunity for seeing the influence of the physical elements is like the opportunity for splintering (the tree), the opportunity for creating mental and bodily exertion is like the opportunity for drying (the broken parts) in the wind and heat, the burning of the *kilesas* with knowledge is like the burning (the pieces) with fire, the continuing existence of the five *khandhas* is like the making of ashes, the unmendable cessation of the five *khandhas* is like the scattering of the destroyed roots in a great wind or washing them away in the current of a river, and the state of the non-manifestation, without any further arising, of *khandhas* which are the fruits of previous actions in a new birth is to be known as being like the attained condition of non-manifestation because of the scattering (in the wind) and the washing away (in the river).<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The term *evam* is sometimes glossed in the commentaries as being a “term of comparison” (*upamāvacana*); see for example Pj I 208.

<sup>2</sup> Mp III 179–80: *evam eva kho ti ettha idam opammasaṇsandanam: rukko viya hi attabhāvo daṭṭhabbo, rukkham paṭicca chāyā viya kusalākusalakammam, chāyam appavattam kātukāmo puriso viya yogāvacaro, kuddālo viya paññā,*

In the quotation above, the *Manorathapūrani* names the interpretive strategy which it employs to connect these two passages as *opammasamsandanā*.<sup>1</sup> The presence of this same interpretive strategy in the *Nibbānasutta* suggests that its composition may have followed a generic pattern already well-established in earlier texts; that is, the general process at work in the creation of summary texts included the use of models found in other texts. This suggestion finds some confirmation when we look at the serial simile of the “city of Nibbāna” in the *Nibbānasutta* which itself seems to build on patterns already present in the commentaries and other types of Theravādin literature.<sup>2</sup>

Moreover, as indicated by the passages found in the *Nibbānasutta* which are taken from the *Majjhima Nikāya* and the *Theragāthā*, the process of creating new texts included the direct use of materials found in older texts. We see a similar use of older material in other allegedly non-canonical suttas, such as the *Tundilovādasutta* and the *Ākāravattārasutta*.<sup>3</sup> Indeed, the process of making new texts out of the materials of older texts seems to have become quite common in the later Theravāda; we can refer here to such Pāli texts as the *Jinakālamāli*,

---

piṭakam viya samādhi, khaṇitti viyavipassanā, khaṇittiyā mūlānam  
 palikhaṇanakālo viya arahattamaggena avijjāya chedanakālo, khaṇḍākhaṇḍam  
 karaṇakālo viya khandhavasena diṭṭhakālo, phāṇanakālo viya āyatanavasena  
 diṭṭhakālo, sakali karaṇakālo viya dhātuvasena diṭṭhakālo, vātātpe visosanakālo  
 viya kāyikacetasikassa (taking variant reading for kāyikavācasikassa) viriyassa  
 karaṇakālo, agginā dahanakālo viya nānena kilesānam dahanakālo,  
 masikaranakālo viya dharamāṇaka-pañcakkhandhakālo, mahāvāte opunanakālo  
 viya nadisote pavāhanakālo chinnamūlakānam pañcannam khandhānam  
 appaṭisandhikārodro, opunanapavāhanehi appaññattika-bhāvupagamo viya  
 punabbhave vipākakhandhānam anuppādena apaññattikabhāvo veditabbo.

<sup>1</sup> See as well A II 201 and Mp III 181–82; Vism 346; Sv (I) 127.

<sup>2</sup> For example, Mil 330–45; see as well Bv-a 155–56; Sv (III) 881; Sv-pṭ III 78.

<sup>3</sup> Compare *Tundilovāda* 176–77 and Bv-a 121; *Tundilovāda* 186 and Bv-a 121; see Jaini, *Ākāravattārasutta*, 197, 199, 200 note 13, 201 notes 14–15, 209 note 21.

the *Pathamasambodhi*, the *Jinamahānidāna* and the *Saṅgītiyavaṃsa*, all composed in Thailand.<sup>1</sup> It should be noted that one result of this process of composing new texts would be a blurring of the distinctions between canonical and non-canonical literature.

An awareness of the special problems which the Theravāda faced in transmitting a systematic, but complex doctrine abstracted from a large and diffuse literary tradition is important for understanding the continuing literary activities of Buddhists in Sri Lanka and Southeast Asia. This awareness above all allows us to acknowledge the conditions under which new suttas, such as the *Nibbānasutta*, could have been composed and accepted in the Theravāda; it is easy to see that the very idea of a closed canon might well have functioned more as a rhetorical marker than as a strictly closed list in contexts where the canon circulated and was known in its parts rather than as a whole.<sup>2</sup> But we should be careful not to limit the ramifications of this fact to the admission that "new" texts could probably find some acceptance in such contexts; we could make this admission and still care little for the contents of these individual suttas on the grounds that they seem to add little to the scholarly understanding of the doctrinal orientations of the

---

<sup>1</sup> *Jinakālamāli* (London: Pali Text Society, 1962), *Jinamahānidāna* (Bangkok: National Library — Fine Arts Department, 1987); *Saṅgītiyavaṃsa* (Bangkok: 1926). On the *Pathamasambodhi*, see George Cœdès, "Une vie Indochinoise de Buddha: La *Pathamasambodhi*," in *Mélanges d'Indianisme à la mémoire de Louis Renou* (Paris: Institut de Civilisation indienne, 1968), pp. 217–27. There is some precedent for this process of composition in the Pali Canon itself, most notably in the *Samyutta-nikāya* and the *Ānguttara-nikāya*.

<sup>2</sup> For a discussion of the significance of the idea of a closed canon in the Theravāda, see Steven Collins, "On the Very Idea of the Pali Canon," *Journal of the Pali Text Society* XV (1990), pp. 89–126; for a discussion of the idea of the *tipiṭaka* functioning as a marker for "orthodoxy", see François Bizot, *Le figuier a cinq branches* (Paris: École Française d'Extrême Orient, 1976), p. 21. Bizot argues that the term *tipiṭaka* "refers less to a collection of texts than to an ideological concept."

Theravāda. This would be unfortunate, since their condensed format may in fact display relative emphases of doctrine and practice within the Theravādin traditions which might otherwise be hard to discern.

We have so far noted the elaboration of the metaphor of “the city of Nibbāna” in the *Nibbānasutta* as an illustration of the processes involved in the composition of new texts in the Theravāda. When we turn to the contents of the *Nibbānasutta*, we see that this metaphor is indeed a helpful device for listing and linking a variety of doctrinal items and practices; the different parts of a city are associated with various aspects of Buddhist life. It is thus easy to see that such a metaphor could be conducive to the *Nibbānasutta*’s functional role as a summary of the *Dhamma*. While recognizing this, we should be careful not to ignore the role that such imagery may have had in generating “relgio-aesthetic experiences” which would have enriched an understanding of particular doctrinal points and which may have also motivated individuals to practice the Buddhist religious life.<sup>1</sup>

As already noted, metaphorical applications of a city to the constituents of Buddhist life have a long history in the Theravāda; examples are found in the *Milinda-pañha* as well as in the *Madhuratthavilāsinī*, the *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī*, and the *Tuṇḍilovādasutta*.<sup>2</sup> We can find a very pleasant example of such an application in the *Saddharma-ratnāvaliya*, a thirteenth-century Sinhala translation of the *Dhammapada Atthakathā*, a book which itself was intended to be an instructional aid to those on the way to the city of Nibbāna<sup>3</sup>:

<sup>1</sup> The possible danger of overlooking the significance of metaphors in “relgio-aesthetic experiences” was emphasised to me by P.B. Meegaskumbura. In this regard, it is thus worth noting the prominent place of metaphorical sequences in both the *Ākāravattārasutta* and the *Tuṇḍilovādasutta*.

<sup>2</sup> Mil 330–45; Bv-a 155–56; Sv (III) 881; Sv-pṭ III 78; *Tuṇḍilovāda* 192–94.

<sup>3</sup> Ranjini Obeyesekere, *Jewels of the Doctrine* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991), p. 3.

Thus, having begged for alms in the countryside of the *arahat*, he arrived finally at the city of the Teachings of the King of the Universe, the Enlightened Buddha.

That city had a long wall made of Morality, a moat made of the restraints, Fear and Shame, a city gate of Wisdom, with lintels of Effort, a protective column of Faith, and watchmen of Mindfulness. It had a nine-storied palace of the Nine Spiritual Attainments, four roads of the Fourfold Path going in four directions and the Three Signs, Impermanence, Sorrow, and Soullessness, pointing in the three directions. It had also the Hall of Justice named the “Rules of the Monastic Order” and a royal thoroughfare called “The Path of Mindfulness.” There were market stalls selling the flowers of Higher Knowledge, stalls selling perfumes of Moral Conduct, and fruit stalls selling the Fruits of the Path. There were also stalls selling medicinal preparations of The *Dharmas* of the Thirty-Seven Constituents of Enlightenment<sup>1</sup> for curing the disease of Defilements, and which could destroy Decay and Death. In addition, there were stalls full of the gems of Moral Conduct and Contemplation, which could bring Enlightenment. There was a stall that was filled with the blessings of high status, wealth, long life, good health, good looks, and intelligence; and also the blessings of the human world, the heavenly worlds, the Brahma worlds, and of *nirvāṇa*.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> I have modified Obeyesekere's translation at this point.

<sup>2</sup> Obeyesekere, *Jewels of the Doctrine*, p. 207; this is a translation of *Saddharmaratnāvaliya* (Colombo: Sri Lanka Oriental Studies Society, 1985), I.126. This passage obviously owes much to the account of the “City of Righteousness” in Mil 330–45.

Each of these associations between a Buddhist idea or practice and a part of a city could be interpreted, apparently,<sup>1</sup> through a process of comparison which would specify on what basis the two things are juxtaposed in the metaphor; the *Sumaṅgalavilāsini* describes this process as asking "What is it like, because of what?"<sup>2</sup> The *ṭīkā* on the *Dīgha Nikāya*, for example, glosses the simile that *sīla* is like a wall by saying: "*Sīla* is like a wall because it has the nature of protecting completely those who attain it."<sup>3</sup> It is particularly interesting, as a comparison with the similar application of the metaphor in the *Nibbānasutta* displays, that there is no fixed association between the parts of a city and a Buddhist counterpart. For example, the door or gate (*dvāra*) to the city of Nibbāna is variously said to be *sīla*,<sup>4</sup> *dāna*,<sup>5</sup> the *ariyamagga*,<sup>6</sup> and *ñāṇa*.<sup>7</sup> This variability is further evidence that the different examples of the serial simile of the city of Nibbāna may be the products of different applications of a common process rather than derivations from a single source.

This variability also suggests that the serial simile might be derivative from and secondary to a more fundamental conventional

<sup>1</sup> I say "apparently" since as I mentioned in the introduction to *Tuṇḍilovādasutta* (p. 163), it is not always self-evident what the similarities between the two juxtaposed elements might be, and most often we are dependent on commentarial glosses to specify the intended similarities.

<sup>2</sup> Sv (III) 881: *tattha 'kim kena sadisan' ti ce* . . . . This might be an allusion to the method of instruction mentioned in the *Naṅgalisa Jātaka* (Ja I 448): "eliciting comparisons and reasons" (*upamañ ca kāraṇañ ca kathāpeti*). The method is explicitly used in the *Nibbānasutta* when Nibbāna is compared to the moon, the sun, the earth, a mountain, the ocean.

<sup>3</sup> Sv-pṭ III 78.

<sup>4</sup> *Tuṇḍilovāda* 177.

<sup>5</sup> *Tuṇḍilovāda* 174, 193.

<sup>6</sup> Sv (III) 881; this is a common gloss on the notion of "the door to that without death" (*amatadvāra*) — see M I 353, S I 137, Vin I 5, etc.

<sup>7</sup> *Nibbānasutta*, see p. 122 below.

metaphor of the city of Nibbāna, which itself is linked to the conventional metaphor of Nibbāna as a “place”. In this regard, quite significantly, the contents of the *Nibbānasutta* help us to understand and thus to appreciate better the cognitive import of this conventional metaphor which is found throughout much of Theravādin literature, including Buddhaghosa’s commentaries. On the basis of what can be seen in the *Nibbānasutta*, we may be able to avoid the temptation to dismiss a common image of this sort as an over-used “literary ornament” or “figure of speech”, since we see in this text that it may not actually function as such. Rather, we can see that such common images are probably better understood as “conventional metaphors”, part of the normal ways that Buddhists talk about, conceive and even experience their own situations.<sup>1</sup>

When the *Nibbānasutta*, using the method just mentioned, compares Nibbāna to a collection of good things (*sudhammā*), on the grounds that both are collocations or combinations (*samodhāna*), it makes a point which is quite relevant to understanding the image of a city as a metaphor for Nibbāna. In this context, we can recall that a city is sometimes defined on the basis of its combining a physical layout with buildings, and inhabitants,<sup>2</sup> and with this in mind, we can see that it is

<sup>1</sup> George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), p. 51. In a related vein, see the valuable discussion of one important set of images and their relations with the *anattā* doctrine in the Theravāda by Steven Collins in *Selfless Persons* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), and more generally, see Diana Eck, “The Dynamics of Indian Symbolism,” *The Other Side of God*, edited by Peter L. Berger (Garden City: Doubleday, 1981), pp. 157–81.

<sup>2</sup> See, for example, Bv-a 66–67 (on Bv IIA 3–4): “(3) The City was complete in all respects. It engaged in every industry, (4) was possessed of the seven kinds of treasures, crowded with all kinds of people; prosperous as a deva-city, it was a dwelling place for doers of merit. Therein *complete in all respects* means: possessed of all the constituent parts of a city, with city gateways, halls and so forth. . . .” (I.B. Horner, translator, *The Clarifier of the Sweet Meaning* (London:

significant that the serial simile specifies not only the buildings of the city, but the flocks of birds (i.e. the city's inhabitants, the arahants, etc.) which frequent it.<sup>1</sup> We can also recall that a traditional gloss of a city is that it is *rakkhāvaraṇagutti*: it protects, shuts out, and provides security.<sup>2</sup> Thus we might conclude that the significance of the metaphor of the city of Nibbāna lies less in its individual parts, which we have seen can have varying associations, but rather in its being a general picture which defines Nibbāna as something with both form, coherence, and function.<sup>3</sup> This insight is applicable to the use of the metaphor of the city of Nibbāna scattered throughout Theravādin literature.

Although the metaphor of the city of Nibbāna occurs frequently in commentarial and post-commentarial Theravādin literature,<sup>4</sup> it apparently does not occur in those parts of the canon

---

Pali Text Society, 1978), pp. 99–100. For a similar definition of a city, see Totagamuve Sri Rahula, *Pañcikāpradipaya*, edited by R. Tennakoon (Colombo: M.D. Gunasena, 1962), p. 359.

<sup>1</sup> See the pictorial representation of Nibbāna, which includes both a tank and attending birds, in the illustration from the *Traibhūmikathā*, found in *The Three Worlds According to King Ruang*, translated by Frank E. Reynolds and Mani B. Reynolds (Berkeley: Berkeley Buddhist Series, 1982).

<sup>2</sup> This gloss was told to me by P.B. Meegaskumbura.

<sup>3</sup> For a similar use of this city metaphor with respect to diligence in the religious life, see Dhp-a III 488, on Dhp 315. See as well the “Nagaropamasuttanta” at A IV 106–13 and Mp IV 53–66.

<sup>4</sup> It may also be properly said that the metaphor predates the commentaries, since it is found at Mil 333. Moreover, the metaphor occurs in non-Theravādin literature; see Dieter Schlingloff (ed.): *Ein Buddhistisches Yogalehrbuch* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1964), 162R5 (p. 169); J. Duncan M. Derrett, *A Textbook for Novices: Jayarakṣita's “Perspicuous Commentary on the Compendium of Conduct by Śrīghāna”* (Turin: Pubblicazioni di “Indologica Taurinensia”, 1983), p. 17; E.H. Johnston (ed.), *The Saundarananda of Aśvaghoṣa* (Delhi: Motilal Barnarsidass, 1975), p. 106; R.E. Emmerick, *The Sūtra of Golden Light* (Oxford: Pali Text Society, 1990), p. 24 [amṛtapura]; R.E. Emmerick, *The Book of Zambasta* (London: Oxford University Press, 1968), pp. 153, 303, 317, 421; Giotto Canevacini, *The Khotanese Saṅghāṭasūtra* (Ph.D. Dissertation,

which are usually considered to be early, that is the Vinaya and the four Nikāyas. The metaphor coheres, however, with another conventional metaphor in the canon — that conditions and experiences are places (*thāna*), and thus I do not think that there would be anything automatically controversial or objectionable about it as a piece of imagery.<sup>1</sup> Without speculating about the actual origins of the metaphor of the city of Nibbāna, we can at least say that it may have been used as an image because it evoked and elaborated the conventional metaphor of Nibbāna as a place, which is found in the canon. Furthermore, the metaphor of the city of Nibbāna was apparently grounded in the canon by commentators' reinterpreting canonical references to cities as references to the city of Nibbāna. For example, Sāriputta uses a simile of a border city and its watchman to convey his limited knowledge of the Buddha's maximal greatness in the *Sampasādaniyasutta* and in the *Mahāparinibbānasutta*; this simile is glossed in Buddhaghosa's

---

University of Hamburg, 1992), p. 213. Analogous applications of the metaphor of a city are also found in medieval Indian Buddhist inscriptions; see the references to *muktipura* (thirteenth century) found at Grosrawa (*Indian Antiquary* 17 [1888], p. 310); to *jinapura* (thirteenth century) found at Bodhgaya (*Indian Antiquary* 10 [1881], p. 342); and to *praśamapura* (fifth century) found at Ajanta (Ghulam Yazdani, *Ajanta* [Delhi: Swat Publications, 1983] Pt IV, p. 115). The metaphor is also found in the Chinese translation of the Dharmaguptaka version of the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*; see André Bareau, *En suivant Buddha* (Paris: Lebaud, 1985), p. 289. This text apparently takes "entering the city of *nirvāṇa*" as referring to *parinirvāṇa*. The diversity of these examples suggests at least that the metaphor of the city of *nirvāṇa* was in common usage among the different Buddhist traditions. I wish to thank Gregory Schopen for bringing the inscriptional, Aśvaghoṣa, and Dharmaguptaka examples to my attention.

<sup>1</sup> As the entry on "nibbāna" in the PTSD says: Nibbāna "is a reality, and its characteristic features may be described, may be grasped in terms of earthly language, in terms of space (as this is the only means at our disposal to describe abstract notions of time and mentality)"; PTSD, s.v. *nibbāna*, p. 362b. See as well PTSD, s.v. *thāna*.

commentary as referring to the city of Nibbāna.<sup>1</sup> The *ṭīkā* to this passage then uses the metaphor to extend understanding and insight through the same process of comparing and giving reasons we have already noted: “*Nibbāna is like a city* because it is to be approached by those seeking it, and because it is the condition (*thāna*) of the attainment of *sukha* without any dangers for those who reach it.”<sup>2</sup>

We can gain some further understanding of the connotations of the metaphor as a whole if we look at two different uses of the image of the city in the *Dhammapada Atthakathā*. The first compares the mind to a city and comments on the stanza, “Securing this mind as a citadel”.<sup>3</sup>

*As a city*: A city having a deep moat, encircled by a wall, containing gates and watchtowers, is firm from outside; inside, it is fitted out with well-apportioned streets, squares, crossroads, and shopping areas. Thieves come from without, saying, “Let us loot it !” [But] being unable to enter, [they] remain as if confronting, and being checked by, a [mighty] rock. As one standing in the city [attacks such] a horde of robbers with many kinds of weaponry — single-edged [weapons], and so on — in exactly the same way, *securing*: making firm his “insight-mind”, as if it were a citadel ... .<sup>4</sup>

The second application of the city metaphor in the *Dhammapada* compares the body to a shed for storing grain which in turn is said to be a city, in part because it is constructed with various

<sup>1</sup> Sv (III) 881. The commentary on the *Mahāparinibbānasutta* refers readers to this gloss; Sv (II) 538. For similar incidental glosses using the metaphor of the city of Nibbāna, see Ap-a 291 (on verse 133); Bv-a 155; Vv-a 284.

