

Pali Text Society

JOURNAL

OF THE

PALI TEXT SOCIETY

VOLUME XXII

EDITED BY

O. VON HINÜBER

AND

R. F. GOMBRICH

Published by
THE PALI TEXT SOCIETY
OXFORD

1996

CONTENTS

The I. B. Horner Lecture 1995: Lexicography, Pali and Pali lexicography By Margaret Cone	1
Chips from Buddhist Workshops Scribes and Manuscripts from Northern Thailand By Oskar von Hinüber	35
A Pāli Canonical Passage of Importance for the History of Indian Medicine By Jinadasa Liyanaratne	59
Studies in Vinaya technical terms I-III By Édith Nolot	73
The Sambuddhe verses and later Theravādin Buddhology By Peter Skilling	150
List of Members of the Pali Text Society	185
Contributors to this Volume	223
Notices	225

COPYRIGHT NOTICE

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means analogue, digital, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise stored in any retrieval system of any nature without the written permission of The Pali Text Society Limited of 73 Lime Walk, Headington, Oxford OX3 7AD.

© *Pali Text Society 1996*

ISBN 0 86013 333 8

First published in 1996
Distributed by Lavis Marketing
73 Lime Walk
Oxford OX3 7AD

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

The I. B. Horner Lecture 1995 Lexicography, Pali, and Pali lexicography

My official title at Cambridge includes the words Pali Lexicography — a rather general and abstract way to refer to what I am engaged in, which is something much more specific: the writing of a new Pali-English Dictionary for the Pali Text Society. I should like to speak about that dictionary, about what it will be like, what it will aim to do, how it is being written. But I shall speak also about the business of dictionary-writing, and about the history of Pali lexicography in particular.

I would like to begin with a quotation, from a preface — prefaces and quotations, which are part of the stuff of dictionary writing, will feature fairly prominently in my remarks tonight. So, from a preface:

It is the fate of those who toil at the lower employments of life, to be rather driven by the fear of evil than attracted by the prospect of good; to be exposed to censure, without hope of praise; to be disgraced by miscarriage, or punished for neglect, where success would have been without applause, and diligence without reward. Among these unhappy mortals is the writer of dictionaries; whom mankind have considered, not as the pupil, but the slave of science, the pioneer of literature, doomed only to remove rubbish and clear obstructions from the paths of learning and Genius, who press forward to conquest and glory, without bestowing a smile on the humble drudge that facilitates their progress. Every other author may aspire to praise; the lexicographer can

only hope to escape reproach, and even this negative recompense has been yet granted to very few.

That is the opening of Dr. Johnson's Preface to his Dictionary. I hope you can enjoy the power of his rhetoric and language. I fear that, unless you have ever been a dictionary-writer, you will not appreciate the truth of what he says. Lexicographers inhabit a closed and secret region, unvisited, unknown to others. I have more in common, more fellow-feeling, with other writers of dictionaries than with those who seem nearer to me, such as the denizens of Oriental Faculties, or indeed other Pali scholars, and I shall frequently use the words of three lexicographers, Johnson, Monier-Williams and Stede, to express my own feelings.

If you read the prefaces to dictionaries — although you probably won't: they are usually read only by other lexicographers — but if you were to read the prefaces, you would often find, not the sober statement of the aims of the dictionary, its format, and how best to use it, that you might expect, but a passionate apologia, a piteous cry about the difficulties, the despairs, the unlooked-for but unavoidable delays, the dastardly or dull-witted acts of others — a preface which in rugby parlance is getting its retaliation in first. One aspect of my talk is a kind of preface to the Pali-English Dictionary on which I work, and if you think you hear a note of defensive self-justification, you are probably right.

I have said there will be quotations and prefaces. Another theme will be of evolution and relationship. I am associated with Darwin College, Cambridge, and a Darwinian slant seems appropriate. Lexicography indeed illustrates Natural Selection, or perhaps better the Survival of the Fittest — rather literally, as the work seems to take a heavy toll. Who can forget Dr. Schönberg, described by Monier-Williams in the introduction to his Sanskrit Dictionary?

[He] came to the work in a condition of great physical weakness, and [his] assistance only extended from May 1884 to July 1885, when he left me to die;

or indeed Prof. Goldstücker, commemorated in the same introduction, who

... was singularly unpractical in some of his ideas ... he finished the printing of 480 pages of his own work, which only brought him to the word *arimḍama* ... when an untimely death cut short his lexicographical labours;

but you may not know of Herbert Coleridge, first editor of the New English Dictionary (later the Oxford English Dictionary) who

died in 1861 at the early age of 31, from consumption brought on by a chill caused by sitting in damp clothes during a Philological Society lecture. When he was told that he would not recover he is reported to have exclaimed, "I must begin Sanskrit tomorrow".

His successor as editor-in-chief, Sir James Murray, died in July 1915, after 36 years' work; the last part of the Dictionary appeared in the beginning of 1928. Monier-Williams himself completed the Sanskrit Dictionary only a few days before his death, and did not see it published. And of course, Thomas William Rhys Davids, begetter of the Pali Text Society's first Pali-English Dictionary, died in 1922, three years before the final part of that dictionary was published. I do not say that lexicography is a dangerous pursuit — only that the project is often longer-lived than the writer.

And there is survival of the fittest in another way too: the good dictionary makes others redundant. As in Sanskrit grammar Pāṇini survives, so in Sanskrit lexicography Amarasiṃha remains the chief name. And he forms part of a chain or tree of development, — not a series in which the succeeding practitioners out-do their predecessors, but where each one makes use of what has gone before, using previous work for a new kind of work. With both arrogance and humility, I set myself at a present point on this line of succession, taking a place in a *paramparā* of workers in words.

Claus Vogel begins his survey of Indian Lexicography with these words:

Lexicographic work started in India at a very early date with the compilation of word-lists (*nighaṇṭu*) giving rare, unexplained, vague, or otherwise difficult terms culled from sacred writings.

Already you can see the line of descent: I spend much of my time with rare, unexplained, vague or otherwise difficult terms culled from sacred writings. Of course the Nighaṇṭu is not like the Pali-English Dictionary, but it does set a pattern for several centuries of Indian lexicography. It begins with three sections of synonyms, the first section giving words for physical things, beginning with earth, the second words for man and qualities associated with man, the third words for abstract qualities; then follows a list of difficult words; and finally a section of the names of deities, beginning with Agni. To the user of a modern dictionary it all seems rather disorganised — the order of words often appears arbitrary, verbal forms occur beside nouns or adjectives — but if we add to it Yāska's Nirukta, of the early centuries BC, we have various elements which will persist. Yāska defines the obscure or difficult words, often giving an etymology or derivation, quoting the Ṛg-vedic verse and

adding a commentary to explain or justify his definition; he considers suffixes and particles, describing their sense, their position, their use, noting differences between Vedic and Classical Sanskrit, again supporting his assertions with quotations. One recognises the method. One recognises other things too. His etymologies are usually fanciful; and already there is present a characteristic of many (perhaps all) lexicographers and commentators: often they don't know what the word means. Dr. Johnson, when asked by a lady why he defined 'pastern' — wrongly — as the knee of a horse, replied 'Ignorance, madam, pure ignorance'. Look for example at Nirukta 2:7 foll. where Yāska gives two meanings for the word *nirṛti*, neither of which is that given to it in the Nighaṇṭu. And the Nighaṇṭu and Yāska are like the Pali-English Dictionary in this, that their concern is with a limited and fairly homogeneous body of texts; their function is as a teaching aid in the interpretation of scripture; the definitions and explanations must make sense within the world-view of that scripture, not merely in some abstract and general linguistic sphere.

We have similar material in the Pali Canon itself, although we don't have any lists of words without contexts. But in the Vinaya Piṭaka the important words in a rule are explained or defined. This is definition with a specific and limited purpose: to make clear precisely what the *sikkhāpada* refers to, so that there is no doubt about what is an *āpatti* and what not. It is not quite definition in the way we would expect in a dictionary. See Vin III 23,37 foll.: the rule begins *yo pana bhikkhu ...* and the old commentary has

*yo panā ti yo yādiso yathāyutto yathājacco yathānāmo
yathāgotto yathāsīlo yathāvihārī yathāgocarō thero vā
navo vā majjhimo vā eso vuccati yo panā ti. bhikkhū ti
bhikkhako ti bhikkhu, bhikkhācariyaṃ ajjhūpagato ti,*

bhinnapaṭadharo ti bhikkhu ... ehi bhikkhū ti bhikkhu

...

In this case, various explanations are given, and one is chosen as most appropriate for this particular context. Or see Vin III 189,11:

*upāsikā nāma buddhaṃ saraṇaṃ gatā dhammaṃ
saraṇaṃ gatā saṅghaṃ saraṇaṃ gatā.*

Sometimes the old commentary is closer to that method of synonyms we are familiar with, eg Vin III 46,35:

*ādiyeyyā ti ādiyeyya hareyya avahareyya iriyāpathaṃ
vikopeyya thānā cāveyya saṅketam vītināmeyya.*

And already there are grammatical explanations, eg Vin III 73,33:

ambho purisā ti ālapanavacanam etam.

The real lexicographical text is the Niddesa, which deals with each word of the Aṭṭhaka and Pārāyaṇa vaggas of the Sutta Nipāta in a way which supplies the place of a dictionary. Practically every word is clarified, either by synonyms, or by what is really a doctrinal exegesis, or by a statement of the word's grammatical form and function. Let us look merely at the first verse of the Kāmasutta:

*kāmaṃ kāmayamānassa tassa ce taṃ samijjhati
addhā pītimano hoti laddhā macco yad icchati*

The Niddesa tells us there are two types of *kāma* — *vatthukāmā* and *kīlesakāmā*. It then explains the two types, giving many examples. Synonyms are given for *kāmayamānassa*, *samijjhati*, *pītimano*, *macco*

and *icchati*. *tassa* is explained as any sort of man or god. *addhā* is defined as an expression for certainty: *ekamsavacanam nissamsayavacanam* etc. *pītimano* is split into *pīti* and *mano*, and synonyms given. For *laddhā* the more familiar form *labhitvā* is given, with more near synonyms. And this is the pattern throughout the Niddesa. It is rather wasteful, as when a word recurs, the same explanation is given in full. But this is of course a text to be memorised. Every repetition both relaxes the effort and reinforces the message.

A comparable practice is followed in the Peṭakopadesa and Nettipakarāṇa, especially in the *vevacana* sections. And in all these texts, the Vinaya, the Niddesa, Peṭakopadesa and Netti, we recognise a primary aim, similar to that we saw in the Nighaṇṭu and Nirukta, first to clarify the words of the Buddha, to specify their acceptation, and then to place those words within the overall teaching, to define not merely what a particular word can mean, but what it means in that context and in the context of the *dhamma* as a whole. And this is an aim I think even an English twentieth century definer of Pali words must keep in mind. I dread being asked what I do, for every word I say requires several sentences of explanation. You may not be quite aware of the depth of *avijjā* about Pali — in the sense both of ignorance and of wrong knowledge — of those who are quite conversant with superconductivity or Pre-Raphaelite painting or even medieval theology. But at some point I say ‘Pali is the language of Theravāda Buddhist texts’, and though that statement is an attempt to make simple a complicated question, it expresses an important truth. The Nirukta, the *padabhājanīya* sections of the Vinaya, the Pali-English Dictionary, look inward; they aim to tell what a term connotes at a particular time in a particular context, not what it might or could connote in a living, developing language.

The format of word-lists is used by that other survivor in Sanskrit lexicography, Amarasimha, of about the seventh or eighth

century of our era, but in his work, Nāmaṅgānuśāsana, one is aware of more order. Like the Nighaṇṭu, he has sections of synonyms, beginning with heaven and the gods, and including appellations of the Buddha. Then there is a section of homonyms — words with more than one sense, or words of the same form but different meaning; and then a section of indeclinables. And our first Pali dictionary appears to be mainly based on Amarasimha's work. That is the Abhidhānappadīpikā by a certain Moggallāna who lived in the Jetavana vihāra in Polonnaruva during the reign and under the patronage of Parakkama Bāhu I, in the twelfth century of our era. The format of the Abhidhānappadīpikā is very similar to that of the Amarakośa: it begins with three sections of synonyms, the first section — *saggakaṇḍa* — dealing with heaven, the gods, the quarters of space, time, mental states, virtues, vices, dancing, musical instruments, objects of the senses, the Vedas, but beginning in this case with the appellations of a Buddha, and of our Buddha, Gotama (the first word is *buddho*), and including expressions for *nibbāna*. It sounds rather chaotic, but in fact there is a sort of logical progression of ideas, enough to help those who had to memorise it, who were also helped by its being in verse, mainly in ślokaś. The second section, *bhūkaṇḍa*, deals with earth and countries, with towns and buildings; with men and women, their bodies, their ornaments, their diseases and disabilities, with their class and occupations; with forests and trees and plants, with mountains, with animals, birds and insects; with rivers and seas and lotuses; then we have adjectives, and other nouns which have not already been covered. Moggallāna provides a considerable amount of information: synonyms are given in the nominative case, and where the gender of a word is not clear from its form, the gender is specified, eg by *thī* or *tthiyam* for a feminine, *napumsake* for a neuter, *nīthiyam* if the word can be masculine or neuter. Not all is consistent — remember, it is difficult to write any kind of dictionary, especially in verse. It is not always clear where a subject changes; and there are words to fill a line which can be confusing. Most entries are lists of synonyms, but

sometimes they merely list associated words, for example, after names for Indra we are given the name of Indra's wife, of his elephant, of his chariot etc. And some entries list types of things, eg 147 lists types of perfumes, 148 lists the six categories of tastes.

Moggallāna's next section, like Amarasimha's, is of homonyms. Here the head-word is in the nominative, and the meanings in the locative, sometimes compounded. If the word in different senses differs in gender, then the head-word is repeated with the appropriate termination. The head-word is not always given first, but because it is the only nominative, there is no confusion. And as with the synonyms, gender is marked where there could be ambiguity or misunderstanding, eg 808:

*so bandhave 'ttani ca saṃ so dhanasmim anitthiyam
sā pume sunakhe vutto 'ttanīye so tilingiko.*

The words are given in descending order of the number of senses, or perhaps, better, according to the length of the verse. The first word — *samaya*, v 778 — has nine meanings in two *anuṣṭubh* lines; but *dāna*, v 1014, has six meanings in one line. Otherwise, there is no obvious method to the ordering of words. Occasionally a word is defined by itself, but only in the Sinhalese edition, not in the Burmese. As often, we wonder: does the Burmese reading give us the original text, or did some Burmese editor recognise the unsatisfactoriness, and 'emend'?

The final section of the Abhidhānappadīpikā deals with indeclinables — particles, prefixes, adverbs. I am disappointed not to find among the words for 'where?' the form *ko* (Sanskrit *kva*), which is recognised by Buddhaghosa and by Aggavaṃsa in the Saddanīti (although Moggallāna does give *kva* itself).

Moggallāna's Abhidhānappadīpikā is based on Amarasīṃha's work, and perhaps other Sanskrit *kośas*, and he gives Pali words which have not — not yet at any rate — been found in any Pali text, and we might suspect these words are merely Sanskrit words Pali-ised. It may be, rather, that comparatively late texts in Pali, not sufficiently studied by lexicographers, make use of such words, and are Moggallāna's source and justification. For Moggallāna does not slavishly follow Amarasīṃha — he is compiling a *kośa* for Pali Buddhist texts, with specifically Buddhist words and ideas. For example, as well as that entry including *nibbāna*:

*mokkho nirodho nibbānaṃ dīpo taṇhakkhayo paraṃ
tānaṃ lenaṃ arūpaṃ ca santaṃ saccaṃ anālayaṃ ...*

there are canonical references such as 157, listing the fourfold *virīya*.

The Abhidhānappadīpikā is by no means merely an historical curiosity or indeed merely a guide to 12th century Pali. I think we can assume it reflects a long tradition of understanding and, like Aggavaṃsa's Saddanīti, is the product of someone with a wide knowledge of the texts. Both Moggallāna and Aggavaṃsa give explanations of difficult or obscure words or passages, which we should take seriously. Often, when they seem to us to make statements contrary to our Sanskrit-trained analysis, or to assign a sense to a word for which we see no etymological justification, they are dealing with a specific case in the texts which they need to interpret in conformity with its Buddhist context, and they may be right in what they say. For example, the Pali-English Dictionary explains *tathāgata* only as an epithet of an *arhat* (it does not actually *define* the word). Abh 93 lists *tathāgata* among words meaning a living being, and 1099 states: *tathāgato jine satte*. However we explain or derive *tathāgata*, there are passages where it cannot refer

only to the Buddha, and we must accept Moggallāna's testimony — that is what he and the tradition understood, and it makes sense.

Accepting all that, nevertheless Moggallāna is beginning with a Sanskrit model, adapting it to Pali, and adding or changing where the Canon does not fit the model, and this cannot be ultimately satisfactory. A Pali lexicographer now should make use of the Abhidhānappadīpikā and its testimony, but should begin with Pali and the texts, trying to explain what is actually there. As so often, we must find a Middle Way, between the extremes of seeing the Pali Canon as an hermetically sealed, self-sufficient corpus, best explained by itself, without historical or linguistic context, or as a totally dependent system, which, to put it crudely, exhibits a rather perverse misunderstanding of other systems of thought and analysis. Like Moggallāna and Aggavaṃsa we must deal with and interpret what is before us, not what might have been; but we are free of some of their limitations and constraints.

The Nighaṇṭu and Yāska, Amarasīṃha, the Vinaya, Niddesa and Moggallāna — a long connected tradition leads to an Englishman, Robert Caesar Childers, born in 1838, the son of the English chaplain at Nice. In the early 1860s he was in Śrī Lanākā, first as a writer in the Ceylon Civil Service, then for three years as private secretary to the Governor, Sir Charles McCarthy. He is said to have taken great pains to understand the Sinhalese, studying their language and literature and religion, even, *mirabile dictu*, giving up one of his vacations to study Pali under Yātrāmullē Terunnānse. He himself, however, said that his effort to learn Pali under a native pandit met with indifferent success. In March 1864 his health broke down, and he returned to England, where, after studying with Rost, in 1869 he published in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society the Pali text of the Khuddakapāṭha with a translation and notes. This was the first Pali text printed in England. He then devoted the greater part of his time for the rest of his life to a Pali Dictionary. The

first volume of that dictionary was published in 1872, the second volume in 1875, by which time he was Professor of Pali and Buddhist Literature at University College London.

If one reads Childers' preface to his Dictionary, three things, I think, strike one. The first is the absolute confidence of his assertions about Pali and Pali Buddhism, probably none of which we would now accept without reservation. Here is a thought on Pali:

... the softening or breaking up of groups of consonants, the dropping of final consonants, the absence of rigid rules of sandhi, the absence of sounds like *r*, *ṣ* and *au* — all this gives to Pali a softness and flexibility for which we may gladly exchange the stately but harsh regularity of Sanskrit.

I shouldn't imagine I'm alone among students of Pali in not rarely sighing for the regularity of Sanskrit. And on Pali Buddhism:

... the North Buddhist books have no claim to originality, but are partly translations or adaptations of the Pali sacred books, made several centuries after Gotama's time, and partly late outgrowths of Buddhism exhibiting that religion in an extraordinary state of corruption and travesty.

This is hardly politically correct. But this vehemence springs, I feel, from the second striking thing, a very sympathetic trait: his great enthusiasm for Pali and Pali Buddhism. For example, he says:

If the proud boast that the Magadhese [as he considers Pali to be] is the one primeval language fades in the

light of comparative philology, Buddhists may console themselves with the thought that the teaching of Gotama confers upon it a greater lustre than it can derive from any fancied antiquity.

And he compares Pali and the Canon with Dante's Tuscan Italian and the Divine Comedy. The third thing is the very small number of texts to which he apparently had access, or at any rate lists as 'Authorities Quoted': Minayeff's *Prātimokṣasūtra*; his own *Khuddakapāṭha*; Fausbøll's *Dhammapada* of 1855; the same scholar's *Five Jātakas* and *Ten Jātakas*; six suttas of the *Dīgha Nikāya*, with the commentary to three of them, all in manuscript; Turnour's *Mahāvamsa*; and Trenckner's edition of the first chapter of the *Milindapañha*; and not much else. Except, of course, *Moggallāna's Abhidhānappadīpikā*, edited by Waskaḍuwē Subhūti, with whom Childers was in correspondence, and who supplied him with much information. I think we must also believe that Childers' studies had made him familiar with many more texts than he was able to cite.

I consider Childers' Dictionary an admirable work. It is clear and straightforward, although he gives his articles in the order of the Roman alphabet, which requires concentration on the part of the reader, I find. Compounds are given within the article. He gives a Sanskrit parallel where possible; defines the word; quotes from a text, if available, and translates the quotation. For the more difficult or doctrinal terms he gives an exposition rather than a definition. Compare, if you can, Childers' article on *dharmā*, in three columns, with PED's article (seven and a half columns). Childers begins with a list of definitions, and follows that with quotations illustrating the various senses, translating these quotations so that it is clear how he understands the word in each context. PED seems to me confused in layout and organisation, and overweighted with technical terms from psychology. Or compare the articles on

kamma. Or read his very first article, on the negative prefix *a-*, *an-*. I follow PED in describing the general use of the prefix, and giving examples only in their proper place, but Childers' article with its column of various kinds of examples is illuminating and still to be read with profit.

His article on *nibbāna* is a long essay, and, like all of his articles, is based on the texts and tradition. His evidences and sources are the texts and the practitioners, and seemingly for him, as for me, the main duty of a Pali lexicographer is to define words in a way that makes sense within the texts as we have them, not as we fancy some original meaning might have been, in some imagined original teaching.

Of course Childers' Dictionary is not perfect — how could it be at that stage of knowledge of Pali? There are words and passages he has misunderstood, or where he has followed other writers like Gogerly who had misunderstood. But it is a considerable achievement, and Childers forms an important link in the chain of Pali lexicography. I quote now from the Dictionary of National Biography:

After the completion of the Dictionary Childers with unwearied zeal looked forward to renewed activity. He had announced his intention of publishing a complete translation of the Buddhist Jātaka book ... but a cold contracted in the early part of 1876 developed into a rapid consumption, and he died on 25th July 1876 at the age of 38 ... To an unusually powerful memory and indomitable energy Childers united an enthusiasm in the cause of research, a passionate patience, rare even in new and promising fields.

I like that 'passionate patience'. The writer of that article in the DNB was Thomas William Rhys Davids. He joined the Ceylon Civil Service in 1866 — two years after Childers left — and stayed there for eight years. He also studied Pali with Yātrāmullē Terunnānsē, and, although called to the Bar in 1877, he devoted himself to the study of Pali and Pali Buddhism for the rest of his life. An improved Pali-English Dictionary was always one of his aims. In 1902 he hoped to begin to create this dictionary. As his later collaborator wrote,

It was to be compiled on the basis of the texts issued by the Pali Text Society since its foundation in 1882, and it was conceived on an international plan, according to which some seven or eight famous Sanskrit scholars of Europe should each contribute to the work. Every one of them was enthusiastic about it. In 1903 Rhys Davids announced that the Dictionary would be published in 1905, or at latest in 1906 ... by 1909 only one-eighth of the work had been done. Gradually the co-workers sent back the materials which Rhys Davids had supplied to them. Some had done nothing at all, nor even opened the packets. Only Messrs. Duroiselle and Konow and Mrs. Bode had carried out what they had undertaken to do. After Rhys Davids had again conferred with his colleagues at the Copenhagen Congress in 1908, he published the full scheme of the Dictionary in J.P.T.S. for 1909. Then the War came and stopped the plans for good.

This unreliability of co-workers is another of those themes which run through any account of dictionaries. Monier-Williams seems to have found everybody lacking. He writes:

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

And I have read that the Grimm brothers, in compiling their German Dictionary, had found that out of eighty-three helpers only six were satisfactory, and only one of them ideal.

To return to Rhys Davids: in 1916, when he was already over 70 years old, he decided to launch a provisional dictionary himself, with the help of Dr. William Stede as co-editor. For years he had entered quotations and references in his interleaved copy of Childers' Dictionary, a copy bequeathed to him by Childers himself, and this material was the basis of the new dictionary.

The preface to the Pali-English Dictionary makes it clear that the editors were fully aware of the limitations of their work:

... to wait for perfection would postpone the much-needed dictionary to the Greek kalends. It has therefore been decided to proceed as rapidly as possible with the completion of this first edition, and to reserve the proceeds of the sale for the eventual issue of a second edition which shall come nearer to our ideals of what a Pali Dictionary should be.

That was written in 1921. Again we meet a common theme. Put crudely, do we get it right, or get it out? Sir James Murray was continually

pressed, at times in rather unpleasant terms, by the Delegates of the Oxford University Press to produce more quickly and less carefully. Publish now, and correct in a later edition seemed to be the message. For a Pali-English Dictionary I think the choice is less stark. Perfection is impossible, as complete knowledge of the exact sense of every Pali word is impossible. The compromise is, I think, to impose some limitation on the material, and to accept that some problems are as yet insoluble and move on, leaving a query, in order that one can publish within a reasonable time. But to try to make sure that what one does assert, is as accurate and justifiable as possible.

Rhys Davids' preface is a mild statement; the Apologia appears in Dr. Stede's Afterword. There is much which, *mutatis mutandis*, I could copy as a description of my own case. Listen, for example, to his second paragraph:

When Rhys Davids ... entrusted me with the work, he was still hopeful and optimistic about it, in spite of the failure of the first Dictionary scheme, and thought it would take only a few years to get it done. He seemed to think that the material which was at hand (and the value of which he greatly overrated) could be got ready for press with very little trouble. Alas! it was not so. For it was not merely and not principally a rearrangement and editing of ready material: it was creative and re-creative work from beginning to end, building an intellectual (so to say *manomaya*) edifice on newly-sunk foundations and fitting all the larger and smaller (*khuddakānukhuddakāni*) accessories into their places. This was not to be done in a hurry, nor in a leisurely way. It was a path which led through jungle and thicket, over stones and sticks.

The style is not mine, but I recognise the problems.

I expect that all here are familiar with the Pali-English Dictionary, and are well aware of its merits and deficiencies. It still seems to me a fairly reliable guide for one beginning to read Pali. For the majority of words, the definition is sufficiently accurate to enable one to understand the text. Some definitions are, as I think, wrong, but that is inevitable. Even had Rhys Davids and Stede had all the material now available, they were bound — as are all lexicographers — to fail to understand or to misunderstand some passages. On detail in PED I am less happy. As it is one of my sources of material I look up all its references. I have been surprised at the inaccuracy of these references, the occasions on which the same citation is given for two different senses of a word, the long lists of citations of an identical expression, without that fact being made clear in the article. One of my favourite misplacements is *sub voce accharā*², Sanskrit *apsaras*, a celestial nymph, where both citations from the Dhammapada *aṭṭhakathā* belong with *accharā*¹, a snap of the fingers or a pinch. Dh-p-a III 8,22 has the expression *accharam pahari*, which refers to snapping one's fingers as a gesture of dismissal, but could mean 'struck the *apsaras*'; there are *apsarases* in the story, but I don't think the *thera* struck any of them. I also find tedious the large number of unilluminating citations from the commentaries to the *Petavatthu* and *Therīgāthā*, which are very unsatisfactory editions — again, perhaps inevitable, as very few commentaries had then been published. I imagine you have learnt to be suspicious of the articles on words which are not common or obvious, and to check, not only the references given, but also Monier-Williams and Edgerton's *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary*. It seems to me that Stede is sometimes perverse in his refusal to take Sanskrit as evidence for the meaning of a word. This is another subject on which we should take a Middle Way. I have already stressed that a Pali Dictionary must define in the context of the whole Canon and of Buddhist doctrine, and of course there are

words, not only technical terms, which have a meaning in Pali distinct from the Sanskrit sense — after all, that is exactly the sort of thing Edgerton's *Dictionary* is concerned with. But equally there are words which make perfectly good sense if identified with a Sanskrit equivalent, without the need to find some special Pali connotation.

I suppose what I don't like about PED will become clear from the ways in which my dictionary differs from it. Perhaps primarily in relation to style or tone. I find some of Stede's assertions, and the didactic tone of the longer articles, somewhat uncomfortable. I hope my tone will be more neutral, that there will be less of the lexicographer and more of the texts.

But perhaps now is the time to say a little about this lexicographer. I have learnt what I know of Pali from two Presidents of the Pali Text Society — only the best for me — first as an undergraduate from Prof. Gombrich, a great enthusiast for the Pali Canon and an inspiring teacher, and then, as a graduate student and collaborator, from Prof. Norman, an equally inspiring teacher with an awesome knowledge of words. And many years ago I wrote PTS invoices for, and drank the coffee of, that previous President whose scholarship and generosity this lecture commemorates. I feel, however, part of the *paramparā* for another reason: the texts of the Canon and the commentaries which I use belonged to Miss Horner, and came to her, some from Lord Chalmers, editor and translator, and some from the library of Prof. and Mrs. Rhys Davids. So I read the actual pages Rhys Davids read. That I account a privilege and pleasure.

I have traced a lexicographic line — a little tendentiously — from the *Nighaṇṭu* and the *Vinaya* to myself. I have not mentioned — you may have noticed — a rather important dictionary, the *Critical Pali Dictionary* of Copenhagen. I don't intend to speak of it at any length,

partly because I could not do it justice in the confines of this lecture, and partly because, central though it is to Pali studies, it is tangential to my theme, which is mainly of the Pali Text Society and English (or adopted English) scholars. As it were, the branch bifurcates after the *Abhidhānappadīpikā*.

The two motives for CPD were that abandoned International Dictionary scheme of Rhys Davids, and the work of Trenckner. Carl Wilhelm Trenckner (1824 - 1891), a Dane of very wide knowledge in languages, who worked for thirty years teaching Danish and elementary History and Geography in an orphanage, made transcripts of most of the Pali manuscripts in the rich Copenhagen Collection, and of others from London, and had made preparations for a dictionary, in the form of small paper-slips containing words and references, or observations on grammar and syntax, or quotations illustrating secular and daily life. In the Preface to the first fascicle of CPD in 1925 the two editors, Dines Andersen and Helmer Smith, briefly relate the history of the dictionary scheme, and the idea that the redaction of the dictionary should take place at Copenhagen where the work as it progressed could constantly be checked by means of Trenckner's material and with the manuscripts of the Rask Collection. After the war had ended hopes of international co-operation, they write:

in 1916, the present editors conceived a plan of editing the dictionary without the aid of foreign co-workers, a task which must of course be calculated to cover at least fifteen years.

Please note that 'fifteen years'. Volume I (words beginning with short *a-*) was brought to a conclusion in 1948. The Dictionary was so to speak re-launched as — and really this time — an international effort in 1958. The first fascicle of Volume II was published in 1960. CPD has

continued to appear, and has now dealt with words beginning *kan-*. After several vicissitudes, its future now looks more secure.

CPD is a giant work. I have not read anywhere a statement of its aims, but it strikes me as committed to completeness. Everything should be examined, discussed, if possible explained, or even corrected. Light should be shone in every musty corner; meanings, shades of meanings, should be hunted down and dissected. I admit I have felt in some fascicles an oppressive weight of material: citation after almost identical citation, with the worthy aim, I think, of illustrating the word from *every* type and age of text; definitions divided, almost into infinity, in a punctilious attempt to catch every nuance, pin down every metaphorical use; compound after compound, even straightforward *dvandvas*, listed, so that, I suppose, nothing should be unaccounted for. An exhaustive dictionary and, of course, for any serious Pali scholar, indispensable. The first volume, written by two men in whom a wide knowledge of Pali was combined with expertise in philology, in grammar, in Sanskrit and other Indo-Aryan languages in a way rarely seen, is meticulous, scholarly, authoritative, instructive, awe-inspiring. Not all fascicles have reached their standard, but the more recent have regained much of that authority.

I thought it might be interesting to look at examples of my three predecessors — Childers, PED and CPD — before I talk, as the final part of my lecture, of the New Pali-English Dictionary. I mentioned earlier the word *accharā*, a homonym, meaning an *apsaras* or a snap of the fingers. Here are the articles for that second meaning:

Childers: ACCHARĀ (f.) A moment, the snapping of a finger, the twinkling of an eye [*akṣara*]. Ab 66.

You will see that Childers' only reference is to the *Abhidhānappadīpikā*. We must assume that the word did not appear in those *Jātakas* or those

portions of the Dhammapada commentary to which he had access in Fausbøll's editions. The derivation from Sanskrit *akṣara* is presumably merely a guess from the form. Unfortunately, Childers has not found the most common acceptance of the word.

PED: **accharā**¹ (f.) [etym. uncertain, but certainly dialectical; Trenckner connects it with *ācchurita* (Notes 76); Childers compares Sk. *akṣara* (see *akkhara*); there may be a connection with *akkhaṇa* in *akkhaṇavedhin* (cp. BSk. *acchaṭā* Divy 555), or possibly a relation to *ā + tsar*, thus meaning “stealthily”, although the primary meaning is “snapping, a quick sound”] the snapping of the fingers, the bringing together of the finger-tips: I. (lit.) *accharan* (sic) *paharati* to snap the fingers J II 447; III 191; IV 124; 126; V 314; VI 366; DhA I 38, 424; — as measure, as much as one may hold with the finger-tips, a pinch J V 385; DhA II 273 (°-gahaṇamattaṃ); cp *ekaccharamatta* DhA II 274; — 2. (fig.) a finger's snap, ie a short moment, in *ekaccharakkhaṇe* in one moment Miln 102, and in def. of *acchariya* (qv) at DA I 43; VvA 329.

I tend to think the etymological section - in square brackets - too long and not ultimately helpful. *akṣara* / *akkhara* seems ruled out on grounds of meaning (if you looked up *akkhara* as advised, you would find ‘constant, durable, lasting’). *akkhaṇa* is mentioned apparently *only* on grounds of meaning, that it suggests quickness, as sv *akkhaṇavedhin* it is glossed as ‘lightning’. The Divyāvādāna reference seems to me to have nothing to do with *akkhaṇavedhin*: someone is woken *acchaṭāśabdena*. Of course I can be smug here; I have the advantage of Edgerton's dictionary article on *acchaṭā*. The definitions are fine, although more information could have been given, as you will see. Two of the references under meaning 1.

are incorrect. And the commentators' use in their definition of *acchariya* belongs under meaning 1., not 2.; the Vv-a passage is wrongly translated sv *acchariya*.

CPD: **accharā**, f. (comp. also *acchara-*; Amg *accharā*; *acchaṭā* Vyu 138,42; etymol. unknown; TrPM 76 compared sa. *ācchurita*, n. = *nakhavādyā*, noting v.l. *acchurā*- Thī 67; the *Atthakathā* derived *acchariya* from this, see *accharāyogga*); 1. a snapping of the fingers (like to sa. *pucchaṭi*, *mukuṭi*, *mucuṭi*), Abh 66; in the phrase *~am paharati*, (a) as signal of command: Ja IV 336,3 (to a peacock); IV 438,5 (to dogs); Ps III 153,6 (to a horse); — (b) expressive of reprimand: Ja II 447,28; IV 124,20; Dh-p-a I 38,4; III 8,22; 414,6; — (c) do. of dismissal or refuse [sic]: Ja III 191,21; V 314,14; VI 542,7; Dh-p-a I 424,2; — (d) do. of disregard or contempt: Ps II 524,5; — (e) do. of satisfaction or joy: Ja VI 336,25; — 2. the two or three fingers by which a pinch is taken, *~āya gaṇhitvā* (*gahetvā*), Dh-p-a III 19,10-14 (cf. *ib.* 18,9: *tīhi aṅgulīhi gahetvā*). Cf. *accharā-gahaṇa*. — 3. a pinch, *~am sakkharāya* (of sugar), Ja V 385,19. — *lfc.* v. *ekacchara-kkhaṇa*, *ekacchara-matta*.

The etymology section is more concise, and more sensible. As to the definitions, I'm surprised at the placing of the Abh reference, which is clearly concerned with measures of time, not made clear here. Also the Sanskrit words do not add anything for me; they are all given as lexical in Monier-Williams, so I do not know if or how they are used. So, are they 'like to' *accharā*? My next point is a matter of taste, perhaps. The indication here of the context of the snapping of fingers is welcome, and was missing from PED (even if you looked up all its references, you

would not find the full range of uses). But I would prefer to illustrate the contexts by quotation, as I do in my dictionary article, and as later parts of CPD do. I will talk about the articles in New PED in greater detail in a few minutes, but first a few words about the dictionary in general.

It would be silly and dishonest to deny any debt to PED. It is of course the basis for my dictionary, a very important source, a *kośa* of scholarship. But I hope what we will produce will be a considerable improvement. I want the New Pali-English Dictionary to be a useful aid, and, as they say, user-friendly. I will tell you how I think it ought to be.

One aspect of the dictionary remains the same: it is to be compiled mainly on the basis of the texts issued by the Pali Text Society. If you compare the list of books consulted at the beginning of PED with a current PTS List of Issues you will see that we now have much more material. There is available to me all of the Canon and its primary commentaries. To that I add a number of later texts like the Mahāvamsa which have been published by the Pali Text Society; and, unlike PED, the Abhidhānappadīpikā, the lists of verbal roots, the Dhātupāṭha and Dhātumañjusā, and Aggavaṃsa's grammatical work, the Saddanīti. I am able to consult some of the ṭīkā, the sub-commentaries, in a Burmese edition (only the ṭīkā to Sumaṅgalavilāsini has been published by the PTS), but I do not think the dictionary has to cover these texts. Exhaustiveness I leave to CPD. Up until recently I found occurrences of words by means of PED and Childers, the Concordance, and the indexes to whatever is indexed. Now I have also a CD-Rom of the Thai edition of the Canon and commentaries. I haven't yet used this, as I need a new computer for it, but it may make the gathering of material easier and more efficient — I hope.

When I began work, in October 1984, I was presented with twenty-six wooden boxes, about eight inches wide by fifteen long, filled

with cards on which had been pasted all the individual entries from PED. (The work of cutting and sticking which must have been involved makes me feel faint.) And I started by checking the references on each card, correcting them if necessary, adding any other pertinent references, and generally tidying up the article. Within a very short time, I realised this would not do. As Monier-Williams said:

In real truth I am bound to confess that I entered upon my ... lexicographical career with a little too magnificent audacity, and a little too airy hopefulness ...

I remind you also of Stede's words:

... it was not merely and not principally a rearrangement and editing of ready material: it was creative and re-creative work from beginning to end ...

It became necessary to use PED merely as one of a number of sources, and to create an entirely new article. In the best of conditions such work takes time. And it is made more time-consuming by the unreliability of the material. I have spoken already of the deficiencies of PED; the deficiencies of some of the editions came as a considerable shock. For several texts I must automatically check every passage in the oriental editions. Not all mistakes can be specifically corrected in the Dictionary — we would require at least another volume — but I hope some obscurities will be removed, some ghostwords laid to rest.

A dictionary article must, as I think, contain a great deal of information expressed as succinctly but as clearly as possible. It has two strands to it: the information I am giving about the word, and my

evidence or justification for that information. The article is made up like this:

1. The form of the word: the stem for a noun or adjective; the full form for an indeclinable; the third person singular (if the present is attested) for a verb; if we have no present, then the form we have.

2. An indication of what sort of word it is: verb, noun, adjective, etc, which also gives the gender. For example, if we look at some dictionary articles:

kasambu, *m.* (?) [*cf* BHS *kaśambakajāta*], *decomposed or rotten matter; refuse*; Abh 224; A IV 172,7 (*kāraṇḍavaṃ niddhamatha ~uṃ apakassatha*) = Sn 281 (Pj II 311,24 *fol.*: *kaṣaṭabhūtaṃ ca naṃ khattiyādinaṃ majjhe pavitṭhaṃ pabhinnapaggharita-kutṭhaṃ caṇḍālaṃ viya apakassatha*); — *ifc see* *anto-*; — °-**jāta**, *mfn.*, *decomposed; rotten*; Vin II 236,28 (*taṃ puggalaṃ dussilaṃ ... antopūtiṃ avassutaṃ ~aṃ, Be, Ce so; Ee kasambukajātaṃ; Sp 1287,7: ~an ti ākiṇṇadosatāya saṅkiliṭṭhajātaṃ*) = Ud 52,16 (Ud-a 297,24: *sañjāta rāgādikacava rattā sīlavantehi chaḍḍetabbattā ca ~aṃ*) ≠ S IV 181,1 (~o); A IV 171,9 (*rukkhāni antopūṭini avassutāni ~āni*); Vism 57,12* (~o *avassuto pāpo*); Nidd-a I 338,14 (~o *ti saṅkārasabhāvo*).

kasambuka, *m.* (or *mfn.*) [*kasambu + ka*²], *rotten matter (or: rotten)*; — °-**jāta**, *mfn.*, *decomposed; rotten*; Vin II 236,28 (*antopūtiṃ avassutaṃ ~aṃ, Ee so; Be, Ce kasambujātaṃ*) ≠ 239,8 (~o, *Ee so; Be, Ce kasambujāto*).

kasā, *f.* [*S. kaśā, kaṣā*], *a whip*; Abh 370; Vin III 47,6 (~āya *vā vettena vā ... haneyyūṃ*); M I 87,9 (*vividhā kammakāraṇā kārenti ~āhi pi tāḷenti*); Dh 143 (so *nindaṃ apabodhati asso bhadro ~ām iva*); Th 878 (*aṅkusehi ~āhi ca*); Sp 998,28 (*yo ... ~āhi haññati ayaṃ kasāhato*); Mhv 38:82 (*tālesi ~āy' ūrūsu so pi taṃ*); — *ifc see* *kaṇṭaka-*; — °**ābhigāta**, *m.*, *striking with a whip, whipping*; Ud-a 185,7; ...

kasāva (and *kaśāya*), *m.n. and mfn.* [*S. BHS kaśāya; Amg kaśāya*], ...

akkhāti and *akkhāyati*¹, *pr. 3 sg.* [*S. ākhyāti*], *declares, announces; tells, tells about; teaches*; Vin II 202,5* (*asandiddho ca ~āti*);

Thus '**kasambu**, *m.* (?)' tells you *kasambu* is a noun, and is probably masculine, although I can't prove it. '**kasā**, *f.*' is a noun and feminine (and I can prove it, see citations). '**kasāva** (and *kaśāya*), *m.n. and mfn.*' tells you this word appears to have two forms, but *kasāva* is the more usual. It functions as a noun, when it can be masculine or neuter, and also as an adjective. A designation *m(fn)* would mean that the word is in form adjectival, but is found only in the masculine, probably functioning as a noun. '**akkhāti** and *akkhāyati*¹, *pr. 3 sg.*' tells you this is the third person singular of a verb, appearing in two forms, and that *akkhāyati* is a homonym in Pali, being the form also of the third singular of the passive. There follows

3. in square brackets, some explanation of the form of the word, that is, an attempt to place it in a linguistic context. Compared with PED, my statements are very brief, usually merely the parallel word in Sanskrit and/or Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit or another Prakrit. If you can remember the article on *accharā* I quoted from PED, you might compare it with mine:

NPED: **accharā**¹, *f.* [*cf* *AMg* *accharā*, *BHS* *acchatā*;
Trenckner (*Notes 76*) *connects with ācchurita*], ...

If there is an equivalent form in Sanskrit, I go no further. Here perhaps by implication I am didactic or demanding. While anyone who wishes simply to read a Buddhist text can go straight to the definition, those who have more interest in Pali itself, or who wish to contribute to a discussion on meaning, should, in my opinion, know Sanskrit, and the Sanskrit parallel should either tell them what they want to know, or send them off to further research in Monier-Williams etc. When an equivalent form or sense is missing in Sanskrit, it may be supplied by Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit or, say, by ĀrdhaMāgadhī. If I've found no parallel, then I would hope to give its relation to another word in the Dictionary, which has parallels, or even, as a last resort, suggest an etymology. So, referring to the articles above, for *kasā* we have the Sanskrit *kaśā*, *kaṣā*, straightforward. *kasambu* is more difficult, although there is BHS *kaśambakajāta*. 'cf' merely warns you that the word is not absolutely parallel: I would expect anyone really interested to consult Edgerton. *kasambuka* is obviously secondary (and is a reading found only in the PTS edition); *kasambu* in square brackets should send you back to the article on *kasambu*. For *kasāva* I've written [*S.*, *BHS* *kaśāya*; *AMg* *kaśāya*]; this suggests that although the form *kaśāya* is found in Sanskrit, a meaning closer to the Pali is found in BHS, and that the usual Prakrit form has *-āya*, *kasāva* being a specifically Pali development.

The information in square brackets is my first evidence for the meaning of the word.

4. If the declension of the word is irregular, I give the irregular forms. If it is a pronoun, I give the whole declension.

5. Next comes the definition. It may be superfluous to say so, but the definition is the most important, most demanding, and most personal part of the lexicographer's work. Of course some words are straightforward: I did not spend hours puzzling out the best English equivalent for *udaka*. I thought of 'water' quite quickly. But even Dr. Johnson speaks of

the labour of interpreting these words and phrases with brevity, fulness and perspicacity; a task of which the extent and intricacy is sufficiently shewn by the miscarriage of those who have generally attempted it.

And I quote Stede for Pali:

It needs careful and often intricate study to accomplish this task, for even the most skilled and well-read translators have either shirked the most difficult words, or translated them wrongly or with a term which does not and cannot cover the idea adequately. Thus many a crux retarded the work, not to speak of thousands of incorrectnesses in the text of the printed editions.

I hate to criticise a fellow lexicographer, but that 'incorrectnesses' — a word which is indeed in the Complete Oxford English Dictionary, but is rather *recherché* — sets me on one of my hobby-horses, even at the risk of offence. I believe dictionaries, like translations, should be written in their final form by those to whom the second language, the language translated into, is native. And that only as a very, very last resort (one so far distant that I've not yet come to it) should an English word be manufactured, or a word be chosen because etymologically it bears some relationship to the Pali, when its current connotation, or its definition in an English dictionary, is different.

The definition should be as short and all-embracing as possible. A dictionary definition does not have to contain every feasible English translation — it is not the last word. It is a starting-point for understanding a sentence, a passage, a system of thought. Finding the absolutely right English word in a particular context is the job of the reader or translator. After the definition,

6. the citations, quotations, to justify what I have already said. The choice of quotation is the second most personal part of the work, and the most interesting. I have decided almost always actually to quote passages, not merely cite them, as a bare reference tells you very little. There will be more Pali in my dictionary than in PED or the earlier parts of CPD. For example, to return to *accharā*, where CPD describes the usage, I illustrate with quotations, to show just when people snapped their fingers:

1. *snapping of the fingers* (~am paharati, as a gesture of command; of annoyance, refusal, contempt; also as a gesture of pleasure); Ja II 447,28 (bodhisatto ~am paharivā); IV 124,20 (rājā ~am paharivā nassa vasali ... ti tajjesi); Sv 43,16 (°-yoggan ti acchariyam, ~am paharitam yuttan ti attho); Ps II 389,17 (kiṃ tvam ethā ti ~am pahari, so thātam asakkonto tatth'eva antaradhāyi); III 161,8 (daharo ... ~am pahari, asso āgantvā ... bhattam bhuñji); Spk I 293,32 (ekā pi gāyi ekā pi nacci ekā pi ~am pahari); Cp-a 213,1 (tvam ito aññattha yāhi ti tassa ~am pahari).

