

Pali Text Society  
JOURNAL  
OF THE  
PALI TEXT SOCIETY

VOLUME XVI

EDITED BY  
K.R. NORMAN

*Published by*  
THE PALI TEXT SOCIETY  
OXFORD

1992

© *Pali Text Society* 1992

ISBN 0-86013-304-4

First published in 1992  
Distributed by Lavis Marketing  
73 Lime Walk  
Oxford OX3 7AD

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

## CONTENTS

<i>Rūpārūpavibhāga</i> Translation By R.H.B. Exell	1
Documents useful for the identification of Pāli manuscripts of Cambodia, Laos and Thailand By Jacqueline Filliozat	13
The arising of an offence: <i>samuṭṭhāna</i> By Oskar v. Hinüber	55
The case of the murdered monks By Laurence C.R. Mills	71
Pāli Lexicographical Studies IX By K.R. Norman	77
The ritual obligations and donor roles of monks in the Pāli Vinaya By Gregory Schopen	87
The <i>Rakṣā</i> Literature of the <i>Śrāvakayāna</i> By Peter Skilling	109
Contributors to this Volume	183
Notices	185

# RŪPĀRŪPAVIBHĀGA<sup>1</sup>

By Buddhadatta<sup>2</sup>

## THE CLASSIFICATION OF FORMS AND FORMLESS THINGS<sup>3</sup>

*Homage to the Blessed One, the Arahant, the Fully Enlightened One.*

Having paid respect to the Buddha, the seer of forms and formless things, the sage who has gone beyond them, I shall expound the classification of forms and formless things.

### FORMS

There are twenty-eight kinds of form, in which the first four are the basic elements of form, and the rest are derived forms: (1) earth-element, (2) water-element, (3) fire-element, (4) wind-element, (5) eye-element, (6) ear-element, (7) nose-element, (8) tongue-element, (9) body-element, (10) visible form-element, (11) sound-element, (12) smell-element, (13) taste-element, touch-element, (14) female-faculty, (15) male-faculty, (16) faculty of life, (17) heart-base, (18) space-element, (19) bodily communication, (20) verbal communication, (21)

---

<sup>1</sup> The text from which the present translation is made is contained in the Pali Text Society's publication: *Buddhadatta's Manuals*, Part I, ed. A.P. Buddhadatta, London 1915, pp. 149–59. It is one of the nine so-called "Little-finger Manuals" (*Let-than*). For this type of literature, see K.R. Norman, *Pāli Literature*, Wiesbaden 1983, p. 153.

<sup>2</sup> Buddhadatta lived in the tenth century, Buddhist Era, and was a contemporary of Buddhaghosa, who held him in high esteem. The *Rūpārūpavibhāga* is a concise summary of the Theravāda Abhidhamma as it existed at that time.

<sup>3</sup> This translation first appeared in *Visakha Puja*, BE 2507, Bangkok 1964, pp. 43–49. The Publications Committee of the Pali Text Society are grateful to the Buddhist Association of Thailand for giving permission to reprint it here, in a slightly amended form.

lightness of form, (22) softness of form, (23) fitness of form, (24) growth of form, (25) continuity of form, (26) ageing of form, (27) impermanence of form, and (28) material food.

The five kinds of form beginning with the eye-element are internal; the rest are external. Colour, smell, taste, nutriment, and the four great elements are the eight kinds of form inseparable from each other; the rest are separable. The five kinds of form beginning with the eye-element, and the heart-base are bases; the others are not bases. The three faculties and the five beginning with the eye are the eight controlling faculties; the others are not controlling faculties. Setting aside the water-element, the twelve at the beginning are gross; the rest are subtle. Gross form is near, and subtle form is distant. Form produced by kamma is grasped; the rest is not grasped. The sphere of visible form is the only visible form; the others are invisible. Gross form is impinging; the others are not impinging.

The eight faculties and the heart-base are produced by kamma. Bodily communication and verbal communication are produced by mind. Sound is produced by season and mind. Lightness, softness, and fitness are produced by season, mind, and food. Birth, decay, and death do not originate from anything. Growth and continuity are said to arise from all four causes. The remaining nine forms are produced by season, mind, food, and kamma.

The first seventeen and food are the eighteen kinds of material form. The five kinds beginning with bodily communication are variations of form. The space-element is that which separates forms. Birth, ageing, and death are the three characteristics of form.

In the world of sense pleasures all these forms are obtained complete for moisture-born beings, and for spontaneously-born beings. But for male and female egg-born and womb-born beings at the time of rebirth three tenfold groups appear; the body, sex, and heart-base groups; while for the neuter beings and beings in the first age of the world there is no tenfold sex-group. But for these beings the tenfold groups of the eye, ear, nose, and tongue appear in the course of time.

Here the tenfold body-group should be understood as the inseparable forms, the body-faculty, and the faculty of life. The remaining tenfold groups are combined in a similar way.

In the world of pure form the nose, tongue, body, smells, tastes, and touch-objects, and the male and female faculties are not obtained; and for beings without perception the eyes, ears, heart-base, and sounds are not obtained. In the formless world there is no form.

## FORMLESS THINGS

There are three kinds of formless things: states of mind, mental properties, and Nibbāna.

### *States of Mind*

In brief the states of mind are of ten kinds: (1) rebirth, (2) passive state, (3) advertинг, (4) seeing, etc., (5) receiving, (6) investigating, (7) determining, (8) impulsion, (9) retention, and (10) death. But in detail there are eighty-nine kinds.

*The twenty-one good states of mind.* There are eight good states of mind in the sphere of sense pleasures: (1) one spontaneous state accompanied by happiness and associated with knowledge, (2) one prompted state accompanied by happiness and associated with knowledge, (3) one spontaneous state accompanied by happiness and dissociated from knowledge, (4) one prompted state accompanied by happiness and dissociated from knowledge, (5) one spontaneous state accompanied by neutral feeling and associated with knowledge, (6) one prompted state accompanied by neutral feeling and associated with knowledge, (7) one spontaneous state accompanied by neutral feeling and dissociated from knowledge, and (8) one prompted state accompanied by neutral feeling and dissociated from knowledge.

They arise dependent on the heart, or independent of it, immediately after the advertинг mind-consciousness-element. They take

as object visible form, sound, smell, taste, touch, or thought, and are produced by giving, morality, or meditation, etc.

There are five good states of mind in the sphere of pure form: (1) the first stage of contemplation with initial thought, sustained thought, joy, ease, and one-pointedness, (2) the second stage of contemplation with sustained thought, joy, ease, and one-pointedness, (3) the third stage of contemplation with joy, ease, and one-pointedness, (4) the fourth stage of contemplation with ease and one-pointedness, and (5) the fifth stage of contemplation with neutral feeling and one-pointedness.

They arise always dependent on the heart, immediately after a suitable good state of mind associated with knowledge. They are produced by meditation, taking earth, etc., as meditation objects. The fifth stage of contemplation also occurs with the six special knowledges.

There are four good states of mind in the formless sphere: (1) the attainment of the sphere of unlimited space, (2) the attainment of the sphere of unlimited consciousness, (3) the attainment of the sphere of nothingness, and (4) the attainment of the sphere of neither perception nor non-perception.

They arise dependent on the heart, or independent of it, immediately after a good state of mind accompanied by neutral feeling and associated with knowledge. They are produced by meditation, and take as object respectively: (1) the space obtained by removing a meditation object, (2) consciousness of the first formless sphere, (3) the non-existence of anything, and (4) the sphere of nothingness.

There are four good transcendental states of mind: (1) the path of stream-attainment with views and doubt uprooted, (2) the path of once-return with sensual desire and ill will reduced, (3) the path of non-return with sensual desire and ill will uprooted, and (4) the path of Arahantship with the five higher fetters — desire for the sphere of pure form, desire for the formless sphere, conceit, restlessness, and ignorance — uprooted.

In these four good transcendental states of mind the first arises dependent on the heart, and the other three arise dependent on the heart or independent of it. They follow immediately after a suitable good state of mind associated with knowledge. They are produced by meditation, all four taking Nibbāna as object; and they are named 'the emptiness deliverance', 'the signless deliverance', or 'the desireless deliverance'.

*The twelve bad states of mind.* There are eight states of mind accompanied by greed: (1) the spontaneous state accompanied by happiness and associated with view, (2) the similar prompted state, (3) the spontaneous state accompanied by happiness and dissociated from view, (4) the similar prompted state, (5) the spontaneous state accompanied by neutral feeling and associated with view, (6) the similar prompted state, (7) the spontaneous state accompanied by neutral feeling and dissociated from view, and (8) the similar prompted state.

There are two states of mind associated with aversion: (9) the spontaneous state accompanied by unhappiness and associated with aversion, and (10) the similar prompted state.

There are two deluded states of mind: (11) the state accompanied by neutral feeling and associated with doubt, and (12) the state accompanied by neutral feeling and associated with restlessness.

In these twelve bad states of mind the two states associated with aversion arise always dependent on the heart, and the others arise dependent on the heart or independent of it. They take one or other of the six objects (beginning with visible form), and they follow immediately after the advertiring mind-consciousness-element.

*The thirty-six resultant states of mind.* There are sixteen good resultant states of mind in the sphere of sense pleasures.

Eight of these do not contain root-causes: (1) Good resultant eye-consciousness accompanied by neutral feeling is dependent on the eye and takes a pleasing visible form as object. It arises by means of light immediately after the advertiring mind-element. (2) Good resultant ear-consciousness accompanied by neutral feeling is dependent on the ear and takes a pleasing sound as object. It arises by means of space

immediately after the advertинг mind-element. (3) Good resultant nose-consciousness accompanied by neutral feeling is dependent on the nose and takes a pleasing smell as object. It arises by means of the wind-element immediately after the advertинг mind-element. (4) Good resultant tongue-consciousness accompanied by neutral feeling is dependent on the tongue and takes a pleasing taste as object. It arises by means of the water-element immediately after the advertинг mind-element. (5) Good resultant body-consciousness accompanied by ease is dependent on the body and takes a pleasing touch as object. It arises by means of the earth-element immediately after the advertинг mind-element. (6) The receiving state of mind, which is the good resultant mind-element not containing root-causes, and which is accompanied by neutral feeling, arises dependent on the heart. It follows immediately after one of the above five good resultant types of consciousness and takes the same object. (7) The investigating state of mind, which is the good resultant mind-consciousness-element not containing root-causes, and which is accompanied by happiness, arises dependent on the heart and takes one or other of the six pleasant objects. It is named 'investigating' when it follows immediately after the good resultant receiving mind-element; or it is named 'retention' when it follows immediately after impulsion. (8) The investigating state of mind, which is the good resultant mind-consciousness-element not containing root-causes, and which is accompanied by neutral feeling, arises dependent on the heart and takes one or other of the six pleasant objects. It is named 'investigating' when it follows immediately after the good resultant receiving mind-element not containing root-causes; it is named 'retention' when it follows immediately after impulsion; it is named 'passive state' when it follows immediately after retention; it is named 'death' at the decay of the passive state; it is named 'rebirth' when it follows immediately after the moment of death; or it is named 'passive state' when it follows immediately after rebirth.

There are eight resultant states of mind containing root-causes in the sphere of sense pleasures: (1) the spontaneous state accompanied

by happiness and associated with knowledge, (2) the similar prompted state, (3) ... (8). They arise always dependent on the heart and take one or other of the six pleasant objects. They are named 'retention' when they follow immediately after impulsion; they are named 'passive state' when they follow immediately after retention; they are named 'death' at the decay of the passive state; they are named 'rebirth' when they follow immediately after the moment of death; or they are named 'passive state' when they follow immediately after rebirth.

There are five resultant states of mind in the sphere of pure form: (1) the first stage of contemplation with initial thought, sustained thought, joy, ease, and one-pointedness, (2) ... (5). They arise always dependent on the heart and take earth, etc., as meditation objects. They are named 'passive state' when they follow immediately after impulsion; they are named 'death' at the decay of the passive state; they are named 'rebirth' when they follow immediately after the moment of death; or they are named 'passive state' when they follow immediately after rebirth.

There are four resultant states of mind in the formless sphere: (1) the sphere of unlimited space, (2) ... (4). They arise independent of the heart, and take as object respectively: (1) the space obtained by removing a meditation object, (2) ... (4). They are named 'passive state' when they follow immediately after impulsion; they are named 'death' at the decay of the passive state; they are named 'rebirth' when they follow immediately after the moment of death; or they are named 'passive state' when they follow immediately after rebirth.

There are four states of mind which are transcendental fruits: (1) the fruit of stream-attainment, (2) ... (4). Of these the fruit of stream-attainment arising immediately after the path is always dependent on the heart. The other three are dependent on the heart or independent of it. All four take Nibbāna as object; and when they first appear immediately after the path they are named 'the emptiness deliverance', 'the signless deliverance', or 'the desireless deliverance'.

There are seven bad resultant states of mind: (1) Bad resultant eye-consciousness accompanied by neutral feeling is dependent on the eye and takes an unpleasant visible form as object. It arises by means of light immediately after the advertiring mind-element. (2) ... (4). (5) Bad resultant body-consciousness accompanied by pain is dependent on the body and takes an unpleasant touch as object. It arises by means of the earth-element immediately after the advertiring mind-element. (6) The receiving state of mind, which is the bad resultant mind-element not containing root-causes, and which is accompanied by neutral feeling, arises dependent on the heart. It follows immediately after one of the above five bad resultant types of consciousness and takes the same object. (7) The investigating state of mind, which is the bad resultant mind-consciousness-element not containing root-causes, and which is accompanied by neutral feeling, arises dependent on the heart and takes one or other of the six unpleasant objects. It is named 'investigating' when it follows immediately after the bad resultant receiving mind-element not containing root-causes; it is named 'retention' when it follows immediately after impulsion; it is named 'passive state' when it follows immediately after retention; it is named 'death' at the decay of the passive state; it is named 'rebirth' when it follows immediately after the moment of death; or it is named 'passive state' when it follows immediately after rebirth.

*The twenty inoperative states of mind.* There are eleven inoperative states of mind in the sphere of sense pleasures. Three of these do not contain root-causes: (1) The mind-element accompanied by neutral feeling which advertises to the doors of the five senses is dependent on the heart, and arises immediately after the passive state. It takes one or other of the five objects, and precedes the five types of sense-consciousness. (2) The mind-consciousness-element accompanied by happiness which produces the smile of the Arahant is always dependent on the heart. It takes one or other of the six objects at the mind-door, and follows immediately after the advertiring mind-consciousness-element. (3) The advertiring mind-consciousness-element accompanied by neutral

feeling arises dependent on the heart or independent of it. It is named 'adverting' when it follows immediately after the passive state; or it is named 'determining' when it follows immediately after investigation. It takes one or other of the six objects, and it precedes the good, bad, and inoperative impulsive states of mind in the sphere of sense pleasures.

There are eight inoperative states of mind accompanied by root-causes in the sphere of sense pleasures: (1) the spontaneous state accompanied by happiness and associated with knowledge, (2) ... (8). They are dependent on the heart or independent of it, they take one or other of the six objects, and they arise immediately after the advertting mind-consciousness-element.

There are five inoperative states of mind in the sphere of pure form: (1) the first stage of contemplation with initial thought, sustained thought, joy, ease, and one-pointedness, (2) ... (5). They arise always dependent on the heart, immediately after a suitable inoperative state of mind associated with knowledge, and they take earth, etc., as meditation objects. The fifth stage of contemplation also occurs with the six special knowledges.

There are four inoperative states of mind in the formless sphere: (1) the attainment of the sphere of unlimited space, (2) ... (4). They arise dependent on the heart or independent of it, immediately after an inoperative state of mind accompanied by neutral feeling and associated with knowledge. They take as object respectively: (1) the space obtained by removing a meditation object, (2) ... (4).

### *Mental Properties*

There are fifty-two mental properties.

*The mental properties common to all states of mind.* There are seven of these as follows: (1) contact, (2) feeling, (3) perception, (4) volition, (5) one-pointedness, (6) faculty of life, and (7) attention.

*The good mental properties.* The following twenty mental properties do not arise in thirty of the states of mind — the bad states,

and the states not containing root-causes: (1) faculty of faith, (2) faculty of mindfulness, (3) faculty of wisdom, (4) power of moral shame, (5) power of fearing to do evil, (6) non-greed, (7) non-hate, (8) calmness of the body, (9) calmness of the state of mind, (10) lightness of the body, (11) lightness of the state of mind, (12) softness of the body, (13) softness of the state of mind, (14) fitness of the body, (15) fitness of the state of mind, (16) capability of the body, (17) capability of the state of mind, (18) uprightness of the body, (19) uprightness of the state of mind, and (20) neutrality. But wisdom is not obtained in the twelve states dissociated from knowledge, so it does not arise in forty-two of the states of mind.

(21) Compassion and (22) gladness arise at times and separately in twenty states of mind: in the states of mind in the sphere of pure form, with the exception of the fifth stage of contemplation; in the good states of mind accompanied by happiness in the sphere of sense pleasures; and in the inoperative states of mind containing root causes and accompanied by happiness. (23) Right speech, (24) right conduct, and (25) right livelihood arise in the transcendental states of mind. Among the worldly states of mind they also arise at times and variously in the good states in the sphere of sense pleasures.

There are six miscellaneous mental properties: (1) initial thought, (2) sustained thought, (3) joy, (4) the faculty of energy, (5) will, and (6) determination. Among these, initial thought and sustained thought do not arise in thirty-one states of mind: the types of sense-consciousness in two fivefold groups, the three highest states of mind in the sphere of pure form, and all the states of mind in the formless sphere. Joy does not arise in fifty-four states of mind: the states accompanied by unhappiness and those accompanied by neutral feeling, body-consciousness, the fourth stage of contemplation, and the state of mind adverting to the mind-door. Energy does not arise in sixteen states of mind: the resultant states not containing root-causes, and the adverting mind-element. Will does not arise in twenty states of mind: the eighteen states of mind not containing root-causes (comprising the types

of sense-consciousness in two fivefold groups, the three mind-elements, the investigating states, the smiling state, and the determining state), and also the two deluded states of mind. Determination does not arise in eleven states of mind: the types of sense-consciousness in two fivefold groups, and the state of mind with doubt.

*The bad mental properties.* The following four mental properties are common to all bad states of mind: (1) delusion, (2) shamelessness, (3) not fearing to do evil, and (4) restlessness. (5) Greed arises in the eight states of mind accompanied by greed. (6) View arises in the four states of mind associated with view. (7) Conceit sometimes arises in the four states of mind dissociated from view. (8) Sloth and (9) torpor arise in the five prompted states of mind. (10) Hatred arises in the two states of mind with aversion. (11) Envy, (12) stinginess, and (13) worry arise at times and separately in the two states of mind accompanied by unhappiness. (14) Doubt arises in the state of mind accompanied by doubt. These fourteen mental properties are invariably bad.

*The combinations of mental properties.* There are seven mental properties in the two fivefold groups of sense-consciousness; ten in the three mind-elements, and in the two types of rebirth not containing root-causes; eleven in the investigating state accompanied by happiness, and in the determining state; and twelve in the smiling state of mind.

Among the bad states of mind there are fifteen mental properties in the two deluded states; eighteen in the fifth, seventh, and ninth states; nineteen in the first and third; twenty in the sixth, eighth, and tenth; and twenty-one in the second and fourth.

There are thirty mental properties in the fifth stage of contemplation in the sphere of pure form, and in the states of the formless sphere; thirty-one in the resultant and inoperative states of mind accompanied by neutral feeling and dissociated from knowledge, and in the fourth stage of contemplation; thirty-two in the resultant and inoperative states accompanied by neutral feeling and associated with knowledge, in the good state accompanied by neutral feeling and

dissociated from knowledge, in the resultant state accompanied by happiness and dissociated from knowledge, and in the third stage of contemplation; thirty-three in the good and inoperative states accompanied by happiness and dissociated from knowledge, in the good state accompanied by neutral feeling and associated with knowledge, in the resultant state accompanied by happiness and associated with knowledge, and in the second stage of contemplation; and thirty-four in the good and inoperative states accompanied by happiness and associated with knowledge, and in the first stage of contemplation.

The abstinences and the boundless states also arise together. In the transcendental states of mind there are thirty-four mental properties.

### *Nibbāna*

Everlasting, deathless, secure, constant, peaceful, and unformed — having surpassed words the Tathāgata proclaimed Nibbāna.

By this merit may Buddhadatta, released from the fear of dwelling in samsāra, quickly acquire the exalted, blissful dispelling of passion that is free from all intoxication.

Bangkok

R.H.B. Exell

# DOCUMENTS USEFUL FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF PĀLI MANUSCRIPTS OF CAMBODIA, LAOS AND THAILAND

Having been confronted for about ten years by the problems of identification and cataloguing of more than a thousand manuscripts in Pāli in the major European collections, roughly a hundred of which have no apparent title or colophon, I was led to establish, for the lack of anything better, alphabetic cards, listing the beginnings and ends of the texts, the stanzas, when I recognised them, and the visually most obvious passages, for example, the litanies, repetitions, formulae, etc., in the hope of identifying them, or at least putting them in accordance with one another or finding possible concordances with the edited texts.

I thus, during the course of my transcriptions, put together a large collection of documents which could serve to identify the thousands of other Pāli manuscripts still awaiting classification in our libraries and archives of Europe.

In the absence of such elementary tools as alphabetical lists of the Pāli texts written or used in Cambodia, Laos or Thailand, or histories of this Pāli literature, I was led to collect together all the documentation scattered in the various works and articles of our teachers (Finot, Cœdès, Saddhatissa) which have never been indexed but are nevertheless rich in notes and information on those texts, which have until now remained unedited or unknown, in order to be able to make use of a single work of reference, when I had several hundred pages to search through.

“**Documents I**” below constitutes a first attempt at an alphabetical classification of the principal titles or colophons of the texts in the Pāli of Indochina indicated by our philologists from 1917 to 1989.

The editions of the “Institut bouddhique de Phnom Penh”, so precious since they establish texts lost in their original manuscript form, occasionally contain, in the best instances, very long lists of contents that have to be studied from beginning to end to find the desired text.

In "Documents II", I give their classification in alphabetical order to facilitate access to them.

These collected materials now constitute a base of information easy to consult on computer, which will permit a new approach to the Pāli literature of Cambodia, Laos and Thailand.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> English translation by Beatrice Chrystall.

## I

Alphabetical table of titles<sup>2</sup> of Pāli works mentioned in:

**DPLT** H. Saddhatissa, The Dawn of Pali Literature in Thailand, in *Malalasekera Commemoration Volume*, Colombo 1976, chapter 3, pp. 315–24

**NPT** G. Cœdès, Note sur les ouvrages pâlis composés en pays thai, *BEFEO* XV n° 3, Hanoi 1915, pp. 39–46

**PBST** H. Saddhatissa, Pali Buddhist Studies in Thailand today, in *Nyānātiloka Centenary Volume*, Kandy 1978, pp. 31–46

**PLC** H. Saddhatissa, Pali Literature in Cambodia, *JPTS IX*, 1981, pp. 178–97

**PLL** H. Saddhatissa, Pali Literature from Laos, in *Studies in Pali and Buddhism (A Memorial Volume in Honor of Bhikkhu Jagdish Kashyap)*, Delhi 1979, pp. 327–40

**PLT** H. Saddhatissa, Pali Literature of Thailand, in *Buddhist Studies in honour of I.B. Horner*, Dordrecht 1974, pp. 211–25

**RLL** L. Finot, Recherches sur la littérature laotienne, *BEFEO* XVII n° 5, Hanoi 1917, pp. 42–83

**RME** G. Cœdès, Rapport sur une mission d'études philologiques et archéologiques au Cambodge, *BEFEO* XII, Hanoi 1912, pp. 176–79

**RPA** G. Cœdès, Une recension pâlie des annales d'Ayuthya, *BEFEO* XIV n° 3, Hanoi 1914, pp. 1–31

**SPLT** H. Saddhatissa, A Survey of the Pali Literature of Thailand, in *Amalā Prajñā: Aspects of Buddhist Studies (P.V. Bapat Volume)*, Delhi 1989, pp. 41–46

Akkharaginṭhi PLL 337

Akkharasap RLL 63

Atṭhakathā-Caturāga DPLT 318

<sup>2</sup> Pāli texts and titles are reproduced here as they are transcribed by the authors.

Āṭṭhakathā-ṭīkā-Abhidhammāvatāra DPLT 318  
Āṭṭhakathā-ṭīkā- Vinaya DPLT 318  
Āṭṭhasaṅgīti-akharasamśodhana SPLT 44  
Āṭṭhasālinī Atthayojanā SPLT 41  
Addhabhāgabuddharūpanidāna NPT 46, SPLT 44  
Atthayojanā-Samantapāsādikā NPT 41, PLT 213–15  
Atthayojanā-Abhidhamma NPT 41, PLT 213–15  
Anāgatabuddhavāṇsa PLC 192  
Anāgatavāṇsa DPLT 318, RLL 65  
Anuṭīkā Hiṅgadhamma DPLT 318  
Anuruddhasutta PLL 334  
Abhidhamma cet kambī PLL 329  
Abhidhammatthavibhāvinī pañcika-Atthayojanā SPLT 41  
Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha RLL 52  
Abhidhammasaṅgaha DPLT 318  
Amatarasadhbārā PLC 181  
Amarakatabuddharūpanidāna NPT 46, PLT 213, SPLT 44  
Arindamajātaka PLL 330  
Aruṇavatī PLL 335  
Aruṇavatīsutta RLL 42  
Aruṇavatti DPLT 318  
Alambusājātaka RLL 50  
Asokadhammarājanibbāna PLL 337  
Ākaravattasutta PLL 334, RLL 58  
Ādikamma PLC 182  
Ānandanibbāna RLL 66  
Ānisamṇsa PLC 185, RLL 73  
Iti pi so ... RLL 58  
Indasāva PLC 185  
Uṇhassavijaya RLL 74–76  
Uṇhassavijayajātaka PLL 335  
Uppātasanti NPT 39  
Uppātasantipakaraṇa RLL 60

Uppālasanti SPLT 45  
Ovādānusāsanā PLC 183  
Kaccāyanarūpadipanī RME 177, NPT 41, PLT 214  
Kaccāyanasāra RLL 61  
Kaccāyanasārasaṁvāṇṇanā RLL 61  
Kathāvatthu Atthayojanā SPLT 41  
Kaṭhinānisamṣakathā PLC 187  
Kavikaṇṭhābhāraṇa RLL 63  
Kāyanagara PLC 186  
Kārakanyāsa RLL 62  
Kāvyasāravilāsinī RLL 63  
Kusaladhammadhavinicchayakathā PLL 336  
Kesadhātu RLL 69  
Khuddhasikkhā yojanā RME 178  
Gaṇṭhidipanī (Pātimokkha) NPT 41, PLT 214  
Ganthasāra PLT 215, SLPT 43  
Ganthābhāraṇā NPT 41, PLT 218, SPLT 43  
Ganthabhāraṇaṭīkā SPLT 43  
Gandhaghātakajātaka PLL 333  
Gavampattisutta RLL 66  
Gāthālokaneyya PLC 189  
Govindasutta RLL 42  
Cakkavāḍadipanī PLT 217, SPLT 45  
Cakkānavuttijātaka PLL 333  
Cakkhānavuttipāpasutta PLL 333  
Catupārisuddhasīla PLC 182  
Catubhāṇavāra PLC 184  
Caturārakkhā PLC 184, PLL 335  
Caturāśītidhammadakkhandhasahassasaṁvāṇṇanā PLL 337  
Catuvīsatisutta RLL 59  
Candagādhajātaka PLL 329  
Candapajjotajātaka RLL 49  
Candabrahmaṇajātaka RLL 49

Candasamuddajātaka RLL 49  
Candasuriyakumārajātaka RLL 50  
Cariyāpiṭaka DPLT 318  
Cāmadevīvāmsa NPT 43, PLT 213, SPLT 43  
Citraganṭhidīpanī RLL 71  
Cundasūkarikasutta PLL 334, RLL 72  
Cullaṭīkāvisuddhimaggā PLC 187  
Culladhammapālajātaka RLL 44  
Cullapāramī RLL 72  
Cūlayuddhakāravāmsa PLT 220  
Cūlārājaparitta PBST 39  
Cūlasaddhammasaṅgaha SPLT 44  
Cetanabheda PLL 334, RLL 72  
Cetanabhedavaṇṇanā PLL 339  
Chandavuttivilāsinī RLL 63  
Jakkhaṇabhidhamma DPLT 318  
Jambudipasaṅgītiniddesa RPA 4  
Jambupatisutta PLC 189, PLT 222, RLL 66  
Jātattaginidāna PLL 340  
Jinakālamālinī NPT 45, PLL 336  
Jinakālamālīpakaraṇa DPLT 317, RME 178, RPA 4, PLT 215, SPLT 44  
Jinaguyhadhātu RLL 70  
Jinālāñkāra DPLT 318  
Timśāpāramī PLL 336  
Tinṇakavatthu PLC 187  
Tilakkhaṇasuttasaṅgaha PLL 329  
Tilokadīpanī PLL 336  
Tilokavinicchaya PLC 187  
Traiphum RLL 71  
Trailokaviniścaya PLC 187  
Trailokyavinicchayakathā RLL 71  
Dantadhātu RLL 69

Dabbanibbāna RLL 66  
Dasa-anāgatabuddhavāmaṇsa PLL 337  
Dasapuññakiriyavatthu PLC 185  
Dasabodhisatta-uddesa PLC 192  
Dasavatthu PLC 185  
Dasavarañāṇabuddhābhiseka PLL 334  
Dibbamanta RLL 59 (= Khandhaporita)<sup>3</sup>  
Dibbamantasutta PLL 339  
Dukammajātaka PLL 329  
Devadūtasutta RLL 42  
Devadhitapañhā PLL 335  
Dvesīsajātaka PLL 330  
Dhammakkhandha (84,000 Tipiṭaka units) RLL 76  
Dhammajātaka DPLT 318  
Dhammadāyāda RLL 42  
Dhammadāsajātaka RLL 50  
Dhammadesanāpāda RLL 72  
Dhammapada DPLT 318  
Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā NPT 40, RLL 71  
Dhammapadasuttasaṅgaḥatilakkhaṇavinicchaya PLL 329  
Dhammanahākathā DPLT 318  
Dhammasaṁvega RLL 72  
Dhammasaṅganī-Mātikathasarūpa SPLT 42  
Dhammasaṅgaṇīmātikā RLL 57  
Dhammasavane RLL 50  
Dhammikapaṇḍitajātaka PLL 334  
Dhammikarājājātaka RLL 50  
Dhātukathā Atthayojanā SPLT 41  
Dhātvāhāra RLL 62  
Nandakumāra PLL 329  
Nandasutta PLL 333

---

<sup>3</sup> The 4th sutta of *Sattaparitta* does not correspond to P.S. Jaini's ed.

Niddesanyāsasaṅgaha PLL 327

Nibbāna, fortress of crystal RLL 77

Nibbānasutta PLL 332

Nirutti RLL 77

Paṁsukūladānāniśaṁsakathā PLC 192

Pañcagatidīpanī PLC 186–87

Pañcappakaraṇaṭṭhakathā PLT 214

Pañcabuddhabhyākaraṇa PLC 192

Paññāpāramī RLL 72

Paññāsaṅgaha PLC 188, RLL 44

Patipattisaṅgaha RME 178

Paṭhamamullamūlīṭikā RLL 77

Paṭṭhana Atthayojanā SPLT 41

Pathamasambodhi PLC 180, NPT 41, RME 177, PLT 218, SPLT 44, PLL 335–36

Padakkamayojanāsaddatthabhedacintā SPLT 42

Papañcasūdanī DPLT 318

Pabbajjāniśaṁsa PLL 335

Paritta RLL 52–55

Parinibbānasutta PLL 329

Pavaranahaṁsaṅgātaka PLL 332

Pādalakkhaṇagāthā = yassa pādesu jātāni dve cakkāni mahesino RLL 57

Pāramidīpanī RLL 72

Pārileyyaka DPLT 323

Pālimuttakavinayavinicchayavinayasaṅgahaṭīkā RLL 51

Pālileyyaka DPLT 323

Pāleyayaka DPLT 318

Puggalapaññatti Atthayojanā SPLT 41

Puṇṇakaseṭṭhijātaka RLL 50

Pet mun RLL 76

Praya Tham jātaka RLL 50

Praya Sankasayaṅgātaka RLL 50

Poraṇasaṅgaha PLL 327

Phra Malai RLL 65  
Balasaṃkyā RLL 72  
Balasaṃkyājātaka RLL 49  
Bārāṇasirājajātaka PLL 338  
Bālasaṅkhyājātaka PLL 331  
Bāhumiṭikā PLC 190  
Bāhumiṣa / Bāhumiṣa-cintāmaṇiratana PLC 190  
Bāhumiṣahassa PLC 191  
Bimbātherījātaka RLL 49<sup>4</sup>  
Bimbādevī PLC 181  
Bimbānibbāna RLL 66  
Bimbābhilābhavaṇṇanā PLC 181  
Bimbābhilāyasutta PLC 181  
Buddhaguṇa RLL 72  
Buddhaghosanidāna PLT 214  
Buddhajayamaṅgala PLC 191  
Buddhalakkhaṇa PLT 221  
Buddhavāmsa DPLT 318, RLL 42  
Buddhānussatti RLL 72  
Buddhāpadāna PLL 328  
Buddhābhiseka PLL 334  
Buddhābhisekagāthā RLL 57, 58  
Bojjhaṅgapāṭhabhāvanā PLC 184  
Bodhipakkhiyādhammā RLL 72  
Brahmadattajātaka RLL 50  
Bhayaratjātaka RLL 49  
Bhikkhupātimokkhaganṭhidipanī SPLT 41  
Maṅgala-aṭṭhatthasāra-aṭṭhakathā PLC 186  
Maṅgalagāthā RLL 58–59  
Maṅgalatthadipanī PLT 217, DPLT 317, SPLT 42  
Maṅgaladipanī NPT 39, RME 177, RLL 71

<sup>4</sup> Colophon: yasondarāya bhikkhuṇīya parinibbānavanṇanā niṭhitā

Mañgalavivāha PLC 180  
Madhuratthapakāsini PLC 190  
Madhuratthapurāṇavilāsini DPLT 318  
Manorathapūraṇi DPLT 318  
Malai Pothisat RLL 65  
Malai Mun RLL 65  
Malai Sen RLL 65  
Mahākappalokasañthānapaññatti PLC 186  
Mahākalpa DPLT 318  
Mahākassapattheraparinibbānakathā PLL 336  
Mahākassapanibbāna RLL 66  
Mahākumāsānphalaparitta PLC 190  
Mahācakkavālaparitta PLC 190  
Mahājambupatisarājā PLC 189  
Mahādibbamanta PLC 191  
Mahānidāna DPLT 318, PLL 336  
Mahābuddhaguna PLC 186  
Mahāmoggallānaparinibbānavatthu PLL 337  
Mahāyuddhakāravāmsa PLT 220  
Mahāratanabimbaṇavāmsa PLC 181  
Mahārājapabbam PLC 189  
Mahārājaparitta PBST 39  
Mahāvipāka PLC 182, PLL 334  
Mahāvessantara-āṭṭhakathā PLC 188–89  
Mahāsampiṇḍitanidāna PLC 181  
Mahāsaddanīta RLL 62  
Mahāsāriputtanibbānasutta PLL 336  
Mātikatthasarūpa-Dhammasaṅganī SPLT 42  
Mālikā PLL 329  
Mālikājātaka RLL 50  
Māleyyatherasutta PLT 215  
Milindaṭṭikā PLC 190  
Milindapañha DPLT 318

Milindapañhaṭikā RME 178  
Mukhamatthakathā PLT 220  
Mūlakaccāyanayojanā SPLT 43  
Mūlakammaṭṭhāna PLL 328  
Mūlakittijātaka PLL 333  
Mūlasāsana PLT 216  
Metteyyasutta PLL 328, RLL 65  
Yamaka Atthayojanā SPLT 41  
Yasasassatha PLC 187  
Yokappakko Ācāriya PLL 335  
Yogāvacara RLL 77  
Yojanāsamāsa PLC 188  
Ratanabimbaṇaṁsa NPT 46, PLT 213  
Ratanabimbaṇasapakaraṇavaṇṇanākathā SPLT 43  
Ratanamālā = Liṅgatthavivaraṇa RLL 62  
Ratanamālābhidhāna RLL 62  
Ratasutta RLL 60  
Rassisiṅga = Alambusājātaka RLL 50  
Rāmaññasamaṇavamsa PLT 221  
Rāhulaparittā RLL 59  
Laṅkādīpacatutthavārasaṅgahaniddesa RPA 4  
Liṅgatthavivaraṇa = Ratanamālābhidhāra RLL 62  
Līnatthapakāsana RLL 62  
Līnatthappakāsinī DPLT 323, RLL 62  
Līnatthavisodhanī RLL 62  
Lem luon RLL 76  
Lokadīpanī PLT 217  
Lokadvipa PLL 336  
Lokapaññatti DPLT 318  
Lokavidū PLL 334  
Lokavinaya PLL 331  
Lokasaṇṭhānajotaratatanaganṭhi RLL 71  
Lokipaṇṇasajātaka PLT 221

Lokūpapatti DPLT 318  
 Lohagoṇajātaka PLL 333  
 Vajirabodhiṭkā RLL 51  
 Vajirasāratthasaṅgaha PLT 216  
 Vajirasāratthasaṅgahaṭikā SPLT 43  
 Varavarnsajātaka PLL 338  
 Vākyasāravilāsinī RLL 62  
 Vāmadantadhātusutta PLL 328, RLL 69  
 Vijayajātaka = Si Vixai RLL 49  
 Vijādhara = Vijñādhammajātaka PLC 188  
 Vijñādhammajātaka = Vijādhara PLC 188  
 Vidagdhamukhamanḍanāṭikā RME 178  
 Vidadhimukhamanḍanāṭikā = Vidagdhamukhamanḍanāṭikā RME 178  
 Vinai rom RLL 52  
 Vinayakiccavicaraṇa RLL 52  
 Vinayapadayojanā RLL 52  
 Vinayavinicchaya RLL 52  
 Vinayasāṅgaha RLL 51  
 Vuttivyākhyā RLL 62  
 Vuttodaya aṭṭhakathā RLL 63  
 Vuttodayayojanā RLL 63  
 Vemativinodanī RLL 61  
 Velāmajātaka PLC 192  
 Vessantarajātaka RLL 44<sup>5</sup>  
 Vessantaradīpanī NPT 41, PLT 217, SPLT 42  
 Saṃpiṇḍitamahānidāna PLC 180, PLL 336  
 Samvegavatthu RLL 72  
 Sakkapabbam PLC 189  
 Saṅkhittovāda RLL 72

<sup>5</sup> 6 chapters are found independently: Dasavara, Himavanta, Vanappavesana, Jūjaka, Mahāvana, Kumāra; the gāthā also can be independent: gāthā Jūjaka, Vana<sup>o</sup> and the abridged story Mahājāti rom

Saṅkhepa-athajotanī PLT 218  
Saṅkhepatthajotanī Visuddhimaggacūlaṭīkā PLC 188  
Saṅkhyāṭīkā SPLT 43  
Saṅkhyāpakāsaka PLT 217, NPT 39  
Saṅkhyāpakāsakaṭīkā SPLT 45  
Saṅkhyāpakāsakadīpanī SPLT 42  
Saṅgītikathā PLC 183  
Saṅgītivāṇīsa RPA 4, PLT 219, RME 178, SPLT 44  
Saṅsāravattajātaka RLL 49  
Sattamaṅgalagāthā RLL 59  
Saddatthabhedacintā RLL 61  
Saddatthabhedacintāpadakkamayojanā SPLT 42  
Saddatthabhedāvātara RLL 62  
Saddabindu PLT 215, RLL 61, 62  
Saddabindu-abhinavatīkā SPLT 43  
Saddabinduṭīkā RLL 61  
Saddabinduvitṭīhāratīkā RLL 62  
Saddabheda RLL 61  
Saddasaṅgaha RLL 52  
Saddasutta = Sut Satta = Kaccāyana RLL 57  
Saddavācakalakkhaṇa RLL 62  
Saddavidhānalakkhaṇa RLL 62  
Saddavidhānalakkhaṇatīkā RLL 62  
Saddavimala RLL 62  
Saddavisesana RLL 62  
Saddavuttipakāsaṭīkā RLL 62  
Saddhammasaṅgaha PLT 212, RPA 4, NPT 43, SPLT 44  
Sandhikappa RLL 57  
Sappurisasutta PLL 328  
Sabbapāramī RLL 72  
Sabbasutta RLL 50  
Samantapāsādikā DPLT 318  
Samantapāsādikā-athayojanā SPLT 41

Samāśarūpadīpanī PLC 188  
 Sammohavinodanī Athayojanā SPLT 41  
 Sambhamittajātaka PLL 330  
 Sarākarivijāsutta PLL 339  
 Sarātthasaṅgaha NPT 40, SPLT 42  
 Salākarivijasutta PLL 335  
 Sāratthadīpanī DPLT 318  
 Sāratthapakāsinī DPLT 318  
 Sāratthasaṅgaha RLL 62, 72  
 Sārasaṅgaha DPLT 318  
 Sāriputtanibbāna RLL 66  
 Sārīrakavinicchaya DPLT 318  
 Sāsanasobhaṇa PBST 39  
 Sāsanavaṇṇa NPT 39  
 Sāsanāyuppakaraṇa PLC 183  
 Siṅgālasutta RLL 42  
 Siṅguttara RLL 69  
 Siñjayajātaka RLL 50  
 Sinnorathapakāsinī DPLT 318  
 Sivijayajātaka PLC 189  
 Sihīṅganidāna PLT 213, NPT 43, SPLT 43  
 Sīmāsankaravinicchaya SPLT 41  
 Silajātaka = Sīlavimāṃsaka° or Sīlavanāga° PLC 188  
 Sīhagati RLL 62  
 Suet mon (Paritta) RLL 54  
 Sut RLL 53  
 Sut iti pi so RLL 58  
 Sut catuvīk RLL 59  
 Sut Tippamona = Dibbamanta RLL 59  
 Sut Pothisat RLL 57<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> bhagavato rūpakāyathomanā buddhābhisekagāthā

Sut Banton RLL 58–59  
Sut Sadda RLL 61  
Sut Son = Sandhikappa RLL 57  
Suttaniddesa RLL 61  
Suttantimātikā = Dhammasaṅganimātikā RLL 57  
Suttasaṅgaha PLL 328, RLL 50  
Sudhanajātaka PLL 329  
Suddhakammajātaka PLC 188  
Suddhantaparivāsa PLC 183  
Sunandarājajātaka RLL 50  
Sunandarājasutta PLL 333  
Subodhālānkara RLL 63  
Subhamittajātaka PLL 330  
Sumaṅgalavilāsinī DPLT 318  
Surindakumārajātaka RLL 50  
Surindajambujātaka RLL 50  
Suriyavamśasahamśajātaka PLL 332  
Suvaṇṇacakkajātaka RLL 50  
Suvaṇṇajātaka PLL 331  
Suvaṇṇabrahmajātaka PLL 332  
Suvaṇṇameghajātaka PLL 332, RLL 50  
Suvaṇṇamukhajātaka RLL 49  
Suvaṇṇasirasājātaka PLL 338  
Suvaṇṇahamśa PLL 330  
Suvaṇṇahamśajātaka PLL 332  
Sotabbamālinī PLT 219  
Sodattakimahānidāna PLL 335  
Soḷasamaṅgalaparitta PLC 190

## II

**Index of Bhāṇavārapālī**  
 (Institut bouddhique edition, Phnom Penh 1936)

Contents in alphabetical order: titles, beginnings and endings of texts, stanzas and significant passages (except the *Bhikkhupātimokkha*). References are to pages.

**beg.** = beginning; **end.** = ending; **mid.** = middle of texts.

aggato ve pasannānam aggam dhammam vijānatam agge buddhe  
 pasannānam dakkhiṇeyye anuttare 105, beg. **Aggappasāda-sutta**  
**Aggappasādasutta**

aggato ve pasannānam | la | aggappatto pamodatī ti 117, only stanza  
**Aggappasādasutta**

**Aggappasādasutta** 394

**Aggappasādasutta** 105, 117

**Aggappasādasuttanidhikāṇḍa** 117

**Aggappasādasuttappakāsana** 394

agghiuttamukhā yaññā sāvitti chandaso mukham rājā mukham  
 manussānam nadinām sāgaro mukham 111, beg.  
**Keñiyānumodanāgāthā**

aggeyeva pasādattham tam suttantam bhañmase 394, end.  
**Aggappasādasuttappakāsana**

**Āngulimālaparittapubbaka** 20, 56

**Āngulimālaparittappakāsana** 20

aññamaññassa ujuvipaccanikavādā bhagavantam piṭhitō piṭhitō  
 anubandhā honti bhikkhusaṅghañ ca 269, end. **Sūtra**

aññena pariyāyena veneyye sampabodhayam 375, beg. **Guhaṭṭhaka-sutta**  
**Aggappasādasutta**

**Āṭhaṅgikamaggagāthā** 358

atitam nāndāgameyya nappaṭīkaikhe anāgatam yadatitampahinantam  
 102, beg. **Bhaddekarattagāthā**

attam nirattam na hi tassa atthi addhosi so ditṭhim idh' eva sabban ti  
 378, end. **Duṭṭhaṭṭhakasutta**

attamanā te bhikkhū bhagavato bhāsitam abhinandun ti 130, end.

**Dasadhammasuttapāṭha**; 139, end. **Mettānisamśasutta-pāṭha**; 195, end. **Āṭānāṭiyasuttapāṭha** (pacchimabhāga);  
 249, end. **Mahāsatipaṭṭhānasuttapāṭha**; 286, end.

Pahānabhāvanasutta; 290, end. Dhammaniyāmasutta; 294, end. Apaññakasutta; 316, end. Balasutta; 331, end. Chanissāraṇiyadhātusutta; 332, end. Sārāṇiyadhammasutta; 341, end. Sāvatthiniidāna ādittapariyāyasutta; 345, end. Bhikkhu-aparihāniyadhammasutta; 357, end. Maggavibhaṅgasutta; 372, end. Dasanāthakarāṇadhammasutta; 383, end. Paṭhamamarāṇassatisutta; 387, end. Dutiyamarāṇassatisutta

attamanā te licchavī bhagavato bhāsitam abhinandun ti 343, end.

**Licchavi-aparihāniyadhammasutta**

attamanā mahāpajāpati gotamī bhagavato bhāsitam abhinandī ti 366, end. **Gotamisutta**

attamano āyasmā ānando bhagavato tāsitaṁ abhinandī ti 284, end.

**Karaṇīyākaraṇīyasuttapāṭha**

atha kho bhagavā tassā rattiyā accayena bhikkhū āmantesi 182, beg.

**Āṭānātiyāsuttapāṭha (pacchimabhāga)**

atthapparahitam jātam parittantambhaṇāmahe 58, end. **Abhaya-parittappakāsana**

atthi imasmīm kāye kesā lomā nakhā dantā taco | māṃsaṁ nahārū 127, beg. **Dvattimśākārapāṭha**

atthi kho tena bhagavatā jānatā passatā arahatā sammāsambuddhena 286, beg. **Byākatābyākatavatthuddaya**; 296, beg.

**Satipaṭṭhānapāṭha**; 308, beg. **Caturappamaññāpāṭha**; 311, beg. **Abhiññappaccavekkhaṇāpāṭha**; 317, beg. **Chalabhiññāpāṭha**; 367, beg. **Navāghātavatthuparidīpaka-pāṭha**; 368, beg. **Navāghātappaṭṭivinayaparidīpaka-pāṭha**; 388, beg. **Khandhavibhajanāpāṭha**; 391, beg.

