

Pali Text Society

JOURNAL

OF THE

PALI TEXT SOCIETY

VOLUME XIII

EDITED BY

K.R. NORMAN

Published by
THE PALI TEXT SOCIETY
OXFORD

1989

© *Pali Text Society* 1989

ISBN 0 86013 290 0

First published in 1989
Distributed by Lavis Marketing
73 Lime Walk
Oxford OX3 7AD

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

CONTENTS

Burmese Manuscripts in the Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.	
By William Pruitt	1
Studies in the Pāli Grammarians I	
By Ole Holten Pind	33
The Stūpa cult and the Extant Pāli Vinaya	
By Gregory Schopen	83
Patna Dharmapada I	
By Margaret Cone	101
Pāli Lexicographical Studies VI	
By K.R. Norman	219
Contributors to this Volume	229
Notice from the Council of the Pali Text Society	231
Editorial Notice	233

**BURMESE MANUSCRIPTS IN THE LIBRARY OF
CONGRESS, WASHINGTON, D.C.**

In *The Annual Report of the Librarian of Congress* for 1905,¹ it is reported that the Library of Congress, Washington, D.C., had acquired a set of Burmese manuscripts containing the basic Buddhist canon. The manuscripts, which are spoken of as “the Rockhill gifts”, were bought by Rev. W.H.S. Hascall, who was a missionary in Lower Burma. The exact number of manuscripts is not given in the report, but three volumes of the Sutta-piṭaka are mentioned, five volumes of the Vinaya-piṭaka, and seven volumes of the Abhidhamma-piṭaka. Each series is said to contain Pāli texts, nissayas (word-by-word translations into Burmese), and Aṭṭhakathās (commentaries).

A detailed list of titles is given. The titles are transcribed following Burmese pronunciation, and it is fairly easy for someone familiar with Burmese to recognize which works are indicated. “Thote the let kon”, for example, is “Sutta-[Piṭaka] Sīlakkhan[dha-vagga]”.

The report goes on to mention manuscripts which include Jātaka stories and “certain examples of other books of doctrine or of ritual.” This last category includes some *īkās* and manuscripts in Burmese. The Burmese titles are less easy to guess than the Pāli ones. The books of ritual include three Kammavācā manuscripts, “one on wood and one on a composition metal which contains silver. The third is a very beautiful and old specimen of the service on strips of ivory with the ancient round Pali text in heavy lacquer”.²

Additional manuscripts were acquired more recently by the Library of Congress and catalogued by Daw Khin Thet Htar in 1985.

¹Pages 42-46, 182.

²U Thaw Kaung, Chief Librarian of the Universities' Library, Rangoon, inspected this “ivory” Kammavācā and said that it is not of ivory.

The following list gives

- (1) the call number,
- (2) the title by which the text is best known in the West (Burmese texts with a Pāli title are given in Roman script; for those in Burmese I have given the titles in transliteration and in Burmese script using a font developed by U Sein Aye),
- (3) titles used in the manuscript [on wood covers, on covering leaves, in the margins, in colophons—all variants are not included, as slight variations in spelling abound],
- (4) the language used—Pāli, Burmese, or word-by-word translation (nissaya)—when this is not obvious from the title,¹
- (5) the numbers of the leaves (using the Burmese numbering system)² or the total number of leaves (for some of the texts catalogued by Daw Khin Thet Htar),
- (6) the author, if known, for lesser known works and Burmese nissaya (the authors of standard commentaries, etc., are not given),
- (7) the date,³
- (8) references to the same or similar texts found in catalogues of Burmese manuscripts or reference books when I thought it would be useful. If an item is missing, the information is not known to me.

The older group of manuscripts are listed in H. Poleman, *A Census of Indic Manuscripts in the United States and Canada* (New Haven, Conn.: American Oriental Society, 1938).⁴ I have

¹The titles used in Burma often specify “pāli-tō” for Pāli (-tō being an honorific suffix) or “nissaya” (spelled many different ways, e.g.: nisaya, nisyā, nissya, nissara, etc.).

²For an explanation of this system, see Bur MSS I, p. xviii. The numbering is usually based on combining vowel signs with consonants. There is one case in the manuscripts here of a leaf numbered with the Burmese character for “1” plus the vowel “ā” (Burmese-Pāli 100, last f.).

³on converting Burmese dates into those of the Gregorian calendar, see Bur MSS I, pp. xixf. The scribes frequently made mistakes in the dates. I have made a guess at the correct date and given the scribe’s date in parenthesis (e.g., Date: 1839 [3938 !]).

⁴Several Kammavācā texts (Poleman, p. 339) are listed as “on exhibition”.

therefore retained the old numbers (Burmese-Pāli 1-80). I include the information on dimensions (given to the nearest tenth of an inch) and the number of lines on one side of a leaf given by Poleman. Manuscripts catalogued more recently were given numbers beginning "Burmese manuscript 1", etc. I have renumbered these, adding them to the old list (beginning Burmese-Pāli 81).¹

I wish to thank Louis A. Jacob, Head of the Southern Asia Section, and other members of the staff of the Library of Congress for their aid and encouragement in preparing this list. I am particularly grateful to Heinz Braun, who carefully proofread this list and made many valuable corrections and suggestions.

Abbreviations

Bode M.H. Bode, *The Pali Literature of Burma* (Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, 1909, repr. 1966).

Bur MSS I Heinz Bechert, Daw Khin Khin Su, Daw Tin Tin Myint, compilers, *Burmese Manuscripts, Part 1* (Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH, 1979).

Bur MSS II Heinz Braun, Daw Tin Tin Myint, compilers, *Burmese Manuscripts, Part 2* (Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH, 1985).

Cop C.E. Godakumbura, assisted by U Tin Lwin, *Catalogue of Cambodian and Burmese Pāli Manuscripts* (Copenhagen: The Royal Library, 1983).

Forch E. Forchhammer, *Report on the Literary Work Performed on Behalf of Government During the Year 1879-80* (Rangoon 1880, 1882).

¹One MS mentioned by Poleman (no. 6327: *Kammavācā*, ff. 1-4, 12-13, 16; tamarind-seed script; lacquered cloth leaves with decorated wood covers; 19.6x3.75; 6 lines) is identified as being: John Davis Batchelder Deposit 7 (Rare Book Department). Its present whereabouts are not known and so it is not included in this list.

Poleman H. Poleman, *A Census of Indic Manuscripts in the United States and Canada* (New Haven, Conn.: American Oriental Society, 1938).

Report *Annual Report of the Librarian of Congress*, 1905.

Burmese-Pāli 1. MS not found. Poleman (no. 5542) assigns this number to the description corresponding to Burmese-Pāli 47.

Burmese-Pāli 1a, 1c.

(1a) **Dhammasaṅgaṇi nissaya**, ff. ka-ñō. Date: 1763. Cf. Poleman, no. 5516 (19.9×2.3; 8 lines).

(1c) **Dhammasaṅgaṇi**, ff. ka-ṭhu. Cf. Poleman, no. 6437 (19.75×2.1; 8 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 1b. Sumaṅgalavilāsini (Sīlakkhandavagga-aṭṭhakathā) **nissaya** (Part 1) (Sut sīlakkhaṃ aṭṭhakathā nissaya), ff. ka-gyō. Date: 1791. Bur MSS I 63. Cf. Poleman, no. 5508 (9.4×2.3; 8 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 1d. Dīgha-nikāya-ṭikā. (Līnatthavaṇṇanā, part 1: Sīlakkhanda-vagga-ṭikā) ff. ka-ṇū. Date: 1871. Cf. Poleman, no. 6372 (20.25×2.6; 8 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 2a. Vibhaṅgappakarāṇa, ff. ka-dhe. Date: 1774. Cf. Poleman, no. 6426 (19.5×2.5; 10 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 2b. Visuddhimagga nissaya (part 4), ff. ka-mā:. Bur MSS II 341. Cf. Poleman, no. 5517 (20×2.5; 9 lines; “Vibaṅga” [sic]).

Burmese-Pāli 2c. Sumaṅgalavilāsini (Mahāvagga-aṭṭhakathā) **nissaya** (Sut Mahāvā aṭṭhakathā nissaya), ff. raṃ-nyu. Date: 1875 [2875 !]. Cf. Poleman, no. 6304 (20.5×2.3; 8 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 2d. Vinaya-piṭaka, Mahāvagga-ṭikā. (Sīvali-vatthuka) (Burmese) ff. ka-maṃ. Cf. Poleman, no 5503 (18.75×2.2; 9 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 3. Eighteen Jātaka stories with nissaya.

(A) Cittasambhūta-jātaka (no. 498), ff. ga-yu.

(B) Sivi-jātaka (no. 499), ff. yī-ṇā.

(C) Rohaṇa-jātaka (no. 501) (Rohanta-), ff. ca-chè.

(D) Haṃsa-jātaka (no. 502) (Cūḷahaṃsa-), ff. cho-jo.

(E) Sattigumba-jātaka (no. 503), ff. jō-jhaṃ.

(F) Bhallāttiya-jātaka (no. 504), ff. ghā-ṭa.

(G) Somanassa-jātaka (no. 505), ff. tā-ṭhū.

(H) Campeyya-jātaka (no. 506), ff. ṭhe-ghè.

(I) Mahāpalobhana-jātaka (no. 507), ff. gho-ṇū.

(J) Hatthipāla-jātaka (no. 509), ff. ṇe-dā.

(K) Ayoghara-jātaka (no. 510), ff. di-dhè.

(L) Kiṃchanda-jātaka (no. 511), ff. dho-pī.

(M) Kumbha-jātaka (no. 512), ff. pu-pho.

(N) Jayaddisa-jātaka (no. 513), ff. phō-bhe.

(O) Chaddanta-jātaka (no. 514), ff. phè-ru.

(P) Sambhava-jātaka (no. 515), ff. rū-lo.

(Q) Mahākapi-jātaka (no. 516), ff. lō-va.

(R) Paṇḍaranāgarāja-jātaka (no. 518) (Paṇḍara-), ff. sa-hō.

Cf. Poleman, no. 6536 (19.75×2.1; 9 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 3a. Sumaṅgalavilāsini (Pāṭikavagga, Pātheyya-vagga-aṭṭhakathā) **nissaya** (Sut pātheyya pāḷi-tō nissaya), ff. ka-jha. Cf. Poleman, no. 5547 (20.25×2.4; 8 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 3a¹. =3a. Sumaṅgalavilāsini (Pāṭikavagga, Pātheyya-vagga-aṭṭhakathā), ff. ka-ṭa. Date: 1786. Cf. Poleman, no. 5548 (19.75×2.25; 9 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 3b. Vinaya-piṭaka, Mahāvagga, nissaya (Mahāvā nissaya), ff. ka-ta. Date: 1783. Cf. Poleman, no. 5502 (19.5×2.4; 10-11 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 3c. Sumaṅgalavilāsini (Pāṭikavagga Pātheyyavagga-aṭṭhakathā), ff. ka-ṭhō. Date: 1773. See *Burmese-Pāli 3a*. Cf. Poleman, no. 6516 (19.5×1.9; 8 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 3d. =3c. Sumaṅgalavilāsini (Pāṭikavagga, Pātheyyavagga), ff. ka-ṭā. Not in Poleman.

Burmese-Pāli 4.

(A) **Anumodanā**, ff. ka-ḍū. Bur MSS II 407.

(B) **Mrañ mū tarā: cā** (မြ ၼ မှ တရား ဝဘ) (Burmese), ff. taṃ-bhō. Date: 1889. There is a gap in the numbering between the two texts.

Cf. Poleman, no. 5528 (18.75×2.4; 10 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 4a. Saṅghe bhokavaggo (Saṅghabhedakkhandhaka of Cūlavagga ?) (title on wood cover: Parivā pāṭh [Parivāra]), ff. ka-dha. Date: 1863. Cf. Poleman, no. 6445 (19.1×2.25; 10 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 4b. (A) Puggalapaññatti, ff. ka-ghu.

(B) **Puggalapaññatti nissaya**, ff. ka-jè.

Cf. Poleman, no. 5523 (19.4×2.4; 9 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 4c. Terasakaṇḍa-ṭikā [Sārattha-dīpanī, or Pāli-muttaka-vinaya-vinicchaya-saṅgaha, or Vimativinodanī ? See Bode, p. 102, no. 10 and Forch, p. v.], ff. ka-ri. Date: 1850. Cf. Poleman, no. 5521 (19.6×2.25; 9 lines). Forchhammer lists a manuscript entitled *Terasaka ṭika* and says it is on the first two rules of the Pārājikas of the Pātimokkha and that it is by Sāriputta of Sri Lanka. This reference was brought to my attention by Heinz Bechert. Cf. *Burmese-Pāli 26*.

Burmese-Pāli 5. Dhammadesanāgambhīraṭṭha nissaya, ff. ka-dhè. Owner: Rhañ Muninda cā (“Ven. Muninda’s book;” see *Burmese-Pāli 8*). Date: 1839 (3938!). Cf. Poleman, no. 5534 (19.25×2.4; 10 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 5a. Kathāvatthu nissaya, ff. bhū-ṭhyu. Date: 1810. Cf. Poleman, no. 5519 (20.25×2.4; 9 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 5b. Suttavibhaṅga (Pārājikakaṇḍa) *nissaya*, ff. ka-jyā:. In Burma, the title “Pārājika” refers to the four Pārājika rules and the other rules through the thirty Nissaggiya rules (Vin III) [See Cop Pa (Burm.) 18.] Date: 1762. Cf. Poleman, no. 5507 (18.75×2.1; 8 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 5c. Vibhaṅga-mūlaṭṭika, ff. ka-ḍaṃ. Date: 1856. Cf. Poleman, no. 6431 (20×2.5; 12 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 6a. Yamaka (Pāli) (Yamuik), ff. ka-he. Date 1776. Cf. Poleman, no. 6462 (19.5×2.25; 9 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 6b. Yamaka nissaya (Yamuik nissaya), ff. ka-sī. Author (?): Charā-krī: Ū: Sā Twan. Date 1880. Cf. Poleman, no. 5524 (19.6×2.3; 9 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 6c.

(A) *Sammohavinodanī nissaya* (Samo aṭṭhakathā), ff. ka-tho.

(B) *Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha nissaya* (Saṅgruih adhippāy), ff. tō-bho.

Cf. Poleman, no. 5518 (7.1×2.25; 10 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 7. Aṅguttara-Nikāya (Pāli) (Aṭṭhaṅguttara [sic] pāli-tō [Asaṅgu- (sic)]), ff. dhā:-chyā. Cf. Poleman, no. 6394 (19.5×2.4; 9 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 7b. Paṭṭhāna nissaya (Paṭṭhān rasi cu; Paṭṭhan arakok), ff. ka-no. Author: Toṅ-bhī-lū: charā-tō Rhañ Ananta-dhaja. Date: 1800. See Bur MSS I no. 10 (a different author). Cf. Poleman, no. 5509 (19.75×2.4; 9 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 7c. Pañcappakaraṇaṭṭhakathā (Pañca-pagruṇ ṭṭhakathā).

(A) **Puggalapaññatti-aṭṭhakathā**, ff. ka-ṇu.

(B, C) **Kathāvatthu-aṭṭhakathā** and **Yamaka-aṭṭhakathā** (Yamuik aṭṭhakathā) (Pāli), ff. ṇū-ṭho.

(D) **Dānaphaluppatti nissaya**, ff. ta [sic]-jū. Date: 1880 (13062 !). Cf. Bur MSS II no. 221.

Cf. Poleman, no. 6430 (dimensions not given).

Burmese-Pāli 8.

(A) **Bhikkhu-pāṭimokkha nissaya**, ff. ka-cā.

(B) **Bhikkhunī-pāṭimokkha nissaya**, ff. ca [sic]-ṇū.

(C) **Khuddasikkhā nissaya**, ñe-dhā:.

Author: Nwā:-prañ: charā-tō Rhañ Munindasāra (based on the teachings of his superior, Paṭhama Bā:karā charā-tō Rhañ Dhammābhinanda). Cf. Bur MSS II no. 247. Date: 1853. Cf. Poleman, no. 5536 (19.9×2.5; 9 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 9. Vinaya-Piṭaka, Cūlavagga (title on f. ka: Pācit pāli-tō [sic]), ff. ka-thaṃ. Date: 1836. Cf. Poleman, no. 6307 (20.9×2.4; 9 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 10. Petavatthu nissaya, ff. ka-tā: Date: 1878 (Sakka-rāj 124; I assume it should be Sakka-rāj 1240). Cf. Poleman, no. 5510 (20.1×2.6; 10 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 11. Parivāra nissaya, ff. ka-lā: . Date: 1847. Cf. Poleman, no. 5506 (19×2.4; 9 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 12. Three Jātaka stories nissaya.

(A) Mūgapakkha-jātaka (no. 538) (Temi-), ff. ka-gā:.

(B) Nimi-jātaka (no. 541) (Nemi-), ff. thi [sic]-ṇa.

(C) Bhūridatta-jātaka (no. 543), ff. nī-pā:.

Date: 1878. Cf. Poleman, no. 5511 (19.25×2.6; 10 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 13. Nām nissaya Dakkhiṇavaṃ (title on paper on wood cover: Naṃ ṭikā), ff. ci-bhu. Date: 1847 (3847 !). This seems to be part 3 of the text, coming after part 2 of Burmese-Pāli 54. Cf. Poleman, no. 5535 (20×2.25; 10 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 14.

(A) **Nissaya** of texts of the Abhidhamma-Piṭaka (includes **Dhammasaṅgaṇi nissaya** and **Kathāvattu nissaya**, (perhaps others), ff. khi-gè.

(B) **Chagatidīpanī nissaya**, ff. pa-lō (from another manuscript). Date: 1838. Cf. A.A. Hazlewood, "A Translation of Pañcagatidīpanī," JPTS XI (1987), pp. 133-159. Cf. Poleman, no. 5529 (19.1×2.1; 9 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 15. Leaves from several different manuscripts.(A) **Siri-jātaka nissaya** (no. 284), ff. nī-nē. Date: 1865.(B) **Desakkamadīpanī nissaya**, ff. ye-sō. Date: 1844.(C) **Ther(agāth)ā (?) pāli-tō**, ff. ka-gaṃ. Date: 1861.

(D) **Padakosallañāṇa nissaya** (Pud cac), ff. ka-nō. Cf. Bur MSS I no. 35, no. 135. Date: 1854.

(E) **Chadīpapālasutta nissaya**, ff. che-chā:. Owner: Rhañ Muninda.

(F) **Bhikkhu-pāṭimokkha** (Bhikkhu-paṭimok) (Pāli), ff. khī-ga. Owner: Rhañ Muninda. Date: 1861.

(G) **Khuddasikkhā** ff. gè-ñi. Owner: Rhañ Muninda. Date: 1861.

(H) **Aggikkhandhopama-sutta**, ff. ka-kū. Owner: Rhañ Muninda. Date: 1861.

(E) **Yamaka nissaya** and **Paṭṭhāna nissaya** (Yamuik paṭhan nañ:).

(F) **Paramatthavisesa-mañjū nissaya**.

(G) **Mahāsamaya-sutta nissaya** (see Burmese-Pāli 15 [L]).

(H) **Sutta(vaṇṇassa)-vandanā nissaya** (Sutvandanā).

(I) No title found (Burmese).

ff. ka-the. Date: 1863. Cf. Poleman, no. 5531 (19.75×2.25; 9 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 19. Vinaya-piṭaka, Cūlavagga nissaya, ff. ka-bhā. Date: 1830. On ticket: Part II. Cf. Poleman, no. 5505 (19×2.1; 8 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 20a. Dhātukathā, ff. ñè-ḍe. Date 1881. Cf. Poleman, no. 6457 (18.75×2.25; 10 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 20b. Dhātukathā nissaya, ff. ka-jī. Date: 1771 [sic]. Cf. Poleman, no. 6457 (19.6×2.4; 9 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 21. MS not found. This number is mentioned in Poleman [no. 6295: “Samantapāsādikā”, ... ff. 1-132, 1-95... with wood covers and pegs. 19.4/.75×2.25/.3. Dated: Th. 1131 (=1769).] I have not been able to determine if this is one of the MSS of that title in this list.

Burmese-Pāli 22. Suttavibhaṅga nissaya (Pārājika nissaya), ff. ka-ñyā:. Author: Khè-toñ-krī: Rhañ Mahā-Upali (see Bur MSS I, nos. 56, 60). See Burmese-Pāli 5b. Cf. Poleman, no. 5499 (19.4×2.4; 9 lines). Cf. Poleman, no. 5499 (19.4×2.4; 9 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 23. Tathāgata nissaya (Ubhato-Vibhaṅga Khan-dhaka-Parivā[ra] pāli aṭṭhakathā [samantapāsādikā]), ff. se-ryī. Date: 1866 (2866 !). Cf. Poleman, no. 5532 (19.5×2.25; 9 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 24.(A) **Desanasaṅgaha (Burmese)**, ff. kā-ñī.(B) **Sut nak sandhi nissaya**, (သုတ်နက်သန္တိနိဿယ) ff. go [sic]-cō. Date: 1862.

Cf. Poleman, no. 5533 (18.9×2.2; 9 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 25. Sammohavinodanī nissaya (Samohavinodattḥī) (Pāli), ff. ka-lo. Cf. Bur MSS I, no. 77. Cf. Poleman, no. 6434 (19.25×2.1; 9 lines).*Burmese-Pāli 26. Terasakaṃ ṭikā* (Sāratthadīpanī, or Pālimuttaka-vinaya-vinicchaya-saṅgaha, or Vimativinodanī ?, see Burmese-Pāli 4c), ff. ka-phā. According to Hascall, a subcommentary on the Puggalapaññatti. (See Report, p. 44: "Ah-be-dah-ma, IV.C. Tay ra tha kan te ka.") Cf. Poleman, no. 5537 (19.4×2.1; 9 lines). At least one f. (f. kī) is missing. A separate paper with this MS has written on it "Burmese-Pāli no. 70" (no MS with no. 70 has been located).*Burmese-Pāli 27. (A) Buddhavaṃsa nissaya* (Buddhavaṅ pāṭh nissaya), ff. ka-tō. Date: 1866.(B) **Buddhavaṃsa**, ff. ka-gaṃ. Date: 1865.

Cf. Poleman, no. 6424 (19.75×2.4; 9 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 28.(A) **Puggalapaññatti**, ff. ka-gā.(B) **Kathāvatthu**, ff. ka-gaṃ. Date: 1865.(C) **Teyyasamvāsakavinicchaya** (Burmese), ff. dū-bè.
Cf. Poleman, no. 6312 (19.5×1.8; 7 lines).*Burmese-Pāli 29. Vinaya-piṭaka, Cūlavagga nissaya*, ff. ka-ñī. Date: 1785. (On ticket: Part 1.) Cf. Poleman, no. 5504 (19.25×2.3; 10 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 30. **Dīgha-nikāya, Mahāvagga** (Sut Mahāvā), ff. ka-ḍu. Cf. Poleman, no. 6302 (19.75×2.2; 8 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 31. **Kathāvatthu nissaya**, ff. pa-jyè. Date: 1808. Cf. Poleman, no. 5520 (19.25×2.1; 8 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 32a, b, c, d. **Samantapāsādikā**.

(32a) Vinayavibhaṅga commentary [from Pācittiya to the end] (Bhikkhu Pācit aṭṭhakathā; Pācityādi aṭṭhakathā), ff. ka-cha.

(32b) Mahāvagga commentary (Mahāvā aṭṭhakathā), ff. cha-dhè.

(32c) Cūlavagga commentary (Cūlavā aṭṭhakathā), ff. dhō-dhū.

(32d) Parivāra commentary (Parivā aṭṭhakatha), ff. dhe-bhī. Date: 1878.

Cf. Poleman, no. 6284 (18.75×2.2; 9-10 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 33. **Suttavibhaṅga nissaya** (Pācit pāli-tō nissaya), ff. ka-sī. Cf. Poleman, no. 5501 (18.75×2.2; 8 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 34.

(A) **Suttavibhaṅga** (Pārājika pāli-tō) (*see* Burmese-Pāli 5b), ff. ka-ḍham.

(B) **Ādikappa** (Burmese), ff. ka-jhī. Date: 1884. Cf. Poleman, no. 6290 (19.9×2.1; 9 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 35. **Samantapāsādikā (Mahāvagga) nissaya** (Sut Mahāvā aṭṭhakathā nissaya), ff. ka-mū. Date: 1914. Not found in Poleman.

Burmese-Pāli 36. **Vimativinodanī-ṭīkā**, ff. ka-bū. Not found in Poleman.

Burmese-Pāli 37. **Sāratthadīpanī-ṭīkā**, ff. ka-yī. Date: 1810. Not found in Poleman.

Burmese-Pāli 38. Sumaṅgalavilāsini (Sīlakkhanda-vagga) (see Burmese-Pāli 1b), ff. ka-to. Date 1763. Not found in Poleman. Cf. Burmese-Pāli 1b.

Burmese-Pāli 39. (A) Sumaṅgalavilāsini (Sīlakkhanda-vagga), ff. ka-ḍi. Date 1768.

(B) **Sumaṅgalavilāsini (Sīlakkhanda-vagga) nissaya**, ff. ka-pha:. Date: 1778.

Cf. Poleman, no. 6370 (18.75×2; 7 lines). Cf. Burmese-Pāli 1b.

Burmese-Pāli 40. MS not found. [Poleman, no. 6417: “Vessantara-jātaka”. “This and the following item (Burmese-Pāli 17) together comprise the complete jātaka. ff. 277-396, 1-94... 19.5×2.4; 9 lines”.]

Burmese-Pāli 41. Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha.

(A) **Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha nissaya** (Saṅgruih nissaya), ff. ka-jhaṃ.

(B) **Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha**, ff. ña-ṭha.

(C) **Saṅgruih adhibbāy** (Burmese), ff. ño [sic]-bhō. Date: 1888.

Cf. Poleman, no. 6647 (18.1×2.2; 9 lines), identified there as “Eight books of Pali grammar in 2 vols”.

Burmese-Pāli 42. Vajirabuddhi-ṭikā, ff. ka-pō. Date: 1903. Cf. Poleman, no. 6285 (19.1×2.25; 10 lines). A work with this title is identified as a commentary on the Samantapāsādikā by A. Cabaton (*Catalogue sommaire des manuscrits sanscrits et pālis [Bibliothèque nationale, Paris]* (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1908), fasc. 2, no. 43).

Burmese-Pāli 43. Cūḷadesanālaṅkāra nissaya, ff. ka-ṭā. Date: 1833. Cf. Poleman, no. 5498 (19.5×2.3; 9 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 44. Kaccāyana (Saddā pāḷi Saddā nissaya).

Chapters: (1) Sandhi nissaya, ff. ka-ghe; (2) Nām[a] nissaya, ff. ghè-tū; (3) Kāraka nissaya, ff. te-dam; (4) Samās[a] nissaya, ff. dā:-bū (5) Taddhita (Taddit) nissaya, ff. bè-vā. Date: 1857-1860. Cf. Poleman, no. 6648 (20.4×2.25; 11 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 45. Vinaya-piṭaka, Mahāvagga (Mahāvā paḷi-tō), ff. ka-bā. Cf. Poleman, no. 6301 (19.3×2.25; 9 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 46. MS not found. [Poleman, no. 5538 refers to Burmese-Pāli 46, but the description fits Burmese-Pāli 64.]

Burmese-Pāli 47. Chuttanippān (ဆုတ္တနိပိဒ်) (Burmese), double folded rice paper, ff. ka-khū. A text on law according to Report, p. 182. Cf. Poleman, no. 5542¹ (13.6 [when folded]×24; 23 lines to each half sheet).

Burmese-Pāli 48. Kaccāyana (Saddā athak thup nam: kyoñ:).

Chapters: (1) Taddhit[a] nissaya, ff. ka-ca; (2) Ākhyāt[a] (Ākhāk) nissaya, ff. ci-dā; (3) Kibbidhāna (Kit) nissaya, ff. ḍi-dhe; (4) Uṇād[i] kyam: [nissaya], ff. dhe [sic]-bo. Date: 1821-1825. Cf. Poleman, no. 6481 (20.25×2.6; 10 lines), identified there as “Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha”.

Burmese-Pāli 49. Vinayālaṅkāra-ṭikā. (A Vinaya compilation.) Author: Tipiṭakālaṅkāra of Tiriyapabbata, ff. ka-bam. Date: 1858. Cf. Poleman, no. 6494 (19.6×2.25).

Burmese-Pāli 50. Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī nissaya, ff. ka-mō. Date: 1759.

¹Poleman’s description corresponds to Burmese-Pāli 47, but he says this is Burmese-Pāli 1. He says Burmese-Pāli 47 is a “text on sacred law in a Burmese dialect ... 9ff. of parchment paper, rolled in a cotton wrapper with tying cord. 12.4×18.i; 31 lines”. (Poleman, no. 5557.) This manuscript is not now a part of the Burmese-Pāli series.

Burmese-Pāli 51. Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha (Saṅgruih pāli), ff. dho-ṇè.

Burmese-Pāli 52. Abhidhānappadīpikā, ff. khu-gha:. Date: 1870.

Burmese-Pāli 53. Namakkāra (Pāli, nissaya), ff. jō-ṇo. Date: 1871.

Burmese-Pāli 54. Dakkhiṇavaṃsa nissaya (Dakkhiṇāvan nissaya) (Part 2), ff. ge-ci. Date: 1835. This seems to precede Burmese-Pāli 13. Cf. Poleman, no. 5530 (19.4×2.4; 9 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 55. Lokanīti, ff. ka-kū. Two detached leaves of a nissaya (f. wi and f. ssè) are also included. Date: 1865. Cf. Poleman, no. 6530 (19.6×2.25; 9 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 56. Suttavibhaṅga, (Pārājikaṃ nissaya), ff. ka-jyā:. Date: 1762. Cf. Poleman, no. 6507 (19.1×2.5; 10 lines), identified there as “Namakkāra”.

Burmese-Pāli 57. Paritta (Parit krī: pāli), ff. ka-ke. Date: 1849. Cf. Poleman, no. 6514 (19.25×2.5; 10 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 58. Mahājanaka-jātaka nissaya (no. 539) (Mahājanakka jāt; Janakka nissaya), ff. yaṃ-jhu. Cf. Poleman, no. 5512 (18.9×2.1; 9 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 59. Bhikkhunī-pātimokkha, ff. ka-khī. Cf. Poleman, no. 6518 (19.75×2.25; 8 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 60. Dhammasaṅgaṇi, ff. ka-ḍa. Date: 1778. Cf. Poleman, no. 6440 (20×2.9; 11 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 61.

(A) 'Oñ khrañ rhac pā: pāṭh (ဧ အ ဝ ဇ ခြ ဇ ဣ ဝ ဃ : ဝ ဝ ဋ)
(Burmese), ff. che-chō.

In red ink on covering leaf: "Poñ le Ū Paññā Parit krī pāḷi ...". Cf. Poleman, no. 6511 (no dimensions given).

(B) Ratanā rhwe khyuiñ (ဂ ဝ န န ဝ ဧ ဣ ချ ဇ) (nissaya style),
ff. chaṃ-ch[ā:].

Burmese-Pāli 62. Lokanīti, ff. ka-ko. Date: 1858. Cf. Poleman, no. 6531 (19.5×2.8; 8 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 63. Lokanīti (nissaya), ff. [ka]-ko. Date: 1874. Several leaves are broken. Cf. Poleman, no. 5526 (19.1×2.3; 9 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 64. Vinayasaṅgaha (Vinañ Saṅgruih pāḷi-tō), ff. ka-lō (plus one unnumbered leaf). Cf. Bur MSS II no. 304. Cf. Poleman, no. 5538 (19.9×2.75; 9 lines); this is incorrectly said to be Burmese-Pāli 46. Poleman describes a manuscript as being Burmese-Pāli 64 [no. 6523 (7.4×2.4; 8 lines), identified there as "Mañjala-sutta" (Maṅgāla- ?) with only 7 ff. (date: Th. 1213 = 1849)]. I have not found a MS corresponding to this description.

Burmese-Pāli 65. Maṅgala-sutta nissaya, ff. ka-kī. Cf. Poleman, no. 6524 (19.9×2.5; 10 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 66. (A) Suttavibhaṅga (Pārājika) (First part), ff. kè-ko, khi-khu, jhī-tè.

(B) *Suttavibhaṅga (Pārājika) nissaya*, ff. ka-tī. Date: 1808.

See Burmese-Pāli 5b. Cf. Poleman, no. 6292 (19.6×2.4; 8 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 67. Vinayasaṅgaha (Vinañ Saṅgruih), ff. ka-yi. Date: 1751. Cf. Poleman, no. 6288 (19×1.75; 7-8 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 68. Kathāvatthu, ff. ka-bè. Cf. Poleman, no. 6446 (20.25×1.9; 7 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 69. Visuddhidīpanī nissaya, ff. ka-khya. Date: 1866. Cf. Poleman, no. 5527 (20.25×2.75; 12 lines). He suggests this is the “Visuddhimaggadīpanī”.

Burmese-Pāli 70. MS not found. Not mentioned in Poleman. A separate paper with Burmese-Pāli 26 has written on it “Burmese-Pāli no. 70”.

Burmese-Pāli 71. Pātimokkha nissaya, ff. ka-gha. Author: Ariyālaṅkāra. Date: 1786. Cf. Poleman, no. 5497 (19×2.4; 8 lines). Parts of the text have been eaten away by insects.

Burmese-Pāli 72. Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha, ff. cō-ji. Date: 1864. Cf. Poleman, no. 6480 (18.75×2.25; 10 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 73.

(A) **Lokaṇīti nissaya**, ff. dhu-pi. Date: 1849. Many leaves badly damaged.

(B) **Lokaṇīti nissaya**, ff. vī-se.

Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha (5 copies):

(C) Abhidhammattha-saṅgruih, ff. khu-gè.

(D) Abhidhammattha-saṅgruih, ff. khu-gè, chā-jhe. Date: 1840.

(E) Saṅgruih nissaya (actually in Pāli), ff. ka-khī, khū-khe.

Date: 1871.

(F) Saṅgruih pāli, ff. ṇo-tā.

(G) Abhidhamma-saṅgruih (Pāli), ff. ka-[kī].

Cf. Poleman, no. 6479 (19.5×2.2; 9 lines).

(H) **Puttovāda mruī phat** (၇ ဧ ဣ ဝ ဝ ဝ ဒ [၉]°, ၈ ဝ) (Burmese), ff. kè-kā:. In ink on one f.: “Detached leaves”. Many leaves are badly eaten away.

(I) Unidentified, f. dhè.

Burmese-Pāli 74. **Maṅgala-sutta nissaya**, ff. ka-ke. Date: 1855.

Burmese-Pāli 75. **Kammavācā**. 13 lacquered palm leaves (only one wood cover). Cf. Poleman no. 6328 (19.75×3.4; 5 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 76. Sixteen texts in various hands.

(A) **Dānabheda[nī]** (nissaya style), ff. ka-gī. Date: 1853. Cf. Poleman, no. 5548b (18.1×2; 8 lines).

(B) **Sīmā-kammavācā**, ff. ka-ke. In modern Burmese script. Cf. Poleman, no. 6333 (10.1×2; 5 lines).

The following leaves (C-G) of or from 5 texts are catalogued by Poleman as 3 texts: no. 6549 (18.1×2; 7 lines; 21ff.), no. 6550 (18.1×2; 7-9 lines; 45ff.), no. 6551 (18.1×2; 7-9 lines; 33 ff.).

(C) Unidentified nissaya, ff. ka-kè, 5 unnumbered ff., f. ga, 6 unnumbered ff., f. kā.

(D) **Asīti rhac kyit** (အသီတိ ရှစ် ကျိတ်) (nissaya style), ff. ka-gi. Title from covering f.

(E) Unidentified, ff. kā-kā.

(F) Unidentified, 7 unnumbered ff.

(G) **Uppātasanti** (Uppetasanti) **nissaya**, ff. [ka]-gè. Date: 1799. Cf. Bode, p. 47 (Uppātasanti).

(H) **Paritta Paccavekkhaṇā** (Parit krī pāli-tō; Paccaññ pāṭh nissaya), ff. ka-ko. Date: 1834. Cf. Poleman, no. 6512 (18.1×2; 8 lines), incomplete.

(I) **Maṅgala-sutta** (nissaya), ff. ka-ku. Date: 1838. Cf. Poleman, no. 6521 (18.1×2; 8 lines).

(J) **Maṅgala-sutta nissaya**, ff. ka-kī. Date: 1861. Cf. Poleman, no. 6522 (18.1×2; 9 lines).

(K) One unnumbered f.

(L) **Kammavācā**, ff. ka-ke. Modern Burmese script. Cf. Poleman, no. 6332 (10.1×2; 5 lines).

(M) **Paritta** (Parit krī: pāli-tō), ff. ka-kā:. Date: 1893. Cf. Poleman, no. 6513 (18.1×2; 8 lines).

(N) **Jinālaṅkāra-ṭikā nissaya**, ff. ka-kha. Date: 1821. Cf. Poleman, no. 6500 (18.1×2.8; 8 lines).

(O) **Taṃ tā: ū: taññi sa muiṅ:** (တံ တာ: ဦး တည် သ မှီ ၵး) (nissaya), ff. ka-[khi]. Date: 1852. Cf. Poleman, no. 5548a (18.1×2; 8 lines).

(P) **Kammavācā**, ff. ka-ke. Date 1788. Modern Burmese script. Cf. Poleman, no. 6331 (10.1×2; 5 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 77. MS not found. This number is cited in Poleman [no. 6305: “Samantapāsādikā” (215ff. Palm leaves with lacquered wood covers and tying cord. 19.7×2.2; 8 lines)]. I have not been able to determine if this is one of the MSS with that title in this list.

Burmese-Pāli 78. **Lokaṅṭi nissaya**, ff. ka-ghā. Date: 1738. Cf. Poleman, no. 5525 (19.25×2.2; 8 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 79. **Samantapāsādikā** (On the first section of the rules, see Burmese-Pāli 5b) (Pārājikaṅ aṭṭhakathā), ff. ka-ghyū. Cf. Poleman, no. 6293 (19.1×2.1; 7 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 80. **Paṭṭhāna**, ff. ka-ne. Date: 1836. Cf. Poleman, no. 6470 (21.75×2.3; 10 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 81. **Jinatthapakāsani** (Burmese), 299ff. Author: Kyī-thè-le:-thap charā-tō (1818-1895 or 6). Date: 1876.

Burmese-Pāli 82. **Dīgha-nikāya-ṭikā (Mahāvagga)** (Linattha-vaṅṅanā), ff. ka-ḍaṃ. Date: 1765.

Burmese-Pāli 83. **Bhikkhuni-vibhaṅga**, ff. ka-jaṃ. Date: 1769.

Burmese-Pāli 84. **Mūla-Moggallāna nissaya**, ff. ka-phe (perhaps incomplete). Date: 1876.

Burmese-Pāli 85. **Bhikkhu-vibhaṅga**, ff. ka-ṭā:

Burmese-Pāli 86. **Mahā-ummagga-jātaka** (no. 546) (Mahosathā-jāt nissaya), ff. ka-ṭho, plus two leaves numbered f. ḍe and f. ḍe; they have the same title (Maho-gāt [sic] nissaya) but seem to be from a separate MS.

Burmese-Pāli 87. **Vinayālaṅkāra-ṭikā nissaya**, ff. ka-le. Date: 1924.

Burmese-Pāli 88. **Abhidhammatthavibhāvanī** (Ṭikā kyō nissaya), 164ff. Date: 1855.

Burmese-Pāli 89. **Vinayālaṅkāra-ṭikā nissaya**, 331ff. Date: 1924.

Burmese-Pāli 90. **Vinaya-piṭaka, Mahāvagga** (Mahāvā pāli-tō), 224ff. Date: 1834.

Burmese-Pāli 91. **Samantapāsādikā** (On the first part of the rules) (Pārājikan aṭṭhakathā nissaya, pathama sut[ta]), 266ff. Date: 1895.

Burmese-Pāli 92. **Vinaya-piṭaka, Cūlavagga** (Cūlavā pāli-tō), 221ff. Date: 1920. The first leaves are damaged.

Burmese-Pāli 93. **Jātaka Stories** (?), 370ff. Date: 1877. Identified by Daw Khin Thet Htar as Paramatthajotikā [sic]. “Ekanipāt[a], Dukanipāt[a], jāt[aka] aṭṭhakathā”. The Tika-nipāta is also said to be included.

Burmese-Pāli 94. **Rūpasiddhi nissaya**, 268ff. Date: 1914.

Burmese-Pāli 95. **Sumaṅgalavilāsinī**, 166ff. Date: 1795. *See* Burmese-Pali 1b.

Burmese-Pāli 96. **Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha** (Saṅgruih nissaya sac), 320ff. Date: 1844.

Burmese-Pāli 97. **Abhidhammatthavibhāvanī-ṭikā nissaya** (Ṭikā kyō nissaya), 300ff. Date: 1858. Author: Maṇiratanā charā-tō Rhañ Ariyalaṅkāra (b. ca. 1708). The author was also known as Ne-rañ: charā-tō.

Burmese-Pāli 98. **Vattālaṅkāra kyam**: (nissaya style), 123ff. Author: Nandamālā. Date: 1898. This contains stories from the Therīgāthā. On the author (Chum-thā: charā-tō Rhañ Nandamālā [1718-1784]) *see* Bur MSS I no. 81.

Burmese-Pāli 99. Eleven texts:

(A) **Maṅgala-sutta nissaya**, ff. ka-ku.

(B) **Apraṅ 'oṅ khraṅ**: [Aṭṭhajayamaṅgalagāthā] (အ ဥ ဧ ဧ အ ဝ ဧ ဧ ဧ) (Burmese), ff. kū-ko. Date: 1890.

(C) **Atwaṅ 'oṅ khraṅ**: (အ ဝ ဧ ဧ အ ဝ ဧ ဧ ဧ) (Burmese), ff. kō-kha.

(D) **Ratanā-sutta nissaya** (Ratanā rwhe khyuiṅ), ff. khā-khu.

(E) **Namakkāra nissaya**, ff. khū-gi.

(F) **Mahāsamaya-sutta nissaya**, ff. ṅo [sic]-chā;

(G) **Dhammacakkappavattana[-sutta] nissaya**, ff. chi-ja. Date: 1835 [sic].

(H) **Anattalakkhaṇa-sutta nissaya**, ff. jā-jhè.

(I) **Maggaṅ rhac pāṭh anak** (မ ဝ ဧ ဧ ဝ ဧ အ န ၵ) (Burmese), ff. jho-ña.

(J) **Dhāraṇa paritta nissaya**, ff. ñā-ñè. *See* Bur MSS II 217.

(K) **Mahāsatipañña-sutta nissaya**, ff. ṭō [sic]-tī.

Burmese-Pāli 100. Kammaṭṭhāna-dīpanī kyam: (Burmese with some passages in Pāli), ff. ṭe-ṇè, f. 1ā. Date: 1888. This is a text on Kammaṭṭhāna (meditation).

Burmese-Pāli 101. Astrology chart; 5 small leaves sewn together. Date: 1842.

Burmese-Pāli 102. Sāratthadīpanī-ṭikā, ff. ka-bhī. Date: 1861.

Burmese-Pāli 103.

(A) **Mātikā**, ff. ka-kī.

(B) **Mātikā nissaya**, ff. kī-ja. Author: Paṭhama Bā:karā charā-tō Rhañ Dhammābhinanda. Date: 1891. This is the same nissaya as Bur MSS I no. 30.