This may reflect my greater liking for language and literature than for words; it also reflects my liking for the great English dictionaries of Johnson and Murray, which are treasure-stores of notable writing in English, teaching meaning by usage and context. I hope my selection

serves several purposes. The passages should confirm or support the definition; in the case of doubtful or unusual words, I would quote a commentary, which may be right and which may be wrong, as Stede says. The passages should show the full spectrum of the senses of the word. They should show the range of texts in which the word is found. Some words occur only in verse texts, some only in the philosophical texts. If the word is found throughout the Canon, I would try to quote from each of several categories of text, such as the Vinaya, the verse texts, the Jātakas, the chronicles, although I would not necessarily quote a common word from the commentaries also. The information is rather negative than positive: for example, if I give no Vinaya reference for a particular word, it means I have not found that word in the Vinaya. The quotations should exemplify various grammatical forms: for example I might try to show two forms of the locative singular, if appropriate. For verbs, I aim to give an example of each tense, especially forms of the aorist, which cannot always be predicted. Thus sv *akkhāti* I list futures and various aorists, as well as the absolutive, passive, past participle and future passive participle. And finally I hope to show by my quotations the usual context of the word, what other ideas it is associated with. Notice sv *kasambu* the several occurrences of *avassuta*. The difficulty in the choosing of quotations is to leave some of them out: there are so many really interesting or quintessential or illuminating sentences in Pali. And as Dr. Johnson in a similar dilemma said, “Some passages I have yet spared, which may relieve the labour of verbal searches, and intersperse with verdure and flowers the dusty deserts of barren philology”. For example, sv *akkhāna* we don't need Buddhaghosa's explanation, but it's nice: *akkhānan ti Bhārata-Rāmāyaṇādi* (so in the PTS edition; the Burmese edition has *Bhāratayujjhanādikaṃ*). The article continues with

7. compounds. First in the article there is reference to compounds of which the head-word is the second or final member, and

then a listing of compounds in which the head-word is the first member. As a general rule, only those compounds appear in the dictionary whose meaning is not easily predictable, or one of whose members is not attested as a separate word. This general rule can and must be broken on occasions, otherwise a false view of the language would result. For example, look again at *kasambu*. The compound *kasambujāta* is not difficult to work out; both members appear in the dictionary as separate words, but not to list *kasambujāta* and its occurrences would make *kasambu* seem a much more uncommon word than it is. The article might then end with a reference to another article, eg *akkhāti* refers you also to *ākhyāti*.

What more to say ? When will it be finished ?

It has been said that the experience of all lexicographers, including Johnson, is that to be certain of a date by which his dictionary will be fairly begun or ended has been the lie in the soul.

The OED was originally planned for ten years but actually took nearly fifty; nor does this include the twenty years before, during which the millions of citations forming the basis of the work were collected.

I will not answer my question. I simply call to witness Monier-Williams, moaner extraordinaire, to attest what a terribly difficult and lonely job it is writing a dictionary:

No-one but those who have taken part in similar labours can at all realize the amount of tedious toil — I might almost say dreary drudgery — involved in the daily routine of small lexicographical details, such as

verifying references and meanings, making indices and lists of words, sorting and sifting an ever-increasing store of materials, revising old work, arranging and re-arranging new, writing and rewriting and interlineating copy, correcting and recorrecting proofs — printed, be it remembered, in five kinds of intricate type, bristling with countless accents and diacritical points, and putting the eyesight, patience and temper ... to severe trial.

But let Dr. Johnson speak for me one last time:

These complaints of difficulty will, by those that have never considered words ... be thought only the jargon of a man willing to magnify his labours ... but every art is obscure to those that have not learned it ... of all the candidates for literary praise, the unhappy lexicographer holds the lowest place ... It appeared that the province allotted me was of all the regions of learning generally confessed to be the least delightful, that it was believed to produce neither fruits nor flowers, and that after a long and laborious cultivation, not even the barren laurel had been found on it. Yet on this province ... I enter'd with the pleasing hope, that as it was low, it likewise would be safe. I was drawn forward with the prospect of employment, which, tho' not splendid, could be useful, and which tho' it could not make my life envied, would keep it innocent, which could awaken no passion, engage me in no contention, nor throw in my way any temptation to disturb the quiet of others by censure, or my own by flattery ... and whatever be the event of my

endeavours, I shall not easily regret an attempt which has procured me the honour of appearing thus publickly ... [the Pali Text Society's] most obedient and most humble servant.

Cambridge

Margaret Cone

Chips from Buddhist Workshops Scribes and Manuscripts from Northern Thailand¹

At the 4th International Conference on Thai Studies in Kunming in 1990 some colophons of old Lān²-nā Pāli manuscripts were discussed in a rather general and preliminary way². This survey can and will be supplemented now by more detailed and new information gathered in the meantime first of all while working on a catalogue of the collection of Pāli manuscripts kept at Vat Lai Hin near Lampang. This collection is among the most remarkable ones by any standard anywhere in respect of both age and quality of the manuscripts, the oldest dated of which was copied in CS 833 : A.D. 1471. Today about 140 Pāli manuscripts are found in this collection, and quite a few fragments or single folios are sad witnesses of the former existence of many, sometimes fairly old, manuscripts, for originally this collection must have been substantially larger and richer. This is not only proved by these fragments, but also by those manuscripts which have found their way from Vat Lai Hin into other libraries under unknown circumstances. Some are with the Siam Society, Bangkok³, and at least one is today in the National Library, Bangkok: no. 303/5, *tī*² 129, *ja* 82/5: Samantapāsādikā, fasc. 5, which is one of the missing fascicles of Siam Society no. 54, as proved by identical measures and identical colophons. Otherwise the holdings of older northern Pāli manuscripts in the National Library are negligible as

¹ Manuscripts are quoted either in referring to the forthcoming catalogue: Die Pāli Handschriften des Klosters Lai Hin bei Lampang/Thailand" or to the microfilms of the "Preservation of Northern Thai Manuscripts Project" (PNTMP). – The letter ø is used for the "o ang".

² O. v.Hinüber: On some colophons of old Lānā Pāli manuscripts, in: Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Thai Studies. 11-13th May 1990. Kunming 1990, Vol. IV, p.56-77.

³ Cf. O. v.Hinüber: The Pāli manuscripts kept at the Siam Society, Bangkok. A Short Catalogue. JSS 75.1987, p.9-74.

far as the catalogue is to be trusted. Furthermore, some of the manuscripts formerly preserved at the National Museum, Chiang Mai, and now transferred partly to the National Archives, partly to the National Library, both in Chiang Mai, seem to have belonged to Vat Lai Hin once.

Equally obscure as the reasons for the dispersion of part of this collection are the time and the circumstances under which it was brought together in this rather unassuming, though old, monastery. Hardly anything is known about its history. Fortunately, there is an inscription on one of the beams supporting the roof of the *vihāra*, which gives the year CS 1045 : A.D. 1683 as the date of the construction or reconstruction of this building. Furthermore, the person who directed the (re-)construction is mentioned by name. For the *mūla-pradhān* “initiator” (?) was Mahā Kesārapañña Cau together with his *śiṣyānuśiṣya*.

The name Kesārapañña is well known also from the colophons of 11 manuscripts preserved at Vat Lai Hin which have been copied or donated by Bra Mahā Kesārapañña Selāraññavāsī Bhikkhu between CS 1052 : A.D. 1690 and CS 1083 : A.D. 1721. As Kesārapañña is a *selāraññavāsī* “resident of the Stone Forest (Monastery)”, which is the Pāli name for Vat Lai Hin⁴, there is hardly any room for doubt that he is the person mentioned in the inscription, while a Cau Khanān (“former monk”) Kesāra of CS 1026 : A.D. 1674, and a Kesārapañña mentioned in the colophon of no. 69: Jātaka (Ekanipāta), about A.D. 1500 are obviously different people.

⁴ The names *selārañña*, *selāraññapabbata* and *vaṣ hlāy hrin meṭṭh nagor jāy* occur side by side in different colophons of no. 16: Vinaya-piṭaka (Cullavagga), CS 1117 : A.D. 1755.

Kesārapañña seems to have been a keen student of Buddhist texts, though not necessarily in Pāli, for all the 11 manuscripts copied or sponsored by him are *vohāra*, “explicative translations”.⁵ Therefore it is tempting to think of him as the collector of the older Pāli manuscripts dating from the late 15th to the early 17th centuries. However that may be, during Kesārapañña’s time Vat Lai Hin seems to have enjoyed a certain reputation for the manuscripts it possessed. For a certain Nārada Bhikkhu, who copied a *vohāra* on the Buddha-apadāna (Ap 1,7-6,16) in CS 1077 : A.D. 1715, that is during Kesārapañña’s later years, explicitly states that he did so while residing at Vat Lai Hin: *meiəa yū vaṣ pā¹ lāy hin*, PNTMP 02-020-01. Today this manuscript is in the possession of Vat Kittivong at Mae Hong Son. Otherwise only manuscripts dated from the late 18th century, which belonged to Vat Hai Lin originally, survive.

Kesārapañña’s career can be followed for 38 years between A.D. 1683 and A.D. 1721. This is not unlikely. Already in the earliest document Kesārapañña has a rather high status as evinced by the fact that he is surrounded by his “pupils and pupils of his pupils”. Consequently, he could have been between 35 and 40 years old in A.D. 1683, when the *vihāra* was (re-)constructed, and he could have been a fully ordained monk for 15 to 20 years, assuming that he entered monkhood at the earliest possible age permitted by the Vinaya, which is 15 years for the lower ordination (*pabbajjā* : *na ... ūnapannarasavasso dārako pabbājetabbo*, Vin I 79,5) and 20 years for the higher ordination (*upasampadā* : *na ... ūnavīsativasso puggalo upasampādetabbo*, Vin I 78,30) calculated from the time of conception (*gabbhavīsam*, Vin I 93,23). If Kesārapañña died not too long after completing his last manuscript in A.D. 1721, he could have been about 80 years old then.

⁵ On this terminology cf. O.v.Hinüber: A Handbook of Pāli Literature. Berlin 1996 §203.

Thus his lifetime spans approximately between A.D. 1645 and A.D. 1725.

His age is by no means unlikely. A monk named Seen Før or simply Før says: “The Atthakaṇḍa has been copied by the Venerable Mahāsaddhā Før when he was 80 years old in the year *kā plau* CS 975 : A.D. 1613”, and in a second, somewhat confused, colophon: “The Venerable Saddhā Føn was 80 years old when he had entered the age (!) into the order for 9 years, he wrote with effort ... this text”, no. 132: Dhammasaṅgaṇi-atthakaṇḍa-pariccheda-vohāra, CS 975 : A.D. 1613⁶. A further rather unusual colophon informs us about the personal life of Seen Før. The language is an attempt to write Pāli: *braḥ mahāsaddhā seen før lagana* (read: *nagara?*) *jayapura rājadhānam* (!) *vaṭṭakāñcanarājassa mahāmacca gihikāle gharāvāse dosam passivā nikkhama pabbaji ratanabimbārāme vase jinasāsane navavasse asītāyukāle likhitāyaṃ dhammasaṅgaṇiatthakaṇḍaparicchedaṃ niṭṭhitam samata* (!) “The Venerable Mahāsaddhā Før from the town Jayapura (Lampang), where a king resides, was, while he was living as a householder and as a minister of King Vaṭṭakāñcana. Having considered the state of a householder as a fault, he went forth to become a monk in the Ratanabimbārāma. This has been written after he had lived in the Buddhist order for 9 years and when he had reached the age of 80⁷. The Dhammasaṅgaṇiatthakaṇḍapariccheda has come to an end”.

Again, this colophon seems to contain a mistake: *lagana* for *nagara*, and much more unfortunately, the pagination of this manuscript is confused. Of course this may be due to the advanced age of the scribe,

⁶ Atthā(kathā)kaṇḍa is the alternative title for the Atthuddhārakaṇḍa, Dhs § 1368-1599, cf. v.Hinüber: Handbook as note 5 above §134.

⁷ This kind of information is rare, cf.: *sāraḥ dād sī sān vai meṇḍ dai 6 vassā*, no. 68: Jātaka (Ekanipāta), CS 989 : A.D. 1767: “Sāradassī has made (this manuscript) when he was (monk) for 6 years”.

but still the faulty pagination creates serious problems now for finding the beginning of the text at once.

Usually, however, these palm leaf manuscripts are paginated with the utmost care. Figures are used rarely although they do also occur in older manuscripts such as no. 86: Jātaka(Visatiniṭṭā), first half of the 16th century, folios 20-34.

The usual procedure, however, is to apply letters in the following well known way: *ka, kā, kī ... ke, kai, ko, kau, kam, kaḥ* written on the verso of each folio. This series, which is not entirely based on the Sanskrit alphabet as there are neither *kṛ* nor *kḷ*, covers a set of 12 folios or 24 pages. Occasionally such a set is called *ankā*, written phonetically for *aṅga*⁸, in Northern Thai Pāli manuscripts. Two such sets, e.g. *ka* and *kha* form one fascicle or *phūk*. It is common to start from the *phūk* containing *ka* and *kha* and to continue up to fascicle 16: *ha, ḷa*. Sometimes a series *a, ā, i, ī*, etc. is used following *ha* and *ḷa* as in no. 110: Suttasaṅgaha (*sūḍ rəm*), CS 903/4 : A.D. 1541/2. Of course there are much longer manuscripts comprising more than 16 fascicles. Therefore this series needs extending, which is achieved by a combination of two letters: the second set of again 16 fascicles starts with *kya, khya, ... hya, ḷya*, the last fascicle being no. 32, which, however, is by no means sufficient as the upper limit for a very long text such as the commentary on the Mūlapaṇṇāsa of the Majjhimanikāya, which covers 725 pages in two volumes of the PTS edition. This equals 37 fascicles in no. 32: Papañcasūdanī (Mūlapaṇṇāsa), CS 911 : A.D. 1549. As the last fascicle, no. 37, contains the folios *jha-jhaḥ, ṇa-ṇaḥ*, in fasc. 33 the pagination starts again from the very beginning, although it would have been possible to use a third series (see below).

⁸ This division is also used in Burma: H. Bechert et alii: Burmese Manuscripts. Wiesbaden 1979. Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Band XXIII,1, p.XVII.

Manuscripts of this length are rare, and if they survive they are almost never complete. Consequently, the possibility of tracing a confusion such as the following one is a rare exception: no. 101: Apadāna-aṭṭhakathā, CS 899 : A.D. 1537: first fascicle extant: fasc. 16: *na, pa* (correctly: *ha, la*) ... fasc. 22: *la, kya*, fasc. 23: *khya, gya(!)*, fasc. 24: *ka, kha(!)* ... fasc. 33: *dha, na-nū*. Still, order prevails over confusion as e.g. in no. 61: Paramatthajotikā II (commentary on the Suttanipāta), early 16th century: first fascicle extant: fasc. 13: *ma, ya* ... fasc. 16: *ha, la(!)*, fasc. 17: *kya, khya* ... fasc. 27: *pya, phya, bya-byū* (end of the text). Here, the last fascicle has been extended to almost twice the normal length. This is done fairly often if the last fascicle would have been incomplete otherwise, e.g. no. 118: Yamaka, CS 859 : A.D. 1497, fasc. 21: *jhya, ñya, tya-tyai* (end of the text).

A method of avoiding a long series of letters and at the same time the danger of confusion is either to split up texts into sections or chapters such as the Aṅguttaranikāya into Eka-, Duka-, Tika-nipāta etc., which results in handy sequences, or to divide a long text somewhat arbitrarily in the middle. Thus two, very rarely three, bundles (*maḍ*) are created.⁹ The Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā is such a text split up between the Arahanta- and the Sahassavagga (Dhp-a II 201/202), which is roughly the middle of the text: E° 642 : 723 pages, C° (1898) pages 1-315 : 315-659 that is 315 : 344 pages.¹⁰ Therefore fascicle 3: *na, ca* of no. 53: Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā, about A.D. 1500, contains part of the Daṇḍavagga. It is called in the colophon: 3 *dhammapada maḍ plāy* “fascicle 3 of the last bundle of the Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā”. Consequently, the first lost fascicle started with the pagination *ka, kha* and contained the beginning of the Sahassavattu.

⁹ H. Hundius: The colophons of thirty Pāli manuscripts from Northern Thailand, JPTS 14, 1990, p.54.

¹⁰ The middle of the text is easily recognizable in C°, which is printed without notes. Consequently the single pages contain a text of almost even length.

A second manuscript of this text reaches the end of the Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā on folio *bhra* of fascicle 35: no. 56 Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā, about A.D. 1500. The relevant colophon has: *dhammapada maḍ plāy ... 34 ...* with an obviously confused and erroneous pagination: the series *ṇra, ḍhra* has been corrected to *pra* (only *ṇra > pra*), which still does not seem to be correct. For fascicle 34 should have *gra, ghra* or *kra, khra*. Again, the few surviving folios do not allow any further conclusion.

The use of *pra* etc. besides *pya* etc. is certainly very rare and shared only by a second fragment, which could even be part of no. 56: Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā that is no. 55: Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā, early 16th century, fasc. 21: *thra, dra* which is the third set of pagination.¹¹

A really unique form of pagination is found in no. 6: Vinayapīṭaka (Pācittiya/Nissaggiya), CS 1073 : A.D. 1711, where the sequence is: ... fasc. 14(!): *va, ṣa*, fasc. 15: *sa, ha*, fasc. 16: *la, a*, fasc. 17: *kya, khya* etc.. The retroflex *ṣa* is never again found in any of the Pāli manuscripts of Vat Lai Hin.

Equally unique is the pagination of the last folio of a fascicle as *caḥ²* with a raised figure in no. 85: Jātaka(Pakiṇṇaka), CS 932 : A.D. 1571, fasc. 3: *na, ca-caḥ, caḥ²*. The reason for this unusual pagination is not clear. The text breaks off in the middle of a word to be continued in the next and last fasc. 4: *ja(!), jha-jho*. Perhaps the scribe tried to reproduce fasc. 3 of the original he had before him as one fascicle, but miscalculated his handwriting.

In contrast to single folios, whole fascicles are usually numbered in figures. Only very occasionally do figures and letters stand

¹¹ On the *kra* series see H. Bechert as note 8 above.

side by side: no. 34: Saṃyuttanikāya (Sagāthavagga), CS 911 : A.D. 1549: 3. *ki. na ca* “(fascicle 3 = *ki*, (folios) *na*, *ca*)” and again in this set, which also comprises the commentary: no. 36: Sāratthapakāsinī (Sagāthavagga), CS 911 : A.D. 1549; similarly: no. 81: Jātaka (Aṭṭha-, Cattālīsa-, Paññāsa-, Saṭṭhi-, Sattati-nipāta), CS 912 : A.D. 1550, no. 117: Yamaka, CS 909 : A.D. 1547, and no. 110: Suttasaṅgha (*sūḍ rōm*), CS 903/4 : A.D. 1541/2. All these manuscripts have been written by Javanapañña, the most prominent scribe of 16th century manuscripts in the Lai Hin collection. Therefore, this particular way of numbering fascicles may be a personal feature.

After having devoted so much attention to the outward appearance of these palm leaf manuscripts, the question arises whether it is really worthwhile to describe these minor details. The usefulness of this knowledge, pedestrian as it may seem or even be, is obvious to anyone engaged in working on these manuscripts and on fragmentary ones in particular. For a clear pagination is extremely helpful when it comes to reassembling scattered fascicles or single folios once the string holding them together, the “book binding” as it is, has been broken or lost, which is more often the case than not. In this respect the beautiful golden pattern painted on the mostly red, rarely black, lacquer with which the manuscripts are coated is also helpful. This, however, applies to younger manuscripts only, for older ones are coated in plain red lacquer. I once found a manuscript that had never been opened after the lacquer had been applied some 400 years ago: no. 64: Vimānavatthu-aṭṭhakathā, 16th century, was “uncut” when it was read for the first time ever on 28th July 1987.

Furthermore, as we all know from daily use, pagination is necessary to organize a book, and no reader would like to do without it. For only pagination makes a table of contents possible, which is by no means so commonplace as a modern reader might be inclined to think.

In older manuscripts tables of contents are very rare. They are found e.g. in: no. 35: Saṃyuttanikāya (Sagāthavagga), CS 905 : A.D. 1543 on the cover leaf: *naḷavagga pathama sin mee ki* “the first chapter called Naḷavagga ends on folio *ki*”.¹² It is still more astonishing that the verses of the Sagāthavagga are counted and grouped together in sets of eight verses each in this well organized manuscript.

These attempts, or rather the very beginnings of organizing books, deserve some discussion in a much broader context. For, simple and trivial as it may seem, it is by no means a small step forward when it comes to handling, transmitting and acquiring knowledge, as the relevant material from mediaeval Europe, which has been discussed with most interesting results by W. Raible¹³, amply demonstrates. A corresponding study of the manuscript tradition in Indian culture or in cultures influenced by India would certainly be rewarding.

While not too much attention was paid to the organization of the text itself, the scribes were consistent in keeping certain rules concerning the beginning or end of the text. These rules underline the religious significance of the manuscripts. It is well known that a canonical Pāli text or a commentary should start with the formula *namo tassa bhagavato arahato sammāsambuddhassa*, abbreviated sometimes as *namo tass' atthu* or simply *nam' atthu*. This seems to be a typical Theravāda formula, if Buddhist Sanskrit texts are compared, which begin

¹² Further tables of contents are found in: no. 87: Jātaka (Visati-, Timsa-, Sattati-nipāta), CS 833 : A.D. 1471, which is the oldest dated Pāli manuscript; no. 69: Jātaka (Ekanipāta), about A.D. 1500; no. 76: Jātaka (Pañca-, Chakka-nipāta), CS 954 : A.D. 1592, cf. no. 94: Jātaka (Mahānipāta: Nārada), CS 938 : A.D. 1576.

¹³ W. Raible: Die Semiotik der Textgestalt, and: Zur Entwicklung von Alphabet-schrift-Systemen. Is fecit cui prodest, both: Heidelberg 1991: Abhandlungen/Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Abhandlung/Bericht 1.

with: *namaḥ sarvabuddhabodhisatvebhyaḥ*¹⁴, *namo bhagavatyai prajñāpāramitāyai* (Prajñāpāramitā texts), *namaḥ śrī vajrasatvāya* (Guh-yasamājantra), *namas sarvajñāya*¹⁵, etc.

However, even in Theravāda the beginning of a sacred text is not as uniform as printed editions both oriental and western have it.¹⁶ The *namo tassa ...* is preceded by *subham atthu svasdī jayastu antarāyaṃ namo tassa ...*, no. 34: Saṃyuttanikāya (Sagāthavagga), CS 911 : A.D. 1549 “may it be auspicious! hail! may there be victory over danger (?)”. The commentary to this text has: *svasdī jeyya mahālābho. karuṇā*^o, no.36: Sāratthapakāsini (Sagāthavagga), CS 911 : A.D. 1549 “hail! victory! great gain!”. This set has been copied by Javanapañña at Dā Søy, who also wrote no. 90: Jātaka (Kusarāja), CS 913 : A.D. 1551 beginning: *I. svasdī. jayastu antarāyaṃ. idan te ...* “(fascicle) 1. hail! may there be victory over danger(?)”.¹⁷

A further manuscript also copied at Dā Søy begins: *namo tassa bhagavato arahato sammāsambuddhassa. jayatu sugatasāsanam* and ends: *... samattā ti. 4. svasti namo buddhāya jayatu sugatasāsanam*,

¹⁴ A probably unique opening formula is: *namaḥ sarbbajñāya. purbbācāryyebhyo ...*, Adhikamāsavinichāy, CS 940 : A.D. 1578, cf.: Catalogue of Palm-Leaf Texts on Microfilm at the Social Research Institute, Chiang Mai University. Chiang Mai 1986, 06-108.

¹⁵ This is found in a Sanskrit text from 9th century Ceylon: O. v.Hinüber: Sieben Goldblätter einer Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā aus Anurādhapura. Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. I. Philologisch-historische Klasse, Jahrgang 1983, Nr. 7, p.193/[7].

¹⁶ Cf. also the unusual beginning of the Peṭakopadesa; O. v.Hinüber as above note 5 § 167.

¹⁷ *svasti* is also used at the beginning of Buddhist texts in Ceylonese manuscripts, though written at the left margin next to the pagination *ka*: C.E. Godakumbura: Catalogue of Ceylonese Manuscripts. Copenhagen 1980. Catalogue of Oriental Manuscripts, Xylographs etc. in Danish Collections. Vol. I, p.L, and O. v.Hinüber as above note 15.

no. 40: Aṅguttaranikāya (Dukanipāta), first half of the 16th century, similarly: *namo tass’ atthu. jayatu jinasāsanam. manorath*^o, Siam Society no. 55: Manorathapūraṇi (Ekanipāta), CS 893 : A.D. 1531 copied at Dā Søy. No formula at all is found at the beginning of Lai Hin no. 42: Aṅguttaranikāya (Sattakanipāta), CS 949 : A.D. 1587, which ends: *... samattā. jayatu sugatasāsanam. svasti. namo buddhāya*. This manuscript has been copied at Chiang Mai. Two parts of the commentary, which belongs to this set, begin: *svasti namo buddhāya. jayatu sugatasāsanam*, no. 46: Manorathapūraṇi (Chakkanipāta), CS 949 : A.D. 1587, Chiang Mai; no. 48: Manorathapūraṇi (Sattakanipāta), CS 949 : A.D. 1587, Chiang Mai.¹⁸ And finally, a further manuscript copied at Dā Søy begins: *svasdī. namo buddhāya. jayatu sugatasāsanam. dukanipāta*^o, no. 44: Manorathapūraṇi (Dukanipāta), first half of the 16th century, cf. the end of the colophons in no. 31: Papañcasūdanī (Mūlapaṇṇāsa), CS 895 : A.D. 1533 from Mei: fasc. 17: *jayatu sāsānam*, fasc. 18: *svastī bahavatu* and *svastī hotu*.

Only two manuscripts begin simply with: *namo buddhāya*, no. 9: Vinaya (Mahāvagga), CS 1116 : A.D. 1754 from Lampang, and no. 88: Jātaka (Tiṃsanipāta), about A.D. 1500: *svastī namo buddhāya. tiṃsanipāte*

The opening formula *namo buddhāya. pañca buddhā namām’ aham*, no. 19: Samantapāsādikā (Cullavagga), CS 950 : A.D. 1588, and correspondingly no. 125: Thūpavaṃsa, CS 1084 : A.D. 1722 is rather surprising at first sight. For, as is well known, the number of Buddhas current in Theravāda is the six predecessors of Buddha Gotama as enumerated in the Dīghanikāya, no. XIV. Mahāpadānasuttanta, DN II 1-54 and in addition the Buddha Gotama himself: *namo bhagavato namo sattannam sambuddhānam*, Vin II 110,19 = AN II 73,9, quoted Ja II

¹⁸ The first folio is only on the microfilm of the Social Research Institute, Chiang Mai University, no. 145.17.

147,24, or Buddha Gotama and his 24 predecessors as described in the Buddhavaṃsa, where the list has been extended by three names in chapter XXVII, which is a later addition as already noticed in the commentary (Bv-a 295,31). This set of 28 Buddhas became popular in South-East Asia.

Five Buddhas, on the other hand, do not figure prominently in Pāli texts, although there seems to be some archaeological evidence for this group from Amarāvati and Nāgārjunakoṇḍa in South India.¹⁹ This group, which is totally different from the better known five Buddhas in Mahāyāna: Vairocana (centre), Akṣobhya (east), Ratnasambhava (south), Amitābha (west), Amoghasiddhi (north)²⁰, comprises the five Buddhas of the present *bhaddakappa*: Kakusandha, Koṇāgamana, Kassapa, Gotama: DN III 2,21-28 together with Metteyya, DN III 76,25foll. mentioned in the Cakkavattisihanādasuttanta, Dīghanikāya no. XXVI. Thus the colophons also preserve some traces of this set of five Buddhas.

In addition to this there is an extremely short text comprising only a single folio, which mentions these Buddhas by name: *namo jeyyaḥ itī pi so bhagavā buddha Kukkusindho ... Koṇāghamano ... Kassapo ... siri Sakyamunī Goḍaṇṇ siri ariyaḥ Maitī*, Siam Society no. 52.

Only two Buddhas are mentioned by name in the colophons. They are, of course, Gotama and Metteyya, who are conspicuous in the wishes expressed by the scribes at the end of their manuscripts after finishing their work.

¹⁹ M. Bénisti: Les stūpas aus cinq piliers. BEFEO 58.1971, p.131-162, cf.: G. Terral: Pañcabuddhabyākaraṇa. BEFEO 55.1969, p.125-144.

²⁰ Hōbōgirin s.v. *butsu*.

Mostly, and particularly so in the older manuscripts, the wishes expressed by the scribes are of a rather general nature. As is well known, Buddhists are and always were concerned about the eventual disappearance of the *sāsana*. In a famous passage in the Cullavagga, Vin II 256,9-16 the Buddha is supposed to have said that the *dhamma* might last for a whole millennium, but, once women were admitted to the order, that period would be reduced to 500 years. About 500 years after the supposed date of the *nirvāṇa*, at the latest, this period was extended ultimately to 5000 years.²¹ Being aware of the fact that they contribute by their work to the subsistence of the *dhamma* the scribes express their respective wishes in very few words in the older colophons: *sāṇ vai pen mūlasnā braḥ buddha cau hā ban vassā*, no. 61: Paramatthajotikā II (Commentary on the Suttanipāta), early 16th century. There are slight variations such as the use of *plī* instead of *vassā*, no. 102: Buddhavaṃsa, CS 913 : A.D. 1551, *braḥ gotama cau* and *plī*, no. 54: Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā, CS 883 : A.D. 1521, or *bija sāsna* instead of *mūlasāsna*, no. 68: Jātaka (Ekanipāta), CS 989 : A.D. 1627, fasc. 15: “I have made (this manuscript) as a root/germ for the teaching of the Exalted Buddha (that it may last) five thousand years”. This formula appears in six manuscripts of the Lai Hin collection and in slightly different wording in a seventh: *sāṇ ḍvay tan vai buddhasāsna hā ban vassā*, no. 111: Paṭhamasambodhi, CS 936 : A.D. 1574 “I have made (this manuscript) myself for the teaching of the Buddha (that it may last) five thousand years”. Furthermore, the following colophon from the collection of Vat Sung Men at Phrae may be quoted here: *atthakathā uparipañāsa mahā-saṅgharāja cau āram vaṇ pan² sāṇ upatthambhaka sāsna braḥ buddha cau hā ban vassā. culasakkarāja ḍai 912*, PNTMP 01-04-231-00: Papañcasūdani (Uparipañāsa), CS 912 : A.D. 1550 “Commentary on the Uparipañāsa (of the Majjhimanikāya). The Venerable Saṅgharāja of

²¹ E. Lamotte: Histoire du Bouddhisme Indien. Louvain 1958, p.210foll.; 215foll.; Samantapāsādikā 1291,18-26. – Further: J. Nattier: Once Upon a Future Time. Studies in a Buddhist Prophecy of Decline. Berkeley 1991.

the Vañ-Pan-Monastery had (this manuscript) made to support the teaching of the Exalted Buddha (that it may last) five thousand years. CS 912”.

In the second half of the 16th century this extreme brevity was abandoned in favour of a marginally enlarged version: *vai pen mūla sāsānā bra gotama cau taṃ dau hā ban vassā*, no. 58: Itivuttaka-atṭhakathā, CS 906 : A.D. 1544 “I (made this manuscript) as a root for the teaching of the Exalted Gotama that it may last five thousand years”. This wording survives in altogether seven manuscripts copied between A.D. 1544 and A.D. 1592, and more than a century later very much abbreviated as: *toṃ dau 5 ban vassā*, no. 97: Jātaka (Vessantara/Māleyya), CS 1076 : A.D. 1714, cf. also: *sān vai kap vara buddhasāsānā toṃ dau 5000 vassā lee*, PNTMP 07-04-005-00: Dhammasaṅgaṇī, CS 991 : A.D. 1629 from Vat Phra Singh at Chiang Mai.

During the early 17th century the formula was further enlarged: *sān vai pen upatthambhaka sāsānā braḥ cau trāp 5000 vassā*, no. 113: Sammohavinodanī (Commentary on the Vibhaṅga), about 1600 “I made (this manuscript) to support the teaching of the Exalted One so that it may reach 5000 years”, cf. the earlier, similar colophon of the Papañcasūdanī quoted above, and: *sān vai kap sāsānā bra buddha cau trāp 5000 vassā*, no. 20: Samantapāsādikā, CS 1001 : A.D. 1639, or: *vai beṭṭh prayojnaḥ pen mūla kee sāsānā bra buddha cau rau taṃ dau theiṃ 5000 bra vassā*, no. 50: Dhammapada, CS 973 : A.D. 1611: “I have deposited (this manuscript) for the use as a root of the teaching of our Exalted Buddha that it may reach eventually 5000 years”. Here it is tempting to think of *prayojnaḥ* as an abbreviation, if the following colophon is compared: *sān vai pen mūla sāsānā bra gotama cau hā ban vassā beṭṭh cāk hū pen prayojnaḥ kee kulapud daṃ lāy*, no. 74: Jātaka (Duka-, Tika-, Pañca-nipāta), CS 922/3 : A.D. 1560/1 “I made (this manuscript) as a root for

the teaching of the Exalted Gotama (that it may last) five thousand years, for the use to many sons from good families”.

By the end of the 17th century the scribes seem to have preferred still another wording: *beṭṭh jotaka sāsānā hā ban vassā*, no. 5: Vinayaṭṭhaka (Pārājika), CS 1055 : A.D. 1693 “that the teaching may shine for five thousand years”. This formula occurs four times between 1693 and 1754, and once even earlier during the 16th century: no. 117: *Gūlhatthadīpanī*.²²

Thus it seems that the preference for certain expressions changed in the course of time. It should be kept in mind, however, that the material is rather limited, and consequently does not allow any certain conclusions based on statistics. Furthermore, regional variation cannot be excluded. The latter seems to apply for: *saṃ vai beṭṭh sāsānā ciratthitakāla hā² ban vassā*, no. 45: Manorathapūraṇī (Tikanipāta), CS 949 : A.D. 1587 “I made (this manuscript) for a long duration of the teaching for five thousand years”, and: *sān vai sāsānupatthāmbhaka ciratthitikāle*, no. 49: Manorathapūraṇī-ṭīkā (Tikanipāta), CS 948 : A.D. 1586. Both manuscripts have been donated by the same person, perhaps at Chiang Mai, for the following set, in which a similar formula has been used, was copied there: *beṭṭh sāsānā ciratthitikāle*, no. 41: Aṅguttaranikāya (Chakkanipāta), CS 949 : A.D. 1587, Chiang Mai, fasc. 7, together with: *beṭṭh sāsānā tthitikāla*, no. 46: Manorathapūraṇī (Chakkanipāta) CS 949 : A.D. 1587, Chiang Mai. Again, this set was donated by one person. As all four manuscripts have been copied almost at the same time and as all of them use the same formula not traced in other manuscripts so far, this might have been a wording typical for Chiang Mai at that period.

²² This is a commentary on the Sammohavinodanī, cf. CPD (Epilegomena) 3.9.3 and 1.3.6.4.

In addition to these general remarks, personal wishes are seldom expressed in the older manuscripts, but with increasing frequency in newer ones. Donors and scribes alike wish to be reborn during the time of the future Buddha Metteyya. A rather early instance of this particular wish is: *nibbānapaccayo hotu me cūṇ pen praḥcaiyāḥ kee ehibhikkhu nai sāmṇak braḥ ariyaḥ metteyyaḥ tan an cak mā pen braḥ buddha bāy hnā nī*, no. 99: Apadāna-aṭṭhakathā, CS 899 : A.D. 1537 “may this be the basis for the *nibbāna* for me that it is the foundation for the *ehibhikkhu* (-*upasampadā*) in the assembly of the Exalted Noble Metteya, who will come to be Buddha in future”. The ordination by *ehi bhikkhu* “come, monk” can be gained only from a Buddha. Therefore it was considered a very special distinction, so much so that it is believed that a monk’s robe (*cīvara*) would appear magically on a monk ordained in this particular way, a *ehibhikkhucīvara*.²³

It is only by the year A.D. 1700 that this wish becomes more frequent: *khom hū han hnā bra siriya* (read: *siri ariya*) *mettaiy cau an cak mā dām raḍ traś sabbaññu cak mā bāy hnā nī*, no. 5: Vinayapīṭaka (Pārājika), CS 1055 : A.D. 1693 “I pray to see the face of the Noble Metteya, who will come to reach enlightenment and omniscience in future”. During the 18th century wordings such as the following become popular: *beio prayojnaḥ catusaccapaṭivedha pracaiy nai sāmṇak bra mettaiy cau cak mā brāy hnā*, no. 6: Vinayapīṭaka (Pārājika), CS 1073 : A.D. 1711, fasc. 8 “useful as a foundation to penetrate the four (noble) truths in the assembly of the Exalted Metteya, who will come in future”. This wording occurs six times altogether between A.D. 1693 and A.D. 1849, and with some changes in wording in three further manuscripts:

²³ Cf. CPD s.v. – The wish for an *ehibhikkhuupasampadā* occurs again in the Pāli colophon to no. 99: Sivijayapañhā, CS 1201 : A.D. 1839: ...*anāgatakāre arahantā rabheyyaṃ ariyaḥ metteyyabuddhasantike ehibhikkhupaccaya-bhavāyaṃ paccayo hotu saṅsāle saṅsaranto*.... This again is a rather unsuccessful attempt to write in Pāli.

prāthnā au yaṇ bhavaḥkyaḥ (read: *bhavakkhaya*) *nai sāmṇak bra metteyya cau*, no. 1: Pātimokkhasutta, CS 1123 : A.D. 1761 “my wish is the extinction of rebirth in the assembly of the Exalted Metteyya”, and again in no. 7: Vinayapīṭaka (Pācittiya), CS 1088 : A.D. 1716, fasc. 8. In fasc. 3 of the same manuscript a different scribe remarks: *prāthnā au yaṇ bhava nai* ... “my wish is the rebirth in ...”, which is almost certainly a mistake for *bhavakkhaya*. For this scribe is also a bit careless in his wishes elsewhere when he writes in fasc. 7: *gām prāthanā khō hū khā dai rū dhamma dvay hmür ban khan* “my wish is that I come to know the *dhamma* in its 11,000 sections”. This is hardly modesty on the part of the scribe, who rather left out the figures 8 (*hmür*) and 4 (*ban*): it is well known that the *dhamma* has 84,000 sections (*khandā*, *Sumaṅgalavilāsini* 24,18 etc.).

Only once and at an early date is the wish of penetrating knowledge disconnected from the four noble truths and the wish to be reborn in Metteyya’s presence: *sān vai kap buddhasāsnā pañcasahassāyuka saddhādhika sabbaññutañāṇ paṭivedhapaccayo hotu*, no. 64: Vimānavatthu-aṭṭhakathā, 16th century (?) “made for the teaching of the Buddha (that it may reach) the age of 5000 years, may it be the foundation for deep faith and for penetrating into the knowledge of omniscience”.

If *sabbaññutañāṇa* is to be taken in its true meaning, this wish, of course, implies that the scribe wants to become a Buddha in future. This desire is rarely expressed in clear and unambiguous words as in the following colophon of a manuscript copied in Central Thailand and written in Khmer script: *suvaṇṇarājena bhikkhunā sabbaññubuddha-bhāvapatthentena imam likhāpitaṃ vipullasaddhāya*, National Library, Bangkok, no. 6290 (126-5/6): Dasajāṭaka (=Jātaka: Mahānipāta), BS 2203 : A.D. 1660 “the monk Suvaṇṇarāja, who wishes to attain the state of an omniscient Buddha, had this written in deep faith”. Otherwise this

seems to be a wish of authors rather than scribes, e.g.: *ahaṃ tu uttamaṃ bodhiṃ, pāpuṇeyyam anāgate / taṃ patvā akhile satte, moceyyaṃ bhavabandhanā*, PNTMP 02-04-179-00: Kaccāyanarūpadīpanī, CS 950 : A.D. 1588. Here, the author Ñāṇakitti (15th century) is speaking, and not the scribe of this manuscript, which is kept at Vat Sung Men in Phrae today.

Equally rare is the wish to become an Arahant: *hū pen praccai taṃ dau arahattamagga*, no. 74: Jātaka (Tikanipāta), CS 922 : A.D. 1560, fasc. 5 “that it may be the basis for the route towards Arahantship”.

The scribe of no. 16: Vinaya (Cullavagga), CS 1117 : A.D. 1755 wants to display his erudition by replacing *paṭivedha*: *beiḥ prayojnaḥ catusaccapaṭisambhidāñāṇa pracai nai sāmnaḥ bra metteyya cau*, fasc. 8. However, the common expression found already in canonical Pāli (Paṭisambhidāmagga II 57,3) is *saccapaṭivedha*, whereas *paṭisambhidā* is not normally used in this connection, with the exception of ... *paṭisambhidāhi arahattam pāpuṇi. saha saccapaṭivedhena ...*, Mil 18,18.

Nevertheless, the wish for *paṭisambhidā* in the presence of the future Buddha seems to make more sense than the one for *paṭivedha*. For the latter can be gained any time during the 5000 years of the duration of the *dharmā*, while *paṭisambhidā* is possible only during the first thousand years after a Buddha has re-established the teaching, and consequently the next opportunity will be at the time of Metteyya.²⁴

Individual wishes are also presented in a more personal form e.g. if a scribe says: *tan dai au bai ryan kḍi khyan kḍi lau kḍi au bai fan*

²⁴ Cf. E. Lamotte: *Le Traité de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse de Nāgārjuna (Mahā-prajñāpāramitāśāstra)*. Louvain 1970. Tome III, p.1614foll. and *Samantapāsādikā* 1291,19.

kḍi hū pen phala kee khā hū sān, no. 66: Petavatthu-aṭṭhakathā, CS 876 : A.D. 1514 “whenever somebody takes (this manuscript) with him to read it, to copy it, to recite it, or takes it with him to hear it (i.e. to have it read out to him?), then this will be merit for me, who has made (the manuscript)”, and similarly: *daiy tan dai dai² du kḍi khūn cai kḍi cuṇ pen pur kee khā dūn*, no. 109: Paritta, CS 1039 : A.D. 1677 “whoever wants to see (this manuscript) or learn it by heart, should do so, for it is certainly merit for me”. By this ingenious wish the donor or scribe managed and still manages to accumulate merit even while these manuscripts are used for research.

In both cases it is by no means clear to whom the merit will ultimately go, to the donor or to the scribe, or to both of them. For, leaving aside the somewhat ambiguous *sān* “to produce”²⁵, which can be employed by both, scribes and donors alike, the subject of the corresponding sentences is rarely expressed explicitly. Therefore the long colophons typical for Javanapañña, which have been discussed and translated by H. Hundijs²⁶ state to whom exactly the merit of the donation is going to belong: *cuṇ hū dai lokiya lee lokuttarasampatti kee dāyak phū (hū) sān nan dūn. rau anumodanā dvay lee*, no. 36: Sāratthapakāsinī (Sagātha-vagga), CS 911 : A.D. 1549 “that there may be success in the mundane and supramundane attainments for the donor, the person who had (this manuscript) made. We give our blessings”. This makes it sufficiently clear that the merit will go to the *upāsikā* Gāṃ Bā, one of the rather numerous female donors of manuscripts.

²⁵ In the colophons to a manuscript of the Mahājanakajātaka in the National Library, Bangkok (No. 6290), copied in A.D. 1660 the verb *sān* has been used in the Thai colophons as an equivalent to *likhāpita* of the Pāli colophons of the same manuscript. Both colophon series have been written by the monk Suvaṇṇarāja.

²⁶ H. Hundijs as above note 9, p.70, no. 8.

At the same time it is obvious that more than one person is involved in the donation. This fact is still more evident in a second colophon from Javanapañña's hand: *mahāthera hlvañ cau pen upatthambhaka gam anumodanā dvay lee cuñ hū pen pracañy kee lokiya lokuttarasampatti kee phū hū sāñ*, no. 119: Yamaka, CS 909 : A.D. 1547, fasc. 7 "the Venerable Mahāthera gives his blessings as the supporter that ...". The person who gives his blessings is called *upatthambhaka* "supporter". At the same time, he is not the scribe of this manuscript, for only the colophon, not the text itself, has been copied in Javanapañña's very characteristic hand. Thus altogether three people participated in donating this manuscript.

Occasionally quite a few people have contributed in one way or another to have a manuscript made. As many as twenty people are named or mentioned indirectly in no. 103: *Buddhavaṃsa-aṭṭhakathā*, CS 913 : A.D. 1551. This number is quite exceptional, although sometimes an anonymous group of people, and possibly a large one, is mentioned: *nák puñ dāñ hlāy jāv meiy mī mahāsāmī cau puññaramsī pen pradhāñ*, no. 29: *Majjhimanikāya* (*Mūlapaṇṇāsa*), CS 895 : A.D. 1533 "numerous inhabitants of Meiy, who want to make merit, together with the Venerable Mahāsvāmī Puññaramsī as a leader²⁷".

The *Buddhavaṃsa-aṭṭhakathā* not only names all these many people who worked together but also, remarkably, describes their respective parts in the making of this manuscript. The Mahāthera Ratana is called *ādikammasādhaka* or *sabbādikammasādhaka*, and he is the only monk mentioned in these colophons. Lay people named are sometimes specified as *p(r)accayadāyaka*. This means that they have given the money necessary to write the manuscript, which consists of a set comprising the *Buddhavaṃsa* and its commentary, the

²⁷ On the title *mahāsvāmin*: H. Pent: Reflections on the *Saddhammasaṅgaha*. JSS 65.1.1977, p.264fol.

Madhuratthavilāsini. The sum paid for the palm leaves was 8,000 *pé* and for copying the text 54,000 *pé*, *Buddhavaṃsa*, fasc. 1.²⁸ Interestingly, a (female?) ascetic named Yū gave some money too: *phā khāv yū*, *Buddhavaṃsa*, fasc. 7, which at the same time is an early reference to these ascetics wearing white clothes. The leading donor who is mentioned most frequently is: *upāsikā jū nāñ pā' gām* "the lay woman named Pā Gām". She is called *paccayadāyikā* and *upatthambhaka* "supporter". This means that the relevant terminology was neither fixed nor uniform. For when Javanapañña is called *upatthambhaka*, no. 57: *Itivuttaka*, CS 908 : A.D. 1546, fasc. 3, or: *then cau sur inda pen upatthambhaka*, no. 43: *Manorathapūraṇi* (*Ekanipāta*), CS 891(?) : A.D. 1529 or 1589(?), most likely both monks acted in the same way as did the Mahāthera Ratana, who is the *ādikammasādhaka*: both, Javanapañña and Ratana, gave their blessings (*anumodana*). There even seems to be a third expression used in the same context: *silananda pāñ kvāv kvañ hū sāñ therā anomadassī cau pen mūla lām bāñ*, no. 18: *Samantapāsādikā* (*Pārājika/ Saṃghādisesa*), about A.D. 1500 "Silananda from Pāñ Kvāv Kvañ had (this manuscript) made. The Thera Anomadassī was the *mūla*. In Lampang".

Only in the colophons of the *Buddhavaṃsa* manuscript, however, are the activities of the *ādikammasādhaka* briefly described: *jāk jvar nák pur dañ hlāy*, no. 102: *Buddhavaṃsa*, CS 913 : A.D. 1551, fasc. 1 "he persuaded many people, who want to make merit", and: *mahāthen ratana dai gā lāñ nák puñ dai deyyadhamma cāñ khyāñ lee*, *Buddhavaṃsa*, fasc. 4 "the Mahāthera Ratana has received the sum (to be used for buying) palm leaves; those, who want to make merit, have donated (the sum to be used for) copying". Evidently Ratana urged lay people to provide the funds necessary to acquire the writing materials and

²⁸ On the prices of manuscripts: O. v. Hinüber as above note 2, p.72; cf. also M. A. Stein : A Sanskrit Deed of Sale concerning a Kashmirian Mahābhārata MS., JRS 1900, p.187-194.

to pay for the scribes. Only one of these scribes has been honoured by mentioning his name: *8 pai ācān seen doṅ sān ḍvay hatthakamma*, *Buddhavaṃsa-aṭṭhakathā*, fasc. 19 “eight folios have been made by Ācārya Seen Doṅ by his own hand”. This, of course, is an extremely modest contribution to a manuscript comprising eighteen and a half fascicles corresponding to 444 folios. Therefore it seems likely that Ācārya Seen Doṅ, who copied only the very last eight folios of this text, was some important person, perhaps not receiving any fee as the other scribes, but contributing either for sake of his own merit or to give special weight to this donation. All other scribes are passed over in silence.