**Rūparūpakkammaṭṭhānapāṭha**

atthi paṭṭiccasamuppānnā arūpino dhammā ime dhammā kusalā 269, end. **Dhammasaṅgañī** (7 lines)

atthippaccayo nathipaccayo vigatappaccayo avigatappaccayo 101, 272 end. **Paṭṭhānamātikāpāṭha, Mahāpaṭṭhāna** (7 lines)

atthi loke silaguno saccam̄ soceyyanuddayā 45, beg. **Chaṭṭhamā Vāṅgakāparitta**

adissamanā manujehi nātā tasmā hi ne rakkhatha appamattā 114, end.

**Devatābhismammantanagāthā**

Adhikaraṇasamathuddesa 499

Anattalakkhaṇasutta 85

anāgāmiphalasacchikiriyāya paṭipanno arahā arahattaphalasacchikiriyāya paṭipanno ti | (ayam khandhappaññattāti chavidhena vibhaggam puggalappaññattippakaraṇam nāma samattam) 437, end. **Puggalappaññatti** (3 pages)

aniccā vata saṅkhārā uppādavayadhammino uppajjivtā nirujjhanti tesam  
rūpasamo sukho | 396, beg. **Samvejanīyagāthā**

Aniyatuddesa 461

aniyato paṭipannako phale ṭhito arahā arahattāya paṭipanno 270, end.

**Puggalapāññatti** (7 lines)

anuttaram abhisambodhiṃ sambujjhitvā tathāgato pathamam yam  
adesesi dhammacakkam anuttaram 67, beg. **Dhammacakk-  
ppavattanasuttappakāsana**

Anuttarasuttappakāsana 320

Anuttariyasutta 321

anuppannāsavānam ve anuppādāya ādito 303, beg. **Catuppaccaya-  
ppaccavekkhaṇapāṭhappakāsana**

Anumodanāvidhipakabyānumodanā 109

anulomapaññicaka 438

anekā antarāyāpi vinassantu asesato 2, end. **Sattaparitta**

apaññakappakāsi yo lokatamonudo muni 291, beg. **Apaññaka-  
suttappakāsana**

Apaññakasutta 291

Apaññakasuttappakāsana 291

appativānītā ca padhānasmiṃ vijjā ca vimutti ca khaye nāṇam anuppāde  
nāṇan ti 428, end. **Suttantamātikā**

appamatto mahāviro patto sambodhimuttamam 378, beg.  
**Paṭhamamaranassatisuttappakāsana**

appamādarato nātho appamāde niyojako 383, beg. **Dutiyamaraṇassatisuttappakāsana**

appasannehi nāthassa sāsane sādhu sammate amanussehi cañdehi sadā  
kibbisakāribhi 17, 50, beg. **Āṭānātiyaparittappakāsana**

apekkacce nāmagottam sāvetvā tatthevantaradhāyīmu 182, end.

**Āṭānātiyasuttapāṭha** (pubbabhāga)

abbulhasallo caram appamatto nāsiṃsatī lokam imam parañ cā ti 376,  
end. **Guhaṭhakasutta**

Abhayaparita 58

Abhiññāya kho so bhagavā dhammaṃ deseti no anabhiññāya 278, beg.  
**Gotamacetiyadhammapariyāya**

Abhiñhappaccavekkhaṇapāṭha 311

Abhiñhappaccavekkhaṇapāṭhappakāsana 311

Abhidhamma 269 (abridgement in 3 and a half pages)

Abhidhammatthasaṅgahagāthā 400–16

Abhidhammapiṭaka Dhammasaṅgaṇimātikā 419 (25 lines)

Abhidhammamātikā 419, 427

abhisaññū hitvā abhisaṅkhiptvā ayam vuccati rūpakkhandho 270, end.

**Vibhaṅga** (5 lines)

araham̄ sammāsambuddho uttamam̄ dhammam aijhagā mahāsaṅgham̄  
 pabodhesi icchetam̄ ratanattayaṁ 25, 61, beg. **Ratana-**  
**ttayappakāvābhiyācanagāthā**  
**Ariyadhanagāthā** 96  
**Ariyavamsikasutta** 300  
**Ariyavamsikasuttappakāsana** 300  
 alam̄ attamanatāya alam̄ somanassāya sammāsambuddho bhagavā  
 svākkhāto bhagavatā dhammo supaṭipanno saṅgo ti 278, end.  
**Gotamacetiyadhammapariyāya**  
 assu vasā khelo siṅhānikā lasikā muttam̄ | matthake matthaluṅgan ti  
 127, end. **Dvattim̄sākārapāṭha**  
**Ahirājasuttapāṭha** 136  
 amhe rakkhatu saddhammo sabbe pi dhammacārino vuddhiṁ  
 sampāpuṇeyyāma dhammāriyappavedite 282, end. **Pattidāna-**  
**gāthā**  
 āghātarahito buddho āghātavinaye rato 367, beg. **Navāghātavatthu-**  
**paridīpākāpāṭhappakāsana**  
**Ātānātiyaparitta** 18, 50  
**Ātānātiyaparittappakāsana** 17  
**Ātānātiyasuttapāṭha** (pubbabhāga) 169  
**Ātānātiyasuttapāṭha** (pacchimabhāga) 182  
 āṇakkhettamhi sabbattha sabbadā sabbapāṇinām̄ sabbaso pi nivāreti  
 parittantam bhaṇāmahe 12, end. **Khandhaporittappakāsana**  
**Ādittapariyāyasutta** 90  
**Ādittapariyāyasuttappakāsana** 335  
**Ādiyasuttagāthā** 120  
 āyudo balado dhīro vannado paṭibhānado sukhassa dātā medhāvī sukhām̄  
 so adhigacchati 120, beg. **Bhojanadanumodanāgāthā**  
 āsavā āsaravippayuttā kho pana dhammā sāsavā pi anāsavā pi 422, end.  
**Āsavagocchaka**  
**Āsavagocchaka** 422  
 āsavā dhammā no āsavā dhammā sāsavā dhammā anāsavā dhammā 421,  
 beg. **Āsavagocchaka**  
 icchānuruddharacite abhidhammatthasaṅgahe navame paricchedasmim̄  
 catasso samudāhatā 417, end. **Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha-**  
**gāthā**  
 icchitam̄ patthitam tuyham̄ khippam eva samijjhātu sabbe pūrentu  
 saṅkappā cando paṇṇaraso yathā maṇijotiraso yathā 109, end.  
**Anumodanāvidhi**  
 iti pi so bhagavā araham̄ sammāsambuddho vijjācaraṇasampanno sugato  
 lokavidū anuttaro purisadammasārathi satthā devamanussānam̄

buddho bhagavā ti 106, mid. **Buddhajayamaṅgala**; 267, mid. **Vinaya**

iti h' idam ayasmato koṇḍaññassa aññākoṇḍañño tveva nāmañ ahosī ti 73, end. **Dhammacakkappavattanasutta**

idam pi saṅge ratanam pañitam etena saccena suvatthi hotu 117, end. **Parittakaraṇapāṭha**

idha vassam vasiśsāmi idha hemantagimhisu 278, beg. **Ututtayādi-saṁvegagāthā**

idh' eva nam pasāmsanti pecca sagge pamodatī ti 120, end. **Ādiya-suttaṅgāthā**

indo somā varuṇo ca bhāradvājo pajāpati candano kāmasettho ca 180, 193 stanzas middle **Āṭānāṭiyasuttapāṭha** (pubbabhāga, pacchimabhāga)

indriyayamakan ti dasavidhena vibhattam yamakapparaṇam nāma samattam 431, end. **Yamaka** (3 lines)

imam atthaṅgasamannāgatam buddhapaññattam uposatham imañ ca rattim imañ ca divasam sammadeva abhirakkhitum samādiyāmi 274, end. **Uposathaṅgasamādāna**

imam so parittam katvā moro vāsamakappayi ti 13, 45, end. **Mora-paritta**; 141, end. **Moraparittapāṭha**

imasmiñ ca pana veyyākaraṇasmiñ bhaññamāne tassa bhikkhu-sahassassa anupādāya āsavehi cittāni vimuccimisū ti 94, end. **Ādittapariyāyasutta**

imā kho tena bhagavatā jānatā passatā arahatā sammāsambuddhena catasso appamaññāyo sammadakkhātā ti 309, end. **Catur-appamaññāpāṭha**; 320, end. **Chālabhiññapāṭha**

ime kho tena bhagavatā jānatā passatā arahatā sammāsambuddhena nava dhammā sammadakkhātā navāghātavatthūnī ti 368, end. **Navāghātavatthuparidīpakapāṭha**; 369, end. **Navāghātappaṭivinayaparidīpakapāṭha**

**Isigilisuttapāṭha** 163

ukāsa yo pana bhikkhu dhammānuḍhammappaṭipanno viharati sāmīcippaṭipanno beg. **Bhasitovāda**

ukāsa sirīsakyamunisabbaññubuddhassa balavappaccūsasamaye kusinārāya 263, beg. **Pakasakarāja**

**Ututtayādisaṁvegagāthā** 278

udetayañ cakkhumā ekarāja harissavanṇo papavippakāsotam tam tam namassāmi 13, 44, beg. **Moraparitta**; 141, beg. **Mora-parittapāṭha**

upādānavippayuttā kho pana dhammā upādāniyā pi anupādāniyā pi 425, end. **Upādānagocchaka**

upādānā dhammā no upādānā dhammā upādāniyā dhammā anupādāniyā dhammā 425, beg. **Upādānagocchaka**

Uposathaṅgappaccavekkhaṇa 274

Uposathaṅgasamādāna 273

uposatho ca me upavuttho bhavissati 277, end. **Uposathaṅgappaccavekkhaṇa**

uppannānam veyyābādhikānam vedanānam paṭighātāya abyāpajjhāparamattā yāti 128, **Tam khaṇikappaccavekkhaṇapāṭha**

ekan nāma kiṁ I sabbe sattā āhāratthitikā I dve nāma kiṁ 126, beg. **Sāmaṇerappaññāpāṭha**

etam saraṇamāgama sabbadukkhā pamuccatī ti 103, end **Khemākhemasaraṇagamanaparidīpikāgāthā**

etādisāni katvāna sabbathamaparājītā sabbattha sotthim gacchanti tantesam maṅgalam uttaman ti 6, 37, 132 end. **Maṅgalasutta**

etāpi buddhajayamaṅgala aṭṭhagāthā yo vācano dinadine sarate matandī hitvāna nekavividhāni cupaddavānī mokkham sukham adhigameyya naro sapañño 107, mid. **stanzas Buddhajayamaṅgala**

etena maggena tarīṣu pubbe tarissare ceva taranti co ghanti 299, end.

**Satipaṭṭhānapāṭha**

etena saccavajjena sotthi te hotu sabbadā 95, end. **Saccakiriyāgāthā**

etena saccavajjena sotthi te hotu sabbadā ekasmīm samaye natho moggallānañ ca kassapam gilāne dukkhite disvā 21, mid. **Āṅgulimālaparitta**

evam kho arūpakammaṭṭhānam sammadakkhātam bhagavatā ti 392, end. **Rūparūpakammaṭṭhānapāṭha**

evam mahatthikā esā yadidam puññasampadā tasmā dhīrā pasāmsanti paññitā katapuññatanti 119, end. **Nidhikāṇḍa**

evam saṅkārabhūtesu andhabhūte puthujjane atirocati paññāya sammāsambuddhasāvako ti 105, end. **Dhammakaravādīgāthā**

evamādiguṇupetam 4, 41, end. **Kāraṇīyamettasutappakāṣāṇa**

evamādiguṇupetam anekaguṇasaṅgahañ usathañ ca imam mantam bojjhaṅgantam bhanāmahe 57, end. **Bojjhaṅgaparittapakāṣāṇa**

evam buddham sarantānam dhammam saṅghañ ca bhikkhavo bhayam vā chambhi tattam vā lomahamso na hessatī ti 17, 49, end. **Dhajaggaparitta; 147, end. Dhajaggasuttapāṭha**

evam me sutam ... antarā ca rājagahañ antarā ca nālandam 268, beg. **Sūtra**

evam me sutam ... kapilavatthusmīm mahāvane ... dasahi ca lokadhātūhi devatā yebhuyyena 74, beg. **Mahāsamayasutta**

evam me sutam ... kurūsu ... kammāsadhammam 198, beg. **Mahāsatipaṭṭhānasuttapāṭha**

evam me sutam ... gayāyam ... gayāsise ... cakkhuviññānam ādittam  
cakkhusamphasso āditto ... 91, beg. **Ādittapariyāyasutta**

evam me sutam ... nādike viharati giñjakavasathe 378, beg.  
**Pathamamaranassatisutta;** 383, beg. **Dutiyamaranassati-  
sutta**

evam me sutam ... bārānasiyam ... isipatane ... dve me bhikkhave  
antāpabbajitena 67, beg. **Dhammacakkappavattanasutta**

evam me sutam ... bārānasiyam ... isipatane ... migadāye ... rūpam  
bhikkhave anattā rūpāñ ca hidam bhikkhave attā abhavissa 85,  
beg. **Anattalakkhaṇasutta**

evam me sutam ... rājagahe ... isigilismiñ pabbate 163, beg.  
**Isigilisuttapāṭha**

evam me sutam ... rājagahe ... gijjhakūte pabbate 169, beg.  
**Ātānātiyasuttapāṭha;** 344, **Bhikkhu-aparihāniyadhamma-  
sutta**

evam me sutam ... rājagahe ... veluvane kalandakanivāpe ... āyasmā  
mahākassapo 149, beg. **Mahākassapabojjhāṅgasuttapāṭha**

evam me sutam ... rājagahe ... veluvane kalandakanivāpe ... āyasmā  
mahācundo 153, beg. **Mahācundabojjhāṅgasuttapāṭha**

evam me sutam ... rājagahe ... veluvane kalandakanivāpe ... āyasmā  
mahāmoggallāno 151, beg. **Mahāmoggallānabojjhāṅgasutta-  
pāṭha**

evam me sutam ... vesāliyam ... mahāvane kūṭāgārasālāyam 365, beg.  
**Gotamisutta**

evam me sutam ... vesāliyam ... sārandade cetiye 341, beg. **Licchavi-  
aparihāniyadhammasutta**

evam me sutam ... sāvatthiyam ... jetavane anāthapiṇḍikassa ... atha  
kho aññatarā devatā abhikkantāya rattiya abhikkantavanñā  
kevalakappam ... bahū devā manussā ca maṅgalāni acintayum  
akañkhamānā sotthānam brūhi maṅgalam uttamam 4, 35, 130  
beg. **Maṅgalasutta**

evam me sutam ... sāvatthiyam ... jetavane anāthapiṇḍikassa ... atha  
kho āyasmā ānando 282, beg. **Karaṇīyākaraṇīyasuttapāṭha**

evam me sutam ... sāvatthiyam ... jetavane anāthapiṇḍikassa ... atha  
kho jāṇussoṇi brahmaṇo 346, beg. **Sattabbidhamethuna-  
samyogasutta**

evam me sutam ... sāvatthiyam ... jetavane anāthapiṇḍikassa ... atha  
kho sambahulā bhikkhu ahinā daṭṭho kālakato hoti 136,  
**Ahirājasuttapāṭha**

evam me sutam ... sāvatthiyam ... jetavane anāthapiṇḍikassa ... tatra  
kho bhagavā ... akusalam bhikkhave 285, beg. **Pahāna-  
bhāvanāsutta**

evam me sutam ... sāvatthiyam ... jetavane anāthapiṇḍikassa ... tatra  
 kho bhagavā ... aggappasādā 394, beg. **Aggappasādasutta**

evam me sutam ... sāvatthiyam ... jetavane anāthapiṇḍikassa ... tatra  
 kho bhagavā ... aṭhaṅgikam maggam 354, beg. **Magga-  
 vibhaṅgasutta**

evam me sutam ... sāvatthiyam ... jetavane anāthapiṇḍikassa ... tatra  
 kho bhagavā ... apannakappaṭipadā 291, beg. **Āpanṇakasutta**

evam me sutam ... sāvatthiyam ... jetavane anāthapiṇḍikassa ... tatra  
 kho bhagavā ... ariyavamsā 300, beg. **Ariyavamsikāsutta**

evam me sutam ... sāvatthiyam ... jetavane anāthapiṇḍikassa ... tatra  
 kho bhagavā ... ādittapariyāyam vo bhikkhave 335, beg.  
**Sāvatthīnidānam ādittapariyāyasutta**

evam me sutam ... sāvatthiyam ... jetavane anāthapiṇḍikassa ... tatra  
 kho bhagavā ... uppādā vā bhikkhave 290, beg. **Dhamma-  
 niyāmasutta**

evam me sutam ... sāvatthiyam ... jetavane anāthapiṇḍikassa ... tatra  
 kho bhagavā ... chayimāni bhikkhave 321, beg. **Anuttariya-  
 sutta**

evam me sutam ... sāvatthiyam ... jetavane anāthapiṇḍikassa ... tatra  
 kho bhagavā ... chayime bhikkhave 332, beg. **Sārāṇīya-  
 dhammasutta**

evam me sutam ... sāvatthiyam ... jetavane anāthapiṇḍikassa ... tatra  
 kho bhagavā ... dasa ime bhikkhave dhammā pabbajitena abhiñham  
 paccavekkhitabbā 128, beg. **Dasadhammasuttapāṭha**

evam me sutam ... sāvatthiyam ... jetavane anāthapiṇḍikassa ... tatra  
 kho bhagavā ... nissāraṇīyā dhātuyo 328, beg. **Chanissāraṇīya-  
 dhātusutta**

oghagocchaka 423

oghavippayuttā kho pana dhammā oghaniyā pi anoghaniyā pi 423, end.  
**Oghagocchaka**

oghā dhammā no oghā dhammā oghaniyā dhammā anoghaniyā dhammā  
 oghasampayuttā dhammā 423, beg. **Oghagocchaka**

Kathāvatthu 271, 430, 437

kappaṭṭhāyi mahātejam parittantam bhañāmahe 20, 56, end.  
**Āṅgulimālaparittappakāsana; 44, end. Vaṅgakā-  
 parittappakāsana**

kammaṭṭhānānuyogassa rūpārūpassa lakkhaṇam 391, beg.  
**Rūparūpakkammaṭṭhānapāṭhappakāsana**

karāṇiyamatthakusalena yantam santam padam abhisamecca 10, 41,  
 beg. **Karāṇiyamettasutta; 135, beg. Karāṇiyametta-  
 suttapāṭha**

Karāṇiyamettasutta 10, 40, 41

Karaṇīyamettasuttapāṭha 135  
 Karaṇīyamettasuttappakāsana 10  
 Karaṇīyasuttapāṭha 134  
 Karaṇīyākaraṇīyasuttapāṭha 282  
 Karaṇīyākaraṇīyasuttappakāsana 282  
 kalyāṇam vā pāpakaṁ vā tassa dāyādā bhavissanti tam kut' ettha labbhā  
     ti 314, end. **Abhinhappaccavekkhaṇapāṭha**  
 kāmaṇi kāmayamānassa tassa cetam samijjhati 374, beg. **Kāmasutta**  
**Kāmasutta** 374  
**Kāmasuttappakāsana** 374  
**Kāladānasutttagāthā** 112  
**Kāladānasutttagāthāpakāsana** 112  
 kāle dadanti sappaññā vadaññū vītamaccharā kālena dinnam ariyesu  
     ujubhūtesu tādisu 112, beg. **Kāladānasutttagāthā**  
 kim eva disvā uruvelavāsi pahāsi aggiñ kisakovadāno pucchāmi tam  
     kassapa etam attham 95, beg. **Bimbisārasamāgame**  
     **pucchāpaṭiññāgāthā**  
**kilesagocchaka** 426  
**kilesavippayuttā** kho pana dhammā saṅkilesikā pi 426, end.  
     **Kilesagocchaka**  
 kilesā dhammā no kilesā dhammā saṅkilesikā dhammā asaṅkilesikā  
     dhammā saṅkiliññā dhammā 425, beg. **Kilesagocchaka**  
 kusalā dhammā akusalā dhammā abyākatā dhammā | katame dhammā  
     kusalā | yasmiñ samaye kāmāvacaram 269, beg.  
     **Dhammasaṅgañī**  
 kusalā dhammā akusalā dhammā abyākatā dhammā sukhāya vedanāya  
     sampayuttā dhammā dukkhāya vedanāya sampayuttā dhammā 97,  
     beg. **Dhammasaṅgañīmātikāpāṭha**; 419, beg. **Dhamma-**  
     **saṅgañīmātikā**  
**Keñiyānumodanāgāthā** 111  
 khandhappaññatti āyatanappaññatti dhātupappaññatti 430, beg.  
     **Puggalappaññatti** (3 lines); 434, beg. **Puggalappaññatti** (3  
     pages)  
**Khandharittagāthā** 12  
**Khandharitta-Chaddantaparittāpara** 43  
**Khandharittappakāsana** 11  
**Khandhavibhañga** 431  
 khandhavibhañgo āyatanavibhañgo dhātuvibhañgo saccavibhañgo  
     indriyavibhañgo 428, beg. **Vibhañga** (6 lines)  
 khandhavibhañgo ti attharasavidhena vibhattam vibhañgappakaraṇam  
     nāma samattam 433, end. **Khandavibhañga**  
**Khandhavibhajanapāṭha** 388

**Khandhavibhajanapāṭhappakāsana** 387

khandhavibhāgañānattham pariyāyam bhañāmase 387, end.

**Khandhavibhajanapāṭhappakāsana**

khīñāsavā jutimanto te loke parinibbutā ti 280, end.

**Tilakkhanādigāthā**

**Khemākhemasaranagamanaparidipikāgāthā** 102

gañanāna ca muttānam parittantam bhañāmahe 14, 46, end.

**Dhajaggaparittappakāsana**

**Ganthagocchaka** 422

ganthavippayuttā kho pana dhammā ganthaniyā pi aganthaniyā pi 422, end. **Ganthagocchaka**

ganthā dhammā no ganthā dhammā ganthaniyā dhammā aganthaniyā dhammā 422, beg. **Ganthagocchaka**

girimānandassa so ābādho ahosi ti 163, end. **Girimānanda-suttapāṭha**

**Girimānandasuttapāṭha** 157

**Guhatthakasutta** 375

**Guhatthakasuttappakāsana** 375

**Gotamacetiyadhammapariyāya** 278

**Gotamīsutta** 364

**Gotamīsuttappakāsana** 365

gotamo dhāretu ajjataggo pāñupetam saranam gatan ti 353, end.

**Sattabbiḍhamethunasamyojasuttappakāsana**

**Catujjhānapāṭha** 310

**Catujjhānapāṭhappakāsana** 310

**Catutthabhāñavāra** 169

catunnam rūpajjhānānam bhavitattā samahito 316, beg. **Chal-abhiññapāṭhappakāsana**

**Catuppaccayappaccavekkhañāpāṭha** 304

**Catuppaccayappaccavekkhañāpāṭhappakāsana** 303

**Caturappamaññāpāṭha** 308

**Caturappamaññāpāṭhappakāsana** 308

catūhi vippayogo sabhāgo sabbā pi dhammasaṅgañi dhātukathāya mātikā (nayamātikā ti pañcavidhena vibhattam dhātukathāpakarañam nāma samattam) 434, end. **Dhātukathā** (14 lines)

cattāro dhammā vadḍhanti āyuvanño sukham balam 20, 55, end.

**Āṭānātiyaparitta;** 110, end **Anumodanavidhi**

cattāro 'me paccayā bhagavatā anuññātā cīvarañ ca pindapāto ca senāsanañ ca 304, beg. **Catuppaccayappaccavekkhañāpāṭha**

**Cattidānagāthā** 281

**Candaparittapāṭha** 141

cārittasobhitavisālakulodayena saddhābhivuddhaparisuddhaguṇodayena

**417, beg. Pakaraṇāvasānagāthā**

cittaklesavisuddhattham tam maggantam bhañāmase 296, end.

**Satipaṭṭhānapāṭhappakāsana**

cittappasāduppādattham tam suttantam bhañāmase 320, end.

**Anuttarasuttappakāsana**

Cūlantaraduka 421

Chaddantaparitta 44

Chanissāraṇīyadhātusutta 327

Chanissāraṇīyadhātusuttappakāsana 327

cha paññattiyo khandhappaññatti ayatanappaññatti dhātupappaññatti  
saccappaññatti 270, beg. **Puggalapaññatti**

chaṭaṅgupekkhasaññato sabbaso samvutindriyo 335, beg.

**Ādittapariyāyasuttappakāsana**

Chālabhiññāpāṭha 317

Chālabhiññāpāṭhappakāsana 316

cha ve dappaṭivijjhāyā nissaraṇīya dhātuyo 327, beg.

**Chanissāraṇīyadhātusuttappakāsana**

jayam devamanussānam jayo hotu parājito mārasenā abhikkantā samantā  
dvādasayojanā 59, beg. **Jayaparittappakāsana**

Jayaparitta 60

tam abyākatato dhāretha yam mayā byākatam tam byākatato dhārethā ti  
289, end. **Byākatābyākatavatthuddaya**

tam khaṇikappaccarekkhaṇapāṭha 127

tam tadaṭthappasiddhattham tam suttantam bhañāmase 341, end.

**Licchavi-aparihāniyadhammasuttappakāsana**

tam sampakāsakam dhamma pariyāyam bhañāmase 304, end.

**Catuppaccayappaccavekkhaṇapāṭhappakāsana**

Tatiyabhāṇavāra 157

tato nañ anukampanti mātā puttamva urasam devānukampito poso sadā  
bhadrāni passatī ti i 14, end. **Devatādissa-  
dakkhiṇānumodanāgāthā**

tathāgatam devamanussa pūjitatam saṅgham namassāma suvatthi hotu  
40, end. **Ratanasutta**

tathāgato balappatto loke appaṭipuggalo 314, beg. **Balasutta-  
ppakāsana**

tathāñāñānusārena sāsanam kātumicchatam sadhūnam atthasiddhattham  
tam suttantam bhañāmase 85, end. **Anattalakkhaṇa-  
suttappakāsana**

tathā pahino ca bhagavato so ābādho ahosi ti 155, end. **Mahā-  
cundabojjhāṅgasuttapāṭha**

tatheva patipatyattham pariyāyantam bhañāmase 335, end. āditta-pariyāyasuttappakāsana

tasmā mahattam papponti pāsāmsā ca bhavanti te ti 119, end.

**Saṅgahavatthugāthā**

tasmā saddhañca sīlañcā pasādam dhammadassanam anuyuñjetha medhāvi saram buddhāna sāsanam ti 97 end. 1st § **Ariyadhanagāthā**

tā sampakāsakam dhammapariyāyam bhañāmase 308, end.

**Caturappamaññāpāthappakāsana; 316, end. Chañlabhiññāpāthappakāsana**

tikattikañceva dukaddukañca chapaccanīyānulomamhi nayā sugambirāti (catuvīsatippaccayavasena ayam samantapaññānappakaranñānā niññitā) 441, end. **Paññāna** (1 page)

Tirokuññakāñda 121, 441

tirokuññdesu tiññhanti sandhisiñghātakēsu ca dvārabahāsu tiññhanti āgantvā sakam gharām 121, 441, beg. **Tirokuññakāñda**

Tilakkhaññādigāthā 279

Tisaranagamanapātha 125

te atthaladdhā sukhitā vinūhabuddhasāsane arogā sukhitā hotha saha sabbehi ñatibhi 61, end. **Jayaparitta, 296, end. Supubbaññhasutta**

tena saccena sotthi te hotu sotthi gabbhassa 56, end. **Añgulimālaparitta**

tena samayena buddho bhagavā verañjayam viharati ... verañjo brāhmaño 267, mid. **Vinaya**

te pahāya tare ugham nāvam sitvāva paragū ti 375, end. **Kāmasutta**

te ve kālena paccanti yattha dukkham nirujjhati ti 327, end.

**Anuttariyasutta**

te sabbasañghādhigate pahesi parinibbute vandatha appameyye ti 167, **Isigilisuttapātha**

tesam tathā(!)tthasiddhattham tam suttantam bhañāmase 327, end.

**Chanissārañiyadhatusuttappakāsana**

tesam pakāsakam dhammapariyāyam bhañāmase 311, end. **Abhinappaccavekhaññapāthappakāsana; 367, end. Navāññāvatthuparidipakapāthappakāsana**

Dasadhammasuttapātha 128

Dasanāthakaraññadhammasutta 370

Dasanāthakaraññadhammasuttappakāsana 369

Dasasikkhāpadapātha 126

dasahañgehi samannāgato arahāti ruccatī ti 127, end. **Sāmañera-paññhāpātha**

dassanena pahātabbā dhammā na dassanena pahātabbā dhammā bhāvanāya pahātabbā dhammā na bhāvanāya pahātabbā 426, beg.

**Piṭṭhiduka**

dānañ ca peyyavajjañ ca athacariyā ca yā idha samānattatā ca dhammesu tattha tattha yathārahām 119, beg. **Saṅgahavatthugāthā**

diṭṭhiñ ca anupagamma sīlavā dassanena sampanno kāmesu vineyya gedham na hi jātu gabbhaseyyam punar eti ti 11, 42, end.

**Karaṇiyamettasutta;** 136, end. **Karaṇiyamettasuttapāṭha** diṭṭhippahānasiddhattham tam suttantam bhañāmase 377, end.

**Duṭṭhaṭṭhakasuttappakāsana**

diṭṭhiyā duppahānaya pahānopāyadassinā 376, beg. **Duṭṭhaṭṭhakasuttappakasana**

disvā padam santamanūpadhikam akiñcanam kāmabhāve asattam anaññathā bhāvimanāññaneyyam tasmā na yitthena hute arañjin ti 95, end. **Bimbisārasamāgame pucchāpatiññāgāthā**

dīghayu yasavā hoti yattha yathūpapajjati ti 120, end. **Bhojana-dānumodanāgāthā**

devabhūto manusso vā aggappatto pamodatī ti 396, end. **Aggapasādasutta**

desitam tena buddhena tam suttantam bhañāmase 378, end. **Paṭhamamarañassatisuttappakāsana**

dukkhatālakkhañopāyam tam suttantam bhañāmase 91, end. **Ādittapariyāyasuttappakāsana**

dukkharogabhāyā verā sokā sattū cupaddavā anekā antarayāpi vinassantu ca tejasā 111, beg. **stanzas Visesanumodanā-Maṅgala-cakkavāla**

**Duṭṭhaṭṭhakasutta** 377

**Duṭṭhaṭṭhakasuttappakāsana** 376

**Dutiyabhāñavāra** 149

**Dutiyamarañassatisutta** 383

**Dutiyamarañassatisuttappakāsana** 383

dullabham dassanam yassa sambuddhassa abhiñhaso 73, beg. **Mahāsamayasuttappakāsana**

devakāyappahāsattham tam suttantam bhañāmase 74, end. **Mahāsamayasuttappakāsana**

**Devatādissadakkhiñānumodanāgāthā** 113

**Devatābhīsammantanagāthā** 114

devā pi nam pasāmsanti brahmunāpi pasāmsito ti 303, end. **Ariyavāmsikasutta**

devabhūto manusso vā aggappatto pamodatī ti 105, end. **Aggapasādasutttagāthā**

**Dvattimśākārapāṭha** 127

Dvācattālīsaduka 428  
 Dvādasaparitta 31-74  
 Dhajaggaparitta 14, 46  
 Dhajaggaparittappakāsana 14  
 Dhajaggasutta 14, 46  
 Dhajaggasuttapātha 144  
 Dhammakaravādigāthā 103  
 Dhammacakkappavattanasutta 67  
 Dhammatāravādigāthā 103  
 Dhammaniyāmasutta 289  
 Dhammaniyāmasuttappakāsana 289  
 Dhammasaṅgaṇipakaraṇam nāma samattam 420  
 Dhammasaṅgaṇī 269  
 Dhammasaṅgaṇimātikā 419 (25 lines)  
 Dhammasaṅgaṇimātikāpātha 97  
 dhammassavanakāle ayam bhadantā 1, end. **Sattaparitta**  
 dhammadhadayavibhaṅgoti atthārasavidhena vibhaggam vibhaṅga-  
 ppakaraṇam nāma samattam 429, end. **Vibhaṅga** (6 lines)  
 dhammā ajjhattabahiddhārammaṇā dhammā sanidassanasappaṭighā  
 dhammā anidassanasappaṭighā dhammā anidassanā(!)ppaṭighā  
 dhammā 99, end. **Dhammasaṅgaṇimātikāpātha**; 420, end.  
**Dhammasaṅgaṇimātikā**  
 dhammā lokuttarā dhammā kenaci viññeyyā dhammā kenaci na viññeyyā  
 dhammā 421, end. **Cūlantaraduka**  
 dhammā sa-uttarā dhammā anuttarā dhammā saraṇā dhammā aranā  
 dhammā 427, end. **Piṭṭhiduka**  
 Dhātukathā 270, 429, 433  
 dhātukathāpakaṇam nāma samattam 429, end. **Dhātukathā** (8  
 lines)  
 Nakkhattayakkhabhūtānam 65  
 natthi me saraṇam aññam buddho me saraṇam varam etena saccavajjena  
 hotu te jayamaṅgalam 24, mid. **Sattaparitta**, 54, mid.  
**Āṭānāṭiyaparitta**  
 natthi me saraṇam aññam buddho me saraṇam varam etena saccavajjena  
 sotthi te hotu sabbadā 95, beg. **Saccakiriyāgāthā**  
 namo arahato sambuddhassa mahesino namo uttamadhammassa  
 svākkhātasseva tenidha namo mahāsaṅghassāpi 3, 33, beg.  
**Namokāra atthaka**  
 Namokāra atthaka 3, 33  
 namokārassa tejena vidhimhi homi te jarā 3, end. **Sattaparitta**

namo tassa bhagavato arahato sammāsambuddhassa ... 105, beg.  
**Buddhajayamaṅgala;** 125, **Paṭhamabhāṇavāra;** 272,  
**Buddhanamakārapāṭha**  
 namo tassārahantassa bhagavantassa tādino sammā sāmaṇa va buddhassa  
 dhamme vibhajjavādino namo tass' eva dhammassa 400, beg.  
**Paññāmagāthā**  
 nayamātikā ti pañcavidhena vibhattam dhātukathāpakaraṇam nāma  
 samattam 434, end. **Dhātukathā**  
**Navāghātappatīvinayaparidīpakapāṭha** 368  
**Navāghātavatthuparidīpakapāṭha** 367  
**Navāghātavatthuparidīpakapāṭhappakāsana** 367  
 nāmena vissutam suttam dhammacakkappavattanam veyyākaraṇapāṭhena  
 saṅgītantam bhaṇāmase 67, end. **Dhammacakkappavattana-**  
**suttappakāsana**  
**Nidānuddesa** 451  
 nidhim nidheti puriso gambhīre udakantike atthe kicce samuppanne  
 athāya me bhavissati 117, **Nidhikhaṇḍa**  
**Nidhikhaṇḍa** 117  
**nibbānagamanam maggam khippam eva visodhaye** 279, end.  
**Ututtayādisaṁvegagāthā**  
**nibbānamagguttamo buddho sattānam sampabodhano** 387, beg.  
**Khandhavibhajanapāṭhappakāsana**  
**Nissaggiyuddesa** 462  
**Nīvaraṇagocchaka** 424  
**nīvaraṇavippayuttā** kho pana dhammā nīvaraṇiyā pi anīvaraṇiyā pi 424,  
 end. **Nīvaraṇagocchaka**  
**nīvaraṇā** dhammā no nīvaraṇā dhammā nīvaraṇiyā dhammā anīvaraṇiyā  
 dhammā nīvaraṇasampayuttā 423, beg. **Nīvaraṇagocchaka**  
**Pakatyānumodanā** 109  
**Pakaraṇāvasānagāthā** 417  
**Pakasakarāja** 263  
 pacayavasena tā catuvīsatividhena vibhattam mahāpaṭṭhānappakaraṇam  
 nāma samattam 431, end. **Paṭṭhāna** (8 lines)  
 pañcakkhandhā rūpakkhandho vedanākhandho saññākhandho saṅkhāra-  
 kkhandho viññāṇakkhandho 99, beg. **Vipassanābhūmipāṭha;**  
 269, beg. **Vibhaṇga;** 431, beg. **Khandhavibhaṇga**  
**Pañcasikkhāpadasamādāna** 273  
 paññattikusalo nātho sātthesveva niyojano 294, beg. **Supubbaṇha-**  
**suttappakāsana**  
 paññāvadātaguṇāsobhitalajjhikkhū maññantu puññavibhavodaya-  
 maṅgalāya 418, end. **Pakaraṇāvasānagāthā**

paṭipanno pamokkhan ti jhāyino mārabandhanā ti 358, end.  
**Atṭhaṅgikamaggagāthā**  
 paṭisaṅkhā yoniso cīvaraṁ paṭisevāmi yāvadeva sītassa paṭighātāya  
 127, **Tam khaṇikappaccavekkhaṇpāṭha**  
 Pathamam Maṅgalasuttam 35  
 Pathamamaraṇassatisutta 378  
 Paṭhamamaraṇassatisuttappakāsana 378  
 Paṭṭhāna 431, 440  
 Paṭṭhānamātikāpāṭha 101  
 Paṇāmagāthā 400  
 paṇidhānato paṭṭhāya tathāgatassa dasapāramiyo dasa upapāramiyo  
 dasaparamatthapāramiyo 6, 37, beg. **Ratasuttappakāsana**  
 Pattidānagāthā 281  
 padañ ca īatvā virajam alokam sammappajānātibhavassa pāragū ti 364,  
 end. **Lokadhammasutta**  
 Paramattha 267  
 Parāmāsagocchaka 424  
 parāmāsavippayuttā kho pana dhammā parāmaṭhā pi aparāmaṭhā pi  
 424, end. **Parāmāsagocchaka**  
 parāmāsā dhammā no parāmāsā dhammā parāmaṭhā dhammā  
 aparamaṭhā dhammā 424, beg. **Parāmāsagocchaka**  
 parittam yambhaṇantassa nisinnatthāna dhovanam udakam pi vināseti  
 sabbameva parissayam 20, 56, beg. **Āṅgulimālaparitta-  
 ppakāsana**  
 Parittakaraṇapāṭha 115  
 parittassānubhāvena hantvā tesam upaddave | nakkhattayakkhabhūtānam  
 pāpaggahanivāranā parittasānubhāvena hantvā tesam upaddave 30,  
 65 end. **Maṅgalacakkavāla**  
 Pahānabhāvanāsutta 284  
 Pahānabhāvanāsuttappakāsana 284  
 Pācittiyuddesa 471  
 Pātidesaniyuddesa 489  
 pāṇātipātā veramaṇīsikkhāpadam | adinnādānā veramaṇīsikkhā-  
 padam 126, beg. **Dasasikkhāpadapāṭha**  
 pāṇātipātā veramaṇīsikkhāpadam samādiyāmi 273, beg. **Pañca-  
 sikkhāpadasamādāna, Uposathaṅgasamādāna**  
 Pārādhikuddesa 452  
 Piṭṭhiduka 427  
 Puggalappaññatti 270, 430, 434  
 puggalappaññattīti chavidhena vibhattam puggalappaññattippakaranaṁ  
 nāma samattam 430, end. **Puggalappaññatti** (3 lines)

puggalo upalabbhati sacchikatthaparamatthenā ti 271, beg.  
**Kathāvatthu** (6 lines); 437, beg. **Kathāvatthu** (1 page)  
 puññam ākañkhamānānam sañgho ve yajatam mukham 112, end.  
**Keñyānumodanāgāthā**  
 puññalābhām mahātejam vanñakittimahāyasañ sabbasattahitam jātam  
 tam suñantu asesato 58, beg. **Abhayaparittappakāsana**  
 puññāni paralokasmim patitthā honti pāñinan ti 112, end. **Kāladāna-**  
**suttagāthā**; 397, end. **Samvejanīyagāthā**

**Pubbakarañapubbakicca** 447

**Pubbatopamagāthā** ariyadhanagāthā 96

pūretvā pārami sabbā patto sambodhimuttamam etena saccavajjena mā  
 hontu sabbupaddavā 97, end. 2nd § **Ariyadhanagāthā**

pūrentambodhisambhāre nibbattam vañgajātiyam yassa tejena dāvaggi  
 mahāsattam vivajjai 45, beg. **Vañgakāparittappakāsana**

pūrentambodhisambhāre nibbattam morayoniyam yena sirihitārakkham  
 mahāsattam vane carā 12, 44 beg. **Moraparittappakāsana**

balañ ca bhikkhūnananuppadinnam tumhehi puññam pasutan̄ anappakan  
 ti 122, 443, end. **Tirokuñḍakāñḍa**

**Balasutta** 314

**Balasuttappakāsana** 314

bahum̄ ve sarañam yanti pabbatāni vanāni ca ārāmarukkhacetyāni  
 manussā bhayatajjitā 102, beg. **Khemākhemasaranagamana-**  
**paridīpikāgāthā**

bahutabbhakkho bhavati vippavuttho sakam̄ gharā bahūnam̄ upatiranti  
 yo mittānam̄ na dubbhati 139, beg. **Mettānisamsamsagāthā-**  
**pāṭha**

**bāvisatitikamātikā** 420

bāhum̄ sahassamabhinimmita sāvudhantam̄ grīmekhalam̄ uditaghor-  
 sasenamāram̄ dānādidhammadvidhinā jitavā munindo tante jasā  
 bhavatu te jayamañgalāni 106, beg. **stanzas** **Buddhajaya-**  
**mañgala**

**Bimbisārasamāgame** pucchāpaññāgāthā saccakiriyā 95

buddham̄ sarañam̄ gacchāmi dhammam̄ sarañam̄ gacchāmi sañgham̄  
 sarañam̄ gacchāmi (ter) 125, beg. **Tisarañagamanapāṭha**;  
 272, **Sarañagamanapāṭha**

buddhakiccam visodhetvā parittantam bhañamahe 59, end.  
**Jayaparittappakāsana**

buddhagāthābhigito 'mhi no ce muñceyya candiman ti 142, end.  
**Candimaparittapāṭha**

buddhagāthābhigito 'mhi no ce muñceyya suriyan ti 144, end.  
**Suriyaparittapāṭha**

Buddhajayañgala 106

Buddhanamakārapāṭha 272  
 Buddhapādanamakāragāthā 265  
 buddhā paccekabuddhā athopi buddhasāvakā klesārīhi 300, beg.  
**Ariyavāmsikasuttappakāsana**  
 buddhuppāde sāriputto ye caññe aggasāvakā pattapūrānubhāvena  
 mātāpītā pamuñcare 444, end. *stanzas without title*  
 Bojjhaṅgaparitta 20, 57  
 bojjhaṅgo satisaṅkhāto dhammānam vicayo tathā viriyam pīti passaddhi  
 bojjhaṅgā ca tathāpare 57, beg. **Bojjhaṅgaparitta**  
 Byākatābyākatavatthuddaya 286  
 Byākatābyākatavatthuddayappakāsana 286  
 brahmacārīnamaggo so asamo vekapuggalo 346, beg.  
**Sattabhidhamethunasamyogasuttappakāsana**  
 brahmamantan ti akkhātam parittantam bhañāmahe 13, 44, end.  
**Moraparittappakāsana**  
 Bhaddekarattagāthā 102  
 bhañissāma mayam gāthā kāladanappadīpikā etā suñantu sakkaccam  
 dāyakā puññakāmino 112, only stanza **Kāladānasuttagāthāpākāsana**  
 bhavatu sabbamaṅgalam nakkhattayakkhabhūtānam 29  
 bhavatu sabbamaṅgalam rakkhantu sabbadevatā sabbabuddhānubhavena  
 sadā sotthī bhavantu te 29, 64, mid. **Maṅgalacakkavāla**  
 bhavatu sabbamaṅgalam rakkhantu sabbadevatā sabbasaṅghānubhāvena  
 sadā sotthī bhavantu te 109, end. **Buddhajayamaṅgala**; 111,  
 end. **Visesānumodanā-Maṅgalacakkavāla**  
 Bhāñavāra 4 pathamabhāñavāra 124  
 Bhārasuttagāthā 280  
 bhārā have pañcakhandhā bhārahāro ca puggalo 280, beg. **Bhārasuttagāthā**  
 bhāsitañ tena buddhena apanñakam bhañāmase 291, end. **Apanñakāsuttappakāsana**  
 Bhāsitovāda 259  
 Bhikkhu-aparihāniyadhammasutta 344  
 Bhikkhu-aparihāniyadhammasuttappakāsana 343  
 Bhikkhupātimokkha 451  
 bhuttā bhogā bhatā bhaccā vitiññā āpadāsu me uddhaggā dakkhiñā dinnā  
 atho pañcabali katā 120, beg. **Ādiyasuttagāthā**  
 Bhojanadāññānumodanāgāthā 120  
 Maggavibhaṅgasutta 354  
 Maggavibhaṅgasuttappakāsana 354  
 maggānaṭṭhaṅgiko setṭho saccānam caturo padā 358, beg.  
**Aṭṭhaṅgikamaggagāthā**

maggā hatakkilesā va pattānuppattidhammatā etena saccavajjena sotthi  
te hotu sabbadā 22, end. **Āngulimālaparitta**; 58, end.  
**Bojjhaṅgaparitta**

**Maṅgalacakkavāla** 28, 63, 110

maṅgalatthāya sabbesam̄ tam̄ suttantam̄ bhañāmase 314, end. **Bala-**  
**suttappakāsana**

**Maṅgalasutta** 4, 35

**Maṅgalasuttappakāsana** 3, 33

**Maṅgalasuttapāṭha** 130

**Maraṇassatisutta** 378, 383

**Maraṇassatisuttappakāsana** 378, 383

**Mahantaraduka** 425

**Mahākassapabhojjhaṅgasuttapāṭha** 149

mahākassapassa so abādho ahosi ti 151, end. **Mahākassapa-**  
**bojjhaṅgasuttapāṭha**

mahākāruṇiko nātho athāya sabbapāṇinam̄ pūretvā pāramī sabbā patto  
sambodhim uttamam̄ 97, beg. 2nd § **Ariyadhanagāthā**

mahākāruṇiko nātho sunakkhattam̄ so atthaladdho 23

mahākāruṇiko nātho hitāya sabbapāṇinam̄ 60, beg. **Jayaparitta**;  
108, mid. **stanzas** **Buddhajayamaṅgala**

mahākāruṇiko buddho sāvakānam̄ hitesako 343, beg. **Bhikkhu-**  
**apariyāniyadhammasuttappakāsana**

**Mahācundabojjhāṅgasuttapāṭha** 153

**Mahāpaṭṭhāna** 271

**Mahāmoggallānabojjhāṅgasuttapāṭha** 151

mahāmoggallānassa so abādho ahosi ti 153, end. **Mahāmoggallāna-**  
**bojjhaṅgasuttapāṭha**