(C) **Dhātukathā**, ff. jā-ṭu. Date: 1891.

(D) **Dhātukathā nissaya**, ff. ṭū-ṇu.

(E) **Abhidhānappadīpikā**, ff. ṇū-da. Cf. Bur MSS I no. 18.

(F) **Saddavutti** (Burmese), ff. dā-dō. Cf. Bur MSS I no. 15.

(G) **Sandhi pud cac** (Burmese), ff. daṃ-bhā (?). See Bur MSS I, nos. 35, 135, "Pud cac" or "Saddā krī: pud cac".

Burmese-Pāli 104. Samantacakkhudīpanī kyam: (Burmese with some Pāli), ff. ka-ra. Author: Muṃ-rwe: charā-tō (See Bur MSS II no. 360). Date: 1876. "Questions and answers on various beliefs in Buddhism as it appears in the Theravāda Buddhist canonical texts". (Note by Daw Khin Thet Htar.)

Burmese-Pāli 105. Mukhamatthadīpanī (also known as **Nyāsa**), ff. ka-pū. Date: 1848. Commentary on Kaccāyanabyākaraṇa. Chapters: (1) Sandhi, ff. ka-go; (2) Nāma (Naṃ), ff. gō-jā; (3) Kāraka, ff. jha-ṭi.

Burmese-Pāli 106. Paritta nissaya (Parit krī: nissaya), ff. ka-ca. Author: Arhañ Maṇimañjūsā. Date: 1868.

Burmese-Pāli 107. Vinaya-piṭaka, Mahāvagga (Vinaññ Mahāvā pāli-tō), ff. ka-dū. Date: 1920.

Burmese-Pāli 108. Yamaka nissaya (Yamuik ara kok), ff. ka-laṃ. Author: Than: ta pañ charā-tō Rhañ Nandamedhā. Date: 1893. Chapters: (1) Anusaya, ff. ka-pu; (2) Citta, ff. pū-yè; (3) Dhamma, ff. yo-cè; (4) Indriya, ff. co-ñam; (5) Mūḷa, ff. ṇo [sic]-to; (6) Khandha, ff. tō-nā; (7) Āyatana, ff. ni-bhū; (8) Saṅkhāra, ff. bhe-ṭā; (9) Sacca, ff. se-laṃ.

Burmese-Pāli 109. Rūpasiddhi-ṭikā nissaya, 213ff. Author: Jambudīpadhaja. Date: 1900.

Burmese-Pāli 110. Suttavandanā kyam: nissaya, ff. gō-cō. Date: 1278. See *Burmese-Pāli 18 (H)*.

Burmese-Pāli 111. Abhidhammatthavibhāvanī nissaya (Ṭikā kyō nissaya), ff. ka-ḷè. Author: Janinda [f. ḷe]; Re ca krui charā-tō, 1748-1822).

Burmese-Pāli 112. Saddā krī: nissaya (Dakkhiṇavaṃ kāraka kyam:), 294ff. Author: Maṇiratanā charā-tō Rhañ Ariyālaṅkāra. Date: 1885.

Burmese-Pāli 113. Kammavācā, 14ff. Gilded palm leaves. Tamarind-seed script.

Burmese-Pāli 114. Kammavācā, 7ff. Gilded palm leaves. Tamarind-seed script. Cf. Poleman, no. 6329 (18.25×3.9; 6 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 115. Kammavācā, 7ff. Metal leaves. Modern Burmese script.

Burmese-Pāli 116. Kammavācā nissaya. Printed (modern Burmese script). Author: Ū: Phrē Krī:. Date: 1905. Title on cover: “9—Khaṇ: nhaṇ tat Kammavācā”. First text entitled: “Upasampada-khaṇḍaka”. Pencil note: “Presentation of Burmese books to U.S. Library of Congress, Nov. 15, 1948”.

Burmese-Pāli 117. Kammavācā, 11ff. Silvered palm leaves. Tamarind-seed script.

Burmese-Pāli 118. Kammavācā, 11ff. Gilded palm leaves (without wood covers). Tamarind-seed script.

Burmese-Pāli 119. Kammavācā, 26ff. Gilded palm leaves (only one wood cover). Tamarind-seed script.

Burmese-Pāli 120. Kammavācā. Printed (modern Burmese script). Title on cover: “17—Khaṇ: Kammavācā”. Title on back cover: “... Pabbājaniya Kammavā”. Pencil note as Burmese-Pāli no. 116.

Burmese-Pāli 121. Kammavācā, ff. kha-khe. Note on card: “A *Kammavācā* written in Burmese script on gilded palm leaves. The inlay of the wood covers consists of colored glass and semi-precious stones”. Note on ticket: “A Breviary of scripture, relating to membership of the Assembly. ... This is so much of the book as would be held by one monk at the ordination service (Sa-hymin writing [tamarind-seed script])”. Cf. Poleman, no. 6334 (19.3×3.9; 6 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 122. Kammavācā, 16ff. White material in the form of palm leaves (some of the leaves are badly cracked) with tamarind-seed script (directions in modern Burmese script). Ornate covers. Note on ticket: "A Breviary of Scripture, relating to membership of the Assembly. In ancient black letters on ivory leaves. (Ma gyi sit)". U Thaw Kaung informs me that the material of the leaves is not ivory. Cf. Poleman, no. 6335 (20.9×3.1; 6 lines).

Burmese-Pāli 123, 124. Samantapāsādikā nissaya (commentary on the first rules) (Pārājikaṇ aṭṭhakathā nissaya), 2 vols.

Vol. I, ff. ka-lū. Date: 1889.

Vol. II, ff. ka-ḍhyā:. Date: 1899 (1785 !).

Author: Jambudhaja (fl. 1629).

Vincennes

William Pruitt

A Note on the Transliteration of Burmese Used Here

My transliteration of Burmese is very close to the system used in Bur MSS I and II. I have transliterated one vowel and the tones differently, however:

The vowel I transliterate by "è" is transliterated by "ai" in Bur MSS.

The three tones used in Burmese are indicated in Bur MSS by superscript numerals. (This will be changed in Bur MSS III.) I have used a system based on the similarities between Western scripts and the signs used in Burmese: For tone one, "e", "è", and "ui" I use a subscript full stop after the vowel (e.g. mrui.). For tone two, I use a long "o" (e.g. kyō). For tone three, a colon is added (e.g. ca:).

Index of Titles

- Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha 41
(B), 51, 72, 73 (C, D, E,
F, G); nissaya 6c (B), 41
(C), 96; Burmese 41 (C)
- Abhidhammatthavibhāvanī
(Ṭīkā kyō) nissaya 88, 111
- Abhidhammatthavibhāvanī-ṭīkā
nissaya 97
- Abhidhānappadīpikā 52, 103
(E)
- Ādikappa 34 (B)
- Aggikhandhopama sutta 15
(H); nissaya 15 (J)
- Ākhyāt[a] nissaya 48 (2)
- Anattalakkhaṇa-sutta nissaya
99 (H)
- Anumodanā 4 (A)
- Anusaya 108 (1)
- Apraṇ 'oṇ khraṇ: 99 (B)
- Astrology chart 101
- Asīti rhac kyit 76 (D)
- Atwaṇ: 'oṇ khraṇ: 99 (C)
- Āyatana 108 (7)
- Ayoghara-jātaka 3 (K)
- Aṭṭhajayamaṅgalagāthā 99 (B)
- Aṅguttara-nikāya 7
- Bhallātiya-jātaka 3 (F)
- Bhikkhu Pācit aṭṭhakathā 32a
- Bhikkhu-pātimokkha 15 (F);
nissaya 8 (A)
- Bhikkhunī-pātimokkha 59;
nissaya 8 (B)
- Bhikkhuvibhaṅga 85
- Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga 83
- Bhūridatta-jātaka 12 (C), 17
(B)
- Buddhavaṃsa 27 (B); nissaya
27 (A)
- Campeyya-jātaka 3 (H)
- Candakumāra-jātaka 17 (C)
- Chaddanta-jātaka 3 (O)
- Chadīpapālasutta nissaya 15 (E)
- Chagatidīpanī nissaya 14 (B)
- Chandakummāra 17 (C)
- Chuttanippān 47
- Citta 108 (3)
- Cittasambhūta-jātaka 3 (A)
- Cūḷadesanālaṅkāra 43
- Cūḷahaṃsa-jātaka 3 (D)
- Cūḷavagga, Vinaya-Piṭaka 9,
92; nissaya 19, 29
commentary 32c
- Dakkhiṇavaṃ kāraka kyam: 112
Dakkhiṇavaṃsa (Dakkhiṇā-
van) nissaya 54
- Dānabhedanī nissaya 76
- Dānaphaluppatti nissaya 7c (D)
- Desakkamadīpanī nissaya 15 (b)
- Desanaṅgaha 24 (A)
- Dhamma 108 (3)
- Dhammacakkappavattana-sutta
nissaya 15 (I), 99 (G)
- Dhammapada-aṭṭhakathā
nissaya 16
- Dhammasaṅgaṇi 1c, 60; nissaya
1a, 14 (A)
- Dhātukathā 103 (C); nissaya
103 (D)

- Dhāraṇa paritta nissaya 99 (J)
 Dīgha-nikāya, Mahāvagga 30
 Dīgha-nikāya-ṭikā 1d;
 Mahāvagga 82
 Eighteen Jātaka stories 3
 Guṇ-tō phwañ 18 (B)
 Hatthipāla-jātaka 3 (J)
 Haṃsa-jātaka 3 (D)
 Indriya 108 (4)
 Janakka nissaya 58
 Jātaka 3, 12, 15 (A), 17, 18
 (A), 58, 86, 93
 Jayaddisa-jātaka 3 (N)
 Jinatthapakāsaṇī 81
 Jinālaṅkāra-ṭikā nissaya 76 (N)
 Kaccāyanabyākaraṇa 105
 Kaccāyana 44, 48, 105
 Kammavācā 75, 76 (B, L, P),
 113-122 (nissaya 116)
 Kammatṭhānadīpanī kyaṃ 100
 Kathāvattu 28 (B), 68; nissaya
 5a, 14 (A), 31; aṭṭhakathā
 7c (B)
 Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī nissaya 50
 Khandha 14
 Khaṇḍahāla-jātaka 17 (C)
 Khuddasikkhā 15 (G); nissaya 8
 (C)
 Kibbidhāna (Kit) nissaya 48 (3)
 Kiṃchanda-jātaka 3 (L)
 Kumbha-jātaka 3 (M)
 Kāraka 105 (3); nissaya 44 (3)
 Līnatthavaṇṇanā 1d, 82
 Lokanīti 55, 62; nissaya 63, 73
 (A, B), 78
 Maggañ rhac paṭh anak 99 (I)
 Mahā-Nāradakassapa-jātaka 17
 (E)
 Mahāpalobhana-jātaka 3 (I)
 Mahājanaka-jātaka 58
 Mahākapi-jātaka 3 (Q)
 Mahāsamaya-sutta 15 (K);
 nissaya 15 (L), 18 (G), 99
 (F)
 Mahāsatiṭṭhāna-sutta nissaya
 99 (K)
 Mahā-ummagga-jātaka 86
 Mahāvagga, Dīgha-nikāya 30
 Mahāvagga, Vinaya-piṭaka 3b,
 30, 45, 90, 107
 commentary, 32b
 ṭikā 2d
 Mahosathā-jāt nissaya 86
 Maṅgala-sutta nissaya 18 (D),
 65, 74, 76 (I, J), 99 (A)
 Mātikā 103 (A); nissaya 103
 (B)
 Mrañ mū tarā: cā 4 (B)
 Mūgappakkha-jātaka 12 (A)
 Mukhamatthadīpanī 105
 Mūla 108 (5)
 ṭikā 5c
 Mūla-Moggallana nissaya 84
 Nāṃ nissaya 13
 Nāma 105 (2); nissaya 44 (2)
 Namakkāra 53; nissaya 99 (E);
 see also 56
 Nārada-jātaka 17 (E)
 Nemi see Nimi
 Nimi-jātaka 12 (B), 18 (A)

- Nyāsa 105
 'oṅ khraṅ rhac pā: pāṭh 61 (B)
 Paccavekkhaṇā (paritta) 76 (H)
 Pācit pāli-tō nissaya 33
 Padakosallaṇaṇa nissaya 15 (D)
 Pālimuttaka-vinaya-vinicchaya-
 saṅgaha 4c, 26
 Paṇḍara-jātaka 3 (R)
 Pārājikakaṇḍa see Samanta-
 pāsādikā
 Paramatthajotikā 93
 Paramatthavisesamañjū nissaya
 18 (F)
 Parit see Paritta
 Paritta 57, 76 (H, M); nissaya
 76 (H), 106
 Parivāra nissaya 11
 Paṭṭhāna 18 (E), 80; nissaya 7b
 Pātimokkha nissaya 71 (see
 Bhikkhu-p-, Bhikkhunī-p-)
 Petavatthu nissaya 10
 Puggalapaññatti 4b (A), 26, 28
 (A); nissaya 4b (B);
 aṭṭhakathā 7c (A)
 Puttovāda mruī, phat 73 (H)
 Ratanā-sutta nissaya (Ratanā
 rhwe khyuiṅ) 61 (A), 99
 (D)
 Rohaṇa-jātaka (Rohanta-) 3 (C)
 Rūpasiddhi nissaya 94; ṭikā
 nissaya 109
 Sacca 108 (9)
 Saddavutti 103 (F)
 Saddā athak thup nam: kyoṅ: 48
 Saddā krī: pud cac 103 (G)
- Saddā krī: nissaya 112
 Saddā pāli Saddā nissaya 44
 Samantacakkhudīpanī kyam:
 104
 Samanta-pāsādikā
 Pārājikakaṇḍa 78, 91;
 nissaya 123, 124
 Vinayavibhaṅga 32 (a)
 Mahāvagga 32 (b); nissaya
 35
 Cūḷavagga 32 (c)
 Parivāra 32 (d)
 see also 21, 23
 Samāsa nissaya 44 (4)
 Sambhava-jātaka 3 (P)
 Sammohavinodanī nissaya 6c
 (A), 25
 Sandhi 105 (1); nissaya 44 (1)
 Sandhi pud cac 103 (G)
 Sattigumba-jātaka 3 (E)
 Saṅghabhedakkhandhaka
 (Saṅghe bhokavaggo) 4a
 Saṅgruih adhibbāy 41 (C), 6c
 (B), 73 (E); nissaya 96, 41
 (A)
 Saṅgruih pāli 41 (B), 51, 73 (F)
 Sāratthadīpanī 4c, 26
 Sāratthadīpanī-ṭikā 37, 102
 Saṅkhāra 108 (8)
 Sīlakkhanda-vagga 1b, 38, 39;
 ṭikā 1d
 Sīlakkhandavagga,
 Suttavibhaṅga, Vinaya-Piṭaka
 56
 Sīmā-kammavācā 76 (B)

- Siri-jātaka nissaya 15 (A)
 Sivi-jātaka 3 (B)
 Sīvalivatthuka 2d
 Somanassa-jātaka 3 (G)
 Sumaṅgalavilāsini, on
 Pātheyyavagga 3a, 3a¹, 3c,
 3d; on Mahāvagga, nissaya
 2c; on Sīlakkhanda-vagga
 1b, 38, 39;
 Sīlakkhanda-vagga-ṭīkā 1d
 Sut nak sandhi (nissaya) 24 (B)
 Suttavivhaṅga, see Vinaya-
 Piṭaka
 Suttavandanā kyam: 110
 Sutta(vaṇṇassa)-vandanā
 nissaya 18 (H)
 Taddhita nissaya 44 (5), 48 (1)
 Tathāgata nissaya 23
 Taṃ tā: ū: taññ sa muiṅ: 76 (O)
 Tarā: cā 4 (B)
 Temi-jātaka 12 (A)
 Terasakaṇḍa-ṭīkā 4c, 26
 Teyyasamvāsakavinicchaya 28
 (C)
 Ther(agāthā) pāḷi 15 (C)
 Ṭīkā kyō nissaya 88, 97, 111
 Ubhato-Vibhaṅga Khandhaka-
 Parivāra pāḷi aṭṭhakathā 23
 Umaṅga-jātaka 17 (A)
 Uppātasanti nissaya 76 (G)
 Uṇādi kyam: nissaya 48 (4)
 Vajirabuddhi-ṭīkā 42
 Vattālaṅkāra kyam: 98
 Vessantara-jātaka 17 (F), 40
 Vibhaṅgāmūlaṭīkā 5c
 Vibhaṅgappakaraṇa 2a
 Vidhurapaṇḍita-jātaka 17 (D)
 Vimativinodanī 4c, 26; ṭīkā 36
 Vinayālaṅkāra-ṭīkā 49; nissaya
 87, 89
 Vinaya-Piṭaka
 Mahāvagga 45, 90, 107;
 ṭīkā (Sīvalivatthuka) 2d
 Cūlavagga 92; nissaya 19,
 29
 see also Samantapāsādikā
 Vinayaśaṅgaha 64, 67
 Vinayavibhaṅga, see
 Samantapāsādikā
 Vinaññ, see Vinaya
 Visuddhidīpanī 69
 Visuddhimagga nissaya 26
 Visuddhimaggadīpanī 69
 Yamaka 6a; nissaya 6b, 18 (E),
 108; aṭṭhakathā 7c (C)
 Yamuik, see Yamaka

Index of Authors

- Ariyālaṅkāra (Maṇiratanā charā-
 tō) 71, 97, 112
 Dhammābhinanda (Paṭhama
 Bā:karā charā-tō) 8, 103 (B)
 Jambudīpadhaja 109
 Janindābhi 111
 Maṇimañjūsā, Arhaṅ 106
 Muṃ-rwe: chara-tō 104
 Muninda 5, 15 (E) (F) (G) (H)
 (I) (K) (L)

Munindasārā (Nwa:-prañ: charā-
tō) 8

Nandamālā (Chum-thā: charā-
tō) 98

Ne-rañ: charā-tō 97

Ū: Phre Krī: 116

Sāriputta 4c, 26

Sā Twan, Charā-krī: Ū:

Than:-ta-pañ charā-tō 108

Tipiṭakālankāra of

Tiriyapabbata 49

STUDIES IN THE PĀLI GRAMMARIANS

I

Buddhaghosa's References to Grammar and Grammarians

Introduction

It is not known when and under what circumstances a distinct Buddhist grammatical literature devoted to the description of the language of the Pāli canon originated. It is reasonable to assume that, throughout the development of the Buddhist tradition, basic knowledge of the morphology and vocabulary of the canonical language was handed down in some form or another, even though it may never have been based upon any distinct grammatical tradition. The Niddesa, with its strings of glosses and morphological substitute forms may be considered an early instance of the level of sophistication of such basic knowledge.

Strange as it may seem, there is no indication at all in the extant *aṭṭhakathās* and *ṭīkās* that the commentators knew of any Pāli grammar prior to the well-known grammar ascribed to Kaccāyana.¹ This would indicate that Kaccāyana's grammar may well have been the first recorded instance of a Pāli grammar. Although it is not known precisely when it was written, it is no doubt late. Perhaps it dates from the 7th—8th century A.D. since it is not referred to in any of the *aṭṭhakathās* except for Ap-a, a fairly late commentary.² It is there ascribed to Kaccāyana along with the *Mahānirutti* and *Nett*.³

R.O. Franke, who devoted a study — to the best of my knowledge the only one in existence — to the history and criticism of the

¹For the nature of this grammar cf. Franke, *Gramm.*, pp. 14-20 and Norman, *Pāli Literature* p. 163.

²Cf. Norman, *op. cit.* pp. 146-147.

³Cf. Ap-a 491,20.

indigenous Pāli grammar and lexicography, claimed that certain of the grammatical terms found in the commentaries ascribed to Buddhaghosa reflected an old Pāli grammatical system.⁴ This claim is questionable since the available evidence can hardly be said to justify the assumption of a full-fledged system of Pāli grammar before Kaccāyana. Apart from the fact that Buddhaghosa invariably uses a peculiar terminology for denoting the individual case relations, and that he uses the term *bhāvanapum̐saka*⁵ to denote the adverb, there is hardly a single grammatical term of any importance found in Buddhaghosa's works that does not have a parallel in Sanskrit grammatical terminology.

Franke⁶ assumed that the following verse which is often quoted by the Pāli grammarians originally belonged to a Pāli grammar antedating Buddhaghosa:

*paccattaṃ upayogaṃ ca karaṇaṃ sampadānīyaṃ
nisakkaṃ sāmivacanaṃ bhummaṃ ālapanaṭṭhamaṃ.*⁷

⁴Cf. Franke, op. cit. pp. 3-5.

⁵This term is not mentioned among the terms quoted by Franke, op. cit. pp. 3-4. Aggavaṃsa has devoted a whole paragraph to it in the Saddanīti [cf. Sadd 717,15 foll.] because, as he says, it is the designation that is used in the scriptures (*sāsane vohāro*) in contrast to the term *kiriyaṃvisesana* [= sa. *kriyāviśeṣaṇa*] which is used in grammar (*saddasatthe*). The meaning of this peculiar term is probably "a term in the neuter that qualifies a verbal action". The term *bhāva* is borrowed from Sanskrit grammar.

⁶Op. cit. p. 4.

⁷Cf. e.g. Rūp 116,20; Sadd 60,32. In the context of the case terminology it is interesting to note that the term for the vocative, *ālapanaṃ*, is used in the same sense in the Niddesa section of the Vinaya [cf. Vin III 73,33]. Unfortunately we are not in a position to trace the other terms back to the canon. It therefore remains uncertain when and under what circumstances they came to be an integral part of the exegetical and grammatical terminology of the Pāli.

On the contrary, according to Buddhapiya's Rūp-ṭ⁸ it is quoted from the Mahānirutti which, from the available evidence, appears to be an old commentary on Kacc.⁹ The verse was probably conceived by the author of the Mahānirutti as a summary of the terminology used in the atṭhakathās.

There is therefore no reason to believe that the few grammatical terms that have no parallel in Sanskrit grammatical terminology reflect an old system of Pāli grammar. They probably represent part of a terminology that originated with the attempt to establish a canonical exegesis. Buddhaghosa and subsequent generations of Theravāda scholars no doubt continued to use this peculiar terminology because it had become an inseparable part of the Theravāda heritage.

An instance of such canonical exegesis is found in the verse that Buddhaghosa invariably quotes in connection with his interpretation of the canonical stereotypes "*ekaṃ samayaṃ*" and "*tena samayena*":

*taṃ taṃ atthaṃ apekkhitvā bhummēna karaṇena ca
aññatra samayo vutto upayogena so idhā ti.*¹⁰

With regard to this or that motive [the word] "*samaya*" is used elsewhere [in the Pāli] in the locative and the instrumental. In this context, however, it is used in the accusative.

⁸Cf. Rūp-ṭ Be 1965 127,25.

⁹An analysis of the available fragments of Mahānirutti will be treated in *Studies in the Pāli Grammarians II*.

¹⁰Cf. Sv 33,27-28; Ps I 9,31-32; Spk I 11,32-33; Mp I 13,25-26. In order to make the verse fit the context, Buddhaghosa quotes it in a slightly edited version in his comment on "*ekena samayena*" in Sp 108,13-14.

Whenever Buddhaghosa quotes this verse, it is followed by a grammatical quotation which he ascribes to the porāṇās. In Buddhaghosa this normally means the aṭṭhakathâcariyas:

*porāṇā pana vaṇṇayanti: “tasmim samaye ti vā, tena samayenā ti vā, taṃ samayan ti vā abhilāpamattabhedo esa. sabbattha bhummam eva attho” ti.*¹¹

The old ones, moreover, make the comment that “*tasmim samaye*”, or “*tena samayena*”, or “*taṃ samayaṃ*” is merely a difference of expression. In all [three] cases the sense is nothing but locative.

This prose fragment is the only instance of a grammatical reference in Buddhaghosa where he expressly ascribes views on points of grammar to the aṭṭhakathâcariyas. This would seem to support the conclusion that the peculiar case terminology was in use in the lost aṭṭhakathās. But this, of course, cannot be taken as an indication of the existence of a complete system of Pāli grammar. The verse and the prose fragment are clearly context-bound in the sense that they specifically deal with the interpretation of certain irregularities of canonical usage.

The fact that Buddhaghosa makes extensive use of this seemingly archaic terminology contrasts with the fact that his grammatical terminology in general consists of Pāli translations of Sanskrit technical terms. The Samantapāsādikā, which may be considered representative of Buddhaghosa’s grammatical vocabulary,¹² contains

¹¹Cf. Sv 33,29–31; Ps I 10,1–3; Spk I 12,1–3; Mp I 13,27–29; Sp 108,15–17.

¹²Cf. Sp VIII [indexes]. For unknown reasons the terms *bhāva* and *bhāvalakkhaṇa* [e.g. at Sp 108,1] are not recorded in the indexes. The terms

among others the following important technical terms: *accantasamyoga* = sa. *aryantasamyoga* [cf. Pāṇ II 1 29], *ādesa* = sa. *ādeśa* [cf. Pāṇ I 1 56], *itthambhūtakkhyāna* = sa. *itthambhūtākhyāna* [cf. Pāṇ I 4 90], *itthambhūtalakkaṇa* = sa. *itthambhūtalakṣaṇa* [cf. Pāṇ II 3 21], *upapada* [ts.; cf. Pāṇ II 2 19 and passim], *upasagga* = sa. *upasarga* [cf. Pāṇ I 4 59 and passim], *nipāta* [ts.; cf. Pāṇ I 1 14 and passim], *nimitta* [= *nimittasaptamī*; ts.; cf. Mahā-bh ad Pāṇ II 3 36],¹³ *bhāva* [ts.; cf. Pāṇ I 2 21 and passim], *bhāvalakkaṇa* = sa. *bhāvalakṣaṇa* [cf. Pāṇ II 3 37], *liṅga* [ts.; cf. Pāṇ II 4 26], *lopa* [ts.; cf. Pāṇ I 1 60], *vipariṇāma* [ts.], *viparyāya* [= *vipallāsa*] = sa. *viparya(-ā-)ya*, *vibhatti* = sa. *vibhakti*.

Examples such as these show clearly that Buddhaghosa's grammatical vocabulary was largely made up of terms derived from Sanskrit grammar with the addition of a few terms which we may deduce were in use in the aṭṭhakathās, the historical background and development of which remain unknown.

In several instances, however, Buddhaghosa explicitly refers his readers to grammar (*saddasattha* = sa. *śabdaśāstra*) or grammarians (*saddalakkhaṇavidū*,¹⁴ *saddavidū*, *akkharacintakā*) for information about points of grammar that will justify his own grammatical analyses of the

accantasamyoga and *nimitta* (v. s.v. *nimittattha*) have erroneously been omitted from the index of grammatical terms. They are found, however, in the index of words and subjects.

¹³It is interesting that Vjb [Be 1960 57,26-27] on Sp 189,25 (*nimittatthe*) quotes a Pāli version of a Sanskrit verse which is quoted in Mahā-bh ad Pāṇ II 3 36 as an illustration of *nimittasaptamī*.

¹⁴The actual meaning of this term is "those who know the rules of grammar", i.e. grammarians. "*saddalakkhaṇa*" stands for grammar in Buddhaghosa's works; cf. the usage of *śabda* and *lakṣaṇa* in Sanskrit grammar; v. Renou, *Vocabulaire* s. vv.

Pāli. This gives rise to the rather interesting problem of trying to identify the grammatical source or sources to which Buddhaghosa refers.

In the following analysis a number of such references found in Buddhaghosa's works will be addressed. Since there is uncertainty about the actual authorship of some of the works ascribed to Buddhaghosa, the analysis has been limited to those works for which the authorship is beyond doubt: *Visuddhimagga* [Vism], *Samantapāsādikā* [Sp], and the commentaries on the āgamās: *Sumaṅgavilāsinī* [Sv], *Papañcasūdanī* [Ps], *Sāratthappakāsinī* [Spk], and *Manorathapūraṇī* [Mp].¹⁵ Sp is especially rich in grammatical references, but the other commentaries also contain interesting material. In a few instances grammatical statements where Buddhaghosa does not explicitly refer to grammar have been analysed. Such instances are included here either because of their general interest or because they belong to the same set of problems which Buddhaghosa analyses in similar contexts with reference to grammar or grammarians.

The sources to which Buddhaghosa refers have in almost every instance been identified as Pāṇinian grammar, and although the present study does not claim to be exhaustive, it should certainly present sufficient evidence of the pervasive influence of Sanskrit grammar on Buddhaghosa's grammatical analyses. It would thus seem that a reconsideration of the role of Sanskrit in the formation and history of the Pāli grammatical literature is necessary. This will be addressed further in the conclusion.

Visuddhimagga

1 [Vism 8,2-6]

¹⁵For an analysis of the works ascribed to Buddhaghosa, v. Norman, *Pāli Literature* pp. 120-130.

In the first example from Visuddhimagga, Buddhaghosa comments upon the meaning of the word “*sīla*” as it is defined by the grammarians (*saddalakkhaṇavidū*), in contrast to those “etymologists” who derive the word from “*siras*” (head) and “*sītala*” (cool).¹⁶

ken’ atthena sīlan ti. sīlanatthena sīlaṃ. kiṃ idaṃ sīlanam nāma. samādhānaṃ vā: kāyakammādīnaṃ susīlyavasena avippakiṇṇatā ti attho; upadhāraṇam vā: kusalānaṃ dhammānaṃ patitṭhānavasena [so read with v.l.] ādhārabhāvo ti attho. etad eva h’ ettha [v.l. hi ettha] athadvayaṃ saddalakkhaṇavidū anujānanti.¹⁷

In what sense is it virtue? It is virtue in the sense of discipline. What does discipline mean? It means either composure (*samādhānaṃ*), that is, the quality of not being scattered because the acts of the body, etc., are well disciplined, or supporting (*upadhāraṇam*), that is, being a support due to its being the basis of good dhammas. These two are the only meanings which the grammarians admit in this case.

The grammarians to which Buddhaghosa refers here cannot without further evidence be identified with any particular grammatical school. But we are probably justified in assuming that they belong to Pāṇini’s school since the two meanings which Buddhaghosa ascribes to √*sīl* are identical with those recorded in the collection of roots which is

¹⁶Cf.: *aññe pana “sirattho sīlattho sīlattho sīlattho” ti evamādinā nayan’ ev’ ettha attham vaṇṇayanti*, Vism 8,8-10. This is probably a reference to Vimuttimagga. For a translation of the passage in question see *The Path of Freedom* p. 8.

¹⁷Qu. Paṭi-a 15,30-35.

traditionally ascribed to the Pāṇinians. Cf. sa-Dhātup I 556: *śīla samādhau* and sa-Dhātup X 332: *śīla upādharāṇe*.¹⁸

2 [Vism 210,21–28]

This interesting passage is part of the paragraph where Buddhaghosa brings the canonical “etymologies” of the word “*bhagavan*” into focus. After closing the first section of the paragraph with a reference to the Niddesa for detailed information on the method of analysing (*naya*) its various derivations and meanings,¹⁹ he continues by quoting a verse that exemplifies an alternative method of analysing (*apara nayo*) the word “*bhagavan*”:

*bhāgyavā bhaggavā yutto bhagehi ca vibhattavā
bhattavā vantagamano bhavesu bhagavā tato ti.*

Before he continues discussing each of these “etymologies”, Buddhaghosa presents a concise description of the rules of derivation upon which they are based.²⁰ He writes:

*tattha, vaṇṇāgamo vaṇṇavipariyayo ti ādikam niruttī-
lakkhaṇam gahetvā, saddanayena vā pisodarādīpak-
khepalakkhaṇam gahetvā, yasmā lokiyalokuttara-
sukhābhiniḥḥattakam dānasīlādīpārappattam bhāgyam*

¹⁸ Cf. Sadd 434,30 foll.; 435,7 foll.; 564,25.

¹⁹ Cf. Vism 210,19 and Nidd I 142,25 foll.

²⁰ Buddhaghosa and other commentators often refer to or quote Vism on this verse for detailed information on its analysis; cf. Sp 123,13 foll.; Sv 34,10; Ps I 10,15; Spk I 12,16; Mp I 14,13; Ud-a 24,21; It-a I 6,15; Pj I 107,27 foll.; II 444,8; Paṭi-a 532,12; only Nidd-a I 264,7 foll. elaborates on Buddhaghosa’s analysis; cf. note 23 infra.

assa atthi, tasmā bhāgyavā ti vattabbe bhagavā ti vuccatī ti nātabbam.

In this case it should be known — either by adopting the rule of etymology (*niruttilakkhaṇam*) which runs: “letter insertion, letter metathesis”, etc., or by adopting, according to the method of grammar (*saddanayena*), the rule that consists in interpolating [the word in question] in [the word class] beginning with “*pisodara*”²¹ — that since he is blessed with having been perfected with regard to charity and morality, etc., which gives rise to mundane and trans-mundane happiness, he is called “*bhagavan*”, although [in actuality] he ought to be called “*bhāgyavan*”.

In this passage Buddhaghosa quotes the beginning of a Pāli version of the first pada of a Sanskrit verse summarizing five principles of etymological analysis, in order to identify the scope of the rule of etymology (*niruttilakkhaṇam*). The Sanskrit version is found in Kāśikā ad Pāṇ VI 3 109²²:

²¹Cf. Dhammapāla’s commentary: *ādikan ti ādisaddena vaṇṇavikāro, vaṇṇalopo, dhātuatthena niyojanañ cā ti imam tividham lakkhaṇam saṅgaṇhāti. saddanayenā ti byākaraṇanayena. pisodarādīnaṃ saddānaṃ ākatigaṇabhāvato vuttam piso ... pe ... gahetvā ti pakkhipanam eva lakkhaṇam. tappariyāpannatākaraṇam hi pakkhipanam* [Vism-mhṭ Be 1960 I 253,16-20]. Cf. also Vism-mhṭ Be 1960 II 252,3-4: *vaṇṇāgamaviparyayavikāravinasadhātuatthavisesayogehi pañcavidhassa nirutilakkhanassa vasena*, and see next.

²²The original Sanskrit version was identified by H.C. Warren; cf. Vism (ed. HOS) p. 173,30.

*vaṇṇāgamo vaṇṇaviparyayaś ca dvau cāparau vaṇṇa-
vikāranāśau dhātos tadarthātiśayena yogas tad ucyate
pañcavidhaṃ niruktam.*

Letter insertion, letter metathesis, and the following two, namely, letter modification and letter elision, [plus] connecting the root with a meaning surpassing its [own] meaning — these are called the five ways of etymological analysis.²³

²³The first complete Pāli version of this verse is, to the best of my knowledge, found in Upasena's commentary on the Niddesa, which often refers to, or quotes, Buddhaghosa's Vism. The passage where the verse occurs is nothing but an elaborate version of the present section of Vism. It is important because it illustrates how the various principles of etymological analysis were applied to Pāli words. Cp. Nidd-a I 264,7–265,3:

*vaṇṇāgamo, vaṇṇaviparyāyo,
dve cāpare vaṇṇavikāranāśā,
dhātūnam atthātiśayena yogo,
tad uccate pañcavidhaṃ niruttan ti*

evaṃ vuttaniruttillakkhaṇaṃ gahetvā padasiddhi veditabbā. tattha: "nakkhattarājā-r-iva tārakānaṃ" [= Ja V 148,9; Pj II 146,6] ti ettha rakārāgamo viya avijjamānassa akkharassa āgamo vaṇṇāgamo nāma. hiṃsanā hiṃso ti vattabbe siho ti viya vijjamānakkharānaṃ heṭṭhupariyavasena parivattanaṃ vaṇṇavipariyāyo nāma. "navacchādake dāne dīyati" [= Ja III 288,13 (cf. v.ll.)] ti ettha akārassa ekārāpajjanatā viya akkharassa aññakkharāpajjanatā vaṇṇavikāro nāma. jīvanassa mūto jīvanamūto ti vattabbe jīmūto ti vakāranakārānaṃ vināso viya vijjamānakkharavināso vaṇṇavināso nāma. "phārusāhi vācāhi pakubbamāno āsajja maṃ tvaṃ vadasī kumārā" [= Ja IV 47,12] ti ettha pakubbamāno-padassa abhibhavamāno ti atthapaṭipādanaṃ viya tattha tattha yathāyogaṃ visesatthayogo dhātūnaṃ atthātiśayena yogo nāma. evaṃ niruttillakkhaṇaṃ gahetvā, saddanayena vā pisodarādipakkhepalakkhaṇaṃ gahetvā yasmā lokiyalokuttarasukhābhiniḥbattaṃ dānasilādipārappattaṃ bhāgyaṃ assa atthi, tasmā bhāgyavā ti vattabbe bhagavā ti vuccatī ti ñatappaṃ. The verse is quoted in Ap-a 102,17-18 (incomplete version), a comparatively late commentary, and is

The grammatical method (*saddanaya*) consists in analysing the word “*bhagavan*” as if it were a member of the class of word forms (*ākṛtiḡaṇa*)²⁴ belonging to the *gaṇapātha* “*pr̥ṣodarādi*”, to which Pāṇini refers in Pāṇ VI 3 109: “*pr̥ṣodarādīni*” *yathopadiṣṭam*: [the elision, insertion and modification of letters that are observed in such cases as] “*pr̥ṣodara*”, etc., follows the way in which they are stated [by the experts in etymology].

There is clearly no absolute contrast between the two methods since the words that are members of the *gaṇapātha* are subject to much the same rules of derivation as those defined in the verse quoted by the Kāśikā and Buddhaghosa.²⁵ The reason why they are contrasted in this case is probably the fact that “etymology” as such is not within the scope of Pāṇinian grammar, but belongs to a separate branch of grammatical *śāstra*.

It is not possible to identify the source from which Buddhaghosa quotes, nor are we in a position to decide whether he himself is responsible for translating the Sanskrit original into Pāli, or whether he was simply adopting an already existing Pāli version. It is highly unlikely that he should have quoted the verse from the Kāśikā since this important commentary is generally supposed to have been written in the 7th century A.D. All we can safely say is that

often quoted by the Pāli grammarians; cf. e.g. Rūp 277,13-16; Mogg-p 29,5-8 [cf. Mogg-p 29,9 foll. and Mogg-pd pp. 38-39 ad loc.]; Sadd 877,9-11.

²⁴The *ākṛtiḡaṇa* is by definition an open list of words to which other words undergoing the same operations may be added. Cf. Renou, *Vocabulaire* and *DSG* s.v.

²⁵Cf. Kāś ad Pāṇ VI 3 109: *pr̥ṣodaraprakārāṇi śabdārūpāṇi, yeṣu lopāgamavarnavikārāḥ śāstreṇa na vihitāḥ dr̥śyante ca, tāni yathopadiṣṭāni sādḡhūni bhavanti. yāni yāni yathopadiṣṭāni, śiṣṭair uccāritāni prayuktāni, tāni tathavānigantavyāni*; cf. also Mahā-bh ad loc.

Buddhaghosa and the authors of the Kāśikā were conversant with a grammatical tradition where the verse was somehow attached to this specific Pāṇini sūtra as part of its commentary. Patañjali does not quote the verse ad loc., but this, of course, does not exclude the possibility that it belongs to a grammatical tradition antedating Patañjali.

In any case, it clearly appears from Buddhaghosa's concise description of the two methods that he was assuming that his readers would easily be able to identify the full scope of the analytical principles involved, on the basis of a summary reference.

3 [Vism 310,18–22]

In this example Buddhaghosa discusses briefly the etymology of the word *satta* (= sa. *sattva*) as it occurs in the passage (= Paṭiś II 130,26 foll.: *sabbe sattā averā abyāpajjhā ... attānaṃ parihantu*, etc.) upon which he is commenting. First he quotes S III 190,2–6²⁶ where the word is defined in terms of a human being who is attached to (*satta* = sa. *sakta*) and clings to (*visatta* = sa. *viśakta*) the khandhas. He continues:

*rūhisaddena pana vītarāgesu pi ayaṃ vohāro vattati
yeva, vilivamaye pi vijānīvisese tālavaṇṭavohāro viya.
akkharacintakā pana atthaṃ avicāretvā nāmamattaṃ
etan ti icchanti. ye pi atthaṃ vicārenti te sattayogena
[so read for Ee satvāyogena] sattā ti icchanti.²⁷*

However, because it is a conventional term (*rūhi-sadda*), this designation also applies to those who are

²⁶*rūpe kho Rādha yo chando yo rāgo yā nandi yā taṇhā tatra satto tatra visatto tasmā satto ti vuccati. vedanāya saññāya saṅkhāresu viññāne yo chando yo rāgo yā nandi yā taṇhā tatra satto tatra visatto tasmā satto ti vuccati ti.*

²⁷Qu. Paṭiś-a 604,36-38 and 57,20-22.

without desire, just as the word “palm fan” [*tālavanta* = sa. *tālavṛnta*] applies to a particular kind of fan, although it is made of split bamboo. But the grammarians (*akkharacintakā*) maintain that it is a mere name (*nāmamattam*) without considering its meaning. Some people who take its meaning into consideration maintain that beings are called “*sattā*” [= sa. *sattva*, mfn.] because they are possessed of “*satta*” [= sa. *sattva*, n.], intelligence.

It is uncertain which grammarians Buddhaghosa refers to in this context. The reference is too concise to enable us to trace it to any specific grammatical work. What is important in this context is that he contrasts the idea that the term as such can be derived [although it can be applied in other meanings than the one which is supported by the etymology] with the grammarians’ claim that it is a mere name for which no etymology can be adduced. There is no reason to doubt that the origin of this discussion is to be found in the Sanskrit grammatical tradition. Unfortunately Dhammapāla’s commentary does not offer any clue to what Buddhaghosa’s sources might have been.

4 [Vism 423,23–25]

In this paragraph Buddhaghosa explains why the “eye of knowledge” (*ñāṇacakkhu*) has the epithet “divine” (*dibbam*). He presents inter alia the following two explanations followed by the remark that they should be known according to grammar:

*ālokapariggahena mahājutikattā pi dibbaṃ, tiro-
kuḍḍādigatarūpadassanena mahāgatikattā pi dibbaṃ.
taṃ sabbam saddasatthānusārena veditabbaṃ.*²⁸

It is both “divine” because it is of great splendour (*mahājutikattā*) due to its possessing light, and “divine” because it has an enormous range (*mahāgatikattā*) due to its seeing objects that are far removed in space and the like. All this should be known according to grammar.

As in the first example from Vism, Buddhaghosa’s commentary deals with a question of semantics: the meaning of the root $\sqrt{\text{div}}$. Since he uses the terms *mahājutikatta* and *mahāgatikatta* in order to define the meaning of the epithet “*dibba*”, one would assume that this grammatical reference too is to sa-Dhātup where the two meanings *juti* (to light) and *gati* (to move), among others, are ascribed to $\sqrt{\text{div}}$. Cf. sa-Dhātup IV 1 *divú*: *krīḍāvijigīṣavyavahāradyutistutimodanamadasvapnakāntigatiṣu*. Dhammapāla’s *ṭīkā* supports the assumption²⁹.

5 [Vism 518,27–32]

²⁸An identical passage is found in Sp 163,7-9 ad Vin III 5,1: *so dibbena*.