<sup>2</sup> Sv-ṭṭ III 78.

<sup>3</sup> Dhp 40: *nagarūpamaṇi cittam idam ṭhapetvā*.

<sup>4</sup> John Ross Carter and Mahinda Palihawadana, translators, *The Dhammapada*, (New York: Oxford, 1987), p. 128.

parts, and also because such a shed is a “protected structure.”<sup>1</sup> We see in these two uses of the metaphor associations which are obviously shared with the metaphor of the city of Nibbāna. First, all three applications apparently assume that a city is defined by its various constituent parts, arranged in an ordered whole which is “firm from outside,” that is a stable and independent condition in its own right. The image also portrays Nibbāna as a pleasing place inside. This holistic image would seem, then, to lend considerable coherence to a theoretical vision of Nibbāna and its connection to Buddhist soteriological practices.

Finally, I would like to note that the image of the city of Nibbāna could suggest a continuum between Nibbāna and the possible forms of rebirth found in samsāra. The same conventional metaphor that “defines” existential conditions as “places” (*thāna*), which we have already seen with reference to Nibbāna, was also used with respect to some forms of rebirth which are possible in samsāra. Heavens, above all, are defined as cities.<sup>2</sup> This homology between heavens and Nibbāna as “cities” creates, in turn, a double relation between Nibbāna and samsāra. On the one hand, they are still different kinds of things, and are thus best understood doctrinally as opposed to one another, as when we contrast *asaṅkhata* Nibbāna with *saṅkhata* samsāra, or when we contrast the *sukha* of Nibbāna with the *dukkha* of samsāra. On the other hand, heavens as “cities” could also be construed as merely, even if immeasurably, different in degree from the “City of Nibbāna.” As the

<sup>1</sup> Dhp 150; Carter and Palihawadana, p. 217.

<sup>2</sup> See, for example, S IV 202; Vv-a 285; Ja I 47, 49, 52; *The Three Worlds According to King Ruang*, pp. 218, 223–35, 250. The realm of the dead is also sometimes compared to a city or even called a city: *yamapura*; see *The Three Worlds According to King Ruang*, p. 68 and W.F. Gunawardhana, *Guttila Kāvya Varṇanā* (Colombo: Lake House, 1962), p. 208 (verse 317). For a discussion of the symbolism of the royal city in the Sinhala Buddhist pantheon, see Gananath Obeyesekere, *The Cult of the Goddess Pattini* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984), pp. 50–56.

*Traibhūmikathā*, a fourteenth-century Thai-language cosmological treatise, says: "The treasure of Nibbāna brings a high degree of pleasure, happiness, and tranquility; nothing can be found to equal it."<sup>1</sup> This sequence of images of cities may lie behind the location of Nibbāna at the pinnacle of a cosmological hierarchy as has been frequently noted in ethnographic studies of contemporary Theravādin Buddhism.

The manuscript utilized here is now kept in the collections of the École Française d'Extrême Orient in Paris under the reference number EFEO Pali 30. It is a short manuscript, four *ola* leaves in length, and is written in the *mūl* script. It contains two texts: the *Nibbānasutta*, and a fragment of another text called the *Jarāsutta*. A covering leaf is inscribed: *bra mahāgaranibbānasūtravaṇṇanā niṭṭhitā / buddhassa parinibbānato aṭṭhapaññāsādhike catusatadvesahassame byaggha-saṃvacchare siṭesena (?) likkhāmi tamidam*. The alternative title given here, *Mahāgaranibbānasuttavaṇṇanā*, specifies what may have been taken as the main point of the text, the metaphor of the city of Nibbāna; I have followed this covering-leaf's example in the title of this paper. Given the blurring between canonical and non-canonical literature which we noted above, it is significant that the title given here and at the end of the text seems to suggest that it is a commentary (*vaṇṇanā*) on a *sutta*.<sup>2</sup>

If the covering-leaf title, *Mahāgaranibbānasuttavaṇṇanā*, is a true alternative title for this text, then it may provide some evidence that the text was composed in Thailand or Cambodia, since the *tappurisa* compound of the city of Nibbāna is formed in the manner standard in Thai and Khmer, rather than in the manner more commonly found in classical Pali (i.e. *Nibbānanagara*).<sup>3</sup> There is nothing about the language

<sup>1</sup> *The Three Worlds According to King Ruang*, p. 329.

<sup>2</sup> A similar alternation between *sutta* and *vaṇṇanā* is found in the *Ākāravattārasutta*; see Jaini, *Ākāravattārasutta*, 194, 209.

<sup>3</sup> I would like to thank Professor Oskar von Hinüber for pointing this out to me.

or contents of the text which allows us to suggest even a probable date of composition.<sup>1</sup>

We can say more about the manuscript than the text. Given the origins of the collection at the École Française d'Extrême Orient, it seems probable that this manuscript was prepared in Cambodia. Moreover, the inscription on the covering leaf gives some valuable information about the date of the preparation of the manuscript. Despite a persistent problem<sup>2</sup> with the Pali here, we may translate this last passage as providing a date for the copying of the manuscript: "I wrote this in the year of the tiger, two thousand four hundred fifty eight years from the parinibbāna of the Buddha." If we take 544 B.C.E. as the traditional date for the parinibbāna of the Buddha in Southeast Asia, this would give us a date for the manuscript about the year 1914–15 C.E.<sup>3</sup> The dating according to the Buddhist Era seems to agree with the dating to the year of the Tiger in the twelve-year cycle. At the end of the manuscript the scribe has given his name and expressed his aspiration in

<sup>1</sup> Given that the linguistic variations found in this text, such as the suppression of geminate consonants, are also common in Southeast Asian Pali, it seems unlikely to me that such "irregularities" could be used as satisfactory evidence to establish a text's date.

<sup>2</sup> I am unable to make any sense of *sīsesena*, although perhaps it further specifies the date of copying the manuscript, with the date written in a system like "the so-called *ka-ta-pa-ya* system" found in Sri Lankan and Burmese manuscripts; for references to this system of writing numbers, see *Burmese Manuscripts* Part 1, compiled by Heinz Bechert, Daw Khin Khin Su, and Daw Tin Tin Myint (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH, 1979), pp. XIX–XX. This sentence appears in a number of other manuscripts in the collections of the École Française d'Extrême Orient in Paris with some variation in the spelling of this word; see the covering leaves to EFEO Pali 28, *Rathasenajātaka* (*sātesena*), EFEO Pali 31, *Arabhimbjātaka* (*sijesena*), EFEO Pali 32, and *Candasenajātaka* (*sijesena*).

<sup>3</sup> For some brief comments on the reckoning of dates in "Cambodian" manuscripts, see C.E. Godakumbura, *Catalogue of Cambodian and Burmese Pāli Manuscripts*, (Copenhagen: The Royal Library, 1983), p. xvi.

copying the manuscript: “*Aham Indujotam likkhitam Buddhasāsane Buddho homi anāgate.*” The notion of becoming a Buddha in the *Buddhasāsana* is intriguing, although the aspiration to become a Buddha is quite frequent in manuscript colophons in Sri Lanka.<sup>1</sup>

My attempts to find another copy of the text have not met with any success. The *Nibbānasutta* does not seem to be among the Cambodian manuscripts which have been copied by the Cornell University preservation project in Phnom Penh.<sup>2</sup> Although a text of the same title is listed by Louis Finot in his survey of manuscript holdings in Laos, Finot’s note seems to suggest that this text was related to the *Mahāparinibbānasutta* of the *Dīghanikāya*.<sup>3</sup> George Cœdès has described a Lao-language text with the title *Nibbānasutta* in his catalogue of manuscripts in the Royal Library at Copenhagen; from his description, it does not seem likely that this text is a translation of the Pali *Nibbānasutta* with which we are concerned here.<sup>4</sup> There are three texts with a very similar title listed in the *Catalogue of Palm-leaf Texts on Microfilm at the Social Research Institute, Chiang Mai University 1978–86*, but I have not been able to compare these texts with the

<sup>1</sup> This aspiration is very common in the manuscripts found in the Nevill Collection in the British Library. See, for examples chosen almost at random, the eighteenth century copy of the *Dhammapada Sanne* (Or. 6600[52]) and the nineteenth century copy of the *Aggikkhantopama Sutta Pada Ānuma* (Or. 6599[6]), found in Somadasa, pp. 21, 110.

<sup>2</sup> I would like to thank Dr. Judy Ledgerwood for her kind assistance in checking whether the *Nibbānasutta* was among the texts microfilmed by the Cornell University Project.

<sup>3</sup> Finot, p. 194.

<sup>4</sup> Cœdès, p. 66. Cœdès, it should be noted, was hardly impressed by this text, and described it as “un discours assez banal.” It apparently includes an account of some rich merchants being freed from the *preta* world and ascending to a *devaloka* from hearing that *sutta*, something which is completely missing from the text edited here.

manuscript transcribed here.<sup>1</sup> The title does not appear in K.D. Somadasa's survey of the manuscript holdings of Sri Lankan temple libraries.<sup>2</sup>

Since this is a first and necessarily provisional edition of the text, I have only attempted to transcribe accurately the manuscript available to me. I have made no emendations in the text as it is found in the manuscript, but I have given alternative readings in the notes in order to make some sense of the Pali or to clarify the Pali by comparison with the better known forms of classical Pali. Some of these clarifications are merely for the convenience of the reader since the text itself is quite consistent in its own usage, even if it is irregular by the standards of classical Pali, as for example with the creation or suppression of consonant geminates (such as -ññ- which are normally written -ñ- here).<sup>3</sup> The edition provides numbers for each leaf (1a-1b, etc.), but also includes the letter-sequencers (*ka-ki*) given in the manuscript itself.

## NIBBĀNASUTTA

[1a (ka)] Evam me sutam. Ekam samayaṁ Bhagavā Savatthiyam viharati Jetavane Anāthapiṇḍakassa ārāme. Tasmim kho Bhagavā bhikkhūna<sup>4</sup> āmantesi bhikkhavo ti. Bhadante ti te bhikkhū Bhagavato paccasosum.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Catalogue of Palm-Leaf Texts on Microfilm at the Social Research Institute, Chiang Mai University 1978-86 (Chiang Mai: Social Research Institute, 1988), p. 124: s.v. *Nibbānasutra*. I would like to thank Professor Oskar von Hinüber for bringing the existence of these texts to my attention.

<sup>2</sup> K.D. Somadasa, *Lankāvē Puskola Pot Nāmāvaliya* (Colombo: Cultural Department, 1959).

<sup>3</sup> See note 1 on p. 98 above.

<sup>4</sup> Read *bhikkhūnam*.

<sup>5</sup> Read as *paccasosum*; on the suppression of geminates in *mūl* manuscripts, see Martini, p. 371, and Terral, pp. 312-13.

Bhagavā etad avoca: Dhammaṇ bhikkhave desissāmi ādikalyāṇam majjhe kalyāṇam pariyośānakalyāṇam sāttham byañjanam<sup>1</sup> kevalam paripuṇṇam<sup>2</sup> parisuddham brahmacariyam pakāsissāmi yadidam Nibbānasuttam nāma dhammam cariyā.<sup>3</sup> Sakkaccaṇ sunātha<sup>4</sup> sādhukam manasikarothā ti. Evam Bhante ti te bhikkhū Bhagavato paccasosam.<sup>5</sup> Bhagavā etad avoca: Seyyathāpi bhikkhavo puriso mahānagaragantukāmo sakagharā nikkamitvā addhānamaggapaṭisanno;<sup>6</sup> cattāro paccatthikā anubandhantā gacchanti. Atthaṅgate suriye anupubbena mahantam nadim adassa.<sup>7</sup> Udakanāvam pi adisvā vicaranto vuyhanakuṇapam disvā dakkhanahatthena<sup>8</sup> tam gahetvā tam āruyha oramatiram<sup>9</sup> pajahitvā paratiram<sup>10</sup> patvā [1b] matakalēvaram chadetvā<sup>11</sup> nhātvā<sup>12</sup> suvattham nivāsetvā sugandham vilimpetvā attānam alaṅkārehi alaṅkaritvā ujumaggam paṭipanno<sup>13</sup> mahānagarābhimukhena pāyāsi.<sup>14</sup> Bhikkhave yathā puriso mahānagaragantukāmo addhānamaggapaṭipanno<sup>15</sup> eva yogāvacaro gharāvāsam pajihitvā<sup>16</sup> arañe<sup>17</sup> vasati. Yathā

<sup>1</sup> The more usual phrase would be *sāttham sabyañjanam*.

<sup>2</sup> Read *kevalaparipuṇṇam*.

<sup>3</sup> Read *dhammacariyam*; full stop added. Compare these sentences to M I 280 and Nett 5.

<sup>4</sup> Read *sunātha*.

<sup>5</sup> Read *paccassosum*.

<sup>6</sup> Read *paṭipanno*; Jacqueline Filliozat noticed that the palmleaf is inscribed *paṭipanno*, but the manuscript was corrected in ink to *paṭisanno*.

<sup>7</sup> Read *addasa*; see Terral, p. 311, for inversion of geminates in aorist forms.

<sup>8</sup> Read *dakkhiṇahatthe*.

<sup>9</sup> Read *oramatiram*; see Terral, p. 310, for the confusion between long ī and short i.

<sup>10</sup> Read *paratiram*.

<sup>11</sup> Read *chādettvā* or alternatively *chādetvā*. I think the former is preferable; see Terral, p. 314, for dentals replacing cerebrals and Terral, pp. 312–13, for the suppression of geminates.

<sup>12</sup> From *nahāyati*; read *nahātvā*. See Terral, p. 337, concerning *nhāyati* as an acceptable form.

<sup>13</sup> Manuscript adds a stop here.

<sup>14</sup> Full stop added.

<sup>15</sup> Manuscript adds a stop here.

cattāro paccatthikā tam anubbandhantā<sup>1</sup> evam jānāti<sup>2</sup>-jarā-byādhi-maraṇam daṭṭhabbam. Yathā aṭṭhaṅgamite suriye evam parihinakāyo<sup>3</sup> daṭṭhabbo. Yathā mahantam nadim adassa<sup>4</sup> evam taṇhāyo<sup>5</sup> daṭṭhabbo. Yathā udakanāvam pi adisvā evam saṃsādakkhataraṇam<sup>6</sup> daṭṭhabbam. Yathā vuyhamānam kuṇapam disvā evam karajakāyo daṭṭhabbo yathā dakkhiṇahatthena tam gahetvā evam abhipasādā<sup>7</sup> daṭṭhabbā. Yathā kuṇapam āruyha evam cittapasādām daṭṭhabbam. Yathā oramatirām<sup>8</sup> pajahitvā evam saṃsāradukkhataraṇam daṭṭhabbam. Yathā param tīram patvā evam muti<sup>9</sup> daṭṭhabbam. Yathā matakalevaraṇ chadetvā<sup>10</sup> evam karajakāyam daṭṭhabbam. Yathā ṇhatvā<sup>11</sup> evam pañā<sup>12</sup> daṭṭhabbā<sup>13</sup> [2a (kā)] yathā suvattham nivāsetvā evam hiri-ottappam daṭṭhabbam. Yathā sugandham visippetvā<sup>14</sup> evam sillagandham<sup>15</sup> daṭṭhabbam. Yathā attānam alaṅkārehi alaṅkaritvā evam sotāpattiphalam anāgāmiphalam arahattaphalam daṭṭhabbam. Yathā ujum maggapaṭipanno<sup>16</sup> evam aṭṭhaṅgiko maggo daṭṭhabbo. Yathā mahānagarābhimukhena pāyāsi evam mahānibbānamahānagaram daṭṭhabbam. Tasmim yeva

<sup>16</sup> Read *pajahitvā*.

<sup>17</sup> Read *araññe*.

<sup>1</sup> Read *anubandhantā*; on added geminations in “Cambodian” manuscripts, see Terral, pp. 310–11.

<sup>2</sup> Read *jāti-*.

<sup>3</sup> Read *parihinakāyo*.

<sup>4</sup> Read *addasa*.

<sup>5</sup> Seems to be a case-confusion by contamination ?

<sup>6</sup> Read *saṃsāradukkhataraṇam*.

<sup>7</sup> Read *abhippasādā*.

<sup>8</sup> Read *orimatīram*.

<sup>9</sup> A better reading might be *mutti*.

<sup>10</sup> Read *chadetvā* or alternatively *chādetvā*.

<sup>11</sup> Read *nahātvā*.

<sup>12</sup> Read *paññā*.

<sup>13</sup> Read *daṭṭhabbā*.

<sup>14</sup> Read *vilimpetvā*.

<sup>15</sup> Read *sīlagandham*.

<sup>16</sup> Read *ujumaggapaṭipanno*.

nibbānamage<sup>1</sup>-tanatalam<sup>2</sup> samphasantam<sup>3</sup> viya kilesamahiruham<sup>4</sup> adassa<sup>5</sup> abhayañ ca.<sup>6</sup> Kilesamahiruho<sup>7</sup> nibbānamaggasacchādito.<sup>8</sup> Kīdiso<sup>9</sup> kilesamahiruho ? Pañcakhandhabhūmitalasanno avijāvijapabhavo<sup>10</sup> kāyavacimanoduccaritabhāvasitam<sup>11</sup> jalavarasiñci.<sup>12</sup> Lobhaviruyha<sup>13</sup>-pula<sup>14</sup>-dhāritā dosasākhāparikinno<sup>15</sup> mohapallavapattagañibhūto anuparimānakurasampanno<sup>16</sup> vicchikicchā<sup>17</sup>-piñjarapito<sup>18</sup> thinamidam bhusabharito<sup>19</sup> ahirikamanotappavikasitakusumo<sup>20</sup> jātijarābyādhimarañajalasañchanno<sup>21</sup> [2b] narakatiracchānapeta-asurakāyavisesa<sup>22</sup>-dijagañakādītaphalo evarūpo kilesamahīraho<sup>23</sup> nibbānamaggasacchādito.<sup>24</sup> Tamcchinditum<sup>25</sup> vat̄atī ti. Yadi chindanto na sāmañasat̄thena<sup>26</sup> chindi

<sup>1</sup> Reading *nibbānamagge* would seem most obvious, but see next note.

<sup>2</sup> Read *tañ thalam*. It is also possible for the manuscript to be read *ganatalam* (*t* and *g* are easily confused in *mūl* script) and perhaps the scribe may have intended to write *nibbānamaggena*.

<sup>3</sup> Read *samphassantam*.

<sup>4</sup> Read *mahiruham*.

<sup>5</sup> Read *addasa*.

<sup>6</sup> Read perhaps *bhayañ ca* ? Full stop added.