**Mahāsatipatthānasuttapāṭha** 196

**Mahāsamayasutta** 74

mahāsamayo pavanasmim̄ devakāyā samāgatā 75, beg. **stanzas**  
**Mahāsamayasutta**

mātā pitā ca atrajam̄ niccam̄ rakkhanti puttakam̄ evam̄ dhammena rājano  
pajam̄ rakkhantu sabbadā 1 10 gāthā 1 28, 63, end.  
**Sukhābhīyācanagāthā**

mūlayamakam̄ khandhayamakam̄ ayatanayamakam̄ dhātuyamakam̄ 430,  
beg. **Yamaka**

mūsikā katā me rakkhā katā me parittā paṭikkamantu bhūtāni soham̄  
namo bhagavato namo sattannam̄ sammasambuddhānan ti 12, 43,  
end. **Khandhaporitta**; 138, end. **Ahirājasuttapāṭha**

mettānisam̄saṅgāthāpāṭha 139

mettānisam̄saṅgasuttapāṭha 138

moraparitta 13, 44

**moraparittapāṭha** 140

**moraparittappakāsana** 12

yaṁ kiñci ratanam̄ loke vijjati vividham̄ puthuratanam̄ saṅghasamam̄  
natthi tasmā sotthī bhavantu te 25, end. **Sattaparitta**

yaṁ yaṁ devamanussānam̄ maṅgalatthāya bhāsitam̄ tassa  
tassānubhāvena hotu rājakule sukham̄ ye ye ārakkhakā devā tattha  
tatthādhivāsino 27, 62, beg. **Sukhābhīyācanagāthā**

yaṁ ve nibbānañānassa ñānam̄ pubbe pavattate 289, beg.  
**Dhammaniyāmasuttappakāsana**

yaṁ so dhammami dhaññāya parinibbātyanāsavo ti 113, end. **Vihāra-  
dānagāthā**

yatoham̄ bhagini ariyāya jātiyā jato nābhi jānāmi sañcicca 20, 56, beg.  
**Aṅgulimālaparitta**

yathā pi selā vipulā nabham̄ āhacca pabbatā samantā anupariyeyyum 96,  
beg. **Pabbatopamagāthā**

yathā vāri vahā pūrā paripūrenti sāgaram evam eva ito dinnam̄ petānam̄  
upakappati 109, beg. **Anumodanāvidhi**

yadidam̄ cattāri purisayugāni aija purisapuggalā esa bhagavato  
sāvakaseṅghā āhuneyyo pāhuneyyo dakkhineyyo añjalikaranāyo  
anuttaram̄ puññakkhettam̄ lokassā ti 106, mid. **Buddhajaya-  
maṅgala**

yadi saccā damā cāgā khantyā bhiyyodha vijjatī ti 123, end.  
**Saccapānavidhyānurūpagāthā**

yadi hīne gato ṭhāne kāyaduccaritena iminā puññatejena tamhā ṭhānā  
pamuñcatu 443, beg. **stanzas without title**

yantam̄ sattehi dukkhena ñeyyam̄ anattalakkhaṇam̄ 85, beg. **Anatta-  
lakkhaṇasuttappakāsana**

yantena bhagavatā jānatā passatā arahatā sammāsambudhena paṭhamam̄  
pārājikam̄ 267, beg. **Vinaya**

yandunimittam̄ avamaṅgalañca yo cāmanāpo sakunassa saddo  
pāpaggaho dussupinam 22, 58, beg. **Abhayaparitta**

Yandunimittam dukkhappattā ca niddukkhā 22

yandesesi mahāvīro parittantam bhaññamahe 17, 50, end. **Āṭānāṭiya-  
parittappakāsana**

Yamaka 271, 430, 438

yasmiñ padese kappeti vāsam̄ pañditajātiyo sīlavant' ettha bhojetvā  
saññate brahmacārino 113, beg. **Devatādissa-  
dakkhinānumodanāgāthā**

yassa saddhā tathāgate acalā supatiññitā sīlañca yassa kalyānam̄ 96,  
beg. 1st § **Ariyadhanagāthā**

yassānubhāvato yakkhā neva dassenti bhim̄sanam̄ 10, 40, beg.  
**Karaṇīyamettasuttappakāsana**

yassānussaraṇenā pi antalikkhe pi pāṇino patiṭṭhamadhibhigacchanti  
 bhūmiyam viya sabbadā 14, 46, beg. **Dhajaggaparitta**  
 yā devatā santi vihārārāsini thūpe ghare bodhighare tahiṁ tahiṁ 281,  
 beg. **Pattidānagāthā**  
 yāni yānyaggabhūtāni sammatāni tathā tathā 394, beg. **Agga-**  
**ppasādasuttappakāsana**  
 yāni ve pañca thānāni pañcānimmalalocano veneyyānam 311, beg.  
**Abhinhappaccavekkhaṇapāṭhappakāsana**  
 yānīdha bhūtāni samāgatāni bhummāni vā yāni va antalikkhe sabbe va  
 bhūtā sumanā bhavantu 7, 38, 132, beg. **Ratanasutta**,  
**Ratanasuttapāṭha**; 114, beg. **Devatābhismantantanagāthā**  
 yānīdha bhūtāni samāgatāni bhummāni vā yāni va antalikkhe tathāgatam  
 devamanussapūjitaṁ saṅgham namassāma suvatthi hotu 10, 135  
 end. **Ratanasutta**, **Ratanasuttapāṭha**  
 yāvajīvam arahanto pāṇātipātam pahāya pāṇātipātā 274, beg.  
**Uposathaṅgappaccavekkhaṇa**  
 yāvatā vattate loko anekākāracittako 358, beg. **Lokadhamma-**  
**suttappakasana**  
 yāvatā sattā apadā vā dvipadā vā catuppadā vā bahuppadā vā rūpino vā  
 arūpino vā saññino 115, beg. **Parittakaraṇapāṭha**  
 yā sā(!)ppamāṇakā sattā bhāvanānam hi gocaro 308, beg. **Catur-**  
**appamaññipāṭhappakāsana**  
 ye keci kusalā dhammā sabbe te kusalamūlā | ye vā pana kusalamūlā  
 271, beg. **Yamaka**, 438, end. **Yamaka** (3 pages)  
 ye ca atitā sambuddhā ye ca buddhā anāgatā yo cetarahi sambuddho  
 bahunnam sokanāsano 103, beg. **Dhammakaravādigāthā**  
 ye vā pana kusalamūlena ekamūlā sabbe te dhammā kusalā 271, end.  
**Yamaka** (4 lines)  
 ye santā santacittā tisaraṇasaranā ettha lokantare vā bhummā bhummā ca  
 devāgunganagahaṇabyāvajā sabbakālam ete āyantu devā 3, 34,  
 beg. **Mañgalasuttappakāsana**  
 yogagocchaka 423  
 yogā dhammā no yogā dhammā yoganiyā dhammā ayoganiyā dhammā  
 yogasampayuttā dhammā 423, beg. **Yogagocchaka**  
 yogā yogavippayuttā kho pana dhammā yoganiyā pi ayoganiyā pi 423,  
 end. **Yogagocchaka**  
 yo dhammacārikāyena vācāya uda cetasā idheva naṁ pasāmsanti pecca  
 sagge pamodati 96, end. **Pabbatopamagāthā**  
 yoniso paṭipat�attham tam suttantam bhañāmase 289, end.  
**Dhammaniyāmasuttappakāsana**

yoniso patisevitabbā anuppannānam āsavānam anuppādāya uppannānam  
 āsavānam pahānāyā ti 308, end. **Catuppaccaya-ppaccavekkhanapāṭha**  
**Ratanattayappabhāvābhīyācanagāthā 25, 61**  
**Ratanasutta 7, 38**  
**Ratanasuttapāṭha 132**  
**Ratanasuttappakāsana 6, 37**  
**Rūpakammaṭṭhānārūpakammaṭṭhānāpāṭha 391**  
**rūparūpakammaṭṭhatthām taddipakām bhañāmase 391, end.**  
**Rūparūpakammaṭṭhānāpāṭhappakāsana**  
**Rūparūpakammaṭṭhānāpāṭhappakāsana 391**  
**rogāmanussadubbhikkhasambhūtanti vidhambhayam khippam  
 antaradhāpesi parittantam bhañāmahe 7, end. **Ratanasutta-ppakāsana****  
**Licchavi-aparihāniyadhammasutta 341**  
**Licchavi-aparihāniyadhammasuttappakāsana 341**  
**Lokadhammasutta 359**  
**Lokadhammasuttappakāsana 358**  
**lokiyalokuttarasampattisiddham kātabbaṁ ukāsa ārādhanam karomi  
 263, end. **Bhāsitovāda****  
**lokekuttamabhūtassa anuttaratthadāyino 320, beg. **Anuttara-suttappakāsana****  
**lokekuttamasatthussa yassa vākyam anaññathām 286, beg. **Byākatābyākatavatthuddayappakāsana****  
**Vaṅgakāparitta 45**  
**vadanti ve duṭṭhamanā pi eke aññe pi ve saccamanā vadanti 377, beg. **Duṭṭhaṭṭhakasutta****  
**vadhissamenanti parāmasanto bhāsāvamaddakkhi dhajam isinam 44, beg. **Chaddantaparitta****  
**vandāmi buddham bhavaparatīṇam tilokaketum tibhavekanāthām 265, beg. **Buddhapādanamakāragāthā****  
**vijjābhāgino dhammā avijjābhāgino dhammā vijjūpamā dhammā  
 vajirūpamā dhammā bālā dhammā pañditā dhammā kāñhā dhammā  
 427, beg. **Suttantamātikā****  
**viññūnam atthasiddhatthām tam suttantam bhañāmase 374, end. **Kāmasuttappakāsana; 383, end. Dutiyamaranassatisutta-ppakāsana****  
**Vinaya Sūtra Paramattha 267**  
**vinetā sukhamaggasmiṁ veneyye vinayam muni 282, beg. **Karaṇīyākaraṇīyasuttappakāsana****  
**Vipassanābhūmipāṭha 99**

vipassissa nam' athu cakkhumantassa sirimato sikhissa pi nam' athu  
 sabbabhūtānukampino 18, 50, beg. Ātānātiyaparitta; 171,  
 beg. stanzas Ātānātiyasuttapāṭha (pubbabhāga); 184  
 beg. stanzas Ātānātiyasuttapāṭha (pacchimabhāga)

Vibhaṅga 269, 428

virulhamūlasantānam nigrodham iva māluto amittā nappasahanti yo  
 mittānam na dubbhānam na dubbhati ti 140, Mettānisamsa-  
 gāthāpāṭha

virūpakkhehi me mettam mettam erā pathehi me chabyāputtehi me  
 mettam mettam kaṇhāgotamakehi ca 12, beg. Khandhparitta;  
 43, beg. Khandhparitta-Chaddantaparittāpara; 137, beg.  
 stanzas Ahiṇjasuttapāṭha

Visesānumodanā 110

Viharadānagāthā 113

vīsatisatasahassāni namāmi sirasā aham tesam dhammañ ca samghañ ca  
 ... anekā antarāyā pi vinassantu asesato 33, end. Dvāda-  
 paritta

veneyyadamanopāye sabbaso pāramiñ gato amoyavacano buddho  
 abhiññāyānusāsako 90, beg. Ādittapariyāyasuttappakāsana  
 veneyye vinayantena sambuddhena mahesinā 374, beg. Kāmasutta-  
 ppakāsana

Samvaragāthā 280

Samvejaniyagāthā 396

samsāre samsarantānam sabbadukkhavināsane sattadhamme ca bojjhaṅge  
 mārasenappamaddino 56, beg. Bojjhaṅgaparittappakāsana  
 sakavādipañcasuttasatāni paravādipañcasuttasatāni suttasahassam  
 samodhānetvā vibhattam kathavatthuppakaraṇam nāma samattam  
 430, end. Kathāvatthu (2 lines)

sakkatvā buddharatanam osatham uttamam varam hitam deva-  
 manussānam budhatejena sotthinā 24, mid. Abhayaparitta

Saṅgahavatthugāthā 119

saṅgahitam asaṅgahitanti cuddasavidhena vibhattam dhātukathā-  
 pakaraṇam nāma samattam 429, end. Dhātukathā (8 lines)

saṅgaho asaṅgaho | saṅgahitena asaṅgahitam asaṅgahitena 270, 429,  
 433, beg. Dhātukathā

saṅghasambhūtarājūnam sāmaggiyānupālinam 341, beg. Licchavi-  
 aparihāniyadhammasuttappakāsana

Saṅghādisesuddesa 454

sace imam nāgavarena saccam mā maṇi vane bālamigā agañchun ti 44,  
 end. Chaddantaparitta

saccam ve amatā vācā esa dhammo sanantano sacce atthe ca dhamme ca  
 ahu santo patiññitā 123, beg. Saccapānavidhyānurūpagāthā

saccakiriyam karissāma ādissa ratanattayam **400, Pañāmagāthā**  
 Saccapānavidhyānurūpagāthā **122**  
 saccena me samo n' atthi esā me saccapāramī ti **46, end.**  
**Vaṅgakāparitta**  
**Saññojanagocchaka** **422**  
 saññojanavippayuttā kho pana dhammā saññojaniyā pi asaññojaniyā pi  
**422, end. Saññojanagocchaka**  
 saññojanā dhammā no saññojanā dhammā saññojaniyā dhammā  
 asaññojaniyā dhammā **422, beg. Saññojanagocchaka**  
**Satipaṭṭhānapāṭha** **296**  
**Satipaṭṭhānapāṭhappakāsana** **296**  
**Sattaparitta** **1-29**  
**Sattabhidhāmethunasaṃyogasutta** **346**  
**Sattabhidhāmethunasaṃyogasuttappakāsana** **346**  
 satto guhāyam bahunābhichanno tiṭṭham naro mohanasmim pagālho  
**375, beg. Guhaṭṭhakasutta**  
 sadā sotthi bhavantu te nakkhattayakkhabhūtānam hantvā tesam  
 upaddave **102, end. Bhaddekarattagāthā**  
 sadevakassa lokassa nāthabhūto narāsabho **369, beg.**  
**Dasanāthakāraṇadhammasuttappakāsana**  
 sadevako ayaṃ loko samārako sabrahmako **353, beg. Magga-**  
**vibhaṇgasuttappakāsana**  
 saddhapassādasiddhattham duvidhe te bhaṇāmase **286, end.**  
**Byākatābyākatavatthuddayappakāsana**  
 sanāthattā(!)tthasiddhattham tam suttantam bhaṇāmase **369, end.**  
**Dasanāthakāraṇadhammasuttappakāsana**  
 sabbattha saṃvuto bhikkhu sabbadukkhā pamuccatī ti **281, end.**  
**Samvaragāthā**  
 sabbabuddhānubhāvena sabbadhammānubhāvena sabbasaṅghānubhāvena  
 buddharatanam dhammaratanam saṅgharatanam tiṇṇam ratanānam  
 ānubhāvena caturāśīti sahassa **110, beg. Viśesānumodanā,**  
**Maṅgalacakkaṭavāla**  
 sabbapāpassa akaraṇam kusalassūpasampadā **259, beg. stanzas**  
**Bhāsitovada**  
 sabbaso suddhasantāno sabbadhammāna pāragū **365, Gotamisutta-**  
**ppakāsana**  
 sabbā sivisajātīnam dibbamantāgadām viya yasmā seti visam ghoram  
 sesañcā pi parissayaṃ **11, 42, beg. Khandhaparitta-**  
**ppakāsana**  
 sabbītiyo vivajjantu sabbarogo vinassantu mā te bhavatvantarāyo sukhi  
 dīghayuko bhava **109, mid. Anumodanāvidhi**

sabbe buddhā balappattā paccekānañca yambalam arahantānañca tejena  
     rakkham bandhāmi sabbaso **59, end. Abhayaparitta**  
 sabbe vijitasamgāmā bhayātītā yasassino modanti saha bhūtehi sāvakā  
     tejanesutā ti **85, end. Mahāsamayasutta**  
 sabbe sañkhārā aniccāti yadā paññāya passati atha nibbindati dukkhe esa  
     maggo visuddhiyā **279, beg. Tilakkhañādigāthā**  
 samaggakaraṇo buddho sāmaggiyam niyojako samaggakaraṇe dhamme  
**332, beg. Sārāñiyadhammasuttappakāsana**  
 samuññānāhārārammañā paccayo samudayena cāti (mūlayamakadi  
     dasayamakappaññāditam yamakappakaraṇam nama samattam )  
**440, end. Yamaka** (2 pages)  
 samūlam tañham abbulha nicchāto parinibbuto ti **280, end. Bhāra-  
     sutta gāthā**  
 sampaccayā dhammā appaccayā dhammā sañkhata dhammā asañkhata  
     dhammā **421, beg. Cūlantaraduka**  
 sampayuttēna vippayuttam vippayuttēna sampayuttam asañgahitam  
**270, end. Dhātukathā** (4 lines)  
 sambuddhe aṭṭhavisañca dvādasañca sahassake pañcasatasahassāni  
     namāmi sirasā aham **2, 32, beg. Sattaparitta, 2nd §  
         Dvādasaparitta**  
 sambuddho dipadam setho mahākāruṇiko muni **284, beg.**  
**Pahānabhāvanāsuttappakāsana; 296, beg. Satipatṭhāna-  
     pāṭhappakāsana**  
 sammāsambuddhamatulam sasaddhammaganuttamam abhivādiya  
     bhāsissam abhidhammathasañgaham **400, beg.**  
**Abhidhammathasañgahagāthā**  
 Samrāpañṣūtrapañṣukūla **396**  
 sarajjam sasenam sabandhum narindam parittānubhāvo sadā rakkhatū ti  
**1, beg. Sattaparitta; 31, beg. Dvādasaparitta**  
 Saranagamanapāṭha **272**  
 sādhu kho pana tathārūpānam arahatam dassanam hoti ti **268, end.**  
**Vinaya**  
 sādhūnam atthasiddhattham tam suttantam bhañāmase **294, end.**  
**Supubbañhasuttappakāsana; 300, end. Ariyavamsika-  
     suttappakāsana; 332, end. Sārāñiyadhammasutta-  
     ppakāsana; 346, Sattabbiñhamethunasamyogasutta-  
     ppakāsana; 359, end. Lokadhammasuttappakasana; 375,  
     end. Guhaṭṭhakasuttappakāsana**  
 sādhūnam nettibhāvattham tam suttantam bhañāmase **365, end.**  
**Gotamīsuttappakāsana**  
 Sāmanerappaññāhāpāṭha **126**

sārammaṇā dhammā anārammaṇā dhammā cittā dhammā no cittā dhammā

**424, beg. Mahantaraduka**

Sārāṇīyadhammasutta 332

Sārāṇīyadhammasuttappakāsana 332

Sāvatthīnidāna ādittapariyāyasutta 335

siddham atthu (*ter*) idam phalaṁ ekasmim ratanattayasmim  
sampasādanacetaso 26, 62, end. **Ratanattaya-  
ppakāvāhiyācanagāthā**

sirīdhitimatiyejo jaya siddhimahiddhi mahāguṇāparimitapuññādhikārassa  
sabbantarāyanivāraṇasamatthassa bhagavato arahato sammā-  
sambuddhassa dvattīmsamahāpurisalakkhanānubhāvena 28, 63,  
beg. **Maṅgalacakkavāla**

sītaṁ uñham paṭihanti tato vālamigāni ca sīrīmsape ca mabhase sisire  
cāpi vuṭṭhiyo 113, beg. **Vihāradānagāthā**

sukham supatisutto ca pāpam kiñci na passati evam ādiguṇūpetam  
parittantam bhañāmahe 10, end. **Karaṇīyamettasutta-  
ppakāsana**

Sukhābhīyācanagāthā 27, 62

**Suttantamātikā 427**

sunakkhattam sumāṅgalam supabhāgam suhuṭṭhitam sukhaṇo  
sumuhutto ca 295, beg. stanzas **Supubbañhasutta**

sutvā tathānukārāya tam suttantam bhañāmase 282, end.  
**Karaṇīyākaraṇīyasuttappakāsana; 284, end. Pahāna-  
bhāvanāsuttappakāsana**

sutvā nuppaṭipatyattham tam suttantam bhañāmase 344, end.  
**Bhikkhu-aparihāniyadhammasuttappakāsana**

Supubbañhasutta 294

Supubbañhasuttappakāsana 294

subhānu passim viharantam indriyesu asamvutam 280, beg.  
**Samvaragāthā**

surāmerayamajjappamādaṭṭhāna veramaṇisikkhāpadam samādiyāmi 273,  
end. **Pacīcasikkhāpadasamādāna**

Suriyaparittapāṭha 143

suvaṇṇamālike suvaṇṇapabbate sumanakūṭe yonakapure nammadāya  
nadiyā pañca pādavaram hanam aham vandāmi dūrato 265, end.  
**Buddhapādanamakāragāthā**

suvatthisādhanattham pi tam suttantam bhañāmase 354, end. **Magga-  
vibhaṅgasuttappakāsana**

Sūtra 267

Sekhiyuddesa 491

so attā ti evam etam yathābhūtam sammappaññāya daṭṭhabban ti 391,  
end. **Khandhavibhajanapāṭha**

sokaparidevadukkhadomanassupāyāsā nirujjhanti evam etassa kevalassa dukkhakkhandassa nirodho hoti 101, **end.** **Vipassanābhūmi-pāṭha**

so puggalo upalabbhati sacchikatthaparamatthenā ti | micchā | 271, **end.** **Kathāvatthu** (6 lines); 438, **end.** **Kathāvatthu** (1 page)

Solasadhammappabhedasaṅgaham paṭhamabhāṇavara 147

Hetugocchaka 421

hetuppaccayo ārammaṇappaccayo adhipatippaccayo anantarappaccayo 101, **beg.** **Paṭṭhānamātikāpāṭha** (6 lines); 271, **Mahā-paṭṭhāna** (7 lines); 431, **beg.** **Paṭṭhāna** (8 lines); 440, **Paṭṭhāna** (1 page)

hetū kho pana dhammā sahetukā pi ahetukā pi 421, **end.** **Hetugocchaka**

hetū dhammā na hetū dhammā sahetukā dhammā ahetukā dhammā hetu sampayuttā dhammā 420, **beg.** **Hetugocchaka**

# THE ARISING OF AN OFFENCE: *āpattisamuṭṭhāna*

## A note on the structure and history of the Theravāda-Vinaya

The article on the Vinaya word *āpatti-samuṭṭhāna* in the CPD<sup>1</sup> provides little more than the most basic information. Besides the translation and the statement that there are six groups of *āpatti-samuṭṭhāna*, a very few references limited to the Vinaya-Piṭaka and the Samantapāsādikā are given. It is not said what these six groups are, nor is the second set of 13 names of origins mentioned, although two of them actually occur in CPD I, if only as subtitles of a chapter in the Parivāra: *addhāna-samuṭṭhāna* and *ananuññāta-samuṭṭhāna*. A third word belonging to this set almost inevitably escaped the attention of the authors of CPD I in 1931 and 1944 (addenda), as the PTS edition of the Kaṅkhāvitaranī containing *adinnādāna-samuṭṭhāna* (Kkh 23,17) appeared only in 1956, and the Sinhalese print of 1905 mentioned in the Epilegomena may not have been available.

Progressing in the alphabet, the CPD reached another word relevant in this connection: *elakaloma-samuṭṭhāna* “sheep’s wool origin”, which is translated in this way following I.B. Horner (*BD* VI, London 1966, p. 129 = Vin V 88,37). Again, extreme brevity and the lack of further explanation leaves the reader wondering what this word really means, especially as the preceding entry *elakalomasadisa* is said to signify “like sheep’s wool”, referring to *samuṭṭhānādīni elakalomasadisāni* (Kkh 102,3 [read 102,9] ≠ 103,4). This results in a somewhat enigmatic translation of the relevant sentence: “origins like sheep’s wool, etc.”

---

<sup>1</sup> The system of abbreviations used follows: V. Trenckner: *A Critical Pāli Dictionary*, Vol. I, Copenhagen 1924–48; Epilegomena (1948) and H. Bechert: *Abkürzungsverzeichnis zur buddhistischen Literatur in Indien und Südostasien*. Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden. Beiheft 3. Göttingen 1990. Translations from the Vinaya follow: I.B. Horner: *BD*, I–VI, London 1938–66.

It may, therefore, not be altogether useless to explain the different references to *samuṭṭhāna* in some detail, although some, at least, of the most basic facts can be gathered, e.g. from C.S. Upasak's *Dictionary of Early Buddhist Monastic Terms*, (Benares 1975, p. 225, s.v. *samuṭṭhāna*), or from I.B. Horner's translation of the *Parivāra* (*BD*, VI). Furthermore, a full understanding of the *samuṭṭhāna* sheds some light on the development of Buddhist ecclesiastical law, on the methods of the *Vinaya* commentaries, and finally on the somewhat peculiar position of the *Milindapañha* regarding the interpretation of the *Vinaya*.

In the fourth chapter of the *Cullavagga*, the *samatha-kkhandhaka*, the earliest extant classification of six *samuṭṭhāna* can be found, when the question: *āpattādhikaranassa kim mūlam* (*Vin II* 90,29), "what is the root of a legal question concerning an offence (laid down in the *Vinaya*)?"<sup>2</sup> is answered by: *cha āpatisamuṭṭhāna āpattādhikaranassa mūlam* (*Vin II* 90,29 foll.), "six origins of offences are the root of a legal question". These six origins depend on whether an offence arises from:

1. *kāyato na vācato na cittato*
2. *vācato na kāyato na cittato*
3. *kāyato ca vācato ca, na cittato*
4. *kāyato ca cittato ca, na vācato*
5. *vācato ca cittato ca, na kāyato*
6. *kāyato ca vācato ca cittato ca* (*Vin II* 90,30–35).

This paragraph is not commented on in the *Samantapāsādikā*.

Consequently, no offence can arise in mind (*citta*) only: If a monk only thinks of an offence without actually committing it, this intention is not considered as an *āpatti* according to this classification.

Evidently, this text presupposes a common knowledge about this classification among Theravāda monks. For the attribution of these

<sup>2</sup> In Theravāda law there are four such "legal questions" (*adhikarana*, in contrast to *atṭa* "worldly legal question" [cf. *IT* 7, 1979, p. 278 note 12]) concerning 1. *vivāda* "dispute", 2. *anuvāda* "admonition", 3. *āpatti* "offence (against ecclesiastical law)", 4. *kicca* "legal procedure (of the *Samgha* such as *kammavācā* [cf. *StII* 13/14, 1987, p. 102])", *Vin II* 88,18–20.

origins to single rules of the *pātimokkhasutta* is not explained in the Mahāvagga or in the Cullavagga, which for the most part contain the “historical” information about the Vinaya rules, as they record the incidents which induced the Buddha to prescribe a certain rule or to allow a certain procedure, rather than give any systematic treatment of the rules, which is foreshadowed only in the opening chapters of the Cullavagga and fully developed in the Parivāra. Thus any monk who knew by heart the *pātimokkhasutta* as a matter of course, and in addition the Parivāra, which seems to have been composed with strong mnemo-technical purposes in mind, was well equipped to handle all Vinaya questions that might arise in daily monastic life.

At the very beginning of the Parivāra a number of questions is asked and answered about every single rule in the *pātimokkhasutta*. This demonstrates what was considered to be important and necessary knowledge about the Vinaya. Although the whole network of these questions and answers deserves a detailed study, only that section will be discussed here which is connected with the Cullavagga passage quoted above: *channam āpattisamuṭṭhānānam katīhi samuṭṭhānehi samuṭṭhāti* (Vin V 1,14), “from how many origins of the six origins of offences does [the *pārājika*-offence (Vin V 1,6)] arise ?”<sup>3</sup> This is answered by: *ekena samuṭṭhānenā samuṭṭhāti kāyato ca cittato ca samuṭṭhāti na vācato* (Vin V 2,13 foll.), “[the first *pārājika*-offence] arises from one origin, from [the one involving] body and mind, [but] not speech (i.e. no. 4 in the list given above)”.

This is different for the second *pārājika*-offence: *siyā kāyato ca cittato ca samuṭṭhāti na vācato, siyā vācato ca cittato ca samuṭṭhāti na kāyato, siyā kāyato ca vācato ca cittato ca samuṭṭhāti* (Vin V 3,37 foll.). Thus three different varieties of origin are mentioned for this particular

<sup>3</sup> The structure of the first two chapters of the Parivāra has not been understood properly in *BD* in this particular respect as the translation shows: “... by how many origins does (a monk) originate the offence”. Leaving aside the difficulty of taking *sam-ut-sthā* as a transitive verb, the context in the Parivāra itself and later commentaries rule out any other subject in this sentence than *āpatti*.

offence and for the remaining two *pārājika*-offences. The same or sometimes different combinations apply for every single offence, and not rarely even all six combinations apply: *chahi samuṭṭhānehi samuṭṭhāti* (Vin V 6,6), concerning *saṃghadisesa* 6, or only three: *tīhi samuṭṭhānehi samuṭṭhāti* (Vin V 6,18), concerning *saṃghadisesa* 8. In this instance the Parivāra does not indicate which origins it is actually referring to.

A third way to indicate the origin of an offence is finally introduced on the occasion of *nissaggiya* 23: *dvihi samuṭṭhānehi samuṭṭhāti kāthinake* (Vin V 12,3), “arises by two origins as in the *kāthina*-group”. This refers back to *nissaggiya* 1 (Vin V 8,23), where the respective origin is explained. Further references of this kind follow, e.g. *elakalomake* (Vin V 14,15), referring to *pacittiya* 6 or *padasodhamme* (Vin V 14,20), referring to *pācittiya* 7.

How this system of reference operates can be deduced from the third chapter in the Parivāra, which is called *samuṭṭhānass’ uddāna* (Vin V 86,1–90,5). Altogether 13 different origins are enumerated there, and every rule of the *pātimokkhasutta* is assigned to its respective origin. Consequently this arrangement according to origins complements the first two chapters of the Parivāra, where this sequence of rules is kept as it is in the *pātimokkhasutta*.

At the end of each of these 13 groups the total of rules assembled is mentioned, e.g. *chasattati ime sikkhā kāyamānasikā katā* (Vin V 87,4\*), “these trainings are seventy-six done by body and by thought” (I.B. Horner), or *saṃapaññās’ ime dhammā chahi thānehi jāyare* (Vin V 87,36\*), “exactly fifty are these items that are born from six occasions”, where by a slip of the pen *saṃapaññās(a)* is mistranslated by I.B. Horner as “thou understandeth” (BD VI, p. 127).<sup>4</sup>

Comparing this set of 13 *samuṭṭhāna* with the corresponding passage quoted from the Cullavagga, there seems to be an obvious difference. For the Cullavagga enumerates only six combinations of the three concepts *kāya*, *vācā*, and *citta*: *atth’ āpatti kāyato samuṭṭhāti* ...

<sup>4</sup> The actual number is 50, not 49 as suggested in BD VI, p. xix.

(Vin II 90,30), "there is an offence that arises from the body ... ", etc. This formulation seems to allow for only one origin for a particular offence, while the possibility of combining two or more is not even hinted at.

A further detail seems to differ in the system laid down in the Parivāra. For there is not a single offence arising from *kāya* alone. This may be due to the fact that this particular *samuṭṭhāna* has been inserted in the Cullavagga because of theoretical thinking only. In the same way the combination of *kāya* and *vācā* has been mentioned in the Cullavagga without it actually occurring, as observed in *The entrance to the Vinaya*.<sup>5</sup> Evidently it was considered more important to think of all possibilities irrespective of their actual occurrence, rather than to leave a gap in the system.

Alternatively it could be suspected that the opinion in *samuṭṭhāna* had changed in this respect during the perhaps considerable time separating Cullavagga and Parivāra. Although we do not possess any sources from which information can be gathered about the development of Buddhist ecclesiastical law during this period, it is certain that there was a continuous development.<sup>6</sup> In this connection it is therefore not surprising that little, if any, attention has been paid to the origin of offences in the oldest commentary on Vinaya material, namely the explanation of the *pātimokkhasutta* embedded in the Suttavibhaṅga, even

---

<sup>5</sup> Vajirañāṇa: *Vinayamukha: The entrance to the Vinaya*, Vol. I<sup>1</sup> 1916, Bangkok 27<sup>2</sup> 1965, p. 13. Further I.B. Horner draws attention to: *tattha katamāṇ āpatti no adhikaranam: sotāpatti, samāpatti* (Vin II 93,3), "what here is an offence (but) no legal question ? Stream-attainment (and) attainment" (I.B. Horner). This, of course, is a play on words, for there is no *āpatti* in a legal context that is not an offence. In contrast to the Theravādins, the Mūlasarvāstivādins have found an offence which is purely *kāyikī* (see R. Gnoli (ed.): *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Śayanāsanavastu and the Adhikaraṇavastu*, Rome 1978, Serie Orientale Roma 50, p. 74, in the paragraph corresponding to Vin II 90,29-36).

<sup>6</sup> O. v. Hinüber: *Der Beginn der Schrift und frühe Schriftlichkeit in Indien. Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse. Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz. Jahrgang 1989, Nr. 11, Chapter IX.*

if there was an opportunity of doing so, e.g. in *pārājika* 2. Here, different conditions are discussed in the commentary, which might result in committing an *āpatti*, and among them: *theyyacittañ ca paccupatthitam* (Vin III 54,17 etc.), “and the intention to steal arises”. No reference is made to the *samuṭṭhāna*-system expounded in the Cullavagga, and even the wording is markedly different, as *paccupatthita* is used instead of *samuṭṭhita*.

Although the outline of the *samuṭṭhāna*-system can be deduced from the Parivāra, it is much easier to turn to the pertinent explanation in the Kañkhāvitarañī. This commentary quotes three *kārikās*, which contain the different points that should be mentioned in the explanation of *pāṭimokkha*-rules, e.g. *nidāna*: the place such as Vesāli, *puggala*: the person concerned such as Sudinna in *pārājika* 1, *vatthu*: the offence, etc. In the list *samuṭṭhāna* is also found, to which some prominence is given by a further separate *kārikā* on this particular *vidhi*. The relevant passage begins: *sabbāpattinam kāyo vācā kāyavācā kāyacittam vācācittam kāyavācācittan ti imāni ekaṅgikadvaṅgikativaṅgikāni cha samuṭṭhānāni, yāni sikkhāpadasamuṭṭhānāni ti pi vuccanti* (Kkh 22,30–33), “all offences have the [following] six origins:

1. body
2. speech
3. body-speech
4. body-mind
5. speech-mind
6. body-speech-mind,

which may have one (nos. 1,2), two (nos. 3,4,5), or three (no. 6) members, and which are called ‘origins of the (*pāṭimokkha*)-rules’”.

So this agrees with the corresponding passage in the Cullavagga. Then the Kañkhāvitarañī continues in a more specific way: “The first three without and the remaining three with mind: *acittakasacittaka*” (Kkh 22,33 foll.), and, more important still, the following combinations of these six groups of origins are enumerated:

- A. one origin: nos. 4,5,6
- B. two origins: nos. 1 + 4, 2 + 5, 3 + 6, 4 + 6, 5 + 6
- C. three origins: nos. 1 + 2 + 3, 4 + 5 + 6
- D. four origins: nos. 1 + 3 + 4 + 6, 2 + 3 + 5 + 6
- E. five origins: this is explicitly ruled out (Kkh 22,35)
- F. six origins: nos. 1–6

These 13 possible combinations are named after the respective first offence found in the *pāṭimokkhasutta* and considered to arise in that particular way:

- I. *paṭhamapārājika*: no. 4; 1 origin: Sp 271,21: Kkh 25,37
- II. *adinnādāna, pārājika* 2: nos. 4–6 (*sacittaka*); 3 origins: Sp 373,21–24: Kkh 30,26
- III. *sañcaritta, samghādisesa* 5: nos. 1–6; 6 origins: Sp 560,7: Kkh 39,27
- IV. *samanubhāsana, samghādisesa* 10: no. 6; 1 origin: Sp 611,5: Kkh 46,24
- V. *kaṭhina, nissaggiya* 1: nos. 3,6; 2 origins: Sp 650,25: Kkh 58,6
- VI. *elakaloma, nissaggiya* 16: nos. 1,4; 2 origins: Sp 689,10: Kkh 71,15
- VII. *padasodhamma, pācittiya* 4: nos. 2,5; 2 origins: Sp 744,9: Kkh 84,19
- VIII. *addhāna, pācittiya* 27: nos. 1,3,4,6; 4 origins: Sp 807,30: Kkh 100,16
- IX. *theyyasattha, pācittiya* 66: nos. 4,6; 2 origins: Sp 868,28: Kkh 126,17
- X. *dhammadesana, sekkiya* 57: no. 5; 1 origin: Sp 898,29: Kkh 153,21
- XI. *bhūtārocana, pācittiya* 8: nos. 1,2,3; 3 origins: Sp 752,34: Kkh 86,23
- XII. *corīvuṭṭhāpana, bhikkhuni-samghādisesa* 2: nos. 5,6; 2 origins: Sp 910,22: Kkh 162,18
- XIII. *ananuññāta, bhikkhuni-pācittiya* 80: nos. 2,3,5,6; 4 origins: Sp 943,18: Kkh 101,6

This classification, explained very clearly and in great detail at Kkh 22,3\*–23,30, is also dealt with, but very briefly, in the *Samantapāśādikā* (Sp 270,17–271,19). Here only half the origins are mentioned and the reader is simply referred to the *Parivāra*, where the origins “will be evident” (*āvibhavissanti*, Sp 270,20). Even the few names given in the

Samantapāsādikā point to a system slightly different from the one in the Kaikhāvitaranī:

- a. six origins
- b. four origins
- c. three origins
- d. *kathina*
- e. *elakaloma*
- f. *dhuranikkhepa* (Sp 270,21–24 [ending with <sup>o</sup>ādi “etc.”]).

This paragraph in the Samantapāsādikā refers to *pārājika* 1, about which it is said: “according to the origin it has one origin, according to members (*aṅga*) there is a double origin, [for it] arises from body-mind” (Sp 271,22 foll.). At the same time this gives at least a hint at the technical meaning of *aṅga* as used in references to *samuṭṭhāna*, which, again, has been neatly explained in the Kaikhāvitaranī (Kkh 22,32) as quoted above.

Following this system, the Samantapāsādikā regularly uses *chasamuṭṭhāna*, Sp 560,7 (= Kkh 39,29); Sp 574,19 (= Kkh 41,36); Sp 662,19 (against: *sañcaritta*, Kkh 63,35); Sp 664,28 (against: *sañcaritta*, Kkh 64,24, etc.);<sup>7</sup> *catusamuṭṭhāna*, Sp 807,30 (against: *addhāna*, Kkh 100,16); Sp 842,7 (against *addhāna*, Kkh 112,9, etc.).

The last head-word refers to *pācittiya* 27 only in the context of *samuṭṭhāna*; otherwise it is called *saṃvidhāna* (Sp 869,6 = Kkh 126,23, cf. also Vin V 86,23\*). Normally the name of the rule and the name of the *samuṭṭhāna* are identical.

These two groups, *chasamuṭṭhāna-sañcaritta* (or: *sañcari* [Vin V 87,26\*] in the meta-language of the *uddānas*) and *catusamuṭṭhāna-*

<sup>7</sup> Further instances can easily be found by means of the very helpful notes in *BD* VI, pp. 124–31, where all references to the *pātimokkha*-rules have been traced. The commentaries do not always give the name of the pertinent *samuṭṭhāna*, but refer back to preceding rules of identical origin, etc.: *kuṭī-kārasikkhāpade vuttanayen’ eva veditabbam saddhim samuṭṭhānādīhi* (Sp 575,17), and similarly: *samuṭṭhānādīhi catutthasadissān’ eva* (Kkh 66,2), both commenting on *nissaggiya* 7.

*addhāna*, are well defined by giving only the number of origins, as these are not shared by any other group.

At first glance, things seem to be rather confusing in respect to *tisamuṭṭhāna* (Sp 549,30) against: *adinnādāna* (Kkh 37,34 etc.), although the Samantapāsādikā usually enumerates the three relevant origins to remove any possible doubt. Beginning with *pācittiya* 60, however, only *tisamuṭṭhāna* (Sp 864,16) against: *adinnādāna* (Kkh 123,34) is mentioned. There is, however, no want of clearness, as the second group, to which *tisamuṭṭhāna* would apply, comprises only a single rule: *bhūtārocana* (Sp 752,34 = Kkh 86,23). The same is valid for the last two items of the set of 13 groups, *corivuṭṭhāpana* and *ananuññāta*. Therefore the Samantapāsādikā, being well aware of this, combines these three items as *niyata* “restricted (i.e. to one rule: *sikkhāpada*)”: *etān’ eva tīṇi sikkhāpadāni niyatasamuṭṭhānāni, aññehi saddhiṃ asambhinna-samuṭṭhānāni* (Sp 1305,12–14), “for these three rules have a ‘restricted’ origin that is not an origin ‘shared’ with other (rules).<sup>8</sup>

This special position of the groups nos. XI–XIII within the set accounts for the obvious break in the sequence of the head-words selected, which suddenly jumps backwards from no. X *dhammadesana*, *sekhiya* 57 to no. XI *bhūtārocana*, *pācittiya* 8, which has been noted without further comment in *BD VI*, p. 130 note 19.

The next two groups mentioned in the Samantapāsādikā concur with nos. V and VI in the Kaṅkhāvitaranī. Consequently, they do not create any problem, in strong contrast to the very last name. For *dhuranikkhepa* is not used at all in the Kaṅkhāvitaranī, which has *samanubhāsana* instead. This, however, is not alien to the Samantapāsādikā either: *samanubhāsana* occurs at Sp 611,5 = Kkh 46,24, where it is introduced as the name of a particular group following the usage of the Parivāra. In *pācittiya* 64, however, the Samantapāsādikā suddenly

<sup>8</sup> This shows that *niyato* (Vin V 86,16\*) does not mean “regularized” as translated at *BD VI*, p. 123, but “restricted (to only one rule)”, though the verse as a whole remains difficult.

changes to *dhuranikkhepa* (Sp 866,32), perhaps because the expression *dhuram nikkhittamatte* (Sp 866,15) is quoted from Vin IV 128,5 and commented on in this paragraph. In contrast to normal usage it is not the name of this *pātimokkha*-rule, which is called *dutthulla* (Sp 867,1). In this respect it is similar to *saṃvidhāna*: *addhāna*, discussed above.

From then on *dhuranikkhepa* is employed, though somewhat irregularly it seems, for no rule can be found in the erratic changes between the names of this *saṃuṭṭhāna*. The subcommentaries do not offer any help concerning the designation *dhuranikkhepa*. When commenting on *pakinñaka* (Sp 270,16), they simply refer to the possible alternative use of *dhuranikkhepa* and *samanubhāsana* at Sp-ṭ (B<sup>e</sup>) II 96,11 in a long and detailed explanation of the *saṃuṭṭhāna*, which is substantially the same as in the *Kaṅkhāvitaranī*, and at Vmv (B<sup>e</sup>) II 149,9 very briefly and in passing, while the *Vajirabuddhiṭikā* is altogether silent on this point. No subcommentary deemed it necessary to waste any words on the change from *samanubhāsana* to *dhuranikkhepa* in commenting on *pācittiya* 64.

A second difference from the *Kaṅkhāvitaranī* can, on the other hand, easily be explained. Wherever the *Samantapāśādikā* chooses numbers such as *chasamuṭṭhāna* as opposed to *sañcaritta*, it simply follows a system also found in the *Parivāra*, e.g.: *chahi samuṭṭhānehi* (Vin V 9,4). If this is abandoned, and names such as *kaṭhinaka* or *elakalomaka* (nos. V, VI) are preferred to *\*dvisamuṭṭhāna*, a name apparently never used in the commentaries in contrast to *dvihi samuṭṭhānehi* (Vin V 8,23 etc.), in the *Parivāra*, the reason is obvious. Here only the names prevent confusion, as there are four groups with a double origin: *kaṭhina*, *elakaloma*, *padasodhamma*, and *theyyasattha* (nos. V, VI, VII, IX). Correspondingly, *paṭhamapārājika* is preferred to *ekasamuṭṭhāna* (cf. Vin V 5,16 etc.), because of *samanubhāsana* / *dhuranikkhepa* and *bhūtārocana* (nos. I, IV, X) all being subject to arising from only one origin. Where there are three groups sharing an equal number of origins, even the distinction between *sambhinna* “shared” and *niyata* “restricted” would fail to provide the necessary clarity.

Comparing the three Vinaya texts, the Parivāra being by far the oldest, and the Kaikhāvitaranī and the Samantapāsādikā being thought to be more or less contemporaneous, the following differences can be noted:

In the third chapter of the Parivāra all 13 names of *samuṭṭhāna* groups are given, but only *kaṭhinaka* (Vin V 12,3 etc.), *elakalomaka* (Vin V 14,15 etc.), and *padasodhamma* (only Vin V 16,35) are actually used in the first chapter on the Mahā- (i.e. Bhikkhu-) Vibhaṅga, while *dhuranikkhepa* (Vin V 55,15, and frequently in the following paragraphs), *paṭhamapārājika*, (Vin V 56,14 etc.), *kaṭhinaka*, (Vin V 57,33 etc.), *elakalomaka*, (Vin V 59,12 etc.), *theyyasatthaka*, (Vin V 60,27 etc.), and *padasodhamma* (only Vin V 70,16) all occur in the second chapter on the Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga. In both these chapters, however, the pertinent *samuṭṭhāna* is mostly referred to only by its number. Although the complete set of 13 names is available in the third chapter of the Parivāra, only two names have been used frequently in the first chapter, and six in the second chapter. Only in the latter does *dhuranikkhepa* occur, whereas *samanubhāsana* is avoided. Therefore one might suspect that *dhuranikkhepa* as a name of a *samuṭṭhāna* may originally have been a Vinaya word preferred by the nuns.

On the whole, the first two chapters of the Parivāra are much more circumstantial than later texts in the paragraphs concerning *samuṭṭhāna*. For phrases such as “arises from one origin such as body ...”, etc., or “arises from two origins as in the *kaṭhina*-group” could have been, and actually are, simplified by merely referring to the respective names of origins as enumerated in the third chapter of the Parivāra.

A much better systematization has been achieved in this respect in the Samantapāsādikā, in spite of some shortcomings if two names for one group interchange. It should be noted that the Samantapāsādikā, while extending the use of *dhuranikkhepa* to the Bhikkhupāṭimokha, has not been influenced by the Parivāra in selecting either name: the Parivāra, which counts the *pārājika*-rules of the *bhikkhunīs* as nos. 5–8, has *dhuranikkhepa* (Vin V 55,15) in *pārājika* 5, in contrast to *samanubhāsana* (Sp 904,13).

Finally, in the *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī*, the designation *dhuranikkhepa* has been removed from the text. At the same time only the set of 13 names found in the *Parivāra* has been used consistently. Thus some kind of progress in handling and systematizing this difficult material can be observed. This is perhaps most evident at the end of the commentary on the rules of the *pāṭimokkha*, e.g. of *nissaggiya* 1, where the *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī* needs three lines (Kkh 58,6–8) in comparison to six needed by the *Samantapāsādikā* (Sp 650, 24–29) for the same matter.

Earlier *Vinaya* texts, however, are not distinguished in this respect alone from later ones, which occasionally also introduce new elements in the form of new concepts or terminology.

Thus it is said in the *ekuttaraka*-chapter of the *Parivāra* in the *ekaka*-paragraph: *sāvajjapaññatti āpatti jānitabbā anavajjapaññatti āpatti jānitabbā* (Vin V 115,8), “an offence that has been prescribed as ‘blamable’ should be known, an offence that has been prescribed as ‘non-blamable’ should be known”. As this classification is mentioned here for the first time and without any comment or example, it is impossible to control the explanation given in the *Samantapāsādikā*: *sāvajjapaññatti ti lokavajjā, anavajjapaññatti ti paññattivajjā* (Sp 1319,26), “blamable means blamable because of common opinion, non-blamable means blamable because of an instruction (by the Buddha)”.<sup>9</sup> The terms *lokavajja* and *paññattivajja* are used very frequently by both the *Samantapāsādikā* and the *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī*, and they replace the apparently older pair *sāvajja*-, *anavajjapaññatti*, which are preserved only in the passage quoted above from the *Parivāra* and echoed once in: *anantarāyikā paññattivajjā anavajjapaññatti ti ca vuttam ... °āpatti antarāyikā lokavajjasāvajjapaññattito* (Vjb (B<sup>e</sup>) 553,7).