²⁹*evaṃ vihāravijayicchāvohārajutigatisaṅkhātānaṃ atthānaṃ vasena imassa abhiññānassa dibbacakkhubhāvasiddhito. saddavidū ca tesu eva atthesu divú-saddaṃ icchantī ti vuttaṃ “taṃ sabbam saddasatthānusārena veditabban” ti* [Vism-mhṭ Be II 56,27-57,2 ad loc.]; cf. also *mahājutikattā mahāgatikattā ti etesu “saddasatthānusārenā” ti vuttaṃ* [Vjb Be 1960 51,27-28 ad Sp 163,7-9]; *ke ci pana jutigatiatthesu pi saddavidū divú-saddaṃ icchantī ti mahājutikattā mahāgatikattā ti idam eva dvayaṃ sandhāya vuttaṃ. tasmā “saddasatthānusārena veditabban” ti idam dibbati jotayaṭi ti dibbaṃ* [Sp-ṭ Be 1903,10-12 ad Sp 163,7-9]; Sadd 475,24 foll.

In this passage Buddhaghosa analyses the meaning of the suffix *-tā*, when used in the compound “*idappaccayatā*”. He writes:

yathā vuttānaṃ [i.e. in S II 25,17] *etesaṃ jarāmarañādīnaṃ paccayato vā paccayasamūhato vā idappaccayatā ti vutto. tatrāyaṃ vacanatto: imesaṃ paccayā idappaccayā; idappaccayā eva idappaccayatā; idappaccayānaṃ vā samūho idappaccayatā. lakkhaṇaṃ paṇ' ettha saddasatthato pariyesitabbaṃ.*³⁰

The term “*idappaccayatā*” is used either in terms of the conditions of these, or in terms of the collection of conditions of these, such as they have been explained [above], namely, old age, death and the rest. The meaning of the expression in this case is as follows: “*idappaccayā*” means “conditions of these”; “*idappaccayatā*” means “exclusively (*eva*) conditions of these”. Or, “*idappaccayatā*” means “a collection of conditions of these”. In these cases, moreover, the rule should be sought in grammar.

The grammatical rules to which Buddhaghosa in this case asks his reader to refer are two Pāṇini sūtras. The one which justifies the first alternative is Pāṇ V 4 27: *devāt tal:* the suffix “*tā*”, when attached to the word “*deva*” [means “*deva*” as such].³¹ In order to make the delimitative force of the suffix clear Buddhaghosa uses the particle “*eva*” to which Indian grammar traditionally ascribes a delimitative and restrictive force (*avadhāraṇa*).³² The second is Pāṇ IV 2 [37+] 43: *grāmajana-bandhu-*

³⁰This text is identical with Spk II 41,7 foll., q.v.

³¹Cf. *devasābdāt svārthe talpratyayo bhavati. deva eva devatā* [Kāś ad loc].

³²On this term cf. Renou, *Terminologie* s.v.

sahāyebhyas tal: the suffix “*tā*”, when attached to the words “*grāma*”, “*jana*”, “*bandhu*”, and “*sahāya*” [denotes “a collection thereof” (*tasya samūhaḥ* = 37)].³³ Dhammapāla’s *ṭīkā* corroborates in both cases the assumption of Pāṇinian grammar as Buddhaghosa’s source with implicit references to *Kāśikā ad loc.*³⁴

For purely doctrinal reasons Buddhaghosa does not refer his reader to the well-known Pāṇini sūtra V 1 119 defining the other more general function of the abstract suffixes “*tva*” and “*tā*”: *tasya bhāve tvatalau*: the abstract suffixes “*tva*” and “*tā*” are used in the sense of the essence or quality of the thing [denoted by the term to which the two suffixes are attached]. But it is clear that there must have been some Buddhist scholars who did actually interpret *idappaccayatā* with reference to this function of the suffix “*tā*”, because Buddhaghosa refers briefly to their view, but only to refute it.³⁵

6 [Vism 519,34–520,6]

In this section Buddhaghosa presents and rejects the interpretation of some Buddhists who maintain that the term “*paṭiccasamuppāda*” denotes mere arising (*uppādamattam*), in the sense

³³Cf.: *grāmādibhyaḥ talpratyayo bhavati, tasya samūhaḥ ity etasmin viṣaye. grāmānām samūhaḥ grāmātā, janatā, bandhitā, sahāyatā* [Kāś ad loc].

³⁴Cf.: *idappaccayā eva idappaccayatā ti tā-saddena padaṃ vaddhitam; na kiñci athantaram; yathā devo eva devatā ti. idappaccayānaṃ vā samūho idappaccayatā ti. samūhattham tā-saddam āha, yathā janānaṃ samūho janatā ti* [Vism-mḥ Be 1960 II 228,19-22 = Spk-pt Be 1960 II 50,22-26; Be om. *na kiñci athantaram* and reads *samūhattho tā-saddo*; and adds *imam atham sandhāyāha: lakkaṇaṃ ... pe ... veditabban ti*]. Vism-sn 1250,15-16 refers correctly to Pāṇ IV 2 37 and 43, but does not identify the other source, i.e. Pāṇ V 4 27.

³⁵Cf.: *ye pi maññanti: idappaccāyaṃ bhāvo idappaccayatā, bhāvo ca nāma yo ākāro āvijjādīnaṃ saṅkhārādīpātubhāve hetu, so tasmim saṅkhāravikāre paṭiccasamuppādasamaññā ti, tesam tam na yujjati*, Vism 520,15-18.

that it means arising dependently (*paṭicca*) and correctly so (*sammā*), that is, without reference to such causes as those which the heretics imagine, namely, Primordial Matter (*pakati*), The Person (*purisa*) and the like.³⁶

The final argument of the four which Buddhaghosa presents for rejecting this idea is that it is not justified because according to their interpretation the term “*paṭicca*” becomes semantically disjointed from the rest of the compound and is therefore virtually meaningless (*saddabhedato*).³⁷ The argument is developed in the following paragraph. Buddhaghosa does not explicitly refer to grammar in this instance, but the nature and importance of the argument are such that it would seem natural to include it among his grammatical references. He writes:

*saddabhedato ti paṭिकासaddo ca pan' āyam samāne
kattari pubbakāle payujjamāno atthasiddhikaro hoti.
seyyathīdam: “cakkhuñ ca paṭicca rūpe ca uppajjati
cakkhuvīññāṇan” [= S II 72,4] ti. idha pana bhāva-
sāadhanena uppādasaddena saddhiṃ payujjamāno*

³⁶Cf.: *keci pana paṭicca sammā ca tiṭṭhiyaparikkappitapakatipurisādi-
kāraṇanirapekkho uppādo paṭiccasamuppādo ti evaṃ uppādamattam
paṭiccasamuppādo ti vadanti*, Vism 518,33-35. It is not clear to whom
Buddhaghosa refers. The emphasis is on arising as such without particular
reference to its causes and conditions provided that heretical ideas of causes,
such as the *prakṛti* of Sāṃkhya, etc., are excluded. Could it be that Buddhaghosa
briefly presents the view of Sthavira Vasuvarṃā, which is referred to in
Vasubandhu's *Abhidharmakośa* as follows: *ahetunīyahetuvādapratiṣedhārtham
ity apare* [= Sthaviravasuvārmā, Sphuṭārtha ad loc.]. *nāsati hetau bhāvo bhavati,
na cānutpattimato nityāt prakṛtipuruṣādīkāṭ kiñcid utpadyata iti*, AkBhāṣ 47,7-
8 ? Perhaps Vasuvarṃā interpreted “*pratiṭyasanutpāda*” in the light of the other
canonical explanation of arising “*asmin satīdam bhavati, asyotpādād idam
utpadyate*”, to which the quotation relates. In any case it has this generalised
form which appears to be the idea underlying the view which Buddhaghosa
rejects.

³⁷Cf. Dhammapāla's ṭīkā: *saddabhedato ti saddavināsato saddāyogato* [Vism-
mḥ Be 1960 II 230,20-21].

samānassa kattu abhāvato saddabhedam gacchati, na ca kiñci attham sādhetī ti saddabhedato pi na uppādamattam paṭiccasamuppādo ti.

“Because of word disjunction”: again, when the word “*paṭicca*”, provided that the agent is the same (*samāne kattari*), is used in the sense of [the action expressed by the verb to which the absolutive suffix is added] being anterior in time [to the action expressed by the finite verb], it achieves its meaning (*atthasiddhikaro*). As, for instance, [in the following sentence]: “After having come into contact with the eye and the sense objects, eye consciousness arises [= S II 72,4]”. In the present case, however, when [the word “*paṭicca*”] is used together with the word “*uppāda*” which is an action noun (*bhāvasādhanena*),³⁸ it leads to word disjunction since the agent is not the same, and so it does not achieve any meaning at all. Therefore, also because of word disjunction, *paṭiccasamuppāda* is not mere arising.

What is important for Buddhaghosa to point out in this connection is that, in order for the term “*paṭiccasamuppāda*” to be meaningful, it is necessary for the two actions expressed by the absolutive form “*paṭicca*” and the action noun “*samuppāda*” to have the same agent (*kattā*). If this were not the case, there would be no connection between them in terms of their having the same agent. To illustrate this point Buddhaghosa quotes a well-known passage from Saṃyuttanikāya where *cakkhuvīññāṇa*, by implication, represents the

³⁸On this technical term of grammar cf. Renou *Vocabulaire* and DSG s.v.

identical agent of the successive verbal actions expressed by “*paṭicca*” and “*uppajati*”.³⁹ The opponent, however, generalizes the scope of meaning of “*paṭiccasamuppāda*” to such an extent that it becomes virtually impossible to interpret it with reference to specific agents and specific causes and conditions. Consequently, the action expressed by the term “*paṭicca*” would not at all relate, by virtue of identity of agent, to the action expressed by “*uppāda*”.

In order to clarify this idea he makes an implicit reference to Pāṇini’s definition of the usage and meaning of the absolutive suffix (*ktivā*), which is found in Pāṇ III 4 21: *samānakarṭṛkayoḥ pūrvakāle*: [when two verbal actions] have the same agent [the absolutive suffix attached to the verb expressing one action] is used in the sense of being anterior in time [to the action expressed by the other verb].⁴⁰

Buddhaghosa’s interpretation, of course, entails the obvious paradox that in order for *cakkhuvīññāṇa* to arise it must first be dependent and thus already existent, which makes its arising illogical. Perhaps the underlying intention of the opponent’s thesis was exactly to avoid this paradox by emphasising the notion of origination, in which case Buddhaghosa stands out as a conservative defender of what he considered to be the correct Theravāda tradition, while at the same time adhering strictly to the original Pāṇinian definition of the semantical function of the absolutive suffix.

We know from a parallel discussion with grammarians recorded in Vasubandhu’s *Abhidharmakośa* about the correct interpretation of “*paṭiccasamuppāda*”,⁴¹ that the Buddhists tried to avoid the unwanted

³⁹On the paradox which this interpretation entails see the following.

⁴⁰Cf.: *samānaḥ kartā yayoh dhātvarthayos tatra pūrvakāle dhātvarthe vartamānād dhātoḥ ktivā pratyayo bhavati* [Kāś ad loc.].

⁴¹Cf. the grammarians’ objection: *na yukta esa padārthaḥ. kim kāraṇam ? ekasya hi kartur dvayoh kriyayoh pūrvakālāyām kriyāyām ktivāvidhir bhavati. tad*

implications, pointed out by the grammarians, of a strict Pāṇinian interpretation of “*paṭicca*”, by taking the absolute suffix as indicating an action that takes place simultaneously with the action expressed by the action noun “*samuppāda*”. For this interpretation they could refer to one of Katyāyana’s vārttikas on Pāṇini’s sūtra, which allows for interpreting “*paṭicca*” as expressing an action that is simultaneous with the action expressed by “*samuppāda*”.⁴²

We do not find any trace of this discussion in Buddhaghosa’s works, but it was well-known to subsequent generations of Pāli writers.⁴³ Dhammapāla, who was conversant with this discussion and the relevant Sanskrit grammatical literature, as appears from his *ṭīkā*, is evidently embarrassed by the implications of Buddhaghosa’s criticism and tries to avoid them by claiming that Buddhaghosa only refers to Pāṇini’s definition of the usage of the absolute suffix in general terms (*yebhuyyena*), whereas in the present case the term “*paṭicca*” can only be interpreted as expressing an action that is simultaneous with the action expressed by “*samuppāda*”.⁴⁴

yathā: snātvā bhūṅkta iti. na cāsau pūrvam utpādāt kaścīd asti, yaḥ praṭīyottarakālam utpadyate. na cāpy akartṛkāsti kriye ti, AkBhāṣ 454,1-4.

⁴²Cf.: *vyādāya svapīṭīty upasaṃkhyānam apūrvakālatvāt, vārt. 5 ad loc. Vasubandhu refers to this vārttika in his reply to the grammarians: sahabhāve ’pi ca ktvāsti dīpaṃ prāpya tamo gatam; āsyaṃ vyādāya śete vā, paścāc cet kiṃ na saṃvṛte, AkBhāṣ 455,7-8. Cf. Vism-sn p. 1254,12: dīpaṃ prāpya tamo vigacchati.*

⁴³Cf. the following passage from Mahānāma’s [first half of the sixth century A.D.] commentary on Paṭis: *nimittaṃ paṭisaṅkhā nāṇaṃ uppajjati* [Paṭis II 63,34-35], *kāmaṇ ca na paṭhamam jānitvā pacchā nāṇaṃ uppajjati; vohāravasena pana “mānaṇ ca paṭicca dhamme ca uppajjati manoviññāṇaṇ” ti ādīni viya evaṃ vuccati. Saddasatthavidū ’pi ca “ādiccaṃ pāpunītvā tamo vigacchati” ti ādīsu viya samānakāle ’pi imaṃ padaṃ icchanti* [= Paṭis-a 567,12-16 ad loc.]; for the reference to grammarians cf. the parallel passage from AkBhāṣ quoted supra.

⁴⁴Cf.: *samāne kattarī ti ekasmiṃ yeva kattarī uppajjanakiriyāya yo kattā, tasmim yeva paccayanakiriyāya ca katubhūte ti attho. yathā “nhatvā bhūṅjati; bhutvā*

It would be interesting to know whether Buddhaghosa relied on Sanskrit sources for the elaborate discussion of “*paṭiccasamuppāda*” in Chapter 17 of *Visuddhimagga*, which from a doctrinal point of view is one of the most complex sections of the work. It is not unlikely, but only a detailed investigation of the chapter as a whole will make it possible to reach a conclusion on this point.

The present context is sufficient to conclude that the references to grammar and grammarians in *Visuddhimagga* clearly indicate that

sayati” ti. *pubbakāle ti idaṅ ca tvā-saddānaṃ padānaṃ yebhuyyena purimakālakiriyāya dīpanato vuttam. na idha paṭiccasaddassa purimakālatthattā. evaṅ hi “cakkhuṃ paṭiccā” ti nidassanavacanaṃ nidassitabbena saṃsandeyya. atha vā, kāmaṅ c’ ettha ubhinnaṃ kiriyānaṃ samakālatā uppajjanakiriyāya pubbe paccayanakiriyāya asambhavato. tathā pi phalakiriyāya hetukiriyā purimakālo viya voharituṃ yuttā evam ettha hetuphalavavathhānaṃ supākataṃ hotī ti upacārasiddhaṃ purimakālaṃ gahetvā vuttaṃ pubbakāle ti. atthasiddhikaro ti vākyatthapaṭivivāṅattikaro. paṭiccasamuppādo ti hi ettha vākyatthāvabodho idha atthasiddhī ti adhippeto. payujjamāno paṭiccasaddo uppādasaddena vuccamānassa samānassa kattu abhāvato ti padaṃ ānetvā yojetabham. ayaṅ h’ ettha attho “cakkhuṃ ca paṭicca rūpe ca uppajjati cakkhuvivāṅānaṃ” ti ādisu paccayanakiriyāya, uppajjanakiriyāya ca vivāṅānaṃ eva kattā ti samānakattujatā labbhati. paṭiccasamuppādo ti ettha pana uppādasaddassa bhāvasādhanatāya kiriyā va vuttā ti samānakattulakkhaṇo saddappayogo na sambhavatī ti. tenāha “saddabhedam gacchati” ti. apasaddappayogo hotī ti attho. na c’ ettha parāparayogo [≠ Pāṇ III 4 20] “appavā nadim pabbato, atikamma pabbataṃ naṭī” ti ādisu viya; nāpi lakkhanahetuādīpayogo “siham disvā bhayaṃ hoti, ghaṭaṃ pivitvā balaṃ jāyate, ‘dhan’ ti katvā daṇḍo patito” ti ādisu viya. n’ ev’ ettha saddabhedo. na hi hatthatale āmalakaṃ viya sabbaññeyyaṃ paccakkham katvā ṭhitānaṃ mahesinaṃ vacane akkharacintakānaṃ vippalāpo avasaraṃ labhati. labhatu, vākyatthena saddasiddhito “nhatvā gamanaṃ, bhuvā sayanaṃ” ti ādisu viyā ti. evam pi na ca kiñci atthaṃ sādheti. yadi pi paccakaṃ padattho labbhati, vākyatthe pana na yujjati, tasmā dasadādimādivākyāni viya asambandhatthatāya niratthakaṃ hotī ti adhippāyo [Vism-mhṭ Be 1960 II 231,18–232,17 ad loc.]; cf. also ibid. p. 238,1-4: *samānakāle tva: andhakāraṃ nihantvāra, udito ’yaṃ dipākaro ... keci pana “mukhaṃ byādāya sayati”*, which is an echo of the discussion in *AkKhāṣ*, for which v. note 42 supra.*

Buddhaghosa was conversant with the Sanskrit grammatical tradition, which in all likelihood is identical with Pāṇinian grammar. This conclusion is furthermore corroborated by the evidence found in the *aṭṭhakathās* ascribed to Buddhaghosa. In the following a number of references to grammar and grammarians found in these works will be analysed.

Samantapāsādikā

1 [Sp 204,25–32 ad Vin III 13,5–6]

In the Vinaya passage which Buddhaghosa comments upon: *na tvam tāta Sudinna kiñci dukkhassa jānāsī ti*, it would seem natural to construe *na ... kiñci jānāsī* with *dukkhassa*, in the sense: “you, good Sudinna, know nothing of misery”.⁴⁵ This is apparently what he had in mind, as is evident from the following paraphrase: *tvam tāta Sudinna kiñci appamattakam pi kalabhāgaṃ dukkhassa na jānāsī*: “you, good Sudinna, know nothing, i.e., not even the slightest fraction of a fraction, of misery”. But in addition to this straightforward exegesis, he offers two more complex alternative interpretations of the clause:

athavā kiñci dukkhena nānubhosī ti attho: karaṇatthe sāmivacanam anubhavanatthe ca jānanā. athavā kiñci dukkham na sarasī ti attho: upayogatthe svāmivacanam saraṇatthe ca jānanā. vikappadvaye pi purimapadassa uttarapadena samānavibhattilopo

⁴⁵This interpretation presupposes that *kiñci* is used substantivally and is to be construed with *dukkhassa*. It is, of course, also possible to construe *kiñci* adverbially, in which case *dukkhassa* has to be construed with *jānāsī* in the sense suggested by Buddhaghosa in the following.

*daṭṭhabbo. taṃ sabbam saddasatthānusārena
nātabbam.*

Either the meaning is: “you do not suffer from any misfortune”, the genitive (*sāmivacanam*) being used in the sense of the instrumental (*karaṇatthe*) and √*jñā* in the sense of “experiencing, suffering” (*anubhavanatthe*), or the meaning is: “you do not remember any misfortune”, the genitive being used in the sense of the accusative (*upayogatthe*) and √*jñā* in the sense of “remembering, recalling” (*saraṇatthe*). In either alternative (*vikappadvaye*), however, one should take into consideration that the case morpheme which the preceding word (*purimapadassa = kiñci*) has in common with the subsequent word (*uttarapadena = dukkhassa*) is elided (*samānavibhattilopo*). All this should be known in accordance with grammar (*saddasatthānusārena*).

According to this interpretation, it is obvious that *kiñci* becomes difficult to construe unless it is assumed that it is in agreement with *dukkhassa*. Buddhaghosa therefore postulates that *kiñci* is actually in agreement with *dukkhassa*, when it is assumed that *kiñci = kassaci* because the genitive case morpheme which indicates the agreement has been elided from *kiñci*.

It has not been possible to find any justification in traditional Indian grammar for adding supposedly elided case morphemes in the way suggested by Buddhaghosa, but the grammar which justifies his interpretation of √*jñā* constructed with the genitive in the sense indicated above can easily be identified. In both cases it is based on the application of two Pāṇini sūtras. The first alternative is undoubtedly based on Pāṇ II

3 [50+] 51: *jñō 'vidarthasya karaṇe*: the verb $\sqrt{jñā}$, when not used in the sense of “to know”, is constructed with the genitive in the sense of the instrument *kāraṇa*.⁴⁶ The second is based on the subsequent sūtra Pāṇ II 3 [50+] 52: *adhīgarthadayeśāṃ karmaṇi*: verbs, when used in the sense of “remembering” [cf. sa-Dhātup II 38] ... , are constructed with the genitive in the sense of the object *kāraṇa*.⁴⁷

There is no reason to doubt that the grammar (*saddasattha*) Buddhaghosa refers to is identical with Pāṇinian grammar. But the grammatical source which justifies *samānavibhattilopo* remains unknown. If there were any identifiable grammatical tradition justifying *samānavibhattilopo* in the way suggested by Buddhaghosa, it is unlikely that an eminent scholar like Sāriputta would have failed to identify it. Under such circumstances the possibility cannot be excluded that it represents Buddhaghosa's own contribution to the grammatical analysis of the Pāli. Sāriputta corroborates, however, the assumption of Pāṇinian grammar as Buddhaghosa's main source through implicit references to *Kāśikā* ad loc.⁴⁸

⁴⁶Cf. *Kāś* ad loc.: *jānāter avidarthasyājñānārthasya karaṇe kāraṇe ṣaṣṭhī vibhaktir bhavati: sarpiṣo jānīte; madhuno jānīte.*

⁴⁷Cf. *Kāś* ad loc.: *adhīgarthāḥ smaraṇārthāḥ ... eteṣāṃ karmaṇi kāraṇe ṣeṣatvena vivakṣite ṣaṣṭhī vibhaktir bhavati ... mātuḥ smarati.*

⁴⁸Cf. Sāriputta ad loc.: *yadā jānāti-saddo bodhanattho na hoti, tadā tassa payoge “sappino jānāti, madhuno jānāti” ti ādisu viya karaṇatthe sāmivacanāṃ saddasatthavidū icchanti ti āha: “kiñci ... pe ... ” ti. tenāha: “karaṇa-° ... pe ... ” ti. ettha ca “kiñci ... pe ... ” ti kenaci dukkhena karaṇabhūtena visayaṃ nānubhosī ti evam attho veditabbo. “kiñci” ti etthāpi hi karaṇatthe sāmivacanassa lopo kato. ten' eva ca vakkhati “vikappa-° ... pe ... ” ti. yadā pana jānāti-saddo saraṇattho hoti, tadā saraṇatthānaṃ dhātusaddānaṃ payoge mātu sarati, pitu sarati, bhātu jānāti ti ādisu viya upayogatthe sāmivacanāṃ saddasatthavidū vadanti ti āha: “athavā ... pe ... ” ti. kassaci dukkhassa ananubhūtattā attanā anubhūtaṃ appamattakam pi dukkhaṃ pariyesamāno pi abhāvato yeva na sarati ti attho. “vikappadvaye pi” ti anubhavana-saraṇatthavasena vutte dutiyatīyavikappadvaye. “purimapaḍassā” ti = kiñci ti paḍassa. “uttarapadenā” ti dukkhassā ti padena. “samānavibhattilopo” ti*

2 [Sp 209,27–210,1 ad Vin III 16,5]

After having quoted the passage in question: *atthi nāma tāta Sudinna ābhidosikaṃ kummāsaṃ paribhuñjissasī ti*: “Is it possible, dear Sudinna, that you are eating last evening’s barley-gruel?”, Buddhaghosa continues:

*akkharacintakā pan’ ettha imaṃ lakkhaṇaṃ vadanti:
anokappanāmarisanatthavasena etaṃ atthi-nāma-sadde*
[so read for Ee *atthi nāma sadde*] *upapade*
paribhuñjissasī ti anāgatavacanāṃ kataṃ. tassāyaṃ
attho: atthi nāma — pe — paribhuñjissasī ti idaṃ
paccakkhaṃ pi ahaṃ na saddahāmi, na marisayāmi [so
read with v.l. for Ee *parisayāmi*] *ti*.

In this case, moreover, the grammarians (*akkharacintakā*), set forth the following rule (*lakkhaṇaṃ*): according to whether the meaning is that something is not likely to take place, or is not to be tolerated (*anokappanāmarisanatthavasena*), the future *paribhuñjissasī* is employed, when the expression “is it possible?” is a sentence complement (*atthi-nāma-sadde upapade*). The meaning of the [sentence] “Is it possible...?” is as follows: “I do not believe it, even though it is evident, nor do I tolerate it”.

uttarapadenasamānassa sāmivacanassa lopo. kassaci dukkhassā ti vattabbe
vikappaadvaye pi purimapade sāmivacanassa lopaṃ katvā kiñci dukkhassā ti
niddeso kato [Sp-ṭ Be 1960 II 4,17–5,6].

In this grammatical analysis, Buddhaghosa focuses on a syntactical peculiarity of the sentence complement (*upapada*) “*atthi*”, which systematically requires construction with the future tense, whereas, from a semantical point of view, the implied tense in such a context is to be interpreted as present.⁴⁹ The grammarians mentioned by Buddhaghosa in this case are undoubtedly identical with the Pāṇinians since the analysis is based on Pāṇ III 3 [145+] 146: *kiṃkilāstyarthesu lṛṭ*: the future (denoted *lṛṭ*) is used when [the words] “how comes it?” (*kiṃkila*) or [the words] meaning “is it possible?” (*asti*) [are syntactically constructed with it, and the action is either not likely to take place, or not to be tolerated].⁵⁰

3 [Sp 288,12–15 ad Vin III 42,13–14]

kathaṃ hi nāma so bhikkhave moghapuriso sabbamattikāmayam kuṭikaṃ karissatī [= Vin III 42,13–14] ti idaṃ atītatthe anāgatavacanam akāsi ti vuttam hoti; tassa lakkhaṇam saddasatthato pariyesitabham.

With regard to the [sentence]: “How can it be, monks, that this foolish man has made a hut out of nothing

⁴⁹As noted by Sāriputta in his comment, the usage of the future tense in a construction like this is exclusively present in meaning. Cf. his commentary ad loc.: *anokappanāmarisanatthavasenā ti ettha anokappanam asaddahanam. amarisanam asahanam. anāgatavacanam anāgatasaddappayoge. attho pana vat-tamānakāliko va. tenāha “paccakkham pi” ti. na marisayāmi ti na visahāmi [Sp-ṭ Be 1960 II 9,1-3].*

⁵⁰Cf. Kāś ad loc.: *anavakḷptamarṣayoḥ iti vartate. ... kiṃkilāstyarthesu upapadesu anavakḷptamarṣayoḥ dhātoḥ lṛṭ pratyayo bhavati. ... asti nāma tatrabhavān vṛṣalam yājayisyati. ... na śraddadhe, na marṣayāmi.*

mud?”, it is explained that the future (*anāgatavacanam*) is used in the sense of the past (*atītatthe*); the rule (*lakḥhanam*) for this should be sought in grammar (*saddasatthato*).

The intention of this note is to explain why the future is used in preference to the tense required by the actual time [= past time] of the action referred to. In the present case Buddhaghosa refers to Pāṇ III 3 [142+] 144: *kiṃvṛtte liṅlṛtau*: “the [inflections] of the potential mood (*liṅ*) and the future (*lṛt*) are used when [interrogative pronouns like] ‘*kiṃ*’ occur [as a sentence complement, the meaning implied by the sentence being that of ‘censure’]”.⁵¹

One would have expected Buddhaghosa to refer to Pāṇ III 3 [142+] 143: *vibhāṣā kathami liṅ ca*: the [inflections] of the potential mood (*liṅ*) [as well as the inflections of the present tense (*laṭ*)] are optionally used, when [the word] “*katham*” [is used as a sentence complement, the meaning implied by the sentence being that of “censure”].⁵² There are in fact quite a number of instances in the Vin where “*katham*” is constructed with the potential mood, but they are not commented upon by Buddhaghosa.⁵³ It is possible, however, that he reinterpreted the scope of Pāṇ III 3 144 in order to find a grammatical justification for the usage in the Pāli, which in this case deviates from the usage described by Pāṇini. Sāriputta’s commentary on this passage in Sp

⁵¹Cf. Kās ad loc.: *kiṃvṛtte upapade garhāyāṃ gamyamānāyāṃ dhātoḥ liṅlṛtau pratyayau bhavataḥ. sarvalakārāṇāṃ apavādaḥ. liṅgrahaṇam laṭo ’parigrahārtham.*

⁵²Cf. Kās ad loc.: *kathami upapade garhāyāṃ gamyamānāyāṃ dhātoḥ liṅ pratyayo bhavati, cakārāl laṭ ca. vibhāṣāgrahaṇam yathāsvaṃ kālaviṣaye vihitānāṃ abādhanārtham.*

⁵³Cf.: *katham hi nāma mādiso samaṇam vā brāhmaṇam vā vijite vasantaṃ haneyya vā badheyya vā pabbājeyya vā, Vin III 44,15-17.*

shows that he identified the reference to *saddasattha* with Pāṇ III 3 144.⁵⁴

4 [Sp 296,13–14 ad Vin III 44,19]

Once again Buddhaghosa focuses on a question of semantics: the meaning of \sqrt{pac} . The term *vipācenti* which he comments upon in this case is found in the following passage: *manussā ujjhāyanti khīyanti vipācenti: “alajjino ime samaṇā sakyaputtiyā ... ”* [= Vin III 44,19 foll.]. He writes:

*vipācentī ti vitthārikam karonti, sabbattha pattharanti;
ayañ ca attho saddasathānusārena veditabbo.*

“*vipācenti*” means: they disseminate far and wide, they report in detail everywhere. The meaning, moreover, should be known according to grammar.

Grammar in this case is, as in the previous examples from Vism, in all probability identical with sa-Dhātup. Cf. sa-Dhātup X 109: *paci vistāravacane*.⁵⁵

⁵⁴Cf. Sāriputta ad loc.: *saddasatthavidūhi kiṃsaddayoge anāgatavacanassa icchitattā vuttam “tassa lakkhaṇam saddasatthato pariyesitabban” ti* [Sp-ṭ Be 1960 II 117,14-16].

⁵⁵Cf. Sadd 528,26: *paci vitthāre*.

5 [Sp 480,26–481,6 ad Vin III 88,2–4]

The problem which Buddhaghosa addresses this time is how to interpret the past participle “*bhāsito*” which occurs in the following passage:

*eso yeva kho āvuso seyyo yo amhākaṃ gihīnaṃ
aññamaññassa uttarimanussadhammassa vaṇṇo
bhāsito ti.*

The best thing, friends, is if we speak to householders in praise of one another’s superhuman properties.

It would seem natural in the present case to construe the genitive “*amhākaṃ*” [= the agent] with “*bhāsito*” used in the sense of the present tense.⁵⁶ If, however, it is interpreted according to the absolute tense value of the past participle, and this is clearly how Buddhaghosa interprets the form, it would seem to be in contradiction to the context in which the enunciation occurs: the *Vajjī janapada* is suffering from the famine and the monks have difficulties in providing for themselves. Therefore they decide to speak in praise of one another’s spiritual attainments in order to ingratiate themselves with householders, hoping that they, on those grounds, will provide for them. Since the context makes it impossible to interpret “*bhāsito*” as referring to the past, Buddhaghosa suggests complementing the sentence in such a way that the intention becomes unambiguous. He writes:

⁵⁶Cf. Pāṇ II 3 67: *ktasya ca vartamāne*: The past participle in *-ta* [is constructed with the genitive], when used in the sense of the present tense. Cf. also Pāṇ III 2 187-188; Pāṇ does not mention $\sqrt{bhāṣ}$ among the roots the pp. of which may be interpreted in the sense of the present tense. In Pāli, however, this usage seems to be extended to include other instances than those described by Pāṇini.

*anāgatasambandhe pana asati na etehi yo tasmim
khaṇe bhāsito 'va yasmā [CeBeSe so; Ee tasmā] na
yujjati, tasmā anāgatasambandhaṃ katvā yo evaṃ
bhāsito bhavissati so seyyo ti evaṃ ettha attho ved-
itabbo. lakkhaṇaṃ pana saddasatthato pariyesitabbaṃ.*

Since the [praise they] spoke at that moment would be unjustified, if there were no connection [of *bhāsito* = pp. of $\sqrt{bhās}$] with the future tense (*anāgatasambandhe pana asati*), by formulating a connection with the future tense, the meaning is in this case to be understood as follows: “the best thing would be if we spoke (*bhāsito bhavissati*) in such and such a way”. The rule, moreover, should be sought in grammar.

The rule to which Buddhaghosa refers here as a justification for complementing the verbal form *bhāsito* with the future form *bhavissati* [from $\sqrt{bhū}$], is found in Pāṇ III 4 1: *dhātusambandhe pratyayāḥ*: affixes are [valid in denoting a time other than the one for which they have been specifically enjoined] when they are used for [establishing] a relation between [the meanings of] the roots [in question].

The problem which Pāṇini addresses in this sūtra is that the usage of a particular suffix is generally restricted to the specific tense value that is attached to it. For instance, according to Pāṇ III 2 85 a word like “*agniṣṭomayājīn*” has a past tense value. It denotes a person who already has performed the *agniṣṭoma*. But in a sentence like “*agniṣṭomayājy asya putro janitā*”: “he shall have a son who will perform the *agniṣṭoma*”, a word with a past tense value (“*agniṣṭomayājīn*”) is construed with a word that has a future tense value (“*janitā*”). In such a case the future tense value of *janitā* takes precedence over the past tense value of

agniṣṭomayājin, which thus assumes a future value. The same is the case in a sentence like: *kṛtaḥ kaṭaḥ śvo bhavitā*: “the mat will be made tomorrow”. In this clause the future tense value of *bhavitā* takes precedence over the absolute tense value of the past participle *kṛtaḥ*.⁵⁷

Here too, there is no reason for doubting that the grammar to which Buddhaghosa refers his readers is identical with Pāṇinian grammar. Sāriputta cannot have been in doubt since he quotes the sūtra in question. In addition he presents a slightly edited quotation from the Kāśikā.⁵⁸

6 [Sp 500,18–20 ad Vin III 95,3]

ukkhēṭito [= Vin III 95,3] *ti idaṃ ariyamaggena uttāsitattā ... svāyam attho saddasatthatato pariyesitabbo.*

The expression “scared” [*ukkhēṭito*] is used because he is scared of the Noble Path. ... The meaning is to be sought in grammar.

Here Buddhaghosa is concerned with the meaning of *ut + √khiṭ*. In this case too, grammar is probably identical with sa-Dhātup. Cf. sa-

⁵⁷Cf. Kāś ad loc.: *dhātvarthānaṃ sambandho viśeṣaṇaviśeṣyabhāvaḥ. tasmin sati ayathākāloktā api pratyayāḥ sādhave bhavanti. ... kṛtaḥ kaṭaḥ śvo bhavitā. ... tatra bhūtaḥ kālaḥ bhaviṣyatkālena abhisambadhyamānaḥ sādhu bhavati. viśeṣaṇaṃ guṇatvād viśeṣyakālaṃ anurudhyate, tena viparyayo na bhavati.*

⁵⁸Cf.: “*anāgatasambandhe pana asatī*” *ti bhāsito bhavissatī ti pāṭhasesaṃ katvā anāgatasambandhe asati. bhāsito ti atītavacanaṃ kathaṃ anāgatavacanena sambandham upagacchati ti āha* “*lakkhaṇaṃ pana saddasatthato pariyesitabban*” *ti. idise hi thāne “dhātusambandhe paccayā”* [= Pāṇ III 4 1] *ti iminā lakkhaṇena dhātvatthasambandhe asati ayathākālavihitā pi paccayā sādhave santi* [≠ Kāś ad Pāṇ III 4 1] *ti saddasatthavidū vadanti* [Sp-ṭ Be 1960 II 278,21-26 ad loc.].

Dhātup I 324: *khiṭ trāse*. This assumption is corroborated by Sāriputta’s *tīkā ad loc.*⁵⁹

7 [Sp 584,16–21 ad Vin III 163,21,30]

It is not clear how we are to interpret Buddhaghosa’s reference to grammar (*saddalakkhaṇam*) in this case. The two words he comments upon (*duṭṭho doso*) occur in the following passage: *yo pana bhikkhu bhikkhum duṭṭho doso appatīto ... anuddhamseyya*: “whatever monk, offended, indignant⁶⁰, and ill-tempered, would defame a monk ... ” [= Vin III 163,21–22]. The *niddesa* presents the following gloss on the two words: *duṭṭho doso ti kupīto anattamano anabhiraddho āhatacitto khilajāto* [= Vin III 163,30–31], but this gloss obviously does not clarify the question of how to construe them. The past participle *duṭṭho* [from $\sqrt{duṣ}$] presents no problem, but *doso* does. In this particular context it can only be interpreted as an adjective which in meaning is related to, if not synonymous with, *duṭṭho* and derived from the same root.⁶¹ This, apparently, is also the view of Buddhaghosa, who seems to interpret *doso* as a derivative of the causative stem of $\sqrt{duṣ}$:

“*duṭṭho doso*” *ti, dūsito c’ eva dūsako ca, uppanne hi dose puggalo tena dosenā dūsito hoti: pakatibhāvaṃ*

⁵⁹Cf.: *khiṭasaddaṃ saddasatthavidū uttāsatthe paṭhantī ti āha* “*svāyam attho saddasatthataṭṭo pariyesitabbo*” *ti* [Sp-ṭ Be 1960 II 290,19-20]; Sadd 352,11: *khiṭa uttrāsane*.

⁶⁰The translation is tentative. It is obvious from the context that corrupted and corrupting are too strong; *doso* is probably used epeexegetically of *duṭṭho* in order to show that it does not mean corrupted, but rather indignant and upset, which the context would seem to support.

⁶¹In Pāli *dosa* normally occurs as a noun. This passage is the only recorded instance in the canon where it would seem necessary to interpret *dosa* as an adjective.

jahāpito, tasmā duṭṭho ti vuccati. parañ ca dūseti vināseti, tasmā doso ti vuccati. iti duṭṭho doso ti. ekass' ev' etam puggalassa dassitam [v.l. nidassanam], tena vuttam duṭṭho doso ti dūsito c' eva dūsako cā ti. tattha saddalakkhaṇam pariyesitabham.

“Offended, offending”, that is, “one who is both offended and one who offends (*dūsito c' eva dūsako ca*)”. Because (*hi*), when an offence has taken place (*uppanne dose*), a person is offended on account of this offence, that is, he is shocked (*pakatibhāvaṃ jahāpito*), therefore he is called “offended”. And because he causes another [person] to be offended and frustrated therefore he is called “offending”. Hence (*iti*) [the words] “offended, offending”. This is used as an illustration of a single person according to the difference in his behaviour (*ākāranānattena*). Therefore it is said [above]: “offended, offending”, that is, “one who is both offended and one who offends”. One should consult grammar (*saddalakkhaṇam*) on this point.

The question is whether Buddhaghosa actually wants his reader to refer to grammar for information on the derivation and meaning of *duṭṭha* and *doso*. It is clear that his purpose is to show that the two terms are mutually opposed, in the sense that one (*duṭṭha*) is intransitive (*kammasādhana*), whereas the other (*doso*) is transitive (*kattusādhana*), which, of course, is reflected in their respective meanings. This is also the way in which Sāriputta understands Buddhaghosa. But in addition he points out that the reason why Buddhaghosa says that a person who is *dūsito* is one who is shocked, is because \sqrt{dus} is read [in the Dhātupāṭha]

in the sense of alteration (*vikatīyaṃ paṭhitattā*).⁶² This remark seems to point to the fact that we are dealing with yet another reference to sa-Dhātup, which in view of the other references to sa-Dhātup is likely to be true. In that case it must be a reference to sa-Dhātup IV 76: *duṣa vaikṛtye*.

8 [Sp 770,33–37 ad Vin IV 38,2–3]

The last instance of explicit reference to grammar in Buddhaghosa's *Samantapāsādikā* is presumably also to sa-Dhātup. In this case it is to the meaning of the root *ut* + *√jhe* (= sa. *√dhyā*). The passage in which the form occurs presents no problem; it represents one of the stereotypes that are often met with in the *Nikāyas*.

ujjhāpentī [= Vin IV 38,2–3; this reading is recorded as a variant by the ct., which reads *ujjhāyanti*]; *Dabbam Mallaputtam bhikkhū ujjhāyanti ... tam āyasmantaṃ tehi bhikkhūhi avajānāpentī avaññāya olokāpentī lāmakato vā cintāpentī ti attho. lakkhaṇaṃ pan' ettha saddasatthānusārena veditabbaṃ.*

The definition (*lakkhaṇaṃ*) is this time found in sa-Dhātup I 957: *dhyai cintāyāṃ*. The identification is, if Sāriputta is correct, confirmed by his explicit reference to the Dhātupāṭha, with the remark

⁶²Cf. *dūsito ti duṭṭhasaddassa kammaśādhanaṃ dasseti. dūsayati paraṃ vināseti ti dūsako; iminā dūsayati ti doso ti dosasaddassa kattusādhanaṃ vuttā. "pakatibhāvaṃ jahāpito" ti dusasaddassa vikatīyaṃ paṭhitattā vuttaṃ* [Sp-ṭ Be 1960 II 347,15-18 ad loc.].

that, since verbal roots have multiple meanings, the root \sqrt{jhe} has also the meaning of “looking down upon”.⁶³

Sumaṅgalavilāsini

1 [Sv 43,13–15 ad D I 2,9]

In this short passage Buddhaghosa comments upon the expression “*acchariyaṃ āvuso*”. The subject matter is the etymology of the word *acchariya*. First he presents the grammatical derivation (*saddanaya*) which he subsequently contrasts with the etymological derivation presented by the Aṭṭhakathās (*aṭṭhakathānaya*). The *saddanaya* is explained in this way:

*tattha andhassa pabbatārohanaṃ viya niccaṃ na hotī ti
acchariyaṃ. ayaṃ tāva saddanayo.*⁶⁴

In this case *acchariyaṃ* means something unusual (*na ... niccaṃ*), like for instance a blind man who goes mountain climbing. This, in the first place, is the grammatical derivation⁶⁵.

⁶³Cf. *tatiye dhātupāṭhe jhesaddo cintāyaṃ paṭhito ti āha “lāmakato vā cintāpentī” ti ādi. ayaṃ eva ca anekatthattā dhātūnaṃ olokanattho pi hotī ti daṭṭhabbaṃ* [Sp-ṭ Be 1960 III 24,17-19 ad loc.].

⁶⁴Cf. Mp I 113,11-13 ad *acchariyamanusso*.

⁶⁵Cf. *saddasatthaṃ anugato nayo saddanayo. tattha hi anabhiṇhavuttike acchariyosaddo icchito. ten’ ev’ āha “andhassa pabbatārohanaṃ viyā” ti* [Sv-pt I 67,17-18 ad loc.].