<sup>7</sup> Read *mahiruho*.

<sup>8</sup> Read *sañchādito*.

<sup>9</sup> Manuscript adds a stop here.

<sup>10</sup> Read *avijābijappabhavo* or alternatively *avijāvijjāpabhavo*.

<sup>11</sup> Read *kāyavacīmanoduccaritabhāvasito*.

<sup>12</sup> Read *pallavararāsi ca*; or perhaps *jalāvāram siñci* ?

<sup>13</sup> Read *virūha-*.

<sup>14</sup> Read *phala*, or alternatively *mūla*.

<sup>15</sup> Read *parikinño*.

<sup>16</sup> Read *anuparimāñānakurasampanno*.

<sup>17</sup> Read *vicikicchā-*.

<sup>18</sup> Read *piñjarapīto*.

<sup>19</sup> Read *thinamiddhabhusabharito* ?

<sup>20</sup> Read *ahirimanottappavikasitakusumo*.

<sup>21</sup> Read alternatively *jātijarābyādhimarañajalasañchanno*.

<sup>22</sup> Read *-visesa-*.

<sup>23</sup> Read *kilesamahīraho*.

<sup>24</sup> Read *nibbānamaggasañchādito*; full stop added.

<sup>25</sup> Read *tañ chinditum*.

na pharasunā vāsiyā chindi ti yeva.<sup>1</sup> Api ca kho añata<sup>2</sup> nisitasamādhisilāya<sup>3</sup> maggañāṇapharasunā chinditum sakkoti. Seyyathāpi bhikkhave parikiṇṇo parikkhāro sunisitasattham ādāya vanantaram pavisitvā mahārukham samphassamāno<sup>4</sup> kiñ paṭhamam chindāmī ti maññati.<sup>5</sup> Handa mūlam chindāmī ti mūlam chinditvā aggam chinditvā nirasesam<sup>6</sup> chinditvā nirasesam<sup>7</sup> chinditvā yathā sukham gacchati. Evam eva yogāvacaro sattavidhakammaṭṭhānaparikiṇṇo silamayadadalha-parikkhāro<sup>8</sup> suṇisita<sup>9</sup>-maggañāṇapharasum ādāya vivekavanantara-kilesasākham chinditvā yathā sukham tiṭṭhati yeva. Atite<sup>10</sup> saṅkilesamahīruho<sup>11</sup> nibbānamahānagaram paññayati.<sup>12</sup> Kenatthena nibbānam pavuccati ? Sitalatthena<sup>13</sup> [3a (ki)] cando viya nibbānam. Kilesussanatthena<sup>14</sup> suriye<sup>15</sup> viya nibbānam. Patiṭṭhānatthena pathavī<sup>16</sup> viya nibbānam. Acalanatthena seleñḍo<sup>17</sup> viya nibbānam. Ratanānam sambhutatthena<sup>18</sup> sāgaro viya nibbānam. Samodhānatthena sudhammā

<sup>26</sup> Read *sāmaññasatthena*.

<sup>1</sup> Read *yadi chindanto ... chindati ... chindati yevāti*.

<sup>2</sup> Read *aññathā*; see Terral, p. 315, for replacement of an aspirated consonant by a simple consonant.

<sup>3</sup> Read *nisitasamādhisilena*.

<sup>4</sup> Read *sampassamāno*.

<sup>5</sup> Read *maññati*.

<sup>6</sup> Read *majjhām* ?

<sup>7</sup> Alternatively to previous note, read here *niravasesam*, or take this second *nirasesam chinditvā* as an unintentional repetition.

<sup>8</sup> Read *silamayadaddalha-parikkhāro*.

<sup>9</sup> Read *sunisita*.

<sup>10</sup> Read *atite*.

<sup>11</sup> Read *saṅkilesamahīruhe*; this reading and the one preceding are not entirely satisfactory.

<sup>12</sup> Read *paññāyati*.

<sup>13</sup> Read *sītalatthena*.

<sup>14</sup> Read *kilesasussanatthena*.

<sup>15</sup> Read *suriyo*.

<sup>16</sup> Read *paṭhavī*.

<sup>17</sup> Read *selendo* or *selindo*.

<sup>18</sup> Read *sambhutatthena*, or alternatively, *sambhūtatthena*.

viya nibbānam. Tañ ca nibbānam pathavi<sup>1</sup> natthi āpo natthi tejo natthi vāyo natthi sitam<sup>2</sup> natthi uṇham natthi. Yasmā ajāti-abyādhi-maraṇam<sup>3</sup> khemam santam paramam sukham padam evam nibbānamahānagaram. Tañ ca nibbānamahānagaram sapākāram saddhāra<sup>4</sup>-saṭālakam<sup>5</sup> sa-parikkham<sup>6</sup> savithi<sup>7</sup> sa-antarāpanam sathambham sagabbham sasayanaṁ sapallamkam sapadipajalitam<sup>8</sup> sapokkharaṇiṁ sasitajalaparipuṇṇam<sup>9</sup> sabālukam<sup>10</sup> sabhamarasevitam sahamsa-sacākavāka<sup>11</sup>-jīvajīvaka<sup>12</sup>-kokila-mayura-koñcāgaṇasevitam evam nibbānamahānagaram. Kin tam pākāram? Silapākāram.<sup>13</sup> Kin tam pākāram?<sup>14</sup> Nānam dvāram. Kin tam ṭālakam?<sup>15</sup> Samādhiṭālakam.<sup>16</sup> Kin tam parikkham?<sup>17</sup> Mettāparikkham. Kin tam<sup>18</sup> vithim?<sup>19</sup> Cattālisasamathakammathānavithim<sup>20</sup> Cin<sup>21</sup> tam antarāpanam? Bodhipakkhiya-antarāpanam. Kin tam thambham? Viriyathambham.<sup>22</sup> [3b] Kin tam gabbham? Abhidhammapakaraṇa-

<sup>1</sup> Read *paṭhavi*.

<sup>2</sup> Read *sitam*.

<sup>3</sup> Read *ajāti-ajarā-abyādhi-amaranam*?

<sup>4</sup> Read *sadvāra-*.

<sup>5</sup> Read *sāṭālakam*; it might also be possible to read *sataṭākam*.

<sup>6</sup> Read *parikkham*.

<sup>7</sup> Read *savithi*.

<sup>8</sup> Read *sapadipajalitam*.

<sup>9</sup> Read *sasitajalaparipuṇṇam*.

<sup>10</sup> Read *savālukam*.

<sup>11</sup> Read *sacākavāka-*.

<sup>12</sup> Read *jīvanjīvaka*.

<sup>13</sup> Read *Silapākāram*.

<sup>14</sup> Read *dvāram*.

<sup>15</sup> Read *ṭāṭālakam* or alternatively *ṭālakam*.

<sup>16</sup> Read *saṭādhi-ṭāṭālakam* or alternatively *saṭādhiṭālakam*; see previous note.

<sup>17</sup> Read *parikkham*.

<sup>18</sup> Read *tā*; the structure of the passage (*kin tam ...*) may have discouraged the use of feminine or plural forms.

<sup>19</sup> Read *vīthi*.

<sup>20</sup> Read *cattālisasamathakammaṭṭhānavīthi*.

<sup>21</sup> Read *Kin*.

<sup>22</sup> Read *Viriyatthambham*.

gabbham.<sup>1</sup> Kin tam sayanam ? Nikkhammasayanam.<sup>2</sup> Kin tam pallañkam ? Vimuttiñāñapallañkam. Kin tam padipajalitam ? Vimuttiñāñadasasanapadipajalitam.<sup>3</sup> Kin tam pokkarañi ? Bhāvanā-pokkharañi. Kin tam sītajalaparipuññam ? Karuñāsītajalaparipuññam.<sup>4</sup> Kin tam bālukam ?<sup>5</sup> Aññhārasabuddhañāñabālukam.<sup>6</sup> Kin tam bhamarasevitam ? Khiñāsavabhamarasevitam.<sup>7</sup> Kin tam hamṣa-cākavāka-jivajivaka-kokila-mayura-koñcāgañasevitam ?<sup>8</sup> Buddha-arahanta-nidosasamkilesa-hamṣa-cākavāka-jivajivaka-kokila-mayura-koñcāgañasevitam.<sup>9</sup> Evam nibbānamahānagaram santam lenam dhuram<sup>10</sup> iti parāyanam. Kena kasmiñ gamissati ? Na hatthiyānena vā na assayānena vā na rathassayānena vā na dolāyayānena<sup>11</sup> vā na sivikāyayānena<sup>12</sup> vā na upāhanayānena vā na padagamaneva<sup>13</sup> vā api ca kho aññatra<sup>14</sup> Buddhasarañena Dhammasarañena Sañghasarañena evarūpena Dhammasavañe<sup>15</sup> vā tam gantum vaṭṭati. Yathā hi yo ca Buddhañ ca Dhammasamṛghañ ca sarañam gato āpadam so na gaccheyya, adhigaccheya<sup>16</sup> padam sukhan ti. Iti Bhagavā nibbānapaṭisamyuttā Dhammapariyāyagāthā [4a (kī)] bhikkhūnañ desesi. Tena vuttam:

<sup>1</sup> Read *abhidhammappakarañagabbham*.

<sup>2</sup> Read *nekkhammasayanam*.

<sup>3</sup> Read *vimuttiñāñadasasanapadipajalitam*.

<sup>4</sup> Read *karuñāsītajalaparipuññam*.

<sup>5</sup> Read *vālukam*.

<sup>6</sup> Read *aññhārasabuddhañāñavālukam*.

<sup>7</sup> Read *Khiñāsavabhamarasevitam*.

<sup>8</sup> Read *hamṣa-cākavāka-jīvamjīvaka-kokila-mayūrakoñcāgañasevitam*.

<sup>9</sup> Read *Buddha-arahanta-niddosasamkilesa-hamṣacākavākajīvamjīvaka-kokila-mayūrakoñcāgañasevitam*.

<sup>10</sup> Read *dhuvam* ?

<sup>11</sup> Read *dolāyānena*.

<sup>12</sup> Read *sivikāyānena*.

<sup>13</sup> Read *padagamanena*.

<sup>14</sup> Read *aññatra*.

<sup>15</sup> Read *Dhammasavañe*.

<sup>16</sup> Read *adhigaccheyya*.

Tumhe ārabbhatha<sup>1</sup> nikhamatha yuñjatha buddhasāsane  
 dhunātha maccuno yesam<sup>2</sup> nañgāram va kuñjaro.<sup>3</sup>  
 Yo imasmim Dhammadinaye appamatto viharati  
 pahāya jatisañsāram<sup>4</sup> dukkhasantam<sup>5</sup> karissatha.<sup>6</sup>

Santam pañitam<sup>7</sup> apasam̄sava<sup>8</sup>-abhayam accutam  
 ajāti-ajarā-khemam nibbānam nāma bbyadisan<sup>9</sup> ti.<sup>10</sup>

Nibbānasuttavannanā nitthitā.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Read ārabhatha.

<sup>2</sup> Read senam.

<sup>3</sup> Compare to Th 256 = S I 156 = Mil 245. See also *Lokapaññatti*, edited by Eugène Denis (Lille: Reproduction des Thèses, Université de Lille III, 1977), Vol. I, p. 5.

<sup>4</sup> Read jātisāñsāram.

<sup>5</sup> Read dukkhasantam.

<sup>6</sup> Read karissati.

<sup>7</sup> Read pañitam.

<sup>8</sup> Read apasam̄savā.

<sup>9</sup> Read byādisan ti.

<sup>10</sup> Compare to the closing verse of *Tuñdilovādasutta* (here emended from what appears at *Tuñdilovāda* 194):

Santam pañitam amalam sivam abhayam accutam  
 Ajaram amatam khemam nibbānam nāma idisan ti

<sup>11</sup> Read nitthitā.

## TRANSLATION

Thus I have heard. At one time the Blessed One was living at Savatthi in the Jetavana garden of Anāthapiṇḍaka. There the Blessed One addressed the monks, "O monks," and those monks replied to the Blessed One, "Sir." The Blessed One said this: "O monks, I will teach the Dhamma which is good in the beginning, good in the middle, good at the end, with its own meaning and form;<sup>1</sup> I will explain the holy life which is entirely perfect and pure, that is, the (account of the) observance of the good life<sup>2</sup> called the *Nibbānasutta*. Listen carefully and bear it in mind well." "Yes, O Sir," those monks replied to the Blessed One. The Blessed One said this: "Just as, O monks, a man who desires to go to a great city, having left his own house, becomes one going along the high road; four pursuing enemies also go (on that road). In the course of time, when the sun was setting, he saw a great river. Not seeing a boat, and wandering about, he saw a corpse being carried (by the current). Taking it with the right hand, and climbing onto the corpse, he abandoned the near shore and reached the other shore. He discarded (the corpse), washed, put on fine cloth, smeared (himself) with fragrant perfume, adorned himself with ornaments, and going along the straight road, he set out towards the great city.

O monks, just like the man desiring to go to the great city goes along the high road is the *yogāvacaro* who renounces the household life and lives in the forest. Birth, old age, sickness, and death are to be seen as just like the four enemies pursuing him. The decaying body is to be regarded as like the setting sun. Desire is to be seen as the great river which he saw. (Looking for something for) crossing the suffering of *samsāra* is like not seeing a boat. The body born from *kamma* is to be regarded as the corpse being carried (by the current) which he saw.

---

<sup>1</sup> *sātthām sabyañjanam*.

<sup>2</sup> *dhammacariyam*.

Trust<sup>1</sup> is to be seen as like when he took it with his right hand. Mental calm<sup>2</sup> is to be seen as like the climbing on the corpse. Crossing the suffering of *samsāra* is to be seen as like abandoning the near shore. Freedom is to be seen as reaching the other shore. The karma-born body is to be seen as like the corpse which he threw away. Wisdom is like him bathing; shame-and-modesty are like his putting on fine cloth; the perfume of virtue<sup>3</sup> is like the perfume with which he anointed himself. The fruits of the stream-winner, once-returner, and arahant are like the ornaments with which he adorned himself.<sup>4</sup> The eightfold path is to be seen as like the straight road he went on. The great city of Nibbāna is like the great city he went towards.

There he saw a dreadful great tree of defilements (which looked) as if it were blocking<sup>5</sup> that place on the road to Nibbāna. The great tree of defilements covered the road to Nibbāna. What was this great tree of defilements like ? It was sunk in the earth of the five aggregates, its origin was the seed of ignorance, and it was a mass of sprouts which were supported by the condition of misbehaviour in body, speech, and mind. It bore fruits which grew from greed, and it was surrounded by branches of hate. It had a host of leaves and sprouts of delusion, it possessed small<sup>6</sup> red and yellow shoots of doubt, and it bore the heavy (weight of) sloth and torpor.<sup>7</sup> It had flowers blossoming with shamelessness and lack of remorse and was covered with the moisture of birth, old age, sickness, and death. Its fruit was eaten by flocks of birds, (beings with) the particular bodies of hell-dwellers, animals, ghosts, and

<sup>1</sup> *abhippasāda*.

<sup>2</sup> *cittapasādam*.

<sup>3</sup> *silagandham*; see Dhp 55 and Vism 58 for other uses of this metaphor.

<sup>4</sup> Note that the fruit of the once-returner (*sakadāgāmiphalam*) is omitted.

<sup>5</sup> *samphassantam*. This translation is somewhat loose, although the passage is itself obscure.

<sup>6</sup> *anuparimāṇa* ?

<sup>7</sup> *vicikicchā* and *thīnamiddha* are two of the five ethical obstacles (*nīvarana*).

asuras. The tree of defilements which was like that covered the road to Nibbāna.

"It would be right to cut it down," (he thought). Although he was cutting it, he did not cut it with a common sword, he did not cut it with an axe or even with an adze. But, in a different manner, it was possible to cut it with an axe of the knowledge of the Path sharpened on concentration and virtue.<sup>1</sup> Just as, O monks, (a man) equipped and having the necessary requisites, taking a very sharp axe, enters the forest and seeing a great tree, he thinks, "What should I cut first?" Thinking "Now I will cut the root," he cuts the root, then the top, and then the middle. Having cut it completely, he goes on satisfied. Just so, the *yogāvacaro*, equipped with the sevenfold subjects of meditation and having requisites brilliant with virtue, takes his well-sharpened axe of Path-knowledge, and cuts the isolated<sup>2</sup> tree<sup>3</sup> of the defilements in the middle of the forest and so he gains happiness. When the tree of defilements is overcome,<sup>4</sup> the great city of Nibbāna is clearly seen.

In what sense is Nibbāna spoken of? Nibbāna is like the moon in the sense that it is cool, and it is like the sun in the sense that it dries up defilements. Nibbāna is like the earth since it is a support, like a mighty mountain<sup>5</sup> since it is unmoving, like the ocean since it is the treasury<sup>6</sup> of jewels, like good *dhammas* since it is a collocation. But this

<sup>1</sup> *nisitasamādhisilena*.

<sup>2</sup> *viveka*.

<sup>3</sup> *sākham*.

<sup>4</sup> *atīte samkilesamahīruhe*.

<sup>5</sup> *selindo*, literally "lord of rock." *Sela* also means "crystal," and it might be recalled here that Nibbāna is called a crystal city in a Shan chronicle, *The Pādæng Chronicle*; see *The Pādæng Chronicle and the Jengtung State Chronicle Translated*, translated by Sao Sāimōng Mangrāi (Ann Arbor: Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies, University of Michigan, 1981), p. 100.

<sup>6</sup> *sambhata*.

Nibbāna is not the earth, it is not water, it is not light, it is not wind, it is not cold, it is not heat. It is the great city of Nibbāna because it is without birth, old age, sickness, and death, because it is calm, peaceful, permanent,<sup>1</sup> the place of happiness.

The great city of Nibbāna has an encircling wall, a gate, a watchtower, a moat, streets, a bazaar, a pillar, an interior (place), a bed, a couch, the brightness of lamps, a lake filled with cool water and sand; it is frequented by bees and by flocks of geese, cakkavāka birds, pheasants, cuckoos, peacocks and heron. What is that encircling wall ? The wall of virtue.<sup>2</sup> What is that gate ? Knowledge is the gate. What is that watchtower ? The watchtower of concentration. What is that moat ? The encircling ditch of loving kindness. What are those streets ? The streets of the forty meditation topics.<sup>3</sup> What is that bazaar ? The bazaar of the constituents of enlightenment. What is that pillar ? The pillar is effort. What is that interior (place) ? The interior place of the books of the Abhidhamma. What is that bed ? The bed of renunciation. What is that couch ? The couch of release. What is that brightness of lamps ? The brightness of the lamps of the vision that comes with liberating knowledge.<sup>4</sup> What is that lake ? The lake of meditation. What is that cool water which fills it ? It is filled with the cool water of compassion. What is that sand ? The eighteen kinds of Buddha-knowledge are the sand. What are those bees that frequent it ?<sup>5</sup> Those who are free from the cankers<sup>6</sup> are the bees which frequent it. What are the flocks of geese, cakkavāka birds, pheasants, cuckoos, peacocks, and heron which frequent it ? Buddhas, arahants and those who are free of

<sup>1</sup> *dhuvam*.

<sup>2</sup> *silapākāram*; perhaps a pun on *silāpākāram*, a wall of stone.

<sup>3</sup> See Vism 187 where the metaphor is also used.

<sup>4</sup> *vimuttiñāṇadassana*.