Thus the *ādikammasādhaka* or the *mūla* seem to have been both the initiator of the meritorious work and also perhaps some kind of spiritual advisor, who gave their blessing upon its completion. It would be interesting to know what exactly was going to happen once a manuscript was finished and ready to be deposited in a monastery. Some kind of ceremony is a likely guess. And it may have been only during this supposed ceremony that the colophons were added, for they are occasionally written in a hand clearly distinct from that of the copyist. In this respect no. 32: *Papañcasūdanī* (*Mūlapaṇṇāsa*), CS 911 : A.D. 1549 is particularly instructive because the colophons in Javanapañña’s hand have been added after the scribe had finished the Pāli text and had written the title on the cover leaf of fasc. 20. The long colophon has been written around the title of the text: “The Venerable Saṃgharāja and the Layman called Samudda and his wife called Keev Maṇī had (this manuscript) made in the year *kāḍ rau* CS 911. Persons, who take (this manuscript) with them to use it and do not know the meaning or the wording (of the text) exactly, should not try to introduce changes or make additions, for that is not good. After having been used (this manuscript) should be brought back immediately, – commentary on the *Mūlapaṇṇāsa* – for it was difficult, to make it. Therefore there should be success for me, who

had (this manuscript) made, in the mundane and supramundane attainments, and it should help people”.

The length of this colophon occurring a couple of times with some variations in manuscripts connected with Javanapañña is rarely matched: “(This manuscript) has been made by the Venerable Ānanda as the leading initiator (*gau saddhā*) as a root for the teaching and as a fountain for attaining omniscience. Until that time I should not (be reborn) as deaf nor as blind nor as a sick person, but as somebody who knows the Tipiṭaka in every rebirth, who is reborn because of the three (meritorious) causes²⁹, who is a wise and able person. I should not be reborn as a poor person, I do not want to be negligent in respect to the Exalted Buddha, the Exalted Teaching, the Exalted Order in future rebirths”, no. 98: *Sivijayapañhā*, CS 947 : A.D. 1585.³⁰

It would be interesting to know whether these long texts were perhaps recited when a manuscript was ceremoniously commissioned. However, from the colophons alone, only a very little can be guessed about the procedure for a donation. Perhaps some text such as the *ānisaṅ piṭak* contains some relevant information. This, however, is a topic extending far beyond the colophons.

Freiburg i. Brsg.

Oskar von Hinüber

Note: This is the enlarged version of a paper read at the 5th International Conference on Thai Studies, London, on 7th July 1993.

²⁹ On *tihetukapaṭisandhi* that is *alobha*, *adosa*, *amoha*: Paṭis II 72,18foll. with Paṭis-a III 571,4-8, cf. *Vism* 104,11 (with *Vism-mht*), *As* 285,10, *Vibh-a* 162,23.

³⁰ This colophon has been discussed by H. Hundius as above note 9, p.133foll., where the date is given erroneously as CS 942 following a mistake made by the scribe.

A Pāli Canonical Passage of Importance for the History of Indian Medicine

The *Brahmajāla*- and *Sāmaññaphala*-suttas of the *Dīghanikāya* have the following almost identical passage on wrongful livelihood (*micchājīva*), based on "low (literally beastly) sciences"¹ (*tiracchānavijjā*), shunned by Buddha Gotama:

"Yathā vā pan' eke bhonto samaṇabrāhmaṇā saddhādeyyāni bhojanāni bhuñjitvā te evarūpāya tiracchānavijjāya micchājīvena jīvikam kappenti - seyyathīdam **santikammaṃ paṇidhikammaṃ bhūrikammaṃ vassakammaṃ vossakammaṃ vatthukammaṃ vatthuparikiraṇam ācamanaṃ nahāpanaṃ juhanaṃ vamaṇam virecanaṃ uddhavirecanaṃ adhovirecanaṃ sīsavirecanaṃ kaṇṇatelaṃ nettatappaṇam natthukammaṃ añjanaṃ paccañjanaṃ sālākiyaṃ sallakattikaṃ dāraatikicchā mūlabhesajjānaṃ anuppādānaṃ osadhīnaṃ paṭimokkho - iti vā iti evarūpāya tiracchānavijjāya micchājīvā paṭivirato Samaṇo Gotamo ti." Iti vā hi bhikkhave puthujjano Tathāgatassa vaṇṇam vadamāno vadeyya.²**

¹ Cf. meaning of the Skt equivalent *vidyā* given in Monier-William's *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*: knowledge, science, learning, scholarship, philosophy... (according to some there are four Vidyās or sciences, 1. *trayī*, the triple Veda; 2. *ānvīkshikī*, logic and metaphysics; 3. *daṇḍa-nīti*, the science of government; 4. *vārttā*, practical arts such as agriculture, commerce, medicine etc....)

² *DN*, Mahāsīla, i.1.27, cf. *Ibid.* ii.62; *DB*, pp.25-6; *CBP*, p.11. On the importance of the two suttas, see K.R. Norman, *Pāli Literature including the canonical literature in Prakrit and Sanskrit of all the Hīnayāna schools of Buddhism*, Wiesbaden 1983, p.33.

In this passage, the words indicated in bold refer to medical practices dealt with in āyurvedic texts. These terms are discussed below from the philological point of view, and their significance for the history of Indian medicine is pointed out at the end. In this discussion, it will be noticed that data found in āyurvedic texts help in elucidating and clarifying the meanings of the terms involved, especially *santikamma*, *bhūrikamma*, *ācamana*, *nahāpana*, *paccañjana*, *sālākiya*, *mūlabhesajja* and *osadhīnaṃ paṭimokkha*. The translations given in the *Sv*, the *DB* and the *CBP* are quoted separately in each case for the sake of comparison. It will be seen that most of the interpretations of the *Sv* agree with the meanings in the āyurvedic texts and help clarify the meanings especially in the case of *mūlabhesajjānaṃ anuppādānaṃ* and *osadhīnaṃ paṭimokkha*. Of the *DB* and the *CBP*, most of the latter's interpretations are more exact and precise than those of the former. Both texts seem to err especially with regard to the interpretation of *sālākiya*, *mūlabhesajjānaṃ anuppādānaṃ* and *osadhīnaṃ paṭimokkha*.

(1) *santikamma* (S., Skt *śāntikarma*) is explained in the *Sv* as fulfilling a vow to a god (*devaṭṭhānaṃ gantvā "Sace me idaṃ nāma samijjhati tumhākaṃ iminā ca iminā ca upahāraṃ karissāmi"*, *samiddhakāle kātappaṃ santi-paṭissava-kammaṃ*). However, *śāntikarma* (propitiatory rites, literally acts of appeasement), along with *baliharaṇa* (offering of oblations), is mentioned in the *Suśr* (Sū 1.4) in the explanation of *bhūtavidyā*, the fourth of the eight branches of Āyurveda,³ the purpose of which is counteracting the "possession" (*graha*) of minds

³The *aṣṭāṅga* in Āyurveda are: *śalya* (surgical knowledge with special reference to the extraction of foreign bodies), *śālākya* (treatment of diseases in the region over the clavicle), *kāyacikitsā* (treatment of general diseases), *bhūtavidyā* (knowledge of diseases caused by supernatural beings: mental disorders), *kaumārabhṛtya* (paediatrics), *agadatantra* (toxicology), *rasāyanatantra* (geriatrics) and *vājīkaraṇatantra* (viriligenics). *Suśr* Sū 1.7.

by various categories of *bhūtas* (Devas, Asuras, Gandharvas, Yakṣas, Rākṣasas, Pitṛs, Piśācas, Nāgas).⁴ *Śāntikarma* was thus a kind of white magic.

In spite of the chronological gap in relation to the texts under discussion, it is interesting to note that in Sri Lanka, the term *śāntikarma*, sometimes simply *śāntiya*, is still used in the sense of white magic, in reference to two types of ceremonies: "*bali*" and "*tovil*". The first is a propitiatory ceremony performed to counter the evil effects of the planets. The second is also a propitiatory ceremony, but coupled with exorcism of evil spirits called *yakṣas*. The term "*bali*" (oblations) is used more or less in the same sense as in the Sanskrit. But "*graha*" in the sense of "possession" or "seizure" applies rather to the *tovil* ceremonies. However, "*graha*" meaning planets, in the context of *bhūtavidyā* of the Sanskrit texts, occurs in another definition quoted in the *Vśś*.⁵

(2) *bhūrikamma*: In the *DN*, the reading [*bhūtikammaṃ*] is suggested by the editors, who give *bhūta*- as a variant reading (from MS in Burmese characters in the Phayre Collection at the India Office) in a footnote.⁶ If the reading *bhūtakammaṃ* is admitted, it corresponds to *bhūtavidyā* discussed above. However, *bhūrikammaṃ* is the term found in the *Sv* which interprets it as "*bhūrihare vasitvā gahitamantassa*

⁴*bhūtavidyā nāma devāsura-gandharva-yakṣa-rakṣaḥ-pitṛ-piśāca-nāga-grahādy upasrṣṭa-cetasāṃ śāntikarma-baliharaṇādi-grahopasamanārtham. Suśr* Sū 1.7.iv. The tr. of *santikammaṃ* in the *CBP*, "les pratiques magiques en vue d'apaiser les esprits" (magical practices in view of appeasing spirits) agrees with that meaning of *bhūtavidyā*. The *DB* follows the meaning given in the *Sv*: "Vowing gifts to a god if a certain benefit be granted".

⁵*grahabhūtapiśācās ca - śākinīḍākinigrahāḥ! eṭeṣāṃ nigrahaḥ samyak - bhūtavidyā nigadyate//* quoted in the *Vśś*, p.752.

⁶*bhūrikamma* is translated as "repeating charms while lodging in an earth house", in the *DB* and as "garder sa maison" (taking care of or staying in one's house) in the *CBP*.

payogakaraṇam." Professor Richard F Gombrich points out⁷ that Buddhaghosa's reading *bhūri*- in the 5th century A.D. is more authentic than the banalised reading *bhūta*- in a Burmese manuscript of the 18th or 19th century, which cannot represent an old tradition. He further explains that "when a person is seeking supernormal powers (*siddhi*), he gets an initiation (*dīkṣā*) at which he receives a *mantra*. The next stage is known as *puraścaraṇa* or 'preliminary action'; he has to practise what he has been taught, for example by reciting his mantra a fixed (large) number of times. This he does while staying in seclusion." Taking this to be the practice referred to by Buddhaghosa, Professor Gombrich translates the gloss on *bhūri*- as "staying in a house and practising the mantra one has received"; he suggests that *bhūrikamma* means "repetition (of a mantra)".

(3) *vassakamma*, promotion of virility, is explained in the *Sv* as derived from "vasso" meaning "man" (*Ettha vasso ti puriso*). Rev. R. Morris traces Pāli "vassa" to Skt "varṣa", from √*vṛṣ*. In comparison, he cites Skt *varṣadhara* and Pāli *vassavara*, "an eunuch".⁸ It would be more correct to retain in this context the meaning, "to have manly power, generative vigour" of √*vṛṣ*, as shown in Monier-Williams' *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, on the basis of the *Dhātupāṭha*. In fact, the Skt adjectival form *vṛṣya*, "productive of sexual vigour", occurs frequently in āyurvedic texts.⁹ In that sense, it corresponds to *vājīkaraṇa*¹⁰, the last

branch of the *aṣṭāṅga*, described as the therapy promoting the increase, purification, accumulation and ejaculation of semen which is scanty, vitiated, deficient and dried up, and also causing pleasure (in men who are thus treated).¹¹

(4) *ācamana*: The term occurs in the *Suśr* (Śā 2.13) as a means of treating vitiated menstrual blood. The commentary explains the term as "water for washing the vagina" with the additional note: "made with drugs removing *doṣas* like *vāta* etc."¹² The *Vś*s explains *ācamana* as "rinsing of the mouth at the end of a meal".¹³ Probably, the term in our text refers to "mouthwash", "rinsing" or "gargle" mentioned in āyurvedic texts (*mukhapūraṇam*).¹⁴ Two kinds of mouthwash are described: *kavala* and *gaṇḍūṣa*, the distinction between the two being that in *kavala* the medicinal liquid could be easily rolled in the mouth whereas in *gaṇḍūṣa* it is the contrary (*Suśr* Ci 40.62, *Ah* Sū 22.11b). The meaning of *ācamana* as mouthwash is supported by the explanation in the *Sv*: *udakena mukhasiddhikaraṇam*.¹⁵

(5) *nahāpana* (Skt *snāna*), bathing, is also recommended in āyurvedic texts as a preventive measure to preserve good health. The *Suśr* (Ci 24.57-60) describes the benefits of bathing and (Ci 24.61-62) gives contraindications. The title of this 24th chapter is worth underlining: *anāgatābādhapraṭiṣedha*. *Ḍalhaṇa* explains *anāgata* as

⁷Personal communication dated 23/07/1995.

⁸Notes and queries, *JPTS* 1889, p.208.

⁹Cf. *kaidārā madhurā vṛṣyā balyāḥ pittanibarhanāḥ/ iṣat kaṣāyālpamalā guravaḥ kaphaśukralāḥ*// *Suśr* Sū 46.17.

¹⁰Todaramalla explains *vājī* as *śukra* (semen) and its production in a person as *vājīkaraṇa*. Bhagwan Dash and Lalitesh Kashyap, *Basic principles of Āyurveda based on Āyurveda saukhyam of Toḍarānanda*, New Delhi 1980, p.60. The other interpretation is sexual vigour, similar to that of a horse (*vājī*): *yad dravyam puruṣam vājivat surataḥsamam karoti tad vājīkaraṇam ucyate*. *Vś*s, p.953. (Rājā Toḍarānanda of Oudh was a Minister to the Moghul Emperor Akbar, 16th

century A.D.. Twenty-three works attributed to him are collectively called *Toḍarānanda*.)

¹¹*vājīkaraṇatantram nāmālpa-duṣṭa- kṣīṇa-viṣuṣka-retasām āpyāyana-pra-sādopacaya-janana-nimittam praharṣajanānārtham ca*. *Suśr* Sū 1.8.

¹²*ācamanaṃ yoniprakṣālanodakam, tad api vātādidoṣaharadravyakṛtam*.

¹³*bhojanāntamukhakaṣālane*.

¹⁴*sneha-kṣīra-kaṣāyādi-dravyair mukhāpūraṇam gaṇḍūṣaḥ*. *Vś*s, p.352.

¹⁵The tr. given in the *DB* is "ceremonial rinsings of the mouth"; that in the *CBP*, "rincer la bouche" (rinsing the mouth), is more precise.

īśadāgataḥ (*anāgata īśadāgataḥ, nañ atra īśadarthe*, literally "not come", i.e. not apparent), *ābādha* as *duḥkham vyādhir* (pain, illness) and *pratiśedha* as *cikitsitam* (remedying). The *Car* (Sū 5.94) also gives in brief the benefits of bathing. As bathing in the canonical passage is given as a craft eschewed by the Buddha, it has to be in that context a medical therapy rather than a part of personal regimen. Hence the *Sv* interpretation, "bathing others" (*aññesaṃ nahāpanaṃ*). That it was also a medical therapy is corroborated in the *Suśr* statement (under *snāna*) that "In cases of an aggravation of the deranged Vāyu and Kapha, the head may be washed with warm water, as a medicine, after a careful consideration of the intensity of the disease".¹⁶

(6) *vamana*, emetics and (7) *virecana*, purgatives are the two purificatory (*saṃśodhana*) therapies in Āyurveda.¹⁷ Drugs having emetic and purgative properties, their administration, diseases for which the two therapies are effective etc. are treated, for instance, in *Suśr* Sū 39, Ci 33 and 34; *Car* Sū 15 and *Ah* Sū 18.

(8) *uddhavirecana* (cleansing from the upper part of the body, i.e. emetics), (9) *adhovirecana* (cleansing from the lower part of the body, i.e. purgation) and (10) *sirovirecana* (= a kind of *nasya*, cleansing from the head, i.e. errhines or administration of medicinal substances through the nose, see footnote 18 below) form part of *vamana* and *virecana*. Dalhaṇa explains: *ūrdhvaḥgāhārāṇi vamanakarāṇī*

¹⁶ Bhishagratna's tr. Italics are mine.

śleṣmamārutakope tu nātvā vyādhibalābalaṃ/

kāmam uṣṇam śirāḥsnānaṃ bhaiṣajyārtham samācaret// Suśr Ci 24.60.

The *DB* renders *nahāpanaṃ* as "Ceremonial bathings" and gives in a footnote the meaning of the *Sv*: "Bathings, that is, of other people"; the *CBP* tr. "baigner" (bathing) corresponds to the significance of the term in the āyurvedic context.

¹⁷ *Tatra dvididham saṃśodhanaṃ - vamaṇaṃ virecanaṃ ca.*

Dalhaṇa's commentary to *Suśr* Sū 39.3.

arthaḥ, adbhobhāgaharāṇī virecanāṇī arthaḥ, śirovirecanāṇī nasyaprayogena śirastham śleṣmānaṃ virecayanti srāvayantī arthaḥ (cleansing from the head means removing the phlegm of the head by means of the administration of drugs through the nose).¹⁸

(11) *kaṇṇatela* is explained in the *Sv* as boiling medicinal oil either for developing the ears or for removing ulcers (*kaṇṇānaṃ vaddhanattham vā vaṇaharaṇattham vā bhesajjatelapacanaṃ*). *Kaṇṇatela* seems to be the same as *karnaṇpūraṇam* of āyurvedic texts, i.e. filling the ears with medicinal oils etc. for curing ear ailments.¹⁹

(12) *nettatappana*, soothing of the eyes by pouring clarified butter mixed with lukewarm water into the cavities of the eyes and retaining it for a specified time is explained in detail in *Suśr* Ut 18, among the following treatments of eye diseases: *puṭapāka* (extraction of

¹⁸ See Dalhaṇa's commentary to *Suśr*, Sū 39.3,4,6.

The *DB* translates *vamana*, *virecana*, *uddhavirecana* and *adhovirecana* as "administering emetics and purgatives". The tr. in the *CBP* is more precise: "faire vomir" (cause vomiting), "faire purger" (cause purging), "chasser les impuretés par le haut" (evacuating impurities from above), "les chasser par le bas" (evacuating them from below). The term *sisavirecana* is translated in the *DB* and the *CBP* respectively as: "purging people to relieve the head (that is by giving drugs to make people sneeze)", and "chasser celles qui sont dans la tête" (evacuating those [impurities] in the head). The explanation in the *Sv* of the five terms is: *vamanan ti yogam datvā vamanakaraṇaṃ, virecane pi es' eva nayo, uddhavirecanan ti uddham dosānaṃ nīharaṇaṃ, adhovirecanan ti adho nīharaṇaṃ, sisavirecanan ti sirovirecanaṃ.*

¹⁹ Cf. *karnaṇaṃ prapūrayet samyak - snehādyair mātrayā bhīṣak/ noccaih śrutir na bādhīryaṃ syān nityaṃ karnaṇpūraṇāt//* quoted in the *Vśś*, p.220.

The tr. of *kaṇṇatelaṃ* in the *DB* follows the explanation of the *Sv*: "Oiling people's ears (either to make them grow or to heal sores on them)". The *CBP* translates it as "préparer de l'huile pour l'oreille" (preparing oil for the ear), cf. *CPD* s.v.

medicinal fluid through a process of heating to be used as *tarpaṇa*), *seka* (sprinkling), *āścyotana* (eye-drops) and *añjana* (salves). The *Sv* explains it as oil for soothing the eyes (*akkhitappanatelam*).²⁰

(13) *natthukamma* (S., Skt *nasya*), administration of medicinal substances, mainly oil through the nose (cf. *sirovirecana* above).²¹ The explanation given in the *Sv*, "*telam yojetvā natthukaraṇam*", agrees with the description in *Suśr*. Vaidya K.L. Bhishagratna (see *Suśr* in the list of abbreviations) translates *nasya* as "snuff" and *sirovirecana* as "errhines".

(14) *Suśr* describes *añjana* as being of three forms: pills, liquid and powder,²² to be applied with a rod (*śalākā*) which, like the receptacle of the *añjana*, should be made of one of the following materials: gold, silver, horn, copper, *vaidūrya* precious stone (diamond), bell metal and iron (Ut 18.61). The *Sv* explains *añjana* as "alkaline salve capable of removing two or three layers (of the eyes)" (*dve vā tīni vā pātālāni nīharaṇasamattham khārañjanam*).²³

(15) *paccañjana* (Skt *pratyañjana*), according to the *Sv*, is "a cooling medicinal salve prepared through successive soaking"

²⁰ The term is translated in the *CBP* as "des lavages d'yeux" (eyewashes) and in the *DB* as "Satisfying people's eyes (soothing them by dropping medicinal oils into them)".

²¹ *auśadham auśadhasiddho vā sneho nāsikābhyāṃ dīyata iti nasyam. tad dvidham śirovirecanam snehanam ca. Suśr Ci 40.21*. Details are given in the same text up to śloka 57. See also *Ah Sū 20*.

The *DB* and the *CBP* have the same meaning: "Administering drugs through the nose" and "des drogues à respirer par le nez" respectively.

²² *guṭikārasacūrṇāni trividhāny añjanāni tu* (Ut 18.58).

²³ *Añjana* is translated in the *DB* as "applying collyrium to the eyes", in the *CBP* as "des collyres" (collyriums).

(*bhāvanīya-sītala-bhesajjañjanam*).²⁴ *Pratyañjana* is explained by Ḍalhaṇa as a secondary salve (*yad añjanasyānuprayujyate, tat pratyañjanam, Suśr Ut 17.36*). Bhishagratna further clarifies the term as a "secondary eye-salve (which) is an antidote for the over-use of an Anjana" (Vol.III, p.73, footnote).

(16) *sālākīya* (Skt *śālākya*) is that section of the eightfold science of medicine (*aṣṭāṅga Āyurveda*) dealing with the treatment of diseases over the clavicle such as ears, eyes, mouth, nose.²⁵

(17) *sallakattika*, described in the *Sv* only as "*sallakatta-vejjakammaṃ*", probably refers to *śalyacikitsā* of the *aṣṭāṅga*, explained in the *Suśr* (Sū 1.7.i) as the removal of extraneous matter such as particles of grass, wood, stone, dust, metals, clay, bone, nails, pus from ulcers, as well as the use of surgical instruments, the application of alkalis (caustics) and fire (cauterisation), along with the diagnosis of ulcers.²⁶ Out of all surgical instruments and appliances, alkali (*kṣāra*) is

²⁴ The tr. in the *DB* is "giving medical ointment for the eyes", that in the *CBP*: "des onguents" (unguents). *Bhāvanā* (verb *bhāvayati*) meaning repeated soaking in medicinal liquids, is rendered "*Bhāvanā* saturation" by Bhishagratna (Vol.III, p.73 and passim). On both *pratyañjana* and *bhāvanā*, cf.

pratyañjanam srotasi yat samutthitam

kramād rasakṣīraghrtesu bhāvitam/ Suśr Ut 17.36ab.

Bhāvanā is explained as "*dravapadārthena punaḥ punaḥ auśadhamāraṇe śoṣaṇe ca*" in the *Vś* (p.748).

²⁵ *śālākyaṃ nāmordhvajatrugātānāṃ śravaṇa-nayana-vadana-ghrāṇādi-saṃśritānāṃ vyādhinām upaśamanārtham* (*Suśr Sū 1.7.ii*). Both the *DB* and the *CBP* translate this term as the treatment of eye diseases ("Practising as an oculist" in the former and "exercer l'ophtalmologie" in the latter).

²⁶ The *DB* and the *CBP* rendering of the term as surgery ("practising as a surgeon", "la chirurgie" respectively) agrees with "*śalya*" in the *aṣṭāṅga*: *śalyam nāma vividha-trṇa-kāṣṭha-pāṣāṇa-pāṃśu-loha-loṣṭāsthi-bālanakha-pūyāsrāva-duṣṭa-vraṇāntargarba-śalyodधारanārtham, yantra-śastra-kṣārāgni-prañidhāna-vraṇaviniścayārtham ca. Suśr Sū 1.7.i.*

considered as the best and cauterly (*agni*) as the better (the good being, by the way, the application of leeches, *jalaukāvidhi*).²⁷ The two therapeutics *kṣārapākavidhi* and *agnikarmavidhi* are described in detail in *Suśr Sū* 11-12 and *Ah Sū* 30; (*jalaukāvidhi* in *Suśr Sū* 13 and *Ah Sū* 26.35-45).

(18) *dāraṭatikicchā*, "*komārabhaccavejjakammaṃ*" in the *Sv*, is the *kaumārabhṛtya* (paediatrics) branch of the *aṣṭāṅga* Āyurveda, including the nursing of infants, the purification of mothers' milk, the pacification of diseases caused by vitiated mothers' milk and the evil influence of malignant stars and spirits, which are classified by *Ḍalhaṇa* as bodily and external causes.²⁸

(19) *mūlabhesajjānaṃ anuppādānaṃ* is explained in the *Sv* as "*kāyatikiccham*". This term in the *aṣṭāṅga* means general diseases, explained by *Suśruta* as "the appeasement of diseases of all parts of the body such as fever, internal haemorrhage, dehydration, insanity, skin diseases, urinary affection, diarrhoea."²⁹

²⁷ *śastrānuśastrebhyaḥ kṣāraḥ pradhānatamaḥ*, *Suśr Sū* 11.3; *kṣārād agnir garīyān*, *Ibid.* *Sū* 12.3.

²⁸ *kaumārabhṛtyaṃ nāma kumārabharaṇa-dhātrīkṣīradoṣa-saṃśodhanārthaṃ duṣṭas tanya-grahasamutthānāṃ ca vyādhīnāṃ upaśamanārtham*. (*Suśr Sū* 1.7.v). *Ḍalhaṇa*'s commentary: *tatra duṣṭas tanyena sārīrāḥ, duṣṭa-graheṇāgantavaḥ*.

The *DB* and the *CBP* have the same meaning, "practising as a doctor for children" in the former and "la pédiatrie" in the latter.

²⁹ *kāyachikitsā nāma sarvāṅgasamśritānāṃ vyādhīnāṃ jvara-raktapitta-śoṣonmādāpasmāra-kuṣṭha-mehātīsārādīnāṃ upaśamanārtham*. (*Suśr Sū* 1.7.iii). This is translated in the *DB* as "administering roots and drugs" and in the *CBP* as "appliquer de nouveaux remèdes consistant en racines" (application of new remedies consisting of roots). *Bhishagratna* (Vol.I, p.3 footnote) explains: "The term *Kāya* literally signifies the vital heat or fire which runs through the entire system, and hence the *Kāya-chikitsā* deals with diseases which may gradually invade the root-principles of a living human organism".

(20) *osadhīnaṃ paṭimokkha* is explained in the *Sv* as "*khārādīni datvā tadanurūpe khāṇe gate tesam apanayanam*" (applying alkali etc. and removing them when the time for them has passed). These are obviously the methods of treatment known as *khārāggivīdhi*, referred to in § 17 above.³⁰

It appears from the above discussion that *santikamma* (= *bhūta-vidyā*), *vassakamma* (= *vājīkaraṇa*), *sālākiya*, *sallakattika* (= *śalya-cikitsā*), *dāraṭatikicchā* (= *kaumārabhṛtya*) and *mūlabhesajja* (= *kāya-cikitsā*) fall within the eightfold division of Āyurveda. On the other hand, *vamana*, *virecana*, *natthukamma* and *sirovirecana* form part of the fivefold therapies (*pañcakarma*)³¹ of āyurvedic texts. The application of alkali and cauterly (*kṣārāgnivīdhi*) also has an important place among āyurvedic remedies.

As these basic terms of āyurvedic therapy are found in two Theravāda Buddhist canonical texts, it may be deduced that those medical practices were already known during the time of Gotama Buddha, for according to the Theravāda tradition, the *Brahmajāla-* and *Sāmaññaphala-suttas* were the foremost among those authenticated at the first council held in Rājagaha, immediately after the *mahāparinirvāna*.³²

³⁰ This is translated in the *DB* as "administering medicines in rotation", and in the *CBP* as "contre-carrer l'effet de médicaments" (counteracting the effect of medicaments).

³¹ *vamana* (emesis), *vireka* (purgation), *nasya* (administration of medicinal drugs through the nose), *nirūha* or *āsthāpana* (decoctional enema) and *anuvāsana* (oleaginous enema).

Cf. *vamaṇaṃ recanaṃ nasyaṃ nirūhaś cānuvāsanaṃ / jñeyaṃ pañcavidhaṃ karma vidhānaṃ tasya gadyate // Siddhasāra*, ed. R.E. Emmerick, Wiesbaden 1980, 30.1.

³² See K.R. Norman, *op. cit.*, p.7. The date of the Buddha's *parinirvāna* is generally considered as 544 B.C. in South Asian Buddhist countries. However, this date has been subject to controversy and suggestions have been made to

These therapeutics, as seen above, are dealt with in the *Suśr*, which forms part of the major triad (*vrddhatrayī*) of āyurvedic literature. According to the late Professor Jean Filliozat, the *Suśr* may be dated back to the last centuries of the pre-Christian era, before coming down to us in a fixed form in the first centuries of the post-Christian era. He also shows that the Suśruta school was anterior to the *Car* for the reason that the latter refers to the specialists of the Dhanvantari school which was the same as the Suśruta school.³³ This fact is pointed out by Bhishagratna, too, (Vol.I, p.xi). Filliozat's thesis that the *Suśr* would have been in the making in the "last centuries of the pre-Christian era" is thus supported by the passage in the *Brahmajāla-* and *Sāmaññaphala-suttas*.

This passage also raises the question of the Buddhist attitude to medicine in that the medical practices under discussion have been described as disdained means of wrongful livelihood. This question has been answered by T.W. Rhys Davids in his remark that there was objection to Buddhist monks' practising medicine "as a means of livelihood", but they might do so "gratis for themselves or for their coreligionists, and laymen might do so for gain" (*DB*, p.26)³⁴. Rhys Davids' statement finds support in the immense contribution made by Buddhists to the development of Indian medicine. Celebrated āyurvedic authors like Agniveśa, Caraka, Vāgbhaṭa, Nāgārjuna and those of the iatrochemical school, according to the French medical practitioner and

bring it down to the 5th or even the 4th century B.C. See Heinz Bechert, *The dating of the historical Buddha*, (Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung, IV,1-2, Göttingen 1991, 1992).

³³ *La doctrine classique de la médecine indienne, ses origines et ses parallèles*, 2nd ed., Paris 1975, pp.11-12.

³⁴ See also my paper, "Buddhism and traditional medicine in Sri Lanka", to appear shortly in *Pacific World*, Journal of the Institute of Buddhist Studies, Berkeley.

Indologist, Palmyr Cordier, were Buddhists.³⁵ Kenneth G Zysk adduces the theory that traditional Indian medicine developed among the mendicant ascetics or *śramaṇas* and that "Buddhism played a key role in the advancement of Indian medicine through its institutionalization of medicine in the Buddhist monastery".³⁶ To these observations may be added, in conclusion, that of R.C. Majumdar, a historian coming from an āyurvedic background: "In medicine, the contributions of Buddhist scholars are of great significance and outstanding value. Nāgārjuna, the medical author, the later Nāgārjuna (who composed many treatises on *rasacikitsā*, metallurgy and alchemy), Vāgbhaṭa, many of the Siddha authors of the iatrochemical school, and nearly all the medical missionaries who carried Indian medical science into Tibet, Central Asia, China and Ceylon were followers of the Buddhist faith".³⁷

I am grateful to Professor Richard F Gombrich for the courtesy of making very useful critical observations on the draft of this paper. My thanks are due to the Pali Text Society for financing this research.

Sainte-Geneviève-des-Bois

Jinadasa Liyanaratne

³⁵ Palmyr Cordier, *Quelques données nouvelles à propos des traités médicaux sanscrits antérieurs au XIIIe siècle*, Calcutta 1899, p.3; *Id.*, *Vāgbhaṭa et l'Aṣṭāṅghriḍayasamhitā, Études sur la médecine hindoue*, Besançon 1896, p.8. Both these texts are reproduced in Arion Rosu, *Gustave Liétard et Palmyr Cordier, Travaux sur l'histoire de la médecine indienne*, Paris 1989, pp.393ff., 419ff.

³⁶ *Asceticism and healing in ancient India, Medicine in the Buddhist monastery*, New York Oxford 1991, p.118.

³⁷ *A concise history of science in India*, eds. D.M. Bose, S.N. Sen, B.V. Subbarayappa. New Delhi 1989 reprint, p.220f.

ABBREVIATIONS

(Publications)

- Ah* = *Aṣṭāṅghrdayasamhitā*, ed. Hariśāstrī Parādkar, Varanasi 1982, reprint.
- CBP* = *Canon bouddhique pāli*, texte et traduction, Suttapiṭaka, Dīghanikāya, par Jules Bloch, Jean Filliozat, Louis Renou, Tome I, Fascicule I, Paris 1949. (Based on the Cambodian ed., compared with the PTS and Burmese eds.).
- Car* = *Carakasamhitā*, ed. P.V. Sharma, 2 Vols., Varanasi 1981, 1983.
- DB* = *Dialogues of the Buddha*, Tr. T.W. and C.A.F Rhys Davids, Pt.I, London 1989 (SBB Vol.II).
- DN* = *The Dīgha Nikāya*, Vol.I, PTS 1890.
- Sv* = *The Sumaṅgalavilāsini*, *Buddhaghosa's commentary on the Dīgha Nikāya*, Pt. I, PTS 1886.
- Suśr* = *Suśrutasamhitā*, ed. Jādavji Trikrajī Ācārya and Nārāyan Rām Ācārya, 2 Vols., Bombay 1938; K.L. Bhishagratna, Tr. *Suśrutasamhitā*, 3 Vols., 3rd ed., Varanasi 1981.
- Vśś* = *Vaidyakaśabdasindhu*, ed. Umeśacandra Gupta, 3rd reprint, Varanasi 1983.

(General)

- Ci* = *Cikitsāsthāna*
S. = *Sinhala*
Si = *Siddhisthāna*
Sū = *Sūtrasthāna*
Ut = *Uttarasthāna*

Studies in Vinaya technical terms I-III

These are intended to be the first three of a series of “microographies”, the purpose of which is to bring together and sort out the relevant Pā. data about a given term occurring in Vin, Kkh, Sp, and in secondary literature. “Vinaya technical term” is taken here in a broad sense, including, on the one hand, what are *stricto sensu* non-technical terms, such as those designating, or referring to, *realia* dealt with in Vinaya rules — e.g., *cīvara*; on the other hand, technical terms shared both by Vinaya texts and by other Indian legal literature — as exemplified recently by Schopen, *Business*. Sub-commentaries and compendia (Vjb, Vin-vn, Utt-vn, Khuddas, Mūla-s, and, when eventually available to me, Sp-ṭ, Vmv, Kkh-t) will be resorted to only when deemed helpful. BHS and Skt. parallels are not meant to be exhaustive, but to provide a convenient set of references for further comparisons with the Pā. data; except when required by the complexity of the data involved, they will not be discussed *per se*, but only insofar as they help us to understand the form, meaning(s), or range of application of a Pā. term. Chin. and Tib. data — derived from secondary literature in European languages — will be resorted to only exceptionally.

The application of Thv(M) prescriptions to *both* monks and nuns will be mentioned only where and when explicitly stated in a text, so as to reflect the relative scarcity of data concerning nuns, and above all to avoid unwarranted extrapolations from the *Bhikkhu-* to the *Bhikkhunī-vinaya* on the excuse that the latter is a truncated version of the former, from which full details about the organisation of former nuns' communities could allegedly be retrieved safely *ex silentio*.

Skt. references are according to school, in the following order: Sa, Mū, Mā, Dha, then — should the occasion arise — Mī, any others, and unidentified schools; texts belonging to one and the same school are

referred to in alphabetical order. The same conventions apply, in theory, to BHS references, for which the only texts available so far belong to the Mā-L school.

Abbreviations follow those of the Epilegomena to CPD, of CPD III.1 (p. II-VI), and of H. Bechert, *Abkürzungsverzeichnis zur buddhistischen Literatur in Indien und Südostasien*, Göttingen, 1990, with some additions listed at the end of this paper. It should be noted that GBM(FacEd) X.1 is quoted here, for the mere sake of practicality, according to the editors' number of page, then, within brackets, editors' number in right margin, together with line; GBM(FacEd) X.6 is quoted according to editors' number in right margin, then, within brackets, editors' number in left margin, together with line; necessary corrections to this faulty numbering are found in Wille, MSV 21-23, 154-165.

R.F. Gombrich gave heartening encouragements; both he and E. Parsons took the trouble to correct my English. R.F. Gombrich and O. von Hinüber made valuable comments. Any inaccuracies are my own.

*

I. *Samgha-kamma*, "procedure"

0. Buddhist *Vinaya* texts, the purpose of which is to codify discipline and proceedings within monastic communities, set forth four types of procedures, by which various agreements, decisions or actions are to be officially and legally sanctioned. Their object may be either administrative (e.g., appointment of monks as office-bearers), ritual (e.g., ordination;

performance of the fortnightly rehearsal of monastic rules), or disciplinary (settling formal disputes)¹.

The relevant Pā. data about the technical terminology of procedures occur at Vin I 315,21-321,28 with Sp 1146,5-1147,30; Vin IV 152,9-12' with Kkh 131,21-134,18; Vin V 220,2-223,3 with Sp 1395,16-1412,17; Sp 1195,1-30 (*ad* Vin II 93,14-17). Their interpretation, and that of BHS and Skt. parallels as well, is most aptly dealt with in the following works, where fully detailed discussions are to be found: KaVā 1-16; v.Hi., *Recht u. Phonetik* (English transl.: v.Hi., SP 198-232); HH, Po-v 199-209; for further Pā. materials, see CPD *s.v. kamma* and foll. (forthcoming). For a summary of Chin. data, with references, see Frauwallner, *Vinaya* 105-107.

1. The validity of a procedure depends on the relevance of the case (*vatthu*); on the explicit mention during its performance, by the monk/nun acting as chairman, of the chapter (*saṃgha*) and of the person(s) to whom the procedure applies; on the relevance, right number, and full performance with flawless pronunciation² of its successive steps (*ñatti* and *anu-ssāvanā*; see below §§ 4-5) in the right order; on the attendance, whether in person (*sammukhī-bhūta*) or by proxy (*chandāraha*), of all the monks/nuns concerned³, i.e., free from any unredressed offence,

¹ With the exception of the *saṃghādisesa* class of offences, disciplinary procedures apply only indirectly to the offences listed in the Pātim. code of discipline (cf. below, § 3 d and n. 23, and SVTT III).

² See v.Hi., *Recht u. Phonetik* (English transl.: v.Hi., SP 198-232), with full translation of Sp 1399,3-1400,36, detailed commentary, and further references.

³ *kammappatta*, "fit [to act] in a procedure" (Vin I 318,10-11 sqq. with Sp 1146,28-30; II 93,34-38 with Sp 1197,11-14; V 221,16; cf. Sp 242,29, 1333,18, 1402,2-5), as opposed to *kammāraha*, "liable to a procedure", always in gen. case when followed by *kammaṃ karoti* (see v.Hi., *Kasussyntax* § 242): Vin IV 37,26 = 126,33 [misprinted Kkh 124,29 as *kammārabhassa*] = 152,19 = 153,29 (*na kammārahassa vā kammaṃ karissati*, instead of which UpāliPr(SR)

belonging to one and the same community, and actually present within one and the same, large enough, clearly defined monastic boundary (*simā*)⁴; on the right quorum of monks/nuns in the assembly (*parisā*), and absence of any objection during the proceedings⁵. A procedure that fails to meet any of these conditions is said to be of “mock validity” (*dhamma-paṭirūpaka*). Further details occur, from a slightly different point of view, in the account of the first rule for the settlement of disputes (see SVTT II, § 2 a and n. 30).

consistently has “weil etwas, das kein Beschluss ist, zum Beschluss erklärt wird”); V 221,32-34 with Sp 1402,10-12; Kkh 46,21-22 = Sp 611,18-19 *ad* Vin III 175,15**, especially relevant here: *tinnaṃ uddham kammārahā na honti na hi saṃgho saṃghassa kammaṃ karoti*: “when more than three, [those who plan to split the Order] are not liable to a procedure: a chapter does not indeed carry out a procedure against a chapter [i.e., four monks; see below, § 2]”. *Kammāraha* therefore designates the object (*vatthu*) of a procedure (disciplinary or otherwise: cf. *upasampadāraha*, “fit to be ordained”, Vin I 327,15 sq.) as is made clear by Sp 1402,10-12 *yasmā tam puggalaṃ vatthum katvā saṃgho kammaṃ karoti, tasmā kammāraho ti vuccati* (cf. 1156,26-28, 1346,20-22).

Some confusion arises from the fact that *kammāraha* does indeed occur as a syn. of *kammappatta* — by analogy with *chandāraha*, “fit [to act in a procedure] by proxy”? — in Sp’s stereotyped gloss of the latter: *kammappatto ti kammaṃ patto kammayutto kammāraha*, where it means “entitled to [act in] a procedure” (Sp 1146,28-30, 1402,2-5, etc.), unlike Vjb (B^e 1960) 537,16-17 *kammappattāyo pīti kammārahā ti* where, conversely, *kammappatta* does seem to assume the sense of *kammāraha* “liable to a procedure” (see SVTT II n. 10).

⁴ Each of two distinct communities may perform separate, valid procedures within the same boundary (Vin I 340,11-30); for full details about the importance of *simā* in the present context, see KP, *Simā* 119-123, 136-143, 286-290, 385 n. 65.

⁵ During the session, one may protest with such mildness as suits the number and aggressiveness of one’s opponents (Vin I 114,33-115,11 with Sp 1059,20-23). Once it is over, its contestation gives rise to a “formal dispute about the duties” of the Order (*kiccādhikaraṇa*; see SVTT II § 1d, 2e, and n. 6).

No one may criticize a valid procedure in which he/she took part by proxy (thereby agreeing *ipso facto* to whatever decision is reached)⁶. Neither may one leave the chapter with no serious reason while deliberations are going on, unless one consents expressly to whatever decision will be reached⁷.

2. The smallest quorum of monks/nuns entitled to act as a regular, complete chapter (*samagga-saṃgha*) is four; this chapter may perform all procedures except those involved in ordination (*upa-sampadā*), Invitation (*pavāraṇa*), and re-admission (*abbhāna*). A chapter of five or more may proceed to Invitation, and to ordination in border countries; ten or more may grant ordination in any country; twenty or more may perform any procedure, including re-admission (cf. SVTT III, § 6). When the smallest quorum acts as a regular chapter, participation by proxy is not valid⁸. No incomplete chapter may carry out a procedure with the expectation of later securing the sanction (*anumati-kappa*) of

⁶ Thv(M) Pāc. n°79 [bhu], Vin IV 151,17 sq. with Kkh 131,21 sq.; n°157 [bhi]. — Cf. UpāliPr(SR) 79, n°55. — Conc.: BhiPr 58, table IV.1 *s.v.* *chandapratyuddhāraḥ*.

⁷ Thv(M) Pāc. n°80 [bhu], Vin IV 152,24 sq. with Kkh 134,30-135,9, Sp 879,28-880,2 (ChinSp 483 [61]); n°158 [bhi]. — Cf. UpāliPr(SR) 87-88, n°79. — Conc.: BhiPr 59, table IV.1 *s.v.* *tūṣṇim viprakramaṇaṃ*.

⁸ Vin V 221,31-38 with Sp 1402,1-9, where *catu-°*, *pañca-°*, *dasa-°*, *vīsati-vagga-karaṇa kamma* does not mean “a formal act [...] carried out by an incomplete [*vagga* < Skt. *vyagra*] fourfold [etc.] assembly” (BD IV 362), but “a procedure whose performance involves a fourfold chapter”, etc.: when not contrasted with *samagga*, “complete”, *vagga* simply means “group” (< Skt. *varga*), as in Vin I 319,24 sq. *catuvagga bhikkhu-saṃgha*, “a fourfold monks’ chapter” (see BD IV 458). *Gaṇa* “chapter” occurs at Vin I 74,10; BhiVin(Mā-L) 236,27', 241,25', 242,13'.

those missing⁹. All participants should be fully ordained, and free from any unredressed offence against the monastic rules. Persons not entitled to help make up a quorum (*gaṇa-pūra*) are: the monk(s)/nun(s) to whom the procedure applies (in such a case, the smallest number of participants, including the smallest regular chapter, is therefore resp. five, six, eleven, twenty-one persons), those staying outside the fixed boundary, and nuns (in a monks' chapter)¹⁰.

Although monks may indicate to nuns how procedures relating to the latter should be carried out, nuns are to officiate all by themselves in their own chapter¹¹.

3. The generic term for “procedure”, occurring *passim* in all *Vinaya* texts, is Pā. *saṃgha-kamma*, n., BHS and Skt. *saṃgha-karma(n)*, n., “(official) act of the chapter”, often shortened as *kamma* / *karma*.

The four formal types of procedures are *apalokaṇā*-°, *ñatti*-°, *ñatti-dutiya*-°, *ñatti-catuttha-kamma*; only the latter two require a vote.

With one exception (see below, § 3 a), the type of procedure applying to a given purpose may not be changed for any other.

⁹ Vin II 301,1-3. This is one of the ten controversial practices said to have been condemned in Vesāli before a compilation (*saṅgīti*) of the *Vinaya* took place there (Chin. parallels: Hofinger, Concile 22-23, 66-73, 127, 132, 134-135; cf. SVTT II, § 2 b.ii).

¹⁰ The only explicit mention of a procedure carried out by a chapter of monks with a nun attending seems to be that of ordination of a (female) probationer by proxy (Vin II 277,20-278,9).

¹¹ About non-disciplinary procedures see, e.g., Vin II 259,26-31, 273,19-34, 275,23-35; about disciplinary ones, see Vin II 260,17-261,17 (cf. SVTT II n. 10).

As to the application of each of these types of procedure, Vin V 222,22-37, KKh 131,32-134,4, and Sp 1402,18-1412,12, make a distinction between those whose purpose is designated by some generic term — expulsion, boycott, reintegration, formal agreement to some appointment, postponement of a ceremony, distribution of extra requisites, acknowledgement of another monk's/nun's confession, formal admonition of a misbehaving monk/nun, etc. — and those that bear no specific name, being simply “qualified by [the generic name of] the procedure [involved]” (*kamma-lakkhaṇa*)¹².

¹² *Tassa hi kammañ ñeva lakkhaṇaṃ, na osāraṇādīni, tasmā kamma-lakkhaṇan ti vuccati* (Sp 1404,16-17 ≠ Kkh 132,10-12). *Osāraṇa-nissāraṇa-bhaṇḍukammādayo viya kammañ ca hutvā aññañ ca nāmaṃ na labhati. Kammam eva hutvā upalakkhiyatīti kamma-lakkhaṇaṃ upanissayo viya. Hetupaccayādi-lakkhaṇavimutto hi sabbo paccaya-viseso tattha saṅgayhati. Evam pi kamma-lakkhaṇam evā ti vuttaṃ. Kamma-lakkhaṇaṃ dassetuṃ acchinnacivara-jinṇacivara-naṭṭhacivarānan* [Sp 1405,19] *ti ādi vuttaṃ. Tato atirekaṃ dentena apaloketvā dātabban* [Sp 1405,24-25] *ti vuttaṃ apalokaṇaṃ kamma-lakkhaṇam eva. Evaṃ sabbattha lakkhaṇaṃ veditabbaṃ.* “Like reintegration, expulsion, shaving the beard [of a candidate for ordination], etc., [such an official act] consists in a procedure, but bears no name apart [from the generic name of the latter]. When it is qualified simply as consisting in [this or that] procedure, the qualification by the [generic name of the] procedure is comparable to [that of] sufficing condition, which includes any sort of condition that is not qualified as a fundamental condition. In the same way, one speaks of qualification by the [generic name of the] procedure. As an illustration of the latter, cases such as those when garments are stolen, worn out, or lost, are mentioned. The formal consultation mentioned by the words “extra [trifles] should be distributed by a formal consultation” is qualified simply as a procedure [of formal consultation]. Thus should the qualification be understood in all cases” (Vjb B^e 1960 579,24-580,6 *ad* Sp 1404,16 sq.). The itemized classification of the objects to which these procedures apply differs according to school (see Hirakawa, ChinBhīVin(Mā) 30-31).