The *saddanaya* to which Buddhaghosa refers here is in all likelihood identical with Pāṇ VI 1 147: *āścaryam anitye*: the word ‘*āścaryam*’ [is formed with the augment *suṭ* = *s-*] in the sense of something unusual.⁶⁶

2 [Sv 245,16–19 ad D 1 87,7–8]

In this case Buddhaghosa selects the following clause for a grammatical comment: *Ukkaṭṭhaṃ ajjhāvasatī ti*, and continues:

*upasaggavasen’ ettha bhummatthe upayogavacanam
veditabbaṃ ... tath’ [Ee tath’] eva lakkhaṇam [CeBe
so; Ee na-] saddasatthato [so read with v.l. and Sv-ṭ]
pariyesitabbaṃ.*

In the present case it should be understood that the accusative, because of the preposition, is used in the sense of the locative. ... The rule for this should be sought in grammar.⁶⁷

The definition which Buddhaghosa has in mind in this case is Pāṇ I 4 [45+46+] 48: *upānvadhyān vasaḥ*: [the place of the action] of

⁶⁶Cf. *anityatayā viṣayabhūtayā adbhutatvam iha upalakṣyate, tasminn āścaryam nipātyate* [Kāś ad loc.].

⁶⁷Cf.: “*saddasatthato pariyesitabban*” *ti etena saddalakkhaṇānuyogato vāyam saddapayogo ti dasseti. upa, anu, adhi, ā iti evampubbake vasanakiriyādhāre upayogavacanam eva pāpuṇātī ti hi saddavidū icchanti* [Sv-ṭ Be 1960 I 376,5–9]. For an identical analysis cf. Ps III 414,24–26 ad M II 164,6.

√*vas*, when preceded by [the prepositions] *upa*, *anu*, *adhi*, and *ā* [is called “*karma*” (= the object *kāraka*)].⁶⁸

3 [Sv 481,3–5 ad D II 55,3]

Even though Buddhaghosa does not explicitly refer to grammarians or to grammar in this concise explanation of an apparent grammatical anomaly, there is good reason for including it among the examples of his references to grammar. Firstly, Buddhaghosa contrasts this explanation with the subsequent explanation of the Aṭṭhakathācariyas. Judging from the way in which he normally contrasts the views of the grammarians on points of grammar with the views represented by the Aṭṭhakathās, one can assume that his explanation is based on the views of the grammarians. Secondly, in his *ṭīkā*, Dhammapāla expressly identifies Buddhaghosa’s grammatical analysis with the opinion of the grammarians (*akkharacintakā*).

*tatrāyam anuttānapadavaṇṇanā. Kurūsu viharatī ti,
Kurū nāma jānapadino rājakumārā, tesam nivāso eko
pi janapado rūḷhisaddena Kurū ti vuccati: tasmim
Kurūsu janapade.*⁶⁹

In this case the following explanation is dealing with an obscure word. “Was dwelling in the Kuru state”:
[the plural form] *Kurū* denotes those citizens who are descendants of the ruling class [of the state]. Although

⁶⁸Cf. Kās ad loc.: *upa, anu, adhi, ā ity evaṃpūrvasya vasater ādhāro yaḥ, tat kārakam karmasañjñam bhavati*. Sv-pt ad loc. would seem to represent a slightly edited version of Kās. Cf. note 67 supra.

⁶⁹Qu. Ps I 225,4-6; Cf. the identical passages in Sv 279,4-7 ad D I 111,2: *Aṅgesu*; 294,4-6 ad D I 127,2: *Magadhesu* and 672,3-8 ad D II 253,3: *Sakkesu*.

their habitation is singular, their state is denoted by the conventional term “*Kurū* [in the plural]”. [Consequently the loc. pl. “*kurūsu*” means] “in the Kuru state”.

The grammatical problem which Buddhaghosa briefly identifies and explains is the fact that the plural form “*Kurū*”, which actually denotes the descendants of the ruling class of a certain state, is used as the name of this state. Since the state as such is confined to a specific territory, one would expect it to be denoted by a noun in the singular. Moreover, when the words “*Kurū*” and “*janapada*” are used in apposition there is no syntactical agreement between them. The reason is, as Buddhaghosa explains, that the usage of the word “*Kurū*” is determined by convention (*rūḥisadda*), which in the present case means that usage takes precedence over the general rules of syntactical agreement.

Buddhaghosa’s source in this case is no doubt Pāṇinian grammar. In his *ṭīkā*, Dhammapāla quotes (in slightly edited Pāli versions) two sūtras in which Pāṇini refers to certain views on grammatical derivation, the necessity and validity of which he is questioning later on.

The first sūtra quoted by Dhammapāla is Pāṇ I 2 51⁷⁰: *lupi yuktavad vyaktivacane*⁷¹: In the case where [a *taddhita* affix] is elided [provided that the elision is denoted by “*lup*”], the gender and number [of the derivative from which they are elided] are the same as when they are

⁷⁰Cf. Sv-ṭṭ II 103,6-7 (Ee is utterly confused): *akkharacintakā hi idisesu thānesu yutte viya* [so read with Be (= sa. *yuktavat*); Ee *suttasu*; cf. v.ll.] *idisaṅgavacanāni* [so read with Be; Ee *viliṅga-*; cf. v.ll.] *icchanti*. In this quote Dhammapāla is replacing the archaic *vyakti* with *liṅga*.

⁷¹Cf. *vyaktiḥ = strīpumnapuṃsakāni*. *vacanam = ekatvadvitvabahutvāni*. *Pañcālāḥ = kṣatriyāḥ puṃliṅgā bahuvacanaṅviśayāḥ*. *teṣaṃ nivāso janapadaḥ*. *yathā teṣu kṣatriyeṣu vyaktivacane tadvaj janapade bhavataḥ*: *Pañcālāḥ, Kuravaḥ* [Kāś ad loc.].

joined [to the original word]. The purpose of this sūtra is to explain why certain words that are considered to be derivatives retain the gender and number of the word from which they are derived. For example, the word *Pañcālāḥ* is masculine plural, but applies to a single *janapada*.

The second sūtra quoted by Dhammapāla is the subsequent sūtra 52: *viśeṣaṇānām cājateḥ*.⁷² The underlying intention of this rule is to explain that terms which qualify such derivatives agree with them except when a qualifier is a class term, e.g. *janapada*, in which case the class term is used in the singular, whereas an additional qualifier agrees with the latter.⁷³

Finally, Dhammapāla might also have been expected to quote Pāṇ IV 2 81: *janapade lup*: [the suffixes whose function is defined in IV 2 67-70] are elided [provided that the elision is denoted by “*lup*”] when [the dwelling-place that is denoted by the word] is a kingdom.⁷⁴

We cannot know, of course, whether Buddhaghosa was actually thinking of these Pāṇinian sūtras when he wrote his commentary. Dhammapāla may be right when he identifies Buddhaghosa’s source with Pāṇ I 2 51-52. But the possibility cannot be excluded that the actual sūtras Buddhaghosa had in mind were the following sūtras 53-55: *tad aśiṣyaṃ saṃjñāpramānatvāt. lubyogāprakhyanāt. yogapramāṇe ca tadabhāve ’darśanaṃ syāt*. In these sūtras Pāṇini explains why it is unnecessary to establish those complicated rules of derivation described in 51-52 in order to explain usages that in the final analysis are based on convention.⁷⁵

⁷²Cf. Sv-pt II 103,11-12: *tabbisesane janapadasadde jātisadde ekavacanam eva*.

⁷³Cf. *ajāteḥ iti kim ? Pañcālāḥ janapadaḥ ... jātyarthasya cāyaṃ yuktavadbhāva-pratiśedhaḥ. tena jātidvāreṇa yāni viśeṣaṇāni teṣāṃ api yuktavadbhāvo na bhavati: Pañcālāḥ janapado ramaṇīyo* [Kāś ad loc.].

⁷⁴Cf. *Pañcālānām nivāso janapado Pañcālāḥ* [Kāś ad loc.].

⁷⁵Cf. Kāś ad 55: *drśyate ca samprati vinaiva kṣatriyasambandhena janapadeṣu pañcālādiśabdāḥ, tato avasiyate nāyaṃ yoganimitakāḥ. kim tarhi rūḍhirūpeṇaiva tatra pravṛttaḥ*.

Papañcasūdanī

1 [Ps I 59,26–28 ad M I 6,27]

In this example Buddhaghosa comments upon the derivation of the city name Sāvattthī. He explains that it has this specific form because it is named after the ṛṣi Savattha who lived there.

*Sāvattthī ti Savatthassa isino nivāsaṭṭhānabhūtā nagarī, yathā Kākandī, Mākandī, [Ce v.l. adds Kosambī; Ee om., cf. Ps-pt] ti. evaṃ akkharacintakā.*⁷⁶

“Sāvattthī” is a city which has status as the place where the ṛṣi Savattha was living, as for example Kākandī and Mākandī. This is the opinion of the grammarians.

This reference is undoubtedly to Pāṇ IV 2 [67+] 69: *tasya nivāsah*: [when attached to a word the affix denoted “aṇ” and its substitutes mean] “dwelling-place of someone”, [the place being named after the person in question]. Buddhaghosa is probably also thinking of the preceding sūtra 68: *tena nirvṛttam*: [an affix attached to a word means] “constructed by someone”, [the place being named after the person in question]. The Kāśikā illustrates inter alia this rule with the following example: *Kuśāmbena nirvṛttā Kauśāmbī nagarī*. Dhammapāla probably

⁷⁶Qu. Pj I 110,15-18; Paṭis-a 532,16-18. Pj I adds after *Mākandī ti evaṃ ithilīṅgavasena Sāvattthī vuccati*. Cf. also Ud-a 55,13-16; Ps II 389,30-390,2 ad M I 320,26: *Kosambiyāṃ*.

has the same rule in mind in his *ṭīkā*.⁷⁷ There is no reference to *ṛṣi* in this particular context in the Pāṇinian tradition, but this, of course, does not exclude the assumption that Buddhaghosa is relying on Pāṇinian tradition for his interpretation.

⁷⁷Cf. *yathā Kākandī Mākandī Kosambī ti yathā Kākandassa isino nivāsattḥāne māpitā nagarī Kākandī, Mākandassa nivāsattḥāne māpitā Mākandī; Kusambassa nivāsattḥāne māpitā Kosambī ti vuccati. evaṃ Sāvathī ti dasseti* [Ps-pt I 140,15-18]; cf. Ps II 390,1-2: *Kusumbassa nāma isino assamato avidūre māpitattā ti pi eke.*

2 [Ps I 129,32–33 ad M I 24,1]

In this instance Buddhaghosa addresses the question of the function and meaning of word-repetition (*āmeṇḍita* = sa. *āmreḍita*) as it occurs in the clause: *abhikkantaṃ bho Gotama, abhikkantaṃ bho Gotama*. In order to define the various semantic properties of *āmeṇḍita*, he quotes the following verse:

*bhaye kodhe paṣaṃsāyaṃ turite kotūhalacchare
hāse soke paṣāde ca kare āmeṇḍitaṃ budho.*⁷⁸

An intelligent person should use word-repetition in the following meanings: [1] threat, [2] anger, [3] praise, [4] haste, [5] excitement, [6] wonder, [7] joy, [8] sorrow, and [9] satisfaction.⁷⁹

Even though Buddhaghosa does not refer to grammarians or grammar in this case, the grammatical interest attached to this verse is reason enough for including it among his grammatical references.

It has not been possible to identify the source used by Buddhaghosa. The possibility cannot be excluded, however, that the verse is a Pāli adaptation of a Sanskrit verse, in which case there is good reason to believe that it represents an old kośa fragment. The verse was adopted by the compiler of the *Abhidhānappadīpikā* [v. Abh 107] and shows a structural similarity with many of the verses that constitute *Abh.*⁸⁰

⁷⁸This verse is found in similar contexts in Sp 170,24–25; Sv 228,11–12 [cf. Sv-pt I 354,25 foll]; Mṃ II 105,25–26; Sadd 40,29.

⁷⁹For examples of the various usages of *āmeṇḍita*, cf. Sv-pt I 354,25–355,7.

⁸⁰For this Pāli dictionary, cf. Norman, *Pāli Literature* pp. 166–167; Franke, *Gramm.* pp. 65–83.

In any case, there is a clear relation between the various functions which the verse ascribes to *āmeṇḍita* and the corresponding definition of *āmreḍita* found in Pāṇ VIII 1 [2+] 8: *vākyâder āmantrit-asyâsūyâsammatikopakutsanabhartsaneṣu*: A vocative in the beginning of a clause is repeated in the following meanings: [1] envy, [2] praise, [3] anger, [4] blame, or [5] threat. It is evident from this sūtra that the set of definitions found in the verse quoted by Buddhaghosa merely represents an elaborate version of the Pāṇinian definition.

3 [Ps II 389,29–390,1–2 ad M I 320,27]

In this example Buddhaghosa comments upon the derivation of the city name Kosambī. This time he does not refer explicitly to the opinion of the grammarians, but since his comment is intimately connected in subject-matter with the preceding example there is no reason to doubt that he is presenting the views of the grammarians. In addition, the specific grammatical rules upon which his comment is based can easily be traced to Pāṇinian grammar.

tatha Kosambīyan ti evaṃnāmake nagare. tassa hi [so read with v.1.; Ee kira] nagarassa ārāmapokkharāṇiādisu tesu tesu ṭhānesu kosambarukkhā va ussannā ahesuṃ, tasmā Kosambī ti saṅkhaṃ agāmasi. Kusumbassa nāma isino assamato avidūre māpitattā ti pi eke.

In this case [the locative] “in Kosambī” means in a city thus named. Because there was an abundance of Kosamba trees in various places of this city such as in the parks and by the lotus ponds or the like, it was called Kosambī. Some [grammarians] are of the

opinion that [it is called Kosambī] because it was constructed not far from the hermitage of the ṛṣi Kusamba”.

There were apparently different views among grammarians about the correct derivation of Kosambī. Buddhaghosa therefore presents two alternative explanations, the first of which probably represents his own view. Both alternatives are based on two Pāṇini sūtras. In the first explanation he analyses Kosambī according to Pāṇ IV 2 67: *tad asminn astūti deśe tannāmnī*: [when attached to a word the affix denoted “aṇ” and its substitutes are used] in the sense of a place having such and such a name because such and such a thing is found in it. In the second explanation he presents the view of some scholars who apparently explained the derivation of Kosambī on the basis of Pāṇ IV 2 70: *adūrabhavaś ca*: and [lastly a place is named after whatever is found in its] vicinity.

Manorathapūraṇī

1 [Mp I 17,12–15 ad A I 1,7]

Buddhaghosa here focusses on the grammarians’ definition of the meaning of the suffix -u attached to the term bhikkhu [= sa. bhikṣu; derived from the desiderative root √bhikṣ]. He writes:

bhikkhavo ti āmantanâkâradīpanaṃ, tañ ca bhikkhaṇa-sīlatâdiguṇayogasiddhattā vuttaṃ; bhikkhaṇasīlatâ-guṇayutto pi hi bhikkhu, bhikkhaṇadhammatâguṇa-

*yutto pi bhikkhu, bhikkhane sādhu-kāritā-guṇayutto pī ti saddavidū maññanti.*⁸¹

The [vocative] “monks” is an encouragement in the form of an invitation (*āmantanākāradīpanam*), and this [encouragement] is used because they have acquired such attributes as the habit of begging, etc. For a mendicant is either one who is in possession of the attribute that consists of the habit of begging, or one who is in possession of the quality that consists of the nature of begging, or one who is in possession of the attribute that consists of skillfulness in begging. This is the opinion of the grammarians.

The grammarians to whom Buddhaghosa refers as his source for this grammatical analysis are definitely Pāṇinians. The three qualities (*sīlatā, dhammatā, sādhu-kāritā*) which he enumerates in order to define the scope of meaning of the term *bhikkhu* are identical with those mentioned in Pāṇ III 2 134: *ā kveḥ tacchīlataddharmatatsādhu-kāriṣu*: from this sūtra to sūtra 177 [the affixes that are being described are used] in the sense [of agents] having such a habit (*sīla*) or such a nature (*dharma*) or such a skill (*sādhu-kārin*). This rule covers Pāṇ III 2 168 where Pāṇini deals with derivatives from desiderative roots and inter alia *√bhikṣ*: *sanāśaṃsabhikṣa uḥ*.⁸² It is obvious that Buddhaghosa must have had both sūtras in mind when he wrote this grammatical comment.

⁸¹This text is also found in Ps I 13,29–33 and Spk II 1,19–2,3.

⁸²Cf. *sanantebhyo dhātubhyaḥ āśaṃser bhikṣeṣ ca tacchīlādiṣu karṣu uḥ pratyayo bhavati* [Kāś ad loc.].

2 [Mp III 76,15–20 ad A II 37,22–23]

In this case Buddhaghosa focusses on the usage of the preposition “*antarā*” in the following passage: *ekam samayaṃ Bhagavā antarā ca Ukkaṭṭhaṃ antarā ca Setabbyaṃ addhānamaggapaṭipanno hoti*: “Once Bhagavā was on his way between Ukkaṭṭhaṃ and Setabbyaṃ”. He continues:

*antarāsaddena pana yuttattā upayogavacanaṃ kataṃ. edisesu ca ṭhānesu akkharacintakā ‘antarā gāmaṃ ca nadiṃ ca yāti’ ti evaṃ ekam eva [v.l. ettha] antarāsaddaṃ payuñjanti, so dutiyapadena pi yojetabbo hoti, ayojyamāne upayogavacanaṃ na pāpuṇāti. idha pana yojetvā eva [v.l. evaṃ] vutto ti.*⁸³

Now the accusative is used because [Ukkaṭṭha and Setabbya] are construed with the word “between” (*antarā*). In such cases, however, the grammarians use the word “between” only once, as [e.g. in the following example]: he is on his way between the village and the river. The [word “*antarā*”] is surely to be construed with the second word, for if it were not construed [with it], the accusative would not obtain. And in the present case it is actually used in construction [with the second word].

⁸³ This text is also found in Sv 35,4-9; Ps II 188,26-30 (v.l.: *īdisesu hi ... ; payuñjanti*). Cf. Ud-a 110,5-9.

This argument is only understandable on the basis of Pāṇ II 3 [1+] 4: *antarāntareṇa yukte*: [a word] when constructed with *antarā* or *antareṇa* [stands in the accusative]. When constructed with two nouns the preposition *antarā* generally precedes and the conjunction *ca* is put after each noun.⁸⁴ This is the basic usage in Sanskrit. In Pāli the situation is slightly different, as appears from the example Buddhaghosa has chosen to comment upon. He was apparently struck by the fact that *antarā* is used twice in contrast to normal Sanskrit usage. But he seems to regard this anomaly as a redundant feature which only emphasises Pāṇini's description of the syntactical usage of *antarā*.

Conclusion

The relatively few instances where Buddhaghosa refers to grammar or grammarians fall into two distinct categories: grammatical references [a] with emphasis on syntactical, morphological and derivational problems, [b] with emphasis on questions of semantics.

In the case of [a] it has been shown that practically all the references can without great difficulty be traced to particular Pāṇinian sūtras. Although the possibility cannot be completely excluded that Buddhaghosa is referring to another grammar or grammatical system, it would seem extremely unlikely, in that the Pāṇinian source is well corroborated by the *ṭīkā*s. Buddhaghosa was obviously conversant with the Pāṇinian tradition as a whole since his references to such topics as the usage of the locative case in a causal sense [= *nimittasaptamī*],⁸⁵ are only understandable on the basis of Mahā-bh [+ *vārttikas*] ad Pāṇ II 3 36. Pāṇini does not himself address this usage in his grammar.

⁸⁴Cf.: *antarā tvāṃ ca māṃ ca kamaṇḍaluḥ ... yuktagrahaṇaṃ kim ? antarā Takṣaśīlāṃ ca Pāṭaliputraṃ Srughnasya prākārah* [Kāś ad loc.].

⁸⁵Cf. Sp 189,25; 727,20; 761,13.

In the case of [b] it is, of course, an open question whether Buddhaghosa actually refers to sa-Dhātup. There is good cause to believe that this is the case since it would be quite natural for him to make references to the collection of roots that was an indispensable part of the Pāṇinian grammatical system. It is, however, impossible to prove definitively that Buddhaghosa knew sa-Dhātup in its present form.

Buddhaghosa's references to grammar are not a pervasive feature in his works. Compared with the scope of his collected works they cannot, in fact, be considered an essential part of Buddhaghosa's scholarly work. But in the relatively few cases where he displays his skill as a grammarian and an interpreter, his analysis is always marked by a degree of sophistication that makes it reasonable to assume that the tradition about his elucidating the "ideas of Patañjali" (*Pātañjalīmata*)⁸⁶ in one night is founded on fact. *Pātañjalīmata* must be identical, in fact, not with the *yogasūtras* as Geiger assumed⁸⁷, but rather with the *Mahā-bh.*

Even though Buddhaghosa's references to grammar are relatively few and in several instances are applied in a way that leads one to assume that they represented a stock of grammatical explanations which he made use of in identical or analogous contexts, it is obvious that he must have assumed that the Buddhist scholars for whom he was writing were capable of identifying his references. Otherwise most of his grammatical analyses and statements about grammar would have been incomprehensible to them. Thus Buddhaghosa's references to grammar indirectly prove that the Sinhalese Buddhist scholars must have been conversant with Sanskrit and Sanskrit grammar.

It is, in fact, difficult to explain these references to Sanskrit grammar unless we assume that there was no clearly defined system of Pāli grammar in existence when Buddhaghosa was writing his

⁸⁶Cf. Mhv XXXVII 217.

⁸⁷Cf. Geiger, Mhv-Trsl. p. 23 no. 1.

commentaries. It appears from the way in which he often presents his analyses that they were conceived as a sort of complement to the explanations embodied in the aṭṭhakathās. In such instances the grammarians' statements are sometimes contrasted with the explanations of the aṭṭhakathās. This too seems to prove that there was no full-scale Pāli grammar available to Buddhaghosa as a reference work.

To conclude, it is highly unlikely that Buddhaghosa, whose respectful attitude towards the tradition is beyond doubt, would have failed to refer to such a work, had it been in existence. There is therefore no cogent reason for assuming that there ever existed a comprehensive Pāli grammar or grammatical system prior to Kaccāyana's grammar. The fact that this, in many ways remarkable, adaptation of the Kātantra is based on a Sanskrit grammar only underlines the dependence of the Pāli grammatical tradition on Sanskrit grammar.

In a subsequent article I shall analyse references to and fragments from Pāli grammars that were presumably written in the tradition of Kaccāyana's grammar, the importance of which is beyond doubt in the development of the Sinhalese Pāli grammatical tradition.

Copenhagen

Ole Holten Pind

THE STŪPA CULT AND THE EXTANT PĀLI VINAYA

One of the more curious things about the Pāli *Vinaya* as we have it is that it contains no rules governing the behaviour of monks in regard to *stūpas*. In this respect it is, among the various *Vinayas* that have come down to us, unique: “tous les *Vinayapiṭaka* ... à la seule exception du *Vinaya pāli*, contiennent”, according to A. Bareau, “d’intéressantes données concernant la construction et le culte des *stūpa*”.¹ Professor Bareau seems to see the absence of such “données” in the Pāli *Vinaya* as a function of the chronology of the compilation of the various *Vinayas*, and seems to suggest that the absence of such material in the Pāli *Vinaya* results from the relatively earlier date of the ‘closing’ of its compilation.² Gustav Roth explains the absence of such rules in the Pāli *Vinaya* in a somewhat different way: “The Pāli tradition apparently did not include such a section, as the compilers of the ancient Pāli canon were governed by a tradition according to which the construction and worship of a *stūpa* was the concern of laymen, and not of monks. Therefore, there was felt to be no need for a particular *stūpa*-section to be included in the *Khandhaka*-section of the Pāli *Vinaya*”.³ There is, however, a passage in a 12th Century Sinhalese *Katikāvata*, or monastic

¹ A. Bareau, “La construction et le culte des *stūpa* d’après les *vinayapiṭaka*”, *Bulletin de l’école française d’extrême-orient* 50 (1960) 229: my emphasis.

² Bareau, *Bulletin de l’école française d’extrême-orient* 50 (1960) 230; 267-68; 273-74.

³ G. Roth, “Symbolism of the Buddhist *Stūpa* according to the Tibetan Version of the *Caitya-vibhāga-vinayodbhāva-sūtra*, the Sanskrit Treatise *Stūpa-lakṣaṇa-kārikā-vivecana*, and a Corresponding Passage in Kuladatta’s *Kriyāsaṃgraha*”, *The Stūpa. Its Religious, Historical and Architectural Significance*, ed. A.L. Dallapiccola & S.Z. Lallemand (Wiesbaden: 1980) 186; K.R. Norman, *Pāli Literature. Including the Canonical Literature in Prakrit and Sanskrit of all the Hīnayāna Schools of Buddhism* (A History of Indian Literature, ed. J. Gonda, Vol. VII, Fasc. 2) (Wiesbaden: 1983) 23, cites Roth’s explanation as probable.

code, a passage in the *Visuddhimagga*, and several passages in the *Suttavibhaṅga*, which might suggest quite a different possible explanation.

The *Mahā-Parākramabāhu Katikāvata*, which has come down to us in a 12th Century inscription from Galvihāra,⁴ was promulgated as a part of one of the many attempts to “purify” or “reform” the Śri Lankan *Saṅgha*, and its authors claim that it “was formulated also without deviating from the tradition of the lineage of preceptors [āduruḷ = ācārya-kula] and after the consultation of Dhamma and Vinaya”.⁵ One of the sections intended to regulate the daily life of the monks says, in part, in Ratnapala’s translation:

“They should rise at dawn and pass the time walking up and down (for the sake of bodily exercise). Thereafter they should wear the cīvara covering themselves properly with it and after they have finished cleaning the teeth and have attended to the duties specified in the Khandhaka such as the duties pertaining to Stūpas, the great bodhi-tree, the temple terrace, the teachers, the Theras, the sick and the lodging places (*dahagab māṃbo aṅgaṇa-vatu-du āduru-vat tera-vat gilān-vat senasun-vat ā kandu-vatu-du sapayā*), should if need arise enter the refectory ...”⁶

⁴ This inscription was first published in E. Müller, *Ancient Inscriptions in Ceylon*, 2 Vols. (London: 1883) Text: pp. 87-90; 120-24; Plates: no. 137. It was re-edited in D.M. de Zilva Wickremasinghe, “Polonnaruva, Gal-Vihara: Rock-Inscription of Parakrama Bahu I”, *Epigraphia Zeylonica* 2 (1928) 256-83; and most recently in N. Ratnapala, *The Katikāvatas. Laws of the Buddhist Order of Ceylon from the 12th Century to the 18th Century* (Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft, Beiheft N) (München: 1971) 37-44; 127-35.

⁵ Ratnapala, *The Katikāvatas*, 38, 129; 304.

⁶ Ratnapala, *The Katikāvatas*, 40, § 12 (text); 131-32 (translation). Exactly the same reading of the text was given earlier by de Zilva Wickremasinghe, and his translation of it differs only very slightly: “... and have attended to the duties specified in the Khandhaka, such as those rules of conduct in respect of the Dāgābas, etc.” (*Epigraphia Zeylonica* 2 (1928) 271, 275). (The version of this passage repeated in the *Dam̄badeni Katikāvata*, which “belongs to the reign of king Parākramabāhu II (1236-1270 A.D.)”, differs slightly: *dahagab mahabō*

It would appear from his translation that Ratnapala understood the *Katikāvata* to be saying that all the “duties” enumerated here were “specified” in the *Khandhaka*, and that he assumes that *Khandhaka*— here refers to the portion of the *Vinaya* so named. But this would suggest, if Ratnapala’s interpretation of the text is correct, that the authorities who drafted this *Katikāvata* in the 12th Century knew — and presupposed that their intended audience knew — a *Khandhaka* which contained rules concerning “duties pertaining to Stūpas”. The *Khandhaka-vatta*, or “duties specified in the *Khandhaka*”, were, again according to Ratnapala, specifically identified by Mahāsvāmi Śāriputra — a leading figure and *Vinaya* authority contemporary with the promulgation of the *Katikāvata* — with “the major and minor duties enumerated in the *Vatta-khandhaka*, i.e. Vin II 207-30”.⁷ Śāriputra, then, also understood *Khandhaka-vatta* to refer to the text of the *Vinaya*, and his specificity, in fact, should make it easy to locate these rules. But when we look at Vin II 207-30 it becomes clear that although there are now rules there regarding “the teachers, the Theras, the sick and the lodging places”, Vin II 207-30, as we have it, does not contain a word about *stūpas*. This might suggest either that Śāriputra was wrong in his identification of the *Khandhaka-vatta* with these specific pages, or that the compilers of the *Katikāvata* knew — and expected contemporaries to have — a *Vinaya* different from the one we have, a *Vinaya* which had a fuller text of Vin II 207-30 than the one that has come down to us. Oddly enough, even if Śāriputra was wrong in his specific identification we are still left in much the same position: even if the *Katikāvata* is not specifically referring to Vin II 207-30 it must at

āṅgana-vatu-du āduru-vat tera-vat gilān-vat senasun-vat ā vatu-du sapayā (61, § 96). It is hard to know for certain whether the omission here of *kandu-* is anything but scribal. It is not noted by Ratnapala, nor reflected in his translation, 158, § 96).

⁷ Ratnapala, *The Katikāvatas*, 193, 197; cf. 290. References to the Pāli *Vinaya* are here and throughout to the Pali Text Society edition by H. Oldenberg.

least be referring to the *Vinaya*,⁸ and it is not just in Vin II 207-30 that there are no references to “duties pertaining to Stūpas”, there are no references to such duties anywhere in the Pāli *Vinaya* that we know. It is, however, not just the authors of our *Katikāvata* who appear possibly to have known a Pāli *Vinaya* different from the one we have.

Buddhaghosa refers on several occasions in his *Visuddhimagga* to the *Khandhaka* and there is, I think, no doubt about what he understood by the term. In one place he says: *ubhato-Vibhaṅgapariyāpannaṃ vā ādibrahmacariyakam, khandhakavattapariyāpannaṃ ābhisamācarikam*, which Pe Maung Tin translates as “Or, that which is included in both the Vibhanga’s is the ‘major precept’; that which is included in the *Khandhaka* duties is the ‘minor precept’”.⁹ At another place he refers to the “proper duties” promulgated by the Blessed One in the *Khandhaka* (*yan taṃ bhagavatā ... khandhake sammāvattaṃ paññattaṃ*) and then quotes a passage similar to that found in our *Katikāvata* which is found

⁸ Cf. T.W. Rhys Davids & W. Stede, *The Pali Text Society’s Pali-English Dictionary* (London: 1921-25) 234; Pe Maung Tin, *The Path of Purity* (Pali Text Society Trans. Series, Nos. 11, 17, 21) (London: 1923-31; repr. 1971) 14 n. 4; 117 n. 3; etc.; which are discussed more fully below.

⁹ H.C. Warren & D. Kosambi, *Visuddhimagga of Buddhaghosācariya* (Harvard Oriental Series, Vol. 41) (Cambridge: 1950) I.27 (p. 10); Pe Maung Tin, *The Path of Purity*, 14. In addition to the instances in the *Visuddhimagga*, Buddhaghosa frequently refers to the *Khandhakavatta* in the *Samantapāsādikā* (see H. Kopp, *Samantapāsādikā. Buddhaghosa’s Commentary on the Vinaya Piṭaka*, Vol. VIII (Indexes to Vols. I-VII) (Pali Text Society Text Series No. 167) (London: n.d.) 1511), at least. Although these references add some detail, they do not seem to suggest a referent for the term other than the text of the *Vinaya*. It should, however, be noted that the “conclusions” drawn in what follows about the *Khandhaka* known to Buddhaghosa raise some serious questions about the relationship of the *Samantapāsādikā* to the text of the *Vinaya* it was commenting on, and the nature and extent of that text. Such problems will only be resolved by a careful and thorough study of this massive commentary in comparison with the *Vinaya* as we have it. Such a study remains to be done.

now at Vin II 231.¹⁰ It seems fairly obvious, then, that when Buddhaghosa uses the terms *Khandhaka* or *Khandhaka-vatta* he is always referring to the text of the “canonical” *Vinaya* which he knew. This is of some importance because in yet another passage in his *Visuddhimagga* he refers his readers to the *Khandhaka* for rules regarding many of the same things that the *Mahā-Parākrāmabhū-katikāvata* refers to. The passage in question reads:

āgantukaṃ pana bhikkhuṃ disvā āgantukapaṭiṣanṭhāro kātabbo va. avasesāni pi cetiyaṅgaṇavatta-bodhiyaṅgaṇavatta-uposathāgāravatta-bhojanasālājantāghara-ācariyupajjhāya-āgantuka-gamikavattādīni sabbāni khandhakavattāni pūretabbān’ eva

which Pe Maung Tin translates as:

“On seeing a guest-monk, he should give him the greetings due to a guest. All the remaining *Khandhaka* duties should be performed, such as the duties of the shrine-yard, the yard of the Bo-tree, the sacred-service hall, the dining-hall, the fire-room, the duties towards the teacher, the preceptor, guests”.¹¹

It is clear from his translation that Pe Maung Tin understood *Khandhaka* in the *Visuddhimagga* to be a proper name or the title of a work. Rhys Davids and Stede before him understood the term in the *Visuddhimagga* in the same way. Citing the same passages we have cited above from the *Visuddhimagga* Rhys Davids and Stede defined *khandhakavatta* as “duties or observances specified in the v. khandha or chapter of the Vinaya which deals with these duties”.¹² But if these scholars are correct, then it is hard to avoid concluding from the passage just cited that, like the authors of the *Katikāvata* who knew a *Khandhaka* containing rules “pertaining to *stūpas*”, Buddhaghosa knew a *Khandhaka*

¹⁰ Warren & Kosambi, *Visuddhimagga* III.71 (p. 82); Pe Maung Tin, *The Path of Purity*, 117. For other similar *Vinaya* passages see Vin II 223; I 46 foll.

¹¹ Warren & Kosambi, *Visuddhimagga* VI.60 (p. 153); Pe Maung Tin, *The Path of Purity*, 215.

¹² Rhys Davids & Stede, *The Pali Text Society’s Pali-English Dictionary*, 234.

that contained rules concerning “the shrine-yard” or *cetiyaṅgaṇa*. Since he was — again like the authors of the *Katikāvata* — giving practical instructions to his “readers” it is again difficult to avoid the assumption that he assumed that they would know or be able to consult a similar *Khandhaka*. But, although the Mahāsāṅghika *Vinaya* preserved in Chinese, for example, has rules concerning what Professor Bareau translates as “l’enceinte du *stūpa*”,¹³ and although the Sanskrit version of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* has rules regarding the *stūpāṅgaṇa*,¹⁴ the Pāli *Vinaya* as we have it does not have a single reference to the *cetiyaṅgaṇa* or *stūpāṅgaṇa*.¹⁵

Unless Ratnapala, Pe Maung Tin, Rhys Davids and Stede are all wrong in their interpretation of the compound *khandhakavatta*, unless, in short, we do not understand what the term actually refers to, these two passages — one from the 5th Century *Visuddhimagga*, the other from a 12th Century Sinhalese *Katikāvata* — seem to suggest that there is a distinct probability that the Pāli *Vinaya*, like virtually all the other *Vinayas* known to us, had once contained specific “duties pertaining to *stūpas*” and “duties of the shrine-yard”. It is, moreover, not just sources external to the Pāli *Vinaya* like the *Visuddhimagga* and *Mahā-*

¹³ Bareau, *Bulletin de l' école française d' extrême-orient* 50 (1960) 251, 253.

¹⁴ R. Gnoli, *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Śayanāsanavastu and the Adhikaraṇavastu. Being the 15th and 16th Sections of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin* (Serie Orientale Roma L.) (Roma: 1978) 38.29; 39.2.

¹⁵ Questions concerning “duties in regard to the yard of the Bo-tree” in the Pāli and other *Vinayas* will also have to be investigated; but given our ignorance in regard to the place of “Bo-trees” in Indian monastic communities, and given the great importance assigned to their presence in Sri Lanka, this will require a separate study. It is, however, perhaps worth noting here that the only clear reference that I know in Indian inscriptional sources to a shrine connected with a Bo-tree explicitly connects that “shrine” with a Sri Lankan monastic community. The “Second Apsidal Temple Inscription F” from Nāgārjunikoṇḍa records the benefactions of the Upāsikā Bodhisiri. One of these is said to have been the construction of “a shrine for the Bodhi-tree at the Sīhaḷa-vihāra”: *sīhaḷa-vihāre bodhi-rukha-pāsādo* (J.Ph. Vogel, “Prakrit Inscriptions from a Buddhist Site at Nagarjunikonda”, *Epigraphia Indica* 20 (1929-30) 22-23).

Parākramabāhu-katikāvata which seem to suggest that this *Vinaya* may have originally contained such rules. There are indications within the Pāli *Vinaya* itself which would seem to point to much the same conclusion.

Although, as we have already noted, the Pāli *Vinaya* as we have it, and more particularly the *Khandhaka*, has no rules specifically governing behaviour in regard to *stūpas*, *stūpas* — or at least *cetiya*s — are taken for granted as an integral part of the monastic life in at least four passages in the *Sutta-vibhaṅga*. We might look briefly at these.

In discussing the passage from the *Visuddhimagga* above I have assumed that Buddhaghosa's *cetiyaṅgaṇa* was the Pāli equivalent for the Mūlasarvāstivādin *stūpāṅgaṇa* and of the "l'enceinte du *stūpa*" found in the Chinese *Vinayas*. Given the narrative uses and descriptions of the *cetiyaṅgaṇa* in Buddhaghosa it would be hard to argue otherwise. But if this equivalence of *cetiya* and *stūpa* holds here it may hold elsewhere as well. Two of the four passages from the *Sutta-vibhaṅga* which concern us, for example, deal with property rights in, and the tripartite economic structure of, Buddhist monastic establishments. The first of these — Vin III 266 — reads:

saṃghassa pariṇatam aññasamghassa vā cetiyassa vā pariṇāmeti, āpatti dukkaṭassa. cetiyassa pariṇatam aññacetiyaṇa vā samghassa vā puggalassa vā pariṇāmeti, āpatti dukkaṭassa. puggalassa pariṇatam aññapuggalassa vā samghassa vā cetiyassa vā pariṇāmeti, āpatti dukkaṭassa.

And I.B. Horner translates the passage as:

"If he appropriates what was apportioned to the Order for another (part of the) Order or for a shrine, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he appropriates what was apportioned to a shrine for an Order or for an individual, there is an offence of wrong-doing. If he appropriates what was apportioned to an individual for another individual or for an Order or for a shrine, there is an offence of wrong-doing".¹⁶

¹⁶ I.B. Horner, *The Book of the Discipline*, Vol. II (London: 1940) 162.

This passage, and the virtually identical passage at Vin IV 156, can, I think, only represent the Pāli versions of similar discussions of property rights found in Sanskrit in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* and in several *Vinayas* now preserved in Chinese. In the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, for example, we find:

bhagavān āha | sarvasaṃghaṃ sannipātyāsau lakṣitavyaḥ | kiṃ sambhinnakārī na vā iti | yadi sambhinnakārī | sāṃghikaṃ stauṇḍhikam karoti | stauṇḍhikam vā sāṃghikam | evam adhārmikam |
 “The Blessed One said: ‘Having assembled the whole community, this is to be considered: is this a (case for) making a full division [or: ‘mixed distribution’], or is it not? If there is a full division (and) it takes what belongs to the Saṅgha as what belongs to the *stūpa*, or what belongs to the *stūpa* as what belongs to the Saṅgha — such (a procedure) is not in conformity with the Dharma (*de lta bu chos dang mi mthun pa yin pas*)’.¹⁷

In regard to the Chinese *Vinayas* Professor Bareau notes, for example, that “les Sarvāstivādin parlent aussi des biens inépuisables du *stūpa*, qui sont inaliénables. Les biens qui sont donnés en offrande au *stūpa* ne peuvent être utilisés à d’autres fins. On ne doit pas les mélanger avec les biens de la Communauté des quatre directions, ni avec les biens consistant en nourriture, ni avec les biens à partager”.¹⁸

¹⁷ N. Dutt, *Gilgit Manuscripts*, Vol. III, Part 2 (Srinagar: 1942) 145.15-146.1; D.T. Suzuki, *The Tibetan Tripitaka, Peking Edition* (Tokyo-Kyoto: 1955) 41, 284-2-2 foll. I am not altogether sure I have completely understood this passage. The text is extremely terse and the technical meaning of *sambhinnakārī* is not well established. I have followed my understanding of the Tibetan translation and the problems do not in any case affect my point here: discussions of property rights similar to those in the Pāli *Sutta-vibhaṅga* which occur in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* refer frequently to *stauṇḍhika* or indicate that what is *buddhasantaka* is to be used for the *stūpa*; cf. *Gilgit Manuscripts* III 2, 143.11; Peking, Vol. 44, 95-3-4 foll.; etc.

¹⁸ Bareau, *Bulletin de l'école française d'extrême-orient* 50 (1960) 257; cf. J. Gernet, *Les aspects économiques du bouddhisme dans la société chinoise du V^e*

It would seem fairly certain that the *Sutta-vibhaṅga* passage, the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* passage, and the Sarvāstivādin material summarized by Bareau are all dealing with the same basic concern: the distribution of property to, and the ownership rights of, the different corporate or juristic entities within a monastic establishment. The fact that in exactly similar contexts the Sarvāstivādin and Mūlasarvāstivādin *Vinayas* speak of *stūpas* or that which “belongs to the *stūpas*” (*stauṭpika*), and the Pāli *Sutta-vibhaṅga* speaks of *cetiya*s, would seem again to suggest that the two terms are equivalent, that *cetiya* in these contexts is the Pāli equivalent for *stūpa*. It is interesting to note that the Pāli preference for *cetiya* may in fact represent a relatively late South Indian influence on the vocabulary of the Pāli *Vinaya*. At Nāgārjunikoṇḍa, for example, what elsewhere would be called a *stūpa* is, in the inscriptions, consistently referred to as a *cetiya*.¹⁹

au X^e siècle (Paris: 1956) 61 foll.; 159 foll. For the persistence in Mahāyāna sūtra literature of both the vocabulary and conception of ownership found in the various *Vinayas* see G. Schopen, “Burial ‘ad sanctos’ and the Physical Presence of the Buddha in Early Indian Buddhism: A Study in the Archeology of Religions”, *Religion* 17 (1987) 207-08.