<sup>5</sup> The translation is necessarily loose. More literally it would be “What is it that is frequented by bees ?”

<sup>6</sup> *khīnāsava*, i.e. arahants.

defilements and faults<sup>1</sup> are the flocks of geese, cakkavāka birds, pheasants, cuckoos, peacocks, and heron which frequent it. Thus the great city of Nibbāna is peaceful, a refuge, the topmost, and thus the final goal.

By what, in what, does one go ? Not by an elephant carriage, nor by a horse carriage, nor by a royal horse carriage, nor a pallanquin, nor by a litter, nor by (wearing) sandals, nor by going barefoot.<sup>2</sup> One ought to go to it in a different manner, by taking refuge in the Buddha, by taking refuge in the Dhamma, by taking refuge in the Saṅgha, and by listening to the teaching of the Dhamma in texts like this.<sup>3</sup> Anyone who takes refuge in the Buddha, the Dhamma, and the Saṅgha does not go to misfortune, (but rather) he attains a place of happiness." Then the Lord taught the monks Dhamma-verses connected with Nibbāna. It was said by him:

Exert yourselves, go forth, devote yourselves to the Buddha's teaching. Knock down the army of death as an elephant knocks down a reed-hut.

Whoever will dwell vigilant in this doctrine and discipline, eliminating journeying-on from rebirth to rebirth will put an end to pain.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> *niddosasamkilesa*.

<sup>2</sup> *padagamanena*.

<sup>3</sup> *evārūpena Dhammasavaṇena*.

<sup>4</sup> Translation of *Theragāthā* 256–57 by K.R. Norman, *The Elders' Verses I: Theragāthā* (London: Pali Text Society, 1969), p. 30; I would like to thank Professor G.D. Wijayawardhana and Steven Collins who each identified this verse. See p. xxi of Norman's introduction for a discussion of multiple ascriptions of verses in canonical literature.

Nibbāna is shown to be peaceful, excellent, without fear because it is not producing (anything else), permanent, without birth, without old age, full of peace.

The exposition on the *Nibbānasutta* is finished.

Cambridge, Massachusetts

Charles Hallisey

## PĀLI MANUSCRIPTS OF SRI LANKA IN THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Out of the rich collection of Pāli manuscripts preserved in the Cambridge University Library, forty-two Sri Lankan manuscripts, written mostly in the Sinhala script, are listed below. In a few cases, the Roman script is used. Most of the manuscripts are written on palm-leaves, some on paper. They all belong to the 19th century.

This list is the result of a rapid survey of these manuscripts undertaken especially with the aim of identifying the unidentified items.<sup>1</sup> In the short period (eleven working days, from 7 to 19 October 1991), sixty-six manuscripts were examined, the forty-two Pāli manuscripts referred to above, and twenty-four Sinhala manuscripts, including six medical texts.<sup>2</sup>

The Sinhala manuscripts have, however, a relevance to Pāli literature due to the fact that Sinhala literature is predominantly inspired by Buddhism. Especially, the Jātakas have provided the themes for the bulk of Sinhala literary works right up to modern times. With regard to the list of Sinhala manuscripts given in the Appendix, it is worth remembering that the *Saddharmālankāraya* (item 13) and the *Saddharmaratnāvaliya* (item 14) have as their main source the *Rasavāhini* and the *Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā*, respectively. In fact, the author of the *Saddharmālankāraya*, echoing the aim of all classical Sinhala authors, says that his work, "although written in a different language is the same

<sup>1</sup> I am grateful to Prof. Dr Ronald E. Emmerick, Prof. K.R. Norman and Mr R.C. Jamieson (Keeper of the Sanskrit manuscripts of the Oriental Department of the Cambridge University Library) for being instrumental in organising that survey, financed by the Rapson Fund.

<sup>2</sup> A list of these Sinhala manuscripts is given in an Appendix at the end of this paper.

Pāli Dharma and it therefore should be listened to respectfully by everybody".<sup>1</sup> The other titles themselves betray their relation to Buddhism.

Item no. 30 below, Add. MS. 972 (13), is given under Pāli manuscripts, because only the Pāli stanzas of the *Rājaratnākaraya* (a chronicle written in Sinhala, with Pāli stanzas interspersed) are given in this particular manuscript. The *Rājaratnākaraya* proper, Add. MS. 971 (8), is included in the Appendix (see ed. P.N. Tisera, 1929).

Four manuscripts mentioned below are from the Scott Collection, identified here for the first time.

Out of the forty-two Pāli manuscripts listed here, twenty-three belonged to T.W. Rhys Davids. Some of these were especially copied for him and some others were purchased by him during his tenure of office in the Ceylon Civil Service. Rhys Davids had procured these manuscripts from widely separated parts of Sri Lanka: Anuradhapura in the North-Central Province, Kalutara in the Western Province, Galle and Matara in the Southern Province.

Rhys Davids had, in fact, published a "List of Pāli manuscripts in the Cambridge University Library" in *JPTS* 1883: pp. 145–46, with forty-four entries. However, twenty-two manuscripts listed below are omitted in that list although ten of them (items 1, 14, 20, 23, 28, 29, 31, 33, 36, 40 below) belonged to Rhys Davids himself. The reason for this omission may be that those ten manuscripts were not in the possession of the Cambridge University Library at the time the list was published in the *JPTS*.

---

<sup>1</sup> "e da vanāhi bhāṣāva venas vuva da pāli dharmaya ma heyin siyallavun visin ādara sahita va äsiya yuttē ya". Ed. Makuḍudūvē Śrī Piyaratana, Colombo 1971, p. 33.

The Library Marks of two manuscripts in Rhys Davids' list need rectification: *Ambaṭṭhasutta-attīthakathā*, Add. MS. 929 (8) instead of 928, and *Ratṭhapālasutta sannaya*, Add. MS. 970 (20) instead of 978.

Most of the notes written by Rhys Davids on the manuscripts give valuable information not only regarding the names and status of the scribes,<sup>1</sup> place and dates of copying, but also regarding the sources of the copies,<sup>2</sup> and the particular value of certain texts. For instance, regarding the *Abhidhammattha-samgaha* (Add. MS. 1957), he remarks that "it was not collated for the edition of the text published in the Pāli Text Society's Journal 1884". Again, regarding the *Mahāvamsa*, Add. MS. 964 (20), he observes that it is "a very correct and valuable copy".

The *Cariyāpiṭaka*, Add. MS. 936 (13), is a collation of various manuscripts, including a Burmese text and commentary. The *Milindapañha*, Add. MS. 1251 (19), according to its colophon, is based on a Siamese copy, for the section beginning with the Archer's question to the end.

Two of the undermentioned manuscripts had belonged to N.C. Macready, Government Agent of Puttalam: *Abhidānappadīpikā sannaya* (Add. MS. 923) and Pāli grammar with Sinhala explanations (Add. MS. 924).

The *Kālakārāmasutta* (Or. 904) was presented to the Cambridge University Library by Mr G. Le Strange, on 14.6.1914. This is a rare example of a miniature-size palm-leaf manuscript (16 folios, 65×5 mm), showing the scribe's skill.

<sup>1</sup> E.g. the Pāli grammar with Sinhala explanations, Add. MS. 924 (14), was written by the Deputy Chief monk of the Chilaw Pattu of Pitigal Kōralē.

<sup>2</sup> E.g. the *Khuddakapāṭha* extracts, Add. MS. 931 (8), were copied from a Burmese manuscript.

The *Mahā-Satipaṭṭhānasutta sannaya* (Or. 1734) was bequeathed to the Library by Sir Ellis Hovell Minns.

The *Jinacarita* was donated to the Library on 20.4.1906 by H.D. Rouse.<sup>1</sup>

Among the works belonging to this collection, attention may be drawn to the value of the *Abhidhānappadīpikā sannaya* as a Pāli lexicon. The *Abhidhānappadīpikā* has been edited in Sinhala characters by the famous Buddhist prelate, the late Waskaduwe Subhuti, with Sinhala and English interpretations, index of the different elements of compound words occurring in the stanzas, two separate indexes on homonyms and indeclinables, an index of all the words, along with the references to stanzas in which they occur, and the text of the *Ekakkhara kosa*, a Pāli lexicon composed by a Burmese Buddhist monk by the name of Saddhamma Kitti (fifth ed., Colombo 1938). A paper on the *Araññavagga* of the *Abhidhānappadīpikā*, section dealing with the names of trees and plants, will be published subsequently in the *JPTS*.

#### LIST OF PĀLI MANUSCRIPTS

##### (1) *Abhidhammatthasamgaha*

Up to the ninth chapter: *Kammaṭṭhāna vibhāga*.

Paper, 67 written pages. Title page, verso: "This m.s. was copied at Kalutara, Ceylon, in 1885 for me. It was not collated for the edition of the text published in the Pali Text Society's Journal 1884. Rh.D." Add. MS. 1957 (9).

---

<sup>1</sup> This must be Dr W.H.D. Rouse, who had given a list of Pāli words (c to ñ) for the compilation of the PTS's *Pali-English Dictionary*. (See *ibid.*, p. vii).

(2) *Abhidhammatthavibhāvāni* or *Abhidhammatthasaṃgaha-ṭīkā*.

Complete. Palm-leaves, 570×60 mm, *ka*, 1 to *cu*, 86 (folio *gū* numbered twice) + 2 fly-leaves, one at the beginning, one at the end. Add. MS. 1960 (22).

(3) *Abhidānappadīpikā sannaya*.

Complete. Palm-leaves, 270×60 mm, [ka] to *ṭhām*, *ṭhāḥ*. On the underside of the upper wooden cover: sgd/ N.C. Macready (left margin); sgd/ T.W. Rhys Davids (right margin). Add. MS. 923 (10).

(4) *Ambaṭṭhasutta vannanā* (Extract).

Paper, 10 written pages. See *Sumamgalavilāśinī*, PTS ed. 1886, pt. 1, pp. 258–62: Origin of the Sākyas. Page 1, left margin: “The origin of the Sākyā and Koliya races: copied for T.W.R.D. from *Ambaṭṭhasutta atṭhakathā*”. Add. MS. 929 (8).

(5) *Bālāvatāra*.

Complete. Palm-leaves, 360×50 mm, *ka* to *gl*. Add. MS. 957 (14).

(6) *Bālāvatāra sannaya*.

Complete. Palm-leaves, 365×50 mm, *ka* to *ñam*. Upper side, left bottom of upper wooden cover: “15/6 63 (?) W.C.M. T.W. Rhys Davids”. Add. MS. 958 (14).

(7) *Bodhivamsa*.

Complete. Palm-leaves, 600×65 mm, *ka*, 1 to *ghau*, 62. Folio 1, right margin: (Rhys Davids' hand), “Copied for T.W. Rhys Davids — *Bodhivāṃsa*”; upper side of upper wooden cover: Title in Roman script, “T.W.R.D. Galle. Dec. 1872”. Add. MS. 953 (24). See also Add. MS. 954 (24).

(8) *Brahmajālasutta*, with Sinhala commentary.

Incomplete. Palm-leaves, 510×55 mm, *ka* to *ghi* + 8 fly-leaves at the end. Two beautifully painted wooden covers. Scott. LL.I.5 (2).

(9) *Brahmajālasutta*.

Pāli text from *ka* to *kho*, Sinhala commentary from *khau* to *ghe*, Sinhala *sanne* from *ghai* to *jhū*. Palm-leaves, 435×60 mm. Writing completed in 1752 of the Śaka era [1830 A.D.]. MS belonged to T.W. Rhys Davids. Add. MS. 956 (17).

(10) *Brahmajālasūtra sannaya*.<sup>1</sup>

Palm-leaves, 435×55 mm, *ka* to *jī*. Folio 1, margin decorated with floral designs and human and animal figures. Name of a monk, Sirimānanda, written in ink on folio 1 and folio *jī* (end). T.W. Rhys Davids has written the title in Roman script, with an annotation, and signed and dated: Galle. 31 Jan. 1871, on back of folio 1. Add. MS. 955 (17).

(11) *Cariyāpiṭaka*.

Paper, 44 leaves. Add. MS. 935 (8).

(12) *Cariyāpiṭaka*.

“Various readings. Galle. Nov. 3, 1869”. Collation of a Burmese text, Burmese commentary, Dadalla MS, Degalla MS. Paper, 48 leaves. Add. MS. 936 (13).

(13) *Dhammadakkappavattanasutta*.

In triplicate: Pāli text 1, *ka* to *kī*; Pāli text 2, *kī* to *khu*, *sanne*, *khū* to *gū*. Palm-leaves, 470×55 mm, *gi* missing. Concluding folios *gī*, *gu*, *gū* placed at the beginning. Two painted wooden covers. Or. 1122 (19).

---

<sup>1</sup> In Sinhala works, Sanskrit loan words are often used instead of the Pāli term. Hence *sūtra*, *dharma* etc.

(14) *Dhammasaṅgani*.

Complete. Palm-leaves, 550×60 mm, *ka* to *ja* + one fly-leaf at the beginning and two at the end. Folio 1, verso: “*Dhammasaṅgani*. Bought at Galle 1885 for T W Rhys Davids P.T.S.”. Add. MS. 1959 (22).

(15) *Dhātuvāmsa* or *Lalātadhātuvāmsa*.

Pāli text with commentary in Roman script. Paper, 99 written pages. 166 *gāthās*. Add. MS. 974 (8).

(16) *Hathavanagallavihāravāmsa*.

Palm-leaves, 450×55 mm, *ka*, 1 to *khī*, 24. Colophon in Sinhala (24 v5) means: “Thus ends the sacred book *Attanagalu*, written in Pāli and belonging to the Chief monk of the monastery of Attanagalla”. Fly-leaf at the end: “*Attanagalu vāmsa*. Copied at Attanagala (sic) in 1867 for T.W. Rhys Davids, Magistrate &c. at Pāsyāla (sic) near Attanagala (sic)”. Add. MS. 925 (17). See also Add. MS. 926 (8).

(17) *Jinacarita sannaya*.

Complete. Palm-leaves, 365×50 mm, *ka* to *nah*. Presented to the Cambridge University Library by H.D. Rouse, 20 April 1906. Or. 678 (14).

(18) *Kālakārāmasutta*.

See G.P. Malalasekera, *Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names*, Vol. I, London 1937, p. 574. Tiny palm-leaf manuscript, 16 folios, 65×5 mm, *ka* to *kah* + 2 fly-leaves at the beginning and the end, 3 or 4 lines per folio. Two thin book covers (horn ?). Manuscript placed in black cloth case and deposited in a small hard cover box. Small note signed by the donor, G. Le Strange, says that the manuscript was given to him by a Buddhist priest in Ceylon in 1822. Or. 904 (3).

(19) *Khuddakapāṭha* (Extracts).

*Saranattaya, Dasa sikkhāpada, Dvattimsākāra, Kumārapañha, Mañgalasutta, Ratanasutta, Tirokuddasutta, Nidhikanḍasutta, Mettasutta.* Paper, 15 pages. “Copied 1869 at Galle by Deva Arnnolis for T.W. Rhys Davids from a Burmese m.s. at Dadalla”. Add. MS. 931 (8).

(20) *Madhuratthappakāśinī sannaya*. Commentary to the *Mahābodhivāṃsa*.

Palm-leaves, 600×65 mm, *sva*, 1 to *ṭhā*, 178. Folio 1: (Rhys Davids’ hand): “Copied for T.W. Rhys Davids. *Bodhi-waṁsa-sannaya*”. Upper wooden cover also bears the title. “T.W.R.D. Galle. Dec. 1872”. Add. MS. 954 (24). See also Add. MS. 953 (24).

(21) *Mahāsatipatṭhānasutta*. (See item 34).

In two parts: *ka* to *ci*: Sinhala translation of Pāli text, *cī* to *jhah*: *sanne*. Palm-leaves, 415×60 mm. Folio numbering letters blackened only up to *kho*. Bequeathed to the Cambridge University Library by Sir Ellis Hovell Minns. Or. 1734 (17).

(22) *Mahāsatipatṭhānasutta*. (See item 34).

Two Sinhala *sanna*, the first containing more exegetical matter. Palm-leaves, 480×55 mm, (1) *ka* to *ci*, (2) *cī* to *chah*. The second part is placed at the beginning of the manuscript. In numbering folios, the *ka* series has been omitted. Two wooden covers painted with usual floral designs. Add. MS. 3683 (19).

(23) *Mahavaga* [Pāli *Mahāvagga*]: *senāsanakkhanda sannaya* etc.

Title page: (Rhys Davids’ hand): “Inheritance &c. of property given to Buddhist priests or priesthood, Galle 1871”. Paper, 22 written pages. Pāli texts in Sinhala and Roman scripts. *Mahāvagga-senāsanakkhanda* (*sannaya*); *Vinayālankāra* (sic), ch. XXI; *Wihāra Vinischaya* (sic) (Roman script, Pāli text followed by English translation); on the turning

aside of advantage, Pāli *muttaka-vinaya* (Roman script); *Makasajātaka* (Sinhala script); Extract from the *Mahāvamsa* [73.1 to 73.80] (Sinhala script); *Mahāvagga*; *senāsanakkhanda* (Sinhala script); tomtom beater's song (Sinhala script); 2 pages, with seal, "Kachcheri, Anuradhapura"; "Chapters of *Narendra-caritāvalokana-pradīpikā*". Add. MS. 952 (8).

(24) *Mahāvamsa*.

Incomplete. Ends at 100.292 (*ṇl* v2).

Palm-leaves, 440×55 mm, *ka* to *ta* + one fly-leaf at the end. Following folios are in duplicate: *ṇ*, *chu*, *chū* and *tah*. Following folios are numbered with three aksaras each: *thl*, *thl̄*, *the* (one leaf); *dhl*, *dhl̄*, *dhe* (one leaf). Add. MS. 962 (17).

(25) *Mahāvamsa*.

Incomplete. Ends at 90.59. Palm-leaves, 580×60 mm, *ka* to *thu* + one fly-leaf at the end. Stanzas 90.57 to 59 vary from PTS ed. 1927. These three stanzas are given as variants in Sumangala and Batuwantudawa ed., Colombo 1877, Vol. II, p. 369. Upper wooden cover: "Mahāvamsa T.W.R.D. 1870". Add. MS. 963 (23).

(26) *Mahāvamsa*.

Incomplete. Ends at 90.45–46 (184 r6). Palm-leaves, 500×60 mm, 1 to 184 + 2 fly-leaves at the end. Folio 1, left margin: signature of T.W. Rhys Davids after endorsement: "Mahāvamsa. A very correct and valuable copy". Add. MS. 964 (20).

(27) *Milindapañha*.

Complete. According to the colophon, the text from the Archer's question to the end is based on "the book brought from Siam". (*Siyamdesato ānitapoththakato issatthassa pañhato pañthāya pariyośāna-*

*vacanāni gahetvā likhitān ti jānitabbam*).<sup>1</sup> Palm-leaves, 500×60 mm, *ka*, 1 to *ñr*, 72 + 2 fly-leaves at the beginning and 2 at the end. Folios of the *ga* series placed in descending order. Add. MS. 1251 (19).

(28) Pāli grammar with Sinhala explanations: declensions, conjugations, nouns.