3 a. An *apalokanā*, n.f., “[formal] consultation [of the chapter]”, consists in a threefold request of the chapter's approval¹³ for the following acts: temporary expulsion, then reintegration, of novices, shaving of the hair and beard of a candidate to noviciate, boycott of disrespectful monks by nuns.

Formal consultation with no specific name applies, e.g., to the boycott of lewd monks by nuns; to the supply of clothes to those who lost them, or of food to those unable to go on alms-tour; to the distribution to monks/nuns of extra medicines, trifles, crops grown on the monastery's grounds, or of food as wages to servants and intendants; to the allotment of deposits to repairs within the monastery¹⁴.

Formal consultation is valid as an alternative to a twofold procedure (see below, § 3 c) only in minor proceedings, e.g., turning a building into a storage place, or appointing a monk/nun to some office (Sp 1098,7-8, 1121,8-11, 1396,3-8 ≠ 1195,18-24).

BHS *an-avalokayitvā*: BhiVin(Mā-L) 144,8** sqq., 282,12,16** sqq.

avalokanā, f. (also as *avalokanā-karma*): BhiVin(Mā-L) 98,7, 144,17, 145,1, 151,26, 157,28, 161,7, 282,22', 284,1 sq.

¹³ The typical formula to be uttered thrice by the chairman (on the latter, see below, § 6) is: “Venerables, I ask the chapter [about this or that decision]; does the chapter approve (*rucati samghassa*)?” (see, e.g., Sp 1402,29-35). The chapter's consent is not expressed. The Mā-L typical formula occurs at BhiVin(Mā-L) 145,1-9, 282,22-26' (cf. Nolot, Règles 378-379). On Pā. *apa-*/BHS, Skt. *ava-*, see v.Hi., Schriftlichkeit 50-51 and n. 108; v.Hi., Mündlichkeit 25.

¹⁴ As *kamma-lakkhaṇa*, formal consultation is the procedure by which various monastic arrangements (*katikā*) are reached (Kkh 132,15-17 [spelled *kathikā*]; Sp 1138,13-21; see CPD s.v. *katika-vatta*, *katikā*; Katk(R) 6). Cf. SVTT III, second part of n. 48.

No **Skt.** parallel has been traced so far (see HH, Po-v 206 n. 3).

3 b. A *ñatti-kamma*, “procedure consisting in a motion (*ñatti*, see below, § 4)” — or, perhaps better, “resolution¹⁵ as the very motion” — is a single request for the chapter's approval¹⁶.

It applies to the introduction into the chapter of a candidate for ordination, or to formal agreement as to his/her preliminary interrogation; to barring an unskilled monk from participation in a committee (see SVTT II, § 2 b.ii); to the decision either to proceed to or to postpone the ceremonies of Observance and Invitation; to the return to a monk/nun of something which had first to be forfeited formally because unduly acquired; to formal acceptance by the chapter of the confession of an offence by a monk/nun.

A *ñatti-kamma* with no specific name applies to the decision to proceed to the settlement of a formal dispute by covering it up (see SVTT II, § 2d.ii).

¹⁵ With *kamma* short for *kamma-vācā*, “legal proposition together with final resolution” (see below, § 5). As “performance of the motion”, *ñatti-kamma* denotes the first stage of a larger procedure (the term occurs in this latter sense at Kkh 196,29 [ad Vin IV 317,27]; in a formally identical context, Kkh 46,17-18 [ad Vin III 174,9] has *ñatti-pariyosāna*, “completion of the motion”).

¹⁶ The typical Pā. formula is: “Venerables, let the chapter listen to me [: this is the case in point]; if it seems right to the chapter, [let this or that be done about it]” (see, e.g., Sp 1409,26 sq.). The motion is referred to only in the sentence (sometimes missing altogether, e.g., at Vin III 196,31-34 = Sp 1410,20-23) introducing the procedure: *samgho ñāpetabbo*, “the chapter should be informed [as follows]”. As is the case with the procedure of formal consultation, the chapter's final consent is not expressed. Unlike the Thv(M) Vin, Skt. Mū. texts regularly mark the end of the procedure by the words *eṣā jñaptiḥ*, “this is the motion”.

No BHS parallel has been traced so far.

Skt. *jñapti*, short for *jñapti-karman*: (Mu) Adhik-v 72,1, 75,21, 77,6 sq., 78,28, 107,21 (footnote)¹⁷; HH, Po-v § 31.1 (= MSV(D) IV 82,8), § 49.2 (= KP, Simā 413 ≠ MSV(D) IV 90,6); KC, Kath-v 54,25 sq. (= MSV(D) II 155,14 sq.); MSV(D) II 178,12.

jñapti-karman: (Mū) MSV(D) II 101,16, 206,19 sq., III 7,11 (*jñāpti-k°* Mvy(M) 266.2) — cf. HH, Po-v 206-207.

muktikā jñapti, f., “isolated motion”¹⁸: (Mū) BhiKaVā(S)¹⁹ 252,17; Upj 13,7, 17,15; Wille, MSV 148 (GBM 2.145, r°2) (Mvy(M) 266.1 m° *jñāpti*).

¹⁷ Adhik-v 72,1, 75,21, 78,28 *kriyājñapti* should be read *kriyā j°*; the sentence *yā saṃghasya kriyā jñapti jñapti-dvītiyaṃ jñapti-caturthaṃ* is paralleled by Vin II 89,2, 93,14-15 *yā saṃghassa kiccayatā karaṇiyatā apalokana-kammaṃ ñatti-kammaṃ ñ°-dutiya-kammaṃ ñ°-catuttha-kammaṃ*. Although *kriyā* might be interpreted *prima facie*, on account of its position in the sequence, as short for *kriyā-kāra*, “arrangement” (Pā. *katikā*) and therefore as a metonymic syn. of Pā. *apalokana-kamma* (cf. CPD s.v. *katikā*; (Mū) MSV(D) IV 133,1 sq.; Divy 338,13 sq., reproduced at MSV(D) IV 38,20 sq.; and above, § 3 a), it is in fact parallel to Pā. *kiccayatā karaṇiyatā*, these three terms being syn. with *karman/kamma*, “procedure” (see HH, Po-v 200-201, 206 n. 3).

¹⁸ A *muktikā jñapti* is equivalent neither to a *ñatti-dutiya-kamma*, (Nolot, Règles 378 n. 9), nor to an *apalokanā-kamma* (v.Hi., Recht u. Phonetik 102-103; English transl.: SP 200 n. 2 [the right refs. to Upj are: 13,7, 17,15]), but to a *ñatti-kamma*: Upj 13,7-10 *muktikā jñapti* (referred to in Guṇ-VinSū(Pravr-v) 11,17 as *jñapti*); concluded and identified by this latter term in KaVā(Mū)₂ 62,10 ≠ Wille, MSV 148 (GBM 2.145, r°2-5) ≠ BhiKaVā(S) 252,17-253,3 (referred to by v.Hi., *ib.* 103 = SP 200 n. 2, from R/VP's edition in BSOS), correspond to the *ñatti-kamma* set forth at Vin I 94,26-29 ≠ II 272,29-32 (introduced by *saṃgho ñāpetabbo*; cf. above, n. 16); Upj 17,15-18,2 *muktikā jñapti* (referred to in Guṇ-VinSū(Pravr-v) 11,31 as *jñapti*); concluded and identified by this latter term in KaVā(Mū)₂ 64,11) ≠ BhiKaVā(S) 254,30-255,5 (with paraphrastic *jñaptim kṛtvā karma kartavyam*), 256,20-26, correspond to the *ñatti-kamma* set forth at Vin I 95,10-12 ≠ II 273,13-15.

Continues...

3 c. A *ñatti-dutiya-kamma* consists of two parts: first a motion (*ñatti*; see below, § 4), then the passing of a resolution (*kamma*, *k°-vācā*, see below, § 5) as its second (*dutiya*) part²⁰. It applies to the boycott of an offending lay donor's gifts by “turning the alms-bowls upside down” until he makes amends; to formal agreement about the monastery's boundaries, about the exceptional relaxation of rules about clothes or

(Mū) Saṅghabh II 80,1 sqq., 83,19 sq., uses the phrase *meṣakena ājñāpay-*, “to enjoin [a monk and his followers to stop plotting to split a community] by a *meṣaka*”; the same verb occurs at II 80,14 sqq. with *jñapti-caturthena* (see below, § 3 d) as a complement, which led Gnoli to suggest hesitatingly that *meṣaka* might be “in the sense of *muktikā* ?” (*ib.* 80 n. 1). Neither the editor's reading, nor the meaning of the term, nor whether it denotes a procedure, are beyond question: its description contains none of the characteristic features of a procedure, and it never qualifies the word *karman* in this text — although it does in Guṇ-VinSū 26,18: *nājñāpayeyur metha(?)kena karmanā* (editor's question-mark; the only recorded meaning of *methaka*, “quarrel, strife” [see BHSD s.v.] does not seem to make sense here). In any case, it can hardly be the equivalent of a *muktika jñapti*.

According to Mukherjee, Devadatta 85, the Chin. Mū. (VinVibh) parallel states that monks should “urge” (*bewegen*) the offending monk, before a *jñapti-caturtha* is carried out against him (the closest, fragmentary Skt. parallel is SHT (VI) 181 (1539), corresponding to Saṅghabh II 83,21 sq. [cf. Vin III 176,20'-30']; SHT(V) 67-68 (1075) corresponds to Saṅghabh II 85,1 sq. [cf. VinVibh(R) 71, § 10; Vin III 173,15'-174,8']).

¹⁹ The Mū. origin of BhiKaVā(R/VP), reedited by M. Schmidt [BhiKaVā(S)], has long been known; see now the latter's article “Zur Schulzugehörigkeit einer nepalischen Handschrift der Bhikṣuṇi-Karmavācānā”, *SWTF Beiheft 5* (1994), 156-164.

²⁰ Sp 242,31 sq., 1195,8-13 gives no grammatical analysis of *ñatti-dutiya-°*, *ñ°-catuttha-kamma*. These cpds. are generally translated: “(procedure) with a motion as its second / fourth part”, which, though supported by (Mū) Guṇ-VinSū(Pravr-v) 5,5-6 *jñapti-caturthena karmanā iti tisro vācānā jñapti-caturthā yasmin karmaṇi tad jñapti-caturthaṃ karma*, does not account for the fixed order — motion first — that is one of the conditions for the validity of the procedure (see above, § 1). HH, Po-v 208-209 suggests to relate *ñ°-d°*, *ñ°-c°* as *tatpuruṣa-s* to *-°kamma*, taken here to mean the final “decision” (see below, § 5), “standing in the ‘second’ / ‘fourth’ place from that of the ‘motion’ (*ñattiyā*)”.

bedding, or about the appointment of monks/nuns as office-bearers; to the distribution of cloth acquired from donors or left by a deceased monk; to the official closing of the period meant for reception of cloth from donors; to the investigation by the chapter of the site of planned individual dwellings before they may be built.

In some cases, this twofold procedure may be replaced by a formal consultation of the chapter (see above, § 3 a).

A *ñatti-dutiya-kamma* with no specific name applies to the third, last set of procedures involved in covering up disputes (see SVTT II, § 2d.ii).

No BHS parallel has been traced so far.

Skt. *jñāpti-dvītiya karman*: (Mū) Adhik-v 72,1-2, 75,21, 77,6 sq., 78,25 sq.; Bendall, Ord. Ritual 376 (B3)²¹; HH, Po-v § 25, § 31.1, § 38.1, § 49.2 (= MSV(D) 80,20, 82,8, 86,5, 90,6); MSV(D) II 178,12, 207,1 sq. (Mvy(M) 266.3 *jñāpti-d*^o).

3 d. A *ñatti-catuttha-kamma* consists of four parts: first a motion, then the passing of a resolution as its fourth part, after the latter has been put three times to the chapter²². It applies to seven penalties²³ which are not formally included in the Patim. code of discipline, but have to be carried out, then cancelled, after decisions and under the supervision of the chapter; to the formal appointment of a monk as exhorter of nuns; to the application and control of the *mānatta* and *parivāsa* penalties (see

²¹ One would expect *jñāpti-caturtha k*^o: see *ib.*, B7, and the parallel at BhiKaVā(S) 255,12-256,4.

²² Cf. above, n. 20.

²³ *tajjanīya*-^o, threefold *ukkhepanīya*-^o, *patisāraṇīya*-^o, *nissaya*-^o, and *pabbājanīya-kamma*.

SVTT III); to the formal threefold admonition of a monk/nun about to commit a *saṃghādisesa* offence.

A *ñatti-catuttha-kamma* with no specific name applies to ordination, and to rehabilitation after completion of the *mānatta* penalty.

BHS *jñāpti-caturtha karma*: BhiVin(Mā-L) 42,6, 50,3, 57,7-8, 76,8²⁴.

Skt. *jñāpti-caturtha karman*: (Sa) Filliozat/Kuno, FragmVin 40 (3a5, 3b2), 41-42 (4b1, 4b3), 46 (6b3, 7a4), 47 (7b4); Finot 1911 622 (Ia6). — (Sa?)²⁵ SHT(V) 59 (1068, Bl.204, r^o3). — (Mū) Adhik-v 72,2, 75,21, 78,29, 107,21; BhiKaVā(S) 271,12; Guṇ-VinSū(Pravr-v) 5,5 sq., 12,2; HH, Po-v § 25, § 31.1, § 38.1, § 49.2 (= MSV(D) IV 80,20, 82,8, 86,5-6, 90,6); KaVā(Mū)₂ 72,12-13; MSV(D) II 178,12, 207,3 sq., III 7,11; SHT(V) 68 (1075, r^o3) (Mvy(M) 266.4, 270.41 *jñāpti-c*^o).

4. Procedures 3b, 3c, 3d begin (and 3b ends) with one motion: Pā. *ñatti*, BHS and Skt. *jñāpti*, f., during which the chairman first calls the chapter to attention, then states the case and the person(s) concerned, then (except for 3b) calls for a vote; the end of the motion is marked by the words Pā. *eṣā ñatti* (except for 3b: see above, n. 16), **Skt.** *eṣā jñāptiḥ*, "this is the motion", **BHS** *ovāyikā eṣā jñāptiḥ*, "this is the appropriate motion"²⁶.

²⁴ This is preceded, to give a further precision, by the epithet *traivācika*, "involving three propositions", which occurs on its own at 143,18.

²⁵ Bl. 206 v^o2 of this ms. has the form *pātayamṭika*, which seems to be typically Sa. (see v.Hi., Bestimmung 63-66; v.Hi., Oldest Pā.Ms. 22).

²⁶ In BhiVin(Mā-L), this formula occurs exclusively in connexion with fourfold procedures (25,8-9, 41,4-5, 49,2, 54,2, 56,7, 66,8, 70,26, 143,13, 236,11, 241,6, 244,5-6), whereas PrMoSū(Mā-L) 5,16 connects it with a twofold one. See Roth, BhiVin(Mā-L) § 25 n. 2; Roth, Term. 347-348 (= Roth, IS 88-89). At

BHS *jñapti*, f.: BhīVin(Mā-L) 236,27', 241,25', 242,13' (only *iic.*).

Skt. *jñapti*, f.: (Sa) Filliozat/Kuno, *FragmVin* 40 (3b2); *Finot* 1911 622 (Ia6); *KaVā* 31 (28.5), 32 (31.6), 33 (34.2), 36 (50.7), 38 (59.4), 39 (62.5), 41 (69.2 [cf. SHT(I) 78 (132)]), 42 (73.5), 45 (91.3), 46 (94.3); *VinVibh(R)* 71 (end of 12); *VP, NF* 847,12. — (Mū) *Adhik-v* 83,15 sq., 85,8 sq., 96,8 sq., 99,14 sq., 106,30 sq.; *Bendall, Ord.Ritual* 375 (A3, A4); *BhīKaVā(S)* 254,30, 255,5 sq., 256,20 sq., 258,7 sq.²⁷; *Guṇ-VinSū* 99,8,28, 100,17, 102,30, 105,8; *HH, Po-v* § 37.1 sqq. (= *MSV(D)* IV 84,19 sqq.); *KP, Sīmā* 389, 401); *KaVā* § 113 (12) = *SHT (VI)* 136 (1437, v^o2); *KaVā(Mū)*₂ 58,7; *KC, Kaṭh-v* 52,28 sq., 54,8 (= *MSV(D)* II 153,8 sq., 155,5); *MSV(D)* II 101,15, 120,10 sq., 121,4, 206,20 sqq., III 6,5 sq., 10,10 sq., 12,13 sq., 24,16 sq.; *Upj* 18,5 sq.; etc. — *unid.sch.*: *SHT (VI)* 129 (1419, v^o4).

5. The motion is to be followed by a single or threefold “subsequent proclamation” (*anu-ssāvanā*, f.²⁸) of the “legal proposition” (*kamma-vācā*, f.²⁹), during which the chairman states the case once more, then the

BhīVin(Mā-L) 54,2, *prajñaptiḥ* is most probably a copyist's *pamāda-lekha*; on *ib.* 30,3 *ovaśikāye*, see Nolot, *Règles* 18 n. 42.

²⁷ On the *nom.ag. jñapti-kāraka* occurring in this text, see below, end of § 6.

²⁸ To be distinguished from *anussāvana*, n., “praise”, *Vin V* 202,30 (quoted as *anusāvana* by *Sp [E^c]* 1378,1), as pointed out by v.Hi., *Recht u. Phonetik* 103, 116 (English transl.: v.Hi., *SP* 201 n. 3, 218 [who remarks that *Sp* 1399,3-4 *anusāvanam* should read *sāvanam* (*Vin V* 221,2)]); the meaning “praise” can, however, hardly apply at *Vin I* 93,2-14 (with *Sp* 1033,5-20); the point needs further investigation. On the *nom.ag. Pā. anu-ssāvaka*, *BHS anuśrāvaṇācaryā*, see below, § 6 and n. 34.

²⁹ *Skt.* (Mū) *Po-v karma-vācanā* occurs in this narrow sense, and is therefore syn. with *BHS anu-śrāvaṇā*, *Pā. anu-ssāvanā*. In a broader sense, the term refers to a text describing the complete set of procedures to be carried out for a particular purpose (e.g., ordination), or to a collection of such texts; still more broadly, it refers to a set of ritual proceedings not connected with the internal

Continues...

matter to be decided upon by vote, then calls for this vote by inviting those who agree to keep silent; he/she finally declares once, by a solemn statement (no technical term), that the resolution is passed.

BHS *anu-śrāvaṇā*, f.: BhīVin(Mā-L) 236,28', 241,26', 242,13', 244,24' (only *iic.*).

karma-vācanā, f.: BhīVin(Mā-L) 30,11 sq., 42,1 sq., 49,13, 54,12, 71,5, 143,18, etc.

Skt. *anu-śrāvaṇā*, n.: (Mū) *Guṇ-VinSū* 100,17. — *anu-śrāvayanti*: (Mū) *MSV(D)* II 207,1 sq.³⁰

karman, short for *karma-vācanā*³¹: (Mū) *Adhik-v* 83,15 sq., 85,8 sq., 96,8 sq., 99,15 sq., 106,30 sq.; *BhīKaVā(S)* 254,30, 255,21, 258,7

dealings of a monastic community (e.g., solemn undertaking of vows by lay followers) (see *HH, Po-v* 201-206; *KP, Sīmā* 418 n. 147).

³⁰ It is not sure whether (Sa) *Filliozat/Kuno, FragnVin* 49 (9a4) *anu-śrāvita*-mf., and (Mū) *MSV(D)* II 206,13 sq. *anu-śrāvaṇā*, n., are *t.t.Vin.*, referring respectively to the fourfold procedure of ordination and to the procedures involved in the penalties (listed above, n. 23) entailing some kind of boycott, then reintegration (cf. *MSV(D)* III 6,3-32,12).

Anu-śrāvaṇā, f., occurring (Sa) *Finot* 475,7 (cf. *PrMoSū* 33 [ASd, r^o4], 159 [BNb, r^o3], 180 [BTa, v^o4], 218 [DM, r^o2]), and *PrMoSū(Mū)*₂ 12,8 is no *t.t.Vin. stricto sensu*, although the *nidān'uddesa* (introduction to the recitation of the Pātim.) does show some of the formal features (but lacks the explicit motion) of a *ñatti-catuttha-kamma* (parallels: *samanu-śrāvayisyati*, -^o*śrāvīyamāna*-, *PrMoSū(Mā-L)* 6,9-10; *anu-ssāvīta*, *anu-ssāvīyamāna*-, *Vin I* 103,5 sq.; cf. *Kkh* 15,21-16,21 [with *anu-sāvāṇa*, n.: cf. above, n. 28]).

In *Mū.* texts, the ger. *anu-śrāvayitavyam* corresponds to *Pā. saṃgho ñāpetabbo*, “the chapter is to be informed” (cf. above, n. 16) which *precedes* both the motion and the one- or threefold proclamation (*anu-sāvanā*); the *Skt.* term therefore means “the proclamation [of the motion] is to be proceeded to”, and does not refer to the *anu-śrāvaṇā* taking place *after* the motion; *anu-śrāvayitavyam* is, accordingly, regularly echoed by *eṣā jñaptiḥ* after the motion has just been put: (Sa) *Finot* 1911 622 (Ia3); *KaVā* § 109.1, § 117.4; *VinVibh(R)* 71 (11), 217 (2).

sq.; HH, Po-v § 17.3 sq., § 30.2 sq., § 37.1 sq. (= MSV(D) IV 78,8 sq., 81,14 sq., 84,20 sq., the latter = KP, *Simā* 389); KC, Kaṭh-v 52,28 sq., 54,8 (= SHT(VI) 136 (1437, v²) = KaVā § 113 [12] = MSV(D) II 153,8 sq., 155,5); MSV(D) III 6,5 sq., 10,10 sq., 12,13 sq., 24,16 sq.; Saṅghabh II 80,18, 81,1, 83,9; Upj 18,5 sq.; etc.

karma-vācanā, f.: (Sa) most probably to be reconstructed VinVibh(R) 72 (13, 14): see HH, Po-v 205(-206) n. 4. — (Mū) Adhik-v 96,19, 99,33, 107,9³²; Bendall, Ord.Ritual 376 (B7); BhīKaVā(S) 256,4, 259,10; Guṇ-VinSū(Pravr-v) 11,18; HH, Po-v § 44.5d, § 51 (= MSV(D) IV 88,2 sq., 90,13 = KP, *Simā* 402, 418); KaVā(Mū)₂ 65,1; MSV(D) III 6,22 sq., 13,6 sq.; Mvy(M) 266.4-7; Upj 18,19.

vācanā, f. (short for *karma-v^o*): (Mu) Guṇ-VinSū 99,8, 102,30, 105,8; Guṇ-VinSū(Pravr-v) 5,5.

6. In Pā. texts, no technical term designates the monk/nun who is to officiate as chairman of the chapter; the phrase that regularly introduces the performance of a procedure is *vyattena bhikkhunā paṭibalena/vyattāya bhikkhuniyā paṭibalāya saṃgho nāpetabbo*, “the chapter is to be informed about the motion by a competent, able monk/nun”³³.

³¹ See KaVā 14-15; KP, *Simā* 390 n. 81; HH, Po-v 200. Whether it reflects an Indian original (not necessarily Mā: cf. Brough, review of BhīVin(Mā-L), BSOAS 36 676a; deJ., Fa-hsien 112), or is a specifically Chinese translator's device, this use of *karman* seems to occur also in Chin. Mā texts (Hirakawa, ChinBhīVin(Mā) 69, 75, 81, 104).

³² In their description of fourfold procedures, this text and Saṅghabh occasionally abridge, or omit altogether, the mention of the threefold proposition (Adhik-v 96,19-20, 99,33-34, 107,9-10; Saṅghabh II 84,32).

³³ See, e.g., Vin I 123,14-15, II 41,35-36, 272,28-29, III 187,7-8, IV 319,11-12.

The *nom.ag.* Pā. *anu-ssāvaka*, “proclaimer” (Vin I 74,9, ordination context) seems to refer to the chairman leading the procedure³⁴.

BHS *karma-kāraka*, m., °*kārikā*, f., “officer, chairman”: BhīVin(Mā-L) 24,7, 28,7, 36,13, 44,2 sq., 48,9, 53,10, 55,23, 70,23, 235,22, 312,2 sq., etc.

Sa. **Skt.** texts state, still more tersely than Pā. texts, that procedures should be conducted *ekena bhikṣuṇā*, “by one monk”: KaVa § 109.1; VinVibh(R) 71(11).

The terminology of Mu Skt. texts is not standardized:

ekena bhikṣuṇā: Adhik-v 96,7, 99,14, 106,29; HH, Po-v § 17.3, § 30.2, § 37.1, § 40.2, § 44.3, etc. (= MSV(D) IV 78,7, 81,14, 84,19 [the latter = KP, *Simā* 389], ≠ 86,12, 87,13, etc.); MSV(D) II 192,18, III 6,5, 10,10; Saṅghabh II 80,17, 83,8 etc.;

karma-kāraka, m., °*kārikā*, f. (followed [+]) or not [-] by *bhikṣu*, *bhikṣuṇī*: Bendall, Ord.Ritual 375 (A1[+]); BhīKaVā(S) 252,10 sq.[+], 254,23 sq.[+], 256,11 sq.[+]; Guṇ-VinSū 99,18[+], 105,4[-]; Guṇ-VinSū (Pravr-v) 11,10 sq.[-], 12,5[-]; HH, Po-v § 51[-] (= MSV(D) IV 90,13 = KP, *Simā* 418), § 53.3[+] (= MSV(D) IV 91,3 = KP, *Simā* 420); MSV(D) III 97,7[-]; Mvy 8729[-] (but Mvy(M) 270.16 °*kāra*); Upj 13,3 sq.[+], 17,7 sq.[+]; Wille, MSV 148 (GBM 2.145, r²[+]).

BhīKaVā(S) 258,7 refers to the monk acting as chairman of a female probationer's fourfold ordination procedure as *jñapti-kāraka bhikṣu*, “performer of the motion”.

³⁴ According to Sp 996,25, it refers to the *ācariya*, “preceptor” of the candidate for ordination; according to Sp 1162,3-4, the preceptor is the one who utters the formulae (*kamma-vācā*, cf. above, n. 29) of the procedures involved; cf. BhīVin(Mā-L) *anuśrāvaṇācaryā* (same context), which does seem to refer to the nun acting as chairman (Nolot, Règles 395-396).

7. In Pā. texts, a valid procedure is termed *dhammika*, *a-kuppa*, *tthānāraha*, “legitimate, indisputable, appropriate to the case”, as opposed to *a-dhammika*, *kuppa*, *a-tthānāraha*³⁵. Although this fixed set of epithets occurs in contexts both of ordination and disciplinary procedures, in the latter the most frequent stock-phrase is *(a)dhamma-kammañ ca hoti (a)vinaya-kammañ ca du-/su-vūpasantañ ca*, “the procedure does / does not conform both to what is legitimate and to the Vinaya rules, and it is (im)properly settled” (Vin II 3,2 sqq. [truncated E° 8,20 sqq.]).

BHS *(a)dharma-karma*, *(a)sthānārha karma*, “(il)legitimate procedure, (in)appropriate to the case”: BhiVin(Mā-L) 275,24' sq.; Prakīrṇ(Mā-L) 328,7 sq.³⁶

Skt. *dharma*, *a-kopya*, *a-sthāpanārha*, “legitimate, indisputable, that there is no reason to discard”, with corresponding antonyms *a-dharma*,

³⁵ Vin I 313,16-18, III 24,10-11 ≠ IV 214,9-10; cf. ChinSp 182 “with no default” (*akuppa*). The inaccurate translation of BD I 42 is corrected at BD III 161, IV 448.

According to Kkh 17,25-19,35 (cf. Sp 243,1-5) *ad* Vin III 24,10-11, a procedure is sanctioned as “indisputable” with regard to its object, to the motion and subsequent proclamation(s), to the monastic boundary, and to the quorum required (see above, § 1-2); it is sanctioned as “fit to stand” in relation to its performance and to the Buddha's teachings.

³⁶ On *sthānāraho no asthānāraho* (*scil. bhikṣu*), see Nolot, *FragmMā(?)* 352-353.

Anāghāta-pañcama karma, “(fourfold) procedure with no objection as its fifth part”, occurs at BhiVin(Mā-L) 42,6-7, 50,3-4, 57,8, 76,9, in the final, solemn statement concluding the procedure by which a candidate becomes officially ordained; it occurs nowhere else in this or, as far as can be seen, other texts. According to Hirakawa, *ChinBhiVin(Mā)* 69, 75, 81, 104, this term is represented in Chin. Mā. by “there have been no objections to the one motion and the three *karma-s*”, “[the candidate] had no obstructing conditions when the one motion and three *karma-s* were performed” (cf. Nolot, *FragmMā(?)* 355 n. 11).

kopya, *sthāpanārha*: (Mū) BhiKaVā(S) 271,12³⁷; KaVā(Mū)₂ 72,13³⁸; MSV(D) II 101,16, 120,11³⁹, 176,8, 178,13, 191,4, III 73,16 sqq.; Upj 25,19⁴⁰; Wille, MSV 152 (GBM 2.129, r°6).

(a)kopyaṃ (a)sthāpanīyaṃ sa-/a-vastukam, “(in)disputable, (not) to be discarded, founded / unfounded”: (Mū?)⁴¹ SHT(V) 104 (1108, r°5, v°1).

dhārmika saṃgha-karaṇīya, n., “legitimate act of the chapter” (corresponding to Vin IV 152,6** *dhammika kamma*): (Sa) Finot 514,1; PrMoSū 68 (AWI, v°4), 125 (BLE, r°5-v°1). — (Mū) Erg.L.Ch 5,13. — *dhārmika-s°*: PrMoSū(Mū)₂ 37,18.

*

³⁷ Tentative restoration (*ib.* n. 394, with Tib. parallels); BhiKaVā(R/VP) 31b1 *akopyenāsthāna*.

³⁸ GBM(FacEd) X.1, 50 (90.4) *akopyenāsthāpanārheṇa*; ed. *akopyena anāsthāpanārheṇa* is erroneous.

³⁹ Cf. Schopen, *Funerals* 5.

⁴⁰ Ed. (and ms.?) *akopyanāsthāpanārheṇa*.

⁴¹ This fragment contains the term *sthalastha* (v°2 sqq.), occurring also in other Mū texts (see SVTT II, § 2 b.ii and n. 45) and, admittedly, at Prakīrṇ(Mā-L) 328,8; v°2 *dharma-karma ca bhavati vinaya-karma ca* stands very close to MSV(D) II 204,16 sqq. (cf. SHT(VI) 111 [1388, r°3 sq.]).

II. *Adhikaraṇa*, “legal question, formal dispute, case”

0. The range of application of this term — the specific Vinaya parallel to *aṭṭa*, “case” in a lay court¹ — covers all disputes that may arise within a monastic community. These disputes are classified into four kinds according to their subject-matter, and are to be dealt with according to one or several of the seven “rules for the settlement of disputes” (*adhikaraṇa-samatha dhamma*). The latter apply to both monks and nuns and form the seventh, and last, chapter of the Pātim.² Disputes and modes of settlement are however set forth in greater detail in the Samatha-kkhandhaka of the Cullavagga³, in the Parivāra⁴, and in MN⁵; a fairly good summary is given by Dutt, EBM 126-138; for a summary of Chin. data, with references, see Frauwallner, Vinaya 113-116.

¹ Sp 906,24-25; v.Hi., Begriffe 278 n. 12 (English transl.: v.Hi., SP 120 n. 12). Accordingly, no disputes but those involving monks/nuns may be termed *adhikaraṇa* (Vin II 92,8-93,23 with Sp 1197,9-10). Neither monks (Sp 909,29-910,8) nor nuns may sue laymen in secular courts (see v.Hi., Buddhist Law 25-26, 28-32, 35; the only Pātim. rule stating so explicitly applies to nuns: Thv(M) 1st Saṃgh., Vin IV 223,4-225,15 with Kkh 160,33-161,30, Sp 906,18-910,11. — Conc.: BhiPr 54, table II.1 s.v. *ussaya*).

² Vin IV 207,1-19** ≠ 351,1-16** with Kkh 153,26-156,15 (cf. Kkh 208,1-2; Sp 948,29-949,2). Conc.: Pachow, CompSt 211 sq. and *ib.*, Appendix IV.VIII, p. 22.

³ Vin II 73,1-104,11 (≠ v.Hi., Oldest Pā.Ms. 106a-107b4b) with Sp 1191,16-1199,11; cf. ChinSp 533-534.

⁴ Vin V 91,1-113,9 with Sp 1314,8-1317,31 (up to Vin V 93,7; Vin V 102,1-112,32 is dealt with in Vjb (B^c 1960) 548,1-551,12); 150,1-157,10 with Sp 1354,2-1359,18.

⁵ MN II 247,3-250,21 with Ps IV 42,4-46,25 ≠ Kkh 153,26-155,41 ≠ Sv 1040,27-1043,22 *ad* DN III 254,10-14.

The seven rules for the settlement of disputes imply formal proceedings (and sometimes procedures)⁶. The first of these rules (*sammukhā-vinaya*; see below, § 2 a) applies, wholly or in part, to all cases, together with whichever rule among the other six is relevant; applying the wrong one to an irrelevant case invalidates the proceedings⁷.

The regular, valid settlement of a dispute may not be criticized by absent monks/nuns who agreed to the proceedings by proxy⁸; neither may the dispute be reopened⁹.

Nuns should settle disputes within their own chapter¹⁰; a Pātim. rule applying specifically to them states that those who do not try their best to settle a dispute, when requested to do so, incur a Pāc. offence¹¹.

⁶ Settlements involving procedures involve *ipso facto* possible disputes concerning the latter (Vin V 111,3-10; cf. Vjb 550,24-551,4).

⁷ Vin II 93,24-104,11; I 325,26-328,23; V 103,12-105,25, 106,7-107,10, 107,24-109,35, 110,30-111,2, 112,10-113,3; cf. BD III 153-154.

⁸ Thv(M) Pāc. n°79 (refs. as above, SVTT I, n. 6).

⁹ Thv(M) Pāc. n°63 [bhu], Vin IV 126,1 sq. with Sp 865,27 sq., Kkh 124,13 sq.; n°144 [bhī]. — UpāliPr(SR) 61, n°4. — Dh [bhu]: CASF(II) 165, n°66. — Conc.: BhiPr 57, table IV.1 s.v. *khoṭanaṃ*.

¹⁰ Vin II 260,37-261,17. Although the exact meaning of *bhikkhuniyo kammappattāyo pi āpatti-gāminiyo pi* (261,7-8) is *prima facie* ambiguous (cf. BD V 362 n. 3), *kammappatta* is probably, if unexpectedly, syn. with *kammāraha*, “liable to a procedure”, as the syntax suggests: 261,9,13,14 *bhikkhunīnaṃ kammaṃ karontu, bhikkhunīnaṃ kammaṃ ropetvā, bhikkhunīnaṃ kammaṃ kātum*, all conform to the regular construction of *kammaṃ* with designation in the gen. case of the person who is the object of the procedure (see SVTT I n. 3). This is confirmed implicitly by Sp 1292,6-9 *ad* 261,12-13: *ettha tajanīyādisu* [i.e., the disciplinary procedures listed in SVTT I n. 23] *idaṃ nāma kamma etissā kātabbān ti evaṃ āropetvā*, and explicitly by Vjb (B^c 1960) 537,16-17: *kammappattāyo pīti kammārahā ti*.

1. The four subject-matters of disputes are controversies (*vivādādhikaraṇa*), censure (*anuvādādhikaraṇa*)¹², offences (*āpattādhikaraṇa*), and legal duties (*kiccādhikaraṇa*). Each one may be the cause of further disputes, or of one or several of the seven types of offences¹³: controversies may lead to the offence of insulting speech, censure to that of making a groundless charge, offences to that of concealing them, legal duties to that of disputing a sanction reached by a regular procedure.

The same applies to *bhikkhunīnaṃ kammaṃ na kariyati*, etc., in the preceding passage (Vin II 260,17-36), and is borne out both by 260,23 *kata-kamma*, whose sense “against whom a procedure was carried out”, “who was sentenced”, is clear from the context (though utterly misunderstood by CPD *s.v.*), and by 260,27 *khamāpentī*, “they ask forgiveness” (cf. Vin II 14,16-17 = III 183,33 with Sp 625,21-22 *dukkataṃ bhante amhehi na puna evaṃ karissāma khamatha amhākaṇaṃ* ti [= Sp 1292,4-5 *ad* Vin 260,27]). It is confirmed by Sp 1292,3-4 *kammaṃ na kariyatīti tajjanīyādi sattavidham pi kammaṃ na kariyati*, “no procedure was carried out — i.e. the seven [disciplinary] procedures, *tajjanīya* and the rest” (BD V 361 n. 1 is hardly correct), and corroborated by the context (Vin II 259,31-261,17 deals with the acknowledgment and redress of offences [Vin II 261,13,15 *kammaṃ ropetvā, āpattim ropetvā* mean resp. “stating a sentence” (Sp 1292,6-9), “charging with an offence” (*passim* Vin and *ct.s.*)]).

¹¹ Thv(M) Pāc. n°45, Vin IV 301,8 sq. — Conc.: BhīPr 67, table III.2.B.2 *s.v. vūpasamena*; see BhīVin(Mā-L) 275,6 sq.; Hirakawa, ChinBhīVin(Mā) 381-382.

¹² CPD's translations of *anuvādādhikaraṇa* (“case of joining one's party”), *anuvadanā*, *anullapanā*, *anubhaṇanā*, *anusampavaṅkatā*, *abbhussahanatā*, *anubalappadāna* (*q.v.*) are not supported by Sp 1194,21-29 *ad* Vin II 88,30-35, Sp 595,3-5 *ad* Vin III 164,9', and Kkh 153,38-39 = Ps IV 43,4-6, and are to be corrected according to BD V 117.

¹³ As listed below, n. 21; see Vin V 99,28-101,23, 111,14-112,9; Utt-vn 285-297. Vin V 101,28-102,38 further considers each type of dispute according to the “triple poison” it presupposes (*pubbamgama*), its ground (*thāna*), its subject-matter (*vatthu*), its base (*bhūmi*), its cause (*hetu*), and its aspect (*ākāra*), together with the rules applying for its settlement. Still further combinations (for mnemotechnic purposes) occur at Vin V 150,2-157,10.

BHS *adhi-karaṇa*, n.: BhīVin(Mā-L) 104,6**, 105,7**, 149,4** sq., 151,9, 160,1, 275,8,17**, 276,2' sq.; PrMoSū(Mā-L) 9,23 sq., 19,10, 35,2.

adhikaraṇa-sāmatha dharma, m.: BhīVin(Mā-L) 51,10; °-*sāmatha*: BhīVin(Mā-L) 300,1; PrMoSū(Mā-L) 35,1,11. — *sāmatha* (*sic* ms.), *sāmatha-vastu*: Prakīrṇ(Mā-L) 332,1; *sāmatha*: *ib.* 333,4-5.

Skt. *adhi-karaṇa*, n.: (Sa) BhīPr 32 (Pa₁₂, r°b); Finot 481,8, 482,1 sq., 11 sq., 503,4; PrMoSū 74 (AYI, r°1 sq.), 79 (AZb, r°4), 87 (BAM, r°5), 151 (BMh, r°3), 152 (BMi, v°2), 227 (EDd, v°4), 229 (FA, r°3), 275 (IN, r°2); VinVibh(R) 33 (M 176, v°3, 5**), 65 n. 1 line 4 (≠ PrMoSū 151 [BMg, v°5]). — (Mū) Adhik-v 59,2*, 71,13 sq., 77,18 sqq.; Guṇ-VinSū 37,2, 108,9-10,15, 110,11,12; Guṇ-VinSū(Pravr) 3,22; MSV(D) III 1,9*; Mvy 9115; PrMoSū(Mū)₂ 18,3,7-8,13, 32,7. — *ādhi-karaṇika*, m(fn): (Mū) HH, Po-v § 98,2,4 (= MSV(D) IV 115,3,9).

adhikaraṇatā, f.: (Mū) Guṇ-VinSū 36,32.

adhikaraṇa-sāmatha dharma, m.: (Sa) PrMoSū 284 (KH, v°4); Schmidt, Schluß 88, r°3 (≠ Finot 539,6). — (Mū) Adhik-v 79,3 sq., 88,24, 95,1-2, 98,17, etc.; PrMoSū(Mū)₂ 54,1,8; Schmidt, Schluß 92 (fol.37, r°1). — (unid. sch.) Schmidt, Schluß 90, r°1; SHT(IV) 255 (623 Bl.35, r°5), (V) 84 (1096, r°3) (the latter *scil. dharma*). — *sāmatha* (*scil. dharma*): (Mū) Guṇ-VinSū 110,6.

anavādādhikaraṇa: (Mū) Adhik-v 71,14 sq., 76,11 sq., 95,8 sq., 100,17-18.

anovāda, m.: (Sa) Hoernle, MR 12 (3, r°4)¹⁴.

¹⁴ From *anavādādhikaraṇa*, which corresponds to Pā. *anuvādādhikaraṇa*, Adhik-v 71,20-21, 74,5, 78,5 sq. extracts *anavavāda*, m., and °-*vādana*, n.; these terms make little sense here (“absence of censure”) if taken *prima facie*, and might be due to a wrong sanskritization of mi. *anuvāda* > *anovāda*, allegedly *an* + mi. *ovāda* > *an-avavāda*, whereas *ovāda* actually < **ud*-° or **ā-vadati* (see SWTF Nachtr 511, *s.v. ano-vāda*; CPD *s.v. ovadati*). That both *anavavāda* and *anovāda* denote the same thing may be inferred from Adhik-v *ib. anavavāda*.

āpatty-adhikaraṇa: (Mū) Adhik-v 71,14 sq., 74,10 sqq., 76,25 sq., 77,23 sqq., 100,23 sq., 110,4.

kṛtyādhikaraṇa: (Mū) Adhik-v 59,7* (v.l. *kṛtvādh*^o), 71,15, 72,1 sq.¹⁵, 75,20 sq., 77,4 sqq., 110,7; Guṇ-VinSū 110,6.

vivādādhikaraṇa: (Mū) Adhik-v 71,14 sqq., 75,25, 77,22 sqq., 95,6 sq.

1 a. Controversies are defined as discussions about the Buddha's statements, practices and prescriptions, about what is the doctrine and what is the discipline, and about the determination and relative gravity of offences against Vinaya rules; they are identical with the eighteen points whose discussion may lead to a split in the Order (*saṃgha-bheda*)¹⁶.

The twelve roots of disputes about these points are those of controversy itself: the first six are anger and resentment, harshness and scorn, envy and greed, wickedness and deceit, evil desires and wrong opinions, and attachment to worldly things together with obstinacy and stubbornness — all of which lead to quarrels out of disrespect for the Buddha, the doctrine, the Order, and the training; the last six roots are those of what is morally either bad or good, depending on whether those arguing do so with covetous, corrupt, foolish minds or not. The dispute itself may be morally good, indeterminate, or bad, depending on the corresponding state of mind of the disputants¹⁷.

prasthāpana, n. / Hoernle, MR *ib. anovāda-prasthāpanā*, f. (followed by -*viṣṭhāpanā*).

¹⁵ Cf. SVTT I n. 17.

¹⁶ Vin II 88,20-30, 204,11-27 ≠ I 354,21-355,8 with Sp 1278,2-1280,21; cf. Vin V 102,1-11; Sp 595,1-3 ad Vin III 164,8-9'. See Bechert, "Schismenedikt" 32-33 ≠ Bechert, Schulz 35-36. (Mū) Adhik-v 73,25-29 lists fourteen such points.

¹⁷ Vin II 89,5-90,3, 91,1-3 with Sp 1196,2-5. Cf. (Mū) Adhik-v 72,5-74,2, 75,25-76,9.

1 b. The subject-matter for censure is a monk's/nun's fall from morality (*śīla-vipatti*), right behaviour (*ācāra-v^o*), right opinions (*ditṭhi-v^o*), or right means of livelihood (*ājīva-v^o*)¹⁸. These shortcomings may be the cause of one or several out of the seven types of offences¹⁹.

The fourteen roots of disputes about these points are those of censure itself: the first twelve are identical with those listed above in § 1a, except for the subject-matter; the last two are body (when censure concerns

¹⁸ Refs. as in n. 12 above.

¹⁹ As listed below, n. 21; cf. below, n. 23. In Vinaya contexts, the first two *vipatti*-s are made to refer strictly to Vibhaṅga categories: *śīla-v^o* refers to Pār. and Saṃgh., *ācāra-v^o* to Thull., Pāc., Pāṭid., Dukk., and Dubbh. offences (explicitly at Vin I 172,8-11 with Sp 989,19-23; cf. Vin V 160,2-11, 146,2-8* with Sp 1348,15-26; Sp 588,21-27 [ChinSp 389], elaborating upon Vin III 163,36').

The fourth one (altogether left out at, e.g., Vin I 63,33-34 = 67,8-10 ≠ 64,1-3 = 67,15-16; I 171,37 sqq.; II 4,24-25; IV 148,16-17; V 122,12-15, 160,2-11) is related empirically to the fivefold Pātim. classification by a definition that flatly lists six offences (detailed only at Vin V 99,5-16, and referred to in commentaries as *cha sikkhāpadāni*) considered under the moral angle of greed: twice the Thv(M) [bhu] fourth Pār., once the fifth Saṃgh., once the 39th Pāc., once the 37th Sekh. (entailing a Dukk.), once the eightfold [bhī] Pāṭid. (Vin V 99,10 *paṭivijānantassa āpatti thullaccayassa* is translated wrongly as "grave offence involving recognition" at BD VI 144 with n. 3; the first *gen.* actually refers to the agent, and the sentence means "for the one [who advertises superhuman powers] with [greedy] lurking thoughts, a gross transgression is incurred").

The third *vipatti* is defined at Vin I 172,11 as *micchāditṭhi antaggāhikā*, "wrong view advocating an extreme standpoint", with surprisingly missing reference either to the procedure of suspension (cf. SVTT III, n. 7), or to the 69th-70th Thv(M) [bhu] Pāc. (Vin IV 135, 18-30**, 137,17-20**): it seems to have resisted inclusion in Vinaya legal categories.

This cursory sketch of attempts at a strictly legal interpretation (see Vin V 98,6-99,27) of the fourfold *vipatti*, which does need further investigation, is yet another illustration (see v.Hi., Buddhist Law 24) of how Vinaya compilers and commentators tried to impart purely technical senses to terms with general doctrinal or moral connotations.

physical defaults) and speech (when it concerns flaws in elocution). The dispute itself may be morally good, indeterminate, or bad (as above, § 1a)²⁰.

1 c. Offences giving rise to disputes are those of the fivefold Pātim. classification, together with those occurring in Vibhaṅga casuistry²¹; such disputes are exemplified by the 8th and 9th Saṃgh. [bhu, bhī]²²

The six roots of such disputes are those of the offence itself: an offence may originate in body, or speech, or both, or in body and mind, or speech and mind, or in body, speech and mind together²³. The dispute itself may be morally indeterminate, or bad, depending on whether the offence in point was committed deliberately or not²⁴.

²⁰ Vin II 90,4-28, 91,14-24. Cf. (Mū) Adhik-v 74,4-7, 76,11-23.

²¹ i.e., the Pār., Saṃgh., Pāc., Pāṭid., and Dukk., to which the Vibhaṅga adds the Thull. and Dubbh. offences — the Dubbh. being a subdivision of Dukk., with the latter quite often referring implicitly to either, or to both (Vin II 88,35-89,1; Kkh 153,40-154,1 ≠ Ps IV 43,6-7, the latter with w.r. *mānikāya āgatā* for *mātikāya āgatā* [so Kkh; Sp 595,5-7 ad Vin III 164,9', 1314,28-29]).