¹⁹ cf. G. Schopen, “On the Buddha and His Bones: The Conception of a Relic in the Inscriptions of Nāgārjunikoṇḍa”, *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 108 (1988) 536. Apart from the odd rule “qui interdisent de faire un *stūpa* avec la nourriture puis de le démolir et de le manger” which the Pāli *Vinaya* shares with that of the Mūlasarvāstivāda according to Bareau (*Bulletin de l'école française d'extrême-orient* 50 (1960) 271 — if that is what *thūṭpikata* actually means), the only actual occurrence of the term *stūpa* in the Pāli *Vinaya* occurs in the bizarre story concerning “the group of six nuns” found at Vin IV 308-09. Here it said that “the Venerable Kappitaka the Venerable Upāli's preceptor” destroyed the *stūpa* that “the group of six” had built for one of their deceased members. This story of an uncharacteristically violent and almost sacrilegious act may be peculiar to the Pāli *Vinaya*. The same rule appears to be explained by a very different story in the *Mahāsāṃghika-Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya*, for example (A. Hirakawa, *Monastic Discipline for the Buddhist Nuns. An English Translation of the Chinese Text of the Mahāsāṃghika-Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya* (Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series, No. XXI) (Patna: 1982) 284-86). It may also be related to what

But if *cetiya* in these contexts, and in the compound *cetiyaṅgaṇa*, is the Pāli equivalent of *stūpa*, then it is equally possible that it is being used in the same way in the two remaining passages we must mention from the *Sutta-vibhaṅga*. *Saṅghādisesa* V prohibits monks from acting as “go-betweens” (*sañcaritta*) but notes that “there is no offence if it is for the Order, or for a shrine, or if he is ill; if he is going on business, if he is mad, if he is a beginner” (*anāpatti saṃghassa vā cetiyassa vā gilānassa vā karaṇīyena gacchati, ummattakassa, ādikammikassā ti*).²⁰ Similarly, in the *Bhikkhunīvibhaṅga*, *Pācittiya* XLIV, which prohibits nuns from doing household work, cooking, etc., it is said that “there is no offence if it [cooking, etc.] is a drink of conjei, if it is for the Order; if it is for worship at a shrine ...” (*anāpatti yāgupāne saṃghabhatte cetiypūjāya ...*).²¹ If Pāli *cetiya* in these two passages does not refer to what in other *Vinayas* would be called *stūpas* it is hard to know what it could refer to. The *cetiya* in these passages is an “object” for whose worship nuns can properly prepare food and for whose sake monks can engage in

appears to be an explicitly local Sri Lankan resistance to *stūpas* for the local monastic dead. At least the argument against the erection of *stūpas* for “virtuous puthujjana monks” found in the Sri Lankan commentaries is a purely local one: *puthujjanabhikkhūnaṃ hi thūpe anuññāyamāne tambapaṇṇadīpe gāmapaṭṭanānaṃ okāso ca na bhaveyya tathā aññesu thānesu*, “for were a *stūpa* to be allowed for puthujjana monks there would be no room for any villages or cities in Tambapaṇṇadīpa (Ceylon), likewise in other places” (P. Masefield, *Divine Revelation in Pali Buddhism* (London: 1986) 23). To what degree this resistance was purely literary remains to be seen although Longhurst already long ago noted that “the *stūpas* erected over the remains of ordinary members of the Buddhist community were very humble little structures. The ashes of the dead were placed in an earthenware pot and covered with a lid, and the humble little *stūpa* erected over it. Plenty of Buddhist *stūpas* of this class may still be seen in the Madras Presidency and also in Ceylon” (A.H. Longhurst, *The Story of the Stūpa* (Colombo: 1936) 14).

²⁰ I.B. Horner, *The Book of the Discipline*, Vol. I (London: 1938) 243; Vin III 143.

²¹ I.B. Horner, *The Book of the Discipline*, Vol. III (London: 1942) 329; Vin IV 301.

activities otherwise forbidden to them. It is unlikely therefore that the term here could be referring to local or non-Buddhist “shrines” — the only other “objects” generally referred to by the term in Pāli canonical literature.²² These considerations, and the fact that the use of Pāli *cetiya* for *stūpa* is virtually assured — as we have seen — elsewhere in the *Sutta-vibhaṅga* would certainly support the possibility that it is so used here as well.

If we keep in mind, then, the equivalence of *cetiya* and *stūpa* which seems virtually certain in two cases in the Pāli *Sutta-vibhaṅga*, and likely in two more, it would appear that the Pāli *Sutta-vibhaṅga*, although it has no rules specifically governing behaviour in regard to *stūpas* or *cetiyas*, takes such behaviour, and the existence of *stūpas* or *cetiyas*, very much for granted when it deals with other matters. The rules governing the division of property, acting as a “go-between”, cooking foods, etc., all take the *stūpa* or *cetiya* and activity undertaken in regard to it as established and fully integrated elements of the monastic life. This, of course, makes the complete absence of rules specifically concerned with *stūpas* or *cetiyas* in the *Khandhaka* even more striking, and would seem to provide yet another argument for concluding that the Pāli *Khandhaka* must originally have contained such rules. But if — as the *Mahā-Parākramabāhu-katikāvata*, the *Visuddhimagga*, and the *Sutta-vibhaṅga* seem to suggest — the Pāli *Vinaya* had originally contained such rules, then the fact that they are no longer found in the *Vinaya* known to us could, apparently, only be explained by assuming that either they had inadvertently dropped out of the manuscripts or, perhaps, were intentionally written out.

²² Cf. B.C. Law, “Cetiya in the Buddhist Literature”, *Studia Indo-Iranica. Ehrengabe für Wilhelm Geiger*, hrsg. v. W. Wüst (Leipzig: 1931) 42-48. That *cetiya* is always used in Pāli literature to refer to a *stūpa* is, of course, not being asserted here.

The comparatively very recent date of the vast majority of the surviving manuscripts for texts in the Pāli canon,²³ coupled with the long and troubled history of their transmission — especially after the 12th Century — could easily account for the loss of material from these texts on a fairly large scale, and makes an uninterrupted transmission of our Pāli texts extremely unlikely. In fact the historical situation would suggest that the transmission was probably interrupted not once, but on several different occasions.²⁴ It is, therefore, possible to think that the loss of “the duties pertaining to Stūpas” could have occurred in just this way. There is at least one consideration, however, which renders this possibility less forceful and may in fact suggest quite a different process.

In the *Vinayas* surveyed by Bareau — those of the Mahīśāsaka, Dharmaguptaka, Mahāsaṅghika, Sarvāstivādin and Mūlasarvāstivādin — the rules regarding *stūpas*, though “concentrated in the various

²³ See, at least, O. von Hinüber, “On the Tradition of Pāli Texts in India, Ceylon and Burma”, in *Buddhism in Ceylon and Studies on Religious Syncretism in Buddhist Countries* (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Phil.-Hist. Klasse. Dritte Folge. Nr. 108) ed. H. Bechert (Göttingen: 1978) 48-57; O. von Hinüber, “Notes on the Pāli Tradition in Burma”, *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen*, I. Phil.-Hist. Klasse Jg. 1983, Nr.3, 67-79; O. von Hinüber, “Pāli Manuscripts of Canonical Texts from North Thailand — A Preliminary Report”, *Journal of the Siam Society* 71 (1983) 75-88; O. von Hinüber, “Two Jātaka Manuscripts from the National Library in Bangkok”, *Journal of the Pāli Text Society* 10 (1985) 1-22; O. von Hinüber, “The Pāli Manuscripts Kept at the Siam Society, Bangkok. A Short Catalogue”, *Journal of the Siam Society* 75 (1987) 9-74; O. von Hinüber, “The Oldest Dated Manuscript of the Milindapañha”, *Journal of the Pāli Text Society* 11 (1987) 111-19; P.E.E. Fernando, “A Note on Three Old Sinhalese Palm-Leaf Manuscripts”, *The Sri Lanka Journal of the Humanities* 8 (1982, actually 1985) 146-57.

²⁴ As one of the many possible sources for the troubled history — both internal and external — of the Sri Lankan Saṅgha from the 12th Century on, see Ratnapala, *The Katikāvatas*, 219-32; for Burma see E.M. Mendelson, *Saṅgha and State in Burma. A Study of Monastic Sectarianism and Leadership* (Ithaca & London: 1975) 31-118; for Thailand, Y. Ishii, *Saṅgha, State and Society. Thai Buddhism in History* (Honolulu: 1986) 59-66; etc.

Kṣudrakavastus, are scattered throughout this *vastu* and, in some of the collections, in other *vastus* or divisions of the *Vinaya* as well.²⁵ They do not occur as a single block. Assuming that much the same held for the Pāli *Vinaya*, that although concentrated in a single *vastu* rules regarding *stūpas* would have been scattered throughout it and elsewhere in the *Skandhaka*, it would be easy enough to see how some of these scattered rules could have been lost through accidents of transmission, but that all such rules would have been lost in this way seems very unlikely. In light of this the total absence of rules regarding *stūpas* in the Pāli *Vinaya* would seem to make sense only if they had been systematically removed. But acknowledging the possibility — if not the likelihood — of such a systematic removal having actually occurred is one thing; knowing why it might have occurred is something else again.

One might be tempted to try to explain any removal from the Pāli *Vinaya* of rules regarding *stūpas* by referring to the purported prohibition of monastic participation in the *stūpa*/relic cult which is supposed to occur in the *Mahāparinibbāna-sutta*. This, however, will raise many more questions than answers and, in fact, leads us to much the same conclusion that consideration of the *Katikāvata*, the *Visuddhimagga*, and the *Sutta-vibhaṅga* suggests. First of all — as I hope to show in some detail elsewhere — the “injunction” addressed to Ānanda concerning *sarīra-pūjā* has nothing to do with an ongoing cult of relics or *stūpas*.²⁶ This can be shown from the *Mahāparinibbāna-sutta* itself and

²⁵ Bareaux, *Bulletin de l' école française d' extrême-orient* 50 (1960) 229-30.

²⁶ The supposed “injunction” occurs, of course, at D II 141,18 (= *Mahāparinibbāna-sutta* V.10). Although the details will have to be given elsewhere, it can, I think, be convincingly shown both that *sarīra-pūjā* does not refer to “worship of the relics” but to what we might call “preparation of the body” prior to cremation, and that even as late as the *Milindapañha* the “injunction” at D II 141 was not understood to apply to all monks. Moreover, if this “injunction”, by itself, were to account for the absence of rules regarding *stūpas* in the Pāli *Vinaya* we would expect to find that other schools who had a similar text of the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra* would also have no such rules in their *Vinayas*, but this is not the case.

related texts, but it is equally clear from other sources as well that any discomfiture with monastic participation in *stūpa* or relic cult activity is distinctly modern. In the *Udāna* version of the story of “Bāhiya of the Bark Garment”, for example, there is a clear directive to monks to build *stūpas*: “... having seen (the body of Bāhiya, the Blessed One) addressed the monks: ‘you, monks, must take up the body of Bāhiya of the Bark Garment ! Having put it on a bier, having carried it out, you must cremate it, and you must build a *stūpa* for it ! For monks, a fellow-monk has died’.” (... *disvāna bhikkhū āmantesi: gaṇhatha bhikkhave Bāhiyassa dārucīriyassa sarīrakam mañcakam āropetvā niharitvā jhāpetha thūpañ c’ assa karotha, sabrahmacārī vo bhikkhave kālaṅkato ti*).²⁷ The *Apadāna* version of the same story has the Buddha saying to the monks: ... *thūpaṃ karotha pūjetha*, “You must build a *stūpa* ! You must worship it !”²⁸ That these texts give expression to very early practice concerning the disposal of the monastic dead is confirmed by some of the earliest archeological and epigraphical evidence that we have. There is, for example, the group of *stūpas* of the local monastic dead at the monastery complex at Bhāja, “probably one of the oldest Buddhist religious centres in the Deccan”,²⁹ or the old *stūpa* of the “forest dweller” Gobhūti built by his monk pupil at Bedsa;³⁰ or *Stūpa* no. 2 at Sāñcī which held the mortuary remains of the local monastic dead, and which Bénisti has recently argued is older even

²⁷ P. Steinthal, *Udāna* (London: 1885) 8,21 (I.10).

²⁸ Bhikkhu J. Kashyap, *The Apadāna* (II) — *Buddhavamsa-Cariyāpiṭaka* [*Khuddakanikāya*, Vol. VII] (Nālandā-Devanāgarī-Pāli-Series) (Bihar: 1959) 125.16 (54.6.216).

²⁹ See S. Nagaraju, *Buddhist Architecture of Western India* (c. 250 B.C. — c. A.D. 300) (Delhi: 1981) 113-30; 329-30; on the inscriptions associated with these *stūpas* see also D.D. Kosambi, “Dhenukāṭa”, *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bombay* 30.2 (1955) 70-71.

³⁰ Nagaraju, *Buddhist Architecture of Western India* 107-8; 329.

than Bharhut:³¹ this *stūpa* appears to have been established and largely funded by monks and nuns.³² The same early kind of evidence proves the early and massive monastic participation in the cult of the relics and *stūpa* of the historical Buddha at Bharhut, Sāñcī and Pauni.³³ Clear evidence for the active participation of monks and nuns in the *stūpa*/relic cult is found as well at other sites. At Pangoraria, in Madhya Pradesh, at a very old monastic site, the *yaṣṭi*, or shaft, and umbrella of the main *stūpa* — both of which were very finely worked — were the gift of a *bhikṣuṇī* and her disciples according to the inscription on the shaft which dates to the 2nd Century B.C.E.³⁴ The inscriptions on the Bhattiprolu relic caskets, which have been dated variously from the 3rd to the 1st Century B.C.E., show that monks (*samana*) took an active and prominent part in the enshrining of the relics of the Buddha (*budhasarira*) there, both as donors and

³¹ M. Bénisti, "Observations concernant le stūpa n° 2 de Sāñcī", *Bulletin d'études indiennes* 4 (1986) 165-70.

³² For the donative inscription connected with the mortuary deposit see J. Marshall, A. Foucher, & N.G. Majumdar, *The Monuments of Sāñcī*, Vol. I (Delhi: 1940) 294, although its interpretation there is perhaps not entirely free of problems. Of the 93 donative inscriptions from Stūpa No. 2 at Sāñcī published by Majumdar nearly 60%, or 52, record the gifts of monastics: monks — nos. 631, 638, 640, 644, 646, 647, 648, 655, 656, 657, 669, 675, 677, 688, 691, 693, 694, 695, 702, 709, 716, 719, Būh xvii, xviii, xix, xx, 803, 820; Nuns — nos. 662, 663, 664, 668, 672, 674, 678, 700, 703, 706, 708, 713, 714, Būh xxi, 759, 812; Female disciples — nos. 637, 645, 673, 704; Male disciples — nos. 632, 633, 634, 671.

³³ For monastic donors at Bharhut and Sāñcī see G. Schopen, "Two Problems in the History of Indian Buddhism: The Layman/Monk Distinction and the Doctrines of the Transference of Merit", *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 10 (1985) 23-24 and notes, although the Sāñcī count there is based on the old publications. For Pauni see S.B. Deo & J.P. Joshi, *Pauni Excavations* (1969-70) (Nagpur: 1972) 37-43.

³⁴ H. Sarkar, "A Post-Asokan Inscription from Pangoraria in the Vindhyan Range", in *Sri Dinesacandrika. Studies in Indology. Shri D.C. Sircar Festschrift*, ed. B.N. Mukherjee, et al. (Delhi: 1983) 403-5.

members of the *gothi* or “committee” that undertook the project.³⁵ Of the many early inscriptions from Amarāvati recording gifts of monks connected with the *stūpa* cult we might note that “in Maurya characters” which records the gift of a *dhamakathika* or “preacher of the Dharma”.³⁶ An inscription dating from the 2nd/1st Century B.C.E. from Guntupalli indicates that the “steps leading to the circular brick chaitya-griha” were the gift “of the pupil of the Thera, the Venerable Namda”.³⁷ An early 1st Century C.E. inscription from Karle says: “a pillar containing a relic (*sasariro thabho*), the gift of the Venerable Satimita, a reciter (*bhāṇaka*) belonging to the Dharmottariya School, from Soparaka”.³⁸ A Kharoṣṭhī inscription from 32 B.C.E. records the gift of relics made by a monk which were given to “the Mahīśāsaka teachers”.³⁹ If it is true, therefore, as Rhys Davids asserted long ago, that the Pāli *Vinaya* “enters at so great length into all the details of the daily life of the recluses”,⁴⁰ then — oddly enough — this archeological and epigraphical evidence would seem to argue for the fact that either the Pāli *Vinaya* must have originally contained rules referring to such activity, or the Pāli *Vinaya* was unknown or had no influence at these early Indian sites, and they are among the earliest that we can know.

³⁵ G. Bühler, “The Bhattiprolu Inscriptions”, *Epigraphia Indica* 2 (1894) 323-29; H. Lüders, “Epigraphische Beiträge. I Die Inschriften von Bhattiprolu”, in *Philologica Indica* (Göttingen: 1940) 213-29; D.C. Sircar, *Select Inscriptions Bearing on Indian History and Civilization*, Vol. I, 2nd ed. (Calcutta: 1965) 224-28.

³⁶ J. Burgess, *The Buddhist Stūpas of Amaravati and Jaggayyapeta in the Krishna District, Madras Presidency, Surveyed in 1882* (Archaeological Survey of Southern India Vol. I) (London: 1887) 94, pl. LVI no. 3.

³⁷ I.K. Sarma, “Epigraphical Discoveries at Guntupalli”, *Journal of the Epigraphical Society of India* 5 (1975) 51.

³⁸ E. Senart, “The Inscriptions in the Caves at Karle”, *Epigraphia Indica* 7 (1902-03) 55, no. 9.

³⁹ G. Fussman, “Nouvelles inscriptions - śaka (iv)”, *Bulletin de l'école française d'extrême-orient* 74 (1985) 47-51.

⁴⁰ T.W. Rhys Davids, *Buddhist Suttas* (Sacred Books of the East, Vol. XI) (Oxford: 1900) xlv; my emphasis.

Sri Lankan literary data too suggests monastic concern with and involvement in the relic/*stūpa* cult from the very beginning and, in so doing, would strongly suggest that pre-modern Sri Lankan tradition could not have understood the “injunction” in the *Mahāparinibbāna-sutta* — or any other passage in the canon — to prohibit monastic participation in the cult. Mahinda, the monk *par excellence* and nominal founder of Sri Lankan monasticism, is presented by the tradition itself as intending to leave the island because “it is a long time since we have seen the Perfect Buddha, the Teacher ... There is nothing here for us to worship”. The reigning king is puzzled and responds “But, sir, did you not tell me that the Perfect Buddha has entered Nirvāṇa ?”; to which the Monk Mahinda responds in turn: “When the relics are seen (or: are present), the Buddha is seen (or: is present)”. The king promises to build a *stūpa*; the Monk Mahinda appoints another monk to fly to India to procure relics; he succeeds; and Mahinda stays.⁴¹ The ‘moral’ of this tale, written by a monk about a monk, seems obvious: the continuance of Buddhist monasticism in Sri Lanka depended on procuring a relic and building a *stūpa* so that the monks would have an object of worship. The relic and *stūpa* cult were, therefore, seen by the author of the *Mahāvamsa* as a primary concern of the monastic community and a necessary prerequisite for its continuance. That such a pivotal part of the institution would have been left out of the rules that governed the early community seems very unlikely.

It would seem, then, that there is much to suggest the likelihood of the interpretation of the *Katikāvata* and *Visuddhimagga* passages, and of the data in the *Sutta-vibhaṅga*, presented here. But even if this interpretation turns out not to be entirely correct, in considering it we have come upon further considerations which seem to indicate at least

⁴¹ W. Geiger, *The Mahāvamsa* (London: 1908) XVII.2-3. On the conception of a relic which is being articulated here see E.W. Adikaram, *Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon* (Colombo: 1946) 136 foll.; Schopen, *Religion* 17 (1987) 193-225; Schopen, *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 108 (1988) 527-37.

that the absence of rules regarding stūpas in the Pāli *Vinaya* is much more problematic for the historian than has heretofore been recognized. If the interpretation presented here is correct, the Pāli *Vinaya*, like all the *Vinayas* had such rules and they were removed at a comparatively recent date. If this interpretation is not correct, and if the Pāli *Vinaya* did not contain such rules, then it either could not have been the *Vinaya* which governed early Buddhist monastic communities in India, or it presents a very incomplete picture of early and actual monastic behaviour and has — therefore — little historical value as a witness for what we know actually occurred on a large scale at all of the earliest monastic sites in India that we have some knowledge of. The whole question clearly deserves further consideration.

Bloomington

Gregory Schopen

PATNA DHARMAPADA

Part I: Text

The Manuscript

In the Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society 21 (1935) pp 21ff., Rāhula Saṅkṛtyāyana described his second visit to Tibet in a search for Indian manuscripts in the summer of 1934. He lists among the MSS he saw at Ngor monastery a Dharmapada (34.1.159). It is not clear when he photographed this MS, but it was presumably during his next visit to Tibet, in 1936 (Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society 23 (1937) pp 1ff.). Since the photographs were taken to Patna, where they are held by the K P Jayaswal Research Institute, I will refer to this MS as Patna. Editions of this MS have been made by N S Shukla (The Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dharmapada, Patna 1979), and G Roth (The Patna Dhammapada, in The Language of the Earliest Buddhist Tradition, Göttingen 1980, pp 93-135). My transcription is based on a photograph of the original photographs, made available to me through the kindness of Prof. Dr H Bechert, der Direktor des Seminars für Indologie und Buddhismuskunde der Universität Göttingen.

The script of Patna can be classed among those called by Bühler (Indian Palaeography, English edition, Bombay 1904, p 48) Proto-Bengali. He gives among his examples the Deopāra Inscription of Vijayasena (Table V, column XVIII; EI 1 (1882) p 308), dated by Kielhorn in EI 1 to the end of the eleventh century AD; and the Cambridge MSS Add.1699, 1-2 (Table VI, column X) dated 1198-9 AD. To these can be added the Gayā Inscription mentioning Govindapāla (EI 35 (1963-4) p 238) dated 1175-6 AD. All three texts are in Sanskrit, and so contain for the most part different conjunct consonants from Patna.

A comparison of Patna with the Gayā Inscription shows a very close similarity between all the single akṣaras found in both texts, with the exception of *visarga*. (No examples of initial *i-* and *u-*, single *cha*, *jha*,

ṭa and *ḍha* occur in the Gayā Inscription.) The few conjuncts they have in common, eg *sta*, *ṣṭa*, *ṣṭha* and *ndra*, are also very similar, but *ku* is different, Gayā retaining the basic shape of *ka*, while Patna does not. The inscription also begins with the same symbol (for *siddham*) as is found in Patna.

The Deopāra Inscription, although recognisably the same script, is not so closely related to Patna, but does confirm the signs for initial *i*- and *u*-, *jha*, *ṭa* and *ḍha*, and exhibits clearly such conjuncts as *ṅca* and *ṅja*. It agrees, however, with the Gayā Inscription against Patna in its signs for *ku* and *visarga*.

The Cambridge MSS Add.1699, 1-2 are in a more flamboyant hand, but basically the signs are very similar to Patna. In this case the similarity includes *ku* and *visarga*, but initial *i*- differs somewhat. The symbols used to number the leaves of Patna resemble closely those used in Cambridge MS Add.1699, 2.

The same type of script is used in the MS of the Bhikṣuṇī Vinaya (Bhī Vin) of the Mahāsaṅghikalokottaravādins, also photographed in Tibet by Saṅkṛtyāyana, and edited by G Roth (Patna 1970). Roth describes the MS and script in his introduction (pp XVIII-XXVII), and reproduces six leaves of the MS (facing p XXVI). A comparison of Patna with this photograph reveals a very close resemblance (the Bhī Vin MS is better and more clearly written). Again, as in the other examples of the script, the language of the Bhī Vin is basically Sanskrit, and so uses different conjunct consonants. The two scripts are not absolutely identical: Bhī Vin always uses for medial *-i-* a sign above the *akṣara* very similar to *nāgarī -e*, whereas Patna uses sometimes a vertical to the left arching over the *akṣara*, and sometimes a simple arch. Bhī Vin's initial *i*- has not the right vertical found in Patna (and in the Deopāra Inscription). Bhī Vin's *la* and *śa* have a double arch (this is true of almost all the other examples discussed), while Patna *śa* is closer to *ga*, and *la* to *nāgarī ta* (in this Cambridge Add.1699, 1 agrees). The forms of *ttha* differ, Patna resembling the *nāgarī* form. None of these examples has *-ā* written as a hook above the *akṣara* as Patna has occasionally (cf eg the final syllable of

vi jāneyā, 3 A vi), but this practice can be seen in the Cambridge MS Add.1643 (1015 AD).

These comparisons suggest that Patna can be dated in the second half of the twelfth century AD.

The photograph of the MS is not easy to read. Some of the leaves are overlapped by others; drawing-pins obscure some lines; and some of the leaves are blurred. In addition, the script itself can be ambiguous: *s* and *m* are indistinguishable, as are *v* and *b*, *t* and *bh*, and *tt* and *tu*; *p*, *y* and *d* can also look very alike, as can *ś* and *g*. Subscript *r* in *tr* is particularly hard to be sure of, and it will be seen that I accept its presence much more rarely than Roth or Shukla.

It is clear that disagreements over readings are very probable, especially when we have no exact parallel in another text. I have recorded all occasions where Roth and/or Shukla differ from my reading, even where their readings are obviously printing errors. Unless I comment otherwise, I am convinced of my reading, either because I believe the MS testimony is clear, or because a parallel supports one possible alternative rather than another.

I have transcribed what the MS has, as far as I can, without any editorial work of correcting, or making consistent, and supplying missing words or syllables (in square brackets) only if we can be certain of what they must have been. On a few occasions I have placed in round brackets possible alternative readings, or have added hyphens to make clear how I understand the text. I have also bracketed with < > obvious mistakes. Otherwise I say with the last Patna scribe: *yathā dṛṣṭam tathā likhitam iti parihāro 'yam asmadiyaḥ*.

Jama

siddhaṃ namaḥ sarvabuddhadharmmāryasamghebhyaḥ

1 B i

Sh oṃ namaḥ sarvabuddhadharmāya samghebhyaḥ

1 Dhp 1 Uv 31:23 Mkv 25 GDhp 201

manopūrvvaṃgamā dhammā	manośreṭṭhā manojavā	
manasā ca praduṣṭena	bhāṣate vā karoti vā	
tato naṃ dukham anneti	cakram vā vahato padaṃ	

a Sh -pūrvvaṃ-

e Sh dukkham anveti fn: 'MS dukkhamanneti'

2 Dhp 2 (= Nett 133, Peṭ 24) Uv 31:24 Mkv 25 GDhp 202

ma[nopūrvvaṃ]gamā dhammā	manośreṭṭhā manojavā		1 B ii
manasā ca prasannena	bhāṣate vā karoti vā		
tato naṃ sukham anneti	cchāyā vā anapāyini		

The end of this leaf is overlapped by leaf 18 B.

b R manodbhavā

e Sh anveti fn: 'MS sukhamanneti'

f Sh chāyā

3 Dhp 15 Uv 28:34 GDhp 205

iha śocati precca śocati
pāpakam[mo ubhaya]ttha śocati |

1 B iii

so śocati so vihaṃnyati
 dṛṣṭā kammakileśam āttano ॥

b R pāpakamme [ubhaya] Sh pāpaka[mmobhaya]

The end of the leaf is overlapped by leaf 18 B. All that is visible here is -m, and a mark consistent with a second -m-, preceded by a sign which can be -e, or the first half of -o. Almost certainly it is the latter, cf 4b: *katapuṇṇo*. At 4c, with a similar sign visible, R restores *so*.

c Sh vihanyati fn: 'MS vihaṃnyati'

4 Dhp 16 Uv 28:35 GDhp 206

iha nandati precca nandati
 katapuṇṇo ubhayattha nandati ॥
 so nandati []dati
 dṛṣṭā kammaviśuddhim āttano ॥

1 B iv

b Sh katapuṇṇo fn: 'MS katapuṇṇo'

c R s[o pramo] Sh [so pramo]

5 Dhp 3 Uv 14:9

ākrośi maṃ avadhi maṃ ajini maṃ ahāsi me ॥
 ye tāni upanahyanti veraṃ tesam na śāmyati ॥

a Sh [śi maṃ]

6 Dhp 4 Uv 14:10

ākro[śi maṃ] avadhi maṃ ajini maṃ ahāsi me ॥ 1 B v
 ye tāni nopanahyanti veraṃ tesam upaśāmyati ॥

7 Dhp 7 Uv 29:15 GDhp 217

śubhā Snupaśśiṃ viharantaṃ indriyesu asaṃvṛtaṃ |
 [bhojana]mhi amātaṃñū kuśīdaṃ hīnavīriyaṃ || 1 B vi
 taṃ ve prasahate māro vāto rukkhaṃ va dubbalaṃ |

c Sh amātaṃñūṃ fn: MS 'amātaṃñūṃ'

d Sh kaśīdaṃ

f Sh rukkhaṃ R durbbalaṃ

8 Dhp 8 Uv 29:16 GDhp 218

aśubhānupaśśiṃ viharantaṃ indriyeṣu susaṃvṛtaṃ ||
 bhojanamhi ca mā[]ddhaṃ āradhvīriyaṃ | 1 B vii
 taṃ ve na prasahate māro vāto śelaṃ va parvataṃ ||

b R indriyesu c R [ttraṃñū sa] Sh [ttaṃñūṃ sa]

e R taṃ f Sh parvataṃ

9 Dhp 328 Uv 14:13

sace labheyā nipakaṃ sapraṃñāṃ
 sāddhiṃcaramṃ sādhuvihāradhīraṃ |
 adhibhūya sabbāṇi pariśrav[]
 careyā tenāttamano satimā || 2 A i

a Sh sapraṃñāṃ fn: 'MS sapraṃñāṃ'

c R pariśra[vāṇi] Sh pariśra[yāṇi] The *akṣara* half-obscured looks more likely to be -v- than -y-.

10 Dhp 329 Uv 14:14

na ce labheyā nipakaṃ sapraṃñāṃ

sāddhiṃcaram sādhuvihāradhīram |
 rājā va rāṣṭram vijitam prahāya
 eko ccare mātaṃgāranne va nāgo ||

a Sh sapraññaṃ R rāṣṭram
 d Sh care

11 Dhṛ 330 Uv 14:16, 14:/16/

ekassa caritaṃ śreyo
 nāsti bāle bitīyatā |
 eko ccare na ca pāpāni kayirā
 appussuko mātaṃgāranne va nāgo ||

2 A ii

b Sh vibhīyatā (?) c Sh care

12 D III 182 = A II 18

chandadoṣabhayā mohā yo dhammaṃ ativattati |
 nihīrate tassa yaśo kālāpakkhe va candramā || 2 A iii

b R abhivattati d Sh kala-

13 D III 182 = A II 18

chandadoṣabhayā mohā yo dhammaṃ nātivattati |
 āpūrate tassa yaśo śuklapakkhe va candramā ||

b R nābhivattati c Sh yaśso

jamavarggaḥ

Apramāda

14 Dhp 21 Uv 4:1 GDhp 115

apramādo amatapadam	pramādo maccuno padam		2 A iv
apramattā na mrīyanti	ye pramattā yathā matā		

15 Dhp 22 Uv 4:2 GDhp 116

etaṃ viśeṣataṃ nyāttā	apramādamhi paṇḍitā		
apramāde pramodanti	ayirāṇaṃ gocare ratā		2 A v

a R taṃ ... nīattā c R pramodante

16 Dhp 23 Uv 4:3 d GDhp 156f

te jhāyino sātatikā	niccaṃ dḍhaparākramā		
phusanti dhīrā nibbāṇaṃ	yogacchemaṃ anuttaraṃ		

17 Dhp 26 Uv 4:10 GDhp 117

pramādam anuyuñjanti	bālā dummedhino janā		2 A vi
apramādan tu medhāvī	dhanaṃ śreṣṭhaṃ va rakkhati		

18 Dhp 29 Uv 19:4 GDhp 118

apramatto pramattesu	suttesu bahujāgaro		
abalāśśam va śighrāśśo	hettā yāti sumedhaso		2 B i

19 Dhp 28 Uv 4:4 GDhp 119

pramādam apramādena	yadā nudati paṇḍito		
praṇñāprāsādam āruhya	aśoko śokinim prajāṃ		

parvvataṭṭho va bhoma Ṣṭṭhe dhīro bāle avecchati ||

c R -prāsādaṃ Sh praññā-
e Sh parvata-

20 Dhp 172 Uv 16:5 GDhp 122

pūrvve cāpi **pramajjittā** yo pacchā na pramajjati | 2 B ii
so imāṃ lokaṃ prabhāseti abhramutto va candramā ||

a Sh pūrvve cāyaṃ This line is overshadowed by leaf 18B.

d R abhramutte ve The mark after *-tt-* could be the right vertical of *-o*, or a following *-e*, but since we require a meaning of *iva*, not *vai*, it seems perverse not to take it as *-o*.

21 Uv 16:6

pūrvve cāpi pramajjittā yo pacchā na pramajjati |
so imāṃ visattikāṃ loke sato **samativattati** || 2 B iii

a Sh pūrvve cāpi

b R pacchā na ve(?) *ve* is unmetrical, and appears rather to be a partly crossed-out mistake in the MS.

22 Dhp 32 Uv 4:32 GDhp 73

apramādagaru bhikkhū pramāde bhayaadaṃsino |
abhavvo parihāṇāya nibbāṇasseva santike ||

a Sh apramādagarū

23 Dhp 31 Uv 4:29 GDhp 74

apramādagaru bhikkhū	pramāde bhayadaṃśino		
saṃyojanam aṇutthūlaṃ	daham aggīva gacchati		2 B iv

a Sh apramādagarū d R dahan

R has divided vv 23-26 differently, presumably following the punctuation of the MS. cf 37.

24 Dhp 327 ab Uv 4:36ad cd Uv 4:27cd GDhp 132cd

apramādaratā hotha	saṃ cittam anurakkhatha	
duggā uddharathāttānaṃ	pake sanno va kuñjaro	

ab = R 23ef cd = R 24ab

b R sa-cittaṃ d R Sh paṃke

25

pramāde pramudino	nipakā śīlasaṃvṛtā		2 B v
te ve kālena prācchanti	yattha prātto na śocati		

ab = R 24cd cd = R 25ab

d Sh pathe prātto

26

pramāde pramodetha	na kāmaratisandhave		
evaṃ viharan ātāpī	śāntacitto Snuddhato		2 B vi
cetośamatham anuyutto	dukkhassantakaro siyā		

ab = R 25cd c-f = R 26

c R viharanātāpī Sh vihara lābhādī

e R ce tu

31 Dhp 167 Uv 4:8 GDhp 121

hīnaṃ dhammaṃ **na** seveyā pramādena na samvase | 3 A iii
micchadr̥ṣṭiṃ na seveyā na siyā lokavaddhano ||

c R micchādr̥ṣṭiṃ

32 Dhp 259 Uv 4:21 GDhp 114

na tāvatā dhammadharo yāvatā bahu bhāṣati |
yo tu appam pi sottāna dhammaṃ kāyena phassaye | 3 A iv
sa ve dhammadharo hoti yo dhamme na pramajjati ||

33 Dhp 371 Uv 31:31 GDhp 75

dhammaṃ vicinātha apramattā
mā vo kāmaguṇā bhrameṃsu cittaṃ |
mā lohaguḍe **gilaṃ** pramatto 3 A v
kraṇḍe dukkham idan ti dahyamāno ||

c R lokaguḍe d Sh krande

apramādavarggaḥ

Brāhmaṇa

34 Dhp 383 Uv 33:60 GDhp 10

chinna sūtraṃ parākṛāmma bhavaṃ praṇuda brāhmaṇa |
saṃkhārāṇāṃ **kha**yaṃ ñāttā akathaso si brāhmaṇa || 3 A vi

c Sh ññāttā

d R akathaṃso si Sh akathaṃ sosi brāhamaṇa The mark R and Sh interpret as *anusvāra*, I take as the tail of *-ṇḍ-* in the line above (3 A v), cf eg 235: *muṇḍa-*, and 247: *śaṇḍām*.

35 Uv 33:64

yamhi dhammaṃ vijāneyā	vṛddhamhi daharamhi vā	
sakkacca naṃ namasseyā	aggihotraṃ va brāhmaṇo	

a Sh vijāneya

b Sh buddhamhi

36 Dhṃ 392 Uv 33:66 GDhp 3

yamhi dhammaṃ vijāneyā	sammasaṃbuddhadeśitaṃ		3 B i
tam eva apacāyeyā	aggihotraṃ va brāhmaṇo		

b R -seśitaṃ

c R apacāpeyā

37 Uv 33:8 GDhp 1

na jaṭāhi na gotreṇa	na jāccā hoti brāhmaṇo		
yo tu bāhati pāpāni	aṇutthūlāni sabbaśo		
bāhanā eva pāpānāṃ	brāhmaṇo ti pravuccati		3 B ii

ef = R 38ab R was presumably following the MS punctuation, which is not rarely to be disregarded, as a glance at 39 would show; and certainly it should be disregarded here.

a Sh jaṭāhi

c R vāhati Sh yo tta vāhati I write *bāhati*, and *bāhanā* in pāda e, although *b* and *v* are indistinguishable, because of the word-play with *brāhmaṇa-*.

e R Sh vāhanā

38 Dhp 401 Uv 33:30 GDhp 21

vārī pukkharapatte vā ārāgre-r-iva sāsavo ||
 yo na lippati kāmesu tam ahaṃ brūmi brāhmaṇaṃ |

= R 38c-f

a R Sh -patre

b R Sh ārāgre-r-iva

c R lipyati Sh limpati

39 Dhp 387 Uv 33:74 GDhp 50

udayaṃ tapati ādicco rātrim ābhāti candramā ||
 sannaddho khattiyo tapati jhāyīṃ tapati brāhmaṇo || 3 B iii
 atha sabbe ahorāṭṭe buddho tapati tejasā ||

c R Sh khatriyo

e R Sh -rātre

40 Dhp 385 GDhp 35

yassa pāram apāram vā pārāpāraṃ na vijjati |
 vītajjaraṃ viṣaṃyuttaṃ tam ahaṃ brūmi brāhmaṇaṃ ||

a R yasya pāraṃ

41 Dhp 384 Uv 33:72 GDhp 14

yadā dayesu dhammesu pārāgū hoti brāhmaṇo | 3 B iv
 athassa sabbe saṃyogā atthaṃ gacchanti jānato ||

a R yayesu Sh padesu *d, y* and *p* can be very similar in the MS. I read *dayesu* as being a more likely form than *yayesu*, and at least more related to the parallels in Dhp and GDhp than *padesu*.

47 Dhp 294, 295 Uv 33:61,62 GDhp 12, 13

mātaraṃ paṭhamaṃ hantā rājānaṃ do ca khattiye |
rāṣṭraṃ sānucaraṃ hantā anigho carati brāhmaṇo ||

a R pa (fn: 'abbreviation for *pitarāṃ*') saṃhantā Sh yaḥ saṃhantā

b R Sh khatriye c R rāṣṭraṃ Sh rāṣṭraṃ

48 Dhp 403 Uv 33:33 GDhp 49

gambhīrapraṃñāṃ medhāvīṃ māggā smāggassa kovidāṃ |
uttamātham anuprāttam tam ahaṃ brūmi brāhmaṇaṃ || 4 A ii

a Sh -paññaṃ d Sh brāhmaṇaṃ

49 Dhp 386 Uv 33:32 GDhp 48

jhāyīṃ virajam āsīnaṃ katakiccaṃ anāsavaṃ |
uttamātham anuprāttam tam ahaṃ brūmi brāhmaṇaṃ ||

c R uttamātham Sh anuprāttam

d Sh brāhmaṇaṃ

brāhmaṇavarggaḥ

Bhikṣu

50

sabbattha saṃvaro sādhu sādhu sabbattha saṃvaro | 4 A iii
sabbattha saṃvṛto bhikkhū sabbadukkhā pramuccati ||

c R sabattha

51 Dhp 361 Uv 7:11 Mvu III 423 PrātMā p 37 PrātMū Endstr. 9
GDhp 52

kāyena saṃvaro sādhu	sādhu vācāya saṃvaro		
manasā pi saṃvaro sādhu	sādhu sabbattha saṃvaro		4 A iv
sabbattha saṃvṛto bhikkhū	sabbadukkhā pramuccati		

b Sh vacāya

52 Dhp 362 Uv 32:7 GDhp 53

hastasamyyato pādasamyyato		
vācāsamyyato saṃvṛtendriyo		
ajjhattarato samāhito		4 A v
eko saṃtuṣīto tam āhu bhikkhuṃ		

a Sh hastasamyyato pādasamyyato b Sh samyyato

53 Dhp 378 Uv 32:24

śāntakāyo śāntacitto	śāntavā susamāhito		
vāntalokāmiṣo bhikkhū	upaśānto ti vuccati		4 A vi

54 Dhp 363 Uv 8:10 GDhp 54

yo mukhe samyyato bhikkhū	mantābhāṣi anuddhato	
atthaṃ dhammañ ca deṣeti	madhuraṃ tassa bhāṣitaṃ	

a Sh samyyato

55 Dhp 365 Uv 13:8 GDhp 61

saṃ lābhaṃ nātimaññeyā	nā ṣṃñesaṃ prihayaṃ care	
aññesaṃ prihayaṃ bhikkhū	samādhin nādhigacchati	4 B i

a R nābhimaññeyā Sh nātimaññeyā
b Sh nā 'ññesaṃ c Sh aññesaṃ

56 Dhp 366 Uv 13:12 GDhp 62

appalābho pi ce bhikkhū	saṃ lābhaṃ nātimaññati	
taṃ ve devā praśaṃsanti	śuddhājīviṃ atandritaṃ	

a Sh bhikkhu b Sh nātimaññati
c Sh praśaṃsanti d R śuddhājīvaṃ

57 Dhp 369 Uv 26:12 Mvu III 421 GDhp 76

siñca bhikkhu imāṃ nāvāṃ	sittā te laghu hehiti	
hettā rāgaṃ ca doṣaṃ ca	tato nibbāṇam ehisi	4 B ii

a Sh bhikkhu b Sh laghum ehiti fn: 'MS Hehiti'

58 Uv 32:23 Mvu III 422 cf GDhp 71, 72

udāggracitto sumano	adhibhūya priyā ṣpriyaṃ	
tato prāmojjabahulo	sato bhikkhū parivraje	

a Sh udāgra- c R pramojja-
d Sh bhikkhu

59 cf Dhp 368 Thī 182 Uv 32:21 Mvu III 421 GDhp 70, 71

mettāvihārī bhikkhū	prasanno buddhaśāsane		4 B iii
paṭivijjhi padaṃ śāntaṃ	saṃkhāropaśamaṃ sukhaṃ		
dr̥ṣṭe va dhamme nibbānaṃ	yogacchemaṃ anuttaraṃ		

ef = R 60ab I attach these pādas to 59, as I feel *nibbānaṃ* is more likely to be a complement to *padaṃ śāntaṃ* than to *śuṃñāgāraṃ*.

a R mettrā- Sh vihāri bhikkhu

b Sh paṭivijjet fn: 'MS paṭivijjit'

d R Sh saṃkhāropasamaṃ

60 Dhp 373 Uv 32:9 GDhp 55

śuṃñā ṣgāraṃ praviṣṭassa	śāntacittassa bhikkhuṇo		4 B iv
amānuṣā ratī hoti	sammaṃ dhammaṃ vipaśśato		

= R 60c-f

a R praviṣṭasya Sh śuṃñā, gāraṃ

b R -cittasya

61 Dhp 374 Uv 32:10 GDhp 56

yathā yathā sammasati	khandhānāṃ udayavyayaṃ		
labhate cittassa prāmojjaṃ	amatā hetuṃ vijānato		4 B v

b Sh udayavyayaṃ

c R citassa

62 Dhp 372 Uv 32:25 PrātMā p 37 GDhp 58

nāsti jhānaṃ apraṃñassa	praṃñā nāsti ajhāyato		
yamhi jhānaṃ ca praṃñā ca	sa ve nibbānasantike		

a Sh apraññassa

b Sh praññā

c Sh praññā

63 Dhp 375a-d Uv 32:26, 27ab PrātMā p 37 GDhp 59

tathāyam ādī bhavati
indriyagottī sāntoṣṭhīiha praññassa bhikkhuṇo | 4 B vi
prātimokkhe ca saṃvaro ||

a R Sh ādī

b Sh praññassa

c R sāntoṣṭhī

d Sh pratimokkhe

64 Dhp 375ef, 376 (Be, Ce 376a-f) Uv 32:6 PrātMā p 37
GDhp 60mitte bhajetha kallāṇe
paṭisandharavatti ssa
tato prāmojjabahulośuddhājīvī atandrito |
ācārakušalo siyā |
sato bhikkhū parivraje ||

5 A i

a R mitre

b Sh atandito

c Sh paṭisancara-vattissa

e R pramojja-

f Sh bhikkhu

bhikṣuvarggaḥ

Attha

65 Dhp 331 Uv 30:34

atthesu jātesu sukhā sakhāyā
puṇṇaṃ sukhaṃ jīvitasamkhayamhi |
toṣṭhī sukhā yā itari[]
sabbassa pāpassa sukhaṃ prahāṇaṃ ||

5 A ii

b Sh pumñiṃ

c Sh itarītarena The three *akṣaras* following *itarī-* are covered by a drawing-pin.