Palm-leaves, 360×50 mm. Three texts: (1) *ka* to *kām*; (2) *kañ* to *khñ*; (3) *khñ* to *khe*. Colophon in Sinhala (*khe* r7) means: "Grammar books written for the Government Agent of Puttalam, by the Deputy Chief monk of the Chilaw Pattu of Pitigal Korale. Year sixty-nine". Upper side of folio 1: (Rhys Davids' hand): "Written for N.C. Macready Esqr by the priest of the 2nd rank in the Chilaw district of the Puttalam Division of N.W. Province of Ceylon. Written in 1869. Bought after Mr McReady's death by T.W. Rhys Davids". Written in the middle: "Akhyata Waranagila" (sic) [Conjugation of verbs] Add. MS. 924 (14).

(29) *Petavatthu*.

Complete. Paper, 63 written pages. Colophon (p. 63) means: "Thus ends the *Petavatthuvanññanā* done by the great Rev. Thera, Ācariya Dhammapāla, residing in the Badaratittha vihāra. Thus ends the Pāli text of the *Petavatthu*". Title page: "Copied for me at Kalutara, Ceylon, in 1885 Rh. D." Add. MS. 1955 (9).

(30) *Rājaratnākara*.

Pāli *gāthās* only. Paper, 8 written pages, 203 stanzas (199 in the printed ed.). A list of references to the sources of some of the stanzas of the text is given at the end (p. 8). T.W. Rhys Davids writes at the back of p. 8:

<sup>1</sup> The same endorsement is found in MS, BN Pāli 359 in the Bibliothèque nationale in Paris. See Jacqueline Filliozat, *Catalogue des manuscrits pālis des collections françaises, fonds des bibliothèques publiques et privées*, to be published by the PTS in collaboration with the Bibliothèque nationale and the École Française d'Extrême-Orient.

“Rājaratnākara without the *sanne*. It differs a little (a few verses being omitted and a few added) from the text contained in my other copy. Nov. 1870”. Add. MS. 972 (13). See Add. MS. 971 (8): *Rājaratnākaraya*.

(31) *Rasavāhini*.

Incomplete. First four stories only: (1) *Dhammasoñdaka vatthu*, (2) *Migaluddaka vatthu*, (3) *Tiññam janānam vatthu*, (4) *Buddheniyā vatthu*, incomplete. Paper, 11 written pages. Text better than that in the edition of Friedrich Spiegel, *Anecdota Pālica*, Leipzig 1845 (Tales 1–4 in Nāgari characters). Add. MS. 973 (13).

(32) *Ratthapālasūtra arthavyākhyānaya*.

Complete. Palm-leaves, 520×55 mm, *ka* to *ga* + one fly-leaf at the end. Folio 1, right margin: sgd/ “T.W. Rhys Davids. C.C.S.” Add. MS. 970 (20).

(33) *Samyutta Nikāya*.

Complete. Palm-leaves, 620×65 mm, *ka* to *bū* + one fly-leaf at the beginning. Folio *khām* bears the numbering *ka* as well; from folio *ju*, Arabic numerals are inscribed in parallel, starting with 1. Arabic numeral 243 in folio *bū* at the end is not the exact number of the last folio, as two consecutive folios are numbered *the*. Folio *ka* (1), left margin: “This m.s. of the *Samyutta* was bought for me at Galle in 1884. T.W. Rhys Davids”. Paper label on upper wooden cover: “Add. 1961 *Samyutta*. Bought from P.T.S. Received Jan. 31, 1887”. Add. 1961 (24).

(34) *Satipatthānasutta sannaya*.

Complete. Palm-leaves, 490×60 mm, *ka* to *gho*. Neatly written. Two plain wooden covers. Scott. LL.5.1.

(35) *Sigālovādasutta*.

Pāli text in Roman script. Paper, 22 written pages. Copied by “Dewa Aranolis for T.W. Rhys Davids Esqr from a m.s. at Dadalla, 20.4.70” [1870]. Appended at the end (Rhys Davids’ hand): “Notes on *Sigālovāda Sutta*. Galle. Oct. 26. 1870”. Add. MS. 984 (8).

(36) *Udāna*.

Paper, 155 pages. “Copied at Kalutara, Ceylon, in the Spring of 1885 for T.W. Rhys Davids”. Letter dated 24 January (?) 1887, addressed to Prof. Robertson Smith by T.W. Rhys Davids is attached. Bought from the P.T.S. Add. MS. 1952b (9). See also Add. MS. 1953 (22).

(37) *Udāna*.

Complete. Palm-leaves, 590×60 mm, *ka* to *go*. Folio 1 recto: “The *Udāna* text. Presented by Sūriyagoda Sonuttara Thera of the Pattirippuva Māligāva Kandy to the Pali Text Society of London at the suggestion of Edmund Gooneratne Atapattu Mudaliyar<sup>1</sup> of Galle. Kandy 15th March 1884”. Add. MS. 1953 (22). See also Add. MS. 1952b (9).

(38) *Vāmsatthappakāsinī*. Commentary on the *Mahāvāmsa*.

Complete. Palm-leaves, 565×60 mm, *ka*, 1 to *thl*, 187 + 2 fly-leaves at the beginning and the end. Folio *jām* is numbered 127, 128, 129. Endorsement in Sinhala at the end of folio 187 verso, means: “Completed revising, using the book at Dadalla Vihāra, on 21st August 1871”. Folio 1 verso: “*Mahā-vamsa-tikā*. T.W. Rhys Davids. Anuradhapura”. Folios assembled with verso on upper side. Add. MS. 965 (22).

---

<sup>1</sup> Atapattu Mudaliyar was the title given to the Interpreter/Translators to the Government Agents of Colombo and Galle under the British administration. (*Simhaśabdaśāsana*, Colombo 1937, Vol. I).

(39) *Vibhaṅga*.

Incomplete. Ends at *Paccayakāravibhaṅga*, *mātikā* XX. See PTS ed. 1904, p. 143. Palm-leaves, 450×55 mm, *ka* to *ghe*. Folio 1 recto: sgd/ T.W. Rhys Davids. Add. MS. 978 (17).

(40) *Vimānavatthu*.

Complete. Paper, 72 written pages, interleaved. Colophon (p.72) means: "Thus completed the *Vimānavatthu vannanā*, done by Ācariya Dhammapāla. Thus completed the *Vimānavatthupakkaraṇa*". Title page verso, (Rhys Davids' hand): "This m.s. was copied in the district of Matara, Ceylon, through the instrumentality of Abraham Mendis &c in 1884 for T.W. Rhys Davids". Add. MS. 1956 (9).

(41) *Visuddhimagga*.

Complete. Palm-leaves, 570×60 mm, *ka* to *tr* + 2 fly-leaves at the beginning and 2 at the end. Paper label on lower wooden cover: "Add. 1954 *Visuddhi Magga* P.T.S. July/86. Recd. January 31, 1887". Add. MS. 1954 (23).

(42) *Visuddhimagga sannaya*.

Incomplete. Beginning and end missing. Ch. III: *Kammaṭṭhānagahana niddeso*; *dasa palibodhā*. See PTS ed. Vol. I, pp. 96 ff. Palm-leaves, 580×60 mm, *kā* to *ne*, *ke* placed at the beginning. Two leaves numbered *kai*. Manuscript belonged to T.W. Rhys Davids. Add. MS. 934 (23).

## APPENDIX

## LIST OF SINHALA MANUSCRIPTS

## (1) Astrological notes. Palm-leaves, irregular folio numbering. Or. 1162.

- (2) *Attanagaluvamsa* (Sinhala prose version of the Pāli *Haththavanagalla vihāravamsa*). Palm-leaves, 62 folios. Add. MS. 926 (8).
- (3) Bible (Fragmentary Sinhala translation). Palm-leaves, 1 to 117. Add. MS. 3329 (16).
- (4) Christian sermon in Sinhala, based on ISAIAS XI:9: "They shall not hurt, nor shall they kill in all my holy mountain; for the earth is filled with the Knowledge of the Lord, as the covering waters of the sea". Palm-leaves, 1 to 9. Or. 874 (14).
- (5) *Dāna paricchedaya* (extract from the *Pariccheda pota*), and *Kukkura Jātakaya*. Palm-leaves, *ka* to *ci*. Or. 766 (16).
- (6) *Elu Umaṇḍāva* (Sinhala version of the *Ummagga Jātaka*). Palm-leaves, *ka* to *thai*. Scott. LL.5.17.
- (7) *Guttila Jātakaya* [*kāvya*]. Palm-leaves, 1 to 50. Add. MS. 932 (18).
- (8) *Kosalabimba varṇanāva* etc. (Collection of Buddhist tales, including the *Jātakas*: *Kuḍupa*°, *Svarṇakarkaṭaka*°, *Serivāṇija*°, *Padamānavaka*°, *Silavimamsa*°, *Silānisamsa*°, *Dahamsoñda*°). Palm-leaves, 3 parts, irregular folio numbering. Add. MS. 2596 (20).
- (9) *Narendracaritāvalokana pradīpikā* (abridged version). Paper, 65 pages. Add. MS. 999 (1).
- (10) Panegyric (2 verses with paraphrase) in honour of Governor Sir Edward Barnes, invoking blessings on him. Palm-leaves, 1 to 2. Add. MS. 339 (2).

- (11) *Pansiyapanas Jātakapota*, last three *Jātakas*: *Vidhura*, *Ummagga* and *Vessantara Jātakas*. Palm-leaves, *dva sa to ti ghau*. Or. 2261 (35).
- (12) *Rājaratnākaraya*. Paper, 163 pages. Add. MS. 971 (8).
- (13) *Saddharmālaṅkāraya* (Extracts) etc.: *Svarṇatilakā vastuva*, *Buddheniyā vastuva*, *Pādapīṭhikā vastuva* + *Utpalagandha vastuva* + *Javanahamṣa* and *Svarṇakarkaṭaka Jātakas*. Palm-leaves, *ka to ṇah*. Add. MS. 1003.
- (14) *Suciloma pretavata* etc. (Extracts from the *Petavatthu*, *Saddharmaratnāvalī* etc.: *Kavandha pretavata*, *Matasūra kathāva*, *Daruvan satdenā vadā kana pretiyagē kathāva* (Tale of the petī who gave birth to seven children and ate them), *Kāli yakinnagē kathāva*, *Patipūjikāvangē kathāva*, *Ubbarī kathāva*, *Mahākāla upāsakayangē kathāva*, *Vaira bāñdi kathāva* (the tale of hatred), *Maduañganā nam gama demala doraṭuvehi bilī väddahugē kathāva* (the tale of the angler at the Tamil gate of the village named Maduañganā), *Tirokuḍḍa pretavata*, *Revatī vata*. Palm-leaves, *ka to ghā*. Scott. LL.3.1.
- (15) Sermon in Sinhala based on the *Ratṭhapālasutta*. See *Majjhima Nikāya* II.82. Palm-leaves, *ki to khī*. Add. MS. 339 (22).
- (16) *Siyabasmaldama* (Sanskrit *Svabhāśāmālādāma*, Sinhala versification of the story of Vijaya, first king of Sri Lanka). Palm-leaves, *ka, 1 to gu*, 37. Add. MS. 993 (17).
- (17) *Thūpavamsaya*. Palm-leaves, *ka to ṇū*. Or. 898 (19).
- (18) *Weligama gal sannasa* A.D. 1470. (After building the Rājakula-vaḍana Vihāra to offer merit to king Sirisaṅgabo Śrī Bhuvanekabāhu, the Minister Kaṭu Parākrama decrees the continuation of the services to the

monastery). See JCBRAS 1870, p. 21. One palm-leaf. Add. MS. 1873 (14).

(19) to (24) Six medical manuscripts: Or. 958 (9), Or. 1163 (9), Or. 1720 (11), Or. 2270 (7), Add. MS. 300 (10), Add. MS. 966 (8).

The following manuscripts in the above list belonged to T.W. Rhys Davids: *Attanagaluvamsa* ("1867 A.D. Written at the spot for T.W. Rhys Davids"); *Guttila Jātakaya* (kāvyaya) (sgd/ T.W. Rhys Davids, Colombo 1872); *Narendracaritāvalokana pradīpikā*; *Rājaratnākaraya* ("Anuradhapura, Oct. 1871. Copied from a m.s. at Talāwe Wihāra by Deva Arnolis for T.W. Rhys Davids C.S.").

The *Pansiyapanas Jātakapota* belonged to G.H. Muller, and the *Siyabasmaldama* to William Alexander Arneves (?).

Manuscript Scott. LL.3.1 has the title *Vimanvatayi* (Pāli: *Vimānavatthu*) inscribed on the upper side of folio *ka* and at the end of the text (folio *ghā*). But it is really a collection of Buddhist tales taken from the *Petavatthu*, the *Saddharmaratnāvaliya* etc.

Items 3 and 4 above are important documents for the study of Christian literature in Sri Lanka and the development of the Sinhala language in that field.

The two wooden covers (*pot kamba*) of the *Thūpavamsaya* (Or. 898) are beautifully painted on the underside with scenes from the *Vessantara Jātaka*, especially the scene where the Bodhisatta gives away his son Jāliya and his daughter Kṛṣṇajinā to the Brahmin Jūjaka.

The medical manuscripts will be analysed in detail in a separate paper on the same lines as the "Sri Lankan medical manuscripts in the Bodleian

Library, Oxford", which appeared in the *Journal of the European Āyurvedic Society*, 2, 1992, pp. 36–53.

The present paper is respectfully dedicated to the memory of the great scholar Thomas William Rhys Davids (1843–1922) as a token of gratitude to his inestimable contribution to Pāli and Buddhist studies.

Sainte-Geneviève-des-Bois (France)

Jinadasa Liyanaratne



## SIX PĀLI ETYMOLOGIES

Here is another random group of words which are either omitted from PED,<sup>2</sup> or given an incorrect meaning or etymology there.

1. *kaddhati* “to drag”
2. *tiracchānakathā* “gossip”
3. *pacchābandha* “rudder”
4. *mātaṅg'arañña* “elephant forest”
5. *vidha* “buckle”
6. *setṭhi* “dregs”

1. *kaddhati* “to drag”

PED explains<sup>3</sup> this word as a dialect form which is alleged to equal Skt *karsati*. It compares Pkt *kaddhai* “to pull, tear”, and *khaḍḍā* “pit, dug-out”. It also refers to Bloomfield’s article (see below).

<sup>1</sup> See K.R. Norman, “Pāli Lexicographical Studies X”, in *JPTS* XVII, 1992, pp. 215–18.

<sup>2</sup> Abbreviations of the titles of Pāli texts are as in the Epilegomena to V. Trenckner: *A Critical Pāli Dictionary*, Vol. I, Copenhagen 1924–48 (= CPD). In addition: BHS(D) = Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit (Dictionary); CDIAL = R.L. Turner, *Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*, London 1966; CP I, II, III = K.R. Norman, *Collected Papers*, Vols. I, II, III, PTS 1990, 1991, 1992; DPPN = *Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names*; Erz. = *Ausgewählte Erzählungen in Māhārāṣṭrī*; MW = M. Monier-Williams, *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, Oxford 1899; PTS = Pali Text Society; PED = PTS’s *Pali-English Dictionary*; PTC = *Pāli Tipiṭakam Concordance*; Pkt = Prakrit; Skt = Sanskrit; Be = Burmese edition; Ce = Sinhalese edition; Ee = European edition; cty/cties = commentary/commentaries.

<sup>3</sup> See PED, s.v. *kaddhati*.

CPD<sup>1</sup> says that *okaḍḍhati* is a denominative from *o + kaddha < kaṭṭha < Skt krṣṭa*, which is the past participle of √krṣ “to drag”. For the form with *o-* it compares Pāli *apakaddhati* and *avakaddhati*, and BHS *okaṭṭati*.

Earlier discussions of *kaddhati* include the following suggestions:

- 1) Weber (perhaps for the wrong reason) suggested that the word which he at first read as *āaṭṭana* in Hāla's Sattasaī 109 was to be derived from *ākrṣṭa*.<sup>2</sup> He mis-quoted<sup>3</sup> Hemacandra IX 187 (where Hemacandra states that *kaddhai* is one of the six *ādeśas* of the root *krṣ*). By 1881 Weber had decided<sup>4</sup> to read *āaddhāna*, quoting Marāṭhī *kāḍhanem* in support of his decision.
- 2) S. Goldschmidt<sup>5</sup> derived *kadḍhai < \*kaṭṭhai < \*krṣṭati*, without stating specifically that it was a denominative verb.
- 3) E. Leumann stated<sup>6</sup> that *pakaddhijai* was the passive of a verb from the past participle passive *pakaddha* (= *prakṛṣṭa*) and referred to Goldschmidt and to Hemacandra IX 187, as had Weber already before him.

<sup>1</sup> See CPD, s.v. *okaḍḍhati*.

<sup>2</sup> A. Weber, *Ueber das Saptaçatakam des Hāla*, Leipzig 1870, p. 107.

<sup>3</sup> A. Weber, “Zum Saptaçatakam des Hāla”, *ZDMG*, 28, 1874, pp. 345–436 (p. 375).

<sup>4</sup> A. Weber, *Das Saptaśatakam des Hāla*, Leipzig 1881.

<sup>5</sup> “Prākṛtische miscellen”, *Zeit. für vergl. Sprach.*, XXVI, pp. 103–12 (pp. 105–6).

<sup>6</sup> *Das Aupapātika Sūtra*, 1883, Index p. 130, s.v. *pakadḍhij-*.

4) J. Bloch, discussing Marāṭhī *kādhñem*, followed the derivation < *krṣṭa*.<sup>1</sup>

5) Geiger<sup>2</sup> said that *kaddhati* = \**kardhati*, which he described as a side-form of *karsati*, etc. He gave no explanation of the structure of \**kardh-*. It might be taken as an extension in *-dh-* to *kar-*, in the belief that *kars* shows an extension in *-s-*, but there seems to be no evidence for a root *kar-* with the meaning "drag".

6) Bloomfield<sup>3</sup> suggested a derivation < \**kržd*. He presumably saw an extension in *-d-* to *krṣ-*, cf. Burrow's suggestions for *luth-* and *lud-* from *luṣ-*, and *heth-* and *hīd-* from *hes-*.<sup>4</sup> Turner, however, said<sup>5</sup> that Bloomfield's suggestion was phonetically unjustified (presumably because of the unexpected aspiration < *s + d*).

7) Lüders<sup>6</sup> gave examples of the change of *-ṭṭ(h)-* > *-dd(h)-*, but denied<sup>7</sup> the derivation < *krṣṭa* and acquiesced in Bloomfield's suggestion. He seemed to base his objection on the fact that *kaddhati* occurs only rarely in canonical texts, the more common forms being based upon *kass-*. His implication was, therefore, that *kaddh-* is a non-Eastern form, and he supported this statement by quoting New Indo-Aryan developments from Western languages only. This is, however, to ignore the fact that various forms from *kaddh-* occur in Jain canonical texts, which would seem to

<sup>1</sup> *La formation de la langue marathe*, 1920 (but based upon a thesis published in 1914), §§ 112, 231.

<sup>2</sup> W. Geiger, Pāli Literatur und Sprache, § 130.

<sup>3</sup> *JAOS* 41, 1921, p. 465.

<sup>4</sup> T. Burrow, "Skt. *lubh* 'to disturb'", *JRAS* 1956, pp. 191–200.

<sup>5</sup> CDIAL (App. p. 825).

<sup>6</sup> H. Lüders, *Beobachtungen über die Sprache des buddhistischen Urkanons*, §§ 151–58.