The more recent terms *lokavajja* and *paññattivajja* emerge for the first time in the *Milindapañha*: *lokavajjam paññattivajjam ... udake hassa-*

<sup>9</sup> In spite of a correct explanation of this sentence in the footnote accompanying the translation, the text itself is mistranslated as “an offence the description (of which) is ‘blamable’ ...”, *BD* VI, p. 172 and note 9.

*dhammam mahārāja lokassa anavajjam, tam jinasāsane vajjam* (Mil 266,19–28), “blamable by the world, ... blamable by the regulation (of the Vinaya) ... playing in the water is, sire, blameless in the world, but is blamable in the Dispensation of the Conqueror” (I.B. Horner: *Milinda's Questions* II, 1969, pp. 83 foll.). Although quite a few new words and forms are introduced by the Milindapañha into the Pāli vocabulary such as *iha* for older *idha* (CPD), *kaṭumika* (CPD), *jathara* or *lipi*,<sup>10</sup> *lokavajja*: *paññattivajja* may surface here perhaps by mere chance, because the idea as such is much older, as the Parivāra shows. Two things, however, are striking. Instead of *paññatti* (Vin V 115,15), the form *paññatti* is used in the Milindapañha and consistently in the Vinaya commentaries in *paññattivajja*, which even intrudes into the quotation of *anavajja*-, *paññattivajja* in the Vajirabuddhiṭikā. It seems impossible to decide whether an old eastern oral tradition is brought to the surface here, providing a further example of an old eastern Vinaya term,<sup>11</sup> or whether this rather mirrors the later Middle Indic development of -ññ- > -ṇṇ- (*Das ältere Mittelindisch im Überblick*, § 250).<sup>12</sup>

The second point is perhaps more interesting. In the Milindapañha *hassadhamma* comes under the category *lokassa anavajja* (Mil 266,28). This refers to *udake hāsadhammam pācittiyaṁ* (Vin IV 112,22\*\* [*pācittiya* 53]), which is said to be *lokavajjam* (Sp 861,21), which is confirmed by Kkh 119,34. There is, however, no contradiction between the Vinaya commentaries and the Milindapañha, when the behaviour described in other *pātimokkha*-rules is attributed to *lokassa anavajja* in the latter text: *vikālabhojana* and *bhūtagāmavikopana* refer to *pācittiya* 37 and

<sup>10</sup> Cf. K.R. Norman: *Pāli Literature* (A History of Indian Literature, VII,2), Wiesbaden 1983, p. 111.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. *sammannati*, etc.: O. v. Hinüber: *The Oldest Pāli Manuscript*. Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse. Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz. Jahrgang 1991, Nr. 6, p. 13.

<sup>12</sup> The reading *paññatti* with -ṇṇ-, not -ññ-, is confirmed throughout by the Milindapañha manuscript from Vat Lai Hin, North Thailand, dated AD 1495, cf. *JPTS* XI, 1987, pp. 111–19 and XII, 1988, pp. 173 foll.

11 respectively, which are classified as *paññattivajja* (Sp 838,7 and 769,12). Both offences are typical of the misbehaviour of monks, while there is nothing wrong if a layman eats at any time or digs the earth. Nor was it considered indecent or offensive for laymen to enjoy a bath, as is well known from innumerable references in classical Sanskrit literature. This may actually have induced the author of this passage in the Milindapañha to take *hassadhamma* as *lokassa anavajja* corresponding to *paññattivajja*, for which he gives a definition that differs from the one found in later legal literature: *dasa akusalakammapathā idam vuccati lokavajjam* (Mil 266,20 foll.), in contrast to: *yassa sacittakapakkhe cittam akusalam eva hoti tam lokavajjam nāma, sesam paññattivajjam*, (Sp 229,2 foll. ≠ Kkh 24,13–15). At the same time the Samantapāsādikā considers the 10 *akusalakammapatha* as enumerated at D III 269,1–4 or Vibh 391,25–27 as *akusaladhamma*, which are divided into *kāya-*, *vāci-*, and *mano-duccarita* (Sp 134,11–16). This does not have any connection with the classification as *sa-citta*: *a-citta* of the *pātimokkha*-rules, which can be seen quite clearly, e.g. at Sp 271,25–30: the *akusalacitta* conditioning *pārājika* 1 is *lobhacitta*, which does not figure among the *akusalakammapatha*.

Thus both texts, the Milindapañha on the one hand, and the Samantapāsādikā/Kaikhāvitaranī on the other, use different definitions of *lokavajja*, and within their respective definitions the classification seems to be consistent. Again, it is impossible to tell whether this remarkable difference should be interpreted in terms of chronology, i.e. understood as a development of Theravāda ecclesiastical law, or as sectarian.<sup>13</sup> If the

<sup>13</sup> Attention is drawn to this important alternative in explaining differences among different Vinayas by G. Schopen, "On Avoiding Ghosts and Social Censure", *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 10, 1992, pp. 1–39, especially p. 4. In spite of Schopen's brilliant argument, I am convinced that the Pāli Vinaya is by far the oldest extant text of its type. This, of course, does not mean that other Vinayas do not very occasionally contain very old material, while the Mūlarsarvāstivāda-Vinaya seems especially to be penetrated by the spirit of innovation. This, however, needs much more research, and these remarks are not meant to diminish the highly interesting and important results of Schopen's

latter were correct, this would point to the Milindapañha as being some sort of an intruder into the Theravāda tradition, importing a new idea which in this particular case has not been accepted by the Mahāvihāra orthodoxy.

For modern interpreters of the Vinaya, the divisions *sacittaka* : *acittaka* and *lokavajja* : *pannattivajja* remain meaningful, and the latter is even developed in a rather bold way quite in contrast to the *samutthāna*, which are thought to be “superfluous and unclear” by Vajirañāṇa, the 10th Samgharāja of Thailand, in his *Vinayamukha: The entrance to the Vinaya*, I, pp. 12–16, especially p. 13.

Freiburg

Oskar v. Hinüber

---

contribution as a whole. It would be interesting to know if there are traces of a similar *samutthāna*-classification in Vinaya schools other than the Theravāda. If the Samantapāśādikā was translated into Chinese under Dharmaguptaka influence as stated by P.V. Bapat: *Shan-Chien-P'i-P'o-Sha*, Poona 1970, p. 1, this school at least did not seem to have been very familiar with this concept as the gross mistranslation of Sp 62,17–21 (p. 422), the somewhat surprising translation of Sp 228,1 foll. (p. 169) and other instances show. The pair *sāvadyaṁ*: *anavadyaṁ* turns up in *pātayamitika* 75 (Sarvāstivāda) in: G. v. Simson: *Prātimokṣasūtra der Sarvāstivādins*. Teil I. Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden XI. Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse. Dritte Folge Nr. 155. Göttingen 1986, p. 229 (SHT 538, Bl. 26R4). However, the sentence containing the relevant words occurs in only one manuscript, and is missing in others.



## THE CASE OF THE MURDERED MONKS

This is possibly the first time that the *Journal of the Pali Text Society* has been offered material with a title so sensational as to suggest one of the more luridly covered paperbacks ! Still, the subject-matter to be examined here, a really mysterious case, does occur in the pages of the Vinayapitaka, being found there as the principal story of the third *pārājika* (defeat). In this paper it is intended to summarize the story, to look into the Vinaya Commentary's elaborations, to compare these matters with the account in the Dharmagupta Vinaya and finally to comment on the issues raised.

The Mahāvibhaṅga (Vin III 68 foll.) tells a very strange story. At that time, it relates, the Buddha was instructing the monks in the practice of the unattractiveness of the body (*asubhabhāvanā*). When he had completed this he undertook a fortnight's retreat, seeing no-one except the monk who brought him almsfood. As the monks practised *asubha* it seems that self-hatred arose very strongly in them, for they came to loathe their bodies, rather than seeing them dispassionately as impure. Some committed suicide, while others took the lives of their fellow monks, apparently making pacts: "I'll kill you, you kill me". Some went to a hanger-on of the monastery, a man called Migalañḍika who had a yellow robe and pretended to be a monk, and asked him to take their lives. He did this 'service' in exchange for the dead monks' robes and bowls. Afterwards he took his blood-stained knife down to the river Vaggumudā to wash it there. Then he repented of his violence, thinking that he had deprived many virtuous monks of life. At this point he experienced some sort of vision and it is hard to decide whether this 'being' was something external to him, or an aspect of his own mind. In any case, the '*devatā*' told him that he had done good in bringing across, or as we should say 'saving', those who were not yet across, had not yet attained Nibbāna. After this he was convinced that what he had done was good, and consequently he returned to the monastery, where he

went from one building to another crying out, "Who has not crossed ? Whom do I bring across ?" (Vin III 69,10-11). We are told that in this way he 'brought across' as many as sixty monks in a day; that is, he murdered them.

At the end of his retreat the Buddha noticed that the number of monks had decreased and asked Ānanda the reason for this. When he was informed of what had happened he called a saṅgha-meeting, at first saying nothing of the recent spate of killings but instructing the remaining monks in mindfulness of breathing (*ānāpānasati*). His disapproval is only expressed with a stock passage recurring frequently in the Vinaya, "It is not proper, it is not seemly ... this is not for the benefit of unbelievers"; after which he is shown as laying down the basic rule. We find this an incredible account of what actually took place, as the Buddha does not allude to the doings of Migalañḍika or even forbid suicide. Only at a later time is he depicted as doing so.

Turning now to the Commentary (Sp 393-479) for some light upon these strange events, we are treated to elaborations of the *asubha*-practice followed by some comments on the story. We are informed that, for reasons obvious below, *no-one*, apart from the monk appointed, could interrupt the Buddha's retreat.

At this point the Commentary tells a story of the past to try to account for the terrible Vinaya tale of wholesale suicide and murder. This woefully inadequate story concerns a group of 500 hunters who had killed deer in their past lives and later, in the one then current, had been ordained, still without having exhausted the fruits of their evil *kamma*. Due to this they killed themselves and other monks, but apparently only those of their own group. The Commentary points out that among them many were noble (*ariya*) while some were ordinary (*puthujjana*). It is implied that the latter would reach a path/fruit through meditation on *asubha*, while of course the future of the former was in no doubt. What

an extraordinary story ! Does this mean that those ennobled by the Dhamma went around killing other monks ? It is rare in the Suttas to find even examples of monks who took their own lives in the last stages of terminal illness, when as Arahants they were not to be blamed; what is to be said of monks killing others ! The Commentator then attributes some improbable thoughts to the Buddha: he says to himself, "I am not able to save them with my divine power. I am of no use to them". The Commentator grapples with the dilemma of proclaiming the Buddha omniscient on the one hand (as all Commentaries claim in opposition to the Buddha's own words [M I 482,14-18]), while showing him doing nothing to stop his monks committing suicide and murder on the other. The explanation offered is that the Buddha was in *jhāna* and that no-one could talk to him. This conflicts with the Vinaya text which mentions that one monk took him almsfood every day.

After commenting on Migalandika, of whom it is said that he went to the river not only to wash his knife but also to purify himself of evil *kamma*, the Commentator arrives at another difficult point: explaining why the Buddha asked Ānanda where the monks had gone. If he was omniscient he knew already; if not, then he would be like ordinary people who need to ask. This issue is resolved by implying that the Buddha had been playing around: though he knew, still he asked as though he did not know. Such complications always follow from claims to omniscience when this is defined as knowing everything all at once. There is some gentle mockery of the Jain teacher's claims to omniscience at M II 214.

The Dharmagupta Vinaya story agrees essentially with the Pāli account. It makes much of the kammic retribution that had to fall on the 500 former hunters, by then monks, who would be forced to slaughter one another. Other Vinayas may throw more light upon this incident. As it stands, the Pāli account presents us with insoluble problems which are not in any way solved by the Commentary:

1. The Buddha knew others' minds, so why did he teach *asubha* meditation if this was likely to lead to suicide and murder?
2. Presumably he knew of the murderous potential of Migalandika, but is shown as going into retreat.
3. No monks, not even Ānanda, did anything to prevent the massacre. Even his attendant monk apparently did not say to the Buddha that monks were being slain or killing themselves in large numbers.
4. Nothing was done to restrain Migalandika, though these events are said to have taken place not far from the city of Vesālī, from which help could easily have been obtained.
5. The Buddha, apparently not knowing of the carnage during his retreat, asks, "Where have the monks gone?" when he emerges from it.

When reviewed like this the whole story appears a piece of improbable fiction, possibly a very distorted account of something which actually did take place. It is strange that a story like this, which does no credit to the Buddha, but quite the opposite, was permitted to remain in the Vinaya. Maybe some exceedingly dark events really did take place and had to be explained away, though the existing account is not successful in doing so. If the story is partly true, it would hardly reflect well on the Buddha, while if the whole is true he appears in a worse light still. As a Buddhist I am naturally reluctant to accept this.

The *Bhikshuni Precepts Manual* of the Dharmagupta Vinaya recounts almost the same story. Here is its account of the monastery at that time: "Due to these circumstances, the grove became littered with corpses. It stank horribly and was in a state of utter chaos and resembled a graveyard. The laity were shocked. They said, 'If these *bhiksus* would

go so far as to kill one another, how much more would they take the lives of other people ! We should not make offerings to them any more.””

It is unlikely that the mystery underlying this Vinaya rule will ever be solved, though other accounts surviving in the various untranslated Vinayas may be of some help. Obviously, the curious account in Pāli does not present the whole picture. Besides this, one must allow for exaggeration, especially of the number of monks killed by Migalandīka: if the Vinaya text is taken literally he killed 265 over several days. The Commentary, more expansive, tells us 500 monks died, but then this is a standard figure for a large number in Pāli.

In this initial exploration of the case we have not been able to offer a satisfactory solution. Perhaps later investigators with more information at their disposal may be able to ‘solve’ this mystery, or if they cannot do this, they may at least make more probable guesses at what happened to those monks outside Vesālī.

Wisemans Ferry

Laurence C.R. Mills (formerly Khantipalo)

### Bibliography

*Vinaya-piṭaka*, ed. H. Oldenberg, Vol. III, PTS, 1964

*The Book of the Discipline*, trans. I.B. Horner, Vol. I, PTS 1970

*Samantapāsādikā*, ed. J. Takakusu & M. Nagai, Vol. II, PTS 1969

*The Bhikshuni Precepts Manual*, (no translator’s name), Vol. I, Dharma Realm Buddhist University, California, 1983

*Shan-Chien-P’i-P’o-Sha*, trans. P.V. Bapat & A. Hirakawa, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona, 1970



## FOUR 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. *kinti* “in order that”
2. *kevala-kappa* “(almost) entire”
3. *sakāya niruttiyā* “in/with own *nirutti*”
4. *hevam* “thus”

1. *kinti* “in order that”

PED gives the meaning “how then ?” for *kinti* with only one reference for it (s.v. *kin*): *kinti te sutam*, D II 74,8. In Skt *kim* is used as a particle of interrogation, and very often it has no more meaning than a question mark. With the particle *iti* it means “why”. In the sentence quoted above (= D II 75,10 = A IV 18,21 foll.) it is simply asking a question: “Have you heard ?”

---

<sup>1</sup> See K.R. Norman, “Pāli Lexicographical Studies VIII”, in *JPTS*, XV, pp. 145–54.

<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 = Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit; CP I = K.R. Norman, *Collected Papers*, Vol. I, PTS 1990; MW = M. Monier-Williams, *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, Oxford 1899; PTS = Pali Text Society; PED = PTS’s *Pali-English Dictionary*; PTC = *Pāli Tipiṭakam Concordance*; Skt = Sanskrit; (M)RE = (Minor) Rock Edict; SepE = Separate Edict; PE = Pillar Edict; cty/cities = commentary/commentaries.

There is, however, another usage found in Pāli, which is not mentioned in PED, where it is constructed with an optative, to indicate a purpose:

*Vajjīnam arahantesu dhammikārakkhāvaraṇa-gutti susamvihitā, kinti anāgatā ca arahanto vijitam āgaccheyyūm*, D II 75,11 = A IV 17,5 = 20,6,10,13: "... so that arahats may enter the territory".

*yāvakīvañ ca bhikkhave bhikkhū paccattam yeva satim upatthāpessanti, kinti anāgatā ca pesalā sabrahmacāri phāsum vihareyyun ti*, D II 77,19 = A IV 22,3: "... so that good fellow-disciples may dwell at ease".

*kinti mahārāja idam dukkham nirujjheyya aññañ ca dukkham na uppajjeyya*, Mil 31,29 = 65,30: "So that this *dukkha* may cease and another *dukkha* may not arise".

The construction with an optative (or occasionally an injunctive) is also found in the Aśokan inscriptions<sup>1</sup>:

*ya ca kiñci parākramāmi aham kiñti bhūtānam ānamñam gacheyam*, RE VI(L) at G: "... so that I may discharge my debt ...".

*ta etāya athāya ayam dhammalipī lekhāpitā kiñti ciram tisṭeya*, RE VI(M) at G: "... so that it may last a long time".

*ya tu kici parikamate devāñampiyo priyadasi rājā ta savam pāratrīkāya kiñti sakale apaparisrave asa*, RE X(C) at G: "... so that there may be little danger".

*na tu tathā dānam va pūjā va devāñampiyo maññate yathā kiti sāravaḍhi asa*, RE XII(B) at G: "... so that there may be an increase in *sāra*".

*tasa tu idam mūlam ya vacigutī kiñti ātpapāsañḍapūjā va parapāsañḍagarahā va no bhave aprakaranamhi*, RE XII(D) at G: "... so

<sup>1</sup> Abbreviations of Aśokan site names: G = Girnar; Sh = Shāhbāzgarhī; Dh = Dhauli; Rūp = Rūpnāth. I follow the sentence divisions of E. Hultzsch, *The Inscriptions of Asoka*, Oxford 1925.

that there should not be praise of one's own sect or blame of another's sect ... ”.

*yo hi koci ātpapāsāmḍam pūjayati parapāsāmḍam va garahati savam ātpapāsāmḍabhatiyā kiṁti ātpapāsāmḍam dīpayema iti*, RE XII(H) at G: “ ... so that we may glorify our own sect”.

*ta samavāyo eva sādhu kiṁti amñamamñasa dhammam sruñāru ca susumsera ca*, RE XII(I) at G: “ ... so that they may hear each other's *dhamma*”.

*evam hi devānampiyasa ichā kiṁti savapāsāmḍā bahusrutā ca asu kalāñāgamā ca*, RE XII(J) at G: “ ... so that all sects may be learned ... ”.

*devānampiyo no tathā dānam va pūjam va māmñate yathā kiṁti sāravadhī asa sarvapāsāmḍānam*, RE XII(L) at G: “ ... so that there may be an increase in *sāra*”.

*anutape pi ca prabhave devanampriyasa vucati teṣa kiti avatrapeyu na ca hamñeyasu*, RE XIII(N) at Sh: “ ... so that they may be ashamed and not be killed”.

*etaye cā aṭhaye ayi dhramadipi nipista kiti putra papotra me asu* (? read *anam*)<sup>1</sup> *navam vijayam ma vijetavia mañiṣu*, RE XIII(X) at Sh: “ ... so that they may not think of another new victory”.

*atha pajāye ichāmi hakam kiṁti savena hitasukhena hidalokikapālalokikāye yujevu ti*, SepE II(E) at Dh: “ ... so that they be provided with complete welfare ... ”.

*ichā hi me kiṁti samghe samage cilathitike siyā ti*, Schism Edict (E) at Sāñcī: “ ... so that the *saṁgha* may be united and last a long time”.

*etāni bhañte dhammapaliyāyāni ichāmi kiṁti bahuke bhikhupāye cā bhikhuniye cā abhikhinam suneyu cā upadhālayeyū cā*, Bhabra (E): “ ... so that many groups of monks and nuns may listen repeatedly ... ”.

*etiya aṭhāye ca sāvane kāte ... iya paka(me) kiti ciraṭhitike siyā*, MRE I(H) at Rūp: “ ... so that it may last a long time”.

<sup>1</sup> See L. Alsdorf, “Der Schluss von Aśokas dreizehntem Felsedikt”, *Mélanges d'Indianisme (à la mémoire de Louis Renou)*, Paris 1968, pp. 23–33 (p. 26).

*tesam ye abhīhāle vā dāmde vā atapatiye me kāte kīm̄ti lajūkā asvathā abhītā kāmānī pavatayevū ti*, PE IV(D): “... so that the *lajūkas* may perform their duties confidently ...”.

*dhammayutena ca viyovadisam̄ti janam jānapadam kīm̄ti hidatam ca pālataṁ ca ālādhayevū ti*, PE IV(E): “... so that they may attain this world and the next”.

*ichitaviye hi esā kīm̄ti viyohālasamatā ca siyā dām̄dasamatā cā*, PE IV(K): “... so that there may be impartiality in proceedings and in punishments”.

This is a development of the usual meaning “Why ?” Someone has done, or will do, something. Why ? That something else may or may not happen (expressed in the optative or injunctive). We may then interpret *kīm̄ti* as introducing the purpose clause. “(The king) has acted, so that something may happen”.

## 2. *kevala-kappa* “(almost) entire”

PED quotes (s.v. *kevala*) this compound from Sn pp. 18, 45 (mistake for 46), 125, Pj I 115 and Vv-a 124 255 with the meaning “a whole *kappa*”, and repeats this (“a whole, complete *kappa*”) with the references Sn pp. 18, 46, 125 (s.v. *kappa*).

These references are all to a stock phrase referring to a divinity illuminating a grove:

*aññatarā devatā ... kevalakappam Jetavanam obhāsetvā*, Sn p. 18,10 = p. 46,14 = Khp p. 2,29 (glossed at Pj I 115,19 foll.) ≠ Sn p. 125,10 (*Brahmā Sahampati*).

*kevalakappam Gijjhakūṭam cando viya suriyo viya ca obhāsentī*, Vv-a 124,11.

*devalokato āgantvā kevalakappam Veļuvanam obhāsento*, Vv-a 255,6.

This stock phrase is widely found.<sup>1</sup> Pj I 115,19 foll., Ps II 125,36 foll., Spk I 15,22 foll. and Mp II 377,2 foll. give the definition *abhisaddahana-vohāra-kāla-paññatti-chedana-vikappa-lesa-samanta-bhāv'-ādi-anekattho* for *kappa*. They quote: *kevalakappam Veļuvanam obhāsetvā ti* (Ñānamoli identifies this as S I 52,21; it would seem preferable to identify it as S I 1,10, since Buddhaghosa deals with the word at Spk I 15,22 foll. [ad S I 1,10]) *evamādisu samantabhāvo. idha pan' assa samantabhāvo attho adhippeto. tasmā kevalakappam Andhavanān ti ettha anavasesam samantato Andhavanān ti evam attho daṭṭhabbo.* Mp III 353,8 (ad A III 309,4) does not give the full explanation but glosses: *kevalakappan ti sakalakappam*. At Mp II 374,30 (ad A I 277,2) *kevalakappam* is glossed: *sakalam kappam*, which is a wrong reading for *sakala-kappam* (Be so). At Sp 972,2 (ad Vin I 26,3) *kevalakappam* is glossed *sakalam kevalam*.

It is clear that the meaning given by PED for these references is incorrect, although Childers<sup>2</sup> had long ago seen correctly that the meaning of *kevalakappam Jetavanam* was “the whole of Jetavana”, and had defined *kevalakappo*<sup>3</sup> as “all, whole, entire”. Masefield points out<sup>4</sup> that this sense is not listed by PED under either *kevala* or *kappa*, and very charitably he does not say that the meaning which is given under both headings is wrong.

This failure is all the more striking because PED does list the correct meaning for *kappa* at the end of compounds (s.v. *kappa*), i.e. “made as, like, resembling”, e.g. *khagga-visāna-kappa* “like the rhinoceros horn”. The difficulty in the Pāli usage lies, as often in Pāli, in a Skt usage, and the solution to the problem is found by consulting

<sup>1</sup> See PTC, s.vv. *obhāseti* and *kevalakappa*.

<sup>2</sup> R.C. Childers, *Dictionary of the Pāli language*, London 1875, s.v. *kappo*.

<sup>3</sup> Childers, *ibid.*, s.v. *kevalakappo*.

<sup>4</sup> P. Masefield, *Vimāna-Stories*, PTS 1989, p. 190 (note 6).

MW,<sup>1</sup> where the meaning is given (inter alia): “having the manner, form of, similar to, like (but with a degree of inferiority), almost”, e.g. *abheda-kalpa* “almost impenetrable”, *prabhāta-kalpa* “nearly become light, approaching dawn”, *mrta-kalpa* “almost dead, apparently dead”.

The meaning of *kevala-kappa* is therefore, “(almost) entire”, or “just about the whole of ...”. This meaning is given in the cities quoted above for *kevalakappā ca Aṅga-Magadha pahūtam khādaniyam bhojaniyam ādāya upasamkamissanti* (Vin I 27,28) “The whole of Aṅga and Magadha will come bringing quantities of food”, for the sense is said to be *yebhuyyatā* “for the most part”, i.e. “almost all”. They also list *kevalakappam* used adverbially: *ayam āyasmato Anuruddhassa Bāhiko nāma saddhivihāriko kevalakappam samghabhedāya thito* (A II 239,21), where the sense is said to be *dalhatthatā* “firmness”.<sup>2</sup> Nāṇamoli translates “This co-resident of the venerable Anuruddha’s named Bāhika has taken his stand entirely for the schism in the Community”, and Woodward translates<sup>3</sup> “stands in every way for dissension in the Order”. Mp III 215,16 glosses: *kevalakappan ti sakalam samantato*.

The same meaning of *kappa* is found in the compound *ahata-kappa* which is used, in conjunction with *ahata*, of clothes: “unwashed or nearly unwashed, i.e. new or nearly new”. Miss Horner misunderstands this, and translates *ahatakappena* (Vin I 255,8) and *ahatakappānam* (Vin I 290,11) “when what is allowable is unsoiled”<sup>4</sup>: Sp

<sup>1</sup> s.v. *kalpa*.

<sup>2</sup> Bhikkhu Nāṇamoli, *Minor Readings and Illustrator*, PTS 1960, pp. 123–24.

<sup>3</sup> F.L. Woodward, *Gradual Sayings*, Vol. II, PTS 1933, p. 244.

<sup>4</sup> I.B. Horner, *Book of the Discipline*, Vol. IV, PTS 1951, pp. 357 and 413. Miss Horner seems not to have understood the meaning of *ahata* and its reference to the Indian way of washing clothes by banging them against a rock: “not struck (against a rock), i.e. never washed, i.e. new”, and *ahata-kappa* “nearly new”. She was perhaps misled by PED’s definition of *ahata* (s.v. *hata*): “unsoiled, clean, new”.

1111,31 (ad Vin I 255,8) glosses: *ahatakappenā ti ahatasadisena ekavāram vā dvikkhattum vā dhotena* “like unwashed (i.e. new), washed (only) once or twice”, and Sp 1128,18 (ad Vin I 290,11) glosses: *ahatakappānan ti ekavāradhotānam* “washed once”. PED rightly lists the usage with *ahata* under the same meaning as for *khagga-visāṇa-kappa*, quoted above. CPD correctly translates *ahata*<sup>1</sup> as “nearly (practically) new”.

### 3. *sakāya niruttiyā* “in/with own *nirutti*”

I am still not persuaded that in the well-known passage (Vin II 139,2–16) *chandaso* means “into the Vedic language”, and consequently I do not agree with the statement, “It is hardly surprising that there was a certain pressure for using Vedic Sanskrit for the recitation of Buddhist texts from the very beginning. The Buddha objected to this, and the issue of language was felt to be important enough to require a rule in the Vinaya explicitly forbidding the use of this language for Buddhist texts in favour of the vernaculars”.<sup>2</sup> The belief that the Buddha ordered the use of vernacular languages depends upon the translation of the words *sakāya niruttiyā*. I wish to return to this problem.

I now think that I was wrong when I said in my earlier discussion of the phrase *buddhavacanam chandaso āropema* that the second time *sakāya* occurs in the story it must refer to the Buddha “since there is nothing else in the sentence to refer to”.<sup>3</sup> *Sakāya* can, and indeed must, I think, refer to *Buddhavacanam*. It is well-known that in the

<sup>1</sup> CPD, Vol. I, s.v. *ahata*.

<sup>2</sup> O. von Hinüber, “Origin and varieties of Buddhist Sanskrit”, in C. Caillat (ed.): *Dialectes dans les littératures indo-aryennes*, Paris 1989, pp. 341–67 (p. 351).

<sup>3</sup> K.R. Norman, “Middle Indo-Aryan Studies VIII”, *Journal of the Oriental Institute* (Baroda), Vol. XX, pp. 329–36 (p. 330) = CP Vol. I, pp. 122–29 (p. 122).

the common Vinaya phrase *anujānāti* means “to ordain or prescribe”.<sup>1</sup> I therefore take the Buddha’s command to mean “I ordain that the *Buddhavacana* be mastered in [or “with” — see below] its own *nirutti*”, i.e. the infinitive *pariyāpunitum* is used in a passive sense, and I think that those who say we must understand the word *vo* in the sentence are wrong.<sup>2</sup> Since, as I said in the same article,<sup>3</sup> it is inconceivable that *sakāya* should have two different referents, it must have the same meaning when it is used earlier.

It is clear that it cannot be the followers’ own *nirutti*. If it were, then we should have to assume that the Buddha, when informed that they were ruining (*dūsenti*) his teaching in/with/by their own *nirutti*, insisted on their using their own *nirutti*, i.e. insisted that they continue to ruin his teaching. Since he insists upon the *Buddhavacana* being mastered *sakāya niruttiyā*, the *nirutti* must also be part of what they are ruining, i.e. it is either the Buddha’s *nirutti* or the *nirutti* of the *Buddhavacana*. We can take *sakāya niruttiyā* either as locative: “The *Buddhavacana* in its own *nirutti*” or as instrumental: “The *Buddhavacana* with its own *nirutti*”. I have said elsewhere<sup>4</sup> that I prefer the idea of “gloss” for *nirutti*. By this I mean some sort of simple commentary, perhaps nothing more than a translation into the local dialect of a single word, or an etymology to make the meaning plain. On the other hand, it would appear that Buddhaghosa was taking *nirutti* as “language”, and this also makes sense: “They are spoiling the *Buddhavacana* in its own language”. Buddhaghosa identified that

<sup>1</sup> See CPD, Vol. I, s.v. *anujānāti*.

<sup>2</sup> e.g. W. Geiger, *Pāli Literature and Language*, (second edition), Calcutta 1956, p. 7 footnote 2.

<sup>3</sup> Norman, *op. cit.* (in note 3 on p. 83), p. 330.

<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 (pp. 61–63).

language with Māgadhi because, as I said earlier,<sup>1</sup> that was the tradition handed down in the Mahāvihāra.

#### 4. *hevam* “thus”

PED s.v. *hevam* gives no text references, but refers to *hi*, where it is stated that *hevam* = *hi evam*. Without doubt this is so in certain contexts. Where *hevam* occurs as a second word in a clause, particularly after *na*, it may stand for *h(i) evam*. Where it occurs as first word in a clause, it must be *hevam*, since *hi*, being an enclitic, cannot stand as first word.

I have elsewhere pointed out that *hevam* occurs in the Kathāvatthu,<sup>2</sup> e.g. *hevam eva tattha dakkha* (Kv 3,11); *hevam patijānāntā*, *hevam niggahetabbā* (Kv 3,15–16). It is interesting to note that another such occurrence is at D I 54,17, in the description of the views of Makkhali Gosāla: *hevam* [Ee prints *h' evam*] *n' atthi doṇa-mite sukha-dukkhe paryanta-katē samsāre*. Since forms with initial *h-* are frequent in the Eastern versions of the Aśokan inscriptions,<sup>3</sup> we can assume that this is a genuine Eastern dialect form, appropriate to the speaker, and therefore retained in the account of his views.

Cambridge

K.R. Norman

<sup>1</sup> Norman, *op. cit.* (in note 3 on p. 83), p. 331.

<sup>2</sup> See K.R. Norman, “Māgadhisms in the Kathāvatthu”, in A.K. Narain (ed.): *Studies in Pali and Buddhism (a Memorial Volume in Honor of Bhikkhu Jagdish Kashyap)*, Delhi 1979, pp. 279–87.

<sup>3</sup> See Hultzsch, *op. cit.* (in note 1 on p. 78), Index, s.vv. *hida*, *hedisa/hedisā*, *heta*, *hemeva*, *hevam*, *hesā*.



## THE RITUAL OBLIGATIONS AND DONOR ROLES OF MONKS IN THE PĀLI VINAYA

More than once recently it has again been suggested that Buddhist monks had little or no role in life-cycle ceremonies in early India.<sup>1</sup> I do not know on what these suggestions are based, but it does not seem that it could be the Pāli texts. In fact, Buddhist *Vinaya* texts in Pāli, Sanskrit, and what G. Roth calls “Prākrit-cum-Sanskrit” seem to suggest quite otherwise. They seem to suggest and assume that monks regularly had a role in such ceremonies and that their ritual presence and performance at such ceremonies was of some importance. Most passages, indeed, employ a language which suggests “obligation” (*karaniya*). The same texts suggest and assume that Buddhist monks were active donors to their own monastic community.

Ironically, the one “life-cycle” ceremony in which a significant place for monks has been explicitly conceded — the funeral — is also the one which is not explicitly included in the list of such moments that occurs in the passage of the Pāli *Vinaya* which seems most concerned with such things. But though the funeral is not there explicitly mentioned, the text may allude at least to death rituals as Edgerton

---

<sup>1</sup> H. Bechert & R. Gombrich, eds., *The World of Buddhism: Buddhist Monks and Nuns in Society and Culture*, (London: 1984), p. 14; R. Gombrich, *Theravada Buddhism. A Social History from Ancient Benares to Modern Colombo*, (London: 1988), p. 124. That these sorts of remarks represent the received wisdom probably does not require documentation. Similar — if not stronger — suggestions have also been frequently made in regard even to monks’ participation in more specifically “Buddhist” ritual and cult practice, but see now G. Schopen, “Monks and the Relic Cult in the *Mahāparinibbānasutta*: An Old Misunderstanding in Regard to Monastic Buddhism”, in *From Benares to Beijing: Essays on Buddhism and Chinese Religion in Honor of Jan Yün-hua*, eds. G. Schopen & K. Shinohara, (Oakville: 1991), pp. 187–201.

sometime ago seemed to surmise: it speaks of “illness” (*gilāna*), and the illness in question seems to be — to judge by context — terminal.<sup>1</sup>

The passage in the Pāli *Vinaya* occurs in the *Vassupanāyikakhandhaka*, the section dealing with the “beginning of the rains.” In the Pali Text Society edition, the only one available to me, this passage is rather badly chopped up in an apparent attempt — on whose part I do not know, whether editor or scribe — to abbreviate repetitions. It deals in general with the occasions or situations in regard to which a monk can legitimately break the rain-retreat during which he was otherwise strictly forbidden to travel. One of these reasons — but only one — has been widely cited: a monk may be away for up to seven days if he goes to learn from a lay-brother (*upāsaka*) a “recognized sūtra” (*abhiññātām ... suttantam*) which would otherwise be in danger of being lost. There are, however, a number of other equally legitimate reasons.<sup>2</sup>

The enumeration of these reasons begins — in I. B. Horner’s translation — as follows:

This is a case, monks, where a dwelling-place for an Order comes to have been built by a layfollower (*idha pana bhikkhave upāsakena samgham uddissa vihāro kārāpito hoti*). If he should send a messenger to monks, saying: “Let the revered sirs come, I want to give a gift and to hear *dhamma* and to see the monks” (*āgacchantu bhaddantā, icchāmi dānañ ca dātum dhammañ ca*

<sup>1</sup> F. Edgerton, “The Hour of Death. Its Importance for Man’s Future Fate in Hindu and Western Religions”, *Annals of the Bhandarkar Institute* 8.3, (1926–27), p. 234; for the participation of monks in monastic funerals in both the Pāli and, especially, the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinayas* see G. Schopen, “On Avoiding Ghosts and Social Censure: Monastic Funerals in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*”, *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 20, (1992), pp. 1–39.

<sup>2</sup> All the Pāli citations below come from H. Oldenberg, *The Vinaya Piṭakam*, Vol. I, (London: 1879), pp. 139–42; the translations are from I.B. Horner, *The Book of The Discipline*, Vol. IV, (London: 1951), pp. 185–89.

*sotum bhikkhū ca passitun ti*), you should go, monks, if you are sent for (*pahita*) and if the business (*karaṇiya*) can be done in seven days, but not if you are not sent for (I 139,27; IV 186,16).

This is followed by a long list of other kinds of buildings — including “bathrooms” — and other kinds of constructions (“a lotus pond”) which a lay-brother has built for “an order,” or “for several monks” or “for one monk,” etc., in regard to which the same instructions are given. Since in these cases the order or the monks are the recipients of that which had been constructed it is perhaps not remarkable that their presence on these occasions was considered important enough to justify breaking the rain-retreat. The same, however, will not account for their presence on other occasions.

The passage continues:

This is a case, monks, where a dwelling comes to have been built by a lay follower for himself (*idha pana bhikkhave upāsakena attano atthāya nivesanam kārāpitam hoti*) ... a sleeping room (*sayanighara*) ... a stable (*uddosita*) ... a hall in the bathroom ... a lotus pond ... a shed ... a park ... (I 140,27; IV 187,22).

This list — an abbreviation of an already abbreviated text — is much longer and contains almost every conceivable kind of construction of a domestic sort. Here there is no question of these things being presented to the monks. They are explicitly said to have been made for the lay-brother himself. The monks in these cases cannot be there as recipients, and their presence must have been sought, and allowed, for other purposes. Since the text expresses the lay-brothers request using the formula “I want to give a gift and to hear *dhamma* and to see the

monks", it would seem reasonable to assume that not just here — but even in the prior cases where the monks were the intended recipients — the reason for the monks presence was essentially ritualistic. It would appear that the text is allowing as legitimate and requiring the presence of the monks at a ceremony of some sort that marked the completion — the verbal form is *kārāpita* — of the construction of all sorts of domestic structures owned by laymen at which they would receive gifts and recite religious texts. It is, in fact, hard to interpret the text otherwise. But two further points should be noted: it appears to have been assumed by the redactors of the text that monks would regularly receive such requests, and that their compliance with such requests was important enough to justify their temporary absence from the rain retreat.

If what we see here looks very much like sanctioned and assumed monastic participation in domestic "house-dedication" rituals of the kind frequently found in traditional cultures, then what follows in the passage can only further the impression. To the list of "house-dedications" the text then adds at least three other occasions of traditional domestic ritual:

This is the case, monks, where a dwelling comes to have been built by a layfollower for himself ... a sleeping room ... a park ... , or there comes to be his son's marriage (*puttassa vā vāreyyam hoti*), or there comes to be his daughter's marriage (*dhītuyā vā vāreyyam hoti*), or he becomes ill (*gilāno vā hoti*) ... (I 140,35; IV 188,3).

In each of these cases — as in those that precede — monks, if requested through the formulaic request, are to go. Since the reason or occasion that immediately follows concerns the preservation of "recognized *sūtras*" which are in danger of being lost, and since no distinction is made between it and the marriages of sons or daughters, for example, it

would seem that the redactors of the *Theravāda-vinaya* considered the latter to have the same importance as the former, or that the presence of monks at weddings was as important as the preservation of *sūtras*. It is, moreover, difficult to avoid the impression that this passage presupposes something like a "client" relationship between monks and lay-brothers. That there was some sense of obligation in this relationship seems virtually certain: the text does not say the monk *may* go, but that — if sent for and if it can be accomplished in seven days — he *must* go (*gantabba*).

The clarity of the text here renders elaborate discussion, I think, unnecessary. That the redactors of this *Vinaya* assumed and insisted on monastic presence at, and participation in, a whole series of purely domestic or life-cycle rituals seems all but self-evident. Our passage is not simply of interest for its clear articulation of a set of ritual obligations bearing on Buddhist monks, however, because it also assumes that requests for the ritual presence of monks will not be made only by laymen. It goes on to enumerate in very nearly the same language another series of individuals who have dwelling places and monasteries built for the order and themselves, and who also request the ritual presence of the monks on such occasions:

This is a case, monks, where a dwelling place ... a site for a monastery for an order ... for several monks ... for him- (her-) self is built by a monk ... a nun ... a probationer ... a novice ... (*idha pana bhikkhave bhikkhunā samgham uddissa, bhikkhuniyā samgham uddissa ... attano atthāya vihāro kārāpito hoti*). If he (she) should send a messenger to monks, saying: "Let the revered sirs (masters) come. I want to give a gift and to hear *dhamma* and to see the monks," you should go, monks, if you are sent for and if the business can be done in seven days ... (I 141,31; IV 189,11).

Here, too, I think, the text has an elegant clarity. The redactors of our passage could only have assumed and taken very much for granted that — exactly as laymen — monks, nuns, “probationers” (*sikkhamāna*), and novices (*sāmanera*), all had monasteries and monastic buildings regularly constructed both for the order and for themselves, and — again like laymen — had on such occasions need for the ritual presence of fellow monks. The text does not rule on, but assumes, that monks and nuns can and do act as major donors. We need not again belabour the fact that this kind of assumption on the part of the redactors of the *Theravāda-vinaya* fits awkwardly, if at all, in the picture of monastic Buddhism found in our handbooks, but very nicely with the actions of monks and nuns recorded in Indian inscriptions.<sup>1</sup> The role of monks in domestic rituals also is not a common-place in modern presentations of monastic Buddhism. The apparent discordancy — since we prefer so often the pictures in our *own* books — might suggest some suspicion in regard to the present passage, or that it is just another aberration peculiar to the Pāli *Vinaya*.<sup>2</sup> That such suspicions are unfounded seems to follow from two further quite different texts.

The *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* found at Gilgit has a section — the *Varṣāvastu* — that corresponds in the main to the Pāli

<sup>1</sup> See G. Schopen, “Filial Piety and the Monk in the Practice of Indian Buddhism”, *T'oung Pao* 70, (1984), pp. 110–26; Schopen, “Two Problems in the History of Indian Buddhism: The Layman/Monk Distinction and Doctrines of the Transference of Merit”, *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 10, (1985), pp. 9–47; Schopen, “On Monks, Nuns and ‘Vulgar’ Practices: The Introduction of the Image Cult into Indian Buddhism”, *Artibus Asiae* 49, 1–2, (1988–89), pp. 153–68; etc.

<sup>2</sup> The presence in the Pāli canonical *Vinaya* of rules governing the obligatory presence of monks at weddings, for example, is particularly intriguing in light of what has recently been said about the modern “change” and “transformation” of Buddhism in Sri Lanka; see R. Gombrich & G. Obeyesekere, *Buddhism Transformed. Religious Change in Sri Lanka*, (Princeton: 1988), pp. 265–73; H.L. Seneviratne, *Rituals of the Kandyan State*, (Cambridge: 1978), p. 129; etc.

*Vassupanāyika-khandhaka*. There is as well in the Gilgit *Varṣāvastu* a long passage which corresponds to the Pāli passage cited above which enumerates the occasions on which the monks may legitimately be away during the rain-retreat. Both the enumeration and language here are similar to what occurs in the Pāli *Vinaya*, but by no means the same. The *Varṣāvastu* passage starts with a list of obligations (*karaṇīya*) owed to *upāsakas* or lay-brothers. Unfortunately the description of the very first of the occasions on which a monk must go when sent for by a layman involves a textual — and perhaps lexical — problem which I cannot solve. It is, however, virtually certain that it had something to do with the marriage of the lay-brother.<sup>1</sup> I therefore cite what is in fact the last occasion enumerated to give an example of the formulaic character of the language used in this text:

There is moreover a further obligation to a lay-brother (*upāsakasya karaṇiyam*). It may occur that a lay-brother has a sickness, suffering, a serious illness. He will send a messenger

---

<sup>1</sup> N. Dutt, *Gilgit Manuscripts*, Vol. III, pt. IV, (Calcutta: 1950), 138.9 prints the text as follows: *kim upāsakasya karaṇīyena / yathāpi tad upāsakasya grha-kalatram pratypasthitam bhavati ātmano veṣṭanam ... sa bhikṣunām dūtam anuprēsayati ...*. On at least two occasions immediately prior to this passage a householder is described in similar terms: *tatra ... grhapatiḥ prativasati / tasya grha-kalatram pratypasthitam / ātmano veṣṭanam ...* (136.15; 137.13; see also 140.22). Unfortunately in all these cases the manuscript seems to read not *grha-kalatram*, but *grha-kanutram* (R. Vira & L. Chandra, *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*, Part 6, (New Delhi: 1974), 733.8; 734.3; 734.7; 736.1), and I do not know what *-kanutram* means. I suspect that Dutt also did not and — as he so often did — silently “corrected” the text on the basis of the Tibetan: *dge bṣnyen gyi bya ba gang zhe na / 'di ltar yang dge bṣnyen gyis khyim du rang gi 'ching ba bag ma blangs te /* (*The Tog Palace Manuscript of the Tibetan Kanjur*, Vol. I, (Leh: 1979), 692.2; cf. 689.2; 690.6; 696.1). Although, again, I do not fully understand the phrase *khyim du rang gi 'ching ba*, the Tibetan text has certainly understood its text to be referring to the lay-brothers' marriage.

to the monks (saying) “Will the Venerable Ones give a recitation” (*āryā vācam dāsyanti*). A monk should go, having been authorized for seven days, through this obligation to a lay-brother (*gantavyam bhiksunā saptāham adhiṣṭhāya upāsakasya karaṇiyena*).<sup>1</sup>

The *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, like the *Vinaya* of the Theravāda, assumes, then, and requires the presence of monks at certain lay, domestic “life-cycle” ceremonies. It does not list all the same occasions, however, referring explicitly only to marriage and serious, if not terminal, illness. The *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* does not seem to refer to “house dedication” rituals; it certainly does not contain the long list of different kinds of structures found in the Pāli. But it does contain some of the same occasions found in the Pāli that are more specifically “Buddhist.” It refers, for example, to a lay-brother having a *vihāra* constructed, although here too it uses a different language: “It may occur that a lay-brother wishes to have erected a monastery for the community of monks from the four directions” (*yathāpi tad upāsakaś cāturdīśe bhikṣu-samghe vihāram pratiṣṭhāpayitu-kāmo bhavati*). It also lists a number of more specifically “Buddhist” occasions not found in the Pāli *Vinaya*: a lay-brother “desiring to donate bedding and seats to that monastery” (... *asminn eva vihāre śayanāsanam anupradātukāmo bhavati*), “wanting to designate a permanent alms giving” in it (... *asminn eva vihāre dhruva-bhiksām prajñapayitukāmo bhavati*), and, interestingly, “wanting to have erected a *stūpa* for the body of the Tathāgata in that monastery” (... *tasminn eva vihāre tathāgatasya śarīra-stūpam pratiṣṭhāpayitu-kāmo bhavati*).<sup>2</sup> In all of these cases — as in the case of marriage and illness — if the monks are sent for, and if they can

<sup>1</sup> Dutt, *Gilgit Manuscripts*, III, 4, 140.17.

<sup>2</sup> Dutt, *Gilgit Manuscripts*, III, 4, 138.14–139.11.

return within seven days, they are of course required to go. One of such occasions, however, may be particularly important because we may be able to connect it with a record that can be much more securely placed in time and place.

The Gilgit text gives one of the more specifically Buddhist occasions in the following form:

There is moreover a further obligation to a lay-brother. It may occur that a lay-brother wants to donate the raising of a staff on that *stūpa*, the raising of an umbrella, the raising of a flag, the raising of a banner ... he sends a messenger to the monks ... a monk should go ... (*aparam apy upāsakasya karaṇiyam. yathāpi tad upāsakas tasminn eva stūpe yaṣṭy-āropanāṁ chatrāropanāṁ dhvajāropanāṁ patākāropanāṁ ... anupradātukāmo bhavati ... sa bhikṣūṇāṁ dūtam anuprēsayati ... gantavyāṁ bhikṣuṇā ...*).<sup>1</sup>

Admitting that the exact sense of *yaṣṭi* — though much discussed<sup>2</sup> — is uncertain, still it is difficult not to see in this passage a regulation which corresponds almost exactly to the record of an actual event which appears to have occurred at a *stūpa* near Bahāwalpur in the first century of the Common Era. This event was recorded in a *Kharoṣṭhī* inscription, the language of which is “a Sanskritized Prākrit.”