²² Vin III 158,2-166,28 with Sp 575,21-598,9; III 166,31-170,35 with Sp 598,11-602,21. — UpāliPr(SR) 47, n°8-9. — Conc.: BhiPr 54, table II.1 s.v. *amūlakam, laisikam*.

²³ On this sixfold classification and its later developments, see v.Hi., Āpattisamuttāhāna (p. 58 line 12, read "*nissaggiya-pācittiya* 16" [Kkh 71,15-16] for "*pācittiya* 6"; p. 69 n. 13 line 6, read "Sp 662,18-21" for "Sp 62,17-21"). Vin V 94,9-97,14 gives a systematic account of the number of offences arising from each of these six origins, together with the four moral shortcomings (as above, § 1 b), the sevenfold classification of offences (as above, n. 21), the kind of dispute involved, and the rule(s) that apply for its settlement.

²⁴ Vin II 90,29-36, 91,25-32 with Sp 1196,6-1197,8; cf. Vin V 106,2-4. According to Sp *ib.*, no dispute about an offence may be morally good, because, as regards a deliberate offender, his/her state of mind is *ipso facto* morally bad; as regards one who commits an offence unwittingly, the question whether his/her state of mind is good, bad or indeterminate simply does not arise; such an offence originates only in body and/or speech, which are physical, and therefore morally

Continues...

1 d. Legal duties are the official procedures carried out by a chapter (*saṃgha-kamma*; see SVTT I), whichever part of them is disputed²⁵.

The root of disputes about procedures is the chapter itself. These disputes may be morally good, indeterminate, or bad, depending on the corresponding state of mind of the chapter's members²⁶.

2. The seven modes of settlement are (1) *sammukhā-vinaya*, "verdict involving the presence" of three or four constitutive elements; (2) *sati-vinaya*, "verdict of innocence"; (3) *amūlha-vinaya*, "verdict of (past) insanity"; (4) *paṭiññāta-karaṇa*, "acknowledgement (of an offence)"; (5) *yebhuyyasikā*, "decision of the majority"; (6) *tassa-pāpiyyasikā*, verdict of "obstinate wrongness"; (7) *tiṇa-vatthāraka*, *-°patthāraka*²⁷, covering up the dispute "as with grass".

Each of these may be morally good, indeterminate, or bad, except the first, which is never bad²⁸.

2 a. *Sammukhā-vinaya* is a "verdict involving" (i) a duly assembled, deliberating chapter (*saṃgha-sammukhatā*), except when a restricted

indeterminate (see further Vjb (B^e 1960) 518,13-520,10). Cf. (Mū) Adhik-v 74,10-75,18, 76,25-77,2.

The cause (*hetu*) of the dispute may, however, be good as well (Vin V 102,24 [E^e to be filled in with 102,6]; Vjb (B^e 1960) 548,14-15 *natthi āpattādhikaraṇam kusalan ti vacanato natthi āpattādhikaraṇassa kusalahetu. Kusalacittam pana aṅgam hotīti likhitam*).

²⁵ Vin II 89,1-4 with Sp 1194,30-1196,1; Sp 595,7-10 ad Vin III 164,9-10'; Sp 601,1-13 ad Vin III 168,34'; cf. Kkh 154,1-2 ≠ Ps IV 43,8-9.

²⁶ Vin II 90,37-38, 91,33-92,3. Cf. (Mū) Adhik-v 75,20-23, 77,4-16.

²⁷ The latter form, occurring v.Hi., Oldest Pā.Ms. 106b3a, 6a, confirms the analysis of the former, which occurs *ib.* 106b4b-c, 107a1c,3b-c,5b,7a sqq. (see *ib.* 12-13).

²⁸ Vin V 105,26-36 (cf. Vjb (B^e 1960) 548,8-12).

committee (*ubbāhikā*) is appointed in its place (see below, § 2 b.ii), or when the first two steps of *paṭiññāta-karaṇa* apply (see below, § 2d.i); (ii) conformity to general rules and teachings (*dhamma-s°*) and (iii) to monastic discipline (*vinaya-s°*); (iv) the presence of both factions (*puggala-s°*)²⁹. This three- or fourfold mode of settlement applies to all cases³⁰, either alone, or together with whichever of the other six is relevant³¹. It is sanctioned as valid only if those who hold the right

²⁹ Vin II 93,32-94,8 (cf. II 73,3-74,23 with Sp 1191,17-30-30; V 224,10-17). In (Mū) Adhik-v, the *sammukha-vinaya* is threefold: *saṃgha-°*, *puḍgala-°*, and *dharma-sammukha*, the latter including conformity to both *dharma* and *vinaya* (92,20-83,7, commenting on the settlement among the chapter prescribed at 82,14-18); cf. Banerjee, SarvLit 237-238 (i).

³⁰ These four prerequisites apply indeed to all procedures whatsoever, with eight exceptions, when the person who is the object of the procedure (*vathu*; see SVTT I n. 3) is dealt with *in absentia*: ordination by proxy, boycott of a donor's gifts, cancellation of this boycott, exemption of mentally ill monks/nuns from attending the *uposatha*, exemption of poor, faithful donors from making gifts to the community, boycott of harsh monks, public proclamation that a bad monk's doings will not be endorsed by the community, decision by nuns to stop greeting an exhibitionist monk (Vin V 220,7-9 with Sp 1396,19-1397,2).

³¹ This is expressed at Vin V 110,5-14 by *kathaṃ siyā samathā sammatehi sammanti/na sammanti*, "how is it that modes of settlement are settled or not together with modes of settlement?", i.e., "which ones have to be applied together or not?", as can be deduced from the following lines (regrettably truncated in E°): each one must occur together and exclusively with *sammukhāvinaya*, all others being unhelpful (Vjb (B° 1960) 550,13-16: *samathā samathehi sammantīti ettha sammantīti sampajjanti. Adhikaraṇā vā pana sammanti vūpasammantīti attho. Tasmā yebhuyyasikā sammukhāvinayena sammantīti imāya sammukhāvinayena saddhīm sampajjati. Na sativinayādihi tesam tassā anupakāraṭṭatīti attho*).

Vin V 110,15-29 then proceeds to list which modes of settlement come to naught (*sammanti*; Vjb 550,16-17 *samathā adhikaraṇehi sammantīti ettha samathā abhāvaṃ gacchantīti attho*) because of (further) disputes. Although, due to the variations in the occurrence of *na* according to recensions (see Vin V 229 *ad* 20), a discussion of this passage would be fruitless here, Vjb 550,18-23 is worth quoting: *sammukhāvinayo vivādādhikaraṇena na sammantīti pātho* [cf. Vin V 110,16-17]. *Yebhuyyasikāya samānabhāvato ca avasāne sammukhāvinayo na kenaci sammantīti ti vuttatā* [cf. *ib.* 111,12] *ca sammukhāvinayo sayam*

Continues...

opinion manage to win over the other monks, whatever the latter's previous opinion might have been³².

The settlement of disputes by this verdict alone is valid in any case, except those concerning offences (see below, § 2d).

BHS *sammukha-vinaya śamatha*, m.: PrMoSū(Mā-L) 35,4³³; *sammukha*: BhīVin(Mā-L) 300,2.

Skt. *sammukha-vinaya* (*scil.*, or followed by, *adhikaraṇaśamatha dharmā*): (Sa) PrMoSū 59 (AS xx, v°2), 95 (BA x, v°6). — (Mū) Adhik-v 79,5 sq. (cf. 82,6 sq.), 95,7-8 sq., 110,6; Guṇ-VinSū 109,17-18; MSV(D) II 207,11; Mvy 8631. — (Sa or Mū) SHT(VI) 119 (1401, B3). — (unid.sch.) SHT(IV) 255 (623 Bl.35, r°6). — *sammukha*: (Mū) Adhik-v 59,5*.

sammukha-karaṇīyaṃ karma: (Mū) MSV(D) II 207,7 sq.

2 b.i. Disputes about controversies (§ 1a above) are to be settled either by a fourfold *sammukhā-vinaya*, or by a majority decision (§ 2b.iii below).

When the settlement of such a dispute cannot be achieved by means of a fourfold *sammukhā-vinaya* within the chapter of the residence concerned, the monks should go and — unless a decision is reached on the way³⁴ — ask for arbitration by those of another residence where

samathena vā adhikaraṇena vā sametabbo na hotīti katvā vutto. Sativinayo kiccādhikaraṇena sammanti. Amūlḥavinaya-tassapāpiya [sic]sika-tinavattharakā pi kiccādhikaraṇena sammanti.

³² Vin II 73,23-74,22 with Sp 1191,17-30.

³³ Ms. *sammukha-vinayo śamatho* (cf. ed. *ad loc.*; BhīVin(Mā-L) 300 n. 1).

³⁴ Cf. Sp 1354,34-1355,13 *ad* Vin V 150,33.

monks are more numerous. After careful deliberation, the latter may take up the case, on the condition that it is put to them in full by the visiting monks, and that the latter will abide by the residents' decision³⁵.

2 b.ii. If confusion arises, and no decision can be reached among the residents' chapter by a fourfold *sammukhā-vinaya*, this same chapter is to carry out a twofold procedure³⁶ for the appointment of a committee (*ubbāhikā*)³⁷ of competent monks, well acquainted with Vinaya matters, who will investigate the case. Any member of the committee whose lack of skill hampers the deliberations should be made to leave³⁸. According to Vin V 224,19-24 (cf. Sp 590,10-15; v.Hi., Buddhist Law 23-24), the

³⁵ Vin II 94,8-95,24.

³⁶ Or, according to Sp 1197,21-22, a formal consultation (see above, SVTT I, § 3 a).

³⁷ The term literally means “shifting”, “the turning over of a difficult or intricate case from the general Saṅgha to a special committee” (SBE XX 49-50 n. 3; cf. Carrithers, Forest Monks 251-252), as explained at Mp V 34,4-5 (with B.K.) *ad* AN V 71,10: *ubbāhikāyā ti sampatta-adhikaraṇaṃ vūpasametum saṅghato ubbāhitvā uddharitvā gahaṇathāya*. The right etymology given in CPD *s.v.* is followed by a wrong explanation “committee for the expulsion of a monk from the Order” (echoing Child *s.v.*); this is not supported by phrases of the type *adhikaraṇaṃ ubbāhikāya vūpasametum* (Vin II 95,27-28), and is inaccurate, insofar as neither a disciplinary point such as suspension, nor any other for that matter, is anything more than the possible starting-point of formal disputes (as occurs at Vin II 298,19-20, on which CPD's interpretation is probably based; see below, n. 40), to the settlement of which *ubbāhikā* specifically belongs. The *abstr. ubbāhikā* < *ud* + √ *ūh*, “to take away”, is paralleled by the Skt. *nom. ag. vyūdhaka* < *vi* + √ *ūh* (see below). That the literal sense of the term applies is clear from (Mū) Adhik-v 83,13 sqq. *bahiḥ sīmām gatvā*, “[the committee will sit] outside the community's legal boundary”, from Vin II 305,36-306,5, where the committee is said to agree upon a separate meeting place, and from the Chin. Mś, Dh and Sa parallels to the latter (Hofinger, Concile 110-111). According to Sp 1197,23-24, a committee may sit (*nisiditvā*, misprinted *mi*^o) either apart from, or among the assembly, but should forbid anyone else to talk during its session.

³⁸ Vin II 95,25-97,16 with Sp 1197,19-1198,5; Kkh 154,2-16 ≠ Ps IV 43,9-26 ≠ Sv 1041,8-25; Vin V 197,19-199,32 with Sp 1377,6-19.

appointment of a committee is particularly appropriate when the majority of monks side with the “unscrupulous” (*alajjī*) party, and that of Vinaya experts when the majority is incompetent.

How this committee proceeds is set forth in some detail in the account of the compilation (*saṅgīti*) of the Vinaya said to have taken place in Vesālī after the settlement of a dispute caused by a controversy³⁹. The relevant data about the case can be summarized as follows: monks from Vesālī decide to carry out a procedure of suspension⁴⁰ against the visiting monk Yasa, who holds that their practices go against the Vinaya rules. Yasa goes and persuades monks from Avanti and Pāvā to take up the dispute (these monks are later called *mulādayaka*, “those who first took up [the case]”⁴¹). Each party tries to secure the support of the learned monk Revata, who makes up his mind to side with Yasa's party and agrees to help settle the dispute, provided that the deliberations take place in Vesālī where it originated. As no settlement (presumably by a fourfold *sammukhā-vinaya*) ensues, Revata appoints a committee, with four monks (including himself) on each side, together with an appointer of seats. The committee moves to another, nearby monastery, then sits and

³⁹ Vin II 294,3-307,34. Chin. parallels from the Mś, Dh, Sa, Mū and Mā Vinayas, and from the (Haimavata) *Vinayamāṭṭrkā* (T. 1463), have been translated by Hofinger, Concile 23-148 (see the remarks of Demiéville, Vaisālī); the parallels to the Thv(M) *ubbāhikā* occur *ib.* 104-125. See also Vallée Poussin, Conciles; Bareau, PCB 31-67; cf. HBI 138-154.

⁴⁰ *Ukkhepanīya-kamma* (cf. above, n. 37). The same disciplinary procedure is also said to have brought about a nearly definitive (cf. Sp 1149,11-17) split in Kosambī (*Kosamba-kkhandhaka*, Vin I 337,3 sq.; cf. MSV(D) II 176,3 sq.; Frauwallner, Vinaya 103-104; Banerjee, SarvLit 220-222), when the Buddha reportedly had a hard time trying to persuade the quarrelling monks that disputes should be avoided right from the first by the conciliatory attitude of all those involved.

⁴¹ Vin II 303,22 (Vjb (B° 1960) 540,13: *pesalakā*, “the good ones”); cf. (Mū) Guṇ-VinSū 108,14,28 *mūla-saṅgha*.

attends the deliberations between Revata, who asks questions about the disputed points, and Sabbakāmi, an Elder staying in Vesālī, appointed on the opposite side, who answers them. The decision thus reached about each point is announced formally by Revata to the attending members, and concretized by casting a token (*salākā*)⁴².

If the committee fails to reach a decision, the dispute is to be settled in the chapter where it originated, by a majority decision (see below, § 2 b.iii).

No BHS parallel has been traced so far.

As regards **Skt.** texts, the only parallels are (Mū) Adhik-v 83,8 sq., 95,14 *vyūḍhaka bhikṣu*, Guṇ-VinSū 108,12, 123,14* *vyūḍha*, m.⁴³, “referee”, to whom the case is handed over. The proceedings described in Adhik-v 80,4-88,24⁴⁴ are as follows: disputes are to be arbitrated by

⁴² Before the session begins, Revata, then Sabbakāmi, asks the formal consent of the whole committee, whom they call to attention by the words *suṇātu me bhante* [Revata]/ *āvuso* [Sabbakāmi] *saṃgho* (on this use of *bhante* and *āvuso*, see v.Hi., Mündlichkeit 10-11). Revata's announcement of each decision opens with *suṇātu me bhante saṃgho* (Vin II 306,9,18 sqq.). *Samgha* does not occur here in its technical sense of “chapter” (about the latter, see SVTT I, § 1), since its members act as mere witnesses of the deliberations, taking no part in the decisions reached; this is confirmed by Kkh 154,16 (with parallels as above, n. 38) *ubbāhikāya vūpasame pan'ettha saṃghassa sammukhatā parihāyati*, and by Vin II 307,30-34 where, after the case has been declared to be officially settled, Revata is invited by Sabbakāmi to proceed to an optional repetition of the whole proceedings, this time *saṃgha-majjhe*, “among the chapter” — i.e., all the monks present within the official boundary of the community where the dispute arose.

⁴³ See Hōbōgirin V 437a44-b5, with Addenda, *ib.* IV, and above, n. 37.

⁴⁴ They are summed up *ib.* 87,26-88,11, and in Guṇ-VinSū 108,3-28 (somewhat obscure, due to both its terse Sūtra style and the unreliability of the edition).

competent, well trained, reliable “monks who stand on firm ground” (?)⁴⁵, who will not conduct intrigues among the conflicting parties, and are able to settle disputes arising in the community (*saṃgham antarena*). If they cannot reach a decision, they should submit the case to the complete chapter; if the latter too fails, its members should appoint, by a twofold procedure, five to ten⁴⁶ referees who will take over the case from the chapter, and settle it outside the residence's boundary. If they too fail, they should appoint (presumably from among themselves) eight or nine *vyūḍhaka-vyūḍhaka*⁴⁷ who will take over the dispute from the referees who were appointed first. If no decision is reached, the latter group is to submit the case again to the complete chapter, who will then appoint a competent deputy⁴⁸, by a twofold procedure. This latter monk's office is to go and ask for arbitration by another chapter, where both *sthavira*-s

⁴⁵ *Sthalastha bhikṣu* (80,4 sqq., 89,14, 91,21, 93,7); the term occurs also in Guṇ-VinSū 107,20, 108,7, 123,14*, in (Mū?) SHT(V) 104 (1108, v² sq.), and in Prakīrṇ(Mā-L) 328,8 in *sthalastha-vartam* (the latter's relevance here is not certain: it is listed quite separately from 332,2 *śamatha*); according to Adhik-v 80 n. a, the term is represented in Tib. by the hardly helpful *skam la gnas* (“dwelling on [dry] land”). According to SHT *ib.*, the duties of a *s*^o include performing procedures (*karmāṇi kartā bhavati*), and reproving offending monks (*bhikṣūmś codayati*) before they are charged with a specific offence. In Adhik-v, the idea of appointing monks to such an office is said to have come to the Buddha's mind after the report of the settlement of a dispute by Śariputra and Maudgalyāyana (79,11-14, without details), whom he then calls his *sthalasthāḥ śrāvakāḥ*; this very appointment is presented as an innovation (*bhikṣavo na jānate ke sthalasthāḥ kati vā itī*). As shown by Adhik-v 82,6-13 (commenting on 82,2-4), the *sthalastha* monks do not act in chapter.

⁴⁶ Tib.: ten to twenty; Guṇ-VinSū 108,12-13: not less than the quorum required to make up a regular chapter (*i.e.*, four).

⁴⁷ The corresponding term in Guṇ-VinSū 108,13 is *vyūḍhaka*.

⁴⁸ *Adhikaraṇa-saṃcāraka* (84,21 sqq., 89,1); see Hōbōgirin (as above, n. 43); also at Guṇ-VinSū 108,15.

and a recension of the Prātimokṣa⁴⁹ are to be found. If no settlement can be achieved in, and by, the latter chapter within six (Guṇ-VinSū 108,16: three) months, the deputy is to apply to Sūtra-, Vinaya-, and Mātrkā-specialists⁵⁰, who will investigate the case informally. If no decision can be reached within one year (Guṇ-VinSū 108,17: six months), the dispute is to be handed over to the deputy, who will then apply to a most eminent, renowned *sthavira* from any residence; the latter is expected to exhort the conflicting parties to harmony and concord, without either taking bribes or getting involved in endless discussions.

If this monk too fails, he is to hand over the case to the deputy, who will put it to the chapter of the community where it originated, there to be settled by a majority decision.

2 b.iii. If the settlement of a dispute caused by a controversy cannot be achieved by a three- or fourfold *sammukhā-vinaya* (including §§ 2 b.i-ii above) alone, the case is to be handed back to the chapter of the community where it originated, and settled by a vote (*salāka-gāha*) “according to the decision of the majority (*yebhuyyasikā*) — be it by one only — of those who hold the right opinion”, under the supervision of a competent, reliable monk appointed as distributor of ballots (*salāka-gāhāpaka*) by a twofold procedure. The vote implies a fourfold *sammukhā-vinaya*⁵¹.

⁴⁹ *Sa-sthavire sa-prātimokṣe saṃghe* (85,25-26, 86,3 sqq.), also at Guṇ-VinSū 108,15 (cf. 105,24-25). A recension of the Prātimokṣa is needed for reference, so that the *sthavira*-s can check which rule(s) should be applied (cf. Sp 1354,29-32 ad Vin V 150,32).

⁵⁰ *Sūtra*-, *vinaya*-, *mātrkā-dhara*, also at Guṇ-VinSū 108,17.

⁵¹ Vin II 84,24-37 (= 97,21-24), 97,17-99,19 with Sp 1198,7-30; Kkh 154,17-27 ≠ Ps IV 43,26-44,13 ≠ Sv 1041,25-37 (cf. Mp II 166,4-5). Chin. data are summarized in Hōbōgirin V 437a17-443b22.

This vote is not valid when resorted to for the settlement of trifling matters; when the case has not been thoroughly investigated in different places; when no one remembers it; when those holding the wrong opinion are known to be in the majority, or the distributor of ballots expects so; when the vote may lead to a split in the Order, or the distributor expects so⁵²; when those holding the wrong opinion take several ballots each, or when several of their opponents take only one, or when opportunists vote against their own opinion⁵³.

The distributor of ballots is to control the proceedings by one of three methods, so as to avoid the dissatisfaction of monks who would then go from monastery to monastery in search of a more suitable decision. As for the first two methods, in case the wrong party wins, the result of the vote may be rejected up to three times; according to Sp, the repetition of the whole proceedings should be postponed until the next day, allowing the distributor to cause dissent among the wrong party.

(i) The voter is made to choose between two clearly different ballots, after being informed openly about which opinion each one symbolizes; the selected ballot is not to be shown to anyone; this is known as “secret vote” (*gūlhakam*), and is particularly appropriate, according to Sp, when the majority side with the wrong party;

(ii) the method is the same as (i), except that the voter is to be informed confidentially; any elder monk who picks up the wrong ballot should be reminded about the proper behaviour that goes with old age; if he still does not understand, he should keep silent about the whole matter;

⁵² In both these latter cases, BD 5 111-112 “when he even thinks [that things could take such a turn]” is inaccurate (Sp 1192,30 *ayam assa ajjhāsayo*; cf. Hōbōgirin V 439b25-30).

⁵³ Vin II 85,1-14 with Sp 1192,20-1193,10.

this is known as “whispering in the ear” (*sakaṇṇa-jappakaṃ*), and is particularly appropriate, according to Sp, when incompetent monks are in the majority;

(iii) ballots may be picked up openly (*vivaṭena*) when the distributor is confident that those who hold the right opinion are in the majority.

BHS *yo-bhūyasika* (scil., or followed by, *śamatha / samatha*): BhīVin(Mā-L) 300,3 (misprinted °*bhu*°); PrMoSū(Mā-L) 35,9.

Skt. *yad-bhūyasikāya-śalākāgrahaṇa*, n.: (Mū) Adhik-v 79,5 (v.l. *yad-bhūyoṣika-ś*°). — *yad-bhūyasikāya*: Mvy 8634 (v.l. *yad-bhūya aiṣikāya*).

yad-bhūyeṣikā: (Sa) PrMoSū 60 (AS yy, r°1), 170 (BP n, r°3).

*yad-bhūyeṣiyā*⁵⁴: (Sa or Mū) SHT(VI) 111 (1388, v°3). — (Mū) PrMoSū(Mū)₂ 54,5(misprinted °*ṣipā*°)-6.

yadbhūyaiṣika(-)śalākāgrahaṇa: (Mū) Adhik-v 88,28, 89,4(misprinted °*śika*),16, 94,24, 95,2,8.

yad-bhūyaiṣiya: — (scil. *adhikaraṇaśamatha-dharma*) (unid. sch.) SHT(IV) 255 (623 Bl.35, r°7). — (scil. *karman*) (Mū) MSV(D) II 207,12. — (°*śalākāgrahaṇa*) (Mū) Adhik-v 88,26, 89,3.

śalākā-cāraka, m(fn)., “distributor of ballots”: (Mū) Adhik-v 89,18 sqq.

śalākā -cāraṇa, n., “vote”: (Mū) Adhik-v 90,2 sqq.

Four methods of control are set out at Adhik-v 90,2 sq.: *channa* (Pā. *gūlhakaṃ*), *vivṛta* (Pā. *vivaṭena*), *sakaṇṇa-tuntunaka* (Pā. *sakaṇṇa-jappakaṃ*), and *sarvasāṃghika*, “[vote] by the whole chapter” (?)⁵⁵.

⁵⁴ Among the following variants, the frequency of those ending in °*ṣiya* (analogical to *tat-svabhāvaiṣiya* [see below, § 2c] ?) seems to exclude a “secondary corruption” (BHSD s.v. *yadbhūyasikāya*).

2 c. Disputes about censure (§ 1b above) are to be settled by one of the following verdicts:

(i) A fourfold *sammukhā-vinaya* (§ 2a above) alone, involving a thorough investigation of the charge⁵⁶.

(ii) A verdict of innocence (*sati-vinaya*), based on the censured monk's mindfulness and own conscience (*sati*), by which he may deny an unfounded charge. Such a verdict is valid only if the monk is actually innocent, but has been censured nonetheless, if he makes a formal, threefold application to a regular chapter for this specific decision, and if this same chapter actually carries out a valid, fourfold procedure (see SVTT I, § 3d) to the same purpose (involving *ipso facto* a fourfold *sammukhā-vinaya*). According to Kkh and its parallels, such a verdict applies to none but Arahants — i.e., the likes of Dabba Mallaputta (Vin II 74,25-29), on whose account it is said to have been first prescribed⁵⁷.

(iii) A verdict of past insanity (*amūlha-vinaya*), by which unawareness when committing an offence, and lapse of memory during the settlement procedure, may be invoked by a censured monk. Such a

⁵⁵ Explained as follows at 90,24-31, but not quite clear to me (cf. Hōbōgirin V 443a36-b4): *yathāpi tac chalākā-cārakasya bhikṣor evaṃ bhavati, asminn āvāse prabhūtā bhikṣavo glānāḥ, ahaṃ ced <asaṃṇiṣaṇṇe> [editor's addition ?] asaṃṇipatite sarva-saṃghe śalākāṃ cārayeyaṃ sthānam etad vidyate prabhūtā bhikṣavaḥ adharmā-śalākāṃ grhṇiyuh [sic ed.] na tv [corr. yan nv ?] ahaṃ sarva-saṃghe saṃṇiṣaṇṇe saṃṇipatite śalākāṃ cārayeyaṃ iti sa sarva-saṃghe saṃṇiṣaṇṇe saṃṇipatite śalākāṃ cārayati, idam ucyate sarvasāṃghikam śalākā-cāraṇam.*

⁵⁶ KKh 154,28-33 = Sv 1041,38-1042,6 = Ps IV 44,12-20 ad MN II 247,10-18. Cf. (Mū) Adhik-v 95,8-18.

⁵⁷ Vin II 99,20-100,14 ≠ I 79,37-80,31 (cf. III 158,2-163,18) with Sp 1192,1-13; Kkh 154,33-38 = Sv 1042,6-11 = Ps IV 44,20-25 ad MN II 247,28-248,4; cf. Mp II 165,34-35. Cf. (Mū) Adhik-v 95,18-98,17.

verdict is valid only if the latter acts in good faith, with further proceedings, *mutatis mutandis*, as in (ii) above⁵⁸.

(iv) A verdict of obstinate wrongness (*tassa-pāpiyyasikā*), given against a convicted offender who tries to equivocate about the offence committed. It applies to unscrupulous monks who are charged either with a Pār., or with minor offences connected with the commission of the latter⁵⁹. If the sentenced monk observes the duties and restrictions prescribed in such a case⁶⁰, the verdict may be revoked by a procedure of reintegration (*osāraṇā*); if not, it amounts to expulsion (*nāsanā*). It is valid only if the censured monk is actually misbehaving, unscrupulous and fault-finding, if he does eventually acknowledge some offence (cf. below, § 2d.i) after due inquiry, and if the fourfold procedure (implying a fourfold *sammukhā-vinaya*) has been carried out according to rule by a regular chapter⁶¹.

In (Mū) Adhik-v and Guṇ-VinSū, this latter verdict does not apply to disputes about censure, but to those about offences (see below, end of § 2d.ii).

⁵⁸ Vin II 100,14-101,5 ≠ 80,32-83,9 with Sp 1192,14-19; Kkh 154,38-155,4 ≠ Sv 1042,12-20 ≠ Ps IV 44,25-45,6 *ad* MN 248,5-20. Cf. (Sa) KaVa § 117; (Mū) Adhik-v 98,19-100,20.

⁵⁹ According to Sp 1199,1-3, either a Dukk. (in connexion with the first Pār.) or a Thull. (in connexion with the second, third and fourth Pār.).

⁶⁰ These restrictions are very similar to (according to AN IV 347,7-15 with Mp IV 160,13-17), or identical with (as referred to in an abridged form at Vin II 86,22-28, *prima facie* to be filled in with II 5,6-15) those to be observed when a procedure of blame (*tajjanīya-kamma*) applies; all of them imply a suppression of the rights and duties of a regular, influential monk (e.g., appointment as an exhorter of nuns, or acting either as preceptor or instructor of a novice).

⁶¹ Vin II 101,5-102,10 with Sp 1199,1-11; II 85,15-86,30 with Sp 1193,12-20; Kkh 155, 4-11 ≠ Ps IV 45,6-14 ≠ Sv 1042,20-27.

BHS *amūḍha-vinaya śamatha*: PrMoSū(Mā-L) 35,6; *amūḍha*: BhīVin(Mā-L) 300,2.

tasya pāpeyasika: BhīVin(Mā-L) 300,3. — *tasya pāpeyasika ś°*: Prakīrṇ(Mā-L) 328,10; PrMoSū(Mā-L) 35,8.

smṛti-vinaya śamatha: PrMoSū(Mā-L) 35,5. — *smṛti*: BhīVin(Mā-L) 300,2.

Skt. *amūḍha-vinaya*: (Sa) Finot 538,7; KaVā 46-47 (94.2,5); PrMoSū 59 (AS xx, v°3). — (Mū) Adhik-v 59,5*, 95,11, 97,14, 98,19 sqq.; Guṇ-VinSū 109,15 (referred to as *asaṃmūḍha ib.* 123,23*); MSV(D) II 207,12; Mvy 8633. — (unid. sch.) SHT(IV) 255 (623 Bl.35, r°6).

tat-svabhāvānveṣika (*scil. bhikṣu*), an accused monk “subjected to an inquiry about his real nature”; also as *abstr.*, m. or n., corresp. to Pā. *tassa-pāpiyyasikā*: (Sa?)⁶² SHT(V) 47 (1057 a, v°5).

tat-svabhāvānveṣikā, in a more general sense “inquiry about facts”: (unid.sch.) SHT(V) 43 (1055 Bl.51, r°1), 158 (1160 Bl.49, r°4, v°1).

tat-svabhāvaiṣatata(?ṣita)tva tat-prabhāvaiṣi(?ṣi)yatva (editor's bracketted, question-marked corrections): (Mū) Guṇ-VinSū 109,31-32 (referred to as *tat-svabhāva ib.* 123,23*).

tat-svabhāvaiṣiya: (Sa) Hoernle, MR 12 (3, r°2).

tat-svabhāvaiṣiya: (Mū) Adhik-v 59,6*, 97,18, 100,25, 106,14 sqq., 110,6; MSV(D) II 207,12. — (unid. sch.) SHT(IV) 255 (623 Bl.35, r°7).

tat-svabhāvaiṣṭika: (Sa) PrMoSū 59 (AS xx, v°5).

smṛti-vinaya: (Mū) Adhik-v 95,11 sqq.; Guṇ-VinSū 109,15; MSV(D) II 207,11; Mvy 8632. — (unid. sch.) SHT(IV) 255 (623 Bl.35, r°6). — *smṛti*: Adhik-v 59,5*; Guṇ-VinSū 123,23*.

⁶² The form *sthūlārti-gāminī āpatti* (corresponding to Pā. *thullaccaya*, BHS/Skt. *sthūlātyaya*) occurs *ib.* b, v°4; see (Sa) VinVibh(R) 16-17, 30 (M 139, v°1 sq.; S 171, r°1 sq.).

2 d. Disputes about offences (§ 1c above) are to be settled according to their gravity. Among the seven traditional rules for settlement, the last two apply *per se* neither to seriously culpable offences nor to those committed against lay people, but only to “light” offences⁶³.

(i) A settlement may be reached by acknowledgement (*paṭiññāta-karaṇa*) of his offence by a guilty monk, in the presence of either one or several monks (implying a threefold *sammukhā-vinaya* in both cases), or before a duly assembled chapter (implying a fourfold *s^o-v^o*), who will issue a formal warning, with no procedure required⁶⁴.

⁶³ *Lahukā āpatti*, i.e. all those of the fivefold Pātim. classification (as listed above, n. 21), except the “seriously culpable” (*thullavajjā āpatti*) Pār. and Saṃgh. Although the penalty applying to each of the last two may by no means be carried out without the accused monk’s preliminary acknowledgement of his offence (cf. below, n. 64) before formal confession (*āpatti-desanā* [of Saṃgh. and lighter offences]), these are not sufficient in themselves: a Pār. offence entails complete exclusion from the community, with no room (*an-avasesa*) for formal confession, and therefore no possible settlement (Vin V 153,25-27 with Sp 1358,11-13); a Saṃgh. offence entails a kind of boycott (*mānatta*; see SVTT III) and a period of probation (in case the offence was concealed for some time before being acknowledged), both to be applied for by the guilty monk to the chapter, after he has proceeded to acknowledgement and formal confession, and to be carried out by regular procedures and under supervision of the same chapter (Vin V 153,5-10). This is why the Pār. and Saṃgh. offences are termed *a-desanāgāminī āpatti*, “offences that cannot be redressed by mere confession”, as opposed to the *desanāgāminī* “light” offences (the highly complex provisions for accusation and confession — see v.Hi., buddhist Law 22, 23-24 — will be investigated elsewhere).

Offences against lay people are to be redressed, after preliminary acknowledgement, by a procedure of reconciliation (*paṭisaraṇiyya-kamma*).

⁶⁴ Vin II 83,10-84,19, 102,11-103,24; Kkh 155,12-25 ≠ Ps IV 45,14-46,3 ≠ Sv 1042,28-1043,4 *ad* MN II 248,21-31. Cf. (Mū) Adhik-v 100,23-102,3 (whatever the editor’s brackets mean, 101,26,29 <an> should not, logically, occur at this place).

Continues...

(ii) When the dispute involves several persons in each faction, and acknowledgement to each other might make things worse, it may be covered up “as with grass” (*tiṇa-vatthāraka*, -*°pattharaka*⁶⁵). Each step of this settlement involves a fourfold *sammukhā-vinaya*. First of all, both factions are to meet so as to form a single, regular chapter, whom a monk acting as chairman will ask whether they agree with the proposal to settle the case in this way; one monk from each faction is then to ask those siding with him whether they agree to his acknowledging their offences on their behalf, together with his own; each of these three procedures consists of a motion (see SVTT I, § 3b). The monk acting on behalf of each party is then to request the chapter to accept this collective acknowledgement and to cover up the dispute, thereby cancelling all accusations; each of these requests is to be made through a twofold procedure (see SVTT I, § 3c).

Acknowledgement is indeed the prerequisite for any further penalty; in no case may the latter be inflicted by using force (Vin II 83,10-84,19; Kkh 155,23-25; Sp 1397,7-10 *ad* Vin V 220,10-11; (Mū) Adhik-v 104,1-3; cf. v.Hi., Buddhist Law 11; Gombrich, *Thv Buddhism* 108-109). According to Sp 624,10-16 (*ad* Vin III 183,5-6), 1360,31-1361,5 (*ad* Vin V 158,19*-28*), one should deal with a scrupulous (*lajjī*) monk according to what he acknowledges; with an unscrupulous one; according to his behaviour (*vatta*; Vin V 158,20 [E] reads *vutta*); a monk’s acknowledgement is to be trusted if consistent with his behaviour. He may be charged with an offence after due, regular inquiry, whether he acknowledges either or both the fact (*vatthu*) and the offence (*āpatti*) it entails; if he acknowledges neither, he should not be charged; the latter case is then, presumably, liable to give rise to a controversy about the offence in question (see above, § 1a). If a monk equivocates about the offence committed, the verdict of “obstinate wrongness” (§ 2c.iv above) applies; if he acknowledges it, but refuses to proceed to formal confession, a procedure of suspension (*āpattiyyā adassane ukkhepaniyya-kamma*) will be carried out against him.

⁶⁵ See above, n. 27.

This specific settlement is valid only for those actually present — be they ill, asleep, absorbed in meditation, or distracted — and who do not object⁶⁶.

(Mū) Adhik-v 108,7-110,3 prescribes no procedures: the most eminent, respected elder in each party is to approach both the monks he sides with — to secure their agreement — and those of the opposite party, in front of whom he will acknowledge the offences committed on his side; if no one objects, the dispute is sanctioned as covered up.

Both this text (95,8-11, 100,23-26, 106,14-108,5) and (Mū) Guṇ-VinSū 109,30-31 add here the settlement by “investigation of [an accused monk’s] real nature” (see above, end of § 2c.iv), the provisions of which correspond to those of the fourth Thv(M) verdict applying to disputes about censure.

BHS *pratijñā*: BhīVin(Mā-L) 300,2. — *pratijñā-kāraka śamatha*: PrMoSū(Mā-L) 35,7.

ṛṇa-prastāraka (*scil.*, or followed by, *śamatha*): BhīVin(Mā-L) 300,3; PrMoSū(Mā-L) 35,10.

Skt. *pratijñā-kāraka* (*scil.*, or followed by, *adh-°k-°ś°*): (Mū) Adhik-v 100,25 sqq., 110,6; Guṇ-VinSū 109,17; MSV(D) II 207,12; Mvy 8637. — (unid. sch.) SHT(IV) 255 (623 Bl.35, r°7-v°1).

pratijñā-karaṇīyaṃ karma: (Mū) MSV(D) II 207,10.

pratijñāna, m. or n.: (Mū) Guṇ-VinSū 109,30.

pratijñā-vinaya (*scil. adh-°k-°ś°*): (Sa) PrMoSū 284 (KH, v°2).

⁶⁶ Vin II 103,24-104,10, 86,31-88,7 with Sp 1193,21-1194,17; Sp 1355,28-34 ad Vin V 151,1; Kkh 155,25-34 ≠ Ps IV 46,3-15 ≠ Sv 1043,5-15 ad MN II 250,1-21.

ṛṇa-prastāraka (*scil.*, or followed by, *id.*): (Sa) PrMoSū 95 (BA y, r°5). — (Mū) Adhik-v 59,6*, 100,26, 108,7 sqq., 110,6-7; Guṇ-VinSū 102,31, 109,18; MSV(D) II 207,13; Mvy 8636. — (unid. sch.) SHT(IV) 255 (623 Bl.35, v°1). — *°prastāraka* (?): (Sa) PrMoSū 170 (BP n, r°4).

2 e. Disputes pertaining to formal procedures (§ 1d above) are to be settled by a fourfold *sammukhā-vinaya* only⁶⁷ (see SVTT I, § 1 and n. 5-6).

*

⁶⁷ Vin II 104,8-9 ≠ Kkh 155,35-36 = Ps IV 46,15-16 ≠ Sv 1043,16-17.

III. *mānatta, parivāsa, abbhāna-kamma*

O. Within the five categories of offences of the Pātim. (see SVTT II n. 20), the Saṃgh. are the only ones whose redress may not be achieved without the supervision of a regular chapter, through penalties (*mānatta* and *parivāsa*) whose end is marked by re-admission (*abbhāna*) to the status of a fully regular monk/nun. Both *mānatta* and *parivāsa* — however intricate their particulars may be —, and re-admission, are to be granted through the most elaborate, fourfold procedures (see SVTT I § 3 d)¹; whereas the smallest quorum of four monks/nuns is sufficient as far as penalties are concerned, re-admission is the only procedure whatsoever that requires the biggest quorum of all, numbering twenty (see SVTT I § 2). Each of the procedures involved should include full details about the circumstances of the case — however complex it may turn out to be — to be given both by the guilty monk and by the chairman².

The relevant dispositions are set forth very briefly at the end of the Saṃgh. section of the Pātim.³, and, with full details, in the Parivāsa-⁴ and Samuccaya-kkhandhaka⁵ of the Cullavagga.

¹ Vin III [bhu] 112,26-30' (with Sp 522,2-16 = Kkh 35,21-27; = Sp 1351,27-33 ad Vin V 148,28*) = 185,37-186,3' = IV [bhi] 225,8-12' = 242,10, truncated E' to be filled in with 237,19-20, whose Pāli text refers by *pa* to 235,4-5, the latter truncated in E', up to 225,8-12'. Saṃgh. offences are said to be “redressed through what others state” (*para-vācāya vutthāti*, Vin V 124,31), that is, by the procedures of probation, etc. (Sp 1329,9 *parivāsa-kammavācādihi vutthāti*).

² Vin II 38,12-39,14; cf. Sp 1173,10-17, 1351,26-33, and below, n. 44.

³ Vin III 186,11-24 with Kkh 48,16-51,35, Sp 629,23-630,8; cf. Vin-vn 504-540, Khuddas II 10-11.

⁴ Vin II 31,3-37,33 with Sp 1159,22-1169,13; cf. Vin-vn 2751-2759.

1. *Mānatta* (n.)⁶ applies either alone — when the offence was acknowledged as soon as committed — or following a period of probation (see below, § 2-3 d) — when it was concealed for some time.

After immediate, due acknowledgement and confession of his offence⁷, the guilty monk is termed *mānattāraha*, “liable to *m*” (Vin II

⁵ Vin II 38,3-72,29 with Sp 1169,15-1191,14; a convenient recapitulation of this Khandhaka occurs at Sp 1189,6-1191,14. Skt. Mū parallel: MSV(D) III 32,13-58,12 (last part of the Pāṇḍulohitaka-vastu), 61,1-88,10 (Pudgala-vastu), 93,1-103,1 (Pārivāsika-vastu); cf. Guṇ-VinSū 104,30-106,6; summary of the Tib. version: Banerjee, SarvLit 227-232.

⁶ Traditional etymology points to some kind of “conciliation”, “conciliatory measure” (BHSD suggests < *māna-tva*, “condition of (paying) respect”): Kkh 51,11-13 = Sp 629,29-30: *bhikkhu mānattāyā ti bhikkhūnaṃ mānana-bhāvāya; ārāadhanathāyā ti vuttaṃ hoti*. — (Sa) PrMoSū 212 [DDa, v°3] *bhikṣu[sic] nāṃ cittaṃ ārādhayamāno*. — ChinSp 404 [7]: “*mānatta*, that is to say in Chinese, to control self-elation; that is, to have humility in one's mind” (for further Chin., and Tib. evidence, see BHSD s.v. *mānatva, mānāpya*; BHSD's definition of *mānatva*, “a kind of penance which is superimposed, after *parivāsa* [“probation”], on a monk guilty of a *saṃghāvaśeṣa* offence which he has concealed”, is misleading: *mānatva* applies in all cases, whether the offence was concealed or not).

⁷ Cf. SVTT II n. 63-64. Dutt states that “for this disciplinary measure [of *parivāsa* and *mānatta*] confession is not a necessary pre-condition. [...] The two penalties are inflicted together in case of non-confession; only *mānatta* is inflicted in case of confession” (EBM 137, 139). This is quite beside the point, which is not confession, expected to occur in any case; if it does not, the relevant procedures are that of suspension for “refusing to see/to redress one's offence, or to give up wrong opinions” (*āpattiyā adassane/appatīkamme, pāpikāya dīṭhiyā appaṭinissagge ukkhepanīya-kamma*). The point here is the time that did, or did not, elapse between commission and confession of the Saṃgh. offence. This is made quite clear when one brings together the relevant occurrences of (*a*)*kāma*, “(un)willing”: a monk who committed such an offence and *is willing* to redress it should apply for this purpose to a regular chapter (Sp 522,4-8 = 1351,27-31 *imaṃ āpattim āpajjivā vutthātu-kāmassa, yan taṃ āpatti-vutthānam [...] saṃgho icchitabbo*); in doing so, the one who first concealed his offence *will* apply knowingly for probation, then *mānatta*, to be undergone “against his own

35,11-22), whereby he becomes subject to the same restrictions as those applying in the case of probation (see below, § 2 a). He should then make a formal, threefold application for *mānatta* to a regular chapter, numbering four monks at least, who will grant it through a fourfold procedure⁸. According to Sp, a monk who has committed several Saṃgh. offences may state each of them during the same session. Once the procedure is over, he should immediately formally undertake the observance of *mānatta*, and announce it before the same chapter. This is called *appaṭicchanna-mānatta*, “*m*^o [applying to an] unconcealed [offence]” (Sp 1171,1-3 ≠ Kkh 51,14-16).

BHS *mānatva*, n.: BhīVin(Mā-L) 17,17, 63,2 sq., 163,25**;
Prakīrṃ(Mā-L) 328,7; PrMoSū(Mā-L) 12,10.

Skt. *mānatva*, n.: (Sa) Finot 487,11.

mānāpya, n.: (Sa) Hoernle, MR 12 (3.2); PrMoSū 84 (BAf, v^o4). — (Sa?)⁹ SHT(V) 22 (1039, v^o3). — (Mū) BhīKaVā(S) 246,5, 247,31, 270,15; Guṇ-VinSū 102,23, 104,18,30, 106,1 (ed. *mānāpya* throughout); MSV(D) II 154,14, 157,16-17 (= KC, Kaṭh-v 53,27, 55,35), 207,16, III 43,1, 44,7 sqq., 56,3 sqq., 61,18, 67,4, 71,9 sq., 94,13, 100,11 sqq., etc.;

will” (Vin III 186,14 *akāmā parivatthabbaṃ* with Sp 629,27 = Kkh 49,4 *akāmena avasena*). This voluntary self-submission and “relatively dignified humiliation” (Carrithers, Forest Monks 145) are stressed by the very structure of all the disciplinary procedures involved: none is valid without that part of the procedure by which this very monk himself, being “desirous of redress” (*vuṭṭhātu-kāma*), applies for the right penalty to be granted to him (cf., e.g., (Mū) MSV(D) III 79,14-83,6) — in striking contrast both with the procedures of suspension, then reintegration, during which the guilty monk plays no active part (cf. Vin II 21,22-22,6 *ādi* with 38,12-39,14 *ādi*), and with the heavier penalties incurred in the latter case (cf. below, second part of n. 19).

⁸ Vin II 38,3-39,14 with Sp 1170,28-1171,29.

⁹ *śhūlārṭi* occurs in r^o3, r^o4 (cf. SVTT II n. 62); ed. *carita[m]=ā[v]āpya* is to be read *carita-mānāpya*.

Mvy(M) 265.14,17; PrMoSū(Mū)₂ 22,1¹⁰. — *mānāpya* (misprint?): (Sa) PrMoSū 41 (ASq, r^o2).

1 a. From now on, the monk is termed *mānatta-cārika*, “undergoing *m*^o”, and should observe, during a fixed period of six days, ninety-four restrictions that can be summarized as follows¹¹.

He is to be denied, and should refuse, both outward marks of respect from regular monks¹², and the latter’s assistance in everyday life (such as

¹⁰ So GBM(FacEd) X.1, 21 (31.1); ed. *mānatta* is erroneous.

¹¹ The full account of restrictions set forth at Vin II 31,4-34,20 (with Sp 1159,22-1170,5) applies to monks undergoing probation, and is then summarized (and truncated in E^o) at Vin II 35,23-36,28 (with Sp 1170,20-25) as applying both to *mānatta-cārika*-s and to the four other groups mentioned below, n. 12, with reference to 31,4 sqq., except when specific restrictions need to be detailed. For the sake of clarity — and with the support of Sp 1173,20-24 ≠ 1189,1-5 — the following account reverses the order of the Pā. text and incorporates these specific restrictions. Skt. Mū. parallel: MSV(D) III 96,20-102,4.