<sup>7</sup> Lüders, *ibid.*, § 165.

make the existence of the Eastern form of the word indisputable. Turner, in fact, quoted derivatives from Eastern New Indo-Aryan languages also.

8) Turner<sup>1</sup> stated that the phonetic or analogical replacement of Middle Indo-Aryan *-t̪h-* by *-d̪h-* is unexplained. Since there is also evidence for a word *\*gaddhati*, he suggested that, with an alternative *-k-* and *-g-*, it is probably non-Aryan. It is not clear why he ignored the other changes of *-t̪h- > -d̪h-* which Lüders gave.

I would accept the suggestion followed by Leumann and Bloch because of the existence of BHS *okaṭṭati* (this, as Edgerton points out<sup>2</sup> and as Lüders accepts in a footnote,<sup>3</sup> is what the MSS read, with occasional occurrences of *-t̪h-*). This seems to me to suggest a form < *-kr̪ṣṭa*. There are other examples of *-ṣṭ-* becoming *-t̪-*, e.g. the spellings *ovat̪ta* and *ovuṭṭa* (< *-vr̪ṣṭa*), and *maṭṭa* < *mr̪ṣṭa* found commonly in Pāli.

The fact that the Pāli canonical preference is for *kass-* (although *kaddh-* is not totally avoided, as already noted), and *kaddh-* is found more commonly as the commentarial gloss, I regard as an example of the phenomenon that I have noted elsewhere<sup>4</sup> — that what one sect regards as canonical another treats as commentarial, and vice versa. I assume, therefore, that texts with both *kaddh-* and *kass-* came to Ceylon from mainland India, but the Theravādin redactors generalised one in the canon and the other in the commentaries.

One objection to the view followed by Leumann and Bloch is the infrequency of denominative verbs made from past participles. Most

<sup>1</sup> CDIAL p. 133, s.v. *√\*kaddh-*.

<sup>2</sup> BHSD, s.v. *kaṭṭati*.

<sup>3</sup> Lüders, *Beob.*, p. 125 note 3.

<sup>4</sup> K.R. Norman, "The dialects in which the Buddha preached", in H. Bechert (ed.): *The language of the earliest Buddhist tradition*, Göttingen 1980, pp. 61–77 (p. 73).

of the Middle Indo-Aryan examples which can be given are no more certain than *okaddhati*, and like *okaddhati* can almost always be explained in a different way if one objects to the idea of a denominative formation. From Pāli we can quote *olaggati* from *olagga* < *avalagna*. This could be taken as coming from *lagyate*, but one then has to explain the double -gg- in the causative *olaggeti*. There is also Pkt *tuttai* from the past participle *tutta* < \**trut-ta*, but *trutyati* is alleged to occur. The Pkt verb *uvakkhadai* “to prepare”<sup>1</sup> is, however, hard to explain except as a denominative from *uvakkhada* < Skt *upaskṛta*. Bloch gave<sup>2</sup> a number of New Indo-Aryan examples.

Another past participle showing the development -ṣṭ- > -ṭṭ- is *ugghatṭa*, which we find in the compound *ugghatṭapādo* at Sn 980. It is glossed: *ugghatṭapādo ti, maggakkamaṇena ghaṭṭapādatalo, pañhikāya vā pañhikam goppakena vā goppakam janṇukena vā janṇukam āgantvā ti ghaṭṭapādo* (Pj II 582,6–9). We presumably have a past participle *ghaṭṭa* < *ghaṭṭha* < *ghṛṣṭa*, with dissimilation of aspirates. The verb *ghaṭṭ-* “to rub” occurs in Skt, and is probably a Prakritism there, if CPD is correct<sup>3</sup> in seeing a derivation from Skt *ghṛṣṭa*. We must then assume a denominative verb formed from the Pkt past participle *ghatṭa*.

The only treatment I know of such forms is by L.A. Schwarzschild.<sup>4</sup> Some of the examples she gives seem irrefutable, but they are for the most part from rather late texts. This, in itself, is an argument from silence. The fact that we do not have early examples does not prove that the type of formation cannot be early.

<sup>1</sup> Uvāsagadasāo, § 68.

<sup>2</sup> Bloch, *op. cit.*, § 231.

<sup>3</sup> CPD, s.v. *ugghatṭa*.

<sup>4</sup> L.A. Schwarzschild, “Prakrit *thakka*, ‘tired’”, *Indian Linguistics*, XIX, 1958, pp. 311–18.

I must make it clear that when I write of “denominative” verbs, I mean verbs made from nouns (or adjectives), i.e. the stem of the noun (or adjective) is taken over as a verbal root. They are not necessarily conjugated as denominative verbs would be in Sanskrit, i.e. I do not thereby imply that they are Class X verbs. We can see this from examples of this type of formation in Sanskrit.

We find in Sanskrit both *cūrṇayati* and *ghūrṇati* (and *ghūrṇāyate* can be deduced from *ghūrṇāyamāna*) as denominative verbs from past participles of verbs which are no longer used in Sanskrit, although they, and derivatives from them, exist in Middle Indo-Aryan, e.g. (\**ghṛ-*?), \**ghurati*,<sup>1</sup> *ghulai* and *gholai* = *ghūrṇati* (Hc), *gholira* (Sattasāi 391 and Erz.); (\**cṛ-*?), *cūraissam*, *cūriādu* (Karpūramāñjari), cf. \**cūra*.<sup>2</sup>

## 2. *tiracchānakathā* “gossip”

References for *tiracchānakathā*, and other compounds of *tiracchāna*, can be found in PTC and in PED, and the word can also be found in the commentaries upon the various canonical texts listed there. To these can be added Pj II 564,5–6 (ad Sn 922): *gāmakathāya āvaraye sotan ti tiracchānakathāto sotam āvareyya*. This is derived from Nidd I 367,27 foll., which is listed in PTC. It is variously translated: “animal-talk, wrong or childish talk”,<sup>3</sup> “low conversation”,<sup>4</sup> “inferior matters”,<sup>5</sup> “worldly talk”,<sup>6</sup> “unedifying conversation”.<sup>7</sup> The last might be thought to

<sup>1</sup> CDIAL 4497.

<sup>2</sup> CDIAL 4888.

<sup>3</sup> PED, s.v. *tiracchāna-kathā*.

<sup>4</sup> T.W. Rhys Davids, *Dialogues of the Buddha*, Vol. I, p. 13.

<sup>5</sup> I.B. Horner, *Book of the Discipline*, Vol. V, p. 99.

<sup>6</sup> I.B. Horner, *Book of the Discipline*, Vol. IV, p. 250, and Pe Maung Tin, *The path of purity*, p. 148.

<sup>7</sup> M. Walshe, *Thus have I heard*, p. 70.

be the nearest to, and is perhaps influenced by, Buddhaghosa's definition at *Sv* 89,16–17, which see below. To these translations can be added: “aimless talk”,<sup>1</sup> “frivolous chatter”,<sup>2</sup> and “childish talk”.<sup>3</sup>

The list of 32 types of *tiracchāna-kathā* which is given at *Nidd* I 367,27 foll. also occurs at *M III* 113,17 foll., but there they are not called *tiracchāna-kathā*, but *kathā hīnā gammā pothujjanikā anariyā anatthasamhitā*, which is another way of saying that *tiracchāna-kathā* = *gāma-kathā*. The meaning of *gāma-kathā* is “village talk, i.e. the sort of talk that goes on in villages, i.e. gossip”, as is made clear by the little snippets given as examples at *Ps III* 221,20 foll., etc. There the adjective *gehasitakathā* is used — “household gossip”. When it is said to be one of the five *ādīnavas* arising from fire,<sup>4</sup> we must suppose that a fire leads to useless talk and gossip about it, on the lines of: “Do you remember the night X's house burned down ?” I would suggest that Hare's translation “tales of animals”<sup>5</sup> is way off the mark.

The commentarial explanation *aniyānikattā* (or *-iyy-*) *saggamokkhamaggānam* *tiracchānabhūtā kathā tiracchānakathā* (*Sv* 89,16–17) comes into the “folk etymology” category. Buddhaghosa is here taking *tiracchāna* in its sense of “crossways”, and is explaining that this type of talk lies crossways, i.e. is an impediment, to the ways to release. It is not specifically condemned for *bhikkhus* in the *Vinaya*. The *chabbaggyā bhikkhus* are rebuked for making a loud noise with their wooden shoes (*Vin I* 189,2–3) or for going to the village at the wrong time (*Vin IV* 165,1–2), rather than for *tiracchānakathā*. Nevertheless, it is designated as unsuitable (*na kho pan' etam ... tumhākam paṭirūpam*

<sup>1</sup> Nāṇamoli, *The path of purification*, p. 133 (ad *Vism* 127,23) and F.L. Woodward, *Gradual Sayings*, Vol. V, p. 86.

<sup>2</sup> Bhikkhu Bodhi, *The all-embracing net of views*, p. 60 (ad *D I* 7,28).

<sup>3</sup> F.L. Woodward, *Kindred Sayings*, Vol. V, p. 355.

<sup>4</sup> *A III* 256,15.

<sup>5</sup> *Gradual Sayings*, Vol. III, p. 188.

... *yam tumhe anekavihitam tiracchānbakatham aanuyuttā vihareyyātha*, A V 128,30–129,3), presumably because it is conducive to thoughts about the material world, rather than to *nibbāna*. The *bhikkhus* were warned against it: *mā bhikkhave anekavihitam tiracchānakatham katheyyātha*, S V 419,23–24, and it is described as *n' esā ... kathā atthasamhitā nādibrahmacariyikā na nibbidāya ... samvattati*, S V 420,4–5. When Dabba is allotting lodgings, the *tiracchānakathikā* come towards the end of the list, with the *kāyadaḥibahulā*, and Dabba thinks they will spend their time *ratiyā* (Vin II 76,1–3). At A V 185,15 it is *paribbājakā* of other sects (*aññatitthiyā*) who are engaging in *tiracchānakathā*. The same statement is made at D I 7,27 foll., where Gotama is said to abstain from such talk (*evarūpāya tiracchānakathāya partivirato samāno Gotamo*, D I 8,4). At D I 178,16 foll. It is Poṭṭhapāda the *paribbājaka* with a large company of *paribbājakas* who is engaging in it, and at D III 36,17 foll. it is Nigrodha the *paribbājaka*, again with a large company of *paribbājakas*, who is engaging in it, whereas it is specifically stated (D III 54,16 foll.) that *arahats* and *sammā-sambuddhas* did not indulge in such talk.

I would suggest that *tiracchāna-kathā* was at one time one example of this 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, just as *gāma-kathā* is used at Sn 922. In *tiracchāna-kathā* and in the compounds which are used to explain it, *kathā* is singular and its meaning is “talk”, although if the words are taken individually the distinction may be blurred, since “talk about kings” (*rāja-kathā*) will, of course, involve “stories about kings”.

### 3. *pacchābandha* “rudder”

Under the entry for *kañcana-mahānāvā* “a big golden ship” the latest fascicle of CPD (i.e. Vol. III fascicle 1) gives a reference which

includes the word *pacchābaddha*: *so kañcana-mahānāvāya pacchā-bandho* (Be so; Ee reads -*ddh*-) *viya satthu padānupadikam anugañchi*, Mp I 182,11. This word is not listed in PED. It is used of something which follows behind a ship, and presumably means “rudder”. A similar reference occurs for *kañcana-nāvā* “golden ship”, which is not listed in CPD: *so kañcana-nāvāya pacchābandho* (Ce so; Be and Ee read -*ddh*-) *viya satthāram padānupadikam anugacchati*, Th-a III 134,29 = Ap-a 264,24.

It is to be noted that the reading *-baddho* in the first reference is that of Ee; Be reads *-bandho*, whereas in the second reference *-baddho* is the reading of Be and Ee; Ce reads *-bandho*, i.e. Ee consistently reads *-baddho*, whereas Be is inconsistent. I think that the noun *bandha* (or *ābandha*) is more likely to be the correct reading “the behind equipment, the equipment behind”, rather than the past participle *baddha* (or *ābaddha*) “(the thing) tied on behind”.

#### 4. *mātaṅg'arañña* “elephant forest”

This collocation of words occurs in two consecutive verses in Dhp and elsewhere in Pāli:

*eko care mātaṅg'araññe va nāgo* (Dhp 329 = M III 154,23\* = Vin I 350,10\* = Ja III 488,23\*) and

*appossukko mātaṅg'araññe va nāgo* (Dhp 330 = M III 154,26\* = Vin I 350,13\* = Ja III 488,26\*).

Max Müller<sup>1</sup> seems to have omitted *mātaṅga* in his translation of Dhp: “let him walk alone … like an elephant in the forest” and “[let a man walk alone] … with few wishes, like an elephant in the forest”.

<sup>1</sup> F. Max Müller, *The Dhammapada*, Sacred Books of the East X, Oxford 1881, pp. 79–80.

Radhakrishnan<sup>1</sup> was inconsistent, translating the first time “walk alone ... like an elephant ... in the forest” but then “let a man walk alone with few wishes like an elephant ... in the elephant forest”. Acharya Budharakkhita<sup>2</sup> translates it as “elephant forest” in both verses. Kalupahana<sup>3</sup> similarly translates it as a compound in both verses: “like the elephant in the Matanga forest”. Miss Horner<sup>4</sup> translates it as “elephant-jungle” in both verses in both M and Vin.

All these translations have in common the fact that they do not follow, and make no comment upon, the commentarial tradition. Carter and Palihawadana, however, who also<sup>5</sup> translate: “like the elephant in the Mātaṅga forest”, point out<sup>6</sup> that in so doing they are going against the commentary which explains: *mātaṅg’ araññe va nāgo ti yathā ca “aham kho ākiṇño viharāmi hatthihi hatthinihi hatthikalabhehi hatthicchāpehi chinnaggānī c’ eva tiṇāni khādāmi, obhaggobhaggāñ ca sākhābhāṅgam khādāmi, āvilāni ca pāniyāni pivāmi, ogāhantassa ca me tiṇṇassa ca hatthiniyo kāyañ upanighāmsantiyo gacchanti, yan nūnāhañ ekako gaṇamhā vūpakaṭṭho vihareyyan” ti evam paṭicikkhitvā [ayam me tena] gamanato mātaṅgo ti laddhanāmo, imasmim araññe ayam hatthināgo yūtham pahāya sabbiriyāpatheresu ekako sukham carati, evam pi eko careyyā ti attho*, Dhp-a IV 29,16–30,9.

Similarly, Ps IV 206,12 foll. (= Sp 1151,26 foll. = Ja III 489,25’ foll.) explains: *mātaṅgaraññe va nāgo ti mātaṅgo araññe nāgo va.*

<sup>1</sup> S. Radhakrishnan, *The Dhammapada*, London 1952, p. 162.

<sup>2</sup> Acharya Budharakkhita, *The Dhammapada*, Kandy 1985, p. 61.

<sup>3</sup> David J. Kalupahana, *A Path of Righteousness: Dhammapada*, Lanham 1986, p. 144.

<sup>4</sup> I.B. Horner, *Middle Length Sayings*, Vol. III, London 1959, p. 199; *Book of the Discipline*, Vol. IV, London 1951, p. 500.

<sup>5</sup> John Ross Carter & Mahinda Palihawadana, *The Dhammapada*, New York 1987, p. 48.

<sup>6</sup> *ibid.*, p. 494 note 15.

*mātaṅgo ti hatthī vuccati. nāgo ti mahantādhivacanam etam.* In this view, therefore, *mātaṅgo nāgo* means “large elephant”.

Carter and Palihawadana justify their rejection of the cty on the grounds that the sandhi of *-o + a- > -a-* seems unusual. They draw attention to two references to the name of a forest named Mātaṅgārañña connected with the outcaste Mātaṅga, quoting DPPN as their authority. One of these references is Mil 130,7, where I can see no mention of the outcaste Mātaṅga, nor does the text seem to justify Malalasekera’s statement that Mātaṅgārañña, which occurs with Daṇḍakārañña, Mejjhārañña and Kaliṅgārañña, is the same as Mejjhārañña. These four forests are the same as those at M I 378,20–21, to which DPPN makes no reference, although it does refer to Ps II 615 (= PTS ed. III 88,11), where Mātaṅgārañña is commented upon. It seems just as likely that Mātaṅga in this name is a geographical location, and I have considered elsewhere<sup>1</sup> a number of compounds where Mataṅga (which presumably underlies Mātaṅga) seems to be a geographical feature. A specific geographical location, however, seems unlikely in the context of the Dhp, since it is not clear why anyone should wander alone or have few desires like an elephant in the Mātaṅgārañña more than in any other place. If, then, we are dealing with a compound, it is more likely to mean nothing more than “elephant forest”, and it would be a synonym of *nāgavana* which occurs in Dhp 324 and elsewhere in Pāli,<sup>2</sup> and also in one of Aśoka’s Pillar Edicts.<sup>3</sup>

It is perhaps worth considering whether the unusual sandhi is sufficient reason for rejecting the cty’s explanation. I cannot at the moment quote another example of the sandhi of *-o + a- > -a-*, but if the

<sup>1</sup> K.R. Norman, “Middle Indo-Aryan Studies (I)”, *JOI(B)*, IX, 1960, pp. 268–73 (pp. 271–73) (= CP I, pp. 15–20 [pp. 18–20]).

<sup>2</sup> See PTC II, p. 460, s.v. *nāgavana*.

<sup>3</sup> Pillar Edict V(I).

word were a compound, then we should have expected *mātaṅgāraññe*, and we must assume that the shortening to *mātaṅgaraññe* is metri causa, to avoid --- in the break in the middle of a Triṣṭubh pāda. If we assume that *mātaṅgāraññe* was an earlier form of the word(s), then we can state that the sandhi of -o + a > -ā- is certainly not unparalleled, e.g. *ratāham* (< *rato* + *aham*) Sn 461, *anuttarāyam* (*anuttaro* + *ayam*) Sn 690, *orakāyam* (< *orako* + *ayam*) Sn 692, and probably *vivattacchaddāsi* (< *vivattacchaddo* + *asi*) Sn 378. There are other examples in Dhp itself: *yāyam* = *yo ayam* 56; *appassutāyam* (*appassuto* + *ayam*), 152; and with shortening of the vowel before a double consonant *y' assa* = *yo assa* 389.<sup>1</sup>

To support their translation Carter and Palihawadana quote PDhp 10–11: *mātaṅgāranne*,<sup>2</sup> but this is no more conclusive than Pāli *mātaṅgarañña*, since it too can be taken in both ways. On the face of it *mātaṅgārañye* in Udāna-v 14.16, which they also quote, is conclusive, because this can be only be taken as a compound. This form of the word cannot be due to the metre, for if the BHS redactor had wished to follow the explanation of the Pāli cities, then he could have written *mātaṅgo* 'rañye, with no change of scansion. A moment's thought, however, shows us that this is not as conclusive as we might wish. If the BHS redactor received *mātaṅgāraññe* in his exemplar, but did not have access to the same commentarial tradition as we find in the Pāli cities, then it is inevitable that he would have taken it as a compound, and "translated" accordingly. Even if he received the same commentarial tradition, it is possible that, being trained in Skt grammar, he would have had the same distaste for the unusual sandhi, and would have rejected this explanation, like Carter and Palihawadana.

<sup>1</sup> For other examples see K.R. Norman, "The influence of the Pāli commentators and grammarians upon the Theravādin tradition", *Buddhist Studies (Bukkyō Kenkyū)*, XV, 1985, pp. 109–23 (= CP III, pp. 95–107).