66 Dhp 332 Uv 30:21

sukhā mātreatā loke tato petteatā sukhā |
śāmannatā sukhā loke tato brāhmannatā sukhā ||

a R mātreyyatā Sh mātteatā (yatā ?)

b R petreyyatā Sh petteatā (yatā ?)

67 Dhp 333 Uv 30:20

sukhaṃ yāvaj jarā śīlaṃ sukhā śraddhā pratiṣṭhitā |
sukhā attharasā vācā assiṃ mānakkhayo sukho || 5 A iii

c Sh attharatā vāca d R asmiṃ Sh asmiṃ mānajayo

68 Dhp 194 Uv 30:22

sukho buddhāna uppādo sukhā dhammassa deśanā |
sukhā saṃghassa sāmaggī samagrāṇaṃ tapo sukho ||

a R buddhānā There is a mark following *buddhāna*, but such a mark frequently appears in the MS immediately before the string-hole, eg at 7 A iii and iv.

c R Sh sāmaggī d Sh samagrāṇaṃ

69 Dhp 206 Uv 30:25 GDhp 175

sukhaṃ daṃṣanam ayirāṇaṃ saṃvāso pi satāṃ sukho | 5 A iv

addaṃśanena bālānāṃ niccam eva sukhī siyā ॥

b Sh sadāṃ

d Sh sukhaṃ *sukhaṃ* is possible, but the parallels support *sukhī*.

70 Dhp 207 Uv 30:26 GDhp 176

bālāsaṅgatacārī hi	drīgham addhāna śocati		
dukkho bālehi saṃvāso	amittehi-r-iva sabbadā		
dhīrā tu sukhasaṃvāsā	ñātīnaṃ vā samāgamo	॥	5 A v

b Sh drigham adhvāna

d R amitre hi-r-iva Sh amitrehir iva

e R dhīrāt tu sukhasaṃvāso

f Sh ññātīnaṃ R va

71 Dhp 208 Uv 25:25 GDhp 177

tassā hi dhīraṃ ca bahuśśutañ ca			
dhoreyaśīlavratamantam ayiraṃ			
taṃ tārīsaṃ sappuruṣaṃ sumedhaṃ			
sevetha nakkhattapathe va candramā	॥		5 A vi

a Sh tasmā

d R Sh nakkhatra-

72 Dhp 212 Uv 5:1

priyāto jāyate dukkhaṃ	priyā śokā priyā bhayaṃ	
priyāto vipramuttassa	nāsti śokā kato bhayaṃ	॥

a Sh priyato ... dukkhā b Sh śoko fn: 'MS śokā'

c R priyāto

d Sh śoko kuto fn: 'MS śokā'

73 Dhp 210 Uv 5:5

mā priyehi samāgaṃma apriyehi kadācanaṃ |
 priyassa addaṃṣanaṃ dukkhaṃ apriyassa ca daṃṣanaṃ || 5 A vii

a R samāgama c R adaṃṣanaṃ Sh dukkaṃ
 d Sh daṃṣanaṃ

74 Dhp 211 Uv 5:8

tassā priyaṃ na kayirātha priyāvādo hi pāpako |
 ggraṃthā tesam na vijjanti yesaṃ nāsti priyāpriyaṃ ||

a Sh tasmā c Sh granthā

75 Dhp 213 Uv 26:7 GDhp 163

chudhā parama rogāṇāṃ saṃkhāraparamaṃ dukhaṃ |
 etaṃ ñāttā yathābhūtaṃ nibbāṇaparamaṃ sukhaṃ || 5 B i

b R dukkhaṃ c Sh ññāttā

76 Dhp 204 Uv 26:6 GDhp 162

ārogaparamā lābhā sāmtoṣṭiparamaṃ dhanam |
 viśśāsaparamā ñātī nibbāṇaparamaṃ sukhaṃ ||

c Sh ññātī

77 Dhp 290 Uv 30:30 GDhp 164

māttāsukhapariccāgā paśse ce vipulaṃ sukhaṃ |

upaśānto sukhaṃ śeti hettā jayaparājayam ॥

82 cf Dhp 333cd Uv 30:24a-c, 30:20d

sukhā najjo sūpatitthā sukho dhammajito jano |
sukho śraddhapaṭilābho pāpassa akaraṇam sukhaṃ || 5 B v

a Sh sukhānaṅgo sūpatittho

c Sh śuddha-

83 Uv 30:23

sukhaṃ draṣṭum śilavanto sukhaṃ draṣṭum bahuśrutā |
arahanto pi sukhaṃ draṣṭum vipramuttā niropadhī ||

a Sh drṣṭam

b R bahuśrutā Sh drṣṭa bahuśrutā

c Sh drṣṭam

atthavarggaḥ

Śoka

84 Ud 92 (= Nett 67, Peṭ 14) Uv 5:3

ye keci śokā paridevitaṃ vā 5 B vi
dukkhaṃ va lokamhi anekarūpaṃ |
priyaṃ paṭicca prabhavanti ete
priye asante na bhavanti ete ||

b R ca

c Sh prabhayanti

d Sh priyeṣu santena

85 Ud 92 (= Nett 67) Uv 5:4

tassā hi te sukhi<khi>no vītaśokā
 yesaṃ priyaṃ nāsti kaḥiṃci loke |
 tassā aśokaṃ virajaṃ prāthayānā
 priyaṃ na kayirātha kaḥiṃci loke ||

5 B vii

a R Sh tasmā R sukhino fn: 'MS sukhikhino' Sh sukhikhino
 The scribe accidentally wrote *-khi-* twice.

c R Sh tasmā R virajam

86 Dhp 90 Uv 29:35

gataddhuno viśokassa vipramuttassa sabbahiṃ | 6 A i
 sabbaggrantaprahīṇassa paridāhā na vijjati ||

b Sh viprayuttassa

c R sabbaggrantha- Sh sabbagganta(tha?)-

87 Dhp 92 Uv 29:25

yesāṃ sannicayo nāsti ye pariñātabhojanā |
 ākāse va śakuntānāṃ padaṃ tesāṃ durannayaṃ ||

b R Sh pariññāta-

c R śakuntānām d Sh durannayaṃ

88 Dhp 96 Uv 31:45 c GDhp 297

śānto tassa mano hoti śāntā vācā ca kaṃmu ca | 6 A ii
 saṃmadaṃñāvimumuttassa upaśāntassa tāyino ||

b Sh kaṃma
d Sh tādino

c R sama- Sh śamadaññā

89 Dhp 94 Uv 19:3

yassendriyāṇi samataṃ gatāni
aśśā yathā sārathinā sudāntā |
prahīṇamānassa anāsavassa
devā pi tassa pri{hayanti tāyino ||

a R yasseṃdriyāṇi

90 Dhp 321 Uv 19:6

dāntaṃ nayanti samitiṃ dāntaṃ rājābhirūhati | 6 A iii
dānto śreṣṭho maṇuṣyesu yo ṣtivāde titikkhati ||

b R -ruhati

d R titikhyati

91 Dhp 322 Uv 19:7, 7/ d GDhp 341

varam assatarā dāntā ājāneyā va sendhavā |
kuñjarā va mahānāgā āttā dānto tato varam || 6 A iv

b R ca

c R ca

d Sh attādānto

92 Dhp 323 Uv 19:8-12

na hi tehi jānājātehi tāṃ bhūmim abhisamḃhave |
yathā ṣṭtanā sudāntena dānto dāntena gacchati ||

b Sh atisaṃbhave

93 Dhp 81 Uv 29:49 GDhp 239

śelo yathā ekaghano	vātena na samīrati		6 A v
evaṃ nindāpraśamsāsu	na samīranti paṇḍitā		

94 Dhp 9 (= Ja II 198) Uv 29:7 GDhp 192

anikkaṣāyo kāṣāyaṃ	yo vastaṃ paridhehiti		
apeto damasaccena	na so kāṣāyam arihati		6 A vi

b R Sh	vastraṃ	d Sh	sa
--------	---------	------	----

95 Dhp 10 (= Ja II 198) Uv 29:8 GDhp 193

yo tu vāntakaṣāyassa	śīlehi susamāhito		
upeto damasaccena	sa ve kāṣāyam arihati		

śokavarggaḥ

Kalyāṇī

96 Dhp 116 Uv 28:23

abhittaretha kallāṇe	pāpā cittaṃ nivāraye		
dhaṃdhaṃ hi karato puṇṇāṃ	pāpamhi ramate mano		6 B i

a Sh	kalyāṇe	c R	kāraye pūṇṇāṃ	Sh	puṇṇāṃ
------	---------	-----	---------------	----	--------

97 Dhp 117 Uv 28:21 GDhp 207

kayira ce puruṣo pāpaṃ	na naṃ kayirā punappuno		
------------------------	-------------------------	--	--

na tamhi chanda[m] kayirātha dukkho pāpassa sa[m]cayo ||

The first line of this leaf is overlapped by leaf 5 B, and the signs for *anusvāra* and *-i-* cannot be seen.

- a Sh kayiraṃ fn: 'MS kayira'
 c R chandaṃ Sh chanda
 d R Sh saṃcayo

98 DhP 118 Uv 28:22 GDhp 208

kayira ce puruṣo pu[m]ñā[m] kay[i]ra cena[m] punappuno |
 tamh[i] eva chanda[m] kayirātha sukho puṃñassa saṃcayo || 6 B ii

- a R puṃñāṃ Sh kayiraṃ ... puññāṃ
 b R kayira ce naṃ Sh kayiraṃ ce na
 c R tamhi eva chandaṃ Sh tamhi evaṃ chanda
 d Sh puññassa

99 MI 39 Uv 16:15 GDhp 327

śuddhasseva sadā phaggū śuddasso Ṣpoṣadho sadā |
 śuddhassa śucikammaṃ sadā saṃpajjate vrataṃ ||

- a Sh phaggu

100 Uv 29:41 ab DhP 314ab GDhp 337ab

akataṃ dukkataṃ śreyo pacchā tapati dukkataṃ |
 dukkataṃ me kataṃ ti śocati bhūyo śocati doggaṭiṃ gato || 6 B iii

- d R yo ggaṭiṃ

101 Uv 29:42 ab Dhp 314cd GDhp 337cd

katañ ca sukataṃ sādhu yaṃ kattā nānutappati |
sukataṃ me kataṃ ti nandati bhūyo nandati soggaṭṭiṃ gato ||

b R nānutapyati

c R kataṃ hi Sh katanti

d Sh soggaṭṭiṃ

102 Dhp 119 Uv 28:19

pāpo pi paśśate bhadrāṃ yāva pāpaṃ na paccati | 6 B iv
yadā tu paccate pāpaṃ atha pāpo pāpāni paśśati ||

c R yadā cca cf 103c

103 Dhp 120 Uv 28:20

bhadro pi paśśate pāpaṃ yāva bhadrāṃ na paccati |
yadā tu paccate bhadrāṃ atha bhadro bhadrāni paśśati || 6 B v

104

pāpaṃ pi karato bhadrāṃ yāva pāpaṃ na paccati |
atha payirāgate kāle pāpo pāpāni paśśati ||

a R karato pāpaṃ

105

bhadrāṃ pi karato pāpaṃ yāva bhadrāṃ na paccati |
atha payirāgate kāle bhadro bhadrāni paśśati || 6 B vi

106 Dhp 124 Uv 28:15

pāṇimhi ce vraṇo nāssa dhāreyā pāṇinā viṣaṃ |
nāvraṇe viṣaṃ anneti nāsti pāpam akurvato ||

a R na'ssa Sh pāṇimhi
d Sh akurvato

107 Dhp 71 (= Nett 161, Peṭ 48) Uv 9:17 (cf Manu 4:172)

na hi pāpakaṃ kataṃ kammaṃ sajjaṃ chīram va mucchati | 7 A i
dahantaṃ bālam anneti bhassachanno va pāpako ||

b R Sh muccati d R Sh bhasma-

108 Uv 9:18

na hi pāpakaṃ kataṃ kammaṃ sajjaṃ śastam va kantati |
maraṇo ṣpeto hi jānāti yā gatī pāpakaṃmuṇo ||

b R Sh śastram
d Sh yāmatāṃ pāpakaṃmuṇo

109 Ja IV 166 Uv 16:1 GDhp 335

anāgataṃ paṭikayirātha kiccaṃ
mā vo kiccaṃ kiccakāle vyadheyā | 7 A ii
taṃ tārisaṃ paṭikatakiccakāriṃ
na naṃ kiccaṃ kiccakāle vyadheti ||

110 S I 57 Mil 66 Uv 4:16

paṭikacceva taṃ kayirā yaṃ nāyyā hitam āttano |

na śākaṭikamanti ssa mantam dhīro parākrame ||

- a Sh yadi kacceva b R nāpyā Sh prāpya
 c R -mantrissa Sh -santissa
 d R mantram Sh mandam viro

111 S I 57 Mil 66 Uv 4:17 Utt 5:14

yathā śākaṭiko māggam samam hettā mahāpatham | 7 A iii
 viṣamam māggam āsājja akkhachinno tha jhāyati ||

- a Sh yathā gāhati homāggam
 b R sammam Sh sugam There is a slight mark above *sa-* which may possibly be meant as an *anusvāra*. R mahāpatham
 d Sh akkha chinnotha jhāyati (royiti?)

112 S I 57 Mil 67 Uv 4:18 Utt 5:15

evam dhammā apakrāmma adhammam anuvattiya |
 bālo maccumukham pratto **akkh**achinno va jhāyati || 7 A iv

113 Dhp 307 (= Vin III 90) Uv 11:9

kāṣāyakamṭhā bahavo pāpadhammā asaṃyyatā |
 pāpā pāpehi kammehi nirayam te upapajjatha ||

b Sh asaṃyatā

114 Dhp 306 (= Ud 45 = It 42-3) Uv 8:1 GDhp 269

abhūtavādī nirayam upeti
 yo cāpi kattā na karomī ti āha | 7 A v
 ubho pi te precca samā bhavanti

nihinakaṃmā manujā paratra ॥

115 Dhp 125 Uv 28:9

yo apraduṣṭassa naro praduṣyati
 śuddhassa poṣassa anamaṅgaṇassa ।
 tam eva bālaṃ pracceti pāpaṃ
 sukhumo rajo paṭivātaṃ va khitto ॥

7 A vi

116 Dhp 123 Uv 28:14

vāṇijo va bhayaṃ māggaṃ appasāttho mahaddhano ।
 viṣaṃ jīvitukāmo va pāpāni parivajjaye ॥

a R vāṇijena va bhayaṃ mārggaṃ

b Sh appasātthattho The extra *-ttha-* I take to be a crossed-out mistake.

117 Dhp 291 Uv 30:2 GDhp 179

paraduk~~kh~~hopadhānena yo icche sukham ātano । 7 B i
 verasaṃsaggasaṃsaṭṭho dukkhā na parimuccati ॥

118

kuṇapassa pi gaṃdhucchijjati
 u ṣddhukitassa (-chitassa) pi rāti accayā ।
 puruṣassa adhammacāriṇo
 annāhaṃ gandho na chijjati ॥

7 B ii

a Sh kuṇapassapi gaṃdhucchi । dṛti

b R uddhu(?)kitas payirā ti । accayā Sh uttakitassapi rāti accayā

c R puruṣasya

119

yatha ggrahapatayo prabhūtaratanā
 āḍitte nagaramhi dahyamāne |
 muttāmaṇiphaṭikarajataheto
 vyāyamanti api nīharema kiṃci ||

- a Sh grhapatayo
 b R āḍittena śaramhi Sh prābhitte
 c Sh -kaṭika-

120

tatha-r-iva śamaṇā prabhūtapraṃñā
 ayirā ayirapathesu sicchamānā |
 jātijarāmarañabhayāddittā dukkhāṭṭā
 vyāyamanti api prāpuṇema śāntiṃ ||

7 B iii

- a R omits Sh tathavidha
 b Sh ayirapathena
 c R -bhayāppittā | dukkhāto Sh -bhayāddittā(tā?) dukkhāttā

kalyāṇivarggaḥ

Puṣpa

121 Dhp 54 Uv 6:16 GDhp 295

na puṣpagandho paṭivātam eti
 na candanaṃ tagaraṃ vāhlikaṃ vā |
 satān tu gandho paṭivātam eti
 sabbā diśā sappuruṣo pravāti ||

7 B iv

- b R na candanaṃ vāhṇikaṃ vā

c Sh satām tu fn: ‘MS satantu’

122 Dhp 55 Uv 6:17 cd GDhp 296

candanam tagaram cāpi	uppalam atha vāsīkiṃ		7 B v
etesam gandhajātānām	śilagandho anuttaro		

c R etesām

123 Dhp 56 Uv 6:18

appāmātro ayam gaṃdho	yoyam tagaracandane		
yo tu śilavatām gandho	vāti devesu uttamo		7 B vi

a R Sh gandho

c Sh ttu

124 Dhp 57 Uv 6:19 GDhp 297

tesam sampannaśīlānām	apramādavihāriṇām		
sammadaṃñāvimuttānām	māro māggaṃ na viṇḍati		

c R -aṃñā- Sh -aññā-

d R mārggaṃ Sh vindati

125 Dhp 51 (= Th 323) Uv 18:6 GDhp 290

yathā pi ruciraṃ puṣpaṃ	vannavantam agandhakaṃ		
evam subhāṣitā vācā	aphalā hoti akurvato		8 A i

c Sh vacā

d Sh akurvato

126 Dhp 52 (= Th 324) Uv 18:7 GDhp 291

yathā pi ruciraṃ puṣpaṃ	vannavantam sagaṃdhakaṃ		
-------------------------	-------------------------	--	--

evaṃ subhāṣitā vācā

saphalā hoti kurvvato ||

b R Sh sagandhakaṃ

c Sh vacā

d Sh kurvato

127 Dhp 49 Uv 18:8 GDhp 292

yathā pi bhramaro puṣpā
praḍeti rasam ādāya

vannagandham aheḍayaṃ |
evaṃ ggrāme muni care ||

8 A ii

d Sh grāme

128 Dhp 47 Uv 18:14 GDhp 294 cf MBh 12:169:12

puṣpāṇi heva pracinantam
suttam ggrāmaṃ mahogho vā

vyāsattamanasaṃ naram |
maccu-r-ādāya gacchati ||

c Sh grāmaṃ

d Sh gaccati

129 Dhp 48 Uv 18:5

puṣpāṇi heva pracinantam
asaṃpuṭṭnesu kāmesu

vyāsattamanasaṃ naram |
antako kurute vaṣe ||

8 A iii

b R vyāsatta-amanasaṃ

c Sh asaṃsannesu

130 Dhp 53 Uv 18:10 GDhp 293

yathā pi puṣparāśimhā
evaṃ jātena māccena

kayirā mālāguṇe bahū |
kātavvaṃ kuśalaṃ bahūṃ |

d Sh kātabbaṃ ... bahūṃ

131 Dhp 44 Uv 18:1 GDhp 301

ko imaṃ paṭhaviṃ vijehiti
yamalokaṃ va imaṃ sadevakaṃ |
ko dhammapade sudeṣite
kuśalo puṣpam iva prajehiti |

8 A iv

b R ca (but va in 132b)

132 Dhp 45 Uv 18:2 GDhp 302

śeṅkko paṭhaviṃ vijehiti
yamalokaṃ va imaṃ sadevakaṃ |
so dhammapade sudeṣite
kuśalo puṣpam iva prajehiti ||

8 A v

a Sh saikho

d Sh prajehi

133 Dhp 377 Uv 18:11 GDhp 298

vāśśikī-r-iva puṣpāṇi mañcakāni pramuñcati |
evaṃ rāgaṇi ca doṣāṇi ca vipramuñcatha bhikkhavo ||

a Sh vāśśikī viya

134 Dhp 46 Uv 18:18, 20 GDhp 300

phenopamaṃ lokam imaṃ vidittā
mañcidhammaṃ abhisam**dh**ānāṃ |
chettāna mārasa prapuṣpakāni
addaṃśanaṃ maccurājassa gacche ||

8 A vi

- a R phenopamam b Sh marici-
d R Sh addaṃsanam

135 Dhp 58 Uv 18:12 GDhp 303

yathā saṃkārahūtamhi ujjhitaṃ mahāpathe |
padumaṃ ubbhidaṃ assa śucigandhaṃ manoramaṃ ||

- c R tabbhidaṃ (?) Sh utthidaṃ

136 Dhp 59 Uv 18:13 GDhp 304

evaṃ saṃkārahūtesu andhabhūte pṛthujjane | 8 B i
atirocanti praññāya saṃmasabuddhasāvakaḥ ||

- b R puthujjane c Sh praññāya
d R -saṃbuddha- Sh -saṃbuddha- fn: 'MS osabuddha'

puṣpavarggaḥ

Tahna

137 Dhp 334 (= Th 399) Uv 3:4 d GDhp 91

manujassa pramattacāriṇo
tahnā vaddhati mālutaḥ iva |
sā prāplavate hurāhuraṃ
phalameṣī va vanamhi vānnaro ||

- c Sh mā prāpnuvate

138 Dhp 335 (= Th 400) Uv 3:9

yam cesā sahate jaṃmī tahnā loke duraccayā | 8 B ii
 śokā tassa pravaddhamti ovaṭṭhā beruṇā iva ||

a Sh cemā c Sh pravaddhanti
 d R berunābhā va Sh oratṭhā (?) veruṇā iva

139 Dhp 336 (= Th 401) Uv 3:10

yo cetām sahate jaṃmiṃ tahnām loke duraccayām |
 śokā tassa vivaṭṭanti udabindū va pukkhare || 8 B iii

c R vivaṭṭhanti Sh vivaḍḍhanti
 d Sh udavindū

140 Uv 3:11 a-d Dhp 337a-d (= Th 402a-d) ab GDhp 126ab

taṃ vo vademi bhadraṃ vo yāvaṃt-ittha samāgatā |
 tahnām samulām khaṇatha uṣīrātthī va beruṇiṃ |
 tahnāya khatamulāya nāsti śokā kato bhayaṃ || 8 B iv

a Sh tam b R yāvant Sh yāvaṃ tittha
 d R uṣīrārtho va Sh veruṇiṃ
 e R khāta- f Sh śoko kuto fn: 'MS kato'

141 Sn 740 (= It 9, A II 10) Uv 3:12

tahnabitiyo puruṣo drīgham addhāna saṃsari |
 etthabhāvaṃñāthābhāvaṃ tattha tattha punappuno ||

a R -vitiyo Sh tahnā vatiyo

b R adhvānaṃ Sh addhānasamsari

c R -aṃñāthī- Sh etthabhāvaṃ a(?) thābhāvaṃ

142 Sn 741 (= It 9, A II 10) Uv 3:18

etam ādīnavaṃ nyāttā

tahnā dukkhassa saṃbhavaṃ |

vītatahno anādāno

sato bhikkhū parivraje || 8 B v

d Sh bhikkhu

143 Dhṃ 345 (= S I 77, Ja II 140, Peṭ 26) Uv 2:5 GDhṃ 169

na taṃ dṛḍhaṃ bandhanam āhu dhīrā

yad āyasaṃ dārujaṃ babbajaṃ vā |

sārattarattā maṇikuṇḍalesu

putresu dāresu ca yā apekhā ||

d R putreso dāresu yā apekhā

144 Dhṃ 346 (= S I 77, Ja II 140, Peṭ 26) Uv 2:6 GDhṃ 170

etam dṛḍhaṃ bandhanam āhu dhīrā

8 B vi

ohāriṃsaṃ sukhumasaṃ dupramaṇisaṃ |

etappi chettāna vrajanti santo

anapekhino sabbadukhaṃ prahāya ||

a Sh bandhanam

b R ohāriṃsaṃ (or -maṃ) ...

dupramaṇisaṃ

c Sh etam pi

145 Dhṃ 186 (= Ja II 313) Uv 2:17 Divy 224

na kāhāpaṇavāsena

ttrettī kāmesu vijjati |

c R Sh tasmā

153 Dhp 357 Uv 16:17

ttriṇadoṣāṇi khettrāṇi	doṣadoṣā ayaṃ prajā	
tassā hi vītaḍoṣesu	dinnaṃ hoti mahapphalaṃ	

a R ṭṛṇa- Sh ṭṛṇa doṣāṇi khettrāṇi

c R Sh tasmā

154 Dhp 358 Uv 16:18

ttriṇadoṣāṇi khettrāṇi	mohadoṣā ayaṃ prajā		9 B i
tassā hi vītamohesu	dinnaṃ hoti mahapphalaṃ		

a R ṭṛṇa- Sh ṭṛṇa doṣāṇi khettrāṇi

c R Sh tasmā

155 Dhp 99 (= Th 992) Uv 29:17

ramaṇīyaṃ vatā Sraṇṇaṃ	yamhiṃ na ramate jano	
vītarāgāttha raṃsanti	nāṃṇe kāmāgaveṣiṇo	

c Sh raṃmanti

d Sh nāṃte kāmāgaveṣiṇo

156 Dhp 338 Uv 3:16

yathā pi mūle anupadrute dṛḍhe
chinno pi rukkho puna-r-iva jāyati |
 em eva tahnānuśaye anūhate
 nivvattate dukkham idaṃ punappuno ||

9 B ii

d Sh nibbattate

d Sh nibbattate

tahnavaṛḡgaḥ

Mala

157 Dhp 241

asajjhāyamaḷā vedā
malo vaṇṇassa kosajjaṃ

anuṭṭhāṇamaḷā gharā | 9 B iii
pramādo rakkhatāṃ malo ||

a Sh assajjhāya-

158 Dhp 242

malo istiye duccharitaṃ
malo pāpāni kaṃmāṇi

maccheraṃ datatāṃ malo |
assim loke paramhi ca || 9 B iv

a R Sh istiye
d R Sh asmiṃ

b Sh datatāṃ

159 Dhp 243

tato malataraṃ brūmi
ete male prahattāna

avijjā maraṇaṃ malaṃ |
niṃmalā caratha bhikkhavo ||

b Sh saraṇaṃ

160 Dhp 240 (= Nett 129, Peṭ 8, 49) Uv 9:19

ayasā tu malo samuṭṭhito
tato uṭṭhāya tam eva khādati |

9 B v

em eva vidhūnacāriyaṃ
sakāni kaṃmāṇi nayanti doggatim ॥

d Sh sahāni R doggatim

161 Dhp 235

pāṇḍupalāśo ca dāni si
yamapuruṣā pi ca **te** upatṭhitā | 9 B vi
uyyogamukhe ca tiṭṭhasi
pātheyaṃ pi ca te na vijjati ॥

162 cf Dhp 236 Uv 16:3

uyyamassa ghaṭassa āttanā
kaṃmāro rajataṃ va niddhame ॥
niddhāntamalo anaṅgano
bitiyaṃ (vitiyaṃ) ayirabhūmim **esi** ॥ 10 A i

a Sh uppamassa d R vitiyaṃ ... emi Sh vibhiyaṃ
... eti

163 Dhp 239 Uv 2:10

anupūrveṇa medhāvī thokathokaṃ khaṇe khaṇe |
kammāro rajatasseva niddhame malam āttano ॥

a R medhāvī Sh anupūrveṇa

b Sh thokaṃ thokaṃ c R rajastass'

164 Dhp 244 Uv 27:3 Jm 16:2 GDhp 221

sujīvaṃ ahirīkena saṃkiliṣṭan tu jīvati |

prakkhaṇḍinā pragabbheṇa

kākaśūreṇa dhansinā ||

c Sh pakkhaṇḍinā

d R -sūreṇa Sh dhaṃsinā

165 Dhp 245 Uv 27:4 Jm 16:3 GDhp 222

hirīmatā tu duj्जīvaṃ
alīnenāpragabbheṇaniccaṃ śucigaveṣiṇā |
śuddhājīvena paśśatā ||

10 A ii

a R hirīmatāt tu

b Sh -gaveṣiṇā

c R -pragabbhena

166 Dhp 252 Uv 27:1 GDhp 272

supaśśaṃ vajjaṃ aṃṇesaṃ
paresāṃ iha vajjāni
āttano puna chādetiāttano puna duddaśaṃ |
uppunāti yathā busaṃ |
kalim va kṛtavāṃ śaṭho ||

10 A iii

a R Sh sudaśśaṃ Sh aṃṇesaṃ

d Sh bhusaṃ

f Sh kalim va kitavā

167 Dhp 163 Uv 28:16 GDhp 264

sukarāṇi asādhūni
yaṃ ve hitaṃ ca sādhuṇ caāttano ahitāni ca |
taṃ ve paramadukkaraṃ ||

d R dukkharaṃ

168

sukarāṇi asādhūni
yāni hitāni sādhuṇiāttano ahitāni ca |
tāni kurvanti paṇḍitā ||

10 A iv

d Sh kurvanti

169 Dhp 316, 317 Uv 16:4 GDhp 273

alajjitavve lajjanti	lajjitavve na lajjatha		
abhaye bhayadaṃṣāvī	bhaye cābhayadaṃṣīno		
micchadr̥ṣṭisamādānā	sattā gacchanti doggatiṃ		10 A v

a R Sh alajjitabbe

b R Sh lajjitabbe

170 Dhp 318

avajje vajjamatino	vajje cāvajjasamñino		
micchadr̥ṣṭisamādānā	sattā gacchanti doggatiṃ		

b Sh -samñino

c Sh micchandṛṣṭi-

171 Dhp 11 Uv 29:3 GDhp 213

asāre sāramatino	sāre cā ṣsārasamñino		
te sārān nādhigacchanti	micchasaṃkappagocarā		10 A vi

b Sh -sañino

172 Dhp 12 Uv 29:4 GDhp 214

sārañ ca sārato ññāttā	asārañ ca asārato		
te sāram adhigacchanti	saṃmasaṃkappagocarā		

a R ññāttā

173 Dhp 209 Uv 5:9 GDhp 266

ayoge yuñjijyāttānaṃ	yogamhi ca ayuñjija		
----------------------	---------------------	--	--

atthaṃ hettā priyaggrāhī pṛhayantatthānuyogināṃ || 10 B i

c Sh priyaggāhī The MS is very unclear at this point.

malavarggaḥ

Bāla

174 Dhp 66 Uv 9:13

caranti bālā dummedhā amitteṇa-r-iva āttanā |
karontā pāpakaṃ kammaṃ yaṃ hoti kaṭukapphalaṃ ||

b R amittreṇa Sh amitreṇa

c Sh karento

175 Dhp 67 Uv 9:14

kathaṃ ca taṃ kare kammaṃ **yaṃ** kattā anutappati | 10 B ii
yassa aṃśumukho rodaṃ vipākaṃ paṭisevati ||

b Sh anutapyati

c Sh aśru-

176 Dhp 68 Uv 9:15

taṃ ca kammaṃ kataṃ sādhu yaṃ kattā nānutappati |
yassa pratīto sumano vipākaṃ paṭisevati ||

a R kammaṃ

177 Dhp 72 Uv 13:2

yāvad eva **an**atthāya ñāttaṃ bālassa jāyati | 10 B iii
 hanti bālassa **śukrā**ṅgaṃ (?) muddham assa nipātaye ||

b Sh ññāttaṃ

c R bālasya śukrāmś taṃ Sh bālasya śukrāmśaṃ I cannot read the syllable following *śukrā-* with any certainty; R's *mśtaṃ* is possible, but Sh's *mśaṃ* is not.

d Sh vipātaye

178 Dhp 73 Uv 13:3

asatāṃ bhāvanam icchanti purekkhāraṇī ca bhikkhusu |
 āvāsesu ca essariyaṃ pūjāṃ para**k**ulesu ca || 10 B iv

d R pūjām

179 Dhp 74a-d Uv 13:4

mameva katamannentu gṛhī pravrajitā ca ye |
 na me pratibalā assa kiccā **ś**kiccesu kesuci ||

b R ca yena

c R me atibalā

180 Dhp 74ef, 75ab Uv 13:5

iti bālassa saṃkappo icchāmāno ca vaddhati |
 aṃñā hi **lā**bhopeniśā aṃñā nibbāṇagāminī || 10 B v

c Sh aññā hi lābhopeniśā

d Sh aññā

181 Dhp 75c-f Uv 13:6

evam etaṃ yathābhūtaṃ paśsaṃ buddhassa sāvako |
 sakkāraṃ nābhinandeyā vivekam anubrūhaye ||

b R paśsaṃ Sh paśyaṃ ... sāvako

d R anubrūhaye

182 S I 163 Uv 20:13

jayaṃ ve manyate bālo vācāya paraṣaṃ bhaṇaṃ | 10 B vi
 satāṃ hesa jayo hoti yā titikkhā vijānato ||

d R yāti bhikkhā(ṃ(?)) Sh yāti bhikkhu

183 S I 222, 223 Uv 20:6

abalaṃ tassa balaṃ hoti yassa bālabalaṃ balaṃ |
 balassa dhammaguttassa paṭivattā na vijjati ||

c Sh -muttassa

184 Dhp 63 Uv 25:22 Divy 490

yo bālo bālamānī paṇḍito cāpi tattha so | 11 A i
 bālo tu paṇḍitamānī sa ve bālo ti vuccati ||

b R tu (?) ttha so Sh tena so (?)

c Sh ca

185 Dhp 60 Mkv p 46 bc Uv 1:19

drīghā assupato rātrī drīghaṃ śāntassa yojanaṃ |

drīgho bālāna saṃsāro saddhammam avijānatāṃ ॥

a R assup(su)ato Sh assa yato
d Sh saddhammam

186 It 68 (= Ja VI 236) Uv 25:7

pūtimacche kuśāggreṇa yo naro upanahyati | 11 A ii
kuśā pi pūtiṃ vāyanti evaṃ bālophasevanā ॥

a Sh pūtigandhe kusāggeṇa
b Sh upavajjati

187 It 68 (= Ja VI 236) Uv 25:8

tagaraṇ ca palāśamhi yo naro upanahyati |
pattaṃ pi surabhiṃ vāti evaṃ dhiropasevanā ॥

a Sh mulāgandhi b Sh upavajjati
c R patraṃ pi Sh mṛdum pi

188 It 67 Uv 25:9

akaronto pi ce pāpaṃ karonte upasevati | 11 A iii
śaṅkiyo hoti pāpamhi avaṇṇo cāssa rūhati ॥

c Sh gandhiyo hoti yāvamhi
d Sh araṇṇo hoti ūhati

189 It 68 (= Ja VI 236) Uv 25:10

sevamāno sevamāne saṃpuṭṭho saṃphusaṃ pare |
śaro litto kalāpe vā alitte upaliṃpati | 11 A iv

upalepabhayā dhīro

neva pāpasakhā siyā ||

b Sh saṃkusaṃ

c Sh saro

e Sh upalepatayā

f R naiva The mark above *ne-* is the *-h-* of *pāpamhi* in 11 A iii.

190 It 68-9 (= Ja VI 236) Uv 25:12

tassā phalapuṭasseva

ñāyyā saṃpākam āttano |

asanto nopaseveyā

santo **se**veya paṇḍito || 11 A v

a R tassā (tasmā(?)) Sh tasmā

b R ñāpyā Sh ññāyya d R paṇḍito

191 Dhp 64 Uv 25:13 GDhp 233

yāvaj jīvaṃ pi ce bālo

paṇḍite payirupāsati |

neva dhammaṃ vijānāti

dravvī sūparasān iva ||

d Sh drabbī

192 Dhp 65 Uv 25:14 GDhp 234 cf MBh 10:5:2, fn 2

muhuttam api ce praṇño

paṇḍite payirupāsati | 11 A vi

khipraṃ dhammaṃ vijānāti

jihvā sūparasān iva ||

a Sh praṇño

d Sh suparasān

193 Dhp 121 Uv 17:5 GDhp 209

nāppaṃ pāpassa maṃñeyā

na me taṃ āgamiṣyati |

udabindunipātena

udakumbho pi pūrati ||

pūrate **bā**lo pāpassa

thokathokaṃ pi ācinaṃ | 11 A vii

ef = R 194ab

a Sh nāssaṃ ... maññeyā

c Sh udavindu-

d Sh udakumbho

194 Dhp 122 Uv 17:6 GDhp 210

nāppaṃ puṃñassa manyeyā

udabindunipātena

pūrate praṃṇo puṃñassa

na me taṃ āgamiṣyati ||

udakumbho pi pūrati |

thokathokaṃ pi ācinaṃ || 11 B i

ab = R 194cd cf = R 195

a Sh nāssaṃ puṃñassa

c Sh udavindu-

e Sh praññā praññassa

b R na m-etam

d R udakumbho

bālavarggaḥ

Daṇḍa

195 Dhp 141 Uv 33:1 Mvu III 412 Divy 339

na naggacariyā na jaṭā na paṃko

nānāśanaṃ tthaṇḍīlaśāyikā vā |

rajoceleṃ ukkuṭukapradhānaṃ

śodhenti māccaṃ avitiṇṇakaṃchaṃ ||

= R 196

a Sh jaṭā

c Sh rakto celeṃ

d Sh śodhanti R -kaṃkaṃ Sh -kaṃkhaṃ

b Sh thaṇḍīla-

196 Dhp 142 Uv 33:2 Mvu III 412 Divy 339 CPS 17:16
GDhp 80

alamkato cāpi samaṃ careyā 11 B ii
dānto śānto niyato dhammacārī |
sabbesu prāṇesu nidhāya daṇḍaṃ
so brāhmaṇo so śamaṇo sa bhikkhū ||

= R 197

d Sh śramaṇo

197 Dhp 133 Uv 26:3

mā vade paruṣaṃ kaṃci vuttā paṭivadeyu taṃ | 11 B iii
dukkhā hi sārambhakathā paṭidaṇḍā phuseyu taṃ ||

= R 198

b Sh pativadeyu d Sh patidaṇḍā

198 Uv 26:4

sace iresi āttānaṃ kaṃso upahato-r-iva | 11 B iv
jātīmaraṇasaṃsāraṃ ciraṃ praccanubhohisi ||

= R 199

a Sh bhāresi b R kaṃso
c R jāti-
d R pradu(?)nubhohisi Sh praccanutohisi

199 Dhp 134 Uv 26:5

na ce iresi āttānaṃ kaṃso anupahato-r-iva |
esa prātto si nibbānaṃ sārambhā te na vijjati ||

= R 200

a Sh na cen māresi

b R kaṃśo

c Sh prātto 'dsi

200 Dhp 135 Uv 1:17 cd GDhp 148

yathā daṇḍena gopālo

evaṃ jarā ca maccū ca

gāvo p(r)ājeti gocaraṃ |

prāṇināṃ adhivattati ||

11 B v

= R 201

b R Sh pājeti The MS is very unclear here, and I cannot be certain of the reading.

201 c-f Dhp 315c-f Uv 5:17c-f GDhp 131b-d

yathā daṇḍena gopālo

evaṃ rakkhatha āttānaṃ

khaṇātītā hi śocanti

gāvo rakṣati sāmināṃ |

khaṇo vo mā upaccagū |

nirayamhi samappitā || 11 B vi

= R 202

b Sh akṣati mārganāṃ R śāmināṃ

d R upaccagga Sh upaccagaṃ

202 Dhp 130 Uv 5:19

sabbe trasanti daṇḍānāṃ

āttānaṃ upamaṃ kattā

sabbesaṃ jīvitaṃ priyaṃ |

neva haṃyyā na ghātaye ||

= R 203

c Sh katvā

d R haṃyye Sh hanye

203 Dhp 131 Uv 30:3

sukhakāmāni bhūtāni
 āttano sukham eṣāṇo

yo daṇḍena vihiṃsati |
 precca so na labhate sukhaṃ || 11 B vii

= R 204

c R āttāno

204 Dhp 132 Uv 30:4

sukhakāmāni bhūtāni
 āttano sukham eṣāṇo

yo daṇḍena na vihiṃsati |
 precca so labhate sukhaṃ ||

This verse is omitted in R.