¹² That is, according to Sp 1160,5-7 (cf. 1169,7-8), all monks, except those ordained later than he who happen to undergo just the same penalty at the same time. The more detailed explanations given at Sp 1170,7-14 point to the restriction of assistance and outward marks of respect to members of equal or lower seniority *within* each of the five groups of monks affected by the disciplinary consequences of a Saṃgh. offence: those undergoing probation (*pārivāsika*), those “liable to be sent back to the beginning” (*mūlāya paṭikassanāraha*) of the relevant penalty (see below, § 3 a), those liable to *mānatta* (*mānattāraha*), those undergoing this latter penalty (*mānatta-cārika*), and those “fit for re-admission” (*abbhānāraha*) as fully regular monks (see below, § 6). Vin II 33,22-23, 35,1-3, 35,17,19-20, 36,10,14, 37,6-7,10-11 accordingly state that monks within each of these penalized groups may not dwell under the same roof as senior monks from the same group (according to Sp 1168,14-1169,6, doing so entails a “break” [*ratti-ccheda*, see below, end of § 1 a] and/or a Dukk. for either or both monks). To sum up, a regular monk is either a fully regular one, or one who undergoes any of the four other penalties entailed by a Saṃgh. offence, or a senior monk who undergoes just the same as oneself. The relativity of the concept of regular status is further stressed by the

providing seats and water, or rubbing each other's back when bathing); failing to do so, he adds a Dukk. offence to the Saṃgh. one. Should other monks be liable to the very same penalty (see above, n. 12), they are considered as a group among whom both outward marks of respect and a set of five activities should be observed according to seniority¹³: proceeding to the fortnightly recitation of Pātim. rules (*uposatha*) and to Invitation (*pavāraṇā*), getting one's share of clothes for the rainy season (*vassika-sātikā*), passing one's turn during the distribution of meals (*oṇojana*)¹⁴, and getting one's share of food (*bhatta*)¹⁵.

A monk undergoing *mānatta* is further to abstain from the following: granting ordination; giving guidance to newly ordained monks; being waited upon by novices; being appointed as exhorter of nuns, or actually

fact that a suspended monk (*ukkhittaka*) is indeed, as far as concealment of Saṃgh. offences is concerned, considered as regular (see below, n. 19).

¹³ According to Sp 1160,25-1161,6, this separate group should sit at the lower hierarchical rank (that of newly ordained monks), where they are to attend or to perform separately the procedures in which they may take part.

¹⁴ According to Sp 1161,6-18, *oṇojana* (Vin II 37,20* *oṇoja*, instead of which Siam. edn. has *avaṇojana* [BD V 54 n. 3], both these latter forms missing in CPD) means giving away (*vissajjana*) one's share of the food to be distributed at pre-arranged meals (*uddesa-bhattādi*, i.e. *uddesa-bh*^o, *nimantanā*, *salāka-bh*^o, *pakkhika*, *uposathika*, *pāṭipadika*: allotted meals, invitations, meals apportioned by tickets, those offered fortnightly, or on *uposatha* days, or on the following day; see refs. in CPD s.v. *uddesa-bhatta*). If the penalized monk is scheduled to receive a share of such a meal, but expects to get a meal personally (*puggalika-bhatta*) on the same day (reading *aññā ca'ssa* with Bp. and C^e (SHB 1948) 860,33), he may reserve this share for the next day, by giving it (i.e., entrusting his right to it) to a regular monk. This disposition is meant to help penalized monks, who have to sit at the lower hierarchical rank for all purposes, and might therefore not get a fair share of food.

¹⁵ According to Sp 1161,18-23, if a penalized monk cannot manage either to join, or to stay in, the row of monks waiting for food, he may move right to where the distributor stands, and help himself "like a swooping hawk" (cf. Sp-y, quoted in CPD s.v. *o-sakkati*).

exhorting them if appointed before he became liable to *mānatta*; committing another Saṃgh. offence, or a graver one (i.e., a Pār.); criticizing either the procedure by which he was granted *mānatta*, or those who carried it out; suspending (on account of some irregularity) the participation of a regular monk either in the fortnightly recitation of Pātim. rules, or in Invitation; issuing commands; occupying a superior position; urging a monk to acknowledge an offence¹⁶; quarrelling with other monks; walking or sitting before a regular monk; receiving anything but the worst seat, bed, and dwelling-place; visiting, with a regular monk, families the latter is used to calling on; undertaking ascetic vows; having food brought to him in secret; living away from regular monks; visiting monks who belong to another community, or monks who belong to his own when he cannot reach there on the same day, without being accompanied by a regular chapter (of four), unless in case of emergency; dwelling under the same roof as a regular monk; standing, sitting or walking on the same level as the latter, or on a higher one. He should inform any monk he meets of his status, and report daily on his case to a regular chapter¹⁷, especially on *uposatha* and Invitation days, sending a monk as messenger to do so on his behalf if he is ill. He may not help make up the quorum required for any procedure connected with penalties involved by Saṃgh. offences.

Among the above restrictions, infringement of any of the following four is considered as a "break" (*ratti-ccheda*) in the observance of *mānatta*, entailing an extension by the same period of the initial fixed

¹⁶ Vin II 32,10 *na okāso kāretabbo, na codetabbo, na sāretabbo*, i.e., the first three regular stages of asking permission (*okāsaṃ kārāpetvā*) from the suspected monk to talk with him about his offence, of reproving (*codetvā*) him about it, and of reminding (*sāretvā*) him of it; the fourth stage is charging (*ropetvā*) him with it (see, e.g., Sp 624,7-18).

¹⁷ He may do so in whatever words he pleases, provided he gives full details (Sp 1171,20-29).

period of six days: dwelling under the same roof as a regular monk; living far from, failing to report daily to, or going about unaccompanied by, a regular chapter of monks who belong to the same community as he does; according to Sp, doing so knowingly entails both a break and a Dukk. offence.

Mānatta may however be postponed (*nikkhipitabba*) if it becomes objectively difficult to observe it properly; this interruption is to be announced formally, either among a regular chapter or, if that is impossible, in front of one or several regular monks; the observance should then be formally resumed (*samāditabba*) in the same way, as soon as possible¹⁸.

2. If the Saṃgh. offence was concealed (*paṭicchanna*) knowingly¹⁹ for any length of time before being acknowledged and confessed, a

¹⁸ Vin II 36,25-28 (to be filled in with 34,3-20); Sp 1171,29-1172,33; Kkh 50,13-29 (Mū parallel: MSV(D) III 102,5-103,14). According to Sp 1162,1-5, a monk undergoing *mānatta* may be required to act either as preceptor or instructor of a novice during the procedures involved in ordination; in such a case, he may postpone his observance for the time being. From then on, and until he formally resumes *mānatta*, his status is that of a regular monk (*pakatatta*; Sp 1171,29-1172,33; cf. below, n. 27, n. 50). Sp 1189,12-15 adds that if he commits one or several further unconcealed offences during this time, he is accordingly not liable to be sent back to the beginning of the postponed probation, but to *mānatta* only; if he commits one or several offences and conceals them, the general dispositions about simple or combined probation apply (see below, § 3-3 d).

¹⁹ Vin II 55,14-39, 58,10-31, state that a monk should not be charged with concealing an offence when he does not know, or has doubts about, or cannot remember, having done so: although he does incur a penalty, only *mānatta* applies in his case (cf. (Mū) MSV(D) III 63,16-64,10; 65,11-15). According to Kkh 48,16-37 (reading *itthan-nāmā*, with C° (SHB 1930) 47,34, for E° 48,23 °-*nāmo*), Sp 1173,31-1176,17, five twofold criteria, that can be summarized as follows, determine concealment — the latter entailing a Dukk.: Sp 1176,3-4; cf. (Mū) MSV(D) III 86,10-87,14, (reading *duṣkṛtā* for ed. *duṣhulā* throughout:

Continues...

period of probation (*parivāsa*, m.) of the same length is to precede *mānatta*; the two penalties are accordingly termed *paṭicchanna-parivāsa*²⁰, *p°-mānatta*²¹. Probation is to be granted, then undergone,

GBM(FacEd) X.6, 930 [209, r°3-6]: there is actually a Saṃgh. offence, and/or the agent thinks so; his status is that of a regular monk, and/or he thinks so (see below in this n.); he is exposed to some danger (which makes it impossible to go and talk to another monk), and/or thinks so (according to Vjb (B° 1960) 512,21-22, Sp 1175,4 should read *an-antarāyikassa pana*); he is physically able to tell about his offence, and/or thinks so; he plans to conceal it, and does so. Stating one's offence is valid when done in whatever words are relevant, in front of any monk who did not commit the same offence, and in a threefold manner: stating the case (*vattu*), then the offence (*āpatti*) it entails, then both together.

In this precise context, regular status is defined by Kkh 48,27 ≠ Sp 1174,14-15 as that of a monk against whom no procedure of suspension (*ukkhepaniyyakamma*) was carried out. Sp 1174,21-25 goes on to quote Vin V 219,20-24*, and refers implicitly to the latter's commentary at Sp 1395,11-13: “since no monastic formality (*vinaya-kamma*) is carried out with the participation of a [suspended monk], he incurs no [blame], no matter whether he conceals a Saṃgh. offence”. The reason is that an *ukkhattaka*, unlike a *mānatta-cārika* or a *pārivāsika* (cf. above, n. 12), is temporarily excluded from the community to which he belonged (*samāna-saṃvāsaka*) for all purposes (taking part in procedures — first of all, fortnightly *uposatha*, and *pāvaraṇā* at the end of monsoon retreat—, sharing gifts from donors, accounting for offences committed: Vin IV 135,30-35, 138,1-2', etc.; see KP, Simā 53-54, 62-65, 121-123). He is now considered as “one who belongs elsewhere due to a [disciplinary] procedure” (*kamma-nānāsaṃvāsaka*), which amounts to saying that he belongs nowhere (see Vin II 23,5-16; Sp 904,3-12 ad Vin IV 219,1). He is, therefore, not in a position (*a-pakatatta*) to make a valid acknowledgement of his offence (Vin V 187,16-18,20-22 with Sp 1375,5-7), or to apply for the penalty he incurs, or to report on his *pārivāsika* status (Sp 1167,3-5): this legal impossibility frees him from any blame in case of concealment. Matters are different if he was suspended *after* committing Saṃgh. offences (see below, § 4).

On the offences entailed by concealing from monks/nuns a Saṃgh. offence committed by another, and by revealing it to anyone who is not ordained, see below, n. 48.

²⁰ For the mere sake of formal symmetry with *appaṭicchanna-mānatta* (§ 1 above), Vin V 118,9, 121,9, 126,2, and Sp 1159,23-1160,1, mention an *appaṭicchanna-parivāsa*, “probation [applying to something] unconcealed”; this

Continues...

very similarly to simple *mānatta*²², through a formal, threefold application by the guilty monk, followed by a fourfold procedure carried out by a regular chapter²³. According to Sp, a monk who committed several Saṃgh. offences may state each of them during the same session; as soon as probation has been granted to him, he should formally undertake the relevant restrictions, and announce it before the chapter²⁴.

BHS *parivāsa*, m.: BhīVin(Mā-L) 324,1; Prakīṃ(Mā-L) 328,6; PrMoSū(Mā-L) 12,9.

Skt. *parivāsa*, m.: (Sa ?)²⁵ SHT(V) 22 (1039, v°1, v°4). — (Mū) Guṇ-VinSū 102,25; MSV(D) II 207,15; III 32,21 sqq., 34,20 sqq., 43,11 sqq., 55,6-7 sq., 61,13 sqq., 68,13 sqq., 94,12 sqq., etc.; Mvy(M) 265.11. — (unid.sch.) SHT(V) 116 (1121, B3).

2 a. Whatever its specific modes (see below, § 3 b-d), probation entails the same restrictions (with the same exceptions) as *mānatta* (see above, § 1 a), except on two points: a *pārivāsika* monk need not report daily to the Order on his case (but must still inform any monk he chances to meet of his status²⁶); if accompanied by one regular monk, he may meet monks belonging to the same residence as himself. Accordingly, a

ad hoc coinage refers to quite another observance, i.e., the probation to be undergone over four months by non-Buddhist male ascetics who are making their first application ever for ordination into a Buddhist community.

²¹ Sp 1171,3-5 ≠ Kkh 51,16-17; Sp 1180,26-29.

²² Compare Sp 1171,10-1172,33 (*mānatta*) ≠ 1177,14-1179,25 (*parivāsa*).

²³ Vin II 40,17-42,19, 43,11-17, 48,14-19; Sp 1173,18-1180,5.

²⁴ Sp 1178,17-23 ≠ 1171,21-28 ≠ Vin IV 127,11-17, 64th Pāc. (cf. below, first part of n. 48). About the ritual duties of *pārivāsika* monks according to Skt./Tib. Mū. texts, see Schopen, Lay Ownership.

²⁵ See above, n. 9.

²⁶ This is exemplified in the *nidāna* of the Thv(M) 64th Pāc., Vin IV 127,7-15 (cf. below, first part of n. 48).

one day break, entailing the extension of probation by the same amount, is incurred by the infringement of any of the three following restrictions: dwelling under the same roof as a regular monk, living away from monks, failing to inform them of one's status (Vin II 33,33-34,2).

If observing probation becomes objectively difficult, it may be temporarily suspended, then resumed, under the same conditions as *mānatta*²⁷.

3. If several Saṃgh. offences are committed at the same time, or new, “secondary” ones (*antarāpatti*, f.)²⁸ are committed during the period

²⁷ Vin II 34,3-30; see above, end of § 1 a. According to Sp 1169,9-13, a monk under probation is entitled to take part in any procedure, except those connected with Saṃgh. offences, provided he formally postpones his observance for the time being. Sp 1179,28-32 adds that if he did so at the very end of the probation period, his subsequent application for *mānatta* is irrelevant (since his status has changed temporarily to that of a regular monk) until he is made to resume his observance, thereby shifting to the status of *parivūṭṭha-parivāsa*, “who has completed probation”, which makes him *ipso facto mānattāraha*, “liable to *m*” (cf. above, n. 18; below, n. 50).

²⁸ Confused by CPD *s.v.* with *antarāyikāpatti* (see BD VI 172-173 n. 15; CPD II.2, top of p. 96b). At Vin V 115,10, the offences committed first are called *pubbāpatti*, “earlier offences”, as opposed to *aparāpatti*, “later ones”, i.e., those committed while undergoing such penalties as probation (*pārivāsikādīhi pacchā āpannāpatti*, Sp 1319,31-32). Vin V 115,11 also mentions “offences secondary to the earlier/late ones” (*pubbāpattīnaṃ/aparāpattīnaṃ antarāpatti*), that is, according to Sp 1319,31-1320,1, secondary offences committed resp. during redress by “being sent back to the beginning” (*mūla-visuddhi*), and during redress by “evaluation” of the longest period (*aggha-visuddhi*) (*mūla-*° does not designate a “root” offence [so BD VI 173 n. 15], but obviously contrasts with *aggha-*°, these abbreviated terms standing resp. for *mūlāya paṭikassana* and *aggha-samodhāna-parivāsa* [see below, § 3 a-b], as stated explicitly by Vjb (B° 1960) 556,28-557,2). An alternative interpretation is that of the Kurundi, according to which *pubbāpatti* refers to earlier offences, *pubbāpattīnaṃ antarāpatti* to those committed while on probation, *aparāpatti* to those committed

of probation or of *mānatta*, or between the two, or between the end of *mānatta* and actual re-admission, they are to be dealt with differently, according to whether they were concealed or not.

A single period of six days' *mānatta* applies to several offences committed before undergoing this penalty.

3 a. Whatever their number, unconcealed secondary offences entail being “sent back to the beginning” (*mūlāya paṭikassana*) of whichever penalty — either probation or *mānatta* — the monk was undergoing, or had just completed, when he committed these new offences²⁹.

3 b. Concealed secondary offences entail “combined probation” (*samodhāna-parivāsa*), *i.e.*, beginning probation again, for a period equivalent to the longest one during which any offence — either the first, or the subsequent one(s) — was concealed³⁰. In Sp (cf. Kkh 50,38-51,10), this is called *odhāna-samodhāna*, “inclusive combination”, when only one former and one later, identical Saṃgh. offences are involved³¹; *aggha-samodhāna*, “combination with evaluation [of the longest period]”, when several, identical Saṃgh. offences are involved³²; *missaka-samodhāna*, “combination applying to mixed [offences]”, when several, different Saṃgh. offences are involved³³.

when liable to *mānatta* (after probation), and *aparāpattīnaṃ antarāpatti* to those committed while undergoing *mānatta* (Sp 1320,1-5).

²⁹ Vin II 43,18-45,17, 46,8-33; Sp 1180,5-32.

³⁰ See BD V 65 n. 1 (first line: for “p. 169”, read “p. 140”).

³¹ Sp 1182,18-1183,18 *ad* Vin II 48,20-49,32.

³² Sp 1183,19-1184,5 *ad* Vin II 51,17-52,37; *aggha-samodhāno nāma sabhāga-vatthukāyo* [see below, n. 44] *sambahulā āpattiyo āpannassa bahurattim paṭicchādītāpattiyam nikkhipitvā dātabbo* (Vjb (B^c 1960) 513,21-22).

³³ Sp 1184,6-20 (cf. below, n. 44).

The dispositions set forth in § 3a-b apply whether the monk is able or not to identify precisely the secondary offences he committed³⁴. The new probation and/or the final six days' *mānatta* apply to the totality of offences involved (although formally identical in all cases whatsoever, this latter penalty is called here *samodhāna-mānatta*, with the same three subdivisions as combined probation, by Sp 1188,16-31).

No BHS parallels have been traced so far.

In Skt. Mū texts, Pā. *odhāna-samodhāna* is represented by *mūla-parivāsa*, “probation back from the beginning”³⁵ — this is incurred by a monk under probation who commits a “secondary offence identical with the former one” (*antarāpatti pūrvāpatti-pratirūpā*), and conceals it; the final period of *mānāpya* is accordingly termed *mūla-mānāpya*³⁶. The parallel to Pā. *aggha-samodhāna* is *mūlāpakarṣa-parivāsa*, “probation entailing being sent back [once again] to the beginning”³⁷ — this is incurred by a *mūla-pārivāsika* monk who commits a “[later] secondary offence identical with the [former] secondary one” (*pratyantārāpatti*

³⁴ (*a*)*parimānāyo āpattiyo*, “(in)definite offences”, Vin II 62,6-31, that is, “(in)definite as to their exact determination” (*āpattipariccheda-vasena*, Sp 1190,27-28), which means that the monk is able or not to discern that the offence committed belongs to the Saṃgh. class (*jāti-vasena*, Vjb (B^c 1960) 514,26 *ad* Vin II 68,25 *parimānaṃ*; cf. below, n. 44). The Skt. Mū parallel is (*a*)*parimānavatī āpatti* (see BHSD *s.v.* *parimānavantī*): MSV(D) III 69,8 sqq., 70,11, 72,7 sqq. (cf. Guṇ-VinSū 104,12-15).

³⁵ MSV(D) II 207,15, III 35,6 sq., 38,4, 41,16, 43,16-17 sqq., 47,20, 55,12 sqq., 74,2 sqq., 80,18 sqq., 96,11, 100,11 sqq., etc.; Mvy(M) 265.12. On this and the following terms, cf. BHSD *s.v.* *mūla* (3).

³⁶ MSV(D) II 154,15 (= KC, Kaṭh-v 53,27-28), 207,16, III 82,9 sq., 85,12 sq., 94,13 (misprinted -°*pānāpya*), 100,12 sqq., etc.; Mvy(M) 265.15.

³⁷ Often shortened as *mūlāpakarṣa*; Guṇ-VinSū 100,19 (cf. 102,26-27 *mūlāpakramatva* ?); MSV(D) II 207,15, III 38,11, 39,10 sqq., 42,10 sqq., 47,21 sqq., 55,18 sqq., 74,5 sqq., 81,13 sqq., 94,12-13, 100,11, etc.; Mvy(M) 265.13.

antarāpatti-pratirūpā), and who conceals it. The final period of *mānāpya* is accordingly termed *mūlāpakarṣa-mānāpya*³⁸.

3 c. The dispositions set forth in § 3a-b do not apply in the following cases: when a monk who concealed two offences goes on concealing one while applying for probation on account of the other; when he applies for probation on account of one offence of which he is conscious, or remembers, or has no doubts about — then, while on probation, becomes conscious, or remembers, or does not doubt, that he committed another one at the same time; when he tries to be granted a reduced period of probation for each offence, or comes to remember, while on probation, that he concealed offences for longer than he had first thought. In all these cases, each offence entails its own, uncombined period of probation³⁹.

3 d. If a monk does not know, or does not remember, or is in doubt about, the exact number of offences he committed, and/or the exact number of days⁴⁰ during which he concealed them, he should make a threefold application for, then be granted, an “absolving probation” (*suddhanta-parivāsa*) by a fourfold procedure⁴¹. According to Sp, the duration of this probation may be either short or long.

The duration of the shorter form is determined by the time that elapsed between the monk's ordination and the moment he ceased to be free from any Saṃgh. offence; one of its distinctive features is that it may

³⁸ MSV(D) II 207,16, III 94,13, 100,12 sqq.; Mvy(M) 265.16.

³⁹ Vin II 53,1-55,14, 56,1-58,10. Skt. Mū Parallel: MSV(D) III 61,19-62,19.

⁴⁰ *Āpatti-°*, *ratti-pariyanta* mean “definite number of offences/days” (Kkh 50,36-37 *āpatti-pariyantaṃ pana ettikā ahaṃ āpattiyo āpanno ti jānātu vā mā vā*), and, as bhvr., “valid for [*idem*]” (both BD V 76 and CPD *s.v.* *āpatti-pariyanta* are somewhat misleading). Cf. below, second part of n. 48.

⁴¹ Vin II 58,32-60,19 with Sp 1181,1-1182,16 (summed up at Kkh 50,31-38).

be lengthened or shortened (*uddhaṃ pi ārohati heṭṭhā pi orohati*) according to circumstances: if the monk thinks he was guilty for one month, then remembers he actually was for two, probation is to be lengthened accordingly; if, when undergoing probation for two months, he comes to know for certain that he was guilty for one only, probation is to be shortened accordingly; furthermore, if the penalty turns out to be inappropriate, an offence is removed when the penalty is heavier than it should have been, but not when it is lighter.

The longer form applies when a monk cannot remember when he ceased to be free from any Saṃgh. offence; in this case, the length of the penalty should be determined by the time elapsed between his ordination and the moment he undertook observing probation; it cannot be made to run for longer (*uddhaṃ nārohati*). If the monk under probation comes to be certain about the period during which he was guilty, the penalty should be shortened accordingly (*heṭṭhā pana orohati*).

No **BHS** parallel has been traced so far.

Skt. *suddhāntika parivāsa*, m.: (Mū) MSV(D) III 72,11, 73,7.

4. If a monk on probation, or liable to be sent back to the beginning of the penalty, or liable to *mānatta*, or undergoing the latter, reverts to lay life or to the status of a novice, or is temporarily out of his senses, or feels acute physical pain, or undergoes suspension (*ukkhepanīya-kamma*, on account of an offence of a different type; cf. above, n. 19), the period spent on probation or *mānatta* is not cancelled, but the penalty should be taken up and completed if he reverts again to the status of a monk, or after he recovers from mental or physical illness, or after his reintegration

(*osāraṇā*); in the same circumstances, a monk who is fit for re-admission should be re-admitted⁴².

4 a. If the offences committed before these same events were disclosed after the latter took place, either probation or *mānatta* applies, depending on whether the offences were concealed or not — whether before or after these events; whether before or after the monk knew for certain, or remembered, or had no doubts anymore that he actually concealed them⁴³.

4 b. If he committed secondary offences before these same events, when on probation, or when liable to be sent back to the beginning of the penalty, or when liable to *mānatta*, or when undergoing the latter, or when fit for readmission, he should afterwards be either sent back to the beginning of the penalty, or granted combined probation (depending on whether these new offences were concealed or not — no matter when), or readmitted. These dispositions apply whether the offences committed are definite or indefinite ([*a*] *parimāṇa*), designated by the same name or not (*eka*°, *nānā-nāma*), identical or not (*sabhāga*, *vi-sabhāga*) within the Saṃgh. class, or belonging to one and the same kind or not (*vavatthita/sambhinna*) within this same class. These data should be weighed up carefully — especially when combined with those set forth above, § 3-3 b: in failing to do so, any irrelevant procedure is considered as null and void, and the monk against which it was carried out may object⁴⁴.

⁴² Vin II 60,21-62,5. Skt. Mū parallel: MSV(D) III 70,13-71,12.

⁴³ Vin II 62,33-65,18 (the text of 63,14-28 is defective; see SBE XVII 423 n. 2).

⁴⁴ Vin II 65,20-67,8; 68,24-72,16. Skt. Mū parallel (with slightly different combinations): MSV(D) III 64,11-70,12, 71,13-72,3, 72,13-73,14, 73,15-79,2; this latter text lists six degrees of redress, according to whether one or several procedures are invalid; the monk is expected to apply insistently for the necessary corrections to wrong procedures (79,14-83,6).

Continues...

4 c. When unable to cope with a monk who commits offences (including Saṃgh. ones) repeatedly, the chapter may subject him to the control of a monk adviser (*nissaya-kamma*)⁴⁵.

5. According to Vin II 67,9-68,23, if two monks (i) commit a Saṃgh. offence and either think so, or are in doubt, or think it is a mixed⁴⁶ offence, or come to think it is a Saṃgh. after learning about the

On *parimāṇa*, see above, n. 34. As explained at Kkh 8,20-9,2 (cf. Sp 1064,10-13 ad Vin I 126,12-13), 49,29-50,7, *sabhāga* offences are, in this context, those — belonging to the same class — whose common element is the fact (*vatthu-sabhāga*) which is constitutive of the offence and which gives the latter its key-word (*gotta*; BD IV 169 “class” is inaccurate) label (e.g., the paradigmatic *saṃcetanika sukka-visatṭhi*, “deliberate emission of semen” [first Saṃgh.], quoted *passim* in the texts dealing with the relevant penalties, to the embarrassment of Victorian scholars [SBE XVII 397 sqq.]), as opposed to offences which do not share it (*nānā-vatthuka*); *sabhāga* and *vi-sabhāga* are therefore syn. resp. with *tabbhāgiya* and *aññabhāgiya* (Vin III 168,20-34). *Nānā-vatthuka* offences — all from the Saṃgh. class — are listed at Sp 1184,6-13, according to which they entail a *missaka-samodhāna* probation (see above, § 3 b). These latter offences are called *asamāpatti* in the Skt. Mū parallel (MSV(D) III 87,15-88,9; cf. Guṇ-VinSū 104,16).

According to Sp 1191,4-5, *vavatthita*, “belonging to one and the same, separate kind”, and *sambhinna*, “mixed [within the same Saṃgh. class]”, are just another way of explaining *sabhāga/visabhāga*.

“Name” (*nāma*) refers either to that of the class (Saṃgh.) to which the offences belong (*sajāti-sādhāraṇa*) or to the generic name (*sabba-sādhāraṇa*) *āpatti*, “offence”. As shown by the examples given at Kkh 50,1-8, these minute distinctions reflect the importance attached to the precision of the guilty monk’s formal statement when applying for the relevant penalty before the chapter which is to control all proceedings from beginning to end: although no fixed set of formulae is required, this statement is to proceed on the above lines, in any combination that makes the case clear enough for determining the accurate penalty (cf. Skt. (Mū) Guṇ-VinSū 102,21 *nāmagotrōpasamhitam āpattivāt kīrtanam*).

⁴⁵ Vin II 7,17-9,27; see SBE XVII 343, n. 1, 384 n. 1.

⁴⁶ According to Sp 1191,7-9, *missaka* designates a Saṃgh. offence whose commission may happen to include the Thull., Dukk. and Dubbh. offences of Vibhaṅga casuistry (all connected with one and the same fact: Vjb (B° 1960)

Continues...

relevant rule during the recitation of the Pātimokkha⁴⁷, (ii) or if they commit a mixed offence and either think so, or think it is a Saṃgh., the one who concealed his own is to be charged with a Dukk. and granted probation; *mānatta* applies to both. If they commit an unmixed offence and think it is a Saṃgh., the one who concealed his own should be charged with a Dukk.; both should be dealt with according to the offence⁴⁸.

514,19 *eka-vatthumhi*) resulting in a Saṃgh. offence (cf. SVTT II n. 21), as opposed to *suddhaka*, “unmixed”, i.e., an offence that belongs to the “light” (*lahuka*) class, excluding the Saṃgh. (and Pār.) ones, which are considered as “heavy” (*garuka*).

⁴⁷ Presumably *bona fide*, when the exceptions to the Thv(M) 73rd [bhu] Pāc. apply. According to this latter rule, a Pāc. is incurred by any monk/nun who pleads not guilty by simulating ignorance of the Pātim. rules, although he/she did attend several times at their complete, fortnightly recitation (Vin IV 144,8-145,30 with Kkh 129,17-37 ≠ Sp 876,31-877,13; n°151 [bhī]. — Cf. UpāliPr(SR) 90, n°85. — Conc.: BhīPr 59, table IV.1 s.v. *śikṣāpada-dravyatāvyaścārah*). As far as can be seen, there are no cross-references to this point in the Cullavagga, in the Vibhaṅga, in Kkh, or in Sp — unlike the Skt. Mū parallel (MSV(D) III 63,2-7 ≠ [badly reconstructed] PrMoSū(Mū)₂ 44,3-8). Besides, it is not clear to me why both the Cullavagga and MSV(D) III 79,3-13 (reading *duṣṭertā* for ed. *duṣṭhulā* throughout: GBM(FacEd) X.6, 926 [207,r°2-4]) mention two monks just here, when a single one would have done as well to exemplify dispositions whose principles entirely conform to those set forth in the preceding and following passages.

⁴⁸ Any monk who deliberately conceals from monks a Saṃgh. offence (*duṭṭhullā āpatti*, “major offence”, refers usually to both Pār. and Saṃgh. [Vin IV 128,1-2], but here to the latter only [Kkh 124,35 ≠ Sp 866,14-15]; cf. the last part of this n.), committed by another incurs a Pāc. offence, unless revealing it would lead to a split in the community (*saṃgha-bheda*), or endanger the physical or spiritual life of its members; or if informing a regular monk is impossible, if the offence is evident *per se*, if one does not mean to conceal it, or is out of one's senses, or is the first to do so (Thv(M) n° 64, Vin IV 127,2-128,32 with Kkh 124,35-125,18 ≠ Sp 866,13-867,2. — Cf. UpāliPr(SR) 78, n°52. — Conc.: BhīPr 58, table IV.1 s.v. *duṣṭhulāpraticchādanam*). In Mś, Mā, and Thv(M) schools, this rule does not apply to nuns (see BhīPr *ib.*), although a similar one provides, in all known schools, that any nun who conceals the Pār. offence committed by another incurs

Continues...

6. Whether or not simple or combined *mānatta* is preceded by simple or combined probation, the monk who observes it until the end (*cinṇamānatta*) is said to be “fit for re-admission” (*abbhānāraha*), and expected as such to observe the same restrictions as monks on probation⁴⁹, until re-admission (*abbhāna*, n. < *ā-hvayati*, “recalls”) as a fully regular monk is granted to him. He is to make a threefold request for this purpose, before a regular chapter numbering twenty monks at

a Pār. (Thv n°2, Vin IV 216,2-217,35 with Kkh 158,24-34 ≠ Sp 903,5-21. — Conc.: BhīPr 53, table I s.v. *vajjapaticchādikā*. The close relationship between these two rules is borne out by their casuistic commentary [Vin IV 128,16-22 = 217,29-35], by Kkh and Sp's commentaries to the latter, and by the brother- [Vin IV 127,5 *bhātuno*] / sisterhood relationship of their respective protagonists [see BhīPr 24-25]).

A twin rule states that unless the order carries out a formal agreement (*sammuti*) for the purpose of informing lay people, any monk/nun who informs someone unordained about the Saṃgh. offence committed by another incurs a Pāc., except if one reveals only the fact (*vatthu*), or only the specific offence (*āpatti*) entailed, or is out of one's senses, or is the first one to do so (Thv(M) n°9 [bhu], Vin IV 30,24-32,19 with Kkh 86,28-87,8, Sp 753,5-754,29; n°105 [bhī]. — Cf. UpāliPr(SR) 62, n°8. — Conc.: BhīPr 57, table IV.1 s.v. *duṣṭhulārocanaṃ*). The formal agreement may bear either on a definite number of offences (*āpatti-pariyanta*; see above, n. 40), or on a definite number of lay people to be informed, or on both; according to Kkh 86,30-33, Sp 754,10, it is an arrangement (*katikā*) to be carried out by a formal consultation (*apalokanā*) of the chapter (see SVTT I § 3 a and n. 14). In this rule also, Saṃgh. offences are referred to by the term *duṭṭhullā āpatti* (Vin IV 31,17-18' = 128,1-2'; see Kkh 86,28-30, Sp 753,5-8). According to Sp 753,15-754,4, although one might argue that revealing to laymen the Pār. offence committed by another is also a Pāc. (because it amounts to disparaging [*omasa-vāda*, first Pāc.] the latter monk; cf. Vin IV 9,8-14), one should rather follow the criteria set by *aṭṭhakathā* specialists, who know what the Buddha meant (cf. Sp 2,27-3,4*). Agreement to inform laymen about a monk's offence is meant neither to disparage the latter, nor to hold back the *sāsana* on his account, but for his own improvement; it is therefore irrelevant to those guilty of a Pār., who incur immediate expulsion together with loss of their status as monks.

⁴⁹ Vin II 36,29-37,12; cf. above, n. 12.

least; the latter will then carry out a fourfold procedure whereby re-admission will become effective⁵⁰.

BHS *āhvayana*, n. (< *ā-hvayati*, “recalls”; cf. Sp 630,3 *a-vhātābba-*): BhīVin(Mā-L) 17,17, 63,2 sq., 163,26; Prakīrṃ(Mā-L) 328,7.

āhvayana-pratibaddha, m(fn), “liable to re-admission” (corresp. to Pā. *abbhānāraha*): BhīVin(Mā-L) 163,26; PrMoSū(Mā-L) 12,11.

Skt. (all forms < *ābr(m)hati/āvr(m)hati* [cf. BHSD s.v. *ābrhati*, *āvarhati*], “extracts, draws out [the offence together with the completed penalty]”)⁵¹

ābarhana, n.: (Mū) Guṇ-VinSū 100,20, 102,2.

(Sa) *an-ābr̥m̥hita-*: PrMoSū 212 (DDa, v^o4). — *ābr̥m̥hitavya-*: PrMoSū 231 (FCc, v^o4). — *an-ābr̥hita-*: Finot 488,3; PrMoSū 244 (GP, r^o2). — *ābr̥hitavya-*: PrMoSū 5 (AAAd, v^o5), 244 (GP, r^o1). — *ābr̥hyāt-*: PrMoSū 133 (BLI, v^o3). — *ābr̥hyāt-*: Finot 488,2; PrMoSū

⁵⁰ Vin III 186,16-20 with Sp 629,30-630,7 ≠ Kkh 51,24-35; Vin II 39,15-40,16 (cf. 42,20-43,10, 46,34-48,13, 51,1-15) with Sp 1173,1-13. According to the latter, a monk who was allowed to postpone *mānatta* on account of some duty (and is now considered as regular) at the very end of the six prescribed days should be made to resume his observance, thereby shifting from the status of a regular monk to that of one who is “fit for re-admission”. Cf. above, n. 18, n. 27. In the Skt. Mū parallel, elaborate censure of, then encouragements to, the monk are inserted resp. after the motion has been put, and at the very end of the re-admission procedure (MSV(D) III 53,11-55,2 ≠ 57,10-58,18).

⁵¹ Although well aware that listing *-b-* and *-v-* forms separately is hardly helpful as far as the study of comparative Vinaya lexicography is concerned, I record here, for the mere sake of convenience, what I read in printed editions, however fluctuating (Guṇ-VinSū, Mvy) the latter may be; the task of assessing the validity of such a distinction must be left aside for the time being. Due to the relative scarcity of occurrences of *ābarhana/āvarhana*, references to both these keywords, and to connected verbal forms in relevant texts, are listed here.

244 (GP, r^o1). — *ābrahitavya-*: Finot 488,1; PrMoSū 133 (BLI, r^o2). — (unid.sch.) *ābrhati*: SHT(V) 116 (1121, B4).

āvarhana, n.: (Mū) Guṇ-VinSū 102,22,30; MSV(D) II 203,16 sq., III 51,9, 53,4; Mvy 8656 (≠ Mvy(M) 265.18 *ābarhana*). — *āvarhana-pratibaddha*, m(fn). (cf. above, BHS): (Mū) PrMoSū(Mū)₂ 22,1.

āvrahana (for *āvarhana*), n.: (Sa) Hoernle, MR 12 (3.2).

(Mū) *an-āvr̥da-*: PrMoSū(Mū)₂ 22,3. — *āvr̥dha-*: MSV(D) III 74,6,16, 75,10,20 sq. — *āvarhita-*: MSV(D) III 57,4, 58,18. — *āvarhitavya-*: MSV(D) III 49,17, 88,9; PrMoSū(Mū)₂ 22,2. — *āvarhet-*: MSV(D) III 53,10; PrMoSū(Mū)₂ 22,3.

7. The *mānatta* penalty applying to nuns who have committed a Saṃgh. offence is the object of the fifth “important rule” among the eight they are expected to stick to all life long⁵². It is to be observed during one

⁵² Vin II 255,16-17 (quoted IV 52,26-28) *garu-dhammaṃ ajjhāpanāya bhikkhuniya ubhato-saṃghe pakkhamānattaṃ caritabbaṃ*. I hope to have shown (Nolot, Règles 401-404; English summary *ib.* 535-536) that the term *garu-dhamma*, “important rule”, that gives its generic name to this as well as to the seven other rules, should not be confused with the homonymous *garu-dhamma* occurring in the text of the fifth one quoted here, where it is syn. with *garukā āpatti* (cf. above, n. 46), and means “heavy offence”, referring here to the Saṃgh. (this is taken for granted by Buddhaghosa, who deals with the *mānatta* applying to nuns together with other forms of the same penalty, at the very beginning of his commentary of the Cullavagga's Samuccaya-kkhandha: the fifth “important rule” is quoted fully — as above — at 1184,29-30; the guilty nun's application for *mānatta* is then exemplified at 1185,7-24 with *gāmantaram*, a key-word of the third Thv(M) [bhi] Saṃgh. [Vin IV 227,20-228,7, 230,4-9',22-25]). Unlike the seven others, this “important rule” is, in all known schools, logically unparalleled in the Pāc. section of their Vibhaṅga-s (see chart in Nolot, *ib.* 399-400): dispositions about Pāc. offences — all of which are classified as “light” — cannot include dispositions about the Saṃgh. ones — all of which are classified as “heavy”. The latter are dealt with extensively in texts of the Khandhaka or Kammavācā type (cf. SVTT I n. 29), like all those whose redress implies procedures (*tajjanīya-kamma*, etc.; cf. SVTT II n. 60), and referred to briefly at the end of the Saṃgh. section of each respective Pātim. (Thv(M) [bhu]: refs.

fortnight (*pakkha-mānatta*), no matter whether the nun concealed her offence or not⁵³. According to Kkh 166,24-168,13 = Sp 1184,26-1188,15, the nun who did so incurs a Dukk.; whatever the case, *mānatta* should be applied for and granted through the same procedure — carried out by a nuns' chapter — as applies to monks (see above, § 1). The formal undertaking of this penalty, then its observance (with provisions for temporary postponement [§ 1 a above], and for sending recidivist nuns back to the beginning of *mānatta* [§ 3 a]) are however to be announced, then reported on daily, before both a monks' and a nuns' chapter of at least four persons each; the nun's female preceptor or instructor is to go and request respected monks, who may not refuse, to come for the purpose. Furthermore, since no nun is allowed to live alone, a regular nun should be appointed as her companion, by a twofold procedure⁵⁴.

The procedure of re-admission is formally identical with that applying to monks; it should be carried out by a nuns' chapter⁵⁵.

Paris

Édith Nolot

above, n. 3; [bhi]: Vin IV 242,13-15 with Kkh 166,24-168,13). There is here therefore no contradiction at all, either in the wording of or in the dispositions concerning this rule, contrary to what is stated by Hüsken, *Einrichtung* 159-160 (cf. Gombrich's review of Bechert Festg. [forthcoming]).

⁵³ Refs. as above, end of n. 52; cf. Sp 1395,3-9 *ad* Vin V 219,23*.

⁵⁴ Vin II 279,17-25; Sp 1188,8-11; cf. third Thv(M) [bhi] Samgh., Vin IV 228,31-229,21, 230,15-17,22-25.

⁵⁵ Vin IV 242,15-19 (≠ III 186,16-20) with Kkh 168,12-14; Sp 1188, 11-12 (E° *bhikkhu-saṃghe* is most probably a mistake; C° (SHB 1948) 879,31, and Bp.: *bhikkhunī*-°, *-ni*-°; Kkh E° 168,12 and C° (SHB 1930) 169,24-25: *bhikkhunī-saṃgho*, no recorded *v.l.*; Sp E° 277,9,25 and C° 199,13,28 *bhikkhunīhi*, no recorded *v.l.*).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bareau, PCB: A. Bareau, *Les premiers conciles bouddhiques*. Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1955 (AMG, Bibliothèque d'Études 60).
- Bechert Festg.: *Studien zur Indologie und Buddhismuskunde*. Festgabe des Seminars für Indologie und Buddhismuskunde für Professor Dr. Heinz Bechert, hrsg. von R. Grünendahl, J.-U. Hartmann, P. Kieffer-Pülz. Bonn, IndTib, 1993 (IndTib 22).
- Bechert, "Schismenedikt": H. Bechert, "Aśokas 'Schismenedikt' und der Begriff Sanghabheda", WZKSO V (1961), 19-52.
- Bendall, Ord.Ritual: C. Bendall, "Fragment of a Buddhist Ordination-Ritual in Sanskrit", in *Album Kern*. Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1903, 373-376.
- BhiKaVā(S): M. Schmidt, "*Bhikṣuṇī-Karmavācanā*. Die Handschrift Sansk.c25(R) der Bodleian Library Oxford", in Bechert Festg., 239-288.
- Carrithers, Forest Monks: M. Carrithers, *The Forest Monks of Sri Lanka. An anthropological and historical study*. Delhi, Oxford University Press, 1983.
- CASF (II): E. Waldschmidt, "Central Asian Sūtra Fragments and their Relation to the Chinese Āgama", in Bechert, *Sprache*, 136-174.
- deJ., Fa-hsien: J.W. de Jong, "Fa-hsien and Buddhist Texts in Ceylon", JPTS IX (1981), 105-115.
- Demiéville, Vaiśālī: P. Demiéville, "A propos du concile de Vaiśālī", TP XL (1950), 239-296.
- Dutt, EBM: S. Dutt, *Early Buddhist Monachism*. Delhi, Munshiram Manoharlal, 1984 (1st ed. 1924).

- GBM(FacEd) X.1, X.6: see above, general introduction to SVTT I-III.
- Gombrich, Thv Buddhism: R.F. Gombrich, *Theravāda Buddhism. A Social History from Ancient Benares to Modern Colombo*. London/New York, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1988.
- Guṇ-VinSū: *Vinayasūtra of Bhadanta Guṇaprabha*, ed. by R. Sankrityayana. Bombay, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1981 (SJS 74).
- Guṇ-VinSū (Pravr-v): Guṇaprabha, *Vinaya-Sūtra and auto-commentary on the same. Chapter I: Pravrajyā-vastu*, ed. by P.V. Bapat and V.V. Gokhale. Patna, KPJResInst, 1982 (TSWS XXII).
- HH, Po-v: Haiyan Hu-von Hinüber, *Das Poṣadhavastu. Vorschriften für die buddhistische Beichtfeier im Vinaya der Mūlasarvāstivādins*. Reinbeck, Dr. I. Wezler, Verlag für Orientalistische Fachpublikationen, 1994 (StIIM 13).
- Hirakawa, ChinBhīVin(Mā): A. Hirakawa, *Monastic Discipline for the Buddhist Nuns. An English Translation of the Chinese Text of the Mahāsāṃghika-Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya*. Patna, KPJResInst, 1982 (TSWS XXI).
- Hofinger, Concile: M. Hofinger, *Étude sur le concile de Vaiśālī*. Louvain, 1946 (BM, vol. 20).
- Hüsken, Einrichtung: U. Hüsken, "Die Legende von der Einrichtung des buddhistischen Nonnenordens im *Vinaya-Piṭaka* der Theravādin", in Bechert Festg., 151-170.
- KaVā(Mū)₂: separate reprint of KaVā(Mū), in A.K. Banerjee, *Two Buddhist Vinaya texts in Sanskrit*. Calcutta, The World Press Private Ltd., 1977, 58-73.
- KC, Kath-v: Kun Chang, *A Comparative Study of the Kathinavastu*. 'S-Gravenhage, Mouton & Co., 1957 (IIM I).

- KP, Simā: P. Kieffer-Pülz, *Die Simā. Vorschriften zur Regelung der buddhistischen Gemeindegrenze in älteren buddhistischen Texten*. Berlin, D. Reimer Verlag, 1992 (MIAKPh 8).
- Mukherjee, Devadatta: B. Mukherjee, *Die Überlieferung von Devadatta, dem Widersacher des Buddha, in den kanonischen Schriften*. München, J. Kitzinger, 1966 (MSS, Beiheft 1).
- Mvy(M): *Mahāvvyutpatti*, ed. by Y. Minaev; 2nd ed. by I.D. Mironov. St. Petersburg, 1910-1911 (Bbu XIII).
- Nolot, FragmMā(?): É. Nolot, "Derechef à propos d'un fragment du ? Mahāsāṃghika-Vinaya", BEI 6 (1988), 351-358.
- Nolot, Règles: É. Nolot, *Règles de discipline des nonnes bouddhistes. Le Bhikṣuṇīvinaya de l'école Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin*. Paris, Collège de France, 1991 (PICI 60).
- Prakīrṇ(Mā-L): "Summary of the *Bhikṣu-Prakīrṇaka* of the Ārya Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin", in BhīVin(Mā-L), 327-334.
- PrMoSū(Mū)₂: separate reprint of PrMoSū(Mū), in A.K. Banerjee, *Two Buddhist Vinaya texts in Sanskrit*. Calcutta, the World Press Private Ltd., 1977, 8-56.
- Roth, Term.: G. Roth, "Terminologisches aus dem Vinaya der Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin", ZDMG 118 (1968), 334-348.
- Schopen, Business: G. Schopen, "Doing business for the Lord: Lending on interest and written loan contracts in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-Vinaya*", JAOS 114/4 (1994), 527-553.
- Schopen, Funerals: G. Schopen, "On avoiding ghosts and social censure: Monastic Funerals in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-Vinaya*", JIP 20 (1992), 1-39.

Schopen, Lay Ownership: G. Schopen, "The Lay Ownership of Monasteries and the Role of the Monk in Mūlasarvāstivādin Monasticism", JIABS (forthcoming).

SVTT: the present Studies on Vinaya Technical Terms.

SWTF Nachtr.: SWTF, *Nachträge* (in SWTF, vol. I, fasc. 6-8).

UpāliPr(SR): V. Stache-Rosen, *Upālipariprocchāsūtra. Ein Text zur buddhistischen Ordensdisziplin*. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984 (AAWG 140).

USHP = v.Hi., *Untersuchungen zur Sprachgeschichte und Handschriftenkunde des Pāli*. Mainz, AAWL, 1988-.

Vallée Poussin, Conciles: L. de La Vallée Poussin, "Les deux premiers conciles", *Muséon* XXIV (1905), 213-323.

v.Hi., Āpattisamuttāhāna: O. von Hinüber, "The arising of an offence: *āpattisamuttāhāna*. A note on the structure and history of the Theravāda-Vinaya", JPTS XVI (1992), 55-69.

v.Hi., Begriffe: O. von Hinüber, "Über drei Begriffe der buddhistischen Rechtssprache: *issaravatā*, *gīvā* und *bhaṇḍadeyya*", IT VII (1979), 275-279.

v.Hi., Bestimmung: O. von Hinüber, "Die Bestimmung der Schulzugehörigkeit buddhistischer Texte nach sprachlichen Kriterien", in Bechert, Schulz I, 57-75.

v.Hi., Buddhist Law: O. von Hinüber, "Buddhist Law According to the Theravāda-Vinaya: A Survey of Theory and Practice", JIABS 18.1 (1995), 7-45.

v.Hi., Mündlichkeit: O. von Hinüber, *Untersuchungen zur Mündlichkeit früherer mittelindischer Texte der Buddhisten* (USHP III). Mainz, 1991 (AAWL, Nr. 5).

v.Hi., Oldest Pa.Ms.: O. von Hinüber, *The Oldest Pāli Manuscript. Four Folios of the Vinaya-Piṭaka from the National Archives, Kathmandu* (USHP II). Mainz, 1991 (AAWL, Nr. 6).

v.Hi., Recht u. Phonetik: O. von Hinüber, "Das buddhistische Recht und die Phonetik des Pāli. Ein Abschnitt aus der Samantapāsādikā über die Vermeidung von Aussprachefehlern in *kammavācās*", StII 13:14 (1987), 101-127.

v.Hi., Schriftlichkeit: O. von Hinüber, *Der Beginn der Schrift und frühe Schriftlichkeit in Indien*. Mainz, 1989 (AAWL, Nr. 11).

v.Hi., SP: O. von Hinüber, *Selected Papers on Pāli Studies*. Oxford, PTS, 1994.