<sup>1</sup> Dutt, *Gilgit Manuscripts*, III, 4, 139.11–17.

<sup>2</sup> F. Weller, “Divyāvadāna 244.7 ff.”, *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung* 1, (1953), pp. 268–76; L. Alsdorf, “Der Stūpa des Kṣemamāṇkara”, *Studia Indologica (Festschrift für Willibald Kirlfel)*, (Bonn: 1955), pp. 9–16; M. Bénisti, “Étude sur le stūpa dans l’Inde ancienne”, *Bulletin de l’École française d’Extrême-Orient* 50, (1960), pp. 37–116, esp. pp. 76 foll.; F.B.J. Kuiper, “Yūpayaṣṭi- (Divy. 244,11)”, *Indo-Iranian Journal* 3, (1959), pp. 204–05; G. Roth, “Bemerkungen zum Stūpa des Kṣemamāṇkara”, *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 5/6, (1980), pp. 181–92; etc.

Although there have been some differences of opinion in regard to its interpretation, Konow's — as usual — appears to be basically correct:

The eleventh year — year 11 — of the Great King, the King Surpassing Kings, the Son of Devas, Kaniṣka, in the month of Daisios, on the eighteenth day — day 18 — when the monk (*bhikṣu*) Nāgadatta, a narrator of *dharma* (*dha[rma]kathi*), the student (*śiṣya*) of the teacher (*acarya*) Damatrāta, the student's student of the teacher Bhava, raised the staff (*yathim aropayata*) here in Damana, the mistress of the monastery (*viharasvamīni*), the lay-sister (*upasika*) Balānandī and the matron, her mother Balajayā, also gave, in addition to the setting up of the *yaṣṭi* (*imam yaṭhipratīṭhanam*), the enclosure (*parivara*). May this be for the benefit and ease of all living beings.<sup>1</sup>

Here we seem to have the record of almost precisely the kind of occasion envisioned in the text. A lay-sister donates "the setting up of a *yaṣṭi*" at a *stūpa*, but the presence of a monk — if not his actual direction of the event — is carefully recorded, using in at least one case exactly the same wording as the *Vinaya* passage. The importance of the epigraphical record lies, of course, in the fact that it allows us to say

---

<sup>1</sup> For Konow's edition and translation see S. Konow, *Kharoshthī Inscriptions with the exception of those of Aśoka* (Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, Vol. II, Part I), (Calcutta: 1929), pp. 139–41 (no. LXXIV), pl. XXVI — my translation is heavily indebted to his. For some earlier interpretations of the record see A.F.R. Hoernle, "Readings from the Arian Pāli", *The Indian Antiquary* 10, (1881), pp. 324–31; B. Indraji, "A Baktro-Pāli Inscription of Sui Bāhāra", *The Indian Antiquary* 11, (1882), pp. 128–29; N.G. Majumdar, "The Suē Vihār Copper-plate of the Reign of Kaniṣka", *Sir Asutosh Mookerji Silver Jubilee Volumes*, III, 1, (Calcutta: 1922), pp. 459–74.

that what was promulgated in at least this *Vinaya* appears to actually have been occurring by the first century.<sup>1</sup>

Apart from these points, and apart from noting too that the *Mūlasarvāstivāda* passage also lists as one occasion the recitation of texts by a lay-brother, we need only note that this *Vinaya* not only confirms the kind of participation of monks in domestic rituals that was taken for granted in the Pāli *Vinaya*, it also assumes — again as in the Pāli — that monks will regularly act as donors. The first of a monk's "obligations" to fellow monks occurs in the following form:

What is the obligation to a monk (*bhikṣoh karaṇiyam*). It may occur that a monk wants to present a park to the community of monks from the four directions (*yathāpi tad bhikṣus cāturdīśe bhikṣusamghe ārāmam niryātayitukāmo bhavati*). By him there an abundance of material things and worldly things are brought together (*tena tatra prabhūto vastulābha āmiṣalābhaś ca*

<sup>1</sup> If our *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* passage strongly argues for Konow's interpretation of the *Kharoṣṭī* inscription, it is less helpful for understanding the references to *yaṣṭis* or *laṣṭis* in a series of records from Western India — see B. Indraji, "The Western Kshatrapas", *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, (1890), p. 652; R.D. Banerji, "The Andhau Inscriptions of the Time of Rudradaman", *Epigraphia Indica* 16, (1921–22), pp. 19–25 (two of these might be Buddhist); S. Gokhale, "Andhau Inscription of Caṣṭana, Śaka 11", *Journal of Ancient Indian History* 2, (1969), pp. 104–11; D.C. Sircar, "Andhau Fragmentary Inscription of Caṣṭana, Year 11", *Journal of Indian History* 48, (1970), pp. 253–57; S. Sankaranarayanan, "A New Early Kushana Brahmi Inscription", *Śrinidhih. Perspectives in Indian Archaeology, Art and Culture. Shri K.R. Srinivasan Festschrift*, ed. K.V. Raman et al., (Madras: 1983), pp. 277–84; etc. — Although the references that I know are late, it is worth noting that — like our *Mūlasarvāstivāda* passage — Hindu inscriptions also refer to a ritual *dhvajāroha* or *dhvajārohana*, see R. Sharma, "Udayapur Inscription of Paramara Udayaditya, Vikrama 1137", *Epigraphia Indica* 38, (1970), pp. 281 foll.; S.L. Katare, "Kalanjara Inscription of V.S. 1147", *Epigraphia Indica* 31, (1955–56), pp. 163 foll.; etc.

*samupānīto bhavati*). He sends a messenger to the monks (saying) “Come! The Reverends will enjoy”. A monk should go, having been authorized for seven days, through this obligation to a monk.<sup>1</sup>

In referring to “bringing together material and worldly things” the text uses exactly the same formulaic wording it had used several times previously in regard to lay-brothers. Moreover, immediately after this passage the text also lists in abbreviated form virtually all the occasions it had enumerated in detail in regard to obligations to lay-brothers (*yathāpi tad bhikṣur asminn evārāme vihāram śayanāsanam dhruvabhikṣām tathāgatasya śārīrastūpam*, etc.).<sup>2</sup> As in the section

<sup>1</sup> Dutt, *Gilgit Manuscripts*, III, 4, 141.1 foll.

<sup>2</sup> Dutt, *Gilgit Manuscripts*, III, 4, 141.6 foll. It will have been noticed that where the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* makes full reference to *stūpas* the *Theravāda-vinaya* has none. On this pattern see G. Schopen, “The *Stūpa* Cult and the Extant Pāli Vinaya”, *JPTS* XIII, (1989), pp. 83–100 and the responses to it in O. von Hinüber, “*Khandhakavatta*. Loss of Text in the Pāli Vinaya”, *JPTS* XV, (1990), pp. 127–38; C. Hallisey, “Apropos the Pāli Vinaya as a Historical Document. A Reply to Gregory Schopen”, *ibid.*, pp. 197–208; R. Gombrich, “Making Mountains Without Molehills: The Case of the Missing *Stūpa*”, *ibid.*, pp. 141–43. What has come out of this discussion — apart from some light entertainment provided by Professor Gombrich — seems to be: an increased awareness of the complexity and extent of Pāli *Vinaya* literature, and a promising suggestion that there is something like an “ideal” *Vinaya* (the canonical *Vinaya*) and an “actually used” *Vinaya* (the various summaries and “different monastic handbooks”), with the consequent confirmation of the suggestion “that the canonical *Vinaya* text is not as useful as once thought as a ready source for extracting usable historical data” (Hallisey, p. 207). It seems too that the suggestion of “the loss of text” is weaker even than I thought, but some problems remain. Though the *Katikāvata* passage might be neutralized by invoking the *du* or *ca*, this will not affect the *Visuddhimagga* passages. They, as Hallisey says, “are more difficult to explain.” There is, moreover, what appears to be a much more likely case of “loss of text” — here again concerning “relics” — in the Sri Lankan mss. of the *Samyutta* (see G. Schopen, “An Old

dealing with lay-brothers, so here the section ends with reference to a monk's obligation to attend to a sick or dying fellow monk by giving a recitation (*yathāpi tad bhikṣur ābādhiko duḥkhito vādhaglāno bhavati. sa bhikṣuṇām dūtam anuprēṣayati. āgacchantv āyuṣmanto vācām bhā[si]syanti*, etc.).<sup>1</sup>

We have, then, two apparently distinct *Vinaya* traditions — the Theravāda and Mūlasarvāstivāda — which both assume and enjoin monastic participation in at least some domestic, lay, life-cycle rituals and take as a given the fact that monks — exactly like laymen — make both major and minor religious donations, and that when they do, other monks are obliged to be present. There is, moreover, at least a third *Vinaya* tradition in which we find something very similar.

The *Abhisamācārikā*, the “Prākrit-cum-Sanskrit” text of which was discovered in Tibet by R. Sankrityayana, belongs to the Mahāsāṅghika-Lokottaravāda monastic tradition. In its formal structure it does not contain divisions corresponding to the Pāli *Vassupanāyikakhandhaka* nor to the Gilgit *Varṣāvastu* and, as a consequence, we do not find in it a passage that formally corresponds to those we have discussed. We do find, however, the expression of the same sorts of

---

Inscription from Amarāvatī and the Cult of the Local Monastic Dead in Indian Buddhist Monasteries”, *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 14.2, (1991), pp. 281–329 [p. 328 note 111]). Finally, it seems absolutely certain — given Professor Gombrich's agreement — that it can no longer be said that the Pāli *Vinaya* does not contain any references to *stūpas*. He seems to have been so convinced by my suggestion that the references to *cetiyas* in the *Sutta-Vibhaṅga* are to be understood as referring to *stūpas* that he wants to use them against me (p. 140). But the presence of such rules in one part of the Pāli *Vinaya*, but not in another, does not seem to puzzle.

<sup>1</sup> Dutt, *Gilgit Manuscripts*, III, 4, 142.5. Elsewhere in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* — in its *Civara-vastu* — there are even more specific rules governing the performance of a “worship of the Teacher (= Buddha)” (*śāstus ca pūjā*) for a sick and dying monk and how that *pūjā* should be financed (N. Dutt, *Gilgit Manuscripts*, Vol. III, Part 2, (Srinagar: 1942), 124.11–125.9).

assumptions and ideas. In its first chapter,<sup>1</sup> for example, which deals in large part with the duties of a senior monk (*saṃgha-sthavira*), it says that one of the duties of such a monk is to determine, when an invitation to a meal has been received by the monks, what the occasion for the meal is (*jānitavyam. kim ālambanam bhaktam*). He is to determine whether, significantly, the invitation is “connected with a birth, connected with a death, connected with a marriage, connected with a house warming” (*jātakam mṛtakam vā vevāhikam vā gr̥ha-praveśakam vā*).<sup>2</sup> These are the occasions, apparently, on which it was assumed monks would receive and accept invitations from the laity, and they — as in the Pāli and Gilgit *Vinayas* — are all connected with domestic life-cycle rituals. The text goes on to say that in addition to the occasion, the senior monk must also determine the source of the invitation, he must determine whether it comes from “a visitor, a villager, a householder, or a renunciant” (*āgantukasya gamikasya gr̥hasthasya pravrajitasya*). It is clear from the instructions given by the senior monk to the person sent to determine these things that when the inviter is a householder he is generally assumed to be a lay-brother or *upāsaka* (*tena gacchiya pr̥cchitavyam, koci imam hi ithannāmo nāma upāsako*). It is equally clear from similar instructions that the inviter could be a monk or nun (*ko nimantreti, bhikṣu bhikṣuṇī upāsakopāsikā āgantuko gamiko vāñjako sārthavāho*).<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The whole text was first edited in B. Jinananda, *Abhisamācārikā* [*Bhikṣuprakīrṇaka*] (Patna: 1969). The first chapter has been again edited and translated — though the latter at least is far from satisfactory — in S. Singh & K. Minowa, “A Critical Edition and Translation of Abhisamācārikā Nāma Bhikṣu-Prakīrṇakah”, *Buddhist Studies. The Journal of the Department of Buddhist Studies, University of Delhi* 12 (1988) pp. 81–146; see also M. Prasad, *A Comparative Study of Abhisamācārikā* (Patna: 1984).

<sup>2</sup> Singh & Minowa, 91.26; Jinananda, 17.8.

<sup>3</sup> Singh & Minowa, 91.27; 89.32; 95.27; Jinananda, 17.9; 14.9; 25.1.

After indicating how all of this should be determined the text goes on to specify how on each occasion the “transfer of merit” apparently expected from the monks should be performed, citing — curiously — both an inappropriate and an appropriate verse to be recited that in every case is tailored to the specific occasion. Typical are the instructions concerning an invitation “connected with a death”:

Now, then, when it is an occasion connected with a death, it is not permissible to direct the reward thus (*nāyam kṣamati evam dakṣinā ādiśitum*):

“Today for you is a very good day, very efficacious. At present has arrived an auspicious moment.

Today for you in the well-ordained, through the well-ordained, the reward in the most excellent vessel shines.”

Not in this way is the reward to be directed, but rather the reward should be directed (*atha khalu dakṣinā ādiśitavyā*):

“All living beings will die. Indeed life ends in death. As was their action so they will go, going towards the result of good or bad.

There is hell for those of bad action; good being done, they go to heaven. Having developed the noble path they without further consequences enter *nirvāṇa*.”

In this way the reward is to be directed.<sup>1</sup>

The monks on each occasion are required to recite an appropriate verse and “to direct the reward” that results from this. Though not frequent the expression used here to refer to the “transfer of

---

<sup>1</sup> Singh & Minowa, 92.15 foll.; Jinananda, 18.13 foll.

merit" — *dakṣinā ādiś-* — does occur in the Pāli canon, and there, as here, is also associated with the recitation of verses. It is far more frequent and firmly anchored in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* and related sources, where again it is frequently connected with the recitation of verses or *Dharma*. And it is referred to as well in other *Mahāsāṅghika* sources.<sup>1</sup> The appropriate verse here — as in most other cases — occurs elsewhere in canonical literature.<sup>2</sup> But for our present purposes the most important point to be noted is, of course, that the *Abhisamācārikā*, though representing yet another distinct *Vinaya* tradition, assumes, and makes rules to govern, the participation of monks in domestic life-cycle rituals, and assumes as well that monks and nuns act as donors. Though minor details may vary, it has in common a set of basic assumptions and ideas with both the *Theravāda* and *Mūlasarvāstivāda* monastic traditions and codes. All share the assumption and acceptance of a monk's obligation to be present at, and to have an active role in, a variety of domestic, life-cycle rituals connected with birth, marriage, house construction, sickness, and death. All promulgate rules governing such obligations.<sup>3</sup> All recognize as perfectly regular that monks and nuns will

---

<sup>1</sup> For references in both primary and secondary sources, and some discussion, concerning the expression *dakṣinā ādiś-* see Schopen, *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 20, (1992), pp. 1-39 (p. 30 note 43). It has yet, however, to be fully studied.

<sup>2</sup> This verse or variants of it occur at *Mahāvastu* II 66; *Samyutta* I 97; etc.

<sup>3</sup> The various *Vinayas* obviously do not list all the same ritual occasions. The *Abhisamācārikā* list is the most inclusive and the Pāli *Vinaya* puts considerable emphasis on "house dedication" rituals. The *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* is noticeably the most restrictive in terms of the kind of domestic rituals at which monks are obliged to be present. The explanation for these differences is, of course, not yet determined, but it may well be related not to chronology, but to the cultural and geographical milieu in which the various codes were redacted. We may see in the restrictive character of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, for example, another indication that it was redacted by, and for, a Buddhist monastic community in close contact with brahmanical or significantly brahmanized

act as donors. The texts, I think, are unambiguous on these points, although there is as well an important qualification in all of them.

The qualification or restriction which appears to apply to the obligations monks owe to others is highlighted in, for example, another discussion in the Pāli *Vinaya*. The case involves a monk whose mother falls ill and sends for him during the rain retreat. The monk is made to recall the Buddha's ruling on the matter, but it apparently does not cover this particular case because the monk says: *ayañ ca me mātā gilānā sā ca anupāsikā. kathāñ nu kho mayā paṭipajjitatban ti*, ("This is my mother who is fallen ill, *but she is not a lay-sister*. How now should I proceed?"). The Buddha responds by adding one's mother and father to the previously established list of individuals — all otherwise formally connected with the Buddhist community — to whom a monk had a clear obligation in such circumstances: A monk, a nun, a probationer, a novice, a woman novice, and lay-brothers and sisters<sup>1</sup>

This case confirms and makes explicit what all our texts, whether Theravāda, Mūlasarvāstivāda, or Mahāsāṅghika, seem to imply: the obligation of monks to attend and participate in lay life-cycle ceremonies is not owed to the total lay population, but only to individuals who are formally designated as lay-brothers (*upāsakas*) or lay-sisters (*upāsikās*). To which the Pāli tradition at least adds one's mother and father, even if the latter are not formerly connected with the Buddhist community. This restriction is significant for understanding the social dynamics of the Buddhist community as it was understood by *vinaya* masters. It is also significant because epigraphical material seems strongly to suggest that only a small part of those people who made

groups in which domestic ritual was already in the hands of other religious specialists. The needs or requirements of a monastic group in "tribal" or partially brahmanized areas could differ markedly. Cf. Schopen, *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 20, (1992), pp. 1–39 (esp. pp. 18–20).

<sup>1</sup> Pāli *Vinaya* I 147,20 foll.

strongly to suggest that only a small part of those people who made gifts at Buddhist sites identified themselves as *upāsakas* or *upāsikās*.<sup>1</sup> The ritual clientele of Buddhist monks may necessarily have been limited in early India. The problem that remains, however, is determining what "early" can mean here.

The situation encountered here is nothing new. It recurs repeatedly in the study of "early" Buddhist canonical sources, especially when textual sources transmitted by more than one Buddhist monastic order are consulted. We have in our case texts redacted and transmitted by the Theravāda, Mūlasarvāstivāda, and Mahāsāṅghika which — although they differ in regard to detail — share or have in common a set of rules and a common assumption in regard to monastic participation in domestic ritual. To account for such shared or common elements two basic theories have been used. One says that common elements in discrete textual and monastic sources must go back to a period which predates the development of "schisms." The other says that such common elements are the result of "contamination," mutual borrowing and a process of levelling, and therefore are late.<sup>2</sup> The first theory depends on the assumption that Buddhist monastic groups can be meaningfully treated as "sects" — this has been repeatedly questioned.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> A thorough study of *upāsakas* and *upāsikās* in Indian Buddhist inscriptions has yet to be done. But at Sāñcī *stūpa* no. 1, for example, only 18 of the more than 325 lay donors call themselves *upāsakas* or *upāsikās*; at Bharhut none do; at Nasik only 4 of 23; at Karle only 2 of 22; and I very much suspect a similar pattern will hold through out until at least the fifth/sixth century.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. L.O. Gómez, "Buddhism in India", in *Buddhism and Asian History*, ed. J.M. Kitagawa & M.D. Cummings, (New York: 1989), p. 64; L. Schmithausen, "Preface", *Earliest Buddhism and Madhyamaka* (Panels of the VIIth World Sanskrit Conference, Vol. II), (Leiden: 1990), pp. 1-2.

<sup>3</sup> See H. Bechert, "Zur Geschichte der buddhistischen Sekten in Indien und Ceylon", *La nouvelle clio* 7-9, (1955-57), pp. 311-60; Bechert, "On the Identification of Buddhist Schools in Early Sri Lanka", *Indology and Law*.

It depends on the assumption that once developed these "sects" existed in isolation, hermetically sealed, with no significant contact or interchange — this is contrary to all our evidence.<sup>1</sup> It depends on the assumption that we actually know when the splits or "schisms" occurred — but we do not. The textual sources — all very late — give a variety of discordant dates and epigraphical sources suggest that discrete monastic orders appeared centuries later than our textual sources say.<sup>2</sup> Finally, this theory assumes that "orthodoxy" or uniformity among related religious groups is established first and then only over time do significant differences develop — this is contrary to almost everything "church historians" and sociologists have discovered: if uniformity is ever achieved it is achieved over more or less long periods of time through a complex process of mutual influence, borrowing, and sometimes violent levelling that works on originally discrete and competing groups and voices.<sup>3</sup> The second theory seems to avoid these problems.

A similar — in fact related — set of questions concerns the date of the various *Vinayas*. But it too seems that the old observations and arguments of Wassilieff and Lévi remain unrefuted and best account for

<sup>1</sup> Ét. Lamotte, *Histoire du bouddhisme indien des origines à l'ère śaka*, (Louvain: 1958), p. 197.

<sup>2</sup> See Schopen, *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 10, (1985), pp. 15–16.

<sup>3</sup> See, for example, the now "classic" W. Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*, (Philadelphia: 1971). Something similar has occasionally been argued in the development of Indian Buddhism — but only occasionally. J. Przyluski, for example, in discussing the *pratītyasamutpāda* formula said many years ago: "En somme, nous ne pouvons admettre qu'il y eût à l'origine du Bouddhisme une série de douze 'conditions' dont les autres listes ne seraient que des déformations récentes. Plus haut nous remontons dans le passé, plus grande est la diversité que nous constatons. C'est probablement à une époque assez tardive qu'on s'efforça de concilier les thèses divergentes et que finit par prévaloir la série: *avidyā ... jarāmaraṇa*" (J. Przyluski, "La roue de la vie à Ajantā", *Journal Asiatique*, (1920), pp. 327–28).

what seem to be the facts. The former said some years ago that it appears that "les Vinayas parvenus à nous ont été rédigés à une époque tardive," and the evidence seems to be mounting in his favour.<sup>1</sup>

Fortunately, however, the dates of the *Vinayas* need not here be decided. It is probably true that in terms of absolute chronology *all* the *Vinayas* are late. But from the point-of-view of relative chronology they also represent the earliest codification of monastic rules that we have. For our specific purposes this means that monastic presence and participation in a range of domestic life-cycle rituals is assumed, judged important, and prescribed in the earliest *Vinaya* literature that we have, and that our earliest *Vinaya* sources assume that monks and nuns will regularly act as donors and rule on the obligations of fellow monks when they do.

We still, of course, do not know if monks actually participated in domestic rituals. We only know that the monk redactors of several *Vinayas* assumed they did and said they should. That monks and nuns acted as donors, however, is certain. Not only do those same monk redactors assume they did, and formulate rules for governing the behaviour of other monks when they would, but Indian inscriptions put

---

<sup>1</sup> W. Wassilieff [V. Vasilyev], "Le bouddhisme dans son plein développement d'après les vinayas", *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 34, (1896), pp. 318–25, esp. pp. 321 foll.; S. Lévi, "Les éléments de formation du *Divyāvadāna*", *T'oung Pao* 8, (1907), pp. 116–17 and note 1; Lévi, "Les saintes écritures du bouddhisme", in *Mémorial Sylvain Lévi*, (Paris: 1937), pp. 82–84: "De plus, la vie du couvent, qui allait en se développant sans cesse, proposait ainsi sans cesse des problèmes pratiques qu'il fallait résoudre au nom du fondateur de l'ordre. Les couvents les plus riches, les mieux fréquentés, se créaient ainsi des collections qui se perpétuaient en s'accroissant. Les religieux errants, qui circulaient toujours nombreux de couvent en couvent, maintenaient dans ce vaste ensemble une communication constante qui tendait à niveler les divergences trop accusées. Réduits par élévation à leurs éléments communs, les *Vinaya* de toutes les écoles se ramènent sans effort à une sorte d'archétype unique, qui n'est pas le *Vinaya* primitif, mais la moyenne des *Vinaya*."

acted as donors, however, is certain. Not only do those same monk redactors assume they did, and formulate rules for governing the behaviour of other monks when they would, but Indian inscriptions put this beyond any doubt. Once again the isolated, socially disengaged "early" Buddhist monk of modern scholars and Mahāyāna polemics is difficult to find.<sup>1</sup>

Austin

Gregory Schopen

---

<sup>1</sup> The influence of the characterizations of "early" monks found in Mahāyāna *sūtra* literature on modern scholarly characterizations is a subject not yet studied, but one which may well be of particular significance. There are cases, for example, where what appears to be Mahāyāna polemical caricature has been used to account for historical development. Dayal has said that "... it seems that the Buddhist monks ... in the second century B.C. ... emphasised a few duties to the exclusion of others. They became too self-centered and contemplative, and did not evince the old zeal for missionary activity among the people. They seem to have cared only for their own liberation from sin and sorrow. They were indifferent to the duty of teaching and helping all human beings ... . The *bodhisattva* ideal can be understood only against this background of a saintly and serene, but inactive and indolent monastic order" (H. Dayal, *The Bodhisattva Doctrine in Buddhist Sanskrit Literature*, (London: 1932), pp. 2-3). This explanation of an historical occurrence has, in a variety of forms, often been repeated (see Lamotte, *Histoire du bouddhisme indien*, 73, 78, 699), but no evidence for it is ever cited, and it appears to be little more than a paraphrase of the polemical position taken in Mahāyāna *sūtras*. There is, moreover, little, if any, indication in Indian inscriptions that monks — either before or after the beginning of the Common Era — were "self-centered", "cared only for their own liberation" and were "indifferent to ... helping all human beings." In fact, the indications are quite otherwise. They suggest a monk very active in giving, concerned with benefiting parents, teachers, friends, and "all beings", and very much engaged in the social world (see the references in note 1 on p. 92 above). We see this monk in Indian inscriptions which date to almost exactly the period during which we think Mahāyāna *sūtras* were first composed. Obviously, much remains to be learned here.



# THE RAKṢĀ LITERATURE OF THE ŚRĀVAKAYĀNA\*

## Contents

Introduction	110
1. The <i>paritta</i> of the Theravādins	116
2. The <i>Mahāsūtras</i> of the Mūlasarvāstivādins	125
3. The <i>svastigāthā</i> of various schools	129
4. The <i>Pañcarakṣā</i> collections	138
5. <i>Rakṣā</i> phraseology	144
6. <i>Rakṣā</i> and <i>mantra</i>	150
7. The <i>rakṣā</i> literature and cults	159
8. <i>Rakṣā</i> and the Mahāyāna	160
9. Śrāvakayāna <i>rakṣā</i> literature and the Tantra	161
10. Archaeological evidence for the <i>rakṣā</i> literature	162
11. Rite and ritual	165
Conclusions	168
Bibliography	170
Table 1: Early <i>paritta</i> lists	174
Table 2: <i>Paritta</i> , <i>Sīrimaṅgalaparitta</i> , <i>Dvādasaparitta</i> , and <i>Sattaparitta</i>	178
Table 3: The seven <i>Pañcarakṣā</i> in relation to other <i>rakṣā</i> and <i>paritta</i> texts	180

---

\* This is a revised and expanded version of a paper delivered at the Tenth Conference of the International Association of Buddhist Studies, Paris, 20 July 1991.

## The Rakṣā Literature of the Śrāvakayāna

### Introduction

In the present paper, I will discuss what I term the “*rakṣā* literature of the Śrāvakayāna”. I have chosen the term *rakṣā* — “protection” or more specifically “protective text” — because it occurs in both Sanskrit and Pali, the latter in the equivalent form *rakkhā*, as in the Sanskrit and Pali versions of the *Āṭānāṭika-sūtra*.<sup>1</sup> In meaning it is no different from the well-known Pali term *paritta*, the use of which, however, seems restricted to Pali.<sup>2</sup> (In Sanskrit *paritrāṇa* occurs frequently as a synonym of *rakṣā*, but in the sense of the *protection sought or offered* rather than *protective text*. Other synonyms of *rakṣā* in the former sense include *gupti*, *parigraha*, *paripālana*, and *āvaraṇa* in Sanskrit,<sup>3</sup> and *gutti* and *paritta* in Pali.<sup>4</sup>)

The *rakṣā* phenomenon was pan-Buddhist (and indeed pan-Indian), in that the invocation of protection against disease, calamity, and malignant spirits through the office of spiritual attainment, profession of truth, *mantras*, or deities was a practice widely resorted to by both the Śrāvaka- and Mahā-yānas.

The concept of *rakṣā* appears in various forms in Buddhist literature. The presence of the Buddha — who is described by such epithets as *akutobhaya*, “without fear from any quarter”,<sup>5</sup> or *khemamṛkara*, “granter

<sup>1</sup> Sanskrit *Āṭānāṭika-sūtra*, 37.3 *āṭānāṭikam sūtram* *vidyām rakṣām*; Pali *Āṭānāṭiya-sutta*, *DN* (32) III 203.1 *āṭānāṭiyā rakkhā*.

<sup>2</sup> See *Jātaka* II 35.7, *imam parittam imam rakkham*. Cf. Lévi 1915, p. 20 and de Silva pp. 3–5.

<sup>3</sup> *MhMVR(T)* 13.1, 15.2; *Mahāśītavatī* 2.9; *GM I* 56.10, in the common phrase *rakṣāvaraṇagupti*.

<sup>4</sup> *Vin* II 110.6; *AN* II 72.27.

<sup>5</sup> *Theragāthā* 510, *Therīgāthā* 333, etc.

of security"<sup>1</sup> — itself bestowed protection. In the *Sonadanda-sutta* of the *Dīghanikāya*, Soṇadanda says that "in whatever town or village the *śramaṇa* Gotama stays, non-humans do not harm the people of that town or village" (DN I 116.14, *samaṇo khalu bho gotamo yasmiṁ gāme vā nigame vā paṭivasati na tasmiṁ gāme vā nigame vā amanussā manusse viheṭhenti).<sup>2</sup> A similar statement is made in the *Mahāsāhasrapramardanī*,<sup>3</sup> and a similar idea occurs in the Mūlasarvāstivādin *Vinayavibhaṅga* in Tibetan and Chinese translation, where the presence of the Buddha is one of the protections against "zombies" or *vetādas*.<sup>4</sup>*

It is therefore no accident that in the earliest images of Mathurā, Gandhāra, Amarāvatī, and Nāgārjunakonḍa, the Buddha, whether seated or standing, is nearly always depicted in the *abhaya-mudrā*, the "gesture

<sup>1</sup> MNI 386.13.

<sup>2</sup> A close parallel occurs in the Chinese counterpart, no. 22 of the *Dīrghāgama* (95b12–14): "Moreover: whichever place the Śramaṇa Gautama reaches, the inhumans and demons would not dare to harass it". (Translation by K. Meisig, "Chung Tēh King — The Chinese Parallel to the Sonadanda-Sutta", in V.N. Jha (ed.), *Kalyāṇa-Mitta: Professor Hajime Nakamura Felicitation Volume*, Delhi, 1991, p. 54.)

<sup>3</sup> *Mahāsāhasrapramardanī* 21.21 = D 558, *rgyud*, *pha*, 75a2.

<sup>4</sup> *Vinayavibhaṅga*, Q 1032, 'dul ba, che, 128b5 foll; T 1442, Vol. 23. *Vetāda* is the preferred orthography of the Mūlasarvāstivādins: cf. *Saṅghabhedavastu* I, 175.6,7,10; II 238.24; R. Gnoli, *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Śayanāsanavastu and the Adhikaraṇavastu*, Rome, 1978, p. 22.5,6,9. The same spelling occurs in non-Mūlasarvāstivādin texts: see references at *BHSD* 508a; *MhMVR*(T) 38.3, 42.10; *Mahāsāhasrapramardanī* 32.1,14; and the title *Saptavetāḍaka-nāma-dhāraṇī* in both the Peking (Q 351, Vol. 7, *rgyud*, *ba*, 231a7) and Stog Palace (Skorupski no. 574) editions of the *Kanjur*. See also *Suvarṇaprabhāsa-sūtra* 55.6, 57.6, where *vetāda* is given as a variant. The preferred Pali spelling, at least in the Burmese and Siamese editions, is *vetāla*, rather than the *vetāla* of the *PTSD* (647a): see K. Meisig, *Das Śāmanyaphala-sūtra*, Wiesbaden, 1987, p. 216, note 13.

of dispelling fear".<sup>1</sup> (Indeed, the symbol of the open hand, which appears even earlier at Bhārhut along with the "aniconic" representation of the Buddha through his footprints, might also represent this *mudrā*).<sup>2</sup> In Mūlasarvāstivādin literature the hand of the *bodhisattva* or of the Buddha is called "bringing relief to the fearful" (*bhitānām āsvāsanakara*);<sup>3</sup> the *Mahāprajñāpāramitā-śāstra*, commenting on the walk (*caṅkrama*) of the Buddha, says "toujours il lève la main droite pour rassurer les êtres".<sup>4</sup> While more complex *mudrās* were evolved over the centuries, the *abhaya-mudrā* never lost its popularity. With the course of time, certain revered images of the Buddha (or of *bodhisattvas*) were themselves held to confer protection.

The very act that defines a Buddhist is the "taking of refuge" (*śarana-gamana*) in the Buddha, the Dharma, and the Saṅgha, and the formula of "triple refuge" opens virtually all Buddhist rites, including the recitation of *paritta*. A verse in the *Mahāsamaya-sutta* states that "they who go for refuge in the Buddha will not go to the lower realms: leaving behind their human form [at death], they swell the ranks of the gods" (*DN* II 255.3–5, *ye keci buddham saranam gatāse, na te gamissanti apāyam; pahāya mānusam deham devakāyam paripūressanti*).<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See D.L. Snellgrove (ed.), *The Image of the Buddha*, Paris, 1978, p. 56 and pls. 29–32 (Mathurā); p. 61 and pls. 33(c), 34, and 35 (Gandhāra), p. 81 and pl. 46 (Nāgārjunakonḍa, Amarāvatī).

<sup>2</sup> See *The Image of the Buddha*, pl. 8, to be compared perhaps with pl. 51 from Amarāvatī.

<sup>3</sup> *Saṅghabhedavastu* I 114 ult. Cf. also *Mahābala-sūtra* 22.9, 67.16.

<sup>4</sup> *Mppś* V 2316; cf. also *Mppś* III 1345 and *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism*, Vol. I, fasc. 1, pp. 20–21, *abhaya-dāna*.

<sup>5</sup> An equivalent verse occurs in the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin *Mahāsamāja-sūtra* in Sanskrit and Tibetan, and, with similar verses on the Dharma and the Saṅgha, in the *Sūkarikāvadāna* (*Divy* 195.26, 196.5).

Another type of protection is the result of spiritual practice: the *Mettānisamṣa-sutta*, a canonical *paritta*, for example, lists eleven benefits from the cultivation of friendliness.<sup>1</sup> In this paper I will deal with a further type, the protection that results from the recitation of certain texts, that is, protection through speech, the spoken word.

A distinguishing mark of the *rakṣā* literature is that it was actually *used* — that is, memorised and recited for specific purposes — by both monks and lay-followers, from a very early date. This is in contrast with the bulk of the canonical literature which would only have been studied by the assiduous few, mainly monk-scholars. *Rakṣā* texts would no doubt have been known by heart by the monks, and by some devout lay followers, as are the *paritta* of the Theravādins up to the present day. Thus the *rakṣā* literature contains texts which, from great antiquity, were regularly employed rather than simply preserved or transmitted. The only comparable classes of texts are the *Prātimokṣa-sūtras* and *Karmavākyas* — essential to the routine of the *bhikṣu-* and *bhikṣunī-saṅghas* — and, in a somewhat different sense, the tales of the *Jātakas* and *Avadānas*, told and retold in sermons up to the present day.<sup>2</sup>

When I speak of the “*rakṣā* literature of the Śrāvakayāna”, I refer here to four specific classes of texts:

- 1) the *paritta* of the Theravādins;
- 2) the *Mahāsūtras* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins;
- 3) the *svasti-*, *svastyayana-*, or *mangala-gāthā* of various schools; and
- 4) certain texts of the *Pañcarakṣā* collections.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> AN V 342.1–14. See also the eight benefits of *mettā* at AN IV 150–51.13, and cp. the similar passage incorporated into the *Megha-sūtra*, p. 294.

<sup>2</sup> I am grateful to Sally Mellick (Oxford) for pointing out the popular didactic use of the *Apadāna* literature.

<sup>3</sup> The use of the plural “collections” will be made clear in the appropriate section.

But these classes are by no means watertight: the *paritta*, the *Mahāsūtras*, and the *Pañcarakṣā* contain *svastigāthā*, the *Pañcarakṣā* contain *paritta*, and so on. All four are traditional classifications of various schools, and I have adopted them as a convenient basis upon which to open my presentation of the *rakṣā* literature: an *upāya* which I hope will prove *kauśalya*. There may well have been other classes or categories; some of the manuscripts retrieved from the sands of Central Asia, for example, seem to be *rakṣā* collections.<sup>1</sup> We know next to nothing of the *rakṣā* literature of the Buddhist schools whose scriptures have not come down to us. The Mādhyamika scholar Bhavya (*circa* 500–70 A.C.?)<sup>2</sup> cites a passage from the *Vidyādharapiṭaka* of the Siddhārthas, whom he classifies in this case under the Mahāsāṃghikas.<sup>3</sup> According to Candrakīrti (*circa* 600–50 A.C.),<sup>4</sup> one of the seven *piṭakas* of the Pūrvaśailas and Aparaśailas — offshoots of the Mahāsāṃghikas — was a *Vidyādhara* (*rig 'dzin*) *Piṭaka*;<sup>5</sup> according to Chi-tsang (549–623 A.C.) and Paramārtha (mid 6th century), one of the five *piṭakas* of the Dharmaguptakas was a “*piṭaka* of magic formulas”.<sup>6</sup> According to Hsüan-tsang (first half of the 7th century), one of the five *piṭakas* of the

<sup>1</sup> See Ernst Waldschmidt, *Kleine Brāhmī-Schrifttrolle*, Göttingen, 1959, for some possible examples.

<sup>2</sup> For Bhavya and his date, see Ruegg 1981 pp. 61–66.

<sup>3</sup> *Tarkajvālā*, Q 5256, Vol. 96, *dbu ma, dza*, 190a6, D 3856, *dbu ma, dza*, 175b1, *dge 'dun* (Q *slon*) *phal chen sde'i nañ tshan don grub pa rnam rig pa 'dzin pa'i sde snod*.

<sup>4</sup> Ruegg 1981 p. 71.

<sup>5</sup> Per K. Sorensen, *Candrakīrti, Triśaṇaṣaptati, the Septuagint on the Three Refuges*, Vienna, 1986, pp. 51–53 (vv. 57–58).

<sup>6</sup> Paul Demiéville, “L’origine des sectes bouddhiques d’après Paramārtha”, in *Mélanges Chinois et Bouddhiques*, Vol. I, Brussels, 1932, p. 61. Demiéville translates “formules magiques”, and gives *dhāraṇī* and *mantra* as Sanskrit equivalents. Matsunaga 1977, p. 169, refers to a *Vidyādhara-piṭaka* of the same school.

Mahāsāṃghikas was a *Mantra-piṭaka*.<sup>1</sup> I-ching (635–713 A.C.) mentions a *Vidyādhara-piṭaka* in 100,000 ślokas;<sup>2</sup> the *Ādikarmapradīpa* cites a verse from a work of the same title.<sup>3</sup> Such collections may well have included *rakṣās*, such as that cited from a *Vidyādhara-piṭaka* in the *Śikṣāsamuccaya* of Śāntideva (first part of 8th century).<sup>4</sup> From all this we may conclude that by the 6th century (at the very latest) Śrāvaka schools of the Mahāsāṃghika fold — the Pūrvāśailas, Aparaśailas, and Siddhārthas — as well as the Dharmaguptakas transmitted a separate *piṭaka*, most probably devoted to *mantras* and spells, known as the *Vidyādhara-piṭaka*.<sup>5</sup>

In a broader sense, the *rakṣā* phenomenon permeates Buddhist literature in general, and cannot be restricted to certain classes of texts. In sections 5 to 7, I will discuss the characteristics of *rakṣā* as a literary phenomenon: its phraseology, and its connection with *mantra* and cults. Although my main topic is the *rakṣā* literature of the Śrāvakayāna, to

<sup>1</sup> Here I follow Lamotte, *Mppś* IV, 1862. Earlier works give the Sanskrit as *Dhāraṇī-piṭaka*: see Samuel Beal, *Si-Yu-Ki, Buddhist Records of the Western World*, [London, 1884] Delhi, 1981, II 164–65, and Thomas Watters, *On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India*, [London, 1904–5] New Delhi, 1973, II 159–60.

<sup>2</sup> Latika Lahiri, *Chinese Monks in India*, Delhi, 1986, p. 65. I-ching also mentions a *Dhāraṇī-piṭaka*, pp. 64, 68. Cf. *Hōbōgirin* I 77, “Biniya”.

<sup>3</sup> Louis de La Vallée Poussin, “The Vidyādharapiṭaka”, *JRAS* 1895, pp. 433–36.

<sup>4</sup> *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 142.12 (date from Ruegg 1981 p. 82). A part of the *mantra* (in both the Sanskrit and Tibetan versions) is in a Prakrit close to Pali: *namo sabba-sammasambuddhāṇam sijhantu me mantapadāḥ svāhā*. The *Vidyādhara-piṭaka* is also referred to in a work of Buddhaghosa preserved in the *Tanjur*: see Jeffrey Hopkins, *The Yoga of Tibet*, London, 1981, pp. 50–51 (the Tibetan is given at p. 254 as *rig 'dzin gyi sde snod*). See also *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism*, Vol. IV, fascicle 4, p. 519.

<sup>5</sup> It may be seen from the references given above that this term is attested in Sanskrit (*Śikṣāsamuccaya*, *Ādikarmapradīpa*) and Tibetan, wherein *rig 'dzin* = *vidyādhara* (Bhavya, Candrakīrti, Buddhaghosa) cannot possibly be confused with *mantra* (*gsan snags*) or *dhāraṇī* (*gzuṇs*). There is some disagreement among scholars about the Sanskrit equivalents of the Chinese terms.

study what I have called a pan-Buddhist phenomenon in isolation would be misleading. In sections 8 and 9, I will therefore touch briefly on *rakṣā* and the Mahāyāna and Tantra. As an influential and popular movement, the *rakṣā* phenomenon should have found expression in the plastic arts. Section 10 will examine the archaeological evidence. Finally, section 11 will deal with the rites associated with *rakṣā*.

### 1. The *paritta* of the Theravādins<sup>1</sup>

The *paritta* collections of the Theravādins are distinguished by the fact that they are used in the day-to-day life of both monks and lay-followers. As noted by Malalasekera, "the *Pirit Pota* ... forms part of the meagre library of every Sinhalese household".<sup>2</sup> Much the same is said for Burma by Mabel Bode: "to this day, [the *paritta* is] more widely known by the Burmese laity of all classes than any other Pali book".<sup>3</sup> Wherever the

<sup>1</sup> The following is an assuredly incomplete bibliography on the *paritta* from the works available to me: E.W. Adikaram, *Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon*, Colombo, 1946, pp. 143–44; M.H. Bode, *The Pali Literature of Burma*, [London, 1909] Rangoon, 1965, pp. 3–4; W. Geiger, *Pāli Literature and Language*, [Calcutta, 1943] Delhi, 1968, § 17; Peter Harvey, *An Introduction to Buddhism: Teachings, history, and practices*, Cambridge, 1990, pp. 180–82; G.P. Malalasekera, *The Pali Literature of Ceylon*, Colombo, [1928] 1958, pp. 75–76; É. Lamotte, *Mppś IV*, 1860–61; K.R. Norman, *Pāli Literature* (Jan Gonda (ed.), *A History of Indian Literature*, Vol. VII, fasc. 2), Wiesbaden, 1983, pp. 173–74; Ven. Piyasilo, *Buddhist Prayer*, Petaling Jaya, 1990, esp. parts III and IV; Shway Yoe, *The Burman: His Life and Notions*, New York, 1963, pp. 397–98; Walpola Rahula, *History of Buddhism in Ceylon*, Colombo, 1956, pp. 276–80; Phya Anuman Rajadhon, *Popular Buddhism in Siam and Other Essays on Thai Studies*, Bangkok, 1986, pp. 57–67; L. Renou, J. Filliozat, et al., *L'Inde Classique*, tome II, Hanoi 1953, §§ 1982, 2039; S.D. Saparamadu (ed.), *The Polonnaruva Period*, Dehiwala, 1973, p. 139; M. Winternitz, *A History of Indian Literature*, Vol. II, New York, [1933] 1972, pp. 80, 380, note 1, 381. Further references are found in Lily de Silva, pp. xi–xii.

<sup>2</sup> Malalasekera, *op. cit.*, p. 75.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 3.

Theravāda holds sway, the average monk may not know a great deal about the *Tipiṭaka*, but will be able to recite numerous chants from memory.

Although there is evidence of the use of *paritta* from an early date in the *Chronicles* and *Commentaries* of Sri Lanka, references are rather scanty, perhaps because as a popular phenomenon the *paritta* was taken for granted. Table 1 shows the earliest known lists of *paritta* titles: those of the *Milinda-pañha*<sup>1</sup> and the *Āṭṭhakathā* of Buddhaghosa (5th century).<sup>2</sup> Some of these lists vary somewhat in the modern Burmese, Siamese, and Singhalese printed editions. The *Visuddhimagga* and *Āṭṭhakathā* lists are given in connection with the definition of the “range of the Buddha’s authority” (*āñākkhetta*): one hundred thousand million universes within which the *parittas* are efficacious. There are three basic lists, with some variants in the different editions:<sup>3</sup>

- 1) Table 1.2.1–4: the four *parittas* “etc.” of the *Dīgha*-, *Majjhima*-, *Āṅguttara*- (*Ekanipāta*), and *Vibhaṅga* *Āṭṭhakathās*;
- 2) Table 1.3.1–2: the five *parittas* of the *Visuddhimagga* and *Samantapāśādikā*;
- 3) Table 1.4: the eight *parittas* of the *Mahāniddesa*- and *Āṅguttara*- (*Tikanipāta*) *Āṭṭhakathās*.

<sup>1</sup> The *Milinda-pañha* is a composite text, dating between the middle of the 2nd century B.C. and the 5th century A.C.: see K.R. Norman, *op. cit.*, pp. 110–13. The section in question comes from one of the later parts.

<sup>2</sup> I am grateful to Ven. Dhammānanda Mahāthera of Burma, now residing at Wat Tamao, Lampang, for many of these references and for information on the Burmese *paritta* tradition. Cf. his important article (in Thai) “On whether or not the chanting of *paritta* is *tiracchānavijjā*”, in Dhammānanda 1992 pp. 191–98.

<sup>3</sup> The titles given in the commentary on the *Āṭānāṭiya-sutta* (Table 1.5) occur in a different context, and are not discussed here.

Taken together, the *Atthakathā* lists give eight titles; when the *Āngulimāla-paritta* of the *Milinda-pañha* list is added, there are nine titles.

The *paritta* of the Theravādins exists today in a number of recensions. In Sri Lanka there is the *Catubhāṇavāra* or *Four Recitations*, current in a shorter recension of 22 texts and a longer recension of 29 texts.<sup>1</sup> The shorter recension must be the older of the two: Sri Lankan commentaries of the 12th and the 18th centuries know only the 22 texts,<sup>2</sup> and the extra seven of the longer version differ somewhat in order and contents in different editions. The *Samantapāśādikā* (5th century A.C.) mentions "four *bhāṇavāra* from the *suttanta*", but from the context probably does not refer to the *paritta* collection.<sup>3</sup> The earliest definite reference to the four *Bhāṇavāra* that I am aware of is an inscription of Kassapa V, dated *circa* 929–39 A.C., from the Jetavana area in Anurādhapura.<sup>4</sup> Another Sri Lankan collection contains nine texts, and is known in Sinhalese as *Piritnava-sūtraya*;<sup>5</sup> the nine titles agree with those of the Siamese *Parittasankhepa* (see below).