205 a-d Dhp 78 Uv 25:3 ef Dhp 76ef Uv 28:7ef GDhp 231ef

na bhajetha pāpake mitre na bhajetha puruṣā ṣdhame | 12 A i
 bhajetha praṃñe (prāṃñā-) medhāvī bhajetha puruṣottame |
 tārise bhajamānassa śreyo hoti na pāpiyo ||

a Sh na tāḍayatha

b Sh tajetha

c Sh tajetha prañña- R prañña-medhavi

d Sh tajetha

e Sh tajamānassa

206 Dhp 76 (= Th 993) Uv 28:7 GDhp 231

nidhino va pravattāraṃ
 nigṛhyavādiṃ medhāvīṃ
 tārisaṃ bhajamānassa

yaṃ paśṣe vajjadaṃṣinaṃ |
 tārisaṃ puruṣaṃ bhaje | 12 A ii
 śreyo hoti na pāpiyo ||

b R -daṃṣinaṃ

c Sh medhāvīṃ

207 Dhp 77 Uv 5:26 GDhp 230

ovadeyā anuśāseyā asabbhāto nivāraye |
satāṃ hetamaṃ priyaṃ hoti asatāṃ hoti apriyaṃ ||

208 S I 19 Uv 5:27

tassā satāñ ca asatāñ ca nānā hoti ito gatī | 12 A iii
asanto nirayaṃ yānti santo saggaparāyaṇā ||

a Sh tasmā b Sh nādhā
d Sh yaggaparāyaṇā

209 Dhp 152

appaśśuto ayaṃ puruṣo balivaddo va (j)jīrati |
māṃsāni tassa vaddhanti praṃñā tassa na vaddhati ||

b R balivaddho va jīrati Sh balivaddo'va jīrati
c Sh vaḍḍhanti d Sh praññā ... vaḍḍhati

210 Dhp 309 Uv 4:14 GDhp 270

cattāri tthāṇāni naro pramatto 12 A iv
āpajjate paradāropasevī |
apuññalābhaṃ anikāmaśeyaṃ
nidaṃ tritīyaṃ nirayaṃ catutthaṃ ||

a R tthāṇāni b Sh āpajjato
c Sh apuñña- d Sh nidraṃ

211 Dhp 310 Uv 4:/15/

apumñalābho ca gatī ca pāpiko
 bhītassa bhītāya ratī pi appikā |
 rājā pi daṇḍaṃ garukaṃ praṇeti
 kāyassa bhedaṃ nirayaṃ upeti ||

12 A v

a Sh apuñña-

d Sh kāyassa teṣā

212 GDhp 325 d Ja IV 172

saṃyyatā sugatiṃ yānti
 mā ssu viśśāsam āpādi

doggatiṃ yānti asaṃyyatā | 12 A vi
 iti vindu samaṃ care ||

a R saṃyattā

c Sh māssa viśrāmam

d R bindu Sh viññu

213 Vin II 195

mā kuñjara nāgam āsida
 dukkho kuñjara nāgamaṃsado |
 na hi nāgahatassa kuñjara
 sugatī hoti ito paraṃ yato ||

12 A vii

a R āsid Sh nāsamāsita

b R nāga-saṃmado Sh nāśasaṃmado

c Sh nāśahatassa

d R sugati Sh sumatī

214

giriduggavicāriṇaṃ yathā
 sīhaṃ parvvatapaṭṭhigocaraṃ |
 naravīraṃ apetaḥheravaṃ
 mā hiṃsittha anomanikramaṃ ||

a R gi[xx]kuvicāriṇaṃ Sh girikumbha-
 b Sh parvata- d Sh -vikramaṃ

215 Dhp 320 Uv 29:21 GDhp 329

aham nāgo va saṃgrāme cāpātipatite śare | 12 B i
 atīvāde titikkhāmi duśśīlo hi bahujano ||

a Sh aham ... saṃgrāme
 c Sh titikkhāni d Sh bahujano

daṇḍavarggaḥ

Śaraṇa

216 Dhp 188 Uv 27:31 Divy 164

bahū ve śaraṇaṃ yānti parvate ca vanāni ca |
 vastūni rukkhacittāṇi manuṣyā bhayatajjitā ||

a Sh bahu b Sh parvate
 c Sh vamāni R -citrāṇi

217 Dhp 189 Uv 27:32 Divy 164

na etaṃ śaraṇaṃ khemmaṃ na etaṃ śaraṇaṃ uttamaṃ | 12 B ii
 etaṃ śaraṇaṃ āgaṃma sabbadukkhā pramuccati ||

d Sh pramuceati

218 Dhp 190 Uv 27:33 Divy 164

yo tu buddhañ ca dhammañ ca saḅhaṃ ca śaraṇaṃ gato |
cattāri ca ayirasaccāni yathābhūtāni paśṣati || 12 B iii

b R saṃghaṃ Sh saṃghaṃ fn: 'MS saḅhaṃ'

c R catvāri

219 Dhp 192 Uv 27:35 Divy 164

etaṃ ve śaraṇaṃ khemmaṃ etaṃ śaraṇaṃ uttamam |
etaṃ śaraṇaṃ āgama sabbadukkhā pramuccati ||

b R uttamam

220 Ja V 222 = A II 75

gavāṃ ce taramāṇānāṃ jihmaṃ gacchati puṅgavo |
sabbā tā jihmaṃ gacchanti nette jihmagate sati || 12 B iv

a R gavāṃceta taramāṇānāṃ Sh gadāṃ ce taramāṇānāṃ

b R puṅgavo Sh aṅgado

c Sh gacchanti

d R Sh netre

221 Ja V 222 = A II 75

evāṃ eva maṇuṣyesu yo hoti śreṣṭhasaṃmato |
sa ce adhaṃmaṃ carati prāg eva itarā prajā ||

c R sace vadhaṃ saṃcarati

222 Ja V 222 = A II 76

gavāṃ ce taramāṇānāṃ ujjuṃ gacchati puṅgavo | 12 B v
sabbā tā ujjuṃ gacchanti nette ujjugate sati ||

- a R gavāṃceta ramāṇānāṃ Sh gadāṃ ce taramāṇānāṃ
b Sh ujjāṃ R puṅgavo
c Sh ujjāṃ gacchanti d R Sh netre Sh ujjagate

223 Ja V 222 = A II 76

evāṃ eva manuṣyesu yo hoti śreṣṭhasaṃmato |
sa ce va dhammaṃ carati prāg eva itarā prajā ||

- c R sace vadhaṃ saṃcarati Sh dhammaṃ

224 Dhṃ 169 Uv 30:5 GDṃ 328

dhammaṃ care sucariṭaṃ na naṃ ducariṭaṃ care | 12 B vi
dhammacārī sukhaṃ śeti assiṃ loke paramhi ca ||

- a R Sh dhammaṃ d R Sh asmiṃ

225

dhammaṃ care sucariṭaṃ na naṃ ducariṭaṃ care |
brahmacārī sukhaṃ śeti assiṃ loke paramhi ca ||

- a R Sh dhammaṃ c Sh brahmacārī
d R Sh asmiṃ

226 Dhṃ 364 Uv 32:8 Mvu III 422 GDṃ 64

dhammārāmo dhammarato dhammaṃ anuvicintayaṃ | 12 B vii

dhammaṃ anussaraṃ bhikkhū dhammā na parihāyati ||

b R dhammam Sh dhammaṃ

c R anusmaram Sh bhikkhu

227 Th 303 Uv 30:7 Mvu II 80-81

dhammo have rakkhati dhammacārī

dhammo sucinno sukhāya dahāti |

13 A i

esānuśaṃso dhamme sucinne

na doggaṭṭiṃ gacchati dhammacārī ||

a R -cāriṇaṃ

b Sh śucinno

d Sh daggaṭṭiṃ

228

dhammo have rakkhati brahmacārī

dhammo sucinno sukhāya dahāti |

esā ṅnuśaṃso dhamme sucinne

na doggaṭṭiṃ gaccha<ccha>ti brahmacārī ||

13 A ii

a Sh brahmacārī

b Sh śucinno

c R sucinno Sh śucinno The *akṣara* is obscured by a drawing-pin. A vertical mark can be seen to the right of *-nn-*, but I take this as a punctuation mark, not as part of *-o*, cf 227c.

d R gacchati fn: 'MS gacchcchati' Sh gacchati brahmacārī (*ccha* is repeated by mistake at the beginning of the line, 13 A ii)

229 Dhṃ 155 Uv 17:3 d GDhṃ 139d

acarittā brahmaceram

aladdhā yovvane dhanam |

jinnakromcā va jhāyaṃti

jhīnamacche va pallare ||

b R Sh yobbane c R Sh -koṃcā Sh jhāyanti
d Sh kṣīnamacche

230 Dhp 156 Uv 17:4 cf GDhp 139B

acarittā brahmaceramaṃ aladdhā yovvane dhanamaṃ |
śenti cāpādhikinno vā porāṇāni aṣṣutthanamaṃ || 13 A iii

b R Sh yobbane c Sh cāpārikhinno
d Sh porānani

231 Dhp 91 Uv 17:1

ujjujjanti satīmanto na nikete ramaṃti te |
haṃsā va pallamaṃ hettā okama okama jamaṃti te ||

a Sh ujjaṃjanti d Sh jamaṃti

232 Dhp 175 Uv 17:2

haṃsā va ādiccapathe vehāyasaṃ yānti iddhiyā | 13 A iv
niyyāṃti dhīrā lokamaṃhi mārasenaṃ pramaḍḍhiya ||

c Sh nīyyanti ... lokamaṃhiṃ

d Sh pramaḍḍhiya

233 Dhp 146 Uv 1:4 Mvu III 376 GDhp 143

kin nu hāso kim ānando niccaṃ prajjalite sati |
andhakāramaṃhi prakkhittā pradīpaṃ na gaveṣatha || 13 A v

a R Sh hāso

234 Dhp 315 Uv 5:16, 17 d-f GDhp 131

praccaṃtamaṃ vā nagaraṃ	guttaṃ sāntarabāhiraṃ		
evaṃ rakkhatha āttānaṃ	khaṇo vo mā upaccagū		
khaṇātītā hi śocaṃti	niraya mi samappitā		13 A vi

d R upaccagga e Sh khaṇāṃtītā hi śocanti

235 Dhp 264 Uv 11:13 GDhp 188

na muṇḍabhāvā śamaṇo	avrato alikaṃ bhanaṃ		
icchālobhasamāpanno	śamaṇo kiṃ bhaviṣyati		

a R muṇḍabhāvo b R abrato Sh abbato

236 Dhp 265 Uv 11:14 GDhp 189

yo tu śameti pāpāni	aṇut thū lāni sabbaśo		13 A vii
śamaṇā eva pāpānāṃ	śamaṇo ti pravuccati		

237 Dhp 339 Uv 31:29

yassa chattrīśatiṃ sotā	mānāphassamayā bhriśā		
vāhā vahanti dudriṣṭiṃ	saṃkappā ggedhaniśśitā		

a R chattrīśatiṃ
c Sh dudriṣṭiṃ d Sh krodhaniśśitā

238 Dhp 221 (= S I 25) Uv 20:1 GDhp 274

krodhaṃ jahe viprajaheya mānaṃ		13 B i
saṃyojanaṃ sabbam atikrameyā		
taṃ nāmarūpami asajjamānaṃ		

akimṇcanaṃ nānupatanti dukkhā ॥

c Sh nāmarupamhi R asajjamāṇaṃ

d Sh nānupacanti

śaraṇavarggaḥ

Khānti

239 Dhp 184 Uv 26:2 PrātMū Endstr. 1 PrātMā Endstr. 1
Khar. Inscr. 510

khāntī paramaṃ tapo titikkhā
nibbāṇaṃ **para**maṃ vadanti buddhā ।
na hi pravrajito paropaghātī
śamaṇo hoti pare vihesayāno ॥

13 B ii

240 Dhp 225 Uv 7:7

ahiṃsakā ye munayo niccaṃ kāyena saṃvṛtā ।
te yānti accutaṃ **ṭṭhā**ṇaṃ yattha gantā na śocati ॥

13 B iii

b Sh saṃvutā

c R **ṭṭhā**ṇaṃ

241 Dhp 300 Uv 15:17 GDhp 104

suprabuddhaṃ prabujjhanti sadā gotamasāvākā ।
yesāṃ divā ca rātro ca ahiṃsāya rato mano ॥

b R -sāvākā

c R rātro Sh rātro

242 Dhp 301 Uv 15:25 GDhp 105

suprabuddhaṃ prabujjhanti sadā gotamasāvakaḥ | 13 B iv
 yesāṃ divā ca rāto ca bhāvanāya rato mano ||

c R Sh rāto

243 Dhp 299 Uv 15:15 GDhp 103

suprabuddhaṃ prabujjhanti sadā gotamasāvakaḥ | 13 B v
 yesāṃ divā ca rāto ca niccaṃ kāyagatā satī ||

c R rāto Sh rāto

244 Dhp 181 Uv 21:9

ye jhānaprasutā dhīrā nekkhaṃmo sphaṣame ratā |
 devā pi tesāṃ prihayanti sambuddhānāṃ satimatāṃ ||

245 Dhp 98 (= Th 991) Uv 29:18

aranne yadi vā ggrāme ninne vā yadi vā thale | 13 B vi
 yattha arahanto viharanti taṃ bhomaṃ ramaṇīyakaṃ ||

a Sh grāme

c Sh viharanti

d R ramaṇīyakaṃ

246 A IV 151 (= It 21) Uv 31:43 GDhp 195

ekaṃ pi ce prāṇam aduṣṭacitto
 mettāyate kuśalī tena hoti |
 sabbe ca prāṇe manasā śnukampī
 prabhūtam ayīro prakaroti puṃṇaṃ || 13 B vii

b R metrāyate d Sh puññaṃ

247 A IV 151 (= It 21) GDhp 196-7

ye sattaśaṇḍāṃ paṭhaviṃ vijettā
rājariṣayo yajamānā ṣṇupariyagu |
aśśamedhaṃ puruṣamedhaṃ saṃmaprāsam
vāyupeyaṃ nirāggaḍaṃ |
mettassa cīttassa subhāvitassa
kalāṃ pi te nānubhavanti ṣoḍaśiṃ |
candaprabhāṃ tāragaṇā va sabbe ||

14 A i

= R 247a-d, 248a-c

a R paṃviṃ (= paṭhaviṃ) Sh sattaḡaṇḍāṃ
b R -pariyayu (?) Sh -pariyasu (?)
c Sh maṃsaāmaṃ (?) d Sh nirāggahaṃ
e R mettrassa Sh prabhāvitassa
g R Sh candra- Sh maddhe

248 Uv 31:42 ab Ja II 61 GDhp 199 cd A IV 151 It 22
 GDhp 198

yo Ṣha metteṇa cittaṇa sabbe prāṇe nukamṃpati |
mettaṃ se sabbabhūtesu veraṃ tassa na kenaci ||

= R 249

a R mettreṇa Sh metreṇa
b R prāṇe 'nukamṃpati Sh prāṇesu kamṃpati
c R mettr'amse Sh mettaṃ me sabbahūtesū

249

yassa sabbe ahorāṭṭe ahiṃsāya rato mano | 14 A ii

mettaṃ se sabbabhūtesu veraṃ tassa na kenaci ||

= R 250

a R Sh -rātre

c R mettaṃ se Sh mettaṃ me sabbabhūtesū

250

yassa sabbe ahorātte bhāvanāya rato mano |

mettaṃ se sabbabhūtesu veraṃ tassa na kenaci ||

= R 251

a R -rātraṃ Sh -rātre

c R mettaṃ se Sh mettaṃ me

d Sh tessa

251

yassa sabbe ahorātte niccaṃ kāyagatā satī | 14 A iii

mettaṃ se sabbabhūtesu veraṃ tassa na kenaci ||

= R 252

a R -rātraṃ Sh -rātre

c R mettaṃ se Sh mettaṃ me

252 A IV 151 (= It 22, Ja IV 71) GDhp 198

yo na hanti na ghātetī na jināti na jāpaye |

mettaṃ se sabbabhūtesu veraṃ tassa na kenaci || 14 A iv

= R 253

b R jāyaye Sh jñāpaye (?)

c R mettaṃ se Sh mettaṃ me

253 Dhp 5 Uv 14:11

na hi vereṇa verāṇi	śāmantīha kadācanaṃ	
averēṇa tu śāmaṃṭi	esa dhaṃmo sanātano	

= R 254

b R śāmaṃṭīha

254 Dhp 6 (= Th 275) Uv 14:8

pare ca na vijānaṃṭi	vayam ettha jayāmatha		14 A v
ye ca tattha vijānaṃṭi	tato śāṃmaṃṭi medhakā		

= R 255

a Sh vijānanti

d R Sh śāmaṃṭi

255 Dhp 197 Uv 30:47 GDhp 166

susukhaṃ vata jīvāmo	veriṇesu averiṇo		
veriṇesu maṇuṣyesu	viharāma averiṇo		14 A vi

= R 256

a R Sh bata

d Sh averino

256 Dhp 199 Uv 30:43 GDhp 165

susukhaṃ vata jīvāmo	ussukesu anussukā	
ussukesu maṇuṣyesu	viharāma anussukā	

= R 257

a R Sh bata

257 GDhp 168 ab Dhp 200 Uv 30:44 *cf also* Utt 9:14ab

susukhaṃ vata jīvāmo	yesaṃ no nāsti kiṃcanaṃ	
sakiñcanesu manuṣyesu	viharāma akimcanaṃ	14 A vii

= R 258

a R Sh bata

c Sh sakiñcaneśu

258 Dhp 170 Uv 27:15

yathā bubbudakaṃ paśse	yathā paśse marīcikaṃ	
evaṃ lokam aveccānaṃ	maccurājā na paśṣati	

= R 259

a Sh bubbūdakaṃ

c Sh lokom avekkhānaṃ

259 Dhp 148 Uv 1:34 GDhp 142

parijinnam idaṃ rūpaṃ	rogañīdaṃ prabhaṅguraṃ	
bhijjīhiti<ti> pūtisaṃdeho	maraṇāntaṃ hi jīvitaṃ	14 B i

= R 260

c R bhijjīhiti ti Sh bhijjīhiti *ti* has been repeated by mistake in the MS.

d R maraṇāntaṃ

260 Th 73 Ja I 139 Uv 1:27

jihmaṃ ca driṣṭā dukhitaṃ ca vyādhitāṃ
 pretañ ca driṣṭā na cirassa mānava |
 saṃvego tīppe (?) vipulo (?) ajāyatha
 acchecchi dhīro gṛhibandhanāni ||

= R 261

a Sh jīṇṇam ... dukkhitam

c R tīppe (?) vipulo Sh tīṇṇo viśulo

d R gr̥hivasunāni Sh acchejji ... gr̥habam̐dhanāni

khāntivarggaḥ

14 B ii

Āsava

261 Dhp 85 Uv 29:33

appakā te manuṣyesu

athāyam itarā prajā

ye janā pāragāmino |

tīram evānudhāvati ||

= R 262

d R -dhavati

262 Dhp 86 Uv 29:34

ye ca kho saṃmadākkhāte

te janā pāram ehiṃti

dhamme dhammānuvattino |

maccudheyaṃ suduttaraṃ || 14 B iii

= R 263

a R -ākkhyāte

d R suduttaraṃ

b R -varttino

263 Dhp 87 Uv 16:14a-d

kihne dhamme viprahāya

okā anokam āgaṃma

śukre bhāvetha paṇḍitā |

viveko yattha dūramaṃ ||

= R 264

b R śukro Sh śukle d Sh dūragam

264 Dhp 88 ab Uv 16:14ef

tatthābhiratim eṣāṇā hettā **kāme** akimcanā | 14 B iv
 payirodametha āttānaṃ cittaṃ kileśehi sabbaṃ ||

= R 265

a R eṣāṇo

d R citta-kileśehi Sh cittaṃ kileśe hi

265 Dhp 89 Uv 31:39

yassa saṃbodhiyaṃgehi samaṃ cittaṃ subhāvitam |
 āttānapaṇissagge **anupādāya** ye ratā | 14 B v
 khīṇāsavā jutimanto te loke parini(v)vṛtā ||

= R 266

c Sh āttānapaṇi vimmagge

f R parinivṛtā Sh parinibbutā The MS is unclear, but appears more like *-nivṛtā* than *-nivvṛtā*.

266 Dhp 292 Uv 4:19a-d GDhp 339a-d

yad<a>hi kiccaṃ tad apaviddham akiccaṃ puna kīrati |
 unnaddhānāṃ pramattānāṃ **tesam** vaddhamti āsavā || 14 B vi

= R 267

a R yad hi Sh yadahi The scribe does not appear to use a *virāma*.
 cf 346.

c R unnattā(?)nāṃ Sh unnalānāṃ The MS is unclear; we might
 possibly read *unnalānāṃ*.

d Sh vaddhanti

267 Dhp 293 Uv 4:20 ab,ef GDhp 340

yesaṃ ca susamāradhā	niccaṃ kāyagatā satī	
akiccaṃ te na sevaṃti	kiṅce sātaccakāriṇo	
satānāṃ samprajānānāṃ	tesaṃ khīyaṃti āsavā	

= R 268

f R khīyaṃti Sh khīyanti

268 Dhp 253 Uv 27:2 cd Uv 4:19ef GDhp 339ef

paravajjānupaśśīnāṃ	niccaṃ ojjhāyasaṃñīnā	14 B vii
āsavā tesaṃ vaddhanti	ārā te āsavakkhaya	

= R 269

b Sh ujjhāya saṃñīnāṃ

269 Dhp 226 Uv 15:8

jāgarikāṃ anuyuttānāṃ	ahorāttānuśikkhiṇāṃ		
nibbāṇe adhimuttānāṃ	atthaṃ gacchaṃti āsavā		15 A i

= R 270

b R Sh -rātrā-

c R adhimuttānāṃ Sh nibbāṇesu vimuttānāṃ

270 Dhp 93 Uv 29:31

yesā ṣsavā parikkhīṇā	āhāre ca anīśītā	
śuṃñatā ānimitto ca	vimogho yesa gocaro	
ākāṣe va śakuntānāṃ	padaṃ tesaṃ durannayaṃ	

= R 271

a R ye sāsavā
d Sh vimoṣo

c R animitto Sh śuññatā animitto

271 Dhp 271 Uv 32:31 Mvu III 422 GDhp 65

na hi śīlavrateneva
atha vā samādhilābhena

bāhuśoccena vā puna |
vivittaśayanena vā ||

15 A ii

= R 272

b Sh bahu śocyena

272 Dhp 272 Uv 32:32 Mvu III 422 GDhp 66

phusāma nekkhaṃmasukhaṃ
bhikkhū vi<ssa>śśāsamāpādi

apṛthujjanasevitaṃ |
aprāpyāsavakkhayaṃ ||

= R 273

a Sh nekkhamma-
d R aprappāsava-

b Sh apṛthakjana-
Sh aprāpy āsava-

273 Uv 4:13 GDhp 133

nāyaṃ pramajjitaṃ kālo
pramattaṃ dukham anneti

Ṣprāpyāsavakkhayaṃ |
sīhaṃ vā mṛgamātikā ||

15 A iii

= R 274

a Sh pramajjitaṃ
d R -mātrikā

c R dukkham

274 Dhp 126 cf Mvu II 424

gabbham eke okraṃmanti

nirayaṃ pāpakaṃmuṇo |

saggaṃ sugatino yānti parinivvānti anāsavā || 15 A iv

= R 275

a R okaṃṃanti Sh okkramanti

c R maggaṃ d R Sh parinibbānti

275 Dhp 82 Uv 17:11 GDhp 225

yathā hrado ssa gaṃbhīro viprasanno anāvilo |
evaṃ dhaṃmāṇi śottāna viprasīdamti paṇḍitā ||

= R 276

a Sh hṛdo c Sh śrottāna

d Sh viprasīdanti

276 Dhp 179 Uv 29:52 Mvu III 91

yassa jitaṃ nā sspajjīyati
jitaṃ assā na upeti antako | 15 A v
taṃ buddham anomanikramaṃ
apadaṃ kena padena nehisi ||

= R 277

a Sh nā 'pyujjīyati b Sh assa

c Sh buddhamano savikramaṃ (?)

277 Dhp 180 Uv 29:53 Mvu III 92

yassa jālini visattikā
tahnā nāsti kaḥiṃ ci netaye |
taṃ buddham anantagocaraṃ 15 A vi
apadaṃ kena padena nehisi ||

= R 278

a Sh visattikā

b Sh taṇhā

āsavavargaḥ

Vācā

278 Dhp 281 Uv 7:12 PrātMū Endstr. 10

vācānurakkhī manasā susaṃvṛto
 kāyena yo akuśalaṃ na sevati |
 ete tt(r)ayo kaṃmapathe viśodhiya
 prāppojja so śāntipadaṃ anuttaraṃ ||

15 A vii

= R 279

c R Sh trayo

d Sh prāpyojja śāntipadṃ

279 Dhp 231 Uv 7:1

kāyapradoṣaṃ rakkheyā kāyena saṃvṛto siyā |
 kāyaduccaritaṃ hettā kāyena sucāritaṃ care ||

15 B i

= R 280

280 Dhp 232 Uv 7:2

vācāpradoṣaṃ rakkheyā vācāya saṃvṛto siyā |
 vācāduccaritaṃ hettā vācāya sucāritaṃ care ||

= R 281

a Sh pradoṣam

b R saṃvṛto

281 Dhp 233 Uv 7:3

manapradoṣaṃ rakkheyā	manasā saṃvṛto siyā		
manoduccariṭaṃ hettā	manasā sucaritaṃ care		15 B ii

= R 282

282 Dhp 234 Uv 7:10 GDhp 51

kāyena saṃvṛtā dhīrā	vācāya utta cetasā		
sabbattha saṃvṛtā dhīrā	te ve supariṣaṃvṛtā		

= R 283

a R saṃvṛtā

283 Dhp 227 GDhp 237 c-f Uv 29:45

porāṇaṃ etaṃ ādhora	na etaṃ ahunā-r-iva		
nindanti tohniṃ āsīnaṃ	nindanti mitabhāṇikaṃ		15 B iii
bahubhāṇikaṃ pi nindanti	nāsti loke anindīto		

= R 284

b R aṃhu (?) nā-r-iva Sh agganāriṣa

d Sh nāstī

284 Dhp 228 Uv 29:46 GDhp 240

na cābhu na ca bhaviṣyati	na cetarahi vijjati		
ekāntanindīto poṣo	ekāntaṃ vā praśaṃsīto		15 B iv

= R 285

a Sh na cābhū

c Sh ekanta-

285

yañ ca bālā adhaṃmaṭṭhaṃ pūjeyu garaheyu vā |
 aviññūṃ avibhāvāya na taṃ atthāya kāyaci ||

= R 286

a R adhaṃmaṭṭhā
 b R pūtreṃu garahe yuvā Sh pūjyesu garaheṣu vā
 c R aviññū Sh aviññū d R kāya ti (ci(?))

286 Dhp 229 GDhp 241 cf Uv 29:47-8

yaṃ ca viñū praśaṃsanti anuvicca suve suve | 15 B v
 acchidravattim medhāvim praññāśīlasamāhitaṃ ||

= R 287

a R Sh viññū d Sh praññā-

287 Dhp 230 GDhp 242

nikkhaṃ jāmbūnadasseva ko taṃ ninditum arihati |
 devā pi naṃ praśaṃsanti brahmuṇā pi praśaṃsito || 15 B vi

= R 288

a Sh jāmbunadasseva b Sh ko ttaṃ ninditum
 c Sh praśaṃsanti

288 Dhp 262 Uv 29:10 GDhp 186

na vākkakaraṇamāṭṭ(r)eṇa vannaṃpukkkhalatāya vā |
 sādthurūpī naro hoti iśśukī maccharī śaṭho ||

= R 289

a R -mātreṇa Sh vākkaraṇamātreṇa

b Sh -pukkharatāya

289 cf Dhp 261, 263 Uv 10:7 GDhp 185, 187

yamhi saccaṃ ca dhammo ca viratī saṃyyamo damo |
sa vāntadoṣo medhāvī sādhurūpī ti vuccati || 15 B vii

= R 290

290 Dhp 19 Uv 4:22 GDhp 190

bahuṃ pi ce sahitaṃ bhāṣamāno
na takkaro hoti naro pramatto |
gopo va gāvo gaṇayaṃ paresaṃ
na bhāgavā śāmaṇṇassa hoti || 16 A i

= R 291

d R śāmaññassa

291 Dhp 20 a-c,f Uv 4:23 ab,ef GDhp 191

appaṃ pi ce sahitaṃ bhāṣamāno
dhammassa hoti anudhammacārī |
rāgaṃ ca doṣaṃ ca prahāya mohaṃ
vimuttacitto akhilo akaṃcho |
anupādiyāno iha vā hure vā
sa bhāgavā śāmaṇṇassa hoti || 16 A ii

= R 292

d R akaṃcho fn: 'Or: akaṃcho'

f Sh śāmaṇṇassa

292 Dhp 224 Uv 20:16 GDhp 281

saccaṃ bhaṇe na k(r)ujjheyā deyā appā pi yācito |
 etehi ttihi tṭhāṇehi gacche devāna santike ||

= R 293

a R kujjheyā Sh krujjheyā (omits na)
 c R ttrihi Sh trihi

293 Dhp 177 Uv 10:2

na ve kadāryyā devalokaṃ vrajanti
 bālā hi bhe (te) na praśaṃsanti dānaṃ | 16 A iii
 dhīro tu dānaṃ anumodamāno
 teneva so devalokaṃ pareti ||

= R 294

a R kadaryyā Sh kadāppī
 b R hi bhe Sh hi te

294 Dhp 217 Uv 5:24 GDhp 322

śīlavantaṃ śuciṃ dacchaṃ dhammaṭṭhaṃ saccavādināṃ |
 āttano kāraṃ śantaṃ taṃ jano kurute priyaṃ || 16 A iv

= R 295

a Sh śīlanvataṃ c R santaṃ

295 Dhp 308 Uv 9:2 GDhp 331

śreyo ayoguḍā bhuttā tattā aggīśikhopamā |
 yaṃ ca bhuñjeya duśśīlo rāṣṭapañḍaṃ asaṃyyato ||

= R 296

a Sh ayogutā d R rāṣṭrapinḍam Sh

296 Dhp 311 Uv 11:4 GDhp 215

kuśo yathā duggrhīto hastam evānukamṭati | 16 A v
 śāmannam dupparāmātṭham nirayāya upakattati ||

= R 297

d R Sh upakaḍḍhati

297 Dhp 176 Uv 9:1

ekadhammam atītassa muṣāvādissa jaṃtuno |
 vitinnaparalokassa nāsti pāpam akāriyaṃ ||

= R 298

d Sh nāṣṭi

298 Ja III 103 Nett 132

na hi śastaṃ suniśitaṃ viṣaṃ hālāhalaṃ tathā | 16 A vi
 evaṃ khipraṃ atipātetī vācā dubbhāṣitā yathā ||

= R 299

a R śastraṃ Sh muninītaṃ (?)

b R taṃ viṣaṃ d Sh dubbhāṣitā

299 Sn 657 Uv 8:2

puruṣassa jāyamānassa kuṭhārī jāyate mukhe |
 yāya chindati āttānaṃ vācaṃ dubbhāṣitaṃ bhaṇaṃ ||16 A vii

= R 300

a R puruṣasya

300 Sn 658 Uv 8:3

yo hi nindiye praśamsati
uttavā nindati yo praśamsiye |
vicināti mukhena so kaliṃ
kalinā tena sukhaṃ na vindati ||

= R 301

a Sh nindīye d Sh sukham

301 Sn 659 (= S I 149, A V 171) Uv 8:4

appāmātto **ayaṃ** kalī 16 B i
yo akkhehi dhanam parājaye |
sabbassaṃ pi sahāpi āttanā
ayam eva mahat(t)aro kalī ||
yo sugatesu manam pradūṣaye

= R 302, 303a ; = Sh 301, 302a

a R -mātro Sh kaliyo b R shanam Sh begins *akkhe hi*
c R saddhammaṃ pi sa hāyi (?) āttanā Sh sabbassaṃ pi mahāpi
āttanā
d R Sh mahattaro

302 Sn 660 (= S I 149, A V 171) Uv 8:5

śataṃ sahasrāṇi nirabbudānāṃ
chattrīśatiṃ pañca ca abbudāni |
yaṃ ayiragarahī nirayaṃ upeti 16 B ii
vācam manam ca praṇidhāya pāpikāṃ ||

= R 303b-e; = Sh 302b-e

b Sh chattīsatim R arbbudāni

c R nirayam

303 Ja I 375 Uv 8:8

kallāṇim eva bhāṣeyā nā Ṣssa mucceya pāpikā |
mokkho kallāṇiye śreyo muttā tapati pāpikāṃ ||

= R 304

304

kallāṇim eva seveyā nā Ṣssa mucceya pāpikā | 16 B iii
mokkho kallāṇiye śreyo muttā tapati pāpikāṃ ||

= R 305

305 a S I 44 c Uv 20:2

vācaṃ bhāṣeya kallāṇim nā Ṣssa mucceya pāpikā(ṃ) |
jātaṃ krodhaṃ nivāreyā so biṣabbhi nirujjhati || 16 B iv

= R 306

b R Sh pāpikāṃ d R Sh viṣabbhi

vācāvarggaḥ

Ātta

306 Dhp 162 Uv 11:10 GDhp 330

yassa accantadośśillaṃ malutā sālam ivo ṡtatā |
karoti so tathāttānaṃ yathā naṃ biṡaṃ icchati || 16 B v

= R 307

b R ivobhatā Sh malatā sālam ivā tatā fn: 'MS malatāsālamivo'
d R Sh viṡaṃ

307 Dhp 161 cd Uv 28:12cd

āttanā hi kataṃ pāpaṃ āttajaṃ āttasaṃbhavaṃ |
anumaṃdhati dummedhaṃ vayiraṃ vā ahmamaṃyaṃ maṇiṃ ||

= R 308

b R -saṃbhavaṃ c Sh anusaṃdhati
d Sh vaṡiraṃ vā aśmaṃyaṃ

308 Dhp 165 Uv 28:11, 12ab

āttanā hi kataṃ pāpaṃ āttanā saṃkiliśśati | 16 B vi
āttanā akataṃ pāpaṃ āttanā ye viśujjhati |
śoddhī aśoddhī praccattaṃ nāṃṇo aṃṇaṃ viśodhaye ||

= R 309

f Sh nāṃṇe aṃṇaṃ

309 Dhp 50 Uv 18:9 PrātMū Endstr. 5 PrātMā Endstr.6
GDhp 271

na paresaṃ vilomāni na paresaṃ katā ṡkataṃ | 16 B vii

āttanā ye aveccheyā katāni akatāni ca ॥

= R 310

310

na paresaṃ vilomāni na paresaṃ samāsamaṃ ।
āttanā ye aveccheyā samāni viṣamāni ca ॥

= R 311

311 S I 72 Uv 5:13

āttānaṃ ce priyaṃ nñāyyā rakkheyā naṃ surakkhitaṃ । 17 A i
na etaṃ sulabhaṃ hoti sukhaṃ dukkatakarīṇaṃ ॥

= R 312

a Sh attānaṃ ... nñāyyā
b R rakkheya d Sh -kārīṇaṃ

312 Dhp 157 Uv 5:15

āttānaṃ ce priyaṃ nñāyyā rakkheyā naṃ surakkhitaṃ ।
ttiṇṇaṃ añataraṃ yāmānaṃ paṭijāggeya paṇḍito ॥

= R 313

a Sh nñāyyā
c R trihmaṃ (?) aṃñataraṃ yāmānaṃ Sh triṇṇaṃ praññabharaṃ
mānaṃ
d Sh paṭijāggeya

313 Dhp 305 Uv 23:2 GDhp 259

ekāsaṇaṃ ekaśeyaṃ ekacariyāṃ atandrito । 17 A ii

eko ramayaṃ āttānaṃ

vanānte ramitā siyā ||

= R 314

c Sh damayam

314

yo śāsanam arahatāṃ
 paṭikkroṣati dummedho
 karoti so tathāttānaṃ

ayirāṇāṃ dhammajivināṃ |
 dṛṣṭiṃ niśśāya pāpikāṃ |
 yathā naṃ biṣam icchati || 17 A iii

= R 315

a R śāsanam

c R paṭikkroṣati

d R dṛṣṭim Sh niśśāya fn: 'MS niśśīya'

f R viṣam Sh visam

315 Dhp 164 Uv 8:7 GDhp 258

yo śāsanam arahatāṃ
 paṭikkroṣati dummedho
 phalāni kaṇṭakasseva

ayirāṇāṃ dhammajivināṃ |
 dṛṣṭiṃ niśśāya pāpikāṃ |
 ātagghannāya phallati || 17 A iv

= R 316

a R śāsanam

b Sh ayirāṇāṃ

d R niśśāya Sh niśśāya

316 cf Uv 23:6

āttānaṃ eva paṭhamam
 athāṃṇam anuśāseyā

atthe dhamme niveśāye |
 evaṃ hohi yathā aham ||

= R 317

c R athāṃṇam Sh attāṃṇam

d R hoti (?) Sh hoti ... śubhaṃ The second syllable of *hohi* is unclear.

317 Dhp 158 Uv 23:7 GDhp 227

āttānam eva paṭhamam paṭirūpe niyojaye | 17 A v
athāṃṇam anuśāsanto na kiliśṣati praṃñavā ||

= R 318

c R athāṃṇam Sh athāṃṇam
d Sh puñña vā

318 Dhp 159 Uv 23:8

āttanā ye tathā kayirā yathāṃṇam anuśāsaye |
adānto vata dameyā āttā hi kira duddamo || 17 A vi

= R 319

b R yathāṃṇam Sh yathāṃṇam
c R sudānto fn: 'looks like *adānto*' Sh bata

319 Dhp 104 Uv 23:4

āttā hi bhe varam dānto yacchāyam itarā prajā |
āttadāntassa poṣassa sadā samyyatacāriṇo ||

= R 320

a Sh hi te

320 Dhp 105 Uv 23:5

neva devā na gandhabbā na māro saha brahmuṇā |
jitaṃ apajitaṃ kayirā tattharūpassa jantuno | 17 A vii

= R 321

321 Dhp 160 Uv 23:11

āttā hi āttano nātho	ko hi nātho paro siyā	
āttanā hi sucinnena	nāthaṃ labhati dullabhaṃ	

= R 322

322 Dhp 380 Uv 19:14

āttā hi āttano nātho	āttā hi āttano gatī		17 B i
tassā saṃyyamayā Ṭtānaṃ	aśśaṃ bhadraṃ va vāñijo		

= R 323

b R satī	c Sh tasmā
----------	------------

323 ab Uv 19:13ab

āttānam eva damaye	aśśasugatiyā sadā		
daṃma śaṃma ujjuṃ hohi(hoti)	tato akuṭilo bhava		
tato dānto sukhī hohi(hoti)	anupādāya nivṛto		17 B ii

= R 324, 325ab

c R hoti Sh ujjam hoti

324 Dhp 379

āttanā codayā Ṭtānaṃ	parimaśāttānam āttanā	
so āttagutto satimā	sukhaṃ bhikkhū vihāhisi	

= R 325cd, 326ab

325 Dhp 166 Uv 23:10 GDhp 265

āttadātthaṃ parātthena	bahunā pi na hāpaye		
āttadāttham paraṃ ñāttā	sadātthaparamo siyā		17 B iii

= R 326c-f

a Sh attadātthaṃ	c Sh ñāttā
------------------	------------

326 Dhp 84 GDhp 324

nevāttaheto na parassa heto		
na saggam icche na dhaṇaṃ na rāṣṭraṃ		
necche adhammeṇa samṛddhim āttano		
so śīlavā praṃñāvā dhāṃmiko siyā		17 B iv

= R 327

b R saggam ... rāṣṭraṃ	
c R neccha	d Sh prañña vā

āttavarggaḥ

Dadanti

327 Dhp 249 Uv 10:12

dadanti ve yathāśraddhaṃ	yathāprasadaṇaṃ janā		
tattha yo duṃmano hoti	paresaṃ pānabhojane		
na so divā ca rāto ca	samādhim adhigacchati		17 B v

= R 328

e R Sh rāto

328 Dhp 250 Uv 10:13

yassa cetam samucchinnam mūlo 5gghaccam samūhatam |
 sa ve divā ca rāto ca samādhim adhigacchati ||

= R 329

b Sh mūlo'grā[gha]ccam c R Sh rāto

329 a-d Dhp 143, 144ab Uv 19:1,2 ef Sn 330cd Uv 22:19cd

aśso va bhadro kaṣāya puṭṭho 17 B vi
 ātāpino saviṃgaṇo carāṇo |
 śraddhāya sīlena ca vīriyeṇa ca
 samādhinā dhammavipaśśanāya ca |
 te khāntisoracchasamādhisaṃṭhitā
 sūtassa praṃñāya ca sāram ajjhagū ||

= R 330

b R ātāpi yo sa viṃgaṇo Sh ātāpiyo saviṃgaṇo ca bāṇo
 c R sīlena ca viriyeṇa ca Sh śraddāya
 d Sh dhammvipaśśanāya
 e R -sāraccha- Sh khāntim āraddha samādhimaṃḍitā
 f Sh śubhassa praṃñāya

330 Uv 10:9 cd GDhp 260

yo dṛṣṭe dhamme labhati śraddhāṃ praṃñāṃ anuttarāṃ |
 sa ve mahaddhano loke moham aṃñam bahuṃ dhanam ||

= R 331

a R yo tha (?) dṛṣṭe Sh yotha dṛṣṭa-dhamme *tha* is almost
 certainly a mistake, ie something crossed out.

- b Sh praññāṃ enuttarāṃ
 c R mahad-dhane Sh sahabhuno
 d Sh moha-saññāṃ

331 Dhp 303 Uv 10:8 GDhp 323

śraddho śīlena saṃpanno yaśabhogasamāhito | 18 A i
 yaṃ yaṃ so bhajate deśaṃ tattha tattheva pūjiyo ||

= R 332

a Sh śīlana

332 S I 25

śraddhabitiyaṃ puruṣaṃ carantaṃ
 na naṃ labhēyā aśraddho va cāro |
 yaśo ca kitti ca tato nam eti
 saggāṃ ca gacche śarīraṃ prahāya || 18 A ii

= R 333

a R Sh śraddhavitiyaṃ c R nameti Sh rameti

333 Dhp 97 Uv 29:23

aśraddho akataṃṇū ca saṃdhiçchedo ca yo naro |
 hatāvakaśo vāntāśo sa ve uttimaporuṣo ||

= R 334

a Sh akataññū

334 Dhp 182 GDhp 263

kiccho buddhāna uppādo kicchā dhammassa deśanā |

kiccho śraddhapaṭilābho

kicchaṃ māccāna jīvitam || 18 A iii

= R 335

a R uppado

c R -paṭilābho Sh śuddhapaṭilābho

335 Dhp 38 Uv 31:28

anavaṭṭhitacittassa
pāriplavaprasādassasaddhammam avijānato |
praṃñā na paripūrati ||

= R 336

b R saddhammam Sh -avijānto

d Sh praṃñā

336 Uv 31:25

nāprasannacittena
śakkam ājānituṃ dhammoduṣṭena kupitena vā |
sāraṃbhabahulena vā || 18 A iv

= R 337

d Sh sāraṃbha-

337 Uv 31:26

yo tu vinīya sāraṃbham
prasannacitto sumanoaprasādam ca cetaso |
sa ve nyāyyā subhāṣitam ||

= R 338

b Sh apramādam cf Uv; *aprasādam* refers back to *aprasanna-* of 336.

338 Dhp 178

maṇuṣyapaṭilābhena
pṛthivyām ekarājena

saggānāṃ gamanena ca |
sotāpattiphalaṃ varaṃ ||

18 A v

= R 339

a Sh -paṭiābhena

d Sh varaṃ

339 Th 507

yassa śraddhā tathāgate
śīlaṅ ca yassa kaḷḷāṇaṃ

acalā supraṭiṣṭhitā |
ayirakāntaṃ praśaṃsiyaṃ ||

18 A vi

= R 340

c Sh kaḷḷāṇaṃ

340 Th 508

saṃghe prasādo yassa asti
adaridro ti tam āhu

ujjubhūtaṅ ca daṃṣaṇaṃ |
amoghaṃ tassa jīvitaṃ ||

= R 341

b Sh ujjha-

341 Th 509

tassā śraddhaṅ ca śīlaṃ ca
anuyuñjeya medhāvī

prasādaṃ dhamma~~da~~ṃsane | 18 A vii
saraṃ buddhāna śāsaṇaṃ ||

= R 342

a R tassāśraddhaṅ Sh tasmā

d Sh manāṃ

dadantīvarggaḥ

Citta

342 Dhp 33 Uv 31:8 GDhp 136

phandanaṃ capalaṃ cittaṃ durakkhaṃ dunnivārayaṃ |
 ujjuṃ karoti medhāvī uṣukāro va tejanā || 18 B i

= R 343

a Sh capalam c Sh ujjam
 d R tejunā

343 Dhp 34 Uv 31:2 GDhp 137B

vārijo va thale khitto okamokātu ubbhato |
 pariphandatimaṃ cittaṃ mārادهyaṃ prahātaye ||

= R 344

b R Sh okamokāta

344 Dhp 37 [Uv 31:8A] a GDhp 137A

dūraṅgamaṃ ekacaraṃ aśarīraṃ guhāsayaṃ |
 ye cittaṃ saṃyyamehinti mokkharṇte mārabaṃdhanā ||

= R 345

d R Sh -bandhanā

345 Dhp 35 Uv 31:1

dunniggrahassa laghuno yatthakāmanipātino | 18 B ii

cittassa damatho sādhu cittaṃ dāntaṃ sukhāvahaṃ ||

= R 346

a R dunniggrahasya

346 Dhp 36

suddaśaṃ sunipuṇaṃ yatthakāmanipātinaṃ |
cittaṃ rakkheya medhāvī tad<a>hi guttaṃ sukhāvahaṃ ||

= R 347

a R sunipuṇaṃ

d R tad ahi Sh tadā hi cf 266.

347 Dhp 39 Uv 28:6 a GDhp 137D

anapāśrayamāṇassa ananvāhatacetaso | 18 B iii
hettā kallāṇapāpāni nāsti jāgarato bhayaṃ ||

= R 348

a R anayāśraya-

b Sh anannāhata-

348 Dhp 79 Uv 30:13 GDhp 224

dhammaprītirasaṃ pāttā viprasannena cetasā |
ayirapavedite dhamme sadā ramati paṇḍito || 18 B iv

= R 349

a R dhammaprītir asaṃyāttā

349 Dhp 41 Uv 1:35 GDhp 153

acirā vata ayaṃ kāyo paṭhaviṃ abhiśehiti |

chūḍo apeta viṃnyāṇo

nirātthaṃ vā kaṭṭharaṃ ||

= R 350

c R chūḍo apeta viṃnyāṇo Sh chudho apeta viṃnyāṇo The reading is uncertain, but the second *akṣara* is not like *ṭh* or *dh*. It seems closest to *ḍ*, perhaps written in mistake for *ḍh*, cf 392: *ḍḍaṃ*.