OTHER ABBREVIATIONS

[bhī]: relevant Thv(M) Pātim. rule applying to nuns (with rule number according to M. Wijayaratna, *Les moniales bouddhistes. Naissance et développement du monachisme féminin*, Paris, Cerf, 1991, 171-195).

[bhū]: relevant Thv(M) Pātim. rule applying to monks.
Conc.: concordance of rule number according to school.

Dubbh.: *dubbhāsita* and variants.

Dukk.: *dukkāṭa* and variants.

NP: *nissaggiya-pācittiya* and variants.

Pāc.: *pācittiya* and variants.

Pār.: *pārājika* and variants.

Pāṭid.: *pāṭidesanīya* and variants.

Po-v: *Posadha-vastu*.

r°: recto.

Samgh.: *saṃghādisesa* and variants.

Sekh.: *sekhiya* and variants.

Thull.: *thullaccaya* and variants.
 Thv(M): Theravādin (Mahāvihārin).
 unid.sch.: unidentified school.
 v°: verso.

*

INDEX

PALI

akāmā parivāsa: III n. 7.
aggaha-visuddhi: III n. 28;
 -°*samodhāna*: see s.v. *parivāsa*.
aṭṭa: II § 0.
aṭṭhakathācariya: III n. 48.
a-desanāgāminī āpatti: II n. 63.
adhikaraṇa-samatha dhamma:
 II § 0, 2 sqq.
(an)antarāyika: III n. 19.
an-avasesa: II n. 63.
anubalappadāna: II n. 12.
anubhaṇanā: II n. 12.
anumati-kappa: I § 2.
anullapanā: II n. 12.
anuvadana: II n. 12.
anuvāda: II n. 14; -°*adhikaraṇa*: II § 1, 1b, 2c; n. 12.
anusampavaṅkatā: II n. 12.
anu-ssāvaka: I § 6.
anu-ssāvana, °*ssāvanā*: I § 1, 5; n. 28-30.
anu-ssāvita: I n. 30.
antarāyikāpatti: III n. 28.

apalokaṅkā-kamma: I § 3, 3a;
 n. 17, 18; III n. 48.
abbhāna: I § 2; III § 6; n. 12.
abbhussahanatā: II n. 12.
amūḷha-vinaya: II § 2, 2c(iii);
 n. 31.
alajjī: II § 2b.ii.
avaṇojana: III n. 14.
avinaya-kamma: I § 7.
ākāra: II n. 13.
ācariya: I n. 34.
ācāra-vipatti: II § 1b; n. 19.
ājīva-vipatti: II § 1b; n. 19.
āpatti (see also s.vv. *jāti*, *vatthu*, *sādhāraṇa*): III n. 19, 48;
aññabhāgiyā: III n.44; °*adhikaraṇa*: II § 1, 1c, 2d; *antara*-°: III § 3-
 4b; n. 28; *apara*-°: III n. 28; (*a*)*parimānā a*°: III § 4b; n. 34; *eka*-
/nānā-nāma-°: III § 4b; n. 44; *garukā ā*°: III n. 46; °*gotta*: III n. 44;
tabbhāgiya: III n.44; *thullavajjā ā*°: II § 2d; n. 63; *duṭṭhullā ā*°: III
 n. 48; °*desanā*: II n. 63; *nānā-vatthukā ā*°: III n. 44; °*pariccheda*:
 III n. 34; °*pariyanta*: III n. 40, 48; *pubba*-°: III n. 28; *missakā ā*°:
 III n. 46; *lahukā ā*°: III n. 46; *vavatthitā/sambhinnā*: III § 4b; n. 44;
 °*vuṭṭhāna*: III n. 7; (*vi*)*sabhāga*-°: III § 4b; n. 44; *suddhakā ā*°: III
 n. 46.
ārohati ≠ *orohati*: III § 3d.
āvuso: II n. 42.
ukkhittaka: III n. 12, 19.
ukkhepanīya-kamma: I n. 23; II n. 40; III § 4; n. 7, 19.
upa-sampadā: I § 2; -°*araha*: I n. 3.
uposatha: II n. 30; III § 1a; n. 19.
ubbāhikā: II § 2a, 2b.ii; n. 37.
okāsaṃ kārāpeti: III n. 16.
oṇojana: III § 1a; n. 14.

omasa-vāda: III n. 48.
orohati: see *ārohati*.
ovadati, ovāda: II n. 14.
osāraṇā: II § 2c(iv); III § 4.
kata-kamma: II n. 10.
katika-vatta, kat(h)ikā: I n. 14, 17; III n. 48.
kamma: I § 3, 3c; n. 12; °-*araha*: I n. 3; II n. 10; °-*ppatta*: I n. 3; II n. 10; °-*lakkhaṇa*: I § 3 sqq.; n. 12, 14.
kamma-vācā: I § 3c, 5; n. 15, 34; III n. 1.
karaṇīyatā: I n. 17.
kiccayatā: I n. 17.
kiccādhikaraṇa: I n. 5; I § 1, 1d, 2e; II n. 31.
(a-)kuppa: I § 7.
kusala: II n. 24.
khamāpeti: II n. 10.
gaṇa: I n. 8.
gaṇa-pūra: I § 2.
garu-dhamma (“important rule” ≠ “heavy offence”): III § 7; n. 52.
gāmantara: III n. 52.
gūlḥakaṃ: II § 2b.iii(i).
codeti: III n. 16.
chandāraha: I § 1; n. 3.
jāti (of *āpatti*): III n. 34, 44.
ñatti: I § 1, 3 b-c, § 4.
ñatti-kamma: I § 3, 3 b; n. 15, 17, 18.
ñatticatuttha-kamma: I § 3, 3 d; n. 17, 20, 30.
ñattidutiya-kamma: I § 3, 3 c; n. 17, 18, 20.
ñatti-pariyosāna: I n. 15.
ñāpetabbo: I § 6; n. 16, 18, 30.
thāna: II n. 13.
thānāraha, a-tth°: I § 7.
tajjanīya-kamma: I n. 23; II n. 10, n. 60; III n. 52.

tassa-pāpiyyasikā: II § 2, 2c(iv); n. 31.
tina-pattharaka, -°vattharaka:
 II § 2, 2d(ii); n. 27.
thullaccaya: II n. 21, n. 62.
thullavajja: see s.v. *āpatti*.
ditṭhi-vipatti: II § 1b; n. 19.
dukkaṭa: II n. 10, n. 21.
duṭṭhulla: see s.v. *āpatti*.
dubbhāsita: II n. 21.
du-vūpasanta: I § 7.
desanāgāminī āpatti: II n. 63.
dhamma-kamma: I § 7; °-*paṭirūpaka*: I § 1.
(a-)dhammika: I § 7.
nānā-samvāsaka, kamma-°: III n. 19.
nāsanā: II § 2c(iv).
nidān'uddesa: I n. 30.
nissaya-kamma: I n. 23; III § 4c.
pakatatta: III n. 18, 19, 27, 50.
paṭiññāta-karaṇa: II § 2, 2a, 2d(i).
paṭibala: I § 6.
paṭisāraṇīya-kamma: I n. 23; II n. 63.
pabbājanīya-kamma: I n. 23.
parivāsa: I § 3 d; III § 0, 2-5; *aggha-samodhāna-°*: III § 3b; n. 28, 32;
appaṭicchanna-°: III n. 20; *odhāna-samodhāna-°*: III § 3b;
paṭicchanna-°: III § 2; *parivutṭha-°*: III n. 27; *missaka-samodhāna-°*:
 III § 3b; n. 44; *suddhanta-°*: III § 3d.
parisā: I § 1.
pavāraṇā: I § 2; III § 1a; n. 19.
pācittiya: II n. 21.
pāṭidesanīya: II n. 21.
pātimokkha: III § 5; n. 47.
pārājika: II n. 21; III n. 48.

pārivāsika: III § 2-5; n. 12, 19.
pubbamaṅgama: II n. 13.
bhatta: III § 1a; *uddesa*-°, *uposathika*-°, *nimantanā*-°, *pakkhika*-°,
pātipadika-°, *puggalika*-°, *salāka*-°: III n. 14.
bhanta: II n. 42.
bhikkhu, *bhikkhunī*: I § 6.
bhūmi: II n. 13.
mānatta: I § 3 d; II n. 63; III § 0-1a, 2a, 3-4b, 5-7; *appaṭicchanna*-°: III
§ 1; n. 20; °-*araha*: III § 1; n. 12, 27; °-*cārika*: III § 1a; n. 12, 19;
cinna-°: III § 6; °-*nikkhepana*: III § 1a; *pakkha*-°: III § 7; n. 52;
paṭicchanna-°: III § 2; °-*samādāna*: III § 1a.
mānana-bhāva: III n. 6.
mūlādāyaka: II § 2b.ii.
mūlāya paṭikassana: III § 3a; n. 12, 28.
mūla-visuddhi: III n. 28.
yebhuyyasikā: II § 2, 2b.iii; n. 31.
ratti-ccheda: III § 1 a; n. 12; °-*pariyanta*: III n. 40.
ruccati: I n. 13.
ropeti: II n. 10; III n. 16.
lahukā āpatti: II § 2d; n. 63.
vagga: I n. 8.
vajjapaṭicchādikā: III n. 48.
vatthu (see also s.v. *āpatti*): I § 1; n. 3; II n. 13, 30; III n. 19, 48;
eka-°: III n. 46; °-*sabhāgā āpatti*: III n. 44.
vavatthita: see s.v. *āpatti*.
vassika-sāṭṭhikā: III § 1a.
vinaya-kamma: III n. 19.
vipatti: *ācāra*-°, *ājīva*-°, *diṭṭhi*-°, *sīla*-°: II § 1b.
vivaṭena: II § 2b.iii(iii).
vivādādhikaraṇa: II § 1, 1a, 2b.i.
vūpasamena: II n. 11.
vyatta: I § 6.

sakaṇṇa-jappakam: II § 2b.iii (ii).
saṅgīti: I n. 9; II § 2b.ii.
saṅgha: I § 1; II n. 42; III n. 7; *ubhato*-°: III § 7; n. 52;
°-*kamma*: I § 3; II § 1d; *bhikkhu*-°, *bhikkhunī*-°: III § 7; n. 54;
°-*bheda*: II § 1a; III n. 48.
saṅghādisesa: II n. 21; III *passim* and n. 48.
sati-vinaya: II § 2, 2c(ii); n. 31.
samagga-saṅgha: § 2; n. 8.
samāna-saṃvāsaka: III n. 19.
sambhinna: see s.v. *āpatti*.
sammukhatā: *dhamma*-°, *puggala*-°, *vinaya*-°, *saṅgha*-°: II § 2a;
n. 42.
sammukhā-vinaya: II § 0, 2 sqq.; n. 31.
sammukhī-bhūta: I § 1.
sammuti: III n. 48.
salāka-gaha, °-*gāhāpaka*: II § 2b.iii.
salākā: II § 2b.ii.
sādhāraṇa: *saṅgīti*-°, *sabba*-°: III n. 44.
sāreti: III n. 16.
sāsana: III n. 48.
sīla-vipatti: II § 1b; n. 19.
sīmā: I § 1; n. 4.
sukka-visatṭhi: III n. 44.
su-vūpasanta: I § 7.
hetu: II n. 13, n. 24.

BHS / SKT.

adhikaraṇatā: II § 1.
adhikaraṇa-śamatha dharma: II § 1; °-*saṃcāraka*: II § 2b.ii; n. 48.
anavavādana: II n. 14.
anavavādādhikaraṇa, °-*prasthāpanā*, °-*viṣṭhāpanā*: II § 1; n. 14.
anāghāta-pañcama: I n. 36.

anu-śrāvaṅṅā: I § 5; n. 29, 30.
anu-śrāvay-: I n. 30.
anovāda: II § 1; n. 14.
amūḍha-vinaya: II § 2c.
amūlakam: II n. 22.
avalokanā: I § 3 a.
a-vastuka, sa-v°: I § 7.
ādhi-karanika: II § 1.
āpatti: -°*adhikaraṇa*: II § 1; *antara-°*: III § 3b; (*a*)*parimāṅavatī ā°*: III n. 34; *asama-°*: III n. 44; *nāma-gotrōpasamhitā ā°*: III n. 44; *pūrva-°*: III § 3b; *pratyantara-°*: III § 3b.
ābarhaṇa: III § 6; n. 51.
ābr(m)hati: III § 6.
āvarhaṇa, āvrahaṇa: III § 6; n. 51.
āhvayati: III § 6.
āhvāyana: III § 6.
āvṛ(m)hati: III § 6.
upa-sampadā: I § 2.
ovaśikāye: I n. 26.
ovāyikā: I § 4; n. 26.
karma-kāraka: I § 6.
karman: I § 3, 5; n. 18, 31, 36.
karma-vācanā: I § 5; n. 29.
kṛtyādhikaraṇa: II § 1.
(a-)kopya: I § 7.
kriyā, k°-kāra: I n. 17.
khoṭanam: II n. 9.
codayati: II n. 45.
chandapratyuddhāra: I n. 6.
channa: II § 2b.iii.
jñapti: I § 3 b, 4; n. 16-18, 30.
jñapti-karman: I § 3 b.

jñapti-kāraka: I § 6.
jñapticaturtha karma(n): I § 3 d; n. 17, 18, 20, 21.
jñaptidvītiya-karma(n): I § 3 c; n. 17.
tat-prabhāvaiṣiyatva: II § 2c.
tat-svabhāvāvesika, °eṣiya, and variants: II § 2c.
tasya pāpeyasika: II § 2c.
tūṣṇīm viprakramaṇam: I n. 7.
trṇa-prastāraka: II § 2d.
(a-)dharma-karma: I § 7; n. 41.
duṣkṛtā āpatti: III n. 19; n. 47.
duṣṭhulā āpatti: III n. 19; n. 47; °*ārocana*: III n. 48; °*praticchādana*: III n. 48.
dhārmika: I § 7.
parivāsa: III § 2, 3b; *mūla-°* III § 3b; *mūlāpakarṣa-°*: III § 3b; *śuddhāntika p°*: III § 3d.
pārivāsika: III § 3b.
pratijñā-karaṇīya, °-kāraka, pratijñāna: II § 2d.
prātimokṣa: II § 2b.ii; n. 49.
bhikṣu, bhikṣuṇī: I § 6.
mātrkā-dhara: II § 2b.ii; n. 50.
mānatva: III § 1; n. 6.
mānāpya: III § 1; n. 6, 9; *mūla-°*: III § 3b; *mūlāpakarṣa-°*: § 3b.
muktikā jñapti: I § 3b; n. 18.
mūlōpakramatva: III n. 37.
metha(?)ka karma: I n. 18.
meṣakena ājñāpay-: I n. 18.
yad-bhūyasikīya and variants: II § 2b.iii.
yo-bhūyasika: II § 2b.iii.
laiśika: II n. 22.
varga: I n. 8.
vinaya-dhara: II § 2b.ii; n. 50.
vivādādhikaraṇa: II § 1.

vyagra: I n. 8.
vācanā: I § 5.
vinaya-karma: I n. 41.
vivṛta: II § 2b.iii.
vyūḍha, vyūḍhaka: II § 2b.ii; n. 37.
samatha: II § 1.
śalākā-grahaṇa, °cāraka, °cārana: II § 2b.iii.
śikṣāpadadravyatā-vyavacāraḥ: III n. 47.
sakarna-tuntunaka: II § 2b.iii.
saṃgha: I § 1; II n. 49; °-karaṇīya: I § 7; °-karma: I § 3; °-bheda: II § 1a; māla-° II n. 41.
saṃghādīśa: I § 3 d; n. 1.
saṃghāvaśeṣa: III n. 6.
saṃmukha: dharma-°, pudgala-°, saṃgha-°: II n. 29; °-karaṇīya, °-vinaya: II § 2a.
samatha: II § 1.
samanu-śrāvay-: I n. 30.
sarvasāṃghika: II § 2b.iii.
sa-vastuka, a-v°: I § 7.
sīmā: I § 1; n. 4; II n. 37.
sūtra-dhara: II § 2b.ii; n. 50.
sthalastha: I n. 41; II § 2b.ii; n.45.
sthavira: II § 2b.ii; n. 49.
sthānārha: I § 7; n. 36.
(a-)sthāpanārha: I § 7.
(a-)sthāpanīya: I § 7.
sthūlātīya: II n. 62.
sthūlārī(-gāminī): II n. 62; III n. 9.
smṛti-vinaya: II § 2c.

The Sambuddhe verses and later Theravādin Buddhology*

1. The *Sambuddhe* verses in Siam

A short verse text, entitled simply *Sambuddhe* or *Sambuddhe-gāthā*, is well known in Siam. In the *Royal Chanting Book*, it is one of the ancillary texts placed at the beginning of the *Seven Parittas* (*Sattaparitta*) — also known as the *Lesser Royal Paritta* (*Cularājaparitra*) or, in Thai, *Seven Protections* (*Jet Tamnan*) — and the *Twelve Parittas* (*Dvādasaparitta*), also known as the *Greater Royal Paritta* (*Mahārājaparitra*) or *Twelve Protections* (*Sipsong Tamnan*).¹ It is included in the various books of chants that are widely available, and in a Khmer script palm-leaf manuscript in the collection of the Siam Society.² Since the *Seven* and *Twelve Parittas* belong to the liturgy of the Siamese order of monks (*saṅgha*), the *Sambuddhe* verses are familiar to or known by heart by most monks and novices. Here I will give the Pāli of the *Royal Chanting Book*, followed by an English translation.

* This is a revised version of an article first published in the *Journal of the Secretarial Office of H.H. the Supreme Patriarch*, Bangkok, Vol. I, No. 2, January–March 2536 [1993], pp. 73–85.

¹ *Suat mant chabap luang*, 13th ed., Bangkok, 2526 [1983], pp. 3–4 and 32–33, respectively (the second occurrence is abbreviated). For the interpretation of *tamnan* as “protection” I follow Dhanit Yupho, who derives the word from the Pāli *tāna*, changed to *tamnān* and then to *tamnān*: see his *Anuphap phraparī* [*The Power of Paritta*, in Thai], Bangkok, n.d., p. 12.

² Oskar von Hinüber, “The Pāli Manuscripts Kept at the Siam Society, Bangkok: A Short Catalogue”, *Journal of the Siam Society* 75 (1987), § 52a, p. 46. The text given by von Hinüber, which might date to the latter part of the 19th century, agrees with that of the *Royal Chanting Book*, with a few minor orthographical variants and misprints.

1.1. Pāli text

- (1) *sambuddhe aṭṭhavisaṅ ca dvādasaṅ ca saḥassake
pañcasatasahassāni namāmi sirasā ahaṃ
tesaṃ dhammaṅ ca saṅghaṅ ca ādarena namāmi 'haṃ
namakārānubhāvena hantvā sabbe upaddave
anekā antarāyā pi vinassantu asesato*
- (2) *sambuddhe pañcapaññāsaṅ ca catuvīsatisahassake
dasasatasahassāni namāmi sirasā ahaṃ
tesaṃ dhammaṅ ca saṅghaṅ ca ādarena namāmi 'haṃ
namakārānubhāvena hantvā sabbe upaddave
anekā antarāyā pi vinassantu asesato*
- (3) *sambuddhe navuttarasate aṭṭhacattālīsisahassake
vīsatisatasahassāni namāmi sirasā ahaṃ
tesaṃ dhammaṅ ca saṅghaṅ ca ādarena namāmi 'haṃ
namakārānubhāvena hantvā sabbe upaddave
anekā antarāyā pi vinassantu asesato*

1.2. Translation

- (1) With my head I pay homage
to the 500 thousand, 12 thousand, and 28 Sambuddhas;
to their Dhamma and their Saṅgha I respectfully pay homage.
By the power of [this] act of homage
may all misfortune be destroyed
and all variety of danger be removed, without exception.

- (2) With my head I pay homage
to the 1 million, 24 thousand, and 55 Sambuddhas;
to their Dhamma and their Saṅgha I respectfully pay homage.
By the power of [this] act of homage
may all misfortune be destroyed
and all variety of danger be removed, without exception.
- (3) With my head I pay homage
to the 2 million, 48 thousand, and 109 Sambuddhas;
to their Dhamma and their Saṅgha I respectfully pay homage.
By the power of [this] act of homage
may all misfortune be destroyed
and all variety of danger be removed, without exception.

2. The *Sambuddhe* verses in Burma

A number of recensions of the *Sambuddhe-gāthā* are said to exist in Burma. The “standard” recension consists of only the first verse of the Siamese version, with one extra line. Whether the remaining two verses are given in other recensions remains to be seen.³ I transcribe here the sole printed version available to me, without any changes.⁴

³ The *Sambuddhe* verses are included in several manuscripts in German collections: see Heinz Braun and Daw Tin Tin Myint, *Burmese Manuscripts*, Part 2 (Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Band XXIII.2), Stuttgart, 1985, §§ 194, 227, 358.

⁴ My transcription is from a xerox-copy of a small book of *gāthās* for which I do not have any bibliographical data; the division of the verses into three sections follows this text (*ka*, *kha*, and *ga*). Ven. Dhammānanda Mahāthera of Burma, now residing at Wat Tamao, Lampang, has confirmed orally that the version known to him consists of only the first verse of the Siamese version, and that it contains the extra line, which he describes as a “later addition”.

2.1. Pāli text

- (1) *sambuddhe aṭṭhavāsaṅ ca | dvādasaṅ ca saḥassake ||*
pañcasata saḥassāni | namāmi siraśamaham ||
- (2) *appakā vālukā gaṅgā | anantā nibbutā jinā ||*
tesaṃ dhammaṅ ca saṅghaṅ ca | ādarena namāmi aham ||
- (3) *namakkārānubhāvena | haṃtvā sabbe upaddave ||*
aneka antarāyā pi | vinassantu asesato ||

2.2. Translation

With my head I pay homage
to the 500 thousand, 12 thousand, and 28 Sambuddhas.
The sands of the Ganges are few,
the Conquerors [Buddhas] who have attained nibbāna are
limitless:
to their Dhamma and their Saṅgha I respectfully pay homage.
By the power of [this] act of homage
may all misfortune be destroyed
and all variety of danger be removed, without exception.

The phrase *nibbutā jinā* indicates that the Buddhas belong to the past. The verses are very popular in Burma, where lay-followers often know them by heart. They are held to be highly efficacious in averting calamity, eliminating obstacles, and promoting welfare, and many stories are circulated about their miraculous power. The Sambuddhe Cetiya at Monywa on the Chindwin River, in Sagaing Division to the northwest of Mandalay, represents 512,028 Buddhas. It was apparently built less than 100 years ago.

The Siamese verses pay homage to three groups of Buddhas, numbering 512,028; 1,024,055; and 2,048,109, respectively. As pointed out by von Hinüber, if the first group is x , the second is $2x-1$, and the third $2(2x-1)-1$. A question naturally arises: what is the significance of these rather large numbers of Buddhas, and from what text or texts are the numbers derived? The figures cannot refer to present Buddhas, since it is a firm tenet of the Theravādins that only one Buddha, in the present age Sakyamuni, can exist at one time.⁵ They should therefore refer to past or future Buddhas. In order to suggest a possible explanation of the figures, and to put the question in its proper context, we must first look briefly at the development of the theory of past and future Buddhas according to the Theravādin and other Buddhist schools.⁶

3. The development of the theory of past Buddhas⁷

3.1. The common heritage

Through his own effort Sakyamuni realized enlightenment beneath the *bodhi*-tree near Gayā, and thus became an enlightened or awakened one, a Buddha. Not long afterwards, *en route* to Vārāṇasī, he

⁵ See, however, Heinz Bechert, “Buddha-field and Transfer of Merit in a Theravāda Source”, *Indo-Iranian Journal* 35 (1992), pp. 95–108.

⁶ For this subject, see J.Ph. Vogel, “The Past Buddhas and Kāśyapa in Indian Art and Epigraphy”, in *Asiatica, Festschrift Friedrich Weller*, Leipzig, 1954, pp. 808–16; I.B. Horner (tr.), *The Minor Anthologies of the Pāli Canon*, Part III, London, 1975, Preface to *Chronicle of the Buddhas (Buddhavamsa)*, pp. ix–xvii; Richard Gombrich, “The Significance of Former Buddhas in the Theravādin Tradition”, in Somaratna Balasooriya et al. (eds.), *Buddhist Studies in Honour of Walpola Rahula*, London, 1980, pp. 62–72; Isshi Yamada (ed.), *Karuṇāpūṇḍarīka*, London, 1968, Vol. I, pp. 121–26.

⁷ References to Pāli texts are to the editions of the Pāli Text Society (PTS), unless otherwise noted. References to Tibetan texts (Q) are to the *The Tibetan Tripiṭaka, Peking Edition*, ed. D.T. Suzuki, Tokyo-Kyoto, 1955–61. Chinese texts are referred to by Taishō catalogue (T) number.

met an ascetic (*ājīvaka*) named Upaka. Impressed by the Buddha's appearance, the latter asked, "Who is your teacher (*satthā*)?" The Buddha replied:

I have no teacher. There is no one like me:
in this world with its gods I have no counterpart.
I am the arhat in this world; I am the unsurpassed teacher;
alone I have become fully enlightened;
I have become cool and realized nibbāna.⁸

The Buddha claimed to have realized enlightenment by himself, and to be the only Buddha in the world in his time. He did not, however, claim to have been the only person to have ever become a Buddha. A phrase referring to "those who were arhats, fully enlightened Buddhas in the past...those who will become arhats, fully enlightened Buddhas in the future" occurs in several places in the Tipiṭaka.⁹ In the *Gārava-sutta*, Brahmā Sahampati speaks the following verses:

The Buddhas of the past, the Buddhas of the future,
and the Buddha of the present, destroyer of much sorrow,
dwelt, will dwell, and dwell paying respect to the Good
Dhamma:
this is the natural rule for Buddhas.¹⁰

⁸ *Majjhimanikāya* I 171,7 (*Ariyapariyesana-sutta*).

⁹ *Samyuttanikāya* I 140,1–5 (spoken by Brahmā Sahampati), *ye pi te bhante ahesum atītam addhānam arahanto sammāsambuddhā...ye pi te bhante bhavissanti anāgataṃ addhānam arahanto sammāsambuddhā*; *Dīghanikāya* III 99,17–100,5 (*Sampasādanīya-sutta*, spoken by the Buddha).

¹⁰ *Samyuttanikāya* I 138–40; a (Mūla)Sarvāstivādin version of the sūtra is found in Śamathadeva, *Abhidharmakośopāyikā-tīkā*, Q5598 (Vol. 118), *thu* 130b1–132a6; for Sanskrit of the verses only, see Franz Bernhard (ed.), *Udānavarga* (*Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden X*), Vol. I, Göttingen, 1965, XXI,11–12.

In the *Nagara-sutta*, the Buddha gives the following simile: a man travelling in the jungle discovers an ancient road travelled by the people of the past; he follows it, and comes to an ancient city, a royal capital. The Buddha explains that similarly he has discovered an ancient path travelled by the Buddhas of the past, that is, the noble eightfold path.¹¹

It is thus clear that the concept of a plurality of past and future Buddhas is implicit to the early strata of the Tipiṭaka, not only of the Theravādins but also of other schools.

The earliest lists of past Buddhas give the names of six predecessors of Sakyamuni, making a total of seven Buddhas. Such lists occur in the *Dīghanikāya*: in verse in the *Ātānāṭiya-sutta* (DN III 195,27–196,8) and in prose in the *Mahāpadāna-sutta* (DN II 2,15 foll.), as well as in the (Mūla)Sarvāstivādin equivalent of the latter, the *Mahāvadāna-sūtra*.¹² The list also occurs in the *Vinaya* literature: in the Theravādin *Bhikkhu-vibhaṅga* (Vin III 7–9); in the Mūlasarvāstivādin *Prātimokṣa*,¹³ *Śayanāsanavastu*,¹⁴ and *Pravrajyāvastu*,¹⁵ in the

¹¹ *Samyuttanikāya* II 104–7. The Sanskrit version of the Sarvāstivādin school is found in the *Nidānasamyukta*: see Chandrabhāl Tripāṭhī (ed.), *Fünfundzwanzig Sūtras des Nidānasamyukta* (*Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden VIII*), Berlin, 1962, pp. 94–106; the *Vinaya* version of the Mūlasarvāstivādin school is lost in Sanskrit but preserved in Tibetan translation in their *Pravrajyāvastu*: see Helmut Eimer (ed.), *Rab tu 'byung ba'i gzhi*, Vol. II, Wiesbaden, 1983, pp. 281,4–289.

¹² The Sanskrit edition of this text is not available to me, but the relevant passage is cited in Tibetan translation by Śamathadeva, *thu* 102a8–103a3, from the *rTogs pa brjod pa chen po'i mdo*. Cf. also Étienne Lamotte, *La Traité de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse*, Vol. I, Louvain, 1965, p. 535 and n. 2.

¹³ Anukul Chandra Banerjee (ed.), *Two Buddhist Vinaya Texts in Sanskrit*, Calcutta, 1977, p. 55,16.

¹⁴ Raniero Gnoli (ed.), *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Śayanāsanavastu and the Adhikaraṇavastu*, Rome, 1978, pp. 27–30.

Lokottaravādin *Mahāvastu*¹⁶ and *Prātimokṣa*;¹⁷ and in other texts of all periods and schools, too numerous to mention.

The seven Buddhas are named in inscriptions and represented “aniconically” on the monuments of Bhārhut and Sāñchī (circa 2nd–1st century BCE).¹⁸ From the early centuries of the Common Era they are depicted (sometimes along with Metteyya) in human form in the sculpture of Mathurā and Gandhāra,¹⁹ and, during the Gupta period, in the murals of Ajanta.²⁰ Although tradition placed these Buddhas aeons before Sakyamuni, it also held that certain sites in India were associated with three of his predecessors: the Nigali Sagar pillar of Aśoka (reigned ca. 272–236 BCE) records that the Emperor enlarged the *thūpa* (*thuba*) of Konakamana (Koṇāgamana) in the fourteenth year of his reign, and that he visited and worshipped it again at a later date,²¹ while the Chinese pilgrims Fa-hsien and Hsüan-tsang describe various sites in India connected with all three.²² Similar traditions developed in South-east

¹⁵ Nalinaksha Dutt (ed.), *Gilgit Manuscripts*, Vol. III pt. 4, [Calcutta, 1950] Delhi, 1984, p. 32,6. The same passage occurs in the *Samgharaksitavadāna*: P.L. Vaidya (ed.), *Divyāvadāna*, Darbhanga, 1959, p. 206,8.

¹⁶ Radhagovinda Basak (ed.), *Mahāvastu Avadāna*, Vol. III, Calcutta, 1968, pp. 320 foll; five predecessors (omitting Śikhin) are given in verse at *Mahāvastu* Vol. I, ed. S. Bagchi, Darbhanga, 1970, p. 240,14.

¹⁷ Nathmal Tatia (ed.), *Prātimokṣasūtram*, Patna, 1975, pp. 36–37.

¹⁸ Cf. John Marshall, *A Guide to Sāñchī*, Calcutta, 1955, pp. 57–58 and pl. ii; Alexander Cunningham, *The Stūpa of Bharhut*, repr. Varanasi, 1962, pp. 108–9, 113–16, and pls. xxix–xxx. The representation of the *bodhi* tree and inscription of Śikhin have not been found.

¹⁹ Cf. Alexander Coburn Soper, *Literary Evidence for Early Buddhist Art in China*, Ascona, 1959, pp. 198–99.

²⁰ Vogel, p. 811.

²¹ Cf. E. Hultzsch, *Inscriptions of Asoka*, Oxford, 1925, p. 165.

²² Alexander Soper, *loc. cit.*

Asia, for example in Burma, where the Shwedagon Pagoda is believed to enshrine relics of Sakyamuni and his three predecessors.²³

3.2. The Theravādin theory of past Buddhas

A study of the development of the Theravādin theory of past Buddhas must take into account two interrelated aspects: the number of past Buddhas referred to, and the nature and length of the bodhisatta’s career during the many past lives in which he practised the perfections (*pāramī*) and aspired to enlightenment. The career is measured in two types of aeon: the “[ordinary] aeon” (*kappa*) and the “incalculable aeon” (*asaṅkheyya*, *asaṅkhiya*). The texts give various definitions of the latter; here it should be seen as an extremely large number (“zillions”) of aeons, each of which is in itself long enough to confound the human imagination. It is important to remember that, except in the theory’s earliest phase, all of the past Buddhas were either associated with Sakyamuni himself when he was a bodhisatta, or are associated with certain types of bodhisattas in general. That is, the number of past Buddhas is never closed: a given figure always refers to the number of Buddhas honoured by Sakyamuni or a representative bodhisatta during a specific period of his bodhisatta career. The implications of this will be discussed in the concluding section.

(1) The earliest phase, which is the common heritage of all Buddhist schools, has been described above. It allows a plurality of past Buddhas, and names seven — Sakyamuni and his six predecessors — as in the *Dīghanikāya* and *Vinaya*.

²³ Aung Thaw, *Historical Sites in Burma*, Rangoon, 1972, pp. 112–14. Only the three immediate predecessors who, like Sakyamuni, arose in the Auspicious Aeon (*bhaddakappa*) could leave traces or relics; the earlier predecessors could not, since they arose in earlier aeons.

(2) In the next phase, the *Buddhavamsa* names 27 (24 + 3) past Buddhas; when Gotama is counted, there are 25 or 28. The same text,²⁴ along with the *Cariyāpiṭaka*,²⁵ the *Milindapañha*,²⁶ and the *Visuddhimagga*,²⁷ states that the bodhisatta's career lasts four incalculable aeons plus 100,000 lesser aeons. Both the number of Buddhas and the description of the career are unique to the Theravādins. The first two texts are canonical, although modern scholarship holds them to be later additions; the *Milindapañha* dates over a number of centuries, from the 2nd century BCE to the early centuries CE.²⁸ The *Visuddhimagga* was composed by Buddhaghosa in the 5th century. The theories most probably date to the beginning of the Common Era, if not earlier.

(3) The *Suttanipāta-aṭṭhakathā* and *Cariyāpiṭaka-aṭṭhakathā* describe three types of bodhisatta, distinguished by the predominance of one of the three faculties of wisdom, faith, or energy. The length of the career of the first type of bodhisatta is as described in the preceding; that of the second is two times the first; of the third two times the second, with the additional figure of 100,000 aeons remaining constant:

- (i) “strong in wisdom” (*paññā-adhika*), attaining enlightenment in four incalculable aeons plus 100,000 aeons;
- (ii) “strong in faith” (*saddhā-adhika*), attaining enlightenment in eight incalculable aeons plus 100,000 aeons;

²⁴ *Buddhavamsa* II,1 (PTS ed. p. 9).

²⁵ *Cariyāpiṭaka* I,1 (PTS ed. p. 1).

²⁶ *Milindapañha*, PTS ed. pp. 232–34, 289; Mahāmakuta ed. pp. 247.7 foll., 365 penult.

²⁷ Mahāmakutaṛājavidyālaya edition II 100.

²⁸ See K.R. Norman, *Pāli Literature* (Jan Gonda, [ed.], *A History of Indian Literature*, Vol. VII, fasc. 2) Wiesbaden, 1983, pp. 110–13.

- (iii) “strong in energy” (*virīya-adhika*), attaining enlightenment in sixteen incalculable aeons plus 100,000 aeons.²⁹

The *Suttanipāta-aṭṭhakathā* is traditionally ascribed to Buddhaghosa (5th century CE), although doubts have been expressed about his authorship;³⁰ the *Cariyāpiṭaka-aṭṭhakathā* is ascribed to Dhammapāla, who may have worked about the middle of the 6th century.³¹ Neither text enumerates any Buddhas. In the *Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā*, also attributed to Buddhaghosa, the Buddha is presented as saying that “many thousands of Buddhas have lived by going for alms”.³² Much later, the theory of the three types of bodhisatta in the form given above was incorporated into Lanna works such as the *Paṭhamamūlamūli*.³³

- (4) The next phase is represented by such late Pāli works as the *Sotatthakī-mahānidāna*,³⁴ the *Sambhāravipāka*,³⁵ the *Mahāsampīṇḍa-*

²⁹ *Suttanipāta-aṭṭhakathā*, Mahāmakutaṛājavidyālaya edition I 58–59; *Cariyāpiṭaka-aṭṭhakathā* tr. by Bhikkhu Bodhi in *The Discourse on the All-embracing Net of Views*, Kandy, 1978, pp. 325–27. In the latter the three types are equated with the three individuals (*ugghaṭṭitaññū*, *vipañcitaññū*, *neyya*); see also François Martini (ed., tr.), *Dasabodhisatta-uddesa*, *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient* 36 (1936), pp. 335 (text), 367–68 (translation); Medhañkara, *Lokāpikasāra*, National Library-Fine Arts Department, Bangkok, 2529 [1986], pp. 553–54.

³⁰ See K.R. Norman, op. cit., p. 129.

³¹ Norman, p. 137.

³² *Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā* (Mahāmakuta ed.) III 164,19 (*Suddhodana-vatthu*), *anekāni hi buddhasahassāni piṇḍāya caritvā va jīvimsu*.

³³ Anatole-Roger Peltier (ed., tr.), *Paṭhamamūlamūli*, Chiang Mai, 1991, pp. 8–9, 102–3. Note that both the French (p. 124) and English (p. 192) translations of the first passage give the wrong figure — 12 instead of 16 — for the last type.

³⁴ *Sotatthakī-mahānidāna*, Bangkok, 2526 [1983], Pāli text pp. 3–4.

³⁵ *Phra sambhāravipāka* (Thai translation), Vol. 1, Bangkok, Rattanakosin era 126, pp. 4 foll.; Supaphan na Bangchang, *Vivadhanakār varṇagatī pāli sai phra suttantapiṭak ti taeng nai pradeś thai*, Bangkok, 2533 [1990], pp. 135–50.

nidāna,³⁶ and the *Jinakālamāli*, and by Sinhalese works such as the *Saddharmālaṅkārayā*.³⁷ The theory seems to have first appeared in the Ceylon of the Polonnaruva period (11th–13th centuries CE), but the question of its origins needs further study. Here the career of the first type of bodhisatta is expanded into three stages, according to the nature of his aspiration to enlightenment.³⁸ His career lasts altogether 20 incalculable aeons plus 100,000 aeons.

- (i) aspiration by mind only, for seven incalculable aeons;
- (ii) aspiration by mind and speech, for nine incalculable aeons;
- (iii) aspiration by mind, speech, and body, for four incalculable aeons.

The texts give breakdowns of the number of Buddhas served in each aeon, along with other details. In the *Jinakālamāli* (which does not calculate the total figure) the breakdown by chapter is as follows:³⁹

<i>Manopañidhānakathā</i>	1	(Purāṇadīpaṅkara, p. 5,24)
<i>Mahānidānakathā</i>	125,000	(p. 7,3)
<i>Atidūrenidānakathā</i>	387,000	(p. 9,3)
<i>Dūrenidānakathā</i>	27	(3 — excluding Dīpaṅkara — p. 9,15, plus 24, p. 19,32 <i>kassapo catuvīsatimo</i>)
Total:	512, 028	

The North Indian scholar Daśabalaśrimitra, writing probably in the 12th or the 13th century, cites an as yet unidentified Theravādin source that gives an accurate account of the theory.⁴⁰

The Ārya Sthaviras state that “Sakyamuni realized omniscience (*sabbaññūtā*) after 20 great incalculable aeons plus an additional 100,000 aeons. Herein, as a bodhisatta the Lord served 125,000 Buddhas for [the first] seven incalculable aeons, aspiring for enlightenment by means of mental resolve alone (*bsams pa tsam ñid kyis*). For the next nine incalculable aeons he served 387,000 Buddhas, engaging in the bodhisatta practices (*bodhisatta-cariyā*) and aspiring by means of mind (*citta*) and speech (*vācā*). For the next four incalculable aeons he served 12 Buddhas, engaged in practices devoted to enlightenment, and aspired for enlightenment by means of body (*kāya*), speech, and mind (*manas*). For 100,000 aeons the Lord, as a bodhisatta, served 15 Buddhas, engaged in the practices of a bodhisatta, and completed all the secondary practices, by means of body, speech, and mind; at the culmination (*agga*) of the 100,000 aeons the Teacher realized omniscience.”

³⁶ Handwritten transcription by Ven. Nāṇāvāsa, pp. 10–11 (I am grateful to W. Sailer for supplying a copy); Supaphan, pp. 150–57.

³⁷ See the translation or summary from that work in R. Spence Hardy, *A Manual of Buddhism*, repr. Varanasi 1967, pp. 86–97. Cf. *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism*, Vol. III, fasc. 3, [Colombo,] 1973, pp. 359–60; N.A. Jayawickrama, *Epochs of the Conqueror*, London, 1968, p. xix.

³⁸ The three periods are mentioned in the *Cariyāpīṭaka-aṭṭhakathā* (6th century), but not correlated with aeons: see Bhikkhu Bodhi, op. cit., p. 313.

³⁹ A.P. Buddhadatta, *Jinakālamāli*, London, 1960.

⁴⁰ Q5865, Vol. 146, folio ño 38a4 foll. His work, *An Analysis of the Conditioned and the Unconditioned*, survives only in an anonymous Tibetan translation of a lost Sanskrit original: see Peter Skilling, “The Saṃskṛtāsāṃskṛtaviniścaya of Daśabalaśrimitra”, *Buddhist Studies Review* 4/1 (1987), pp. 3–23.

That the theory became popular is shown by the fact that it was incorporated into vernacular works in Sinhalese,⁴¹ Burmese,⁴² Khün,⁴³ and Lanna Thai.⁴⁴

(5) The next phase is a logical development of the preceding: the theory of the three types of aspiration is applied to the remaining two types of bodhisatta. As before, the length of the career of the second type is twice that of the first, that of the third twice that of the second, and the figure 100,000 remains constant:

- (i) “strong in wisdom”, realizing omniscience in 20 incalculable aeons plus 100,000 aeons;
- (ii) “strong in faith”, realizing omniscience in 40 incalculable aeons plus 100,000 aeons;
- (iii) “strong in energy”, realizing omniscience in 80 incalculable aeons plus 100,000 aeons.

⁴¹ Cf. the introduction to the *Saddharma Ratnāvaliya*, composed by Dharmasena Thera in the 13th century: Ranjini Obeyesekere (tr.), *Jewels of the Doctrine*, Albany, 1991, p. 2. The concept is worked into the narrative in a manner that implies it would be familiar to the readers.

⁴² Not knowing Burmese, I have only one example to offer: P. Bigandet, *The Life or Legend of Gaudama*, Vol. I, repr. Varanasi, 1979, pp. 6–7, 16–17. This is a translation of a Burmese work entitled *Tathāgata-udāna* (Vol. I, Preface, p. xv) which is based on the Pāli *Mālālamkāra-vatthu* (?) (see Vol. II, p. 149, n. 11, and p. 151).

⁴³ Sao Sāimōng Mangrāi, *The Pādaeng Chronicle and the Jengtung State Chronicle Translated*, Ann Arbor, 1981, pp. 99–100. There is some confusion in the figures.

⁴⁴ *Traibhūmi chabap lanna*, Chiang Mai University, 2524 [1981], *phuk ton*, pp. 1–14; *Tamnan Mūlaśāsanā*, Bangkok, 2518 [1975], pp. 1–2, 17–18, etc.

I have not found this theory in Pāli. It is found in a number of Central Thai texts,⁴⁵ and in Lanna texts such as the *Paṭhamamūla*.⁴⁶

(6) One final step could be taken, and it was: the number of Buddhas was described as limitless. In the non-canonical *Dasabodhisattuppattikathā*, the Buddha tells Sāriputta that “there have been limitless and countless (*anantāparimāṇā*) noble people in the world who have successively fulfilled the perfections and attained Buddhahood”.⁴⁷ A similar statement is found in the *Dasabodhisatta-uddesa*, where the Buddha tells Sāriputta that “there have been Buddhas without end (*buddhā anantā ahesum*): I would reach the end of my life before I reached the limit of the enumeration of Buddhas”.⁴⁸ The apocryphal

⁴⁵ Nāgaprādīp (ed.), *Sambhāravipāka*, Bangkok, 2504 [1961], pp. 246–47; *Phra Śrī āry bistār, kaṇḍ 5*, folio 33a; [Somdet Phra Vanarat], *Phra Mahāpurusaḷakṣaṇa*, Bangkok, 2504 [1961], pp. 34–35; Phra Śrīvisuddhisobhaṇa (Vilāsa Nāṇavaro, P. Dh. 9), *Munināthadīpani*, Bangkok, 2516 [1973], pp. 37–46; Gaṇa Sahāydharm, *Phra Śrī-ariyamettaiy*, Bangkok, 2535 [1992], pp. 8–10.

⁴⁶ *Paṭhamamūla*, in *Lokuppatti aruṇavatisūtra paṭhamamūla paṭhamakap lae Mūlatantraiy*, National Library-Fine Arts Department, Bangkok, 2533 [1990], pp. 115, 152 (the text of the former passage is corrupt, and gives the figures 22, 4, and 80). The *Paṭhamamūla* is another version of the *Paṭhamamūlamūli* cited above; it is interesting that the two recensions incorporate different versions of the theory. For the origin myth presented in these and related texts, see Emmanuel Guillon, “The Ultimate Origin of the World, or the Mūlā Muh, and Other Mon Beliefs”, *Journal of the Siam Society* 79/1 (1991), pp. 22–30.

⁴⁷ H. Saddhatissa, *The Birth-Stories of the Ten Bodhisattas and the Dasabodhisattuppattikathā*, PTS, London, 1975, text p. 119, tr. p. 54. (The long introduction [pp. 1–53] gives a valuable survey of sources on past and future Buddhas, although I do not always agree with the Ven. author’s conclusions.)

⁴⁸ *Dasabodhisatta-uddesa*, text p. 297, tr. p. 337.

Ākāravatta-sutta speaks of “Buddhas as many as the sands of many Ganges rivers”.⁴⁹

Available archaeological or epigraphic evidence for the development of the Theravādin theory is scanty and late. A Pāli inscription giving a verse list of the 28 Buddhas and dating from the middle of the 11th century was discovered at Thaton in Lower Burma;⁵⁰ the verses (known in Ceylon as the *Aṭavisi-pirit*) are incorporated without title into the *Ātānāṭiya-paritta* of the *Twelve Parittas* in the *Royal Chanting Book*.⁵¹ The 28 Buddhas were in full vogue during the Pagan period (11th–12th century), whether in mural or sculptural art or on terracotta tablets.⁵² In Lanna art, ornamented carved wooden stands (*phaeng*) were made to hold numbers of small Buddhas: 28, or larger numbers.⁵³ Larger numbers of Buddhas are also found on tablets of the Pagan period, which depict rows of identical Buddhas totalling 50 or about 100 figures;⁵⁴ tablets with 500 Buddhas are known in Siam.⁵⁵ Such tablets may well be related to the theories discussed above: one

⁴⁹ Padmanabh S. Jaini, “Ākāravattārasutta: An ‘Apocryphal’ Sutta From Thailand”, *Indo-Iranian Journal* 35/2–3 (July 1992), § 6, *anekāya gaṅgāya vālukuppamehi buddhehi*.