<sup>1</sup> See L. de Silva, pp. 5–8; Helmer Smith, *A Critical Pāli Dictionary*, Epilegomena to Vol. I, Copenhagen, 1948, pp. 93\*–95\*; Maria Bidoli and Heinz Bechert, *Singhalesische Handschriften*, Teil 1, Wiesbaden, 1969, § 128, pp. 82–83 (the last named gives an extensive bibliography of printed and manuscript *paritta* collections).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism* Vol. III, fasc. 4, pp. 694–95, *catubhāṇavāra*.

<sup>3</sup> Sp IV 788 ult. I am grateful to L.S. Cousins (Manchester) for this reference.

<sup>4</sup> "Slab-inscription of Kassapa V", *Epigraphia Zeylanica* I, London, 1912, pp. 41–57. For further references from commentaries, chronicles, inscriptions, and Sinhala literature, see L. de Silva, pp. 16–22.

<sup>5</sup> C.E. Godakumbura, *Catalogue of Ceylonese Manuscripts*, The Royal Library, Copenhagen, 1980, pp. 25–26. The collection is not otherwise mentioned in the literature I have consulted, and was not known to two senior Sinhalese monks whom I consulted in Penang. Its origins and current status remain to be determined.

In three of the 22 texts of the shorter *Catubhāṇavāra* — the *Khandhāparitta*, the *Dhajaggāparitta*, and the *Āṭanāṭiyasutta* — the Buddha himself recommends that they be used as *rakkhā*. Thus their use as such is very old. In another seven texts — the *Morāparitta*, the *Candāparitta*, the *Suriyāparitta*, the three *Bojjhaṅgaparittas*, and the *Girimānandāparitta* — protection is granted through the recitation of verses or the teachings of the Buddha, while the *Māngala-* and *Ratana-suttas* deal with *māngala* and *suvatthi*, the “positive side” of *rakṣā*. The (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādins and other schools also used as *rakṣā* their own counterparts of the *Khandha-*, *Dhajagga-*, *Āṭanāṭiya-*, *Mora-*, and *Canda-parittas*, along with the *Māngala-* and *Ratana-suttas*.<sup>1</sup> This further establishes the antiquity of the *rakṣā* status of these texts.

A Burmese manuscript dated 1842 A.C. contains the shorter *Catubhāṇavāra* with one extra *sutta* to total 23 texts; otherwise the contents, order, and division into *bhāṇavāras* are the same as in the Sri Lankan recension.<sup>2</sup> The *Catubhāṇavāra* is not, however, recited or even generally known in Burma today, and its exact status in the past remains to be determined. The recitation of *paritta* is referred to in Pagan inscriptions.<sup>3</sup> The standard collection used in Burma today consists of 11 texts called simply *Paritta* (or sometimes *Mahāparitta*), for which see Table 2A. All but three of the texts of this collection (nos. 1, 6, 11) are named in the *Milindapañha* and *Āṭhakathā* lists. The contents and order of the Burmese *Paritta* are closely related to the *paritta* list of the

<sup>1</sup> These will be discussed below under *Mahāsūtra*, *svastigāthā*, and *Pañcarakṣā*.

<sup>2</sup> Heinz Braun and Daw Tin Tin Myint, *Burmese Manuscripts*, part 2, Stuttgart, 1985, no. 352, pp. 173–75; the extra text, no. 20 of the manuscript, is entitled *Sammāsambuddhabojjhaṅgam*; according to the editors it is equivalent to *SN* V 81 foll. Since this is the only description of a Burmese *Catubhāṇavāra* that I have come across, I cannot say whether or not it is typical.

<sup>3</sup> G.H. Luce, “Economic Life of the Early Burman”, in *Burma Research Society, Fiftieth Anniversary Publications No. 2*, Rangoon, 1960, p. 366 (originally published in the *Journal of the Burma Research Society* XXX.i, pp. 283–335).

Burmese printed edition of the *Milinda-pañha*; to what degree the one is derived from the other, or the two have mutually influenced each other, requires further research.<sup>1</sup> The *Sirimāngala-paritta*, a modern collection settled during the U Nu period, contains the 11 texts of the *Paritta*, to which it adds another 20 texts to make a total of 31, as shown in Table 2B. The last four are non-canonical, although three of them are styled *-sutta* in their titles and open with *evam me sutam*.<sup>2</sup>

The *paritta* tradition of Siam has parallels to both the Sri Lankan and Burmese traditions. As in Sri Lanka, in Siam there are two recensions of the *Catubhāṇavāra*. The longer Siamese *Catubhāṇavāra*, however, is equivalent to the older and shorter Sri Lankan recension of 22 texts; the shorter Siamese *Catubhāṇavāra* is an abridged version containing 17 texts. The division of the two Siamese recensions into recitations differs somewhat from that of the Sri Lankan version. Siam has two further recensions, the *Dvādasa-paritta* and the *Sattaparitta*. The former, also known as the *Mahārāja-paritta* or, in Thai, the *Sipsong Tamnan*, contains the first 11 texts of the Burmese *Paritta* plus the *Jaya-paritta*; the latter, also known as the *Cularāja-paritta* or *Jet Tamnan*, is an abridgement of the former and contains, according to the title, 7 texts.<sup>3</sup> The contents of these collections are given in Tables 2C and 2D.

<sup>1</sup> The *Jinapañjara-gāthā* lists the seven titles of the *Chatthasaṅgīti Milindapañha*, but in a different order.

<sup>2</sup> *Sirimāngalaparitta* nos. 28–31.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Finot 1917 pp. 53–60; Kenneth E. Wells, *Thai Buddhism: Its Rites and Activities*, Bangkok, 1975, pp. 276–82. A list of the contents of the Siamese *Catubhāṇavāra* is given in the *Royal Chanting Book* p. 112. Most editions of the *Sattaparitta* give more than 7 texts (although Finot lists 7), and I am not certain which are the 7 of the title.

The *Parittasaṅkhepa*, most probably composed at Ayutthaya in the 17th–18th centuries, lists and comments on nine *parittas*:<sup>1</sup>

1. *Maṅgala-sutta*
2. *Ratana-sutta*
3. *Metta-sutta*
4. *Khandha-paritta*
5. *Mora-paritta*
6. *Dhajagga-paritta*
7. *Ātānāṭiya-paritta*
8. *Āngulimālā-paritta*
9. *Bojjhaṅga-paritta*.

The titles are the same as those of the Sri Lankan *Piritnava-sūtraya*.

For the study of the Siamese *paritta* tradition, the most important printed source is the *Royal Chanting Book*. This was compiled at the behest of King Rāma V (Chulalongkorn) by Phussadeva, later to be Supreme Patriarch, when he held the rank of Somdet Brahū Buddhaghoṣācārya. It was first published in Ratanakosin Era 99 / B.E. 2423 [1880], in an edition of 10,000 copies, and thus preceded the first printed edition of the *Tipiṭaka*, published in 2436 [1893], by thirteen years. Otherwise, there are numerous chanting books, large and small, such as the popular *Suat Mantabidhī*, published in various editions. It is worth noting that the common element in the Thai titles of chanting books is *manta*, usually in the form *suat manta*. *Suat manta* is also the common verb for “to chant”; *suat brahū paritta* refers to formal ceremonies with string and water, and is hence less common. In titles *paritta* is frequently “Sanskritised” as *paritra*, as in the *Cula-* and *Mahā-rājaparitra* of the *Royal Chanting Book*.

<sup>1</sup> Supaphan Na Bangchang, *Vivadhanākāra Varrnagatī sai Brah Suttantapiṭaka ti Daeng nai Pradeśa Thai*, Bangkok, 2533 [1990], pp. 491–500.

I have been unable to find any evidence for the date or place of origin of the Burmese *Paritta* or the Siamese *Dvādasā-* and *Satta-paritta* collections.<sup>1</sup>

In all of these collections the canonical *paritta* texts are set within ancillary opening and closing verses (*paritta-parikamma*, etc.). A synoptic edition of these verses is a desideratum.

In addition to the *paritta* properly speaking, there exist in Pali numerous non-canonical texts, both prose and verse, of a protective nature. To my knowledge, only one of these has been edited or studied: the *Mahādibbamanta*.<sup>2</sup> The others have not yet been properly catalogued or even listed. In classifying this sort of extra-canonical literature, we might distinguish (A) apocryphal *sutta* texts, opening with the *evam me sutam* formula, and (B) *gāthā* or other texts recognised as having had an historical author, that make no claim to be *Buddhavacana* as such. Here I give a very preliminary list:

(A) Apocryphal *suttas*

1. *Ākāravatta-sutta* (or, more frequently, *-sūtra*);<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. L. de Silva pp. 7 and 14 for the term *mahapirit* or *mahāparitta* in Sri Lanka. According to H. Saddhatissa (*The Birth-Stories of the Ten Bodhisattas and the Dasabodhisattuppattikathā*, London, 1975, p. 37), the *Dvādasaparitta* was "presumably introduced to Ceylon by Siamese *theras* headed by Mahāthera Upāli who arrived in the island in 1753 A.C." This suggests that the origin of the *Dvādasaparitta* (and hence its abridgement, the *Satta-paritta*) is to be sought in Siam, or at least South-east Asia.

<sup>2</sup> Jaini 1965.

<sup>3</sup> *Mahābrahuddhamanta* 21.2; O. von Hinüber, "The Pāli Manuscripts kept at The Siam Society, Bangkok, a Short Catalogue", *Journal of the Siam Society*, Vol. 75, 1987, no. 47, pp. 43–44. The text does not seem to be known in Burma.

2. *Dhāraṇa-paritta*;<sup>1</sup>
3. *Chadisapāla-sutta*;<sup>2</sup>
4. *Cakkaparitta-sutta*;<sup>3</sup>
5. *Parimittajāla-sutta*.<sup>4</sup>

(B) *Gāthā* and other texts

1. *Atṭhavisati-paritta*<sup>5</sup>
2. *Jinapañjara-gāthā*;<sup>6</sup>
3. *Jayamaṅgala-gāthā*<sup>7</sup>
4. *Atṭhamamaṅgala-gāthā*;<sup>8</sup>
5. *Uppātasanti*;<sup>9</sup>
6. *Jaya-paritta*;<sup>10</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Mahābrahuddhamanta* 20.8. Although the printed editions that I have seen do not open with *evam me sutam*, the latter half of the text is addressed to Ānanda. The text has apparently been recently introduced to Siam from Burma. Dhammānanda 1992 p. 441, *Āvenīkaguṇa*, gives the opening on the 18 āvenīkaguṇa, with a note on their Pali sources.

<sup>2</sup> *Sirimaṅgalaparitta* no. 28. This and the next two texts are not known in Siam.

<sup>3</sup> *Sirimaṅgalaparitta* no. 29.

<sup>4</sup> *Sirimaṅgalaparitta* no. 30.

<sup>5</sup> *Royal Chanting Book* pp. 39–40. On the evidence of an 11th century Thaton inscription, this is the earliest attested non-canonical *paritta*: see G.H. Luce, “The Advent of Buddhism to Burma”, in L. Cousins, A. Kunst, and K.R. Norman (ed.), *Buddhist Studies in Honour of I.B. Horner*, Dordrecht, 1974, p. 133. I am grateful to Lance Cousins for this reference.

<sup>6</sup> A number of recensions have been discussed and edited by the present Supreme Patriarch of Siam, *Praḥvati Gāthājinapañjara*, Bangkok, 2529 [1986]. See also Dhammānanda 1992 pp. 199–201.

<sup>7</sup> *Royal Chanting Book* pp. 92–94 (*bāhum*).

<sup>8</sup> Dhammānanda 1992 pp. 438–40.

<sup>9</sup> *Sirimaṅgalaparitta* no. 31; Dhammānanda 1992 pp. 385–435. The text, believed to have been composed in Chiengmai, was reintroduced to Siam from Burma by Ven. Dhammānanda.

<sup>10</sup> *Royal Chanting Book* pp. 25–27 (*mahākāruṇiko nātho*).

7. *Ātānāṭiya-paritta*;<sup>1</sup>
8. *Bojjhaṅga-paritta*;<sup>2</sup>
9. *Mahādibbamanta*;<sup>3</sup>
10. *Yot brahkaṇḍatratraipiṭaka*.<sup>4</sup>

A number of these, along with the *Gini-paritta*, which is not known in South-east Asia, are briefly described by Lily de Silva.<sup>5</sup> The *Jinapañjara-gāthā*, the *Ākāravatta-sūtra*, the *Yot brahkaṇḍatratraipiṭaka*, the *Dhāraṇa-paritta*, and the *Uppātasanti* are especially popular in Siam, where they are published in the numerous collections of chants that are widely available.

Some of these texts, such as the *Ākāravatta-sūtra* and the *Yot brahkaṇḍatratraipiṭaka*, are expansions of the *iti pi so* formula, a key element of the ancient *Dhajagga-paritta*.<sup>6</sup> Others, such as the *Mahādibbamanta*, the *Chadisapāla*, and *Uppātasanti*, derive their efficacy from lists of saints and deities, and thus resemble the canonical *Mahāsamaya-* and *Ātānāṭiya- Suttas*.

<sup>1</sup> I refer here to the text included in the Burmese *Paritta* (no. 8) and the Siamese *Satta-* and *Dvādasa-* *Parittas*, which consists of the opening verses of homage to the seven Buddhas of the *sutta* proper, plus a series of non-canonical verses: see *Royal Chanting Book* pp. 20–22 and 38–43 (the latter incorporating the *Āṭhavīsati-paritta*).

<sup>2</sup> The reference is to the text found in the Burmese *Paritta* (no. 10) and the Siamese *Satta-* and *Dvādasa-* *Parittas*, which is a verse summary of the canonical *Bojjhaṅga-suttas*: see *Royal Chanting Book* p. 23.

<sup>3</sup> Jaini 1965.

<sup>4</sup> *Mahābrahuddhamanta* 21.1.

<sup>5</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 8–11.

<sup>6</sup> See also the short texts (some mixed with Thai) at *Mahābrahuddhamanta* 21.3; 22.2, 3, 5; 26.1–3), and Finot 1917 p. 58, *Sut Iti pi so*.

## 2. The *Mahāsūtras* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins

As far as I know, *Mahāsūtra* as a technical term was applied to two collections of *sūtras*:

- (1) a group of eighteen *Mahāsūtras* listed in the *Vinaya* of the Sarvāstivādins;
- (2) a group of six or eight *Mahāsūtras* listed in the *Vinaya* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins.

These lists, lost in the original Sanskrit, have been preserved in Chinese and Tibetan translation. Both groups consist of *sūtras* extracted from the *Āgamas* of the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin tradition; most, but not all, are common to the *Āgamas* of the other early Buddhist schools.

The Sarvāstivādin list of eighteen *Mahāsūtras* (*Ta ching*) occurs in the fourth section, “On Keeping the Rains Retreat” (*An chü fa* = \**Varṣāvāsadharma*), of the ninth chapter, “Seven Dharmas” (*Ch'i fa* = \**Saptadharma*) of the *Vinaya* of that school as translated into Chinese by Puṇyatara and Kumārajīva between 399 and 413 A.C.<sup>1</sup> This is the only known occurrence of the Sarvāstivādin list of *Mahāsūtras*. I will not discuss them here since there is no evidence that they were used as *rakṣās*.<sup>2</sup> I will only note that the term *Mahāsūtra* must have been in vogue by the 4th century, and that two of the Sarvāstivādin *Mahāsūtras* (nos. 6 and 7, the *Ātānāṭika* and *Mahāsamāja*) are classed as *paritta* by the Theravādins, and that five (no. 3, the *Pañcatraya*; no. 4, the

<sup>1</sup> T 1435, Vol. 23, 174b18; *KBC* 890.

<sup>2</sup> For the list, see A. Hirakawa, *A Study of the Vinaya-Piṭaka* (*Ritsuzō no Kenkyū*, in Japanese), Tokyo, 1960, pp. 779–80 and S. Sasaki, “The *Mahāsūtra* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda as listed in the IDan dkar ma Catalogue” (in Japanese), *Buddhist Studies (Bukkyō Kenkyū)*, Hamamatsu, Vol. XV, Dec. 1985, p. 100.

*Māyājāla*; nos. 6 and 7; and no. 12, the *Bimbisāra*) are also classed as *Mahāsūtras* by the Mūlasarvāstivādins.

The Mūlasarvāstivādin list of *Mahāsūtras* is found in the *Bhikṣu-Vinayavibhaṅga* in both Chinese and Tibetan translation and in the *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinayavibhaṅga* in Chinese translation only, in connection with the third *pārājikā*. The two Chinese lists (translated at the beginning of the 8th century), which are identical, give the titles of six *Mahāsūtras* (*Ta ching*);<sup>1</sup> the Tibetan list (translated c. 800 A.C.) gives the same six titles in the same order, plus two more to make a total of eight *Mahāsūtras* (*mDo chen po che ba*). I will give here the Tibetan list with equivalent Sanskrit titles:<sup>2</sup>

1. <i>Chuṇ nu stoṇ pa ñid</i>	<i>Cūdaśūnyatā</i>
2. <i>Chen po stoṇ pa ñid</i>	<i>Mahāśūnyatā</i>
3. <i>lÑa gsum pa</i>	<i>Pañcatraya</i>
4. <i>sGyu ma'i dra ba</i>	<i>Māyājāla</i>
5. <i>gZugs can sñiñ pos bsu ba</i>	<i>Bimbisārapratyudgamana</i>
6. <i>rGyal mtshan dam pa</i>	<i>Dhvajāgra</i>
7. <i>Kun tu rgyu ba dañ kun tu mi rgyu ba dañ mthun pa'i mdo</i>	<i>Āṭānāṭīya-sūtra</i> <sup>3</sup>
8. <i>Dus pa chen po'i mdo</i>	<i>Mahāsamāja-sūtra</i>

Nine *Mahāsūtras* — the eight listed above, but with two *Dhvajāgra-sūtras* — were translated into Tibetan by Jinamitra, Prajñāvarman, and Ye śes sde in about 800 A.C. Although Sanskrit fragments of six of these *sūtras* (nos. 3–8) have been recovered from Central Asia, and

<sup>1</sup> T 1442, Vol. 23, 662a28; T 1443, Vol. 23, 925c6.

<sup>2</sup> *Vinayavibhaṅga*, Q 1032, 'dul ba, che, 129a5.

<sup>3</sup> The title of this text is variously spelt: *Āṭānāṭīya* by the Mūlasarvāstivādins (in Tibetan transliteration), *Āṭānāṭīka* by the Sarvāstivādins (in Central Asian manuscripts), and *Āṭānāṭīya* by the Theravādins.

although parallel versions of seven of them (nos. 1, 2, 5, two *Dhvajāgras*, 7, 8) were translated into Chinese, only the Tibetan versions are specifically described as *Mahāsūtras* (*mDo chen po*) in their titles and colophons.

The Mūlasarvāstivādin affiliation of the nine Tibetan *Mahāsūtras* is established by the *Vinayavibhaṅga* lists, by the fact that the leading translator, Jinamitra, is described in *Vinaya* colophons as a *vinayadhara* of that school, and by the fact that a contemporary royal edict forbade the translation of any Śrāvakayāna texts apart from those of the Mūlasarvāstivādins.<sup>1</sup>

These nine *Mahāsūtras* were originally transmitted to Tibet as a group. In the “IDan (or IHan) dkar ma Palace Catalogue”, the oldest extant list of works translated into Tibetan, which dates to the early 9th century, they make up the eighth division, *mDo chen por gtogs pa*, “Category of Great Sūtras”.<sup>2</sup> In his *History of Buddhism* (*Chos 'byun*), completed in 1322 or 1323,<sup>3</sup> Bu ston also lists the nine Tibetan titles together, but in a different order.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> E. Obermiller, tr., *History of Buddhism (Chos-hbyung) by Bu-ston*, II. Part, Heidelberg, 1932, p. 197; Claus Vogel, “Bu-ston on the Schism of the Buddhist Church and on the Doctrinal Tendencies of Buddhist Scriptures”, in Heinz Bechert (ed.), *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hinayāna-Literatur*, part I, Göttingen, 1985, pp. 109–10. The correct Sanskrit should be Vogel’s Mūlasarvāstivādin (= Bu ston, Lhasa xylograph, ya, 130b1, *gzi thams cad yod smra*) rather than Obermiller’s Sarvāstivādin. Cf. János Szerb, *Bu ston’s History of Buddhism in Tibet*, Vienna, 1990, p. 46.6 and note 8.

<sup>2</sup> Lalou 1953 pp. 324–25; S. Yoshimura, “The Denkar-Ma, an oldest Catalogue of the Tibetan Buddhist Canons”, Kyoto, 1950 [rep. 1974], p. 23. For the history and date of the IDan dkar ma Catalogue, see Lalou, pp. 313–17; G. Tucci, *Minor Buddhist Texts*, part 2, [Rome, 1958] Delhi, 1986, pp. 46 foll.; D. Snellgrove, *Indo-Tibetan Buddhism*, London, 1987, pp. 440–41.

<sup>3</sup> D.S. Ruegg, *The Life of Bu Ston Rin Po Che*, Rome, 1966, p. xvii.

<sup>4</sup> Bu ston, Lhasa xylograph, ya, 144a4; S. Nishioka, ‘Index to the Catalogue Section of Bu Ston’s “History of Buddhism” (I)’, *Annual Report of the*

The evidence for the *rakṣā* status of the Mūlasarvāstivādin *Mahāsūtras* is found in the *Vinayavibhaṅga* itself, where their recitation is recommended as a protection (*sruṇi ba* = *rakṣā*) against *vetāḍas* (*ro lañś*). The commentary by Vinītadeva, the *Vinayavibhaṅgapadavyākhyāna*, also translated about 800 A.C., states:<sup>1</sup>

“*Mahāsūtra*” means of great fruit (*mahāphala*), because it overcomes opponents (*parapratvādin*) and because it overcomes dangerous *yakṣas*, etc.

Four of the *Mahāsūtras* have counterparts among the *paritta* of the Theravādins: the *Āṭānāṭīya*, the *Mahāsamāja*, and (various elements of) the two *Dhvajāgras*. The principle of selection of the other five is not clear to me.

One other text preserved in Tibetan translation bears the title *Mahāsūtra*: the (*Ārya*) *Vaiśālipraveśa-mahāsūtra*.<sup>2</sup> The translation, under the title ('Phags pa) *Yañś pa'i groñ khyer du 'jug pa'i mdo chen po*, was done by Surendrabodhi and Ye śes sde; since the latter collaborated with the translators of the nine *Mahāsūtras*, the translations were roughly contemporary. Its Mūlasarvāstivādin affiliation is shown by the fact that the entire *sūtra* is incorporated into the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* of the *Vinaya* of that school in both its Tibetan and Chinese versions.<sup>3</sup>

---

*Institute for the Study of Cultural Exchange*, The University of Tokyo, No. 4, 1980, nos. 11–19.

<sup>1</sup> Q 5616, 'dul ba'i 'grel pa, *vu*, 74b2.

<sup>2</sup> Q 142, 714, 978, translated by Léon Feer in *AMG* V, pp. 423–29. There is possibly one more, the *Mahāśītavana* (Q 180) of the Tibetan *Pañcarakṣā* collection; there are, however, difficulties with the title which can only be resolved by further research.

<sup>3</sup> Q 1030, *Vinayavastu*, *sman gyi gži*, *bampo* 28, 'dul ba, *ge*, 42a1–45a4; T 1448, Vol. 24, 27b11–28b6.

The *Vaiśālipraveśa* consists of two parts. In the first, the Buddha and Ānanda travel to Vaiśālī; when they arrive, the Buddha tells Ānanda go to the city and recite certain *mantras* and verses. In the second part, Ānanda does the Buddha's bidding, repeating the *mantras* and verses in full. In the *Bhaiṣajyavastu*, the events occur during the Buddha's last journey, in a version of the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* expanded by the inclusion of long *jātakas* and *avadānas*; the description of the visit to Vaiśālī, ending with the pacification of the epidemic, resembles the setting of the \**Ratna-sūtra* in the texts of other schools.<sup>1</sup> The status of the *Vaiśālipraveśa-mahāsūtra* as a *rakṣā* is clear from the fact that contains a long *mantra* and *svastigāthā* (see § 3), which cure the epidemic in that city, and from the fact that it is included under the title *Mahāmantrānusāriṇī* in the Sanskrit *Pañcarakṣā* collection (see below, § 4).

From the foregoing we may conclude that ten *Mahāsūtras* were popular with the Mūlasarvāstivādins by at least the 8th century, and that these *Mahāsūtras* had *rakṣā* status.

### 3. The *svasti-gāthā* of various schools

The next category of *rakṣā* texts consists of sets of verses variously known as *svasti-*, *svastyayana-*, or *maṅgala-gāthā*,<sup>2</sup> or occasionally as

<sup>1</sup> As far as I know, there is no extant version of a (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin \**Ratna-sūtra*. Whether or not the *Vaiśālipraveśa* is in fact the \**Ratna-sūtra* of that tradition remains to be seen. While the *Vaiśālipraveśa* has only one verse in common with the three extant \**Ratna-sūtras*, and that a verse also found in other texts, it is difficult to believe that the Mūlasarvāstivādins would have two different accounts of the "miracle of Vaiśālī".

<sup>2</sup> For a Jaina text related to this type of *rakṣā* see Gustav Roth, "Notes on the *Pamca-namokkāra-parama-maṅgala* in Jaina Literature", in Heinz Bechert and Petra Kieffer-Pülz (ed.), *Indian Studies (Selected Papers) by Gustav Roth*, Delhi, 1986, pp. 129–46. I expect the tradition of some sort of *svasti-gāthā*

*pranidhāna* or *satyavāk*. For ease of reference, I will henceforth refer to them as *svastigāthā*. They may be described as “verses of welfare, benediction, or blessing”; in a sense they are the positive side of the *rakṣā* coin — the promotion of welfare in contrast with protection against calamity.

The term *svastyayana*(-*gāthā*) is vouchsafed by the *Mahāvastu*, where it describes one of the most popular *parittas*, the *Ratana-sutta*.<sup>1</sup> The same text uses the term *sovattika* for the verses of benediction spoken by the Buddha to the merchants Trapusa and Bhallika.<sup>2</sup> *Svastyayana*, “well-being”, is one of the synonyms of *rakṣā* (in the sense of “protection” rather than “protective text”) in the *Mahāmāyūrī*, and in the *Megha-sūtra*, and the *Ekādaśamukha*;<sup>3</sup> in the *Śārdūlakarṇāvadāna* it occurs in conjunction with *paritrāṇa*.<sup>4</sup> In the *Jātakamālā*, *svastyayana* is used in the sense of “protective charm” or “talisman”.<sup>5</sup>

The only extant collections of *svasti-gāthā* are found in Tibetan translation. The earliest list, of seven titles, occurs in the *lDan dkar ma Catalogue* of the early 9th century, wherein they make up a separate class, section XVIII, under the title *bKra śis kyi rnam grāns* = \**Svastiparyāya*.<sup>6</sup> In the existing recensions of the Tibetan canon, verse

---

must exist in the Brahmanical tradition, but have not seen any references. The concluding verse of *King Mahendra's Bhagavad-Ajuka* (ed., tr. Michael Lockwood and Vishnu Bhat, Madras, 1978, p. 114) may be described as a *svasti-gāthā*.

<sup>1</sup> *Mahāvastu* I 236.2, *svastyayanagāthām bhāṣati*; 236.10, *śrīvāntu svastyayanam jinena bhāṣitam*.

<sup>2</sup> *Mahāvastu* III 404.1 (= Senart 305.10). Cf. *BHSD* 606b, where this is the sole reference.

<sup>3</sup> *MhMVR*(T) 13.2, 15.3, etc; *Megha-sūtra* 298.14; *Ekādaśamukha*, *GM* I 36.2: in all three texts *svastyayana* is preceded by *śānti*, “peace”.

<sup>4</sup> *Divy* 614.6, *paritrāṇam svastyayayam kuryāt*.

<sup>5</sup> *Jātakamālā* VIII, *Maitribala*, vv. 7, 9, etc.; XIX, *Bisa*, v. 15.

<sup>6</sup> Lalou 1953 p. 330.

texts of this type are grouped together at the end of the main divisions of the *Kanjur* and at the end of the *Tanjur*. In the Peking edition, for example, they occur at the end of the *Tantra* division (*rGyud*, Q Vol. 9) properly speaking,<sup>1</sup> at the end of the *Dhāraṇī Collection* (*gZuṇs 'dus*, Q Vol. 11), at the end of the *Vinaya* ('*Dul ba*, Q Vol. 45) — which in the Peking edition equals the end of the *Kanjur* — and at the end of the *Tanjur* (Q Vol. 150), preceding the *Catalogue* (*dKar chag*, Vol. 151). In all cases they perform their function as *svastigāthā*, benedictions or blessings at the conclusion of the meritorious work of compiling the *Tripiṭaka*. This is explained in the *Catalogue* (*dKar chag*) to the *Golden Tanjur*:<sup>2</sup>

“Now, in order to make fruitful the work that has [just been] completed [the copying of the *Tanjur*], the dedications (*bsno ba* = *pariṇamanā*), aspirations (*smon lam* = *pranidhāna*), and blessings (*bkra śis* = *maṅgala*) [follow]...”

Well-placed [here] are the forty-odd  
dedications, aspirations, and verses of blessing  
which when recited accomplish all aims  
and promote welfare at all times.”

Out of the “forty-odd” texts, the *pariṇamanā* and *pranidhāna* (mostly extracted from *Mahāyāna* works) come first, followed by the *svasti-* and *maṅgala-gāthā*, which come at the end. I can give here only a few examples of the latter.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> That is, not counting the three volumes of the “Old Tantras” (*rñiñ rgyud dza, va, ža*) or volume *za*.

<sup>2</sup> *Golden Tanjur*, Vol. 100, *dkar chag, tso*, 182b6–184a1. Similar passages are found in other editions of the *Kanjur* and *Tanjur*.

<sup>3</sup> The following is based on the Peking edition of the *Kanjur* and *Tanjur*. For the Berlin manuscript *Kanjur*, see Hermann Beckh, *Verzeichnis der Tibetischen Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin, Erste Abteilung: Kanjur*

1. A complete extract of the verses of one of the *Mahāsūtras*, the *Vaiśālīpraveśa* (see above, § 2), which are described as *bde legs kyi tshigs su bcad pa* = *svastigāthā*.<sup>1</sup>
2. Verses extracted from the *Mahāśāhasrapramardanī*, a *Pañcarakṣā* text (see below, § 4), equivalent to the *Ratana-sutta* of the Theravādin *Suttanipāta* and the parallel *svastyayana-gāthā* in the Lokottaravādin *Mahāśāṃghika Mahāvastu*, but differing in number of verses, order, and details.<sup>2</sup> The title describes them as *smon lam* = *prañidhāna*.
3. A set of two groups of verses extracted from another *Pañcarakṣā* text, the *Mahāmāyūri*.<sup>3</sup> The first group deals with the Seven Buddhas and their *bodhi*-trees; the second consists of two verses common to the first *Dhvajāgra-mahāsūtra* and to the *Vaiśālīpraveśa*, plus a third

(*Bkah-hgyur*), Berlin, 1914, p. 5 ('*dul ba*), pp. 132–33 (*rgyud*), p. 147 (*gzuṇs 'dus*); for the Derge *Kanjur* see Hakuju Ui *et al.*, *A Complete Catalogue of the Tibetan Canons*, Sendai, 1934, pp. 135–37 (*rgyud*), 178–80 (*gzuṇs 'dus*); for the Lithang *Kanjur*, see Jampa Samten Shastri and Jeremy Russell, "Notes on the Lithang Edition of the Tibetan *bKa*'-'*gyur*", in *The Tibet Journal*, Vol. XII, no. 3, autumn, 1987, Appendix III ('*dul ba*). Because different texts bear similar or identical titles, because the same text sometimes bears different titles in the different divisions of one edition, and because the titles are sometimes given in the colophon rather than at the head of the text, I am unable to give a complete concordance in this paper. Note that the "Them spangs ma" *Kanjurs* have only a few such texts at the end of the *Sūtra* (*mdo sde*) and *Tantra* (*rgyud*) divisions: see for example the Stog Palace *Kanjur*, Skorupski nos. 321–32 and 759–63.

<sup>1</sup> Q 439, Vol. 9, end of *rgyud*; Q 1045, Vol. 45, end of '*dul ba*'; Q 5950, Vol. 150, end of *Tanjur*.

<sup>2</sup> *Stoṇ chen mo rab tu 'joms pa las gsuṇs pa'i smon lam*, Q 436, Vol. 9, end of *rgyud*; Q 719, Vol. 11, end of *gzuṇs 'dus*; Q 1043, Vol. 45, end of '*dul ba*'; Q 5951, Vol. 150, end of *Tanjur*.

<sup>3</sup> *Rig snags kyi rgyal mo rma bya chen mo las gsuṇs pa'i smon lam dan bden tshig*: Q 437, Vol. 9, end of *rgyud*; Q 720, Vol. 11, end of *gzuṇs 'dus*; Q 1044, Vol. 45, end of '*dul ba*'; Q 5953, Vol. 150, end of *Tanjur*.

*satyavāk* verse.<sup>1</sup> The title describes the verses as *pranidhāna* (*smon lam* = first set) and *satyavāk* (*bden tshig* = second set).

4. The *Devapariprcchā-maṅgalagāthā*,<sup>2</sup> parallel to the Pali *Maṅgalasutta*, another of the most popular *parittas*; since it differs in number and order of verses, it is the recension of another, as yet undetermined, school.

5. The *Āśīrvāda-gāthā*,<sup>3</sup> according to the colophon an extract from the *Trapuśabhallikaparivarta* of the *Lalitavistara*.<sup>4</sup> Similar verses, described as *sovatthika*, are found in the *Mahāvastu*.<sup>5</sup> In both cases they are spoken by the Buddha to the merchants Trapuśa and Bhallika. The verses occur in the *Vinaya* of the Mahāsāṃghikas in Chinese translation, but in a different context.<sup>6</sup> A fragmentary Sanskrit manuscript from Central Asia in the Pelliot collection also contains the verses, again addressed to the two merchants,<sup>7</sup> and a parallel is found in Uighur.<sup>8</sup> The stanzas invoke the blessings and protection of 28 *nakṣatras*, 32 *devakumārīs*,

<sup>1</sup> *MhMVR*(T) 13.17–14.3 and 14.15–15.1, respectively.

<sup>2</sup> *Lhas žus pa'i bkra śis kyi tshigs su bcad pa*, Q 442, Vol. 9, end of *rgyud*; Q 721, Vol. 11, end of *gzunś 'dus*; Q 1053, Vol. 45, end of *'dul ba*; Q 5943, Vol. 150, end of *Tanjur*. Studied in French translation by Feer, compared with the Tibetan translation of a Theravādin version, in *AMG* V pp. 224–27.

<sup>3</sup> *Śis par brjod pa'i tshigs su bcad pa*, Q 728, Vol. 11, end of *gzunś 'dus*; Q 1048, Vol. 45, end of *'dul ba*; Q 5949, *ño mtshar bstan bcos, mo*, 336b2–39a4, end of *Tanjur*.

<sup>4</sup> Colophon, *mo*, 339a3; the translated verses indeed agree with those of the Tibetan *Lalitavistara*, Q 763, *mdo, ku*, 209a7–11a4, translated *circa* 800 A.C. by Jinamitra, Dānaśīla, Munivarma, and Ye śes sde (for Sanskrit cf. *Lalitavistara* 282.3–85.8 = vv. 109–52).

<sup>5</sup> *Mahāvastu* III 404.7–10.14 (vv. 7–51).

<sup>6</sup> Bareau 1959 pp. 303–4. Bareau refers to T 1425, 500c–01b.

<sup>7</sup> Pauly 1959 pp. 203–22.

<sup>8</sup> Lore Sander, "Buddhist Literature in Central Asia", *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism*, Vol. IV, fasc. 1, 1979, p. 61.

the Four Great Kings and their assemblies, and four *caityas*, in the sequence of the four quarters, and hence set up a protective circle.<sup>1</sup>

Other texts bear similar titles:

6. *Svasti-gāthā*<sup>2</sup>
7. *Svastyayana-gāthā*<sup>3</sup>
8. *Pañcatathāgatamañgala-gāthā*<sup>4</sup>
9. *Ratnatrayamañgala-gāthā*<sup>5</sup>
10. *Mañgala-gāthā*<sup>6</sup>
11. *Ratnatrayasvastigāthā*<sup>7</sup>
12. *Rig gsum gyi bkra śis kyi tshigs su bcad pa*<sup>8</sup>
13. *Saṁs rgyas rabs bdun gyi bkra śis kyi tshigs su bcad pa.*<sup>9</sup>

Only two *svastigāthās* may be assigned a school with any certainty: the *Vaiśālīpraveśa-svastigāthā*, which occurs in the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* of the

<sup>1</sup> For a summary of the verses in the *Lalitavistara*, *Mahāvastu*, and *Vinaya* see Bareau 1959 pp. 304–9.

<sup>2</sup> *Bde legs kyi tshigs su bcad pa*, Q 440, Vol. 9, end of *rgyud*; Q 772, Vol. 11, end of *gzuṇs 'dus*.

<sup>3</sup> *Bde legs su 'gyur ba'i tshigs su bcad pa*, Q 441, Vol. 9, end of *rgyud*; Q 773, Vol. 11, end of *gzuṇs 'dus*.

<sup>4</sup> *De bzin gṣegs pa lha'i bkra śis kyi tshigs su bcad pa*, Q 445, Vol. 9, end of *rgyud*; Q 726, Vol. 11, end of *gzuṇs 'dus*; translated by Feer, *AMG* V p. 470.

<sup>5</sup> *Dkon mchog gsum gyi bkra śis kyi tshigs su bcad pa*, Q 447, Vol. 9, end of *rgyud*; Q 729, Vol. 11, end of *gzuṇs 'dus*; Q 5958, Vol. 150, end of *Tanjur*.

<sup>6</sup> Q 449, etc.: see references in note 3 on p. 137.

<sup>7</sup> *Dkon mchog gsum gyi bkra śis kyi tshigs su bcad pa*, Q 450, Vol. 9, end of *rgyud*; Q 5955, Vol. 150, end of *Tanjur*.

<sup>8</sup> Q 446, Vol. 9, end of *rgyud*; Q 727, Vol. 11, end of *gzuṇs 'dus*; Q 5961, Vol. 150, end of *Tanjur*; translated by Feer, *AMG* V pp. 474–75. The title means “Verses of Blessing of the Three Families” (\**Trikula / Kulatraya-maṅgalagāthā*).

<sup>9</sup> Q 444, etc.: see references in note 4 on p. 137. The title means “Verses of Blessing (*maṅgalagāthā*) on the Lineage of the Seven Buddhas”.

Mūlasarvāstivādins, and the *Āśīrvāda-gāthā*, which is Mahāsāṃghika in two (most probably three) of its versions.<sup>1</sup>

It is likely that at least some of the *svastigāthā* in the Tibetan *Tripiṭaka* belonged to the liturgy of the monks of the Mūlasarvāstivādin or other *nikāyas* in India. That is, they would have been recited in appropriate contexts — sickness or calamity, or *anumodanā* for *dāna* — just as their Pali counterparts are chanted by Theravādin monks up to the present day.<sup>2</sup> In the Mahāsāṃghika *Vinaya*, the *Āśīrvāda-gāthā* are presented as a model of the benediction to be given by monks to merchants who have made offerings.<sup>3</sup> Examples of verse *abhyanumodanā* are found in the *Vinaya* and *Sūtra* literature of the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādins, where the stock formula is *atha bhagavān* (name of donor, genitive) *tad dānam anayā abhyanumodayā abhyanumodate*.<sup>4</sup> Another formula is *bhagavatā...dakṣinā ādiṣṭā*.<sup>5</sup> Some information about chanting in India in the late 7th century is supplied by I-ching; he does not, however,

<sup>1</sup> The *Mahāvastu*, the *Vinaya* in Chinese, and the *Lalitavistara*. On the basis of style, phraseology, and doctrine, the origins of the last named seem to me to lie more probably with the Mahāsāṃghikas than with the Sarvāstivādins. The common attribution of the text to the latter seems to rest on a sole Chinese reference to the titles of a number of biographies of the Buddha: see Samuel Beal, *The Romantic Legend of Śākyā Buddha*, [London, 1875] Delhi, 1985, pp. v–vi, 386–87.

<sup>2</sup> In terms of purpose — celebration of the merits of an act of giving — *anumodanā* is not strictly speaking a protection, *rakṣā*. But since the verses employed overlap the *rakṣā* literature (the first *Dhvajāgra-mahāsūtra* contains *abhyanumodanā* verses, some of which are elsewhere described as *svasti-gāthā*) and the Pali *anumodanā* are printed along with *paritta* and assorted *rakṣās* (see *Royal Chanting Book*, *anumodanā-vidhī*), it seems more convenient to study *abhyanumodanā* and *svastigāthā* together.

<sup>3</sup> Bareau 1959 pp. 303–4.

<sup>4</sup> See *Saṅghabheda-vastu* I 124.11–20; Ernst Waldschmidt, *Das Mahā-parinirvāṇasūtra*, [Berlin, 1950–51] Kyoto, 1986, §§ 6.11–14, 12.6–9, 26.29–30.

<sup>5</sup> *Saṅghabheda-vastu* I 199.25–27.

mention any canonical texts by name.<sup>1</sup> I-ching's translator, Takakusu (p. 48), gives two Sanskrit terms: *dānagāthā* and *dakṣināgāthā*.<sup>2</sup>

As far as I know, only two of the *svastigāthā* mentioned above are currently recited by members of the Tibetan *saṃgha* (who are by ordination Mūlasarvāstivādin): the *Maṅgalagāthā* on the twelve acts of the Buddha, attributed to Nāgārjuna,<sup>3</sup> and the *Maṅgalagāthā* on the Lineage of the Seven Buddhas.<sup>4</sup> The school of these two texts is uncertain; since neither is overtly Mahāyānistic, they may be described as mainstream *svastigāthā*.

Though not described as such, the last verse of Vasubandhu's *Gāthāsamgraha* is a typical *svastigāthā*:<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> J. Takakusu, tr., *A Record of the Buddhist Religion as Practised in India and the Malay Archipelago*, [London, 1896] New Delhi, 1986, pp. 41–42, 46, 48–49, 152, 166. I-ching does say that he has translated such *gāthās*; Takakusu (p. 48 note 1) refers to the "Rules of Confession", Nanjio 1506 [= T 1903, KBC 1084]. Cf. *Hōbōgirin* I 93 foll. ("Bombai").

<sup>2</sup> See also Soothill and Hodous, *A Dictionary of Chinese Buddhist Terms*, [London, 1937] Delhi, 1977, pp. 285a, 330b.

<sup>3</sup> *Bkra śis kyi tshigs su bcad pa*, Q 449, Vol. 9, *rgyud, tsha*, 321a8; Q 724, Vol. 11, *rgyud, ya*, 278b6; Q 5954, Vol. 150, *no mtshar bstan bcos, mo*, 343a; translated by Feer, *AMG* V pp. 471–74. The attribution of the text to *Slob dpon 'phags pa klu sgrub* is in Q 5954. The text is not mentioned in Chr. Lindtner, *Nagarjuniana*, Copenhagen, 1982, pp. 11–17.

<sup>4</sup> *Saṃs rgyas rabs bdun gyi bkra śis kyi tshigs su bcad pa*, Q 444, Vol. 9, *rgyud, tsha*, 319b; Q 725, Vol. 11, *rgyud, ya*, 280a3. Both this and the preceding text are translated in *The Sublime Path of the Victorious Ones*, Dharamsala, 1981, pp. 83–87.

<sup>5</sup> A. Schiefner, "Über Vasubandhu's *Gāthāsamgraha*", *Mélanges Asiatiques*, St.-Pétersbourg, 1878, p. 566; Q 5603, Vol. 119, *mnon pa'i bstan bcos, nu*, 241a4–5; commentary, Q 5604, Vol. 119, *mnon pa'i bstan bcos, nu*, 285b1–86a4.

May the world be happy, may there be a good harvest;  
 may grain be ample, may government be righteous;  
 may all illness and harm disappear!

In his commentary Vasubandhu notes that the verse is a wish (*smon lam* = *prañidhāna*) for the absence of fear of various kinds of harm, which he describes in some detail.

I have not come across any examples of an equivalent Pali term — *sotthi-gāthā* or *sovatthi-gāthā*.<sup>1</sup> The numerous Pali chants — both canonical (such as the *Ratana-sutta*) and extra-canonical — that contain refrains like *etena saccavajjena suvatthi hotu* may, however, reasonably be classed as *sotthi-gāthā*. The title *maṅgala-gāthā* is common in Pali.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Table 1.1 shows that the Siamese edition of the *Milinda-pañha* includes a *Suvatthi-paritta*. Taking the other lists into account, this might be the *Ratana-sutta*, which has the refrain *etena saccena suvatthi hotu*. Cf. also PTSD 725b, *sotthikamma*, *sotthikāra*, *sotthivācaka*. In the *Suppāraka-jātaka* (Jātaka 463, Vol. IV 142) the *bodhisatta* performs an act of truth (for which see below, § 5) by reciting a verse over a bowl of water, after reflecting, “Apart from myself there is no one whatsoever able to save (*sotthibhāvam kātum*) these people: by means of an act of truth I will bring them to safety (*saccakiriyāya tesam sotthim karissāmi*).

<sup>2</sup> See the texts listed in § 1, pp. 122–23, and also Dhammānanda 1992 p. 440, *Sabbajayamaṅgala-gāthā*.

4. The *Pañcarakṣā* collections<sup>1</sup>

The *Pañcarakṣā* or *Five Protections* were extremely popular in Northern India, Nepal, and Tibet, as may be seen from the numerous manuscripts kept in libraries around the world. Their study is complicated by the fact, belied by a general similarity of titles, that there exist (at least) two different collections, a Tibetan and a Sanskrit, which have only three texts in common: the study therefore involves seven rather than five texts.<sup>2</sup> Since the Tibetan versions were translated in about 800 A.C., and since the *lDan dkar ma Catalogue* treats them as a separate category under the title *gZuṅs chen po lha = Pañca-*

<sup>1</sup> For the present study I have used Takubo's edition of the *Mahāmāyūrī* in Sanskrit (*MhMVR(T)*). For the remaining Sanskrit versions, I originally had access only to the summaries in Rajendralala Mitra's *The Sanskrit Buddhist Literature of Nepal*, [1882] Indian reprint, 1981, pp. 164–69 and in M. Winternitz and A. Keith, *Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library*, Vol. II, Oxford, 1905, pp. 257–59; I also made desultory attempts at the two late Nepalese manuscripts reproduced by Lokesh Chandra, *Pañca-rakṣā*, New Delhi, 1981 (Śata-Piṭaka Series Vol. 267). Only when the paper was in its final draft did I receive (courtesy Dr. Paul Harrison) copies of Iwamoto's romanised editions of the Sanskrit versions of the *Mahāpratisarā*, *Mahāśāhasrapramardanī*, and *Mahāśītavatī*. For the Tibetan translations I have used the Derge (D) edition of the *Kanjur*. The present section summarises my "Note on the *Pañcarakṣā*", delivered at the 10th Conference of the International Association of Buddhist Studies, Paris, July, 1991; the revised version of that paper, which I am preparing for publication, will give fuller bibliographical details.