350 Dhp 40 Uv 31:35

kumbhopamaṃ kāyam **imaṃ** vidittā

18 B v

nagaropamaṃ cittaṃ adhiṣṭhihittā |

yodheya māraṃ praṃñāyudhena

jitaṃ ca rakkhe aniveśano siyā ||

= R 351

a R kumbho-

c Sh praññā-

351 Dhp 13 Uv 31:11 GDhp 219

yathā agāraṃ ducchannaṃ

vatṭhī samitivijjhati |

18 B vi

evaṃ abhāvitaṃ cittaṃ

rāgo samitivijjhati ||

= R 352

352 Dhp 14 Uv 31:17 GDhp 220

yathā agāraṃ succhannaṃ

vatṭhī na samitivijjhati |

evaṃ subhāvitaṃ cittaṃ

rāgo na samitivijjhati ||

= R 353

353 Uv 31:12

yathā agāraṃ ducchannaṃ	vaṭṭhī samitivijjhati		18 B vii
evaṃ abhāvitaṃ cittaṃ	doṣo samitivijjhati		

= R 354

d Sh samitivijjhati

354 Uv 31:18

yathā agāraṃ succhannaṃ	vaṭṭhī na samitivijjhati		
evaṃ subhāvitaṃ cittaṃ	doṣo na samitivijjhati		

= R 355

355 Uv 31:13

yathā agāraṃ ducchannaṃ	vaṭṭhī samitivijjhati		19 A i
evaṃ abhāvitaṃ cittaṃ	moho samitivijjhati		

= R 356

b Sh samitijjhati

356 Uv 31:19

yathā agāraṃ succhannaṃ	vaṭṭhī na samitivijjhati		
evaṃ subhāvitaṃ cittaṃ	moho na samitivijjhati		

= R 357

357 Dhp 183 Uv 28:1 Mvu III 420 PrātMū Endstr. 8
PrātMā Endstr. 4 PrātSa Endstr. 13 Bhī Vin §§ 69, 99

sabbapāpassa akaraṇaṃ
sacittapayirodamaṇaṃ

kuśalassa apasaṃpadā | 19 A ii
etaṃ buddhāna śāsanaṃ ||

= R 358

b Sh upasaṃpadā fn: 'MS apasaṃpadā' The end of the line is unclear in the MS. It is possible that it reads *kuśalassu*.

c R omits sa-

cittavargaḥ

Māgga

358 Dhp 273 Uv 12:4 GDhp 109

māggānaṣṭaṃgiko śreṣṭho saccānaṃ caturo padā |
virāgo śreṣṭho dhammāṇāṃ dupadānaṃ ca cakkhumā || 19 A iii

= R 359

b Sh saccānaṃ catturo c R dhammāṇāṃ

359 Dhp 275cd, 276 a-d Uv 12:9 f Uv 12:11d

ākkhāto vo mayā māggo aṃñāye śallasamaṃsano |
tubbhehi kiccama ātappaṃ akkhātāro tathāgatā |
paṭipannā pramokkhanti jhāyino mārabaṃdhanā || 19 A iv

= R 360

b R -sraṃsano Sh aṃñāye śallamaṃsano

c Sh tuṭṭhehi

360 Dhp 274, 275ab ab Uv 12:11ab

eseva māggo nāstaṃ ṣṇo	daṃśanassa viśuddhiye	
taṃ māggaṃ paṭipajjahvo	mārasse ṣṣā pramohanī	
etāhi tubbhe paṭipannā	dukkhassa antaṃ kariṣyatha	19 A v

= R 361

a Sh nāstaṃṇo	b Sh viśuddhiye
c Sh paṭipajjamho	e Sh tuṭṭhe

361 Dhp 283 Uv 18:3 d GDhp 93d

vanam chindatha mā rukkhe	vanāto jāyate bhayaṃ	
chettā vanañ ca vanadhañ ca	nibbanena gamiśśatha	

= R 362

a Sh rukho	b Sh vanato
d Sh nibbānena	

362 Dhp 284 Uv 18:4 d GDhp 94d

yāvatā vanadho na cchijjati		
aṇumātto pi narassa ñā tisu		19 A vi
paṭibaddhamano hi tattha so		
vaccho cchīravako va mātari		

= R 363

a R chijjati	Sh chijjati	b R Sh -mātro	Sh narrassa
d Sh chīrapākā va	fn: 'MS <i>pa</i> in the margin'		

363 Dhp 285 Uv 18:5 GDhp 299 Utt 10:28

ucchinna sineham āttano

kumudaṃ śāradikaṃ va pāṇinā |
 śāntimāggam eva byūhaya
 nibbāṇaṃ sugatena deśitaṃ ||

19 A vii

= R 364

c Sh brūhaya

364 Dhp 286 Uv 1:38 ab GDhp 333ab

idaṃ vaśśā kariṣyāmi idaṃ hemaṃṇa gṛhmasu |
 iti bālo vicinteti antarāyaṃ na bujjhati ||

= R 365

a Sh vaśśaṃ kariṣyāmi

b R Sh hemanta- The MS has *hemaṃgṛhmasu*, with *na* below the line.

c Sh vicinteti

365 Dhp 287 Uv 1:39 a GDhp 334a

taṃ puttapaśusaṃmattaṃ vyāsattamanasaṃ naraṃ |
 suttam ggrāmaṃ mahogho vā maccu-r-ādāya gacchati || 19 B i

= R 366

a R putra- ... sammatam Sh putra-

c Sh gāmmaṃ

366 Dhp 288 Uv 1:40 GDhp 261

na santi puttā ttāṇāya na pitā no pi bhātaro |
 antakenā ḍdhibhūtaṃ nāsti nātisu ttāṇatā ||

= R 367

- a R puttrā trāṇāya Sh putrā trāṇāya
 b R bhrātaro Sh nāpi bhrātaro
 d R trāṇatā Sh ññatīsu trāṇatā

367

krandatām eva ñātinaṃ vilapatāṃ cevam ekato |
 janā antarahīyaṃti asakāmā jahamṃti naṃ || 19 B ii

= R 368

- a Sh ññātinaṃ b R c'evaṃ
 c Sh antarahīyanti d Sh jahanti

368 Dhp 289 Uv 6:15

etaṃ vidiya medhāvī praṃñāvā vītamaccharī |
 taṃ saggagamaṃ māggaṃ niccam eva viśodhaye |

= R 369

- b Sh prañña vā c Sh taṃ maggadhāmanaṃ

369

tassā hi paṇḍito poṣo saṃpaśsaṃ attham āttano |
 taṃ saggaganaṃ māggaṃ niccam eva viśodhaye || 19 B iii

= R 370

- a Sh tasmā
 b R yaṃ paśsaṃ fn: 'looks in MS like sam'
 c R sagga-ga[ma]naṃ Sh taṃ maggaśanaṃ

370 A IV 271

śraddho śīlena saṃpanno praṃñāvā susamāhito |
 niccaṃ māggaṃ viśodheti sacchayanam sām̐parāyikaṃ ||

= R 371

b Sh prañña vā c Sh māggaṃ

371

śraddho śīlena saṃpanno praṃñāvā susamāhito | 19 B iv
 ramate māggaṃ āsevaṃ ajjhattopasame rato ||

= R 372

b Sh prañña vā d Sh ajjhasattopasame

372 cd Dhp 31cd Uv 4:29cd

śraddho śīlena saṃpanno praṃñāvāgarato sadā |
 saṃyojanam aṇutthūlaṃ daham aggī va gacchati |
 mānamakkhe va pāpake || 19 B v

= R 373

a R saṃpanno b R praṃñāvā śarato Sh prañña
 c R saṃyojanaṃ e Sh mānamkkheva

373 Dhp 277 Uv 12:5 GDhp 106

aniccā sabbasaṃkhārā yato praṃñāya paśśati |
 atha nivvaṇdate dukkhā esa māggo viśuddhiye ||

= R 374

b Sh praññāya
 c R nibbiṇdate fn: 'MS nibbaṇdate' Sh nibbiṇate

d R viśuddhiya

374 Dhp 279 Uv 12:8 GDhp 108

sabbadhammā anāttā ti yato **praṃ**nāya paśśati | 19 B vi
atha nivviṇḍate dukkhā esa māggo viśuddhiye ||

= R 375

a R -dhammā anattā b Sh praññāya
c R nibbiṇḍate Sh nibbiṇṇate

375 Dhp 282 Uv 29:40

yogā hi bhūrī saṃbhavati ayogā bhūrisaṃkhayo |
etaṃ jethāpathaṃ ñāttā bhavāya vibhavāya ca |
tathā śiccheya medhāvī yathā bhūrī pravaddhati || 19 B vii

= R 376

a R ti bhūri c Sh jethāyathaṃ ññāttā
e R tathā-m-iccheya Sh siccheya meddhāvī
f R bhūri

māggavarggaḥ

Sahasra

376 Dhp 100 Mvu III 434 GDhp 306

sahasram api ce vācā anathapadasāhitā |
ekaṃ atthapadaṃ śreyo yaṃ śottā **upa**śāmmati || 20 A i

= R 377

c R ekam

377 Dhp 102 Uv 24:1, 2 GDhp 309

yo ca gāthāśataṃ bhāṣe anathapadasāhitam |
ekam dhamapadam śreyo yaṃ śottā upaśāmmati ||

= R 378

c R dha[m]ma- Sh dhaṃma- The scribe has probably omitted an
anusvāra.

378 Dhp 103 Uv 23:3 Mvu III 434 GDhp 305 Utt 9:34

yo sahasraṃ sahasrāṇāṃ saṃgrāme mānuṣe jine |
ekam ca paṃñāṃ āttānaṃ sa ve saṃgrāmamuttamo ||

= R 379

c Sh paṃñāṃ d Sh saṃgrāmam

379 Dhp 106 c-f Uv 24:16c-f Mvu III 435 GDhp 320

māse māse sahasreṇa yo yajeya śataṃ samā | 20 A ii
ekam ca bhāvi<tta>tāttānaṃ muhuttam api pūjaye |
sā eva pūjanā śreyo yac cha vaśśaśataṃ hutam ||

= R 380

b R śataṃ

c R bhāvitāttānaṃ fn: 'MS bhāvittatāttānaṃ' Sh
bhāvitāttānaṃ

f Sh vaśśaśataṃ

380 Dhp 107 Uv 24:16 Mvu III 435 GDhp 319, 320

yo ca vaśśaśataṃ jantū	aggim̐ paricare vane		20 A iii
ekañ ca bhāvitāttānaṃ	muhuttam api pūjaye		
sā eva pūjanā śreyo	yac cha vaśśaśataṃ hutam̐		

= R 381

a Sh jantu

381 Dhp 108 Mvu III 435-6 GDhp 321

yaṃ kimci yaṣṭam̐ va hutam̐ va loke			
saṃvatsaraṃ yajate puṃṇāpekhī			20 A iv
sabbaṃ pi taṃ na catubbhāgam eti			
abhivādanā ujjugatesu śreyo			

= R 382

b Sh puṃṇā-

382 Uv 24:21 Mvu III 434 GDhp 310 ab Dhp 106ab

māse māse sahasreṇa	yo yajeya śataṃ samā		
na taṃ buddhe prasādassa	kalām̐ agghati ṣoḍaśim̐		20 A v

= R 383

b R Sh yaccheya Sh sataṃ

d Sh aśyati

383 Uv 24:22 Mvu III 435 GDhp 311 ab Dhp 106ab

māse māse sahasreṇa	yo yajeya śataṃ samā		
na taṃ dhamme prasādassa	kalām̐ agghati ṣoḍaśim̐		

= R 384

d Sh aśyati

384 Uv 24:23 Mvu III 435 GDhp 312 ab Dhp 106ab

māse māse sahasreṇa	yo yajeya śataṃ samā		20 A vi
na taṃ saṃghe prasādassa	kalām agghati ṣoḍaśiṃ		

= R 385

d Sh aśyati

385 Mvu III 435 GDhp 313 ab Dhp 106ab Uv 24:21-23ab
cd Dhp 70cd Utt 9:44cd

māse māse sahasreṇa	yo yajeya śataṃ samā	
na taṃ sākḥātadhaṃmāṇāṃ	kalām agghati ṣoḍaśiṃ	

= R 386

a Sh sahasraṇa d Sh aśyati

386 Uv 24:17 Mvu III 435 ab Dhp 70ab Utt 9:44ab
cd GDhp 310cd

māse māse kuśāggreṇa	bālo bhuñjeya bhojanaṃ		20 A vii
na taṃ buddhe prasādassa	kalām agghati ṣoḍaśiṃ		

= R 387

d Sh aśyati

387 Uv 24:18 Mvu III 435 ab Dhp 70ab Utt 9:44ab

māse māse kuśāggreṇa	bālo bhuñjeya bhojanaṃ		
na taṃ dhamme prasādassa	kalām agghati ṣoḍaśiṃ		20 B i

= R 388

d Sh aśyati

388 Uv 24:19 Mvu III 435 ab Dhp 70ab Utt 9:44ab
cd GDhp 312cd

māse māse kuśāggreṇa bālo bhuñjeya bhojanaṃ |
na taṃ saṃghe prasādassa kalām agghati ṣoḍaśiṃ ||

= R 389

d Sh aśyati

389 Dhp 70 Mvu III 435 Utt 9:44 ab Uv 24:17-19ab
cd GDhp 313cd

māse māse kuśāggreṇa bālo bhuñjeya bhojanaṃ |
na taṃ sā~~khā~~khātadhaṃmāṇāṃ kalām agghati ṣoḍaśiṃ || 20 B ii

= R 390

d Sh aśyati

390 Dhp 110 Uv 24:3 Mvu III 436

yo ca vaśśaśataṃ jīve duśśīlo asamāhito |
ekāhaṃ jīvitaṃ śreyo śīlavantassa jhāyato ||

= R 391

c R jīvaṃ taṃ śreyo Sh jīvitaṃ

391 Dhp 111 Uv 24:4

yo ca vaśśaśataṃ jīve dupraṃṇo asamāhito | 20 B iii

ekāhaṃ jīvitam śreyo praṃñavantassa jhāyato ||

= R 392

b Sh dupraṃñāṇo d Sh praṃñā-

392 Dhp 112 Uv 24:5 Mvu III 436 GDhp 316

yo ca vaśśaśataṃ jīve kusīdo hīnavīriyo |
ekāhaṃ jīvitam śreyo vīryyam ārabhato dḍhaṃ || 20 B iv

= R 393

d Sh vīryam R Sh dḍhaṃ cf 349

393 Dhp 113 Uv 24:6 Mvu III 436 GDhp 317

yo ca vaśśaśataṃ jīve apaśśaṃ udayavyayaṃ |
ekāhaṃ jīvitam śreyo paśśato udayavyayaṃ ||

= R 394

394 Dhp 115 Mvu III 436 GDhp 318

yo ca vaśśaśataṃ jīve apaśśaṃ dhammam uttamaṃ |
ekā ḥhaṃ jīvitam śreyo paśśato dhammam uttamaṃ || 20 B v

= R 395

395 Dhp 114 Uv 24:15 Mvu III 436

yo ca vaśśaśataṃ jīve apaśśaṃ amataṃ padaṃ |
ekā ḥhaṃ jīvitam śreyo paśśato amataṃ padaṃ ||

= R 396

396

yo ca vaśśaśataṃ jīve saddhaṃme apratiṣṭhito | 20 B vi
 ekā Ṣhaṃ jīvitaṃ śreyo sadhaṃmam iha vijānato ||

= R 397

a R vaśśa- c R jīvitaṃ

397 Uv 24:8

yo ca vaśśaśataṃ jīve aprāpya āsavakkhayaṃ |
 ekā Ṣhaṃ jīvitaṃ śreyo prāpyato āsavakkhayaṃ || 20 B vii

= R 398

c R sreyo

sahasravarggaḥ

[Uruga]

398 Sn 5 Uv 18:21 GDhp 81

yo nā Ṣjjhagamī bhavesu sāraṃ
 vicinaṃ puṣpam iva udumbaresu |
 so bhikkhu jahāti orapāraṃ
 urago jinnam iva ttacāṃ purāṇiṃ || 21 A i

= R 399

c Sh bhikkhū

d R tucāṃ It is impossible to distinguish *tta-* from *tu-*, but a reading of *tta-* makes the preceding syllable long, as is required.

399

yo uppatitaṃ vineti rāgaṃ
 viṣaṭaṃ sappaviṣaṃ va oṣadhīhi |
 so bhikkhu jahāti orapāraṃ
 urago jinnam iva ttacāṃ purāṇiṃ ||

= R 400

- | | |
|--------------|-----------------|
| a Sh rāgaṃ | b Sh sappaviṣaṃ |
| c Sh bhikkhū | d R tucāṃ |

400

yo uppatitaṃ vineti doṣaṃ
 viṣaṭaṃ sappaviṣaṃ va oṣadhīhi |
 so bhikkhu jahāti orapāraṃ
 urago jinnam iva ttacāṃ purāṇiṃ ||

21 A ii

= R 401

- | | |
|---------------|-----------|
| a R uppatitam | |
| c Sh bhikkhū | d R tucāṃ |

401

yo uppatitaṃ vineti mohamaṃ
 viṣaṭaṃ sappaviṣaṃ va oṣadhīhi |
 so bhikkhu jahāti orapāraṃ
 urago jinnam iva ttacāṃ purāṇiṃ ||

21 A iii

= R 402

- | | |
|---------------|-----------|
| a R uppatitam | |
| c Sh bhikkhū | d R tucāṃ |

402 Sn 1 GDhp 82

yo uppatitaṃ vineti krodhamaṃ

visaṭaṃ sappaviṣaṃ va oṣadhīhi |
 so bhikkhu jahāti orapāraṃ
 urago jinnam iva ttacāṃ purāṇiṃ ||

21 A iv

= R 403

c Sh bhikkhū d R tucāṃ

403 Uv 32:65

yo uppatitaṃ vineti mānaṃ
 visaṭaṃ sappaviṣaṃ va oṣadhīhi |
 so bhikkhu jahāti orapāraṃ
 urago jinnam iva ttacāṃ purāṇiṃ ||

21 A v

= R 404

c Sh bhikkhū d R tucāṃ

404 Sn 2 Uv 18:21A = 32:56 cf GDhp 83

yo rāgam udicchiyā aśeṣaṃ
 bisapuṣpaṃ va sareruhaṃ vigāhya |
 so bhikkhu jahāti orapāraṃ
 urago jinnam iva ttacāṃ purāṇiṃ ||

21 A vi

= R 405

b Sh visa-

c Sh bhikkhū d R tucāṃ

405 Uv 18:21B = 32:57

yo doṣaṃ udicchiyā aśeṣaṃ
 bisapuṣpaṃ va sareruhaṃ vigāhya |
 so bhikkhu jahāti orapāraṃ

urago jinnam iva ttacāṃ purāṇiṃ ॥

= R 406

b R -puṣpam Sh visa-

c Sh bhikkhū

d R tucāṃ

406 Uv 18:21C = 32:58

yo moham udicchiyā aśeṣaṃ
bisapuṣpaṃ va sareruhaṃ vigāhya ।
so bhikkhu jahāti orapāraṃ
urago jinnam iva ttacāṃ purāṇiṃ ॥

21 A vii

= R 407

b R -puṣpam Sh visa-

c Sh bhikkhū

d R tucāṃ

407

yo krodham udicchiyā aśeṣaṃ
bisapuṣpaṃ va sareruhaṃ vigāhya ।
so bhikkhu jahāti orapāraṃ
urago jinnam iva ttacāṃ purāṇiṃ ॥

21 B i

= R 408

b Sh visa-

c Sh bhikkhū

d R tucāṃ

408 Uv 18:21D = 32:59 GDhp 83

yo mānam udicchiyā aśeṣaṃ
bisapuṣpam va sareruhaṃ vigāhya ।
so bhikkhu jahāti orapāraṃ
urago jinnam iva ttacāṃ purāṇiṃ ॥

= R 409

b Sh visapuṣṣaṃ

c Sh bhikkhū

d R tucāṃ

409

yo rāgam udicchiyā aśeṣaṃ

21 B ii

kuśa (krama)-saṃgāni va chetta (chetu) bandhanāni |

so bhikkhu jahāti orapāraṃ

urago jinnam iva ttacāṃ purāṇiṃ ||

= R 410

a R rāgaṃ

b R kramasaṃ pā(?)ni va chetu-bandhanāni Sh kusasaṃgān iva
chettadhanvanāni *ku-* and *kra-* are hard to distinguish.

c Sh bhikkhū

d R tucāṃ purāṇiṃ Sh purāṇiṃ

410 Sn 3 Uv 32:74 GDhp 84

yo tahnā udicchiyā aśeṣaṃ

saritāṃ śīgharayāṃ viśodhayittā |

21 B iii

so bhikkhu jahāti orapāraṃ

urago jinnam iva ttacāṃ purāṇiṃ ||

= R 411

a Sh taṇham

c Sh bhikkhū

d R tucāṃ

411 Sn 8 GDhp 86

yo nā ṣcasarī na preccasārī

sabbaṃ vītasarī imaṃ prapañcaṃ |

so bhikkhu jahāti orapāraṃ

21 B iv

urago jinnam iva ttacāṃ purāṇiṃ ॥

= R 412

c Sh bhikkhū

d R tucāṃ

412 Sn 9 Uv 32:55 GDhp 87

yo nā Ṣccasārī na preccasārī
sabbam idaṃ vitadhaṃ ti moṣadhammaṃ ।
so bhikkhu jahāti orapāraṃ
urago jinnam iva ttacāṃ purāṇiṃ ॥

21 B v

= R 413

c Sh bhikkhū

d R tucāṃ

413 Sn 16 Uv 32:78 GDhp 89

yassa vanathā na saṃti keci
vinibaṃdhāya bhavāya hetukappā ।
so bhikkhu jahāti orapāraṃ
urago jinnam iva ttacāṃ purāṇiṃ ॥

21 B vi

= R 414

c Sh bhikkhū

d R tucāṃ

414 Sn 15, 14 Uv 32:79

yassa jarathā na santi keci
mūlā akkuśalā samūhatā Ṣssa ।
so bhikkhu jahāti orapāraṃ
urago jinnam iva ttacāṃ purāṇiṃ ॥

= R 415

- b R akuśalā fn: 'MS akkuśalā' Sh sulabhā kuśalā
 c Sh bhikkhū d R tucām

No title is given for this *varga*, and I have adopted R's suggestion of *uraga*.

samāptā dharmmapadā¹ amṛtapadāni² gāthāśatāni pañca dve 21 B vii
 ca gāthe || yathā dṛṣṭam tathā likhitam iti parihāroyam asmadiyaḥ ||
 śubham astu sarvvasatvānānam³ ||

¹ Sh dharmapadā

² R amṛtapadāt Sh amṛtapadā I cannot read with any certainty the *akṣara* following *-dā*.

³ R sarvvasatvānān Sh sarvastvānām

Abbreviations

A	Aṅguttara-nikāya, ed R Morris, E Hardy, PTS London, 1885-1900
Aśoka	
Dh, K	Dhauri, Kalsi
M, Sh	Mansehra, Shahbazgarhi
Bhī Vin	Bhikṣunī-Vinaya, ed G Roth, Patna 1970
CPS	Das Catuspariśatasūtra, ed E Waldschmidt, Berlin 1952-62
D	Dīgha-nikāya, ed T W Rhys Davids, J E Carpenter, PTS London 1890-1911
Dhp	Dhammapada (with Latin translation, and excerpts from the Pali commentary), ed V Fausböll, Hauniae 1855
Dhp Be	Dhammapada, Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana edition, Rangoon 1961

- Dhp Ce Dhammapada, Buddha Jayanti Tripitaka Series Vol 24, Ceylon 1960
- Dhp-a Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā, ed H C Norman, PTS London 1906-14
- Divy Divyāvadāna, ed E B Cowell, R A Neil, Cambridge 1886
- E I Epigraphica Indica, Calcutta 1882-
- Endstr. concluding verse
- GDhp The Gāndhārī Dharmapada, ed J Brough, London 1962
- It Itivuttaka, ed E Windisch, PTS London 1889
- Ja The Jātaka together with its commentary, ed V Fausböll, London 1877-96
- Jm Jātakamālā, ed H Kern, Boston 1891
- Khar. Inscr. Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions, ed A M Boyer, E J Rapson, É Senart, P S Noble, Oxford, 1920-29
- M Majjhima-nikāya, ed V Trenckner, R Chalmers, PTS London 1887-1902
- Manu Mānava Dharmaśāstra, ed J Jolly, London 1887
- MBh Mahābhārata, ed V S Sukthankar, S K Belvalkar, Poona 1933-
- Mil Milindapañho, ed V Trenckner, PTS London 1880
- Mkv Mahākarmavibhaṅga (et Karmavibhaṅgopadeśa), ed S Lévi, Paris 1932
- Mvu Mahāvastu, ed É Senart, Paris 1882-97
- Nett Nettipakaraṇa, ed E Hardy, PTS London 1902
- Peṭ Peṭakopadesa, ed A Barua, PTS London 1949
- PrātMā The Prātimokṣasūtra of the Mahāsāṅghikās, ed W Pachow, R Mishra, Allahabad 1956
- PrātMū The Prātimokṣasūtra of the Mūlasarvāstivādins, ed A C Banerjee, Calcutta 1954
- PrātSa The Prātimokṣasūtra of the Sarvāstivādins, ed L Finot, Journal Asiatique 11:2 (1913), pp 465-557

- R The Patna Dhammapada, ed G Roth, in *The Language of the Earliest Buddhist Tradition*, ed H Bechert, Göttingen 1980, pp 93-135
- S Saṃyutta-nikāya, ed L Feer, PTS London 1884-98
- Sh The Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dharmapada, ed N S Shukla, Patna 1979
- Sn Sutta nipāta, ed D Andersen, H Smith, PTS London 1913
- Th, Thī Theragāthā and Therīgāthā, ed H Oldenberg, R Pischel, 2nd edition with Appendices by K R Norman, L Alsdorf, PTS London 1966
- Ud Udāna, ed P Steinthal, PTS London 1885
- Utt Uttarādhyayanasūtra, ed J Charpentier, Uppsala 1922
- Uv Udāna-varga, ed F Bernhard, Göttingen 1965
- Vin Vinayaṭṭhaka, ed H Oldenberg, London 1879-1883

SIX PĀLI ETYMOLOGIES

Here is another random collection of words which are either omitted from PED,² or given an incorrect meaning or etymology there.

1. *āsitta* "cursed"
2. *ghaccā* "killing"
3. *ghañña* "killing"
4. *niruttipatha* "(having) a way of speaking"
5. *matigha* "mother-killer, matricide"
6. *gedha/rodha* "thicket"

1. *āsitta* "cursed"

We find at Ja V 87,23* the compound *āsitta-satto*. The *cty* explains this as *āsitta-visena satto* (V 87,26'), where *satto* is presumably to be derived from Skt *śapta* "cursed". CPD takes the compound *āsitta-visa* as a noun, and we should therefore translate "cursed by the poison (which has been) dripped", although I see no reason for rejecting the view that it is a *bahuvrīhi* adjective, in which case we could translate "cursed by the one who is dripping poison". CPD quotes Ja-gp 398,31 foll., which reads *āsitta-sapatto*, and explains *sapatto* as *sapatha*, i.e. Skt

¹ See K.R. Norman, "Pāli Lexicographical Studies V", in *JPTS*, XII, pp. 49-63.

² 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; PTS = Pali Text Society; PED = PTS's *Pali-English Dictionary*; PTC = *Pāli Tipiṭakam Concordance*; MIA = Middle Indo-Aryan; AMg = *Ardha-Māgadhī*; Pkt = Prakrit; Skt = Sanskrit; GDhp = *Gāndhārī Dharmapada*; Utt = *Uttarajjhayaṇa-sutta*; Ss = *Sattasaī*; BD = *Book of the Discipline*; KS = *Kindred Sayings*; D of B = *Dialogues of the Buddha*; EV = *Elders' Verses*; *cty* = commentary.

śapatha “curse”. I think that the cty is correct in seeing the need for a word meaning “cursed” here, but I think the wrong word has been chosen to bear this meaning. I believe that *āsitta* is to be derived < *āsatta* < **āśapta*. This compound of the root *śap-* seems not to occur in Skt, but there seems to be no reason why it should not have existed. This, then, would be another example of palatalisation of *-a-* after *ś*.³ If we retain the reading *āsitta-satto* it would mean “the cursed person”, but CPD prefers the reading *āsittamatto*, showing the *m/s* alternation,⁴ which would then mean “as soon as cursed”.

2. *ghaccā* “killing”

This word occurs in the compounds *mūla-ghaccā* (D III 67,12 foll.); *sabbasunakhaghaccā* (Ja I 176,27); and *saghaccā* (Ja I 177,4*). There is no doubt about its meaning “killing”, nor about its connection with the root *han-* “to strike”, but PED does not explain its precise form. It is to be derived from *ghātya*, the future passive participle of the root *han-*, meaning “to be killed”, and is an example of the future passive participle being used as an action noun. This usage has been noticed for Skt by Renou: “Les *kṛtya* fournissent assez librement des abstraits neutres”.⁵ He quotes *raṅṣitavya*, *kārya*, *rantavya*, *patitavya*, *geya*, *śayanīya*, *tāpya*, *steya*. He also quotes the feminine *kṛtyā* “action, act, deed”.

Although the use of the past participle as an action noun in MIA is well-known,⁶ the use of the future passive participle in this way

³ See K.R. Norman, “The palatalisation of vowels in Middle Indo-Aryan”, *Journal of the Oriental Institute (Baroda)*, XXV, pp. 328-42 (§ 2.9)

⁴ See EV II, p. 116 (ad Thī 262).

⁵ *Grammaire sanscrite*, § 161 (p. 206).

⁶ See EV I 129 (ad Th 36) and EV II 115 (ad Thī 261).

is less common. We can, however, quote other examples from Pāli and Pkt:

- (a) in Pāli: *chejja* “cutting”; *mūla-chejja* Sp 213,22 (cf. Skt *chedya*)
bhejja “breaking, splitting” Vin III 47,2
khamanīya “healing, getting better” D II 99,22
anumodanīya “thanks, expression of gratitude” (= *anumodana*) A III 50,16; Ap 394,18
theyya “stealing” (cf. Skt *steya*)
palobhiya “seduction”; *isi-palobhiya* Ja V 161,13*
- (b) in Pkt: *jujja* “fighting” Utt 9.35 (< *yudhya*)
pujja “honouring” Utt 11 [title] (< *pūjya*)
hassa “laughing” (in *a-hass-ira*) Utt 11.4 (cf. Skt *hāsyā*)
mohaniija “deluding, delusion” Utt 9.1 (= *mohana*)
āvaraniija “obstructing, obstruction” Utt 33.2 (= *āvaraṇa*)
siṃjiavva Ss 392 “jingling” (**siṅjitavya*)
paampiavva Ss 450 “chattering” (**prajalpitavya*)
ramiavva Ss 461 “pleasure, enjoyment, play” (**ram-itavya*; cf. Skt *rantavya*)
cumviavva Ss 465 “kissing” (**cumbitavya*)
rūsiavva Ss 466 “being angry” (**rūṣitavya*)
rujja Ss 843 “wailing” (**rodya* = *rodanīya*)

3. *ghaṅṅa* “killing”

PED gives the correct etymology for this word, but is hesitant about it, and undecided whether it is a noun or an adjective. It is to be derived from the *vṛddhi* formation noun *ghānya* from *ghana* in its early

sense of “striker, killer, destroyer”. The word exists in Skt, but is used only in the later sense of *ghana* “thick”, and is found in the Skt Dhātupāṭha in the sense of “compactness”. It is therefore a noun, and the *tatpuruṣa* compound with *atta* found at Dhṛ 164 (*attaḡhaññāya phallati*) is also a noun.

4. *niruttipatha* “(having) a way of speaking”

The compound *niruttipatha* occurs in the Pāli Canon at Vin III 57,22-23; D II 63,29 (Sv 503,34 foll.: *niruttipatho ti saratī ti sato, sampajānātī ti sampajāno ti, ādikassa kāraṇāpadesavasena pavattassa vohāressa patho*); 68,19; S III 71-73 (Spk II 279,5: *niruttiyo va nirutti-pathā; atha vā niruttiyo ca tā niruttivasena viññātabbānaṃ atthānaṃ pathattā pathā cā ti nirutti-pathā*) quoted at Kv 140-41; Nidd II 243,26 (§ 563); Dhs 7,12. The PTC translates it as “path, process of language”; BD translates as “way of speaking”; D of B as “process of explanation”; KS as “mode of reckoning”; Points of Controversy as “mode in word”; Dhs-Trsl “processes of explanation”. Professor N.A. Jayawickrama (in a private note which he made in my copy of PED) suggests “linguistic convention”.

In the Vinaya the compound occurs in a set of five stories which are told in the section on *pārājika*,⁷ illustrating the fact that an offence is committed only if there is the intention to do wrong. The first story concerns a monk who spread out his robe in the open air: *tena kho pana samayena aññataro bhikkhu ajjhokāse cīvaraṃ pathharitvā vihāraṃ pāvisi. aññataro bhikkhu mā-y-idaṃ cīvaraṃ nassī ti paṭisāmesi. so nikkhamitvā bhikkhū pucchi: āvuso mayhaṃ cīvaraṃ kena avahaṭan ti. so evaṃ āha: mayā avahaṭan ti. so taṃ ādiyi asamaṇo si tvan ti. tassa kukkucçaṃ*

⁷ The *uddāna* states: *niruttiyā pañca akkhātā*, Vin III 55,27.

*ahosi. bhagavato etam atthaṃ ārocesi. kiṃcitto tvaṃ bhikkhū ti. niruttipatho ahaṃ bhagavā ti. anāpatti bhikkhu niruttipathe ti.*⁸

Miss Horner translates this story⁹: “At one time a certain monk having spread out his robe in the open air, entered the vihāra. A certain monk, saying: “Do not let this robe be lost,” put it aside. Having come out (of the vihāra), he asked the monks: “Your reverences, who has stolen my robe ?” He said: “I have stolen it.” He seized him and said: “You are not a true recluse.” Thereupon he was remorseful. He told this matter to the lord. He said: “Of what were you thinking, monk ?” “I, lord ? It was a way of speaking,” he said. (The lord) said: “There is no offence, monk, in the way of speaking.”

Comparable stories are told (in an abbreviated way, in some cases) about a monk who deposits his robe on a chair, his mat on a chair, his bowl under a chair, and also about a nun who deposits her robe on a fence. In each case the monk who had intended to do a service to the other monk stated that he had stolen the object, but the Buddha announced that there was no offence *niruttipathe*. Although there is some possibility of ambiguity as regards the speaker on each occasion, so that it is not entirely clear who feels remorse, Miss Horner solves the problem by a set of footnotes identifying the speaker on each occasion. She does not explain why the second monk says he has stolen the robe, or what “the way of speaking” means.

In his commentary Buddhaghosa explains: *niruttipathavattthusmiṃ ādiyī ti gaṇhi, coro si tvaṃ ti parāmasi, itaro pana kena avahaṭan ti vutte mayā avahaṭan ti pucchāsabhāgena paṭiñṇaṃ adāsi. yadi hi itarena kena gahitaṃ kena apanītaṃ kena ṭhapitaṃ ti vuttaṃ abhaviṣsa, addhā ayam pi mayā gahitaṃ apanītaṃ ṭhapitaṃ ti vā vadeyya. mukhaṃ*

⁸ Vin III 57,16-23.

⁹ BD, Vol. I, pp. 95-96.

*nāma bhuñjanatthāya ca kathanatthāya ca kataṃ, theyyacittam pana vinā avahāro n' atthi. tena bhagavā anāpatti bhikkhu niruttipathe ti. vohāravacanamatte anāpatti ti attho.*¹⁰ “Without the intention to steal there is no theft. For this reason the Bhagavat said: ‘There is no offence, bhikkhu, in the way of speaking’. This means that there is no offence in the mere conventional use of language”.

From the story in the following section, where there is an intention to steal, and therefore there is an offence,¹¹ it is clear that it was the bhikkhu who was called *asamaṇa* who felt remorse. He felt remorse at being called *asamaṇa* because he was only trying to be helpful, and had not actually taken the robe, in the sense of having stolen it, despite the answer which he had given to the questioner. The word *niruttipatha* is used with reference to the answer he gave. The robe-owner said, “Who has taken, i.e. stolen, my robe?”. The other replied, “I have taken [but not stolen] it.” Since by his words he had, in the robe-owner’s view, confessed his guilt, he called him *asamaṇa*, which caused the would-be do-gooder to feel remorse. When questioned by the Buddha, the robe-remover in effect said, “It was just my way of speaking. He asked who had taken it, and I said I had. He was using the word *avahaṭa* in the sense of ‘stolen’, whereas I was using it in the sense of ‘taken away (for safe keeping)’.”

As Buddhaghosa explains, the second monk was merely repeating the form of words used by the first monk. The latter had said *avahaṭam*, and the second monk had repeated his word. If the questioner had said *gahitam* “seized”, *apanītam* “removed” or *ṭhapitam* “placed”, the second monk would have used the same word in his reply. The point of the story is that *avahaṭa* (and the verb *avaharati* from which it is derived)

¹⁰ Sp 374,10-19. The PTS edition reads *nirutti patheti*, breaking up the compound incorrectly.

¹¹ Vin III 58,5-10.

has two meanings: (1) to take away; (2) to take away with the intention of not returning, i.e. to steal. The first monk was using the word in the second sense “who has stolen my robe?”. The second monk, understanding the questioner to have used it in the first sense and to have said “who has taken my robe away?”, correctly answered “I have taken it away”, but his answer was understood to mean “I have stolen it”. When questioned by the Buddha as to his intention (“*kiṃcitto?*”), the second monk explained that he had used the word in a conventional way of speaking. The Buddha ruled that, even if someone seemed to confess to stealing, offence only arose if there was intention (to steal). There was no offence in the use of the conventional way of speaking, whereby the person who was questioned repeated the form of the words employed by his questioner. If a person, making use of a conventional way of speaking, i.e. repeating the word used by a questioner in conversation, seems to say that he has stolen something, but has not in fact stolen it, then there is no offence.

Miss Horner was clearly uncertain about the way in which to analyse the form of the compound. She took it as a *tatpuruṣa* compound on both occasions, but to do this she has to take *ahaṃ* as a monosyllabic sentence “I?”. Although this is not impossible in itself, it seems very unlikely that it could be possible in this context where it appears as the second word. She puts it as first word in her translation. Unless we are to see *ahaṃ* as an early replacement for *ayaṃ*, it would seem to be essential to take the compound in two different ways. First as a *bahuvrīhi* adjective, in agreement with *ahaṃ*: “I have a way of speaking”, i.e. “I was (merely) using words”, and then as a *tatpuruṣa* compound: “[There is no fault] in a way of speaking, i.e. in the mere use of words”.

5. *mattigha* “mother-killer, matricide”

PED does not list this word, which occurs at Ja V 269,2*. It is glossed at 274,16' as *mātughātika*, and we may compare Skt *māṭṛ-ghātaka* and *māṭṛ-ghna* “a matricide”. The word is of interest because, if we follow the obvious division and take it to be *matti* + *gha* (<Skt *gha*), this is another example of *māṭṛ* becoming *matti-* in compounds, and we can compare it with *matti-sambhava* (Sn 620 = DhP 396). The easiest way to explain *matti-sambhava*, however, is to assume that *matti* is a locative in a *tatpuruṣa* compound, i.e. **mātri* = *mātari*, by analogy with *mātrā* and *mātre*, cf. Skt *mātari-bhvarī*. It does not, however, seem possible to take *matti* as a locative in *mattigha*, and here we should have to assume that *māṭṛ* > **māti*- > *matti*-. The compound occurs at GDhp 17 in the form *yoṇeka-matra-sabhamu*, although it is not clear whether *yoṇeka* should be included in the compound. Brough¹² stated that the interpretation of *matti-* as *māṭṛ-* was difficult and thought that the expression *māṭṛ-sambhava* seemed forced. The GDhp form led him to suggest that *mātra-* is the original sense, although on the basis of the Tibetan version of the Udānavarga (the Skt version was not available to him) he conjectured that the Skr version had *māṭṛ*. Now that Bernhard's edition is available we can see that Udānavarga 33.15 does, in fact, read *māṭṛ-sambhavaṃ*. The existence of Pāli *matti-gha* suggests that the problem of *matti-sambhava* needs to be reconsidered.

6. *gedha/rodha* “thicket”

The word *gedha* occurs in a passage which occurs twice in the Pāli canon: *kathaṅ ca bhikkhave mahācoro gahananissito hoti ? idha bhikkhave mahācoro tiṅgahanam vā nissito hoti rukkhagahanam vā gedham vā mahāvanasaṅgam vā* (A I 154,1 = III 128,23 [although the

¹² GDhp, p. 183.

PTS edition reads *rodham* in the latter reference]). Since the reference is to *gahana*-, one would expect some sort of vegetation to be involved, and in the absence of any other indication, I should prefer the translation “thicket”, which is given in PTC, rather than “cave” which is given in PED.

The cty explains: *gedhan ti ghanam arañham* (v.l. *aññamaññam*) *samsattasākhā ekābaddham mahāvanasaṇḍam* (Mp II 254,6). This too is interpreting the passage as referring to vegetation, rather than a cave. PTC quotes only the word *ghanam* from Mp, which implies that the editor of PTC assumed that *ghanam* was the gloss upon *gedham*. It would look as though *gedham* is being taken as an adjective in PTC, with *mahāvanasaṇḍam*, although the translation “thicket” which is given contradicts this. Taking it as an adjective does pose the question of why there should be the word *vā* following it, unless we are to understand *gedham* as standing for *gedha-gahanam*.

Clearly the tradition found difficulties with the word because, as noted above, we find *rodham* as a reading or as a v.l. in some editions, and the Burmese Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana edition actually reads *rodham* in both the canonical passages and the *aṭṭhakathā*. Although PED translates *rodha*- as “bank, dam”, taking it from 2√*rudh*-, I assume that it is actually from 1√*rudh*-, and means “the growing thing”.

There would then seem to be great doubt as to whether *gedha*- actually exists but, if it does, then I suggest that it does not mean “cave”.

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS VOLUME

Dr M. Cone,
Faculty of Oriental Studies,
Sidgwick Avenue,
Cambridge CB3 9DA.

K.R. Norman,
Faculty of Oriental Studies,
Sidgwick Avenue,
Cambridge CB3 9DA.

Ole Holten Pind,
A Critical Pāli Dictionary,
Købmagergade 52³,
DK-1150 Copenhagen K,
Denmark.

Dr William Pruitt,
5 Rue de Montreuil,
F-94300 Vincennes,
France.

Dr Gregory Schopen,
Department of Religious Studies,
Sycamore Hall 230,
Bloomington,
Indiana 47405,
U.S.A.

PALI TEXT SOCIETY

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 a publishable book, 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. The value will be fixed at 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,
Faculty of Oriental Studies,
Sidgwick Avenue,
Cambridge,
England CB3 9DA.