⁵⁰ G.H. Luce, “The Advent of Buddhism to Burma”, in L. Cousins, A. Kunst, and K.R. Norman (eds.), *Buddhist Studies in Honour of I.B. Horner*, Dordrecht, 1974, p. 133. Cf. also n. 53 (p. 137), which needs confirmation and clarification.

⁵¹ *Suat mant chabap luang*, p. 39.

⁵² Thiripyanchi U Mya, *Votive Tablets of Burma*, Part I, pls. 10, 72, 108, 110; Gordon H. Luce, *Old Burma-Early Pagan*, Vol. III, New York, 1970, pls. 65–67.

⁵³ *Muang Boran Journal* 14/2 (Apr.–June 1988), pp. 93, 94; *Muang Nan: Boranagadi, Prawatisat lae Silpa*, Fine Arts Department, Bangkok, 2530 [1987], pp. 145, 226.

⁵⁴ U Mya, pls. 8, 36, and 43, 46, 107, 109, respectively; Luce, *Old Burma-Early Pagan*, pl. 68.

⁵⁵ See *The Silpakorn Journal* 33/3 (July–August 1989), p. 8, found at Wat Chamadevi, Lamphun, dated to the 10th–12th century CE.

might even speculate that the figures 50 or 500 are abbreviated references to the first figure, 512,028, and the figure 100 to the second figure, 1,024,055. Tablets with 55 Buddhas from Wat Mahādhātu in Sukhothai⁵⁶ might represent the 55 Buddhas of the 1,024,055 of the second verse; like the 28 of the 512,028, this would be a significant group with its own identity. But these interpretations are by no means certain: texts of about the same period extol the merit gained from reproducing the image of the Buddha, and may also have influenced the tablets.⁵⁷ An Old Burmese ink-gloss from Wetkyi-in Kubyaug-gyi at Pagan refers to “past or future Buddhas...be they more in number than the grains in a heap of earth”. The Wetkyi-in Kubyaug-gyi has been tentatively dated to “not later than 1200 CE”.⁵⁸

In a Burmese inscription from the Thahte Mokku temple at Pagan, dated 558 or 59 Sakka era (1195 or 96 CE), the concept of a bodhisatta career lasting four incalculables plus 100,000 aeons is incorporated into the dedication. The editors note that “after the fall of Pagan the phrase becomes a *cliché*, many inscriptions beginning with [a similar phrase]. Here we have probably its first appearance in Burmese.”⁵⁹ In literature a parallel phenomenon is seen in the Pāli *Jinamahānidāna*,⁶⁰ and in the Sinhalese *Saddharma Ratnāvaliya* and

⁵⁶ Illustrated in Piriya Krairiksh, “A New Dating of Sukhothai Art”, *Muang Boran Journal* 12/1 (Jan.–March 1986), p. 42, fig. 14.

⁵⁷ Cf. verses in Richard F. Gombrich, “Kosala-Bimba-Vañṇanā”, in Heinz Bechert (ed.), *Buddhism in Ceylon and Studies on Religious Syncretism in Buddhist Countries*, Göttingen, 1978, pp. 299–302.

⁵⁸ Col. Ba Shin, K.J. Whitbread, G.H. Luce, et al., “Pagan, Wetkyi-in Kubyaug-gyi, an Early Burmese Temple with Ink-glosses”, *Artibus Asiae* XXXIII/3 (1971), pp. 195, 217 (for dating).

⁵⁹ Pe Maung Tin and G.H. Luce, “Inscriptions of Burma, Portfolio I”, *Bulletin of the Burma Historical Commission* III (1963), pp. 102–7.

⁶⁰ *Jinamahānidāna*, National Library-Fine Arts Department, Bangkok, 2530 [1987], Vol. I, p. 1.

Lanna *Paṭhamamūla* and *Mūlasāsanā* referred to above — the mention of the bodhisatta's career is a formula and not an integral part of the text.

The *Sotatthakī-mahānidāna* is included in a list of books donated to a monastery at Pagan in 1442;⁶¹ a verse from the same text, summarizing the four rebirths of the bodhisatta that directly preceded his first encounter with a Buddha is cited (with some variants) in a Pāli inscription from Bassein, dated to the 15th or 16th centuries.⁶² The same text may also be referred to in a Sukhothai inscription from the first half of the 14th century, with reference to future Buddhas.⁶³ In the modern period, the theory is very much alive: in 1986 a temple called Cetiya Vihāra Sambuddhe enshrining 512,028 Buddhas was constructed in Mae Sot district, Tak, in imitation of the temple at Monywa in Burma referred to above.⁶⁴

3.3. The theory of past Buddhas in other Buddhist schools

We have seen above that the concept of a plurality of past and future Buddhas and the list of seven past Buddhas are part of the

⁶¹ Mabel Haynes Bode, *The Pali Literature of Burma*, [London, 1909] Rangoon, 1965, § 95, p. 104; G.H. Luce and Tin Htway, "A 15th Century Inscription and Library at Pagan, Burma", in O.H. de A. Wijesekera (ed.), *Malalasekera Commemoration Volume*, Colombo, 1976, § 95, p. 229.

⁶² Mons. Charles Duroiselle, "Bassein", *Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey of India 1929-30* (repr. Delhi, 1990), pp. 158-60; cf. *Sotatthakī-mahānidāna* verse 23. A similar verse is found in the *Sambhāravipāka* (S. Thammaphakdi, Bangkok, 2504, p. 28).

⁶³ *Prachumsilacharuk*, Vol. I, Bangkok, 2467, p. 48: lines 38-39 of face 2, *mahānidāna*; Praset Na Nagara and A.B. Griswold, *Epigraphic and Historical Studies*, Bangkok, 1992, No. 10, pp. 371-72; introduction to *Sotatthakīmahānidāna*, pp. 9-10.

⁶⁴ Supamat Kasem, "A unique temple with half a million Buddha images", *Bangkok Post*, Vol. XLI No. 235, Section Three, Monday, August 25, 1986.

common Buddhist heritage. In order to place the development of the Theravādin theory in a broader context, I will briefly describe the theories of some other schools. In contrast to the theory of four (or the later figure of 20) incalculables plus 100,000 aeons of the Theravādins, a basic figure of three incalculables was adhered to by the Vaibhāṣikas of Kashmir, the Mūlasarvāstivādins, the Sāmmatiyas, and some Mahāyānists. Since the scriptures of most of the "18 Buddhist schools" are lost, our information about the overall development of Buddhism in India is incomplete. In the present case, we have access to the texts of the schools mentioned above, plus those of the Lokottaravādin branch of the Mahāsamghikas for some points.

3.3.1. The Vaibhāṣika and Mūlasarvāstivādin theory of past Buddhas

Daśabalaśrīmitra quotes a text of the Vaibhāṣikas of Kashmir, which describes Sakyamuni's service to 75,000 Buddhas in the first incalculable aeon, 76,000 in the second, and 77,000 in the third. Verses with the same figures are found in the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* of the *Vinaya* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins.⁶⁵ The three incalculable aeons were followed by a period of 91 lesser aeons during which Sakyamuni served a number of other Buddhas.⁶⁶ The *Bhaiṣajyavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivādin *Vinaya* gives a verse description of the bodhisatta's past lives under various Buddhas, and the acts of worship or service that he performed for each; this is followed by a prose list of the names of 60 past Buddhas.

⁶⁵ Q1030, Vol. 41, *ge* 254b6 foll.

⁶⁶ Daśabalaśrīmitra 37b3 foll. For these sources, see the discussion in E. Obermiller (tr.), *History of Buddhism (Chos-hbyung) by Bu-ston*, Part I, Heidelberg, 1931, pp. 102-4. The figure 91 refers to the fact that Vipassin arose 91 aeons before Sakyamuni.

3.3.2. The Sāmmatiya theory of past Buddhas

Daśabalaśrīmitra reports the theory of the Sāmmatiya school as follows:

According to the Sāmmatiya school, "The present Sakyamuni served 77,000 Buddhas in the first incalculable [aeon], starting with the former Buddha Sakyamuni; in the second incalculable he served 76,000 Buddhas, and in the third incalculable he served 75,000, ending with the Buddha Indradhvaja. He then realized true and complete enlightenment (*samyaksambodhi*)."⁶⁷

The Sāmmatiya figures agree with those of the Vaibhāṣikas and Mūlasarvāstivādins, except that the order is reversed. The total is the same: they agree that as a bodhisatta Sakyamuni served 228,000 Buddhas over a period of three incalculable aeons, to which the Vaibhāṣikas and Mūlasarvāstivādins add a period of 100 aeons (in general, but in the case of Sakyamuni only 91).

3.3.3. The Lokottaravādin theory of past Buddhas

The Buddhology of the Lokottaravādins is given in two sections of the *Mahāvastu*.⁶⁸ Many past Buddhas are listed in succession by name; various details are given, including the relationship of some of them to Sakyamuni as a bodhisatta. Several texts or layers of text seem to be conflated, and it is difficult to detect a coherent system in the mass of names and aeons. There is, however, a list of 16 past Buddhas

⁶⁷ Daśabalaśrīmitra 37b1.

⁶⁸ *Mahāvastu* I 32–44; III 300–331. For an English translation see J.J. Jones (tr.), *The Mahāvastu*, Vol. I, London, [1949] 1973, pp. 39–52; Vol. III, London, [1956] 1978, pp. 219–39.

(including Sakyamuni), similar to those found in the *Mahāśītavana-sūtra*, the *Mahākaruṇāpūṇḍarika-sūtra*, and the Chinese **Abhinīṣkramaṇa-sūtra*.⁶⁹ Elsewhere Sakyamuni tells Mahāmaudgalyāyana that as a bodhisatta he worshipped countless Buddhas.⁷⁰

3.3.4. The Mahāyāna and past Buddhas

Adherents of the Mahāyāna accepted the literature of the Śrāvaka schools, subjecting it to new interpretations. They generally agreed that the bodhisatta's career lasted three incalculable aeons; a second theory gave the figure 33,⁷¹ while the great Tibetan scholar Bu ston Rinpoche discusses theories of 3, 7, 10, and 33 as found in various Indian texts.⁷² Numbers of past Buddhas are mentioned in the vast Mahāyāna sūtra literature. As seen above, the *Mahākaruṇāpūṇḍarika* lists 14 past Buddhas; the *Lalitavistara* lists 55 (or, in the Chinese translation by Dharmarakṣa, 48);⁷³ both lists end with the well-known seven past Buddhas (who always retained their popularity in the Mahāyāna, as in the Śrāvaka schools). The *Bodhisattva-piṭaka* describes Sakyamuni's meeting with various past Buddhas,⁷⁴ and mention of individual Buddhas connected with Sakyamuni in the (often very distant) past are scattered throughout the Mahāyāna sūtra literature.

⁶⁹ *Mahāvastu* III 318,9–319,3; *Mahāśītavana*, Derge edition of the Tibetan Kanjur no. 562, *rgyud pha*, 138b7 foll.; for the last two texts see Yamada, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 126, n. 2 and Jan Nattier, *Once upon a Future Time: Studies in a Buddhist Prophecy of Decline*, Berkeley, 1991, p. 83 and n. 70. The *Mahāvastu* and *Mahāśītavana* give 16 Buddhas, including Sakyamuni. The **Abhinīṣkramaṇa* gives 15, the *Mahākaruṇāpūṇḍarika* 14, both excluding Sakyamuni, who is, needless to say, implied.

⁷⁰ *Mahāvastu* I 32,2; cf. also 39,15.

⁷¹ Daśabalaśrīmitra 40b6 foll.

⁷² Obermiller, Vol. I, pp. 119–27.

⁷³ Cf. Yamada, op. cit., p. 126, n. 2.

⁷⁴ Quoted by Bu ston in Obermiller, Vol. I, pp. 125–27.

There are also lists of past Buddhas associated with Buddhas other than Sakyamuni. The *Sukhāvativyūha* lists 80 (in a Sanskrit recension) or 53 (in a Chinese translation) Buddhas who preceded Lokeśvararāja, under whom the future Buddha Amitābha made his vows as the bodhisatta monk Dharmākara.⁷⁵ Another 53 Buddhas of the far-distant past are named in the *Sūtra on the Contemplation of the Two Bodhisattvas, King of Healing and Supreme Healer*, translated into Chinese in about 424 CE.⁷⁶ The *Bhadrakalpika-sūtra* names 1,000 past Buddhas connected with the bodhisattas who will become the 1,000 Buddhas of the “Auspicious Aeon” (*bhadrakalpa*),⁷⁷ and the names of another 1,000 past Buddhas are invoked for protection in a sūtra translated into Chinese during the Liang dynasty (502–57).⁷⁸

But no list or lists were held to be authoritative, and there is no evidence that the Mahāyāna developed a single theory of past Buddhas. Even a single text such as the *Sūtra on the Contemplation of the Two Bodhisattvas* referred to above mentions in a single breath the seven Buddhas of the past, the 53 Buddhas, the 1,000 Bhadrakalpa Buddhas, and the 35 Buddhas.⁷⁹ (Such anomalies are only to be expected. The Mahāyāna was not a monolithic movement with a single geographical or historical centre; rather, it is a general name applied to diverse streams of thought that developed in far-flung areas of India over many centuries, united primarily by their exaltation of the bodhisatta ideal. Furthermore, some of these streams gave more emphasis to “present Buddhas”, such

⁷⁵ Soper, 200–201.

⁷⁶ *Fo-shuo kuan yao-wang yao-shang erh-p'u-sa ching* (T 1161), tr. in Raoul Birnbaum, *The Healing Buddha*, Boulder, 1979, pp. 130–32.

⁷⁷ Dharma Publishing, *The Fortunate Aeon: How the Thousand Buddhas Become Enlightened*, Vol. IV, Berkeley, 1986, pp. 1480–1733.

⁷⁸ *Kuo ch'ü chuang yen chieh ch'ien fo ming ching* (T 447): Soper 201–2; M.W. de Visser, *Ancient Buddhism in Japan*, Paris, 1928, pp. 380–81.

⁷⁹ Birnbaum, p. 133.

as Amitābha or Akṣobhya, or to “transcendental Buddhas” such as Vairocana.) In his commentary on the *Abhidharmakośa*, dGe 'dun grub, the First Dalai Lama, states that “according to the Mahāyāna, [the bodhisatta] worshipped limitless Buddhas in each incalculable”.⁸⁰ A similar idea is found repeatedly in Mahāyāna sūtras, which mention innumerable Buddhas not only of the past but also of the present.

4. The development of the theory of future Buddhas

4.1. Future Buddhas and the Theravāda

We have seen above that, like the Buddhas of the past, the Buddhas of the future are referred to in the plural in the Pāli canon. In the early texts only one future Buddha, Metteyya, is named, and only in one place, in the *Cakkavattisihanāda-sutta*.⁸¹ Later Theravādin texts such as the *Dasabodhisattuppatti-kathā*⁸² and *Dasabodhisatta-uddesa*⁸³ give the names and “biographies” of ten future Buddhas, starting with Metteyya; the latter text promises that a person who worships the ten Sambuddhas will not be reborn in hell for 100,000 aeons.⁸⁴ The *Sotatthakī-mahānidāna* mentions 510 bodhisattas who will become

⁸⁰ *Mdzod tig thar lam gsal byed*, Varanasi, 1973, p. 270, 1, *theg chen pas ni graṅs med pa re re la yaṅ | saṅs rgyas dpag tu med pa la bsṅen bkur byas par bzed do*.

⁸¹ Cf. *Dīghanikāya* III 75–76 and *Dīghanikāya-aṭṭhakathā* (Nālandā ed.) II 97.

⁸² See H. Saddhatissa, op. cit. For this, the following work, and related literature, see Supaphan Na Bangchang, pp. 190–204.

⁸³ See F. Martini, op. cit. The (unpublished) thesis of Pham Wong-Uan, *Anāgatavaṃsa* (1980), gives a study, critical edition, and Thai translation of this work.

⁸⁴ *Dasabodhisatta-uddesa*, text p. 334, tr. p. 367, *ime dasa ca sambuddhe yo naro pi namassati, kappasatasahassāni nirayaṃ so na gacchati*.

future Buddhas.⁸⁵ In the *Dasabodhisattuppatti-kathā*, the Buddha tells Sāriputta that the number of beings who will become Buddhas in future is limitless and countless (*anantāparimāṇā*), and states that he himself cannot count the future Buddhas.⁸⁶

There is even less archaeological evidence for the ten bodhisattas than for the 28 or more Buddhas. A Sukhothai inscription from the time of King Līdayya (Mahādharmaṛāja I) dated to CE 1361 refers to “Metteyya, etc., the ten bodhisattas”;⁸⁷ an Ayutthaya period chant lists their names.⁸⁸ They are depicted in 18th century Ceylonese painting at the Dambulla caves and at the Malvatta and Kulugammana Rājamaḥa Vihāras in Kandy District.⁸⁹ The wish to become a Buddha in the future occurs in inscriptions and colophons. A Pagan period terracotta tablet gives the aspiration to become a Buddha of Thera Ānanda;⁹⁰ the Sukhothai period monk Śrisaddhā performs a successful “act of truth” (*saccakiriyā*), starting “If it is true that I shall attain omniscience and become a Buddha...”.⁹¹ King Līdayya also was “fully

⁸⁵ *Sotatthakī-mahānidāna* v. 629 (text p. 96), *dasuttarā pañcasatā bodhisattā samuhatā*. I am not certain of the derivation here of *samuhata*, but the figure is clear. The phrase is spoken by the Buddha in answer to a question put by Ānanda, “How many [bodhi]sattas have you predicted?”

⁸⁶ *Dasabodhisattuppatti-kathā*, tr. p. 54, text p. 119.

⁸⁷ *Prachumsilacharuk*, Vol. I, p. 103: lines 12–13 of face 3, *ariyametteyyādīnaṃ dasannam bodhisattānam*.... See also Prasert and Griswold, *Epigraphic and Historical Studies*, No. 11, pt. 1, pp. 424 foll. (repr. from *The Journal of the Siam Society* 61/1).

⁸⁸ Supaphan Na Bangchang, pp. 195–96.

⁸⁹ H. Saddhatissa, pp. 20–21 and plates I and II.

⁹⁰ Luce, *Old Burma-Early Pagan* III, pl. 68, *ānandattherena kataṃ rūpaṃ | tena buddho homi*.

⁹¹ Prasert and Griswold, op. cit., p. 392.

resolved to become a Buddha”.⁹² Such aspirations could not be made if the number of future Buddhas was not held to be open.

4.2. Future Buddhas and other Buddhist schools

The cult of Metteyya or Maitreya was accepted by all known Buddhist schools. I have not found any lists of future Buddhas in the works of the Vaibhāṣikas, Mūlasarvāstivādins, or Sāmmatīyas. The *Bhaiṣajyavastu* and *Śayanāsanavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivādin *Vinaya* name only one future Buddha, Maitreya.⁹³ In the first decade of the Mūlasarvāstivādin *Avadānaśataka*, the Buddha predicts the future Buddhahood of ten individuals, but these are only examples, and are not meant to make up a definitive list. The number of future Buddhas is open.

Daśabalaśrimitra reports that “according to some, five Buddhas arise in this very ‘Auspicious Aeon’ (*bhadrakalpa*); according to others, 500; and according to still others, 1,000”.⁹⁴ Interlinear notes in the Peking edition attribute the first theory to the Sthaviras, the second to the Sāmmatīyas, and the third to the Mahāyāna.⁹⁵ While the first and last are amply confirmed by other sources, the ascription of 500 Bhadrakalpa Buddhas to the Sāmmatīyas cannot be confirmed.

Three Sarvāstivādin texts in the Central Asian language of Uighur refer to 500 Bhadrakalpa Buddhas. Two of these are Maitreya

⁹² Prasert and Griswold, pp. 496–97.

⁹³ *Bhaiṣajyavastu*, loc. cit., *Śayanāsanavastu*, p. 30.

⁹⁴ Daśabalaśrimitra 42b5.

⁹⁵ The notes are not found in the Derge edition (“Karmapa Reprint”, *dbu ma ha*, 139b6–7).

texts of the *Maitrisimit* class,⁹⁶ while one is a confessional text for laity.⁹⁷ Two commentaries by two different authors on two different sections of the Mūlasarvāstivādin *Vinaya* give the same figure. The *Vinayavastu-tīkā*, a commentary on the *Vinayavastu* by the Sūtra Expert (*sūtradhara*) Kalyāṇamitra, states that “Fortunate Aeon is a classification of time (*kālavīṣeṣa*): it is auspicious because in it 500 Tathāgatas arise”. The *Vinayavibhaṅga-padavyākhyāna*, a commentary on the *Vinaya-vibhaṅga* by Vinitadeva, states that “a great Fortunate Aeon is a beautiful aeon (*sundara-kalpa*), because in it 500 Buddhas arise”.⁹⁸ The *Ch’i fo fu-mu hsing-tzu ching*, a recension of the *Mahāpadāna-sutta* of unknown school which was translated into Chinese between 240–54 CE, states that “in this *bhadrakalpa* there will be a full 500 Buddhas”.⁹⁹ Since adherents of the 500 Bhadrakalpa Buddhas would agree that four Buddhas, including Sakyamuni, have already arisen, this means that 496 Buddhas are yet to come, starting with Maitreya.

The *Bahubuddha-sūtra* of the *Mahāvastu* of the Mahāsāṃghika Lokottaravādins names only Maitreya,¹⁰⁰ but elsewhere the *Mahāvastu*

⁹⁶ Jan Nattier, *Once Upon a Future Time: Studies in a Buddhist Prophecy of Decline*, Asian Humanities Press, Berkeley, 1991, n. 30, pp. 23–24, referring to Sinasi Tekin (ed., tr.), *Maitrisimit*, Vol. 1, Akademi Verlag, Berlin, 1980, p. 44, 11–16 (not seen); *Das Zusammentreffen mit Maitreya: die ersten fünf Kapitel der Hami-Version der Maitrisimit*, in Zusammenarbeit mit Helmut Eimer und Jens Peter Laut herausgegeben, übersetzt und kommentiert von Geng Shimin und Hans-Joachim Klimkeit, Teil I, Wiesbaden, 1988, p. 75.

⁹⁷ Nattier, loc. cit., referring to Jan Nattier (ed., tr.), *Ksanti qilmag nom bitig, An Uighur Confession Text for Laity*, unpublished manuscript, 1974 (not seen).

⁹⁸ Q5616, Vol. 122, ‘dul ‘grel vu, 85b7.

⁹⁹ Nattier, loc. cit.

¹⁰⁰ *Mahāvastu* III 319, 3; 323, 4; 327, 4; 328, 4.

states that 1,000 Buddhas arise in the Auspicious Aeon.¹⁰¹ The names of 1,000 future Buddhas are invoked in a sūtra translated into Chinese in the first half of the 6th century.¹⁰² This figure was widely disseminated in the literature of the Mahāyāna, for example in such perennially popular sūtras as the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* and the *Vimalakīrti-nirdeśa*.¹⁰³

5. A solution to the *Sambuddhe* riddle?

Now, after a detour of several aeons, we may return to the *Sambuddhe* verses. The texts agree that the Buddha Sakyamuni is an example of the first type of bodhisatta:¹⁰⁴ that is, his career lasted either four or twenty incalculable aeons plus 100,00 aeons. Since in traditional Buddhology the career of a bodhisatta or the acts of a Buddha are stereotyped — what applies to one applies to all — all bodhisattas of the first type should presumably, like Sakyamuni, encounter 512,028 Buddhas. That figure in the first verse may therefore represent either the number of Buddhas honoured by Sakyamuni, or by the first type of

¹⁰¹ *Mahāvastu* III 437, 10. The text here is confused, and contains several lacunae. While the mention of 1,000 Buddhas might be an interpolation, it is followed by an incomplete description of the extent of the radiance of a number of Bhadrakalpa Buddhas, past and future; this suggests that at least the later Lokottaravādins accepted the figure. The names of the future Buddhas do not agree with those given in the *Bhadrakalpika-sūtra*. See Jones’ notes in *The Mahāvastu*, Vol. III, p. 322.

¹⁰² *Wei lai hsing su chieh ch’ien fo ming ching* (T 448): see de Visser p. 381.

¹⁰³ Cf. Soper pp. 200–202, Nattier, loc. cit., and references and discussion in Peter Skilling, “Buddhist Literature: Some Recent Translations” (particularly the review of *The Fortunate Aeon*), *The Journal of the Siam Society*, Vol. 80/1 (1992).

¹⁰⁴ See, for example, *Jinakālamāli* 1,26–2,1, *amhākaṃ bhagavā kappasatasahassādhikāni cattāri asāṅkheyyāni pāramiyo pūretvā buddhabhāvaṃ patto paññādhiko nāma paññindriyassa balavattā*.

bodhisatta in general.¹⁰⁵ It follows that the figure 1,024,055 of the second verse could refer to the second type of bodhisatta, and the figure 2,048,109 of the third verse to the third type of bodhisatta, since the multiples are similar. In the (apocryphal) *Aruṇavati-sutta*, the past Buddha Sikhī is said to have fulfilled the perfections for eight incalculable aeons plus 100,000 aeons; this means he was a bodhisatta of the second type.¹⁰⁶ In the *Jinakālamāli*, Dīpaṃkara, Purāṇasakyamuni (plus several other past Buddhas), and Metteyya, the next Buddha, are described as bodhisattas of the third type. Thus the three figures of the *Sambuddhe* verses might well refer to the number of Buddhas encountered by the three types of bodhisattas of the past, present, and future. I have not, however, found a text to support this.

When and where were the *Sambuddhe* verses composed? At present I cannot suggest an answer. If the Burmese version, which refers to only 512,028 Buddhas, is the original, it could have been composed by the 11th century, by which time the idea of the “longer career” lasting 20 incalculable aeons seems to have appeared. Further research into Ceylonese, Burmese, Mon, and Shan sources, both epigraphic and literary, must be conducted before even an approximate date for the two higher figures can be suggested.

The tradition reported by such texts as the *Sotatthakīmāhānidāna* is the final and most developed theory of the Theravādins. The number of past Buddhas served by Sakyamuni as a bodhisatta surpasses that given by other Śrāvaka schools, as does the

¹⁰⁵ Since the Burmese version gives only the first figure, and since the extra line places the Buddhas in the past, that version might refer only to the Buddhas honoured by Sakyamuni.

¹⁰⁶ *Aruṇavati-sutta* in *Lokupatti aruṇavati*... (see n. 46) p. 43,8, *sikkhī bodhisatto kappasatasahassādhikāni aṭṭha asaṃkheyyāni pāramiyo pūretvā*....

duration of his career, even in its shortest and earliest form as four aeons.¹⁰⁷ Similarly, the Theravādins adopted a theory of ten perfections (*pāramī*) against the six of Śrāvaka schools such as the Vaibhāṣikas, Mūlasarvāstivādins, Sāmmaṭṭiyas,¹⁰⁸ and Lokottaravādins,¹⁰⁹ or of some Mahāyāna sūtras such as the *Prajñāpāramitā*. By classifying these under three grades they obtained a total of thirty,¹¹⁰ again surpassing the figures given by other Śrāvaka schools, and also the mainstream Mahāyāna. On the subject of Buddhology the Theravādins were far from conservative: they seem to have been the most innovative of the known Śrāvaka schools. That this tendency began at an early date is shown by the fact the theories of four aeons and thirty perfections occur in the canonical *Buddhavaṃsa*, by the beginning of the Common Era.

The three figures given in the *Sambuddhe* verses are not final, and the greatest figure of 2,048,109 is not the maximum number of Buddhas of either the past or the future. The figures only represent the number of Buddhas served by the three types of bodhisattas. In the first case, each of the 512,028 Buddhas would, during his own career, have

¹⁰⁷ Note, however, that Vinitadeva's *Nikāyabhedopadaśana-saṃgraha* attributes to the Mūlasarvāstivādins a theory that “a bodhisatta attains [enlightenment] in from ten to thirty incalculable aeons” (Q5641, Vol. 127, u 190a4, *byañ chub sems dpa' ni bskal pa graṅs med pa bcu phan chad nas sum cu tshun chad kyis 'grubo*). If this reference can be confirmed by other sources, it would suggest a development parallel to that seen in the Theravādin school.

¹⁰⁸ See Daśabalaśrīmitra 171a8, “great bodhisattas, after cultivating the six perfections for three incalculable aeons...realize enlightenment” (*byañ chub sems dpa' chen po rñams ni skal pa graṅs med gsum du pha rol tu phyin pa drug spyad pas...yañ dag par rdzogs pa'i saṅs rgyas su 'gyur ro*).

¹⁰⁹ *Mahāvastu* III 302, 3.

¹¹⁰ Cf. *Buddhavaṃsa* I 76–77 (PTS ed. p. 6); *Apadāna, Buddhāpadāna*, Mahāmakuṭarājavidyālaya ed. (Vol. 32) p. 2, 2. For a thorough study of the *pāramīs*, see H.R.H. Princess Mahā Chakri Sirindhorn, *Dasapāramī in Theravāda Buddhism (Daśapāramī nai buddhaśāsanātheravād, in Thai)*, Bangkok, 2525 [1982].

served either 512,028, 1 million plus, or 2 million plus Buddhas, and each of those Buddhas would, in the course of their own quests for enlightenment, have done the same, in each case depending on the type of bodhisatta. The same may be said for future Buddhas. Thus the number of Buddhas implied by the *Sambuddhe* verses stretches towards infinity in both past and future. This late Theravādin Buddhology is reflected in other chants, such as in the lines that follow the verses of homage to the seven Buddhas in the *Āṭānāṭiya-paritta: ete c' aññe ca sambuddhā anekasatakoṭayo*, “these and other Sambuddhas, many thousands of millions”.¹¹¹ As seen above the Burmese *Sambuddhe-gāthā* adds a line referring to limitless Buddhas, compared to whom the number of grains of sand in the Ganges River is insignificant.

The Theravādin theory seems to describe a full circle, from the open plurality of past and future Buddhas of the earliest texts to the open infinity of past and future Buddhas of the latest texts. The “infinity” of Buddhas is implied but unstated in the earliest, pan-Buddhist theory: in a Saṃsāra that has no beginning or end there must arise in succession Buddhas without beginning or end. The “infinity” of Buddhas completes the idea of the earliest texts by expressing what was left unsaid. It does not contradict the various numbers of Buddhas, past or future, given by the Theravādin or other schools: such figures refer in all cases to specific groups of Buddhas in relation to other Buddhas or to certain periods of time (as, for example, the 512,028 Buddhas served by Sakyamuni), and

¹¹¹ *Suat mant chabap luang*, pp. 21.2, 40.1. In the latter, the verse comes at the end of the *Atavisi-pirit* verses discussed above. Luce’s transcription of the last line of the Pāli, *etesaññeva sambuddhā anekasattako*... (the text continues in old Mon) suggests that the inscription included this verse, which is not found in the modern printed versions available to me. This would date the verse to the 11th century.

are not in themselves final. The figures only make sense when the number of Buddhas is seen to be open.

Theravādin scholars are often uncomfortable about the later, developed Buddhology. Ven. Dhammānanda notes that the “longer career” of the bodhisatta—and hence the numbers of Buddhas given in the *Sambuddhe-gāthā*—need not be accepted, since it is not found in the Tipiṭaka or the Aṭṭhakathā; he further suggests that such theories do not conform to the Mahāvihāra, and might derive from the Abhayagiri. If I have described these theories as Theravādin in this article, it is because they are presented in Pāli works transmitted only (as far as we know) within the Theravādin Vinaya lineage. It is sometimes suggested that the theories derive from Mahāyāna influence, but the evidence is against this. The Buddhas arise serially, in succession: only one Buddha arises at a time; never, as in the Mahāyāna, do multiple Buddhas exist in the present. Only five Buddhas arise in the Auspicious Aeon. There is no hint of Mahāyāna doctrines such as the ten levels (*daśabhūmi*) of a bodhisatta or the three bodies (*trikāya*) of a Buddha, and the description of the career of a bodhisatta—whether as four incalculables plus 100,000 aeons or more—or of the three types of bodhisatta are unique to the Theravādins, as are the numbers of past Buddhas, from the figure 28 of the *Buddhavamsa* upwards. Furthermore, the Theravādin theories bear no formal resemblance to those of the other Śrāvaka schools. Direct copying or imitation of other Śrāvaka schools or of the Mahāyāna may therefore be ruled out.

Certainly, however, there would have been mutual influence, since no school existed in isolation. Some of the past Buddhas stand out as common to several lists. The theories of the different schools have a common origin in the sense that, during the several centuries on either side of the beginning of the Common Era, there seems to have been a preoccupation with the past lives of the Buddha and the path to

Buddhahood: that is, the bodhisatta career. During this period the bodhisatta theories of these schools, including the Theravādins, were formulated; during this period the Mahāyāna began to take shape—not as the initiator of the theories of the bodhisatta career, but as a result of the speculation on that subject.

At any rate, the *Sambuddhe* verses are concerned with power and protection, and not with philosophy or Buddhological speculation. Their efficacy derives from the large number of Buddhas invoked, and, although this is unstated, from the *pāramī* of Sakyamuni or other bodhisattas who honoured or will honour Buddhas of these numbers during the many aeons of their bodhisatta careers. The concept of protection against calamity derived from the recitation of the name or epithets of the Buddha is an old one. It is enshrined, for example, in the ancient and canonical *Dhajagga-sutta*, a popular *paritta* in which the Buddha recommends the recitation of the *iti pi so* formula as a protection against fear. Other canonical *parittas* derive their power from the recitation of the names of *pacceka-buddhas*, as in the *Isigili-sutta*,¹¹² or of various deities, as in the *Mahāsamaya* and *Āṭānāṭiya Suttas*, as do non-canonical *parittas* such as the *Mahādibbamanta* and the *Uppātasanti*. The power of texts like the *Ākāravatta-sutta* and the *Yot phrakantraipidok* stems from combinations of the *iti pi so* formula with the concept of *pāramī*.¹¹³ The invocation of the “power of the name”

¹¹² *Majjhimanikāya* 116, Vol. III, *Uparipaṇṇāsa*. Note that at the end the text seems to recommend that homage be paid “to these and other mighty *pacceka-buddhas*...without limit” (PTS ed. p. 71.3, *ete ca aññe ca mahānubhāvā paccekabuddhā...parinibbute vandatha appameyye*). I.B. Horner (*The Middle Length Sayings* III, London, 1967, p. 113), interprets the passage as “praise all these immeasurable great seers who have attained final nibbāna”.

¹¹³ For these texts, and for *paritta* in general, see Peter Skilling, “The Rakṣā Literature of the Śrāvakayāna”, *Journal of the Pāli Text Society* XVI (1992), pp. 116–24.

occurs in Mahāyāna sūtras such as the sūtras on the 1,000 past and 1,000 future Buddhas referred to above (there is also a parallel sūtra on the 1,000 present Buddhas). The *Names of 5,453 Buddhas*, a text preserved in Tibetan translation, names that many Buddhas, who are not placed in time or space; verses at the end promise protection.¹¹⁴ The *Sambuddhe* verses may be unique in invoking the power of the largest number of Buddhas in the fewest words.

Bangkok

Peter Skilling

¹¹⁴ *Saṅs rgyas kyi mtshan lña ston bzi brgya lña bcu rtsa gsum pa*, Q928 (Vol. 36), *mdo zu*. The text, which has no translators’ colophon or *nidāna*, consists entirely of names, often long and awkward, in the formula “homage to...”, concluding with twelve lines of verse spoken by the Buddha. The colophon to the Stog Palace edition (§ 95) notes that the transmission of the text was confused. A Chinese parallel (T 443) was translated in 594 A.C. For the invocation of the names of the Buddha, see *Hōbōgirin* III 209–10 (Butsumyō).

**List of Members
of the
Pali Text Society**

ARGENTINA

Fundación Instituto de Estudios
Budistas
Casilla 2819
Correo Central
1000 Buenos Aires

AUSTRALIA

Library
Australian National University
Canberra ACT 0200

Buddhist Library & Educ Centre
20 Victoria Street
Lewisham NSW 2049

T Burgess
Terowa Rmb 213 B
St Arnaud VIC 3478

E Chan
17 Biara Avenue
Campsie NSW 2194

John Crompton
36 Rue Montaigne
Petrie 4052
Queensland

Friends of Western Buddhist
Order (Melbourne) Inc
34 Bishop Street
Brunswick
Victoria 3056

Rev Dr R W Fulcher
P O Box 642
Toowong
Brisbane
Queensland 4066

V Goh
Sunnataram Forest Monastery
Lot 1
Teudts Road
Bundanoon NSW 2578

E A A Hazlewood
11 Waterhouse Street
Curtin ACT 2605

Prof J W De Jong
4 Jansz Crescent
Manuka ACT 2603

Lankarama Vihara
27 Asquith Street
North Auburn NSW 2144

Dr P Masefield
11/68 Plowman Street
Bondi NSW 2026

Stephen Morey
4 Sims Street
Sandringham
Victoria 3191

Primoz Pecenko
South & West Asia Centre
Faculty of Asian Studies
A.N.U.
Canberra ACT 0200

AUSTRIA

George Anavilo
Weinberggasse 15/7
A-1190 Wien

Prof Wilfried Grohar
Khevenhüllerstr 5
A-9020 Klagenfurt

Dr Haiyan Hu-von Hinüber
Praterstr 44-46/II/10
A-1020 Wien

Dr W Slaje
Honigtal 166a
A-8047 Graz

Franz Zelsacher
Olmützergergasse 9
A-9020 Klagenfurt

BANGLADESH

Dr S B Barua
698 Mehedhibag Road
Mehedhibag
Chittagong 4000

BELGIUM

Rafael Kips
Teerlingstraat 36
B-9170 Meerdonk

Sangha of Bodhinyana
Buddhist Monastery
Lot 1 Kingsbury Drive
Serpentine WA 6205

Ayya Santa
92 Prices Circuit
Woronora 2232
NSW

Samanera Seevali
Bodhinyana Monastery
Lot 1 Kingsbury Drive
Serpentine WA 6205

Sri Lanka Vihara Melbourne
66 Regent Avenue
Springvale
Victoria 3171

Brett Stephens
Dhamma Books
RMB 3790
Dromedary 7030
Tasmania

Richard & Carolyn Walsh
36 Collaroy Road
New Lambton
NSW 2305

M G Wiltshire
Dept of Religious Studies
Edith Cowan University
2 Bradford Street
Perth WA 6050

BRAZIL

Ricardo Sasaki
R.Albita 606/101
30310-160 Cruzeiro
Belo Horizonte MG

CAMBODIA

Olivier de Bernon
P O Box 878
Phnom Penh

CANADA

Jim Anderson
2-149 Parkview Avenue
Orillia
Ontario L3V 4M2

Robert Banbury
255 Main Street
Apt 603
Toronto
Ontario M4C 4X2

B George Blake PhD
300 Park Road North
Oshawa
Ontario L1J 4M2

Anne F Coates
260 E 24th Street
North Vancouver
British Columbia V7L 3E7

Louis Debras
7 Glen Road No 8
Toronto
Ontario M4X 1M4

Prof Nalini Devdas
330 Metcalfe Street
Apt 802
Ottawa
Ontario K2P 1S4

Bhikkhu Thich Quang Due
1059 Albert Road
Windsor
Ontario NAY 3P4

Mavis L Fenn
Room 104 UH
Religious Studies Dept
McMaster University
Hamilton
Ontario L8S 4K1

Ellen Foster
901-260 Heath St West
Toronto
Ontario M5P 3L6

Prof R P Hayes
Faculty of Religious Studies
William & Henry Birks Bldg
McGill University
3520 University Street
Montreal H3A 2A7

Dianne E Hubert M Ed
15 Strathgowan Avenue
Sub Level A
Toronto
Ontario M4N 1B8

Kinmount Seminary & Academy
c/o Dhamma Centre of Canada
FAO Karen Russell
Kinmount
Ontario K0M 2A0

Jamyang Lodto
305-832 Fisgard Street
Victoria
British Columbia V8W 1S1

Dr N K G Mendis
Isaacs Harbour
Nova Scotia B0H 1S0

François Mercier
8275 de Gaspe
Montréal
Quebec M2P 2J9

David Pinto BA
48 Glen Echo Road
Toronto
Ontario M4N 2E3

Dr Suwanda Sugunasiri
6 Hoskin Avenue
Toronto
Ontario M5S 1H8

Toronto Mahavihara Society
Attn Ven A Ratanasiri
3595 Kingston Road
Scarborough
Ontario M1M 1R8

Jim Vuylsteke
355 Sunnyside Avenue
Toronto
Ontario M6R 2R7

Prof A K Warder PhD
Apt 306
2045 Lakeshore Boulevard West
Toronto
Ontario M8V 2Z6

Tilaka de Zoysa
2131 Lawrence Avenue East
#207
Scarborough
Ontario M1R 5G4

CROATIA

Sinisa Dokic
Josipa Krasa 2
56000 Vinkovci

DENMARK

Ole Bang
Prinsessegade 85 4 nf
DK-1422 København K

Hartmut Buescher
Stradellasvej 16 st/th
DK-2450 København SV

A Critical Pali Dictionary
Nørregade 34, 4
DK-1165 København K

Jon R Jørgensen
Guldbergsgade 92, 1.th.
DK-2200 København N

Else Pauly
Byskillet 8
DK-2960 Rungsted Kyst

Alan Pederson
Nygards Plads 10 9th
DK-2605 Brøndy

Joergen Sodemann
Engdalgaardvej 60
DK-8330 Beder

FRANCE

Jean-Remi Alisse
12 Rue Roland
Grosselin
F-92290 Chatenay Malabry

Prof N Balbir
32 rue des Bruyères
F-92310 Sèvres

Chandaratana
International Buddhist Centre
7 Cité Firmin Bourgeois
F-93350 Le Bourget

École Française d'Extrême Orient
22 Avenue du Président Wilson
F-75116 Paris

Gilbert C Gauche
5 bis Rue Quinault
F-78100 Saint-Germain-en-Laye

M Gobalakichenane
22 Villa Boissière
F-91400 Orsay

Dr J L Guy
43 Rue Jules Guesde
F-93147 Bondy Cedex

T Luong
130 rue du Pt Jour
F-92100 Boulogne Billancourt

Serge Paganon
4 allée du Clos de la Croix
F-78290 Croissy sur Seine

GERMANY

Akademie der Wissenschaften
Katalogisierung der OHD
Hainbundstr 21
D-37085 Göttingen

Akademie der Wissenschaften
Sankrit-Wörterbuch der Turfan-
Funde
Hainbundstr 21
D-37085 Göttingen

Indologisches Seminar der
Universität Bonn
Regina-Pacis-Weg 7
D-53113 Bonn

Michael Buchen
Oldenburger Str 28
D-10551 Berlin

Buddhismus im Westen
Dr Paul Koppler
Heimschule 1
D-56645 Nickenich

Buddhistische Gesellschaft
Berlin eV
Wulfstrasse 6
D-12165 Berlin

Dr E R I Deane
Mittenwalderstrasse 12
D-10961 Berlin

Dr K H Eckert
Henri-Dunant-Str 4
D-86179 Augsburg

Freie Universität Berlin
Institut für Indische Philologie
Königin-Luise Strasse 34A
D-14195 Berlin

Oliver Freiberger
Matzenbergweg 8
D-95447 Bayreuth

Werner Gundel MA
Alte Poststr 15
D-91522 Ansbach

Prof Dr O von Hinüber
Orientalisches Seminar-Indologie
Humboldtstr 5
D-79085 Freiburg

Ute Hüsken
Seminar für Indologie und
Buddhismuskunde
Hainbundstr 21
D-37085 Göttingen

Choi Hyung
Rennweg 23
D-79106 Freiburg

Dr Wiebke Jensen
Hartzloh 36
D-22307 Hamburg

Ayya Khema
Buddha-Haus
Uttenbühl 5
D-87466 Oy-Mittelberg

Dr Petra Kieffer-Pülz
Seminar für Indologie
und Buddhismuskunde
Hainbundstr 21
D-37085 Göttingen

Gabor Kontur
Franz-Nissl-Str 16
D-80999 München

Martin Krakowiak
Donaustrasse 50
D-12043 Berlin

Dr Dieter Maue
Mooserstrasse 56
D-35396 Giessen

Prof Dr Adelheid Mette
Indologisches Seminar der Univ
Salzstrasse 53
D-48143 Münster

E Nothnagel
Thalham 10
84419 Schwindegg

Do Su Paek
Elbenweg 15A
D-79114 Freiburg

Alois Payer
Kriegsstrasse 4
D-72131 Ofterdingen

Philipps-Universität Marburg
Fachgebiet Indologie
Wilhelm-Roepke-Str 6
D-35032 Marburg

Birte Plutat
Oldendorfer Str 18
D-27729 Axstedt

Dr Alexander v. Rospatt
Institut für Indologie und
Zentralasienwissenschaften
Universität Leipzig
D-04109 Leipzig

Anton Roth
Östliche Promenade 17
D-89264 Weissenhorn

Dr Wolfgang Schumann
Im Herrengarten 17
D-53639 Königswinter 21

Seminar für Indologie
Johannes Gutenberg-Univ
D-55099 Mainz

Wolfgang Siepen
Im Branderfeld 6
D-52078 Aachen

Prof Dr J S Sprockhoff
Sem. f. Orient. u. Indologie
der Universität Bochum
Postfach 102148
D-44801 Bochum 1

Dr Jörg Weber
Bülowstrasse 609
D-10783 Berlin 30

Prof Dr A Wezler
Seminar für Kultur
& Geschichte Indiens
Neue Rabenstr 3
D-20354 Hamburg

HONG KONG

Dr Bernard Chan
Room 2109 Melbourne Plaza
33 Queen's Road
Hong Kong

Lo Pun
S.E. Plastics Packaging Co Ltd
22/F Flat A Lung Shing Factory
Blag 148 Texaco Road
N.T.
Hong Kong

HUNGARY

Karpati Gabor
Ivanfahegyalja u 43/B
H-7400 Kaposvar

Tibor Novak
Beke U 3
H-6343 Miske

INDIA

Aleksa Dokic
Embassy of Republic of Croatia
70 Ring Road
Lajpat Nagar-III
New Delhi 110 024

Balbir & Susan Jootla
Jeet Villa
Dalhousie HP 176 304

Ven U Munikumara
Burmese Vihar
Bodh Gaya
Bihar 824 231

L Rathi
28 Mukundnagar
Pune 411 037

Kazuhiko Ueda
Dhammagiri International
Academy
Igatpuri
District Nasik
Maharashtra 422 403

Vipassana Research Institute
Via Dhammagiri
Igatpuri
District Nasik
Maharashtra 422 403

INDONESIA

Kusalo Hudaya Kandahjaya
121 Jalan Suryakencana
Bogor
Jawa Barat 16141

Tan Hoei Toen
Coyudan 843
Parakan
Jawa-Tengah

IRELAND

John O'Grady
22 St Catherine's Drive
Rush
Co Dublin

G Oulsnam
Dept of Computer Science
University College
Cork

ISRAEL

Rafael Sharett
P O Box 37516
Tel Aviv 61374

ITALY

Dr Marco Pucciarini
Via Guido Pompili N18
I-06122 Perugia

JAPAN

Tu Mei Chu
19-3 Selagiaya-ku Chome 4
Nozawa Ofuziso 1-E Room
Tokyo 154

Prof Dr Fumio Enomoto
21-39 Uzumasa Omokagecho
Ukyoku
Kyoto 616

Prof Kotatsu Fujita
3-1-22 Momijidai Minami
Atsubetsu-Ku
Sapporo 897-7415

Tosei Ikegami
3582 Minobu-cho
Yamanasshi - Pref 409-25

International Institute for
Buddhist Studies
5-3-23 Toranomon
Minato-Ku
Tokyo 105

Kazunori Iwagami
3-25-1 Toranomon
Minato-ku
Tokyo 105

Prof Shoryu Katsura
Osuga-Cho 20-10-1101
Minami-Cu
Hiroshima 732

K & V Kawasaki
266-27 Ozuku-Cho
Kashihara Shi
Nara-Ken 634

Rev Kan Eki Kim
c/o Prof S Shimada
2-38-22 Mukouga-Oka
Bunkyo-ku
Tokyo 113

Hideo