<sup>2</sup> On the whole the *Pañcarakṣā* seem to have been rather neglected in the West since Lévi's work on the *Mahāmāyūrī* (Lévi 1915). The best modern discussion (with a comprehensive bibliography) is Pentti Aalto's "Prolegomena to an Edition of the *Pañcarakṣā*" (*Studia Orientalia* XIX:12, Helsinki, 1954, pp. 5–48); see also the introduction to the same scholar's edition of the Mongolian versions, *Qutut-tu Pañcarakṣā Kemekü Tabun Sakiyan Neretü Yeke Kölgen Sudur*, Wiesbaden, 1961, pp. 1–5. It seems to have been Aalto who first recognised that the Sanskrit and Tibetan collections are discrepant, at least for the *Mahāmantrānudharanī*: see the latter work, p. 1, note 1.

*mahādhāraṇī*,<sup>1</sup> the available evidence for the Tibetan collection is earlier than that for the North Indian-cum-Nepalese collection, which survives only in manuscripts from the 11th century on. Fragments of only two *Pañcarakṣā* texts, the *Mahāmāyūrī* and the *Mahāsāhasrapramardanī*, have been found in Central Asia; fragments of the *Mahāpratisarā* were found in Gilgit.<sup>2</sup> The *Pañcarakṣā* was not transmitted as a collection in the Chinese *Tripiṭaka*, although there are independent translations, all, except for several versions of the *Mahāmāyūrī*, quite late.<sup>3</sup> Table 3 shows the relationship between the two collections and independent Tibetan or Chinese translations, and *paritta* and other *rakṣā* texts. In the following summary of the contents of the seven texts, I will present them in the order of the table: the first three are similar in their Tibetan and Sanskrit versions, while the last four are grouped by their (similar) titles, 4a and 5a referring to the Tibetan versions, 4b and 5b to the Sanskrit.<sup>4</sup>

### 1. *Mahāpratisarāvidyārājñī*

The *Mahāpratisarāvidyārājñī*,<sup>5</sup> which is similar in its Sanskrit and Tibetan versions, may be classed under Mahāyāna: the assembly includes

<sup>1</sup> Lalou 1953 § XIII, p. 327.

<sup>2</sup> Oskar von Hinüber, *Die Erforschung der Gilgit-Handschriften*, Göttingen, 1979, Anhang I, nos. 6, 15 and 17.

<sup>3</sup> Aalto's statement ("Prolegomena", p. 7) that there are no Chinese translations of the "Mahāśītavānī and Mahāmantra-anudhārī" (his spellings) needs clarification. The *Mahāśītavatī* and *Mahāmantrānusāriṇī* of the Sanskrit collection are both found in Chinese: out of the "Seven Rakṣā", only the Tibetan *Mahāśītavana* and *Mahāmantrānudharaṇī* have no Chinese (or surviving Sanskrit) counterparts.

<sup>4</sup> The titles themselves pose difficulties. For the Sanskrit versions I have followed Iwamoto (see also the "internal list" at *Mahāsāhasrapramardanī* 41.7); for the Tibetan versions I have provisionally chosen what seems to me the most probable of the variant transcriptions given at the head of the Tibetan translations.

<sup>5</sup> A romanised edition of the Sanskrit was published by Yutaka Iwamoto in *Pañcarakṣā* II, Kyoto, 1938.

a vast number of *bodhisattvas*, and there are references to *bodhicitta* and to the *Mahāyāna* itself. In addition to offering protection against a wide variety of ills, the *mantra* can confer enlightenment: in this it goes further than the other *Pañcarakṣā* texts, which only offer protection.

## 2. *Mahāmāyūrī*

The *Mahāmāyūrī* (also similar in Sanskrit and Tibetan) is the longest of the “seven *Rakṣās*”; it is a composite work, rather complex in stratigraphy.<sup>1</sup> The oldest layer and *raison d'être* is the account of the monk Svāti with its *mantra* and *jātaka*, parallel to that of the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins, the *jātaka* parallel to the Pali *Morajātaka*. To this are added a verse found in the *Morajātaka* but not in the *Bhaiṣajyavastu*, verses on protection against snakes found in the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin *Upasena-sūtra* and the Pali *Vinaya* and *Khandhaparitta*, and verses common to the first *Dhvajāgra-mahāsūtra*, the *Bhadrakarātrī-sūtra*, and the *Vaiśālīpraveśa*. The list of *yakṣas* is close to that of the *Āṭānāṭika-sūtra*, and some of its phraseology must have been influenced by or drawn from a common source as that of that text.

Other elements include the cult of the Seven Buddhas and their trees; lists of *nāgas* and a variety of divine, daemonic, and supernatural beings; lists of rivers, mountains, *nakṣatras*, *grahas*, and “sages of the past”. A characteristically thorough summary of the contents was made by Lévi in 1915 (pp. 19–22), so I need not go into more detail here.

<sup>1</sup> In addition to Takubo's edition, there is that of S. Oldenburg, “Mahāmāyūrī vidyārājñī”, “Otryvki Kaṣgarskich i sanskritskich rukopisej iz sobranija N.F. Petrovskago, II, Otryvki iz Pañcarakṣā”, *Zapiski vostočnago otdelenija imperatorskago russkago archeologičeskago obščestva* 11 (1897–98), pp. 218–61. See also A.F. Rudolf Hoernle, *The Bower Manuscript*, Calcutta, 1893–1912, pp. xciv–xcv, 222–40e, and *SHT* (I) 63, 375, 524, (V) 1459.

3. *Mahāśāhasrapramardani*

The *Mahāśāhasrapramardani*,<sup>1</sup> in both its Sanskrit and Tibetan versions, enshrines a complete \**Ratna-sūtra*, concealed by a tangled overgrowth of *mantras* and long verses.<sup>2</sup> That this is its original kernel is clear from the narrative framework, which belongs to the “*Ratna-sūtra*-Vaiśālī miracle” tradition: the Buddha at Rājagrha, the calamity at Vaiśālī, and the assembly of deities (pp. 1–2); the Buddha’s departure for Vaiśālī, the offering of the divine umbrellas, the decoration of the route, and the *indrakīla* (pp. 21–23); the appeasement of the calamity (p. 29).

4. *Mahāśītavana / Mahāśītavatī*

4.a. The Tibetan *Mahāśītavana* in some ways resembles the *Ātānāṭikasūtra*. The title derives from the location, the Śītavana at Rājagrha. The structure and purpose of the *nidāna* — though not the actual phrasing — parallel that of the *Ātānāṭika*: both texts feature the Four Great Kings, who express concern for monks, nuns, laymen, and laywomen dwelling in remote places, where they are threatened by spirits who have no faith in the Buddha. Only a few verses are common to the two texts. Like the Pali *Ātānāṭiya* (but not the Sanskrit, Tibetan, or Chinese versions), the *Mahāśītavana* gives at the opening a set of verses of homage to past Buddhas; the *Mahāśītavana* list of 17 Buddhas is almost identical to those of the *Mahāvastu*, the *Mahākaruṇāpūṇḍarīka-sūtra*, and the Chinese *Abhiniṣkramaṇa-sūtra*.

4.b. The Sanskrit *Mahāśītavatī* is quite different.<sup>3</sup> The Buddha imparts a long *mantra* to Rāhula, who has been harrassed by a miscellany of

<sup>1</sup> A romanised edition of the Sanskrit was published by Iwamoto in *Pañcarakṣā I*, Kyoto, 1937. Fragments were also published by Oldenburg, *op. cit.*, pp. 215–18, 261–64 (= Iwamoto pp. 35.2–37 penult.), and in *SHT* (III) 983, 1011.

<sup>2</sup> Iwamoto 24.24–26.22; in Lokesh Chandra, *Pañca-rakṣā*, the \**Ratna-sūtra* occurs at *Manuscript A* 112.5 foll., *Manuscript B* 156.1 foll.

<sup>3</sup> A romanised edition of the Sanskrit was published by Yutaka Iwamoto in *Kleinere Dhāraṇī Texte*, Kyoto, 1937.

malignant beings whilst dwelling in the Śītavana. The phraseology is typical of *rakṣā* literature, but otherwise the text does not have much in common with the other six *rakṣās*; furthermore, it is the only text of the seven that is entirely in prose. The Sanskrit title (and that of the Chinese translation<sup>1</sup>) derives from the name of the *dhāraṇī* or *vidyā*.<sup>2</sup> A Tibetan translation, not classed under *Pañcarakṣā*, bears the title *Mahādaṇḍadhāraṇī*, which in this version is the name of the *dhāraṇī*; otherwise the Sanskrit, Tibetan, and Chinese versions are quite close.

### 5. *Mahāmantrānudharaṇī* / *Mahāmantrānusāriṇī*

5.a. As far as I have been able to determine, the *Mahāmantrānudharaṇī* of the Tibetan collection is not extant in Sanskrit or Chinese. The first two thirds of this text are taken up by a brief preamble, the *nidāna*, assorted *mantras*, and lists of *rākṣasīs*. The last third is extremely interesting: it contains material drawn from about ten sources, including verses common to the *Udānavarga* and the Sarvāstivādin and Mūlasarvāstivādin *Prātimokṣa-sūtras*, 26 lines of verse corresponding to the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin *Candra-sūtra* (and thus parallel to the Pali *Canda-paritta*), and a series of *satyavāks* linked with a list of *agraśrāvakas* and of *agraprajñaptis*. The section may be described as a *paritta* collection or *paritta* extracts of an unknown school.

5.b. The *Mahāmantrānusāriṇī* of the Sanskrit collection is completely different: it is none other than a recension of the *Vaiśālīpraveśa-mahāsūtra* discussed above (§ 2). The title derives from the name of the *mantra* as given in the Sanskrit *Mahāmantrānusāriṇī*<sup>3</sup> but not in the Tibetan *Vaiśālīpraveśa*. Apart from this, and the fact that the Sanskrit omits verses 16 and 17 of the Tibetan, the two versions are very close.

<sup>1</sup> T 1392, KBC 1104.

<sup>2</sup> Iwamoto, pp. 2.8, 4.14, 5.15.

<sup>3</sup> *Imāni mahāmantrānusāriṇīmantrapadāni*, in Lokesh Chandra, *Pañca-rakṣā*, A 236.4, 241.3, B 363.1, 370.1.

Out of the seven *Pañcarakṣā* texts, only one, the *Mahā-pratisarāvidyārājñī*, belongs to the Mahāyāna; the remaining six may be classed under the Śrāvakayāna *rakṣā* literature.<sup>1</sup> (My assertion that these texts belong to the Śrāvakayāna is based on a literal reading of their contents. There is no doubt that they were [and are] used by practitioners of the Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna. The difference is one of context [and this may apply to other *rakṣā* texts]: if combined with preliminary rites involving the generation of the *bodhicitta*, they become Mahāyānist in application; if conjoined with further rites of initiation, entry into a *maṇḍala*, or the visualization of the *Pañcarakṣā* deities, they become Vajrayānist in application. Numerous *sādhanas* for the realization of these deities are found in Sanskrit and Tibetan, and the deities are depicted in illuminated manuscripts — North Indian, Nepalese, and Tibetan — of the *Pañcarakṣā*. They are not, however,

---

<sup>1</sup> To determine whether a text belongs to the Śrāvakayāna or Mahāyāna, I follow five guidelines: teacher, place, audience, doctrine, and goal. A Śrāvakayāna *sūtra* is (1) taught by Śākyamuni (or by other “historical” Buddhas of past or future) or by one of his disciples, (2) at one of the North Indian sites which he frequented, (3) to an audience of disciples; (4) its doctrine agrees with that of the *Āgama/Nikāya* tradition, and (5) its highest goal is arighthood. A Mahāyāna *sūtra* is (1) taught by Śākyamuni, by a “non-historical” Buddha such as Vairocana, or by a *bodhisattva*, (2) at one of the historical sites or on another plane of existence such as a distant universe or Buddhafield, (3) to an audience that includes *bodhisattvas*; it (4) teaches voidness and non-origination as in the *Prajñāpāramitā*, and (5) recommends to all the *bodhisattva* path aiming at full enlightenment. The last item entails vows (*pranidhāna*), the aspiration to enlightenment (*bodhicitta*), the prediction (*vyākaraṇa*), and the perfections (*pāramitā*) and levels (*bhūmi*) of a *bodhisattva* (see here R.E. Emmerick, *The Book of Zambasta*, London, 1968, p. 187, and Candrakīrti as cited in Anthony K. Warder, “Original” Buddhism and Mahāyāna, Turin, 1983, p. 8). The *Mahāsāhasrapramardanī* (34.12–20) does mention Akṣobhyarāja, Avalokiteśvara, and Amitābha, but since they play no role whatsoever in the *sūtra* they may be treated as one of its many elements drawn from popular lore. Since the same *sūtra* also lists all five *Pañcarakṣā* titles, it evidently continued to grow after the *Pañcarakṣā* group had come into being.

invoked or described in the *Pañcarakṣā* texts properly speaking, except insofar as their names correspond to those of the *mantras*.<sup>1)</sup>

Of the six Śrāvakayāna *rakṣās*, the Sanskrit *Mahāśītavatī* (= Tibetan *Mahādaṇḍa-dhāraṇī*) does not contain any elements (apart from phraseology) common to the others, or to the *paritta*, *Mahāsūtras*, or *svastigāthā*: it is simply a *rakṣā mantra* with minimal narrative framework. The remaining five may be described as Śrāvakayāna *rakṣās* *par excellence*. All have *paritta* at their heart, and are expanded by preambles, by verses of homage, by *mantras* and praises of *mantras*, by lists of deities, by descriptions of rites, and so on: they are composite compilations that must have evolved over several centuries. All contain common elements, such as the cults of past Buddhas, the Four Kings, and deities such as *yakṣas*, etc., common verses, and common phraseology. The manner in which the *parittas* are buried in such long lists of deities and supernormal beings may be compared with the *paritta* ceremony of Sri Lanka, which contains a long admonition listing similar deities, and can go on all night or for seven days.<sup>2</sup> If a collection of Sri Lankan *parittas* were published along with all such preliminaries, admonitions, ceremonies, and rites, in both contents and length it would resemble one of the composite *Pañcarakṣā* texts, minus, of course, the *mantras*.

### 5. *Rakṣā* phraseology

A certain phraseology characterises the *rakṣā* literature. One frequent element is the “profession of truth” (*satya-vāk*, *satyādhiṣṭhāna*). In Mūlasarvāstivādin literature we find *etena satyavākyena svasty ānandāya*

<sup>1</sup> The *Mahāmāyūrī* (Takubo, 37.17) does give the names of several *Pañcarakṣā* deities (without describing them as such) within a long list of deities: *mahā-pratisarāya svāhā*, *sītavanāya svāhā*, etc.

<sup>2</sup> L. de Silva, pp. 51–52.

*bhikṣave* in the *Śārdūlakarṇāvadāna*, *anena satyena satyavākyena* in the *Prātiḥārya-sūtra*, and *tena me satyavākyena* in the *Upasena-sūtra*.<sup>1</sup> In Theravādin literature we have the refrain of the *Ratana-sutta*, *etena saccena suvatthi hotu*,<sup>2</sup> and similar phrases in numerous extra-canonical *paritta*. In Lokottaravādin literature there is the *etena satyena susvasti bhotu* of that school's version of the *Ratana-sutta*;<sup>3</sup> the *Mahāsāhasrapramardanī* version of the same has *etena satyena ihāstu svasti*.<sup>4</sup> The *Prajñāpāramitā* uses *anena satyena satyavacanena*.<sup>5</sup>

In the *Milindapañha*, King Milinda states that “by truth (*saccena*) truth-speakers (*saccavādino*) perform an act of truth (*saccakiriyañ katvā*), and cause rain to fall, put out fire, counteract poison, or perform various feats as required”.<sup>6</sup> At the conclusion of his discussion of *saccakiriya*, Nāgasena says, “there is no aim at all that those established in the truth do not accomplish”.<sup>7</sup> In the *Prajñāpāramitā* (loc. cit.) the success of an act of truth indicates that a bodhisattva has reached the irreversible stage. In the *Bhadrakalpika-sūtra* it is said that through *satyavāk* miracles (*prātiḥārya*) arise from relics.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Divy* 613.9 and 154.25, and *Upasena-sūtra* (1) 41.2, respectively.

<sup>2</sup> *Sn* vv. 224–35; further examples and references are given by Burlingame (see note 3 on p. 146) p. 434.

<sup>3</sup> *Mahāvastu* I 236.16 etc.

<sup>4</sup> *Mahāsāhasrapramardanī* 25.1 etc.

<sup>5</sup> *Aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā* (BST 4) 189.12–191.25; 247.10–16; Edward Conze, *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Aṣṭāśāsasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā*, Chapters 55 to 70, Rome, 1962, pp. 5.5–8.6; cf. also *Ratnaguṇasamcaya-gāthā* XX 23–24, XXI 1, in P.L. Vaidya (ed.), *Mahāyāna-sūtra-saṃgraha* Part I (BST 17), Darbhanga, 1961. See also *SHT* (VI) 1259.

<sup>6</sup> *Milindapañha*, *Chatṭhasaṅgīti* edition, 124.8. *Milindapañha* 123–26 (= PTS ed. I 119–23) has a long discussion of *saccakiriya*.

<sup>7</sup> *Milindapañha*, *Chatṭhasaṅgīti* edition, 126.19, *sacce ṭhitā na kiñci attham na vindanti*.

<sup>8</sup> *The Fortunate Aeon*, Vol. I, Dharma Publishing, Berkeley, 1986, p. 474.15, *bden pa'i tshig gis riñ bsrel las cho 'phrul 'byuñ ba*.

The “profession of truth” goes beyond the *rakṣā* literature (though the boundary is not always clear) into the *jātakas*,<sup>1</sup> Buddhist drama,<sup>2</sup> and Indian literature in general: the *Mahābhārata*, the *Rāmāyaṇa*, as well as vernacular folktales and Jaina literature.<sup>3</sup> While in such cases the *satyavāk* is a narrative device — a specific act performed by a specific person with specific results — as a *rakṣā* properly speaking it is anonymous and generalised.

The *satyavāk* is sometimes combined with versions of the *agra-prajñapti* formula: examples occur in the *Prātihārya-sūtra*,<sup>4</sup> the *Mahā-mantrānudharanī-sūtra*,<sup>5</sup> and the (Ārya) *Sarvarogapraśamani-dhāraṇī*.<sup>6</sup> Similarly, a non-canonical Pali text entitled *Parittakarana-pāṭha*

<sup>1</sup> See *Jātakamālā* II, XIV, XV, XVI, and Sitaram Roy (ed.), *Suvarṇavarnāvadāna*, Patna, 1971, §§ 159, 163–65, 201–02.

<sup>2</sup> Candragomin’s *Lokānandanāṭaka*, tr. Michael Hahn, *Joy for the World*, Berkeley, 1987, V 40 p. 130.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. E.W. Burlingame, “The Act of Truth (*Saccakiriya*): A Hindu Spell and its Employment as a Psychic Motif in Hindu Fiction”, in *JRAS*, 1917, pp. 429–67; W. Norman Brown, “The Basis for the Hindu Act of Truth”, in *The Review of Religion*, Vol. V, no. 1, Nov. 1940, pp. 36–45; (same author) “The Metaphysics of the Truth Act (\**Satyakriyā*)”, in *Mélanges d’Indianisme à la Mémoire de Louis Renou*, Paris, 1968, pp. 171–77; (same author) “Duty as Truth in Ancient India”, in Rosane Rocher (ed.), *India and Indology: Selected Articles by W. Norman Brown*, Delhi, 1978, pp. 102–19; Heinrich Lüders, “Die magische Kraft der Wahrheit im alten Indien”, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, Band 98 (Neue Folge Band 23), Leipzig, 1944, pp. 1–14; Alex Wayman, “The Hindu-Buddhist Rite of Truth — an Interpretation”, in Bhadriraju Krishnamurti (ed.), *Studies in Indian Linguistics (Professor M.B. Emeneau Śaṣṭipūrti Volume)*, Annamalainagar, 1968, pp. 365–69 (rep. in George R. Elder (ed.), *Buddhist Insight*, Delhi, 1984, pp. 391–97); Peter Khoroche, *Once the Buddha was a Monkey: Ārya Śūra’s Jātakamālā*, Chicago, 1989, p. 258 (note 6). (I am grateful to Prof. Oskar von Hinüber for promptly sending me copies of several of these articles.)

<sup>4</sup> *Divy* 154.19 foll.

<sup>5</sup> D 563, *rgyud 'bum, pha*, 155a4 foll.

<sup>6</sup> Q 207, Vol. 7, *rgyud, pha*, 276a2 (tr. by Feer, *AMG* V, 462).

combines the prose of the *Aggappasāda-sutta* (AN II 34–35) with the verses of the *Ratana-sutta*.<sup>1</sup> *Satyavāk* phrases are also incorporated into *mantras*, which sometimes invoke the power of “truth-speakers” (*satyavādinām*).<sup>2</sup>

Other elements occur in connection with supernormal oremonic beings. Lists of such beings are often given first in male and then in female form:

*yakkho vā yakkhiṇī vā yakkha-potako vā °potikā vā °mahāmatto vā °pārisajjo vā °pacāro vā*;<sup>3</sup>

*gandharvo vā gandharvī vā gandharvamahallako vā °mahallikā vā °potalako vā °potalikā vā °pāriṣado vā °pāriṣadī vā °pracaro vā °pracari vā*;<sup>4</sup>

*devo vā devā vā devaputro vā °duhitā vā °mahallako vā °mahallikā vā °pārṣado vā °pārṣadī vā*;<sup>5</sup>

Similar lists occur in the *Laṅkāvatāra*-<sup>6</sup> and *Mahābala-sūtras*.<sup>7</sup>

A stock phrase (or variants thereof) is used for the action of a malignant spirit who seeks an opportunity or chance to do harm: *avatāraprekṣy*

<sup>1</sup> *Royal Chanting Book* pp. 101–03; *Mahābrahbummanta* 12.5.3.

<sup>2</sup> *Dhvajāgrakeyūra-dhāraṇī*; *Sarvatathāgatādhīṣṭhāna-vyūha*, *GM* I 67.5,6; 76.8.

<sup>3</sup> *Ātānāṭiya* Pali, *DN* III 203.7: and so for *gandhabba*, *kumbhāṇḍa*, *nāga*.

<sup>4</sup> *Ātānāṭika* Sanskrit, p. 59.7: and so for *piśāca*, p. 61, *kumbhāṇḍa*, p. 65, and so on.

<sup>5</sup> *MhMVR(T)* 10.20 foll., in what is probably the longest such list, since it gives 20 different beings.

<sup>6</sup> *Saddharmalaṅkāvatārasūtram* 106.11 foll.

<sup>7</sup> *Mahābala-sūtra* 27.1 foll.

*avatāragavesī*, and fails or will fail to do so, *avatāram na lapsyate*.<sup>1</sup> There is a recurrent curse “may so-and-so’s head split into seven pieces”: *saptadhāsyā sphalen mūrdhā*.<sup>2</sup>

Common also is the “escape clause” which, after lauding the multiple and powerful effects of a *mantra* or other *rakṣā*, notes that it might not succeed “due to the fruition of past *karma*” (*varjayitvā paurāṇam karmavipākam*, or variants thereof), found, for example, in the *Śārdūlakarṇāvadāna*,<sup>3</sup> the *Lalitavistara*,<sup>4</sup> the *Mahāsāhasrapramardanī*,<sup>5</sup> the *Mahāmantrānudharanī*,<sup>6</sup> the *Pratyutpannabuddha-sammukhāvasthita-samādhi-sūtra*,<sup>7</sup> the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā*,<sup>8</sup> and the *Ārya-avalokiteśvara-ekādaśamukha-nāma-dhāranī*.<sup>9</sup> Bhavya

<sup>1</sup> *Āṭānāṭika* 59.13 etc.; *Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra* 233.31; *Aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā* 28.13; *PraS* (I) 118.3.

<sup>2</sup> *Āṭānāṭika* 57.24; *Saddharmapuṇḍarikā* 235.10; *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 141.9; *Mahāsāhasrapramardanī* 37.7; *SHT* (III) 900, 903, 906, 984; *SHT* (VI) 1269, 1310. In Pali the phrase occurs in the *Canda-* and *Suriya-parittas* (*SN* I 50.33, 51.22), and at *DN* I 94.24, *MN* I 231.29, *Jātaka* V 92.8, *Sn* 983, 1026; see also *DN* I 143.13, III 13.28. Cf. A. Syrkin, “Notes on the Buddha’s Threats in the *Dīgha Nikāya*”, *JIABS* Vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 147–58. The curse also occurs in the *Rāmāyaṇa*: see William L. Smith, “Explaining the Inexplicable: Uses of the Curse in Rāma Literature”, in *Kalyāṇamitrārāgaṇam. Essays in Honour of Nils Simonsson*, Oslo, 1986, p. 264. The phrase (in the first person) was also used in oaths.

<sup>3</sup> *Divy* 614.14.

<sup>4</sup> *BST* 1, p. 318.5.

<sup>5</sup> Iwamoto 41.4.

<sup>6</sup> D 563, 154a4. The fifth section (*gnas skabs*) of Karmavajra’s (Las kyi Dorje’s) commentary to this *sūtra* is devoted entirely to this phrase, and contains a long citation of a *Karmavibhaṅga-sūtra*: D 2692, *rgyud, du*, 269a5–72a2.

<sup>7</sup> Sanskrit in *PraS* (II) 298.4; Tibetan in *PraS* (I) 14D, p. 118.13, 24; 14J, v. 14 (p. 124.3).

<sup>8</sup> *BST* 4, pp. 28.14, 19, 24; 38.21; 44.23. Cf. commentary in Padmanabh S. Jaini (ed.), *Sāratamā, A Pañjikā on the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra*, Patna, 1979, p. 37.10–13.

<sup>9</sup> Q 524, Vol. 11, 'a, 212b4 = *GM* I 36.4; translated by Feer, *AMG* V 434.

comments on the phrase in his *Tarkajvālā*.<sup>1</sup> The same idea — though not the exact phrase — is found in the *Milindapañha*: Nāgasena explains that *paritta* may not be take effect because of the obstruction (*āvaraṇa*) of *kamma*.<sup>2</sup> The extra-canonical Pali *Uṇhissavijaya* promises protection from death due to a variety of causes, “except for timely death” (*kālamāritam*), that is, “natural death” as determined by one’s karmic life-span.<sup>3</sup>

The escape clause is characteristic of only some (earlier ? Śrāvakayāna ?) *rakṣā* texts; others promise unqualified results. The *Aparimitāyuḥ Sūtra* states that for one who copies the *sūtra* or causes it to be copied, the obstructions (*āvaraṇa*) of the five deeds of immediate retribution (*ānantarya karma*) and sins even as great as Mt. Meru will all be wiped clean.<sup>4</sup>

Other elements are long lists of diseases<sup>5</sup> or calamities against which protection is offered.<sup>6</sup> Another phrase refers to the marking of a (protective) boundary (*sīmābandha*).<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> D 3856, *dbu ma, dza*, 185b2, *ci'i phyir sñon gyi las kyi rnam par smin pa ni ma gtogs so žes bstan ce na ?...*

<sup>2</sup> *Milindapañha* (Chatthasaṅgīti ed.) 152–55, (PTS ed.) I 150–54.

<sup>3</sup> *Mahābrahubbuddhamanta* p. 113.

<sup>4</sup> Sten Konow, The *Aparimitāyuḥ Sūtra*, in A.F. Rudolf Hoernle, *Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature*, [Oxford, 1916] Amsterdam, 1970, pp. 310–12. Cf. also *Sarvatathāgatādhīṣṭhāna-vyūha*, *GM I* 54–55

<sup>5</sup> *MhMVR(T)* 4.2, etc.; *PraS* 14D; *Sīrimaṅgalaparitta* 29, *Cakkaparitta*, § 9.

<sup>6</sup> *AN V* 342.1–14 (*Metta-sutta*); *Sīrimaṅgalaparitta*, *Parittaparikamma*, v. 9; *Megha-sūtra* 294; *Aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā* 38.7–15; *PraS* 14C, 14D; *Ekādaśamukha*, *GM I* 37.5–11; *Sarvatathāgatādhīṣṭhāna-vyūha*, *GM I* 57.8–13.

<sup>7</sup> *MhMVR(T)* 3.14, etc.; *Suvarṇaprabhāsa-sūtra* 56.14; *Hayagrīva-vidyā*, *GM I* 45.5.

## 6. *Rakṣā* and *mantra*

The sometimes confused relationship between *mantra* and *dhāraṇī* has been clarified by several scholars.<sup>1</sup> While the two terms might at times be synonymous, the latter has a much broader meaning: a faculty or facility in retaining or remembering the teaching of the Buddha(s), hence “retention” or “memory” (Lamotte’s *souvenance*). This is shown by the context in which it occurs in the Mahāyāna *sūtras* and the definitions given in the *śāstras*, which connect it with *smṛti*. The *Mahāprajñā-pāramitāśāstra* classifies *dhāraṇī* in *abhidharmic* terms under *dharmadhātu*, *dharma-yatana*, and *saṃskāra-skandha*: it is either “associated with mind” or “dissociated from mind” (*cittasamprayukta*, *cittaviprayukta*), impure or pure (*sāsrava*, *anāsrava*); it is formless or immaterial (*ārūpya*), invisible (*anidarśana*), non-resistant (*apratiṣṭha*), and knowable by mental-consciousness (*manovijñāna*).<sup>2</sup> Asaṅga gives a fourfold definition of the term; of these it is the third, *mantra-dhāraṇī*, with which I am concerned: “*mantra*-syllables for the appeasement of the calamities of beings (*mantrapadāni iti saṃśamanāya sattvānām*).<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Especially valuable are Lamotte’s translation and notes at *Mppś* I 317–21 and 328, his long note at *Mppś* IV 1854–64 and the following translation (1864–69), and Braarvig 1985. Cf. also Edward Conze, *The Large Sutra on Perfect Wisdom with the divisions of the Abhisamayālankāra*, Berkeley, 1975, p. 21; de Jong 1984 pp. 95–96, and Matsunaga 1977 pp. 169–71. For *mantra*, see Alex Wayman, “The Significance of Mantras, from the Veda down to Buddhist Tantric Practice”, *The Adyar Library Bulletin*, Vol. XXXIX, 1975, pp. 65–89 (reprinted in *Buddhist Insight*, pp. 413–30); for *dhāraṇī*, see BHSD 284b, and *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism*, Vol. IV, fasc. 4, pp. 515–20.

<sup>2</sup> *Mppś* I 317. Cf. also the definition in Corrado Pensa, *L’Abhisamayālamkāravrtti di Ārya-vimuktisena*, Rome, 1967, pp. 101–02.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Mppś* IV 1857–59 and Braarvig 1985 pp. 19–20. The latter’s suggestion that *dhāraṇī* in the compound *mantra-dhāraṇī* does not itself mean a spell, but rather a facility in retaining or remembering spells, and his translation “retaining a formula in the mind” are quite apt.

As far as I have been able to determine, *mantra* (or *mantrapada*), along with *rakṣā* and *vidyā*, is the preferred term in *rakṣā* literature, at least in the main texts studied here, none of which employ the word *dhāraṇī* (except in titles).<sup>1</sup> Scholars often use the two words interchangeably; it would be more accurate, however, to use the word actually employed in the text under consideration.<sup>2</sup> Since *mantra* is the general term of preference in the *rakṣā* literature dealt with here, I will use that term.

For present purposes, I would like to classify *mantras* into two types: protective *mantras* (the *mantra-dhāraṇī* of Asaṅga) and — for want of a better term — spiritual *mantras*. Protective or *rakṣā* *mantras* are recited for worldly or mundane ends: to ward off calamity, disease, or malignant beings, and to promote welfare. The *mantras* of the Śrāvakayāna and of the early Mahāyāna *sūtras* belong to this category. At an uncertain date, but, on the evidence of the Wu dynasty translation of the *Anantamukha-nirhāradhāraṇī*,<sup>3</sup> not later than the second century A.C., *mantras* were given a spiritual application: their recitation not only granted protection and welfare, but could lead to enlightenment (*bodhi*) itself. They became associated with symbolic hand-gestures (*mudrā*), complex rites (*vidhi*, *kalpa*), consecrations (*abhiṣeka*), *maṇḍalas*, and visualization. These are the *mantras* of some Mahāyāna *sūtras* and of the Vajrayāna. In the

<sup>1</sup> The term *dhāraṇīmantrapada* occurs in the *Megha-sūtra*, p. 298.11. *Vijjā* in the sense of spell or charm occurs in the Pali Canon, where several spells are mentioned by name: see *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism* Vol. IV, fasc. 1, "Charms", pp. 130–34. For this and other terms, see David L. Snellgrove, *Indo-Tibetan Buddhism, Indian Buddhists and their Tibetan Successors*, London, 1987, pp. 122, 141–44.

<sup>2</sup> Waldschmidt, for example, describes the *mantras* of the Tibetan *Mahāsamāja* as *Dhāraṇīs*, although the text describes them as *mantrapada* (*gsaṅ sñags kyi tshig*): E. Waldschmidt, *Bruchstücke Buddhistischer Sūtras aus dem Zentralasiatischen Sanskritkanon (Kleinere Sanskrit-texte*, Heft IV), Leipzig, 1932, p. 197.

<sup>3</sup> See below, p. 164.

present paper, I am only concerned with the first type, protective or *rakṣā mantras*.

*Mantras* are most commonly introduced by *tadyathā*, but also by *syādyathedam*.<sup>1</sup> Of the *Pañcarakṣā* texts, the *Mahāsāhasrapramardani*<sup>2</sup> and the *Mahāśītavana* use *syādyathedam*;<sup>3</sup> the *Mahāmantrānudharanī* uses *syādyathedan* once, but otherwise *tadyathā*; the other texts use *tadyathā*. The *Sarvatathāgatādhīṣṭhāna-vyūha* uses *samyathid[am]* (GM I 71.9; some Central Asian Sanskrit fragments have *saryathidam*;<sup>4</sup> the Tibetan translation of the *Hastiratnadharmamyeti* (?) has *satya thedan* (?).<sup>5</sup> Khotanese versions of the *Anantamukhanirhāra-dhāraṇī* introduce the *dhāraṇī-mantra* with *syādathidam*, *syādathedam*, and *syād yathyidam*.<sup>6</sup> (Edgerton notes the forms *sayyathidam* and *sadyathidam* for the *Mahāvastu* only;<sup>7</sup> the related *sayyathāpi* (and *samyathāpi*) *nāma* occurs in the *Lokottaravādin Bhikṣuṇī Vinaya*.<sup>8</sup> In the *Mahāmāyūrī*, the form *samyathedam* occurs.<sup>9</sup> In none of these cases are the phrases connected with *mantras*.) The Pali *Mahādibbamanta* and *Sut Catuvik* introduce their *mantras* with *seyyathidam*.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Pauly 1959 pp. 216, 225.

<sup>2</sup> Iwamoto, 4.21, 5.8, etc.

<sup>3</sup> D 562, 140b1, etc.; in Tibetan usually transliterated as *syādyathedan*. See also *Dharmasāgara-nāma-dhāraṇī*, Q 310, Vol. 7, *rgyud, ba*, 84a3 and *passim* = D 654, *rgyud, ba*, 146b7.

<sup>4</sup> So transcribed at *SHT* (III) 842, R3; 900, V1.

<sup>5</sup> Christopher Wilkinson, “The Tantric Gaṇeśa Texts Preserved in the Tibetan Canon”, in Robert L. Brown (ed.), *Ganesh: Studies of an Asian God*, State University of New York, 1991, p. 271. I have not been able to consult the original.

<sup>6</sup> Inagaki 1987 p. 314.

<sup>7</sup> *BHSD* 582b.

<sup>8</sup> Gustav Roth, *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya: Manual of Discipline for Buddhist Nuns* (TSWS Vol. XII), Patna, 1970, index, p. 399.

<sup>9</sup> *MhMVR(T)* 44.19.

<sup>10</sup> Jaini 1965 p. 67.38; Finot 1917 p. 59.

*Mantras* conclude with *svāhā* in Sanskrit or *svāhāya* (or *svāhāyya*) in Pali.<sup>1</sup> In Tibetan translations text between *tadyathā* and *svāhā* is usually transliterated rather than translated.

*Mantras* include both unintelligible and intelligible elements. The former include phrases like *hulu hulu*,<sup>2</sup> *hili hili*,<sup>3</sup> *mili mili*,<sup>4</sup> or *hili mil*<sup>5</sup> — *hile mile*<sup>6</sup> — *ili mili*<sup>7</sup> — *iti miți*,<sup>8</sup> common to a number of texts. The ubiquitous *hulu hulu* is one of the earliest attested *mantras*, since it occurs in Lokakṣema's Chinese version of the *Drumakinnārarājapariprcchā*, translated between 168 and 172 A.C.;<sup>9</sup> it is also one of the most widespread since it occurs in South-east Asian Pali texts. Though unintelligible, the phrases are not arbitrary (nor the “gibberish” nor the “mumbo jumbo” of earlier scholars), and they are explained in the commentaries. (According to Asaṅga, *mantras* are indeed “without meaning”, but in the sense that all *dharma*s are without meaning.<sup>10</sup>) The

<sup>1</sup> Jaini 1965 p. 67.39.

<sup>2</sup> *Āṭānāṭika* 74.22 (Tib.); *MhMVR*(T) 4.15, 17; 30 ult.; 31.12; *Mahābalasūtra* 24.7; *Saptavetādaka-dhāraṇī* (Feer, *AMG* V) 456; *rGyal ba'i bla ma'i gzuṇs*, Q 488, Vol. 11, *rgyud*, *ba*, 85a8. For Pali occurrences, see below. See *phuluphulu* in *BHSD* 397a for the term in a non-mantric context, which possibly gives a clue to its meaning.

<sup>3</sup> *Āṭānāṭika* 74.22 (Tib.); *MhMVR*(T) 4.18; *Suvarṇaprabhāsa* 56.16; 58.1,2,4; *SHT* (III) 90 V2; *rGyal ba'i bla ma'i gzuṇs* 85a8.

<sup>4</sup> *MhMVR*(T) 4.18, 9.10; *Suvarṇaprabhāsa*, *loc. cit.*

<sup>5</sup> *Vidyādharapitaka* (*Śikṣāsamuccaya* 142.15).

<sup>6</sup> *Āṭānāṭika* 74.7 (Tib.).

<sup>7</sup> *Āṭānāṭika* 54.22; *MhMVR*(T) 9.13; *Ārya-avalokiteśvara-mātā-nāma-dhāraṇī*, Q 534, *rgyud*, 'a, 239a2; *Ekādaśamukha*, *GM* I 39.12, 40.16.

<sup>8</sup> *Bodhisattvabhūmi*, cit. at *Mppś* IV 1858.1.

<sup>9</sup> T 624, *KBC* 129; I am grateful to Paul Harrison (letter of 22 January, 1992) for this information. The “*hulu*” *mantra* also occurs in the later Tibetan translation, Q 824, *mdo*, *pu*, 327b5 (section [15G] in Harrison's forthcoming edition). For Lokakṣema, see E. Zürcher, *The Buddhist Conquest of China*, Leiden, 1972, pp. 35–36.

<sup>10</sup> *Bodhisattvabhūmi* in *Mppś* IV 1858–59; Braarvig 1985 p. 20.

(fragmentary) Uighur version of the *Āṭānāṭika-sūtra* gives a Uighur “translation” of the *mantras*, accompanied by interlinear Sanskrit glosses.<sup>1</sup> The interpretations are in terms of Sarvāstivādin *abhidharma* categories — the sixteen aspects (*ākāra*) of the Four Truths, the four immeasurables (*apramāṇa*), etc. — but this must be the work of later scholiasts. In his *Tarkajvālā*, Bhavya offers a spirited defence of the “*dhāraṇīs, mantras, and vidyās*” of the Mahāyāna. He denies that they are meaningless, noting that “*vidyās* for the most part teach the six perfections (*pāramitā*), the truths of the noble (*ārya-satya*), and the states that conduce to enlightenment (*bodhipakṣya-dharma*)...”. “The unintelligible syllables of spells (*vidyā-pada*) are taught in the supermundane (*lokottara*) language, or in the languages of gods, *nāgas*, or *yakṣas*, etc.”<sup>2</sup> The purpose of some of the recurrent phrases may perhaps be determined from their context when a sufficient number of examples have been collected. Unfortunately, the dictionaries or indexes that I know of do not list *mantra* elements.<sup>3</sup>

Among the intelligible phrases are expressions of homage (*namas*) to Buddha(s) and other *āryas* or to the Three Gems (*triratna*), which are treated as a part of the *mantra*: in Tibetan versions, for example, they are not translated.<sup>4</sup> The *dhāraṇī* of the *Dhvajāgrakeyūra-dhāraṇī*<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Dieter Maue, “Sanskrit-uigurische Fragmente des Āṭānāṭikasūtra und des Āṭānāṭihṛdaya”, *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher, Neue Folge*, Band 5, Wiesbaden, 1985, pp. 98–122. I am grateful to Dr. Lore Sander for this reference.

<sup>2</sup> D 183a6 foll., Q 199b2 foll.

<sup>3</sup> See Edgerton’s remarks at BHSD 284b. While the *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden* (Göttingen) does not record *mantras*, a card index is kept (personal communication from Dr. Siglinde Dietz, 1991).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. the Jaina *Pamca-namokkāra-parama-maṅgala* (Roth, p. 130), which pays homage to five kinds of saints (*arhats, siddhas, ācāryas, upadhyāyas*, and “all *sādhus* in the world”) and is described as “the first *maṅgala* among all the *maṅgalas*”.

<sup>5</sup> Q 306, Vol. 7, *rgyud, ba*, 73b4 foll.

contains *satya-vāk* or *paritta*-like phrases: *buddhasatyena*, *dharmasatyena*, *saṃghasatyena*, *satyavādinām-satyena*; *buddhasatyē mātikrama*, etc., as do *mantras* in the *Suvarṇaprabhāsa* and *Megha-sūtras*, and the *Sarvatathāgatādhīṣṭhāna-vyūha*.<sup>1</sup> The (Ārya) Pratītya-samutpādahṛdaya consists simply of the ye dharmā verse in Tibetan and Sanskrit, followed by the statement “when this hṛdaya is recited once, all sins (pāpa) will be purified”, and so on.<sup>2</sup> Other intelligible phrases in the *Dhvajāgrakeyūra-dhāraṇī*, the *Mahābala-sūtra*, the *Hayagrīva-vidyā*, and other texts are commands or admonishments: *jambhaya*, *stambhaya*, *mohaya*, *hana*, *daha*, *paca*, *matha*, *pramatha*.

It is noteworthy that certain common elements appear in the *mantras* of a wide variety of texts — of the Śrāvakayāna, Mahāyāna, and Vajrayāna — and that some of these, usually found in association, invoke the names of female deities. Examples include *gauri*, *gandhāri*, *caṇḍāli*, and *mātāṅgi*, which occur in the *Āṭānāṭika-sūtra*,<sup>3</sup> the *Bhadrakarātrī-sūtra*,<sup>4</sup> the *Mahāmāyūrī*,<sup>5</sup> the *Mahādaṇḍadhāraṇī*,<sup>6</sup> the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*,<sup>7</sup> the *Mahābala-sūtra*,<sup>8</sup> the *Ārya-avalokiteśvara-mātā-nāma-dhāraṇī*,<sup>9</sup> the *Cauravidhvansana-dhāraṇī*,<sup>10</sup> the Central Asian *Nagaropama-vyākaraṇa*,<sup>11</sup> and an unidentified Central Asian Sanskrit fragment.<sup>12</sup> It is

<sup>1</sup> *Suvarṇaprabhāsa* 58.3; *Megha-sūtra* 300.13 foll., 306.3 foll.; *GMI* 56.4–7.

<sup>2</sup> Q 222, Vol. 7, *rgyud, pha*, 301b7–02a2.

<sup>3</sup> *Āṭānāṭika* 54.24 (Tibetan); 68.9 (Tibetan); 69.8 (Sanskrit).

<sup>4</sup> Q 979 (Vol. 39), *mdo, śu*, 172a4.

<sup>5</sup> *MhMVR(T)* 18.16.

<sup>6</sup> Q 308, Vol. 7, *rgyud, ba*, 77a1, 7.

<sup>7</sup> *BST* 6, ch. 21, p. 234.19.

<sup>8</sup> *Mahābala-sūtra* 24.36, 39.

<sup>9</sup> Q 534, Vol. 11, *rgyud, 'a*, 239a2.

<sup>10</sup> Q 214, Vol. 7, *rgyud, pha*, 278b4; cf. also Q 454, Vol. 9, [rñiñ] *rgyud, va*, 101a6.

<sup>11</sup> *SHT* (II) 176, Bl. 21 R5.

<sup>12</sup> *SHT* (III) 846, V7.

clear that for these and other recurrent phrases (*hulu hulu*, *ili mili*, and so on) the texts drew on a common pool of *mantra* elements.

To whom are the Buddhist *mantras* addressed? In some cases, such as that of the long *mantra* of the *Vaiśālīpraveśa-mahāsūtra*, they are spoken to malignant spirits, after invoking the power or grace of the Buddha, *pratyekabuddhas*, *āryas*, and various deities. In some cases, such as those mentioned in the preceding paragraph, they seem to invoke goddesses. In other cases, but probably not in the Śrāvakayāna *rakṣas*, they are addressed to a specific deity, such as Avalokiteśvara in the *Hayagrīva-vidyā* and *Ekādaśamukha* or the goddess Dhvajāgrakeyūra in the *Dhvajāgrakeyūra-dhāraṇī*. A complete answer can only be made after further research.

No inventory has yet been made of the *mantras* found in (Mūla) Sarvāstivādin texts.<sup>1</sup> Those that I know of are as follows:

- 1) the *mantra* of the *Vaiśālīpraveśa-sūtra*, which is essentially the same in the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivādin *Vinaya*, the independent Tibetan *Vaiśālīpraveśa-mahāsūtra*, and the Nepalese Sanskrit *Mahāmantrānusāriṇī*. It is probably the longest Mūlasarvāstivādin *mantra*;
- 2) the *Mahāmāyūrī-mantra* of the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivādin *Vinaya*, as preserved both in Sanskrit and in Tibetan translation. In an expanded form, it also occurs in the *Mahāmāyūrī-vidyārājñī*;<sup>2</sup>
- 3) the 9 *mantras* of the *Ātānāṭīya-mahāsūtra* as preserved in Tibetan and Chinese translation. The Central Asian Sanskrit recension, the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Mppś* IV 1860 for a brief notice.

<sup>2</sup> N. Dutt, *Gilgit Manuscripts*, Vol. III part 1, [Srinagar, 1947] Delhi, 1984, p. 287.1-7; Tibetan translation in 'dul ba, ne, 46b7; *MhMVR*(T) 8.15-9.1.

Āṭānāṭika-sūtra, probably contained the same *mantras* at the same places, and at least 3 additional *mantras*;

- 4) the 19 *mantras* given in a prose “appendix” to the *Mahāsamājā-mahāsūtra* as preserved in Tibetan translation only;
- 5) the ṣadakṣarī *vidyā* of the *Śārdūlakarnāvadāna*;<sup>1</sup>
- 6) the *mantras* of the Sanskrit *Upasena-sūtra* from Central Asia,<sup>2</sup> its Tibetan version as incorporated into the Mūlasarvāstivādin *Vinayavibhaṅga*,<sup>3</sup> and its Chinese version in the *Samyuktāgama*;<sup>4</sup>
- 7) (probably) the *mantras* of the *Bhadrakarātrī-sūtra* as preserved in Tibetan.<sup>5</sup>

This incomplete list is sufficient to show that *mantras* were fully accepted by the Mūlasarvāstivādins.