<sup>2</sup> See M. Cone, "Patna Dharmapada", *JPTS* XIII, 1989, p. 107.

Another reason for the rejection of the commentarial explanation by modern translators is probably because they find it difficult to include two words for “elephant” in the same sentence. As noted above, some of the commentators avoided this problem by assigning the meaning “large” to *nāga*. We may, however, avoid this problem by assuming that *mātaṅga* is not the name of a particular elephant as the Dhp-a seems to imply, but a type or breed of elephant, perhaps one coming from the Mataṅga region. The epithet would then give the hearer some idea of the quality of the elephant, as Meenakshi<sup>1</sup> suggests, just as *sindhava* “coming from Sindh” was used as an epithet of excellent horses. In this connection we should note the collocation of words for “elephant” in: *koñcam kāhiti mātaṅgo kuñjaro satthihāyano*, Ja VI 497,2\*.

My conclusion, therefore, is that the evidence for the interpretation of *mātaṅg’araññe* in Dhp 329–30 is not sufficient for us to be able to say decisively whether we are dealing with two separate words or a compound. Much depends upon the value which we place upon the commentarial tradition, and there are many scholars who believe that, although it has long been standard practice to consult the Theravāda commentarial interpretations in order to interpret a difficult passage in an early text, every possible effort should be made to avoid the influence of the traditional commentarial interpretations on their own analysis.<sup>2</sup> I would agree wholeheartedly with the view that commentaries are frequently misleading because they are usually the product of a different social and historical background, and the information they give is sometimes unreliable and occasionally incorrect.<sup>3</sup> I would, however, regard it as perverse to ignore completely all the information they give,

<sup>1</sup> K. Meenakshi, “Lexical borrowing from the non-Aryan into Indo-Aryan”, *Indian Linguistics* 50, 1989 [1991], pp. 113–26 [p. 120].

<sup>2</sup> See Grace G. Burford, *Desire, Death, and Goodness*, New York 1991, p. 11.

<sup>3</sup> K.R. Norman, “On translating from Pāli”, *One Vehicle*, Singapore 1984, pp. 77–87 (p. 80) (= CP III, pp. 60–81 [p. 68]).

and would rather hope that it might be possible to evaluate commentarial information, and to determine what is likely to be reliable, and what not.

In this particular case, I should like to propose the principle of *explicatio difficilior*, which states that when two or more explanations are equally possible, preference should be given to the one which involves the greater difficulty. In this particular case, by far the simpler explanation is to take *mātaṅgarañña* as a compound, which is what the *Udāna-v* redactor and all the modern translators I have quoted have done. The Pāli commentarial tradition, however, has adopted the more difficult explanation which involves taking *mātaṅg'* and *arañña* as two separate words, and presuming the existence of the sandhi of *-o + a -> -a-* (via *-ā-*, I believe). This sandhi is rare, although well authenticated, and it would seem perverse for the commentarial tradition to have proposed and followed this more difficult explanation, without alternative, unless it was made on good authority.

### 5. *vidha* "buckle"

In the Nepali folios of the *Vinayapiṭaka* recently studied by Professor von Hinüber<sup>1</sup> we find the variants *vedha* and *vehā* for Pāli *vidha* (which is said to mean "buckle"<sup>2</sup>). Taking these together with the readings *vīha* and *vīṭha* which are found in some oriental editions of the *Vinaya*, Professor von Hinüber was led to suggest a connection with BHS *vethaka*. If this is right, then presumably the correct reading is *vīṭha* or *\*vetha*, with the *i/e* alternation.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Oskar von Hinüber: *The oldest Pāli manuscript. Four folios of the Vinayapiṭaka from the National Archives, Kathmandu*. Mainz, 1991.

<sup>2</sup> See PED, s.v. *vidha*<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> K.R. Norman, "Some vowel values in MIA", *Indian Linguistics*, 21, 1960, pp. 104-7 (CP I, pp. 21-24)

This is presumably to be derived from Skt *veṣṭaka*, which has a variety of meanings based upon the senses “covering, surrounding”. The multiplicity of developments from Skt *ṣṭ* which occur in Middle Indo-Aryan can be well seen by examining the developments of *leṣṭu* (*leṭṭhu*, *ledhukka*, *ledu*, *lelu* [via *lelu*], *leḍdu* [via \**leṭṭu*], *lehuda*)<sup>1</sup> and \**luṣṭa* (*luṭṭha*, *lotṭha*, *loda*, *lodha*) which are found in Middle Indo-Aryan.<sup>2</sup>

It is possible that the word *saṃvelli*, which seems to be a garment worn by wrestlers, is also to be derived from the root *veṣṭ* (via \**vel* < *veṭ*). It is also possible that we should consider here the variants *vegha-*, *vekha-*, and *veṭha-missa* at Th 143, which in EV I I derived from *vesta*.<sup>3</sup> Professor Gombrich suggested that the correct reading was *vedha* “trembling”,<sup>4</sup> but this leaves the problem of the retroflex consonant in one of the v.ll. unexplained.

#### 6. *setṭhi* “dregs”

This word is not listed in PED. It occurs in a list of things which are said in the Aggañña-sutta (§ 16)<sup>5</sup> to have been thrown at those indulging in *methuna*. Buddhaghosa explained it as ashes.<sup>6</sup>

It is to be derived < Skt \**śiṣṭi* < *śiṣ* “to remain”, and means “remainder, dregs”. One might argue that Buddhaghosa’s gloss is justifiable, as ashes are the remainder from a fire, but the usage in New

<sup>1</sup> K.R. Norman, “Middle Indo-Aryan Studies I”, *JOI(B)* IX, 1960, pp. 268–73 (CP I, pp. 15–20 [p. 16]).

<sup>2</sup> K.R. Norman, “Middle Indo-Aryan Studies IV”, *JOI(B)* XIII, 1964, pp. 208–13 (CP I, pp. 36–41 [p. 38]).

<sup>3</sup> K.R. Norman, Elders’ Verses I, p. 154 (ad Th 143).

<sup>4</sup> RFG, “Old bodies like carts”, *JPTS* XI, 1987, pp. 1–4.

<sup>5</sup> *aññe paṇsum khipanti aññe setṭhim khipanti aññe gomayam khipanti*, D III 88,30 = 89,5.

<sup>6</sup> *setṭhin ti chārikam*, Sv 869,24.

Indo-Aryan<sup>1</sup> suggests that it is liquid dregs which are intended. If this is so, then Buddhaghosa was merely guessing the meaning from the context, perhaps with the knowledge of a marriage ceremony where ashes were thrown.

Cambridge

K.R. Norman

---

<sup>1</sup> See CDIAL 12480.

## A CITATION FROM THE \*BUDDHAVAMSA OF THE ABHAYAGIRI SCHOOL

It is well known that the Theravādins of Sri Lanka were divided into two main rival branches, the Mahāvihāravāsins ("Residents of the Great Monastery") and the Abhayagirivāsins ("Residents of Abhayagiri [Monastery]"), and that after more than a thousand years of contention for legitimacy and patronage, the former won out, and the latter disappeared.<sup>1</sup> The Theravāda that we know today is the Mahāvihāra tradition, as settled in the main by the prolific commentator Buddhaghosa in the 5th century; the later Pāli literature of the sub-commentaries (*tikās*) and manuals, although subject to a variety of influences, also belongs to the Mahāvihāravāsin lineage.

No undisputed Abhayagiri text has survived. The Pāli *Saddhammopāyana*<sup>2</sup> and the *Questions of Upāli*<sup>3</sup> and *Vimuttimagga*,<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For the two schools, see André Bareau, *Les sectes bouddhiques du Petit Véhicule* (*Publications de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient XXXVIII*), Paris, 1955, chapters XXIX and XXX. A third branch, the Jetavaniyas or Sāgalikas (Bareau, ch. XXXI) seems to have played a less significant role. For the Abhayagiri, see *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism*, Vol. 1, fasc. 1, [Colombo] 1961, pp. 21–25 ("Abhayagiri"), 25–28 ("Abhayagirivāsins"), and Walpola Rahula, *History of Buddhism in Ceylon*, Colombo, [1956] 1966, pp. 83–85, 92–99, etc.

<sup>2</sup> Translated into English by Ann Hazelwood, *JPTS XII*, pp. 65–168.

<sup>3</sup> See H. Bechert (ed.), *Upālipariprcchāsūtra, ein Text zur buddhistischen Ordensdisziplin*, aus dem Chinesischen übersetzt und den Pāli-Parallelen gegenübergestellt von Valentina Stache-Rosen, Göttingen, 1984, pp. 12–15, 28–31.

<sup>4</sup> Translated into English by N.R.M. Ehara, Soma Thera, and Kheminda Thera, *The Path of Freedom (Vimuttimagga)*, [Colombo, 1961] Kandy, 1977; for a recent note see H. Bechert, "Vimuttimagga and Amatākaravāñjanā", in N.H. Samtani and H.S. Prasad (edd.), *Amalā Prajñā: Aspects of Buddhist Studies (Professor P.V. Bapat Felicitation Volume)*, Delhi, 1989, pp. 11–14. Selected portions of the work are preserved in Tibetan translation: see P. Skilling, "The

both in Chinese translation, have been ascribed to the school, but there is some debate on the subject.<sup>1</sup> In my opinion there is sufficient evidence to conclude that the last named was not a Mahāvihāra text, and that it was either composed by or (if written in India) adopted and transmitted by monks of the Abhayagiri lineage. I will present this evidence in a separate article.<sup>2</sup>

The Abhayagiri monks were broad-minded in outlook; they maintained contacts with foreign Buddhist schools, and themselves established bases in India and in South-east Asia. An inscription from Ratu Baka in central Java, dated 792 A.C., refers to the Abhayagiri-vihāra of the Sinhalese. The presence in North India of the Abhayagiri, or of an affiliated Sthavira tradition with similar views, is shown by the fact that a chapter of the *Vimuttimagga* was translated into Tibetan around 800 A.C., and that lengthy sections were cited by Daśabalaśrīmitra, a North Indian scholar, probably in the 12th century, in a work preserved only in Tibetan translation.<sup>3</sup> A similar tradition is

Samskṛtāsamśkṛta-viniścaya of Daśabalaśrīmitra", in *Buddhist Studies Review*, Vol. 4, no. 1, 1987, pp. 7-8 and 16.

<sup>1</sup> See K.R. Norman, *Pāli Literature* (Jan Gonda [ed.], *A History of Indian Literature*, Vol. VII, fasc. 2), Wiesbaden, 1983, p. 29 and accompanying note, and pp. 159-60. The most recent contribution to the debate is K.R. Norman's "The Literary Works of the Abhayagirivihārins", in V.N. Jha (ed.), *Kalyāṇamitta: Professor Hajime Nakamura Felicitation Volume*, Delhi, 1991, pp. 41-50, which gives an extensive bibliography.

<sup>2</sup> "Vimuttimagga and Abhayagiri: The Form-aggregate according to the Samskṛtāsamśkṛta-viniścaya" (forthcoming), in which I will also discuss the date of the Chinese translation and the name of the translator, about which there has been considerable confusion.

<sup>3</sup> See Skilling (*op. cit.*, p. 16) for references. Some of the shorter passages cited by Daśabalaśrīmitra "from the Āgama of the Ārya Sthaviranikāya", which are not yet traced in Pāli (Skilling pp. 7-8), may possibly be drawn from non-Mahāvihāra — that is North Indian Sthavira or Abhayagiri — sources. An Abhayagiri is referred to in the concluding Khmer portion of a Vajrayānist Sanskrit inscription, dated 1066 A.C., from the vicinity of Nakhon Ratchasima

possibly attested in South-east Asia at an earlier date, since \*Samghabhabara, who translated the *Vimuttimagga* into Chinese in the second decade of the 6th century, was from Funan, but whether he obtained the text there, from India, or in China itself is not clear.

We cannot say with absolute certainty that the scriptures of the Abhayagiri were transmitted in Pāli, although this is most probable, since there is evidence that the two branches shared the same *Piṭakas*, with a few relatively minor differences.<sup>1</sup> Had the Abhayagirivāśins adopted a Sanskrit *Tipiṭaka*, their rivals would surely have been quick to point this out; but no such accusation is found in available literature. The disputes between the school and the Mahāvihāra described in the Pāli chronicles, although frequently the result of a struggle for royal patronage, are usually in some way connected with *Vinaya*; although the Mahāvihāra accuses the Abhayagiri of harbouring “heresy” — that is, leaning towards the Mahāyāna — this seems more of a blanket charge than the real cause of contention. The kings of Sri Lanka made periodic attempts to reunite the two groups, which should have been impossible had they adhered to completely different *Vinayas*, and the points upon which the two branches differed, as described in the *tiṭkās*, are significant only in a Theravādin context.

---

in Central Siam: see Chirapat Prapandvidya, “The Sab Bāk Inscription: Evidence of an Early Vajrayāna Buddhist Presence in Thailand”, in *The Journal of the Siam Society*, Vol. 78, pt. 2 (1990), p. 12 (text line 32), p. 13 (tr.). The precise location of this Abhayagiri (note that the inscription names only an “Abhaya Mountain” (*giri*), where images of “Buddhalokeśvara” and others were installed and later renovated, and not a *vihāra*) is unknown, and it is not clear whether the toponym should be related to the Abhayagiri school of Sri Lanka.

<sup>1</sup> See Bareau, *Les sectes bouddhiques*, pp. 242–43, and Heinz Bechert, “Notes on the Formation of Buddhist Sects and the Origins of Mahāyāna”, in *German Scholars on India*, Vol. 1, Varanasi, 1971, p. 11.

Even the overseas branches of the Abhayagiri would likely have kept their sacred canon in Pāli (as do the Mahāvihāravāsins to this day), although they may have composed some treatises in Sanskrit. Examples of scriptures of several Buddhist schools have been preserved in a number of Prakrit dialects, both in manuscript and inscription, and even Sanskrit texts such as the *Ratnagotravibhāga* or the works of Candrakīrti and Śāntideva cite Prakrit passages in the original. Thus, although a trend towards Sanskritization was certainly evident in some schools, notably the Sarvāstivādins, Mūlasarvāstivādins, and later Dharmaguptakas, there was no compulsion to adopt Sanskrit.

A tantalizing brief citation of an Abhayagiri text is preserved in Tibetan translation in the *Tarkajvālā* of Bhavya.<sup>1</sup> The *Tarkajvālā* is Bhavya's commentary on his own *Madhyamakahṛdaya-kārikās*; only the latter is extant in Sanskrit.<sup>2</sup> As is all too often the case, the exact dates of Bhavya — who is also known as Bhāvaviveka and Bhāviveka — are

<sup>1</sup> Derge (= D) 3856, *dbu ma, dza*, 177a7–b2; Peking (= Q) 5256 in D.T. Suzuki (ed.), *The Tibetan Tripitaka, Peking Edition*, Vol. 96, Tokyo-Kyoto, 1957, *bstan 'gyur, mdo 'grel, dbu ma, dza*, 192b1–6. I am grateful to Dr. Josef Kolmaš of the Oriental Institute, Prague, for providing photo-copies of the relevant sections of the Derge.

<sup>2</sup> For this work, and the thought and work of Bhavya in general, see David Seyfort Ruegg, *The Literature of the Madhyamaka School of Philosophy In India* (Jan Gonda [ed.], *A History of Indian Literature*, Vol. VII, fasc. 1), Wiesbaden, 1981, pp. 61–66; see also the same author's "Towards a Chronology of the Madhyamaka School", in L.A. Hercus *et al.* (edd.), *Indological and Buddhist Studies: Volume in Honour of Professor J.W. de Jong on his Sixtieth Birthday*, [Canberra, 1982] Delhi, 1984, pp. 508, 512–13. Chapter 1 (verses, with Sanskrit, and commentary) has been translated by V.V. Gokhale, "Madhyamakahṛdayakārikā Tarkajvālā, Chapter 1", in Chr. Lindtner (ed.), *Miscellanea Buddhica* (Indiske Studier V), Copenhagen, 1985, pp. 76–107. Part of Chapter 3 has been edited and translated by Shotaro Iida, *Reason and Emptiness: A Study in Logic and Mysticism*, Tokyo, 1980. Iida gives a detailed bibliography of studies of Bhavya's work.

not known. Ruegg suggests *ca.* 500–70, with a question mark.<sup>1</sup> Tāranātha states that he was born in South India, where he received *pravrajyā* and mastered the *Tripiṭaka*.<sup>2</sup>

Chapter 4 of the *Tarkajvālā, Śrāvakatattvāvatāra*, is a mine of precious information on the tenets and scriptures of the Śrāvaka schools.<sup>3</sup> The Abhayagiri citation occurs in the context of Bhavya's response to the contention that monks should not honour or worship a layman, that is, an unordained bodhisattva. He states that "in the texts of most of the eighteen schools (*nikāya*), it is clearly stated that a bodhisattva should be honoured" and goes on to cite examples from the scriptures of seventeen schools.<sup>4</sup> Of these, the Abhayagiri citation is seventh.

Bhavya describes the work from which he draws his citation as '*phags pa gnas brtan pa 'jigs med ri la gnas pa rnams kyi sañs rgyas kyi rigs khri ñis stoñ*: "the *Twelve-thousand Lineage of the Buddhas* of the Ārya Sthavira Abhayagirivāsins". The title consists of two elements:

<sup>1</sup> Ruegg, *op. cit.*, p. 61.

<sup>2</sup> Antonius Schiefner, *Tāranāthae de Doctrine Buddhicae in India Propagatione*, Saint Petersburg, 1868, p. 106.7, *slob dpon legs ldan ni lho phyogs ma lya rar rgyal rigs mchog tu skye ba brñed*; *yul de ñid du rab tu byuñ nas sde snod gsum la mkhas par byas*. Cf. Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya (ed.), *Tāranātha's History of Buddhism in India*, Calcutta, 1980, p. 186.

<sup>3</sup> *Ñan thos kyi de kho na ñid la 'jug pa*, D 144a7 foll.; Q 157b2–218b8 = 123 folio sides. Of these, only about 17 folios have been translated and studied in the form of the independent treatise on the schools extracted from the *Tarkajvālā, bampo* 13 (D 148a4–155b6; Q 161a3–169a5 = Q 5640, Vol. 127, *'dul ba'i 'grel pa, u, 177a1–187b2*): see André Bareau, "Trois traités sur les sectes bouddhiques attribués à Vasumitra, Bhavya, et Vinitadeva", IIe partie, *Journal Asiatique*, 1956, fasc. 2, pp. 167–91.

<sup>4</sup> D 175a7, Q 190a6, *sde pa bco brgyad phal chen gyi gžuñ las kyañ l byañ chub sems dpa' la phyag bya bar rab tu grags te*. The section runs from D 175a7–179b1, Q 190a6–195a2. In a forthcoming article entitled "Bhavya's Citations from the Scriptures of the 'Eighteen Schools'" I will study this section.

*saṅs rgyas kyi rigs* and *khri ŋis stoṅ*. *Saṅs rgyas* = Buddha (plus *kyi*, to make the genitive); *rigs* translates a number of Sanskrit terms, such as *kula*, *gotra*, *jāti*, *varṇa*, *vaṇśa*, *nikāya*. On the basis of the (admittedly brief) context and Pāli usage, \**Buddhavāṇsa* seems a likely equivalent.<sup>1</sup> The second element, *khri ŋis stoṅ*, is a number, 12000 = *dvādasa-sahassa*. The title as a whole may be somewhat tentatively rendered into Pāli as \**Dvādasa-sahassa-buddhavāṇsa*.