I do not believe that any true *mantras* are found in the canon of the Theravādins, which seems to have been closed before the influence of the *mantra* movement could be felt. *Mantras* are found in later extra-canonical *paritta* texts: the *Yot brahkaṇḍatratraipiṭaka* (*hulū* 3; *vitti* 3; *mitti* 2; *citti* 2; *vatti* 2), the *Mahādibbamanta* (*hulu* 3),<sup>6</sup> the *Dhāraṇaparitta* (*illi milli tilli atilli*),<sup>7</sup> the *Sut Catuvik* (*hulu* 2),<sup>8</sup> and the *Giniparitta* (*citti*, *vitti*, etc.),<sup>9</sup> ending in *svāhāy(y)a*. That such *mantras* belonged not only to popular literature but were also accepted by at least

<sup>1</sup> *Divy* 613.26; Q 313 (Vol. 7), (*Ārya-)*Ṣadakṣarī-*vidyā* (‘*phags pa yi ge drug pa’i rig snags*) is based on / extracted from the *Śārdūlakarnāvadāna*.

<sup>2</sup> *Upasena-sūtra* (1); *Upasena-sūtra* (2) pp. 239–44.

<sup>3</sup> Q 1032, Vol. 42, ‘*dul ba, che*, 113a7.

<sup>4</sup> *Tsa a-han-ching*, *Sūtra* 252: see *Upasena-sūtra* (2) pp. 239–44; *Mppś* IV 1860.

<sup>5</sup> Q 599 (*gzuṇis ’dus*); Q 979 (*mdo*). Cf. *SHT* (III) 816 for Sanskrit fragments of the *sūtra*.

<sup>6</sup> Jaini 1965 p. 67.38.

<sup>7</sup> *Mahābrahuddhamanta* 20.8.

<sup>8</sup> Finot 1917 p. 59.

<sup>9</sup> L. de Silva, p. 10.

some scholars is shown by the fact that the anonymous author of the (Ayutthaya-period) *Buddhapādamaṅgala* introduces the *mantra* “*hulū hulū hulū svāhāya*” into his commentary, and explains it in turn.<sup>1</sup> The term *dhāraṇī* is rare in Pali,<sup>2</sup> where it only occurs in extra-canonical texts such as the *Gini Paritta*.<sup>3</sup> The term *dhāraṇā* occurs in the sense of *dhāraṇī* in the title and text of the *Dhāraṇā-paritta*.<sup>4</sup> The author of the *Mahāprajñāpāramitā-śāstra*, who is well versed in the tradition of at least the Sarvāstivādins, notes that *dhāraṇīs* are not found in the system of the Śrāvakas, but allows that “lesser *dhāraṇīs*” can be obtained by universal monarchs, *rāṣṭras*, and others.<sup>5</sup>

I have not seen any *mantras* in available Lokottaravādin literature. I have shown above, however, that the Mahāsāṃghikas are reported to have had a *Mantra-piṭaka* and the Siddhārthas, Pūrvaśailas, and Aparaśailas a *Vidyādhara-piṭaka*, none of which are extant. The Dharmaguptakas are said to have had a similar *piṭaka*, of which the Sanskrit title is uncertain, and their *Vinaya* describes the joint recitation of the *Arapacana* syllabary by monks and laymen.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Supaphan Na Bangchang, *Vivadhanākāra Varrṇagatī sai Brahma Suttantapiṭaka ti Daeng nai Pradeśa Thai*, Bangkok, 2533 [1990], pp. 296–97.

<sup>2</sup> It is not listed in the *Pali Text Society Dictionary* or the *Pāli Tipiṭakam Concordance*. Other forms derived from the same root are used in the sense of retention or memory of the teaching of the Buddha: see *Mppś* IV 1854 and Braarvig 1985 p. 21.

<sup>3</sup> L. de Silva, p. 10.

<sup>4</sup> *Mahābrahmbuddhamanta* 20.8, *imam dhāraṇam amitam asamam*. At *Vinaya* IV 305.27 the phrase *dhāraṇam pariyāpuṇāti* is immediately followed by *guttatthāya parittam pariyāpuṇāti*, but the meaning is obscure. I am grateful to Prof. Oskar von Hinüber for this reference.

<sup>5</sup> *Mppś* I 328, IV 1876–77.

<sup>6</sup> Sylvain Lévi, “Sur la Récitation Primitive des Textes Bouddhiques”, JA, May–June 1915, pp. 439–40; Étienne Lamotte, *Histoire du Bouddhisme Indien*, Louvain-la-Neuve, 1976, p. 549; *Mppś* IV 1866–68; *Hōbōgirin* Vol. I 34 (“Arahashana”), Vol. VI 565 foll. (“Da”); E. Conze, *The Large Sutra* . . . , p. 21, note 118.

## 7. The *rakṣā* literature and cults

The *rakṣā* literature was strongly influenced by popular cults, both Buddhist and pre- or non-Buddhist. The former include the cults of the Seven Buddhas<sup>1</sup> and their trees,<sup>2</sup> of past Buddhas,<sup>3</sup> of *pratyekabuddhas*,<sup>4</sup> and of śrāvakas.<sup>5</sup> The latter include the cults of the Four Great Kings;<sup>6</sup> of *yakṣas*<sup>7</sup> (including the 28 *yakṣasenāpati*, frequently mentioned), *nāgas*, and the whole inventory of divine or daemonic beings in the *Mahāmāyūrī*, and of female goddesses as shown in both verse lists<sup>8</sup> and in the *mantras* that invoke the goddess under various epithets.

It is noteworthy that one of the longest and most influential of the Śrāvakayāna *rakṣās*, the *Āṭānāṭika-sūtra*, is introduced and spoken by the Great King Vaiśravaṇa: the next day the Buddha repeats it to the monks, and recommends that they master it. This seems to be a device to “convert” a non-Buddhist text by giving it the sanction of the Buddha. In the *Jātakamālā* (XXXIII, *Mahiṣa*), a *yakṣa* gives a *rakṣā* to the bodhisattva in his birth as a buffalo.

<sup>1</sup> *MhMVR*(T) pp. 13, 43–45, 56–57; *Āṭānāṭiya* Pali, *DN* III 195.27–96.10.

<sup>2</sup> *MhMVR*(T) p. 13.

<sup>3</sup> *Mahāśītavāna*, D 562, 138b7 foll.; *Āṭīthavīsati-paritta*; *Āṭānāṭiya-paritta*, *Royal Chanting Book* pp. 20, 38–39.

<sup>4</sup> *Isigili-sutta*, *MN* 116 (note the concluding admonition *vandatha*, following the list of *paccekabuddhas*), classed as a paritta in some *Āṭīthakathā* lists (Table 1.4) and the *Catubhāṇavāra*.

<sup>5</sup> *Mahāmantrānudharaṇi*, D 563, 155a7 foll.; *Jinapañjara-gāthā*.

<sup>6</sup> *Āṭānāṭika*, *Mahāsamāja*, *MhMVR*(T) pp. 15 foll., 46, *Mahāśītavāna*, *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, chapter 21; *Suvarṇaprabhāsa*, chapter 7.

<sup>7</sup> *Āṭānāṭika*, *Mahāsamāja*, *MhMVR*, *Mahāśītavāna*.

<sup>8</sup> *Āṭānāṭika*, *Mahāsamāja*, *Mahāmāyūrī*, *Āśīrvāda-gāthā*.

### 8. *Rakṣā* and the *Mahāyāna*

The *rakṣā* movement, with all its characteristic phraseology, *mantras*, and association with cults, influenced the composition of many *Mahāyāna sūtras*. A number of examples have already been cited. Chapter 21 of the *Lotus Sūtra*, the *Dhāraṇīparivarta*, contains *rakṣā mantras* spoken by Vaiśravaṇa and Virūḍhaka, by *rākṣasīs*, and by *bodhisattvas*. Chapter 9 of the *Laṅkāvatāra-sūtra*, which bears the same title as the preceding, contains *rakṣā mantras* delivered by the Buddhas of the three times.<sup>1</sup> The *Suvarṇaprabhāsottama* (which is classed under *Tantra* in some *Kanjurs*) contains several long chapters on protection. Chapter 3 of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā* extols protections and other benefits derived from the *Prajñāpāramitā*, which it describes as a *vidyā*, though no *mantra* is given. Chapter 14 of the *Pratyutpanna-buddha-saṃmukhāvasthita-samādhi-sūtra* and Chapter 27 (the last) of the *Laṭavistara* deal with the protection granted to those who preserve the *sūtras*. Shorter *rakṣā* passages occur in the *Bhadralokapīka-sūtra*<sup>2</sup> and the *Śūramgamasamādhi-sūtra*,<sup>3</sup> and no doubt in many other *sūtras* of the *Mahāyāna*. Śāntideva's *Śikṣāsamuccaya* devotes several pages to *rakṣā mantras*.<sup>4</sup>

At an uncertain date the great and voluminous *Mahāyāna sūtras* were themselves condensed into *mantras* or *dhāraṇīs*, often of only a few lines: various *Prajñāpāramitā sūtras*, from the recension in 100,000

<sup>1</sup> This chapter is not found in the Sung dynasty translation, done in 443 A.C., but is found in the Wei version of about 70 years later: see Jikido Takasaki, "Analysis of the *Laṅkāvatāra*. In Search of its Original Form", in *Indianisme et Bouddhisme: Mélanges offerts à Mgr Étienne Lamotte*, Louvain-la-Neuve, 1980, p. 340.

<sup>2</sup> *The Fortunate Aeon*, Vol. I, Dharma Publishing, Berkeley, 1986, pp. 56–57.

<sup>3</sup> É. Lamotte, *La Concentration de la Marche Héroïque (Śūramgamasamādhisūtra)*, Brussels, 1975, p. 271.

<sup>4</sup> *Śikṣāsamuccaya* 138.14–42.15.

ślokas down, the *Samādhirāja*, and the *Lalitavistara*.<sup>1</sup> The *Avatāmsaka*, six volumes in Tibetan translation, was reduced to a *dhāraṇī* less than one line in length: “by retaining this, the Ārya *Avatāmsaka* will be retained”.<sup>2</sup> Hsüan-tsang used the *Prajñāpāramitā-hṛdaya* as a *rakṣā* to ward off “all sorts of demon shapes and strange goblins” in the deserts of Central Asia; “whenever he was in danger, it was to this [text] alone that he trusted for his safety and deliverance”.<sup>3</sup>

## 9. Śrāvakayāna *rakṣā* literature and the Tantra

Śrāvakayāna *rakṣā* texts classed under *Tantra* (*rGyud*) in the *Kanjur* include the following:

1. *Mahāsamāja-mahāsūtra*
2. *Āṭānāṭiya-mahāsūtra*
3. *Vaiśālīpraveśa-mahāsūtra*
4. *Ṣaḍakṣarī-vidyā*
5. *Bhadrakarātrī-sūtra*
6. *Mahāmāyūrī-vidyārājñī*
7. *Mahāsāhasrapramardanī-sūtra*
8. *Mahāśitavana-sūtra*
9. *Mahāmantrānudharanī-sūtra*.
10. *Mahādaṇḍadhāraṇī*.

Numbers 1 to 4, and most probably 5, belong to the Mūlasarvāstivādin tradition. The affiliation of the *Pañcarakṣā* texts (numbers 6 to 10), all of which are highly composite, is not clear. All ten are classed under

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Q 271 to 284. For the *Prajñāpāramitā*, see Edward Conze, *The Prajñāpāramitā Literature*, 2nd ed., Tokyo, 1978, pp. 86–87.

<sup>2</sup> Q 279, Vol. 7, *rgyud, pha*, 310b8–11a2.

<sup>3</sup> Samuel Beal, *The Life of Hiuen-tsiang by the Shaman Hwui Li*, [London, 1911] New Delhi, 1973, pp. 21–22.

*Kriyā-tantra (Bya ba'i rgyud)*, the lowest of the four classes of Tantra. In addition, many of the short *dhāraṇī* texts — often connected with Indra, Brahma, *yakṣas*, and the Four Great Kings — included in *Kriyā-tantra* show no Mahāyāna or Vajrayāna influence, and may be described as Śrāvakayāna *rakṣas*. Among those translated by Feer, these include the *Sapta-vetādaka-dhāraṇī*, the *Sarvarogapraśamani-dhāraṇī*, the *Jvarapraśamani-dhāraṇī*, and the *Aksirogapraśamani-sūtra*.<sup>1</sup>

## 10. Archaeological evidence for the *rakṣā* literature

Apart from the famous list of *dhammapaliyāya* of the Aśokan inscription (which does not include any *rakṣas*), the only aspects of early Buddhism for which we have concrete evidence are the life of Śākyamuni Buddha along with the related *jātakas*, the cult of the Seven Buddhas and their trees, and the cults of the Four Great Kings, Indra, *yakṣas*, *nāgas*, and goddesses. These are represented in relief on those encyclopaedias in stone, the gateways and railings of Bhārhut, Bodh Gayā, Sāñchī, and other scattered sites. The cults of *yakṣas* and *nāgas* are also represented by the massive free-standing stone figures found in the regions of Patna, Mathurā, Bhubaneswar, and elsewhere; the cult of female deities is well-represented at numerous sites.

Since Bhārhut dates from about 100 B.C., and since the stone reliefs presuppose well-established (presumably oral) traditions as well as figurative prototypes, whether in wood or painted on cloth or other materials, we may say that the elements listed above go back to at least the second century B.C. It is noteworthy that some of them — for example the descent from *Trayaśtrīmīśa*, depicted at both Bhārhut and Sāñchī — are paracanonical for at least the Theravādin tradition.

---

<sup>1</sup> *AMG* V 453–66.

These early monuments can only be understood in the light of such texts as one of the greatest *rakṣās*, the *Ātānāṭika-sūtra*. What did monks, nuns, and lay-followers do when they visited the early *stūpas*? I do not think they wandered about aimlessly, silently staring, like the modern tourist. Rather, they would have performed deliberate circumambulations, and, when making offerings, would have recited verses of homage: to the Buddhas along with their trees, to the Four Great Kings, and other deities — if not the exact verses preserved in extant texts, then certainly their prototypes. The *stūpas* themselves imply the existence of a lore and liturgy which belongs in part to the *rakṣā* literature.

The railings with their gateways functioned as an outer protective *maṇḍala* around the *stūpa*. At Bhārhut the Four Great Kings (the three surviving pillar reliefs identified by inscriptions) stood guard at the four cardinal points; similarly, the verses on the Kings and their retinues in texts such as the *Ātānāṭika-sūtra* (in all versions), and the verses on the *nakṣatras*, *devakumārīs*, and Kings in the *Āśīrvādagāthā* follow the traditional clockwise *pradakṣinā*, so that their recitation would invoke a “magic circle” of protection. I have noted above that the open palms that sometimes adorn the early reliefs might signify the *abhaya-mudrā*. The concept of *svasti* or *maṅgala* is strongly represented in the various auspicious signs that adorn almost every relief: the *svastika*, the *śrīvatsa*, the conch, the sunshade, and so on. The cult of the Seven Buddhas was well established by the time of the Bhārhut and Sāñchī *stūpas*, where they are represented aniconically by their trees. Verses of homage to these, and perhaps other past Buddhas — the prototype of the verses of the *Mahāmāyūrī*, the *Mahāśītavāna*, and the Pali *Ātānāṭiya* — must have been current by that time.

Literary evidence, such as a Chinese version of the *Śārdūlakarṇāvādāna* (for the Śrāvakayāna) and the *Drumakinnārarāja-pariprcchā* (for the

Mahāyāna) shows that protective *mantras* were in vogue by the 2nd century A.C.<sup>1</sup> In the \**Jātaka-sūtra* (*Sheng ching*) translated by Dharmarakṣa in 285 A.C., “magic spells for averting the influence of thieves, evil spirits, and demons are explained by the Buddha”.<sup>2</sup> Indeed, since the Wu dynasty Chinese translation of the *Anantamukhanirhāradhāraṇī* proves that *mantras* had already gained a spiritual application by the same period,<sup>3</sup> it seems safe to conclude that *rakṣā mantras* were employed by the beginning of the Christian era, if not earlier. The available archaeological and literary evidence suggests that the heyday of the *rakṣā* movement was from the second century B.C. to the third century A.C. During this period the cults described above flourished in India (including here regions of present-day Pakistan and Afghanistan, as well as parts of Central Asia). By the third century the influence of the popular cults diminished (although they still persist in rural India), to be progressively eclipsed by the more sophisticated cults of *bodhisattvas*

<sup>1</sup> *Divy*, Appendix A, p. 657. The reference is to the \**Mātaṅgī-sūtra*, translated into Chinese in 230 A.C.: see T 1300, *KBC* 766, and M. Winternitz, *History of Indian Literature*, Vol. II, [1933] New York, 1972, pp. 286–87. In the early third and the fourth centuries, a number of *mantra* texts were rendered into Chinese by various translators: see Chou Yi-liang, “Tantrism in China”, *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, Vol. 8, 1944–45, pp. 242–43, Matsunaga 1977 pp. 169–70, and *Upasena-sūtra* (2) p. 238. For the interesting figure of the “*dhāraṇī* master” Śrīmitra, who translated three “collections of spells”, moved in court circles in the early decade of the 4th century at Chien’ang, and was the first known person to have had a *caitya* built for him at the order of the Emperor, see Zürcher, *op. cit.*, 103–04.

<sup>2</sup> Matsunaga 1977 p. 169; the reference is to T 154, *KBC* 799.

<sup>3</sup> Inagaki 1987: the Wu version was translated between 223 and 253 A.C. (p. 24); the *mantras* of that version are shown in the comparative table of the *mantra*, pp. 310–52. For this *sūtra*, see also *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism*, Vol. I, fasc. 4, pp. 548–50. For an early date for the origins of “Tantra”, see Matsunaga 1977, de Jong 1984, and John C. Huntington, “Note on a Chinese Text Demonstrating the Earliness of Tantra”, *JIABS* Vol. 10, no. 2, 1987, pp. 88–98. For a detailed bibliography of Japanese and other studies on *mantra* and Tantra, early and late, see Hajime Nakamura, *Indian Buddhism: A Survey with Bibliographical Notes*, Hirakata, 1980, Chapter VI, Esoteric Buddhism.

for the Buddhists, and of deities such as Viṣṇu and Śiva for the Hindus. Both in India and abroad, certain cults, such as those of Indra, Brahma, and the Four Great Kings, gained a literary and iconographical longevity, which has allowed them to survive up to the present day in the Buddhist world.

## 11. Rite and ritual

I stated at the outset that a hallmark of the *rakṣā* literature in general is that the texts were actually employed in the day-to-day life of both monks and lay followers. For the *paritta*, there is no need to give any evidence: wherever Theravādin Buddhism is established, the recitation of *paritta* is a regular practice. A detailed description of the *paritta* rites of Sri Lanka has been provided by Lily de Silva in the study frequently referred to.

Several of the early *rakṣā* texts contain internal information about their purpose and use. In the *Dhvajāgra-sūtra* the Buddha recommends the recollection of the Buddha, or the Dharma and the Samgha, to monks beset by fear when in the jungle or in lonely places. In the *Āṭanāṭika-sūtra*, Vaiśravaṇa delivers the protection to be learned by “the disciples of the Lord — monks, nuns, laymen, and laywomen — who dwell in lonely places” for their own security and protection against malignant non-humans; the next day the Buddha repeats the protection to the monks, and recommends that they learn it. In each case it is not the whole *sūtra* in its current form that was to be recited, but only certain parts; at a later date, however, the whole text would have undoubtedly been recited, as is the case with the corresponding Pali *parittas*.

I have not been able to uncover much information about how the Mūlasarvāstivādin *Mahāsūtras* were used. The *Vinayavibhaṅga* passage mentions their recitation as a protection against *vetāda*, without further

detail (although it does mention a number of alternate *rakṣās*). The commentary thereupon describes the function of the *Mahāsūtras*, but says nothing about how, on what occasions, or by whom, they were to be used. The only information about their ritual use is found in the “appendix” to the Tibetan version of the *Mahāsamāja*, which is not found in the Pali, Sanskrit, or Chinese versions. There the Four Great Kings recommend the recitation of the *sūtra*, along with their own *mantras*, over a thread (*sūtra*) or over (a vessel containing) water, and then tying knots in the string or sprinkling the water. The most detailed rites are given by the Buddha himself, who delivers further *mantras*. Here there are references to fasting; to specific days of the lunar cycle; to the recitation of the *mantra* 100 or 108 times while holding and knotting a thread; and to the marking of a boundary (*sīmā*).

The *Samantapāśādikā* (5th century) refers to the use of thread and water in *paritta* ritual (*parittodaka, parittasutta*),<sup>1</sup> as does the *Vinaya-vinicchaya*, which de Silva dates to the 4th or 5th century.<sup>2</sup> The commentary on the *Ratana-sutta* (5th century) states that Ānanda sprinkled water from the Buddha’s alms-bowl as he went through Vesālī reciting the *sutta*.<sup>3</sup> In the *Suppāraka-jātaka* the *bodhisatta* performs an act of truth (*saccakiriya*) holding a bowl full of water (*pūṇṇapāti*).<sup>4</sup> A detailed description of a *paritta* rite is given in the commentary to the *Ātānāṭiya-sutta*.<sup>5</sup> Interesting information about ritual practices connected with the *upoṣadha* ceremony in India and the “Islands of the Southern Sea” in the 7th century is supplied by I-ching. There is much

<sup>1</sup> *Chāṭṭhasaṅgīti* ed. I 577 (ref. from Dhammadāna 1992 p. 193).

<sup>2</sup> L. de Silva, p. 16.

<sup>3</sup> L. de Silva, p. 17.

<sup>4</sup> *Jātaka* 463, Vol. IV, p. 142.

<sup>5</sup> L. de Silva, pp. 17–18.

in common with the *paritta* rituals described by de Silva (including the overfeeding of the monks and the offering of betel-nut).<sup>1</sup>

Brief rites are given at the end of the Sanskrit *Mahāmāyūrī* and the Tibetan *Mahāśītavana*. A number of rites are described in the *Mahāsāhasrapramardanī*, where they are spoken by the Four Great Kings, Brahma, and Vaiśravana.<sup>2</sup> The "Chapter on Sarasvati" in the *Suvarṇaprabhāsa* describes several rites.<sup>3</sup> Other texts in the *Tantra* section of the *Kanjur* refer to recitation of *mantras* over thread and the tying of knots.<sup>4</sup> The spiritually charged thread and water<sup>5</sup> are common not only to the *paritta* but also to Mahāyāna and Vajrayāna rituals, and no doubt belong to early pan-Indian magical or protective rites. Matsunaga has given a chronological account of texts containing ritual elements translated into Chinese, starting with the first half of the third century.<sup>6</sup> There is clearly a great deal to be learned here from Chinese sources.

The texts also recommend that *rakṣas* be written down, on paper or cloth, and tied as amulets to parts of the body or to standards (the latter in battle) or deposited in *stūpas*. This aspect awaits further exploration.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> J. Takakusu, *op. cit.*, chapter IX. For a note on "the habit of chewing betel" in the *Avadāna* literature see J.S. Speyer, *Avadānaśataka*, Vol. II, [1906–09] repr. Osnabrück, 1970, pp. xxxv–xxxvi.

<sup>2</sup> Iwamoto 30–31, 36–37, 38, respectively.

<sup>3</sup> BST 8, chapter 8.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Feer, *AMG* V 455–57, 464, 466. See *SHT* (III) 842, R5–6; *Divy* 614.13 (*Śārdūlakarnāvadāna*), *sūtrena baddhena*.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *Śikṣasamuccaya* 140.18, *abhimantritenā jalena*.

<sup>6</sup> Matsunaga 1977 pp. 171–74.

<sup>7</sup> See *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism* Vol. I, fasc. 3, pp. 493–502 ("Amulet"). For Khmer and Siamese practices, see Catherine Bechetti, *Le Mystère dans les Lettres, Étude sur les yantra bouddhiques du Cambodge et de la Thaïlande*, Bangkok, 1991.

## Conclusions

*Rakṣās*, in one form or another, are an integral part of mainstream Buddhism. The present paper came into being as a result of my work on a critical edition of the Mūlasarvāstivādin *Mahāsūtras* as preserved in Tibetan translation. In the course of my research, I discovered that the *Mahāsūtras* were themselves employed as *rakṣās*, and uncovered the numerous cross-references that led me to conclude that the *rakṣā* phenomenon was extremely influential in early Buddhism. The *paritta* of the Theravādins, the *Mahāsūtras*, *rakṣās*, and *mantras* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins, and the *svastigāthā*, *rakṣās*, and *mantras* of these and other schools of both the Śrāvaka- and Mahā-yānas were not independent or isolated developments. The chanting of certain auspicious verses or texts for protection against disease and malignant spirits and for the promotion of welfare was no doubt a “pan-nikāya” practice, common to all branches of the *saṃgha* from an early date; indeed, on the internal evidence of texts like the *Dhvajāgra* and *Āṭanāṭika Sūtras*, the practice should predate the early schisms. The two *sūtras* just referred to are both *parittas* and *Mahāsūtras*; the *Ratana-sutta* is a *paritta*, a *svastigāthā*, and the key element of a *Pañcarakṣā* text. In some schools or communities the practice of *rakṣā* developed further with the use of *mantras* or *vidyās*, by the beginning of the Common Era at the very latest.

The *Āṭanāṭika-sūtra* seems to have been the prototype of much of the phraseology, and some of the verses, of the Buddhist *rakṣā* literature (when one considers that the *sūtra* would have been memorised by members of the *saṃgha* from an early date, this is not surprising); but this very phraseology and some of the verses were clearly adopted and adapted from contemporary popular magical and cult traditions. The prototype for at least some of the *svastigāthās* may well have been the *Ratana-sutta*. The Buddhist *mantras* derived some of their efficacy from

intelligible elements such as expressions of homage (*namas*) invoking the power of the Buddha(s), other *āryas* and deities, and the Triple Gem (*triratna*), and from the “profession of truth” (*satyavāk*). These were combined with unintelligible phrases; the origin and precise significance of these remain obscure, but it is clear that the texts drew on a common stock of elements, perhaps again from popular magical lore. In all cases the oral tradition, seamless in comparison with the written text, would have played a significant role in the permeation of Buddhist literature with such *rakṣā* and *mantra* phrases.

By definition the *rakṣā* literature is devoted to worldly ends: protection against physical or material threats, and promotion of physical and material well-being. Many of the texts, however, presuppose a certain level of spiritual development for the recitation to be efficacious, in particular the practice of loving-kindness: *maitrī* or *mettā*. And for all Buddhists, of whatever *nikāya* or *yāna*, the ultimate *rakṣā* was always *nirvāna*, described in the early texts as a refuge (*tāna*, *lena*, and so on).

The *rakṣā* literature is a vast topic: in its broader sense, it involves the study of the entire corpus of Buddhist literature in all of its languages. In this paper I have only been able to give an outline, a rough sketch of the *rakṣā* elephant as glimpsed here and there in the profuse jungle of Buddhist literature. Many questions remain to be considered. Who or what offers protection, and through what mechanism? How can past Buddhas offer protection? To what degree does the protection depend on the supplicant, to what degree on the reciter, to what degree on the beings invoked? I hope other scholars will contribute to this somewhat neglected field of research.

## Bibliographical Note

References to Pali texts are to the editions of the Pali Text Society (PTS), with standard abbreviations, unless otherwise noted. References to Tibetan texts are by catalogue numbers of the Peking (Q) (in most cases) and Derge (D) (for the *Pañcarakṣā*) editions; Peking volume numbers refer to the volumes of the reprint edition and not to the original *potis*. Chinese texts are cited by Taishō (T) and Korean Buddhist Canon (*KBC*) catalogue numbers; information about dates of translation is derived from the latter.

## Abbreviations

AMG V	Léon Feer, <i>Fragments extraits du Kandjour, Annales du Musée Guimet</i> , Vol. V, Paris, 1883
BHSD	Franklin Edgerton, <i>Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary</i> , Vol. II, <i>Dictionary</i> , [New Haven, 1953] Delhi, 1972
BST	Buddhist Sanskrit Text series, Darbhanga
D	Derge (sDe dge) edition of the Tibetan Canon
Divy	E.B. Cowell and R.A. Neil, <i>The Divyāvadāna</i> , rep. Delhi, 1987
GMI	Nalinaksha Dutt (ed.), <i>Gilgit Manuscripts</i> , Vol. I, [Srinagar, 1939] Delhi, 1984.
JA	<i>Journal Asiatique</i>
JIABS	<i>Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies</i>
JRAS	<i>Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society</i>
KBC	L.R. Lancaster, <i>The Korean Buddhist Canon: A Descriptive Catalogue</i> , Berkeley, 1979 (reference by catalogue number)
Q	Peking (Qianlong) edition of the Tibetan Canon
PraS (I)	Paul Harrison (ed.), <i>The Tibetan Text of the Pratyutpanna-Buddha-Saṃmukhāvasthita-Samādhī-Sūtra</i> , Tokyo, 1978

PraS (II)	Paul Harrison (tr.), <i>The Samādhi of Direct Encounter with the Buddhas of the Present</i> , Tokyo, 1990
MhMVR(T)	Shūyo Takubo (ed.), <i>Ārya-Mahā-Māyūrī Vidyā-Rājñī</i> , Tokyo, 1972
Mppś	Étienne Lamotte, <i>Le Traité de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse de Nāgārjuna</i> , Louvain, 1949–80
SHT	Ernst Waldschmidt <i>et al.</i> (eds.), <i>Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfan-Funden</i> , Wiesbaden, 1965–
T	Taishō edition of the Chinese <i>Tripiṭaka</i> (reference by catalogue number)

### Sanskrit and Pali titles

*Anantamukhanirhāra-dhāraṇī*, see Inagaki

*Āśṭasāḥasrikā-prajñāpāramitā*, ed. P.L. Vaidya, BST 4, Darbhanga, 1960

*Āṭānāṭīka-sūtra*, ed. Helmut Hoffmann, *Bruchstücke des Āṭānāṭīkasūtra aus dem Zentralasiatischen Sanskritkanon der Buddhisten (Kleinere Sanskrit-Texte, Heft V)*, [Leipzig, 1939] Stuttgart, 1987

*Upasena-sūtra* (1), E. Waldschmidt, *Das Upasenasūtra*, Göttingen, 1957

*Upasena-sūtra* (2), E. Waldschmidt, “The Upasena-sūtra, A Charm against Snake-Bites from the Samyuktāgama”, repr. in Heinz Bechert and Petra Kieffer-Pülz (ed.), *Ernst Waldschmidt: Ausgewählte kleine Schriften*, Stuttgart, 1989, pp. 180–99 (234–52)

*Divyāvadāna*, see *Divy*

*Pratyutpannabuddhasaṃmukhāvasthitasamādhi-sūtra*, see *PraS*

*Mahādibbamanta*, see Jaini

*Mahāpratisarā*, ed. Yutaka Iwamoto, *Pañcaraksā* II (*Beiträge zur Indologie*, Heft 3), Kyoto, 1938

*Mahābala-sūtra*, (Tib.) ed. F.A. Bischoff, *Ārya Mahābala-nāma-mahāyānasūtra*, Paris, 1956

*Mahābrahuddhamanta*, Matcharoen Thiraphatsakun (ed.), *Nangsu Suat Manta*  
*Mahābrahuddhamanta*, Bangkok, 2532 [1989] (reference by section  
 numbers)

*Mahāmāyūrī-vidyārājñī*, see *MhMVR(T)*

*Mahāvastu I*, *Mahāvastu Avadāna*, Vol. I, ed. S. Bagchi, BST 14, Darbhanga,  
 1970

*Mahāvastu III*, *Mahāvastu Avadāna*, Vol. III, ed. R. Basak, Calcutta, 1968

*Mahāśītavatī*, ed. Yutaka Iwamoto, *Kleinere Dhāraṇī Texte (Beiträge zur  
 Indologie*, Heft 2) Kyoto, 1937, pp. 1–6

*Mahāsāhasrapramardanī*, ed. Yutaka Iwamoto, *Pañcarakṣā I (Beiträge zur  
 Indologie*, Heft I), Kyoto, 1937

*Megha-sūtra*, Cecil Bendall, "The Megha-sūtra", *JRAS*, n. s. Vol. XII, pt. II,  
 April, 1880, pp. 286–311

*Lalita-vistara*, ed. P.L. Vaidya, BST 1, Darbhanga, 1958

*Śikṣāsamuccaya*, ed. Cecil Bendall, St. Petersburg, 1902

*Saṅghabhedavastu*, ed. R. Gnoli, *The Gilgit Manuscript of the  
 Saṅghabhedavastu*, part I, Rome, 1977; part II, Rome, 1978

*Saddharmalaṅkāvatārasūtram*, ed. P.L. Vaidya, BST 3, Darbhanga, 1963

*Sīrimaṅgalaparitta*, Rangoon, 1986

*Suvarṇaprabhāsa-sūtra*, ed. S. Bagchi, BST 8, Darbhanga, 1967

### Other works

Bareau, A., 1959, "Constellations et divinités protectrices des marchands dans le  
 bouddhisme ancien", *JA* CCXLVII pp. 303–9

Braarvig, Jens, 1985, "Dhāraṇī and Pratibhāna: Memory and Eloquence of the  
 Bodhisattvas", *JLABS* Vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 17–29

Dhammadāna, 2535 [1992], *Aggamahāpañcītānusarana*, *Brahdhammānanda-  
 mahātherah*, Wat Tamao, Lampang

*Encyclopaedia of Buddhism*, 1961–, Colombo

Finot, Louis, 1917, "Recherches sur la littérature laotienne", in *Bulletin d'École  
 Française d'Extrême Orient* XVII, no. 5

Inagaki, H., 1987, *The Anantamukhanirhāra-Dhāraṇī Sūtra and Jñānagarbha's Commentary: A Study and the Tibetan Text*, Kyoto

Jaini, P.S., 1965, "Mahādibbamanta: A Paritta Manuscript from Cambodia", in the *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies (BSOAS)* 28, pp. 61–80

de Jong, J.W., 1984, "A New History of Tantric Literature in India", in *Studies of Mysticism in Honor of the 1150th Anniversary of Kobo-Daishi's Nirvānam (Acta Indologica VI)*, Narita, pp. 91–113

Lalou, M., 1953, "Les textes bouddhiques au temps du roi Khri-sroṇ-lde bcan", *JA* 241, pp. 313–353

Lévi, Sylvain, 1915, "Le catalogue géographique des yakṣa dans la Mahāmāyūrī", *JA* janvier–février 1915, pp. 19–138

Matsunaga, Yupei, 1977, "A History of Tantric Buddhism in India with Reference to Chinese Translations", in Leslie S. Kawamura and Keith Scott ed., *Buddhist Thought and Asian Civilization: Essays in Honour of Herbert V. Guenther on His Sixtieth Birthday*, Emeryville, pp. 167–81

Pauly, B., 1959, "Fragments Sanskrits de Haute Asie (Mission Pelliot)", *JA* CCXLVII, pp. 203–49

*Royal Chanting Book*, 2526 [1983], *Suat Manta Chabap Luang*, 13th ed., Bangkok,

Ruegg, David Seyfort, 1981, *The Literature of the Madhyamaka School of Philosophy in India* (Jan Gonda, ed., *A History of Indian Literature*, Vol. VII, fasc. 1) Wiesbaden

de Silva, Lily, 1981, "Paritta: A Historical and Religious Study of the Buddhist Ceremony for Peace and Prosperity in Sri Lanka", in *Spolia Zeylanica*, Vol. 36, part I, Colombo

Skorupski, T., 1985, *A Catalogue of the Stog Palace Kanjur*, Tokyo

Table 1: Early paritta lists<sup>1</sup>1. *Milinda-pañha*

PTS 150.27	ChS 152.20	Mm 206.14
1. Ratana-s	1. Ratana-s	1. Khandha-p
2. Khandha-p	2. Metta-s	2. Suvatthi-p
3. Mora-p	3. Khandha-p	3. Mora-p
4. Dhajagga-p	4. Mora-p	4. Dhajagga-p
5. Ātānātiya-p	5. Dhajagga-p	5. Ātānātiya-p
6. Āngulimālā-p	6. Ātānātiya-p	— —
— —	7. Āngulimālā-p	— —

1.2.1. *Sumaṅgala-vilāsinī* (Dīghanikāya-aṭṭhakathā on *Sampasādanīya-s*)

ChS [III] 81.10; Mm III 109.5; PTS III 897.28

1. Ātānātiya-p<sup>2</sup>
2. Mora-p
3. Dhajagga-p
4. Ratana-p
- ādi

<sup>1</sup> In the table, *-s* = *-sutta*, *-p* = *-paritta*. PTS refers to the romanized editions of the Pali Text Society, London; HOS to the romanized ed. of the *Visuddhimagga* in the Harvard Oriental Series; ChS to the Burmese script *Chatthañsaṅgīti* editions, Rangoon, Mm to the Thai script editions published by Mahāmakaṭa Press, Bangkok (consulted as accessible).

<sup>2</sup> ChS and PTS omit *-paritta* here only.

**1.2.2. Papañcasūdanī (Majjhimanikāya-aṭṭhakathā on Bahudhātuka-s)**

ChS [IV] 79.19; PTS IV 114.6	Mm III 522.11
1. Āṭānāṭiya-	1. Āṭānāṭiya-p
2. Mora-p	2. Mora-p
3. Dhajagga-p	3. Dhajagga-p
4. Ratana-p	4. Ratana-p
— ādi	5. Metta-p
	— ādi

**1.2.3. Manorathapūraṇī (Aṅguttaranikāya-aṭṭhakathā, Ekanipāta, on aṭṭhāna)<sup>3</sup>**

ChS [I] 358; PTS II 9.23
1. Āṭānāṭiya-p
2. Mora-p
3. Dhajagga-p
4. Ratana-p
— ādi

**1.2.4. Sammohavinodanī (Vibhaṅga-aṭṭhakathā)**

ChS 411.27; Nalanda ed. 434.14; PTS 430.33
1. Āṭānāṭiya-
2. Mora-p
3. Dhajagga-p <sup>4</sup>
4. Ratana-p
— ādi

<sup>3</sup> The same list occurs at Mp IV (PTS) 114.

<sup>4</sup> Nalanda and PTS omit *-paritta*.

### 1.3.1. Visuddhimagga

ChS II 44.15; HOS 349.21; PTS Mm II 258.20

414.24;

1. Ratana-s	1. Ratana-p
2. Khandha-p	2. Khandha-p
3. Dhajagga-p	3. Dhajagga-p
4. Ātānāṭiya-p	4. Ātānāṭiya-p
5. Mora-p	5. Mora-p

### 1.3.2. Samantapāsādikā I, Verañjakañḍavaññanā<sup>5</sup>

ChS 129.10; PTS I 159.31

Mm I 178.7

1. Ratana-p	1. Ratana-p
2. Khandha-p	2. Metta-p
3. Dhajagga-p	3. Khandha-p
4. Ātānāṭiya-p	4. Dhajagga-p
5. Mora-p	5. Ātānāṭiya-p
— —	6. Mora-p

### 1.4. Mahāniddesa-aṭṭhakathā (Tuvaṭaka-s)

ChS 336.26; Mm II 92.6; PTS II 383.5

#### Manorathapūraṇī (Tikanipāta)

ChS II 210.27; PTS II 342.1

1. Ātānāṭiya-p
2. Isigili-p
3. Dhajagga-p
4. Bojjhaṅga-p
5. Khandha-p
6. Mora-p
7. Metta-p
8. Ratana-p

<sup>5</sup> The list of the Chinese version agrees with ChS, except that the Ātānāṭiya is called *sutta* rather than *paritta* (but it would be interesting to know the Chinese term rendered here as *paritta*): P. V. Bapat and A. Hirakawa, *Shan-Chien-P'i - P'o-Sha, A Chinese Version by Saṅghabhadra of Samantapāsādikā*, Poona, 1970, p. 116. The same list occurs at Patis-a (PTS) 367.35.

**1.5. *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī* (Dīghanikāya-aṭṭhakathā on  
Āṭānāṭiya-sutta)**

ChS [III] 150.23; Mm III 201.20; PTS III 969.15

1. Āṭānāṭiya-s
2. Metta-s
3. Dhajagga-s
4. Ratana-s

Table 2: Paritta, Sirimāngalaparitta, Dvādasaparitta, and Sattaparitta

A. Paritta	B. Sirimāngalaparitta	C. Dvādasaparitta	D. Sattaparitta
1. Mangala-sutta	1. Maingala-sutta	1. Maingala-sutta	1. Maingala-sutta
2. Ratana-sutta	2. Ratana-sutta	2. Ratana-sutta	2. Ratana-sutta
3. Metta-sutta	3. Karanīyametta-sutta	3. Karanīyametta-sutta	3. Karanīyametta-sutta
4. Khandha-sutta	4. Khandha-paritta	4. Khandha-paritta	4. Khandha-paritta
5. Mora-sutta	5. Mora-paritta	5. Mora-paritta	5. Mora-paritta
6. Vatī-sutta	6. Vatī-paritta	—	—
7. Dhajagga-sutta	7. Dhajagga-paritta	6. Dhajagga-paritta	6. Dhajagga-paritta
8. Ātānātiya-sutta	8. Ātānātiya-paritta	7. Ātānātiya-paritta	7. Ātānātiya-paritta
9. Āngulimāla-sutta	9. Āngulimāla-paritta	8. Āngulimāla-paritta	8. Āngulimāla-paritta
10. Bojjhangā-sutta	10. Bojjhangā-paritta	9. Bojjhangā-paritta	9. Bojjhangā-paritta
11. Pubbanha-sutta*	11. Pubbanha-sutta*	11. Abhaya-paritta*	11. Abhaya-paritta*
—	—	12. Jaya-paritta	12. Jaya-paritta
	13. Sammāparibhājanīya-sutta	13. Sammāparibhājanīya-sutta	—
	14. Purābheda-sutta	14. Purābheda-sutta	—
	15. Kalahavivāda-sutta	15. Kalahavivāda-sutta	—
	16. Cūlabyūha-sutta	16. Cūlabyūha-sutta	—
	17. Mahābūha-sutta	17. Mahābūha-sutta	—
	18. Tuvatāka-sutta	18. Tuvatāka-sutta	—

\* = same text under different titles

19. Mahā-āññātiya-sutta
20. Abhinha-sutta
21. Dhammacakkappavattana-sutta
22. Anattalakkhaṇa-sutta
23. Dhammapadapāli
24. Mahāsatipatthāna-sutta
25. Paññānapāli paccayuddesa
26. Paññānapāli paccayaniddesa
27. Brahmajāla-sutta
28. Chādisāpāla-sutta
29. Cakkaparitta-sutta
30. Parimittajāla-sutta
31. Uppātasanti

Table 3: The seven *Pañcarakṣā* in relation to other *rakṣā* and *paritta* texts

			Parallels
<b>A.</b>	<b>Mahāyāna</b>		
(1)	<i>Mahāpratisarā-vidyārājī</i> = <i>Rig pa'i rgyal mo so sor 'brai ba chen mo</i>		<i>None traced</i>
Sanskrit:	Iwamoto, Chandra		
Tibetan:	D 561, Q 179		
Chinese:	tr. Jinamitra, Dānaśīla, Ye šes sde, ca. 800 A.C. T 1154, KBC 454, tr. Ratnacinta, 693 A.C. T 1153, KBC 1349, tr. Amoghavajra, 8th cent.		
<b>B.</b>	<b>Śrāvakayāna<sup>a</sup></b>		
(2)	<i>Mahāmāyūrī-vidyārājī</i> = <i>Rig snags kyi rgyal mo rma bya chen mo</i>		* <i>Māyūrī-jātaka</i> / <i>Mora-jātaka</i> <i>Ātānātiya-sūtra</i> / <i>Ātānātiya-sutta</i> <i>Upasena-sūtra</i> / <i>Khanda-paritta</i>
Sanskrit:	Oldenburg, Takubo, Chandra		
Tibetan:	D 559, Q 178		
	tr. Śilendrabodhi, Jñānasiddhi, Śākyaprabha, Ye šes sde, ca. 800 A.C.		
Chinese:	6 translations between 317 and 907 (see Aalto 1954 p. 7)		

(3)	<i>Mahāśāhasrapramardanī-nāma-mahāvāṇasūtra</i> = <i>sToṇi chen po rab tu 'joms pa žes bya ba'i mdo</i>	* <i>Ratna-sūtra / Ratana-sutta</i>
Sanskrit:	Iwamoto, Chandra	
Tibetan:	D 558, Q 177 tr. Śilendrabodhi, Jñānasiddhi, Śākyaprabha, Ye śes sde, ca. 800 A.C.; rev. g'Zon nu dpal	
Chinese:	T 999, KBC 1096, tr. Dānapāla, 983 A.C.	
(4A)	<i>Mahāśīlavana</i> = <i>bSił ba'i tshal chen mo</i>	Cp. <i>Āśānātika-sūtra / Āśānātiya-sūtra</i>
Sanskrit:	not extant	
Tibetan:	D 562, Q 180 tr. Śilendrabodhi, Jñānasiddhi, Śākyaprabha, Ye śes sde, ca. 800 A.C.; rev. g'Zon nu dpal	
Chinese:	none	<i>None traced</i>
(4B)	<i>Mahāśītavatī-vidyārājī</i>	
Sanskrit:	Iwamoto, Chandra	
Tibetan:	<i>Mahādāṇḍadharanī</i> , <i>Be con chen po žes bya ba'i gzun</i> D 606, Q 308, tr. Jinamitra, Dānaśila, Ye śes sde, ca. 800 A.C.	
Chinese:	T 1392, KBC 1104, tr. Fa-t'ien, 984 A.C.	

					<i>Candra-sūtra / Canda-paritta</i>
					<i>Uḍānavarga, Prātimokṣa-sūtra</i>
					<i>satyavāk, agraprajñapti</i>
(5A)	<i>Mahāmantrānudharanī</i>				
	= <i>gSañ śīags chen mo rjes su 'dzin pa'i mdo</i>				
Sanskrit:	not extant				
Tibetan:	D 563, Q 181				
	tr. Śilendrabodhi, Jñānasiddhi, Śākyaprabha,				
	Ye śes sde, ca. 800 A.C.				
Chinese:	none				
					<i>Vaisālīpravesa-mahāsūtra / Ratana-</i>
(5B)	<i>Mahāmantrānusārīṇī</i>				
	[ <i>gSañ śīags kyi rjes su 'brañ ba chen mo</i> ] <sup>1</sup>				
Sanskrit:	Chandra				
Tibetan:	none				
Chinese:	T 1048, KBC 1102, tr. Fa-t'ien, 984 A.C.				

<sup>1</sup> Tibetan title cited in D 558, *rgnud 'bum, pha*, 86a5.

## CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS VOLUME

Professor R.H.B. Exell,  
Division of Energy Technology,  
Asian Institute of Technology,  
P.O. Box 2754 , Bangkok 10501,  
Thailand.

Peter Skilling,  
49/20 Soi Ruam Rudee 3,  
Ploenchit,  
Bangkok 10330,  
Thailand.

Jacqueline Filliozat,  
École française d'Extrême-Orient,  
22, Avenue du Président Wilson,  
F-75116 Paris,  
France.

Professor O. von Hinüber,  
Orientalisches Seminar  
(Indologie),  
Humboldstr. 5,  
D-7800 Freiburg,  
Germany.

Laurence C.R. Mills,  
Wat Buddha Dhamma,  
Wisemans Ferry,  
N.S.W.,  
Australia.

K.R. Norman,  
6, Huttles Green,  
Shepreth,  
Royston,  
Herts SG8 6PR.

Professor Gregory Schopen,  
SSB 4.126,  
Center for Asian Studies,  
University of Texas at Austin,  
Austin, TX 78712,  
U.S.A.



## 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, at the above address.

To reduce printing costs, contributors are urged, whenever possible, to present their papers in a camera-ready copy form.