A question arises: does the figure 12000 refer to the number of Buddhas, or to the size of the text, measured in *ślokas*? In either case, the Pāli or Sanskrit title would have been the same. In the former case, one would rather expect the translation to read *saṅs rgyas khri ŋis stoṅ gi rigs*, “the lineage or succession of 12000 Buddhas” (but the translators, faced with a brief citation from an unfamiliar text, might have failed to understand the title). While I have not found any references to a group of 12000 Buddhas in the Mahāvihāra texts, the Abhayagiri tradition may have been different. If the latter is the case, the translation may be compared with the Tibetan titles of *Prajñāpāramitā* texts: the *Āṣṭādaśasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā*, for example, is rendered as *Śes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa khri bryad stoṅ pa*.

I have not been able to trace the verses, or any similar verses, in the *Buddhavāṇsa* of the Mahāvihāravāsins. They thus seem to come from a uniquely Abhayagirivāsin text. The brevity does not offer us much information about the tenets of the school. We learn that it accepted ten perfections (*pāramī*); these are not named in the citation, but it is likely that the broader Sthavira tradition agreed on the subject, since the list of the non-Mahāvihārin *Vimuttimagga* (pp. 188–89) agrees with that of the Mahāvihāravāsins. The citation adds to our meagre knowledge of Abhayagiri literature, and gives us an example of

<sup>1</sup> In the following discussion of the citation I will use Pāli equivalents of the Tibetan.

Theravādin devotional verse that is no later than the beginning of the 6th century. It also gives us a third, and the earliest, example of the availability of Sthavira texts in India: we now have the \**Buddhavamsa* in the 6th century, the chapter of the *Vimuttimagga* translated into Tibetan *ca.* 800,<sup>1</sup> and the *Vimuttimagga* and other texts cited by Daśabalaśrīmitra in the 12th or 13th century. While the last two examples show that the *Vimuttimagga* was available in Northern India, we cannot be certain where Bhavya obtained his text. Tradition places much of his career in South India, but also has him visiting Madhyadeśa, and we do not know where he composed the *Tarkajvālā*. The availability of Abhayagiri texts in South India would hardly be surprising, since on a number of occasions monks of that school fled or were banished to the South.

Here follows an English translation; the Tibetan text of the Derge and Peking *Tanjurs* — the only editions available to me — is given in the appendix. I find the text rather difficult at some points, and hope that more able scholars will be able to improve upon my work.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The chapter in question was translated by Vidyākaraprabha and dPal brtsegs. While the origin of the Indian manuscript, or indeed of any other texts translated in the period, is not stated, it is clear that Tibet's religious relations were with Kashmir and Magadha, from which most of the translators hailed. That the text would have been obtained from Lanka or South India is unlikely. Why the text was selected for translation is not known; I assume that it was chosen by the Indian translator(s) because it was highly regarded in their homeland, which again points to North India.

<sup>2</sup> For a note on the quality of the Tibetan translation of the *Tarkajālā*, see V.V. Gokhale, pp. 76–77. I am grateful to Paul Harrison for reading the draft of this article, and making perspicacious suggestions.

1. “The Buddha’s son,<sup>1</sup> the bodhisatta,  
should be honoured by all the world (*loka*):  
[he is] limitless in wisdom (*paññā*),  
virtue (*sīla*), and the wisdom of liberation  
(*paññāvimutti*).
2. Donning the suit of great armour (*sannāha*)  
he attains inconceivable (*acinteyya*) power;  
fulfilling the ten perfections (*pāramī*),  
he realizes the *dhammas* of a Buddha.
3. All the world (*loka*) should pay homage  
to [the bodhisatta], shrine (*cetiya*) for all the world;  
there is no [member of the] community (*saṅgha*) who  
equals him  
in wisdom, virtue, or concentration (*paññā*, *sīla*,  
*saṃādhi*).
4. With the exception of the omniscient (*sabbaññu*)  
Buddha(s),  
[in] the world including the gods  
there is no one who should not honour  
[the bodhisatta] who is honoured by all the world.”

The section as a whole concludes: “Therefore, since it is proven that according to the scriptures of the eighteen schools bodhisattvas

---

<sup>1</sup> *Saṇīs rgyas sras po* = *buddha-putta*, *buddhattaja*. Cf. *Buddhavāṃsa* v. 76, cited below, where *jina-putta* describes the *arhats*. *Jina-putta* (-*putra*) thus has two meanings: (1) a bodhisatt(v)a (cf. Franklin Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*, Vol. II: Dictionary, [New Haven, 1953] Delhi, 1972, pp. 242–43, s.v. *jinaputra*); (2) a disciple of the Buddha (cf. PTSD 284a, PTC Vol. II, pp. 160–61, and *Buddhavāṃsa* citation below).

who have generated the initial aspiration [to Buddhahood], etc., are to be honoured, it is to be known that the Mahāyāna is included within (*antargata*) the eighteen schools".<sup>1</sup>

The three-fold division of the Theravādins of Sri Lanka into Mahāvihāravāsins, Abhayagirivāsins, and Jetavaniyas was well-known in India, although Bhavya himself does not refer to it.<sup>2</sup> That he does not cite the scriptures of the other two schools may simply indicate that he did not have access to them, or that he deemed the Abhayagirivāsins to be representative of the Theras as a whole, and thus felt that a single citation sufficed. The *Buddhavamsa* and the *Jātakanidāna* of the Mahāvihāravāsins may in fact be cited to support Bhavya's case. In the *Sumedhakathā*, after the bodhisatta as Sumedha has stretched himself out in the mud so that Dīpañkara may walk over him without dirtying his feet, we read<sup>3</sup>:

*Dīpañkaradasabalo ca bodhisattam mahāsattam pasam̄sitvā  
at̄thahi pupphamuṭhihi pūjetvā padakkhiṇam̄ katvā pakkāmi; te pi  
catusatasahassā khīnāsavā bodhisattam pupphehi ca gandhehi ca pūjetvā  
padakkhiṇam̄ katvā pakkamīmsu; sadevamanussā pana tath' eva pūjetvā  
vanditvā pakkamīmsu.*

"Dīpañkara of the Ten Powers commended the Bodhisatta, the Great Being, honoured him with eight handfuls of flowers, circled him respectfully, and departed. The four hundred thousand [arhats] who had destroyed the cankers also honoured the Bodhisatta with flowers and

<sup>1</sup> D 179a7, Q 195a1, *de Itar na sde pa bco bryad kyi gžun las dañ po sems bskyed pa la sogz pa'i byañ chub sems dpa' rnamz la phyag bya bar grub pas theg pa chen po sde pa bco bryad kyi khons su gtogs pa yin par rig (Q rigs) par bya'o.*

<sup>2</sup> See the lists given by Bareau, *Les sectes bouddhiques*, pp. 24–26.

<sup>3</sup> *Buddhavamsa-at̄thakathā* (PTS) 94,31–35; *Jātaka I* (PTS) 16,24–28, with a few minor differences.

perfumes, circled him respectfully, and departed. Gods and men as well honoured and worshipped him then and there, and departed."

In this passage, the Buddha Dipaṅkara himself honours the Bodhisatta, who is a layman, a brahman ascetic, as do the arhat monks. In this the *Buddhavāṃsa* and *Jātakanidāna* of the Mahāvihāravāsins go farther than the \**Buddhavāṃsa* of the Abhayagirivāsins, since v. 4 of Bhavya's citation excludes the Buddha from the need to honour the bodhisatta. This is the text of the commentary, which dates in this form to the 5th century. A verse from the *Buddhavāṃsa* itself, which should go back some centuries earlier, gives a simpler account<sup>1</sup>:

*ye tatth' āsum jinaputtā padakkhiṇam akāmsu mam  
devā manussā asurā ca abhivādetvāna pakkamūñ*

Those Victor's sons [the arhats] present there paid their respects to me;  
the gods, humans, and *asuras*,<sup>2</sup> having honoured me,  
departed.

Here only the arhat monks (*jinaputtā*) pay respect to the lay Bodhisatta; it is not stated that Dipaṅkara does so. Thus the *Buddhavāṃsa*, its commentary, and the *Jātakanidāna* may be cited in support of Bhavya.

#### Appendix: Tibetan text

1.                    *sangs rgyas sras po byan chub sems//  
'jig rten kun gyis phyag bgyi'o//*

---

<sup>1</sup> v. 76 of the *Buddhavāṃsa*; v. 86 of the *Jātakanidāna* is similar.

<sup>2</sup> Humans, *nāgas*, and *gandhabbas* (*narā nāgā ca gandhabbā*) according to the *Jātakanidāna*.

śes rab dpag tu med pa dañ//  
tshul khrims śes rab rnam grol dag<sup>1</sup>//

2. go cha chen po'i go bgos nas//  
bsam gyis mi khyab dbañ thob ciñ//  
pha rol phyin bcu rdzogs gyur nas//  
sañs rgyas chos rnams mñon gyur pa//
3. 'jig rten kun gyi mchod rten la//  
'jig rten kun gyis<sup>2</sup> phyag bgyi'o//  
śes rab tshul khrims tiñ 'dzin gyi<sup>3</sup>//  
de dañ mñam pa'i dge 'dun med//
4. 'jig rten kun gyis<sup>4</sup> phyag bgyis pa//  
sañs rgyas kun mkyen ma gtogs<sup>5</sup> pa'i//  
lha dañ bcas pa'i 'jig rten ni//  
'gas kyañ phyag mi bya ba min//

žes 'phags pa gnas brtan pa 'jigs med ri la gnas pa rnams kyi  
sañs rgyas kyi rigs khri ñis stoñ las 'don to//

Bangkok

Peter Skilling

<sup>1</sup> *Dag* D, *bdag* Q. The latter, “self, lord, master (*adhipati*, *ātman*, *pati*)”, seems unlikely in combination with *paññā*, *sīla*, and *paññāvimutti*; I have therefore followed D, *dag*, which simply indicates the plural.

<sup>2</sup> *Gyis* (instrumental) D; *gyi* (genitive) Q.

<sup>3</sup> *Gyi* (genitive) D; *gyis* (instrumental) Q.

<sup>4</sup> *Gyis* (instrumental) D; *gyi* (genitive) Q.

<sup>5</sup> *Gtogs* D; *rtogs* Q.



# AN INDEX TO JPTS VOLUMES IX–XVIII

An Index to The Journals of the Pali Text Society (1882–1927 = Volumes I–VIII), compiled by P.D. Ratnatunga (Mudaliyar) and revised with Appendix and arranged by S.S. Davidson, was published by the Society in 1973. This index lists, by author, the articles published in the Journal since it was revived in 1981.

Bangchang, Supaphan Na: A Pāli letter sent by the Agga-mahāsenāpati of Siam to the royal court at Kandy in 1756	XII.185
Bureau, A.: The Theravādins and East India according to the canonical texts	IX.1
Bechert, H.: The Buddhayāna of Indonesia: a syncretistic form of Theravāda	IX.10
Buddhadatta, A.P.: <i>Paramatthavinicchaya</i> by Anuruddha	X.155
Collins, S.: <i>Brah Māleyyadevattheravatthum</i> : Introduction	XVIII.1
Collins, S.: <i>Kalyāṇamitta</i> and <i>Kalyāṇamittatā</i>	XI.51
Collins, S.: On the very idea of the Pali Canon	XV.89
Collins, S.: The Story of the Elder Māleyyadeva	XVIII.65
Cone, M.: Patna Dharmapada I	XIII.101
Cousins, L.S.: The <i>Paṭṭhāna</i> and the development of the Theravādin Abhidhamma	IX.22
Denis, E.: <i>Brah Māleyyadevattheravatthum</i> : Text	XVIII.19
Exell, R.H.B.: Rūpārūpavibhāga Translation	XVI.1
Filliozat, J.: Documents useful for the identification of Pāli manuscripts of Cambodia, Laos and Thailand	XVI.13
Gombrich, R.: A new Theravādin liturgy	IX.47
Gombrich, R.: A note on Ambapāli's wit	XV.139
Gombrich, R.: Making mountains without molehills: the case of the missing stūpa	XV.141
Gombrich, R.: Old bodies like carts	XI.1

Gombrich, R.: Three souls, one or none: the vagaries of a Pāli pericope	XI.73
Gombrich, R.: Two notes on <i>Visuddhimagga</i> IX	XII.169
Gombrich, R.: Why is a <i>Khattiya</i> called a <i>Khattiya</i> ? The <i>Aggañña Sutta</i> revisited	XVII.213
Hallisey, C.: Apropos the Pāli Vinaya as a historical document	XV.197
Hallisey, C.: <i>Nibbānasutta</i> : an allegedly non-canonical <i>sutta</i> on Nibbāna as a Great City	XVIII.97
Hallisey, C.: <i>Tuṇḍilovāda</i> : An allegedly non-canonical <i>Sutta</i>	XV.155
Hazlewood, A.A.: <i>Pañcagatidīpanī</i>	XI.131
Hazlewood, A.A.: <i>Saddhammopāyana</i> Translation	XII.65
Hinüber, O. von: An additional note on the oldest dated manuscript of the <i>Milindapañha</i>	XII.173
Hinüber, O. von: Khandhakavatta: Loss of text in the Pāli Vinayapitaka ?	XV.127
Hinüber, O. von: Remarks on a list of books sent to Ceylon from Siam in the 18th century	XII.175
Hinüber, O. von: The arising of an offence: <i>āpattisamutthāna</i>	XVI.55
Hinüber, O. von: The ghost word <i>dvihitikā</i> and the descriptions of famine in early Buddhist literature	IX.74
Hinüber, O. von: The oldest dated manuscript of the <i>Milindapañha</i>	XI.111
Hinüber, O. von: Two <i>Jātaka</i> manuscripts from the National Library in Bangkok	X.1
Horner, I.B.: <i>Keci</i> "some" in the Pali commentaries	X.87
Hundius, H.: The colophons of thirty Pāli manuscripts from Northern Thailand	XIV.1
Jackson, P.: A note on Dhammapāla(s)	XV.209
Jaini, P.S.: <i>Tīrthāṅkara-prakṛti</i> and the Bodhisattva path	IX.96
Jong, J.W. de: Fa-hsien and Buddhist texts in Ceylon	IX.105
Kahrs, E.G.: Exploring the <i>Saddanīti</i>	XVII.1
Kalupahana, D.J.: The philosophy of history in early Buddhism	IX.117
Khantipalo, Phra: Where's that <i>sutta</i> ?	X.37

Lamotte, É.: The <i>Gārava-sutta</i> of the <i>Samyutta-nikāya</i> and its Mahāyāna developments	IX.127
Lottermoser, F.: Minor Pāli grammar texts: the <i>Saddabindu</i>	XI.79
Manné, Joy: Categories of sutta in the Pāli Nikāyas	XV.29
Mills, L.C.R. (formerly Phra Khantipalo): The case of the murdered monks	XVI.71
Mori, Sodō: <i>Uttaravihāraṭṭhakathā</i> and <i>Sārasamāsa</i>	XII.1
Norman, K.R.: Devas and adhidevas in Buddhism	IX.145
Norman, K.R.: Index to JPTS Volumes IX–XIV	XIV.227
Norman, K.R.: Index to JPTS Volumes IX–XV	XV.213
Norman, K.R.: Index to JPTS Volumes IX–XVIII	XVIII.177
Norman, K.R.: Pāli lexicographical studies III	X.23
Norman, K.R.: Pāli lexicographical studies IV	XI.33
Norman, K.R.: Pāli lexicographical studies V	XII.49
Norman, K.R.: Pāli lexicographical studies VI	XIII.219
Norman, K.R.: Pāli lexicographical studies VII	XIV.219
Norman, K.R.: Pāli lexicographical studies VIII	XV.145
Norman, K.R.: Pāli lexicographical studies IX	XVI.77
Norman, K.R.: Pāli lexicographical studies X	XVII.215
Norman, K.R.: Pāli lexicographical studies XI	XVIII.149
Pind, O.H.: Studies in the Pāli Grammarians I	XIII.33
Pind, O.H.: Studies in the Pāli Grammarians II.1	XIV.175
Pruitt, W.: References to Pāli in 17th-century French books	XI.121
Pruitt, W.: Burmese Manuscripts in the Library of Congress	XIII.1
Rahula, W.: Humour in Pali literature	IX.156
Ruegg, D. Seyfort: A further note on Pali <i>gotrabhū</i>	IX.175
Saddhātissa, H.: Nāmacāradīpaka	XV.1
Saddhātissa, H.: <i>Nāmarūpasamāso</i> by Khema	XI.5
Saddhātissa, H.: Pali literature in Cambodia	IX.178
Schopen, G.: The ritual obligations and donor roles of monks in the Pāli Vinaya	XVI.87
Schopen, G.: The Stūpa cult and the Extant Pāli Vinaya	XIII.83

Skilling, P.: A Citation from the *Buddhavaṃsa of the Abhayagiri School	XVIII.165
Skilling, P.: The <i>Rakṣā</i> Literature of the <i>Śrāvakayāna</i>	XVI.109
Warder, A.K.: Some problems of the later Pali literature	IX.198

## CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS VOLUME.

Professor Steven Collins,  
Dept of South Asian Languages,  
University of Chicago,  
Foster Hall,  
1130 East 59th Street,  
Chicago, IL 60637,  
U.S.A.

Professor Charles Hallisey,  
Harvard University,  
Committee on the Study of Religion,  
Phillips Brook House, 3rd Floor,  
Cambridge,  
Massachusetts 02138,  
U.S.A.

Dr Jinadasa Liyanaratne,  
31 rue de Séquigny,  
F-91700 Ste.-Geneviève-des-Bois,  
France.

K.R. Norman,  
6, Huttles Green,  
Shepreth,  
Royston,  
Herts SG8 6PR.

Peter Skilling,  
49/20 Soi Ruam Rudee 3,  
Ploenchit,  
Bangkok 10330,  
Thailand.



## NOTICE FROM THE COUNCIL

### RESEARCH FELLOWSHIPS IN PALI STUDIES

The Council of the Pali Text Society invite applications for Research Fellowships from suitably qualified persons, working in the field of Pali studies. Applicants will usually be in the fourth year of a course of graduate research, or its equivalent. The course of research will be expected to lead to publishable material, on the publication rights of which the Pali Text Society will have first option.

Fellowships will be tenable for one year in the first instance, with a possibility of renewal. When fixing the value, account will be taken of the appropriate level for a comparable research worker in the applicant's country of domicile. Letters of application and requests for information should be sent to:

Mr K.R. Norman,  
c/o Pali Text Society,  
73 Lime Walk,  
Headington,  
Oxford OX3 7AD.



## EDITORIAL NOTICE

The Council of the Pali Text Society plan to continue publication of the *Journal* on an *ad hoc* basis, as and when sufficient material of a publishable standard is received.

The *Journal* will publish short Pali texts, translations, and commentaries on texts, catalogues and handlists of Pali books and manuscripts, and similar material.

Papers should be sent to:

Mr K.R. Norman,  
c/o Pali Text Society,  
73 Lime Walk,  
Headington,  
Oxford OX3 7AD.

To reduce printing costs, contributors are urged, whenever possible, to present their papers in a camera-ready copy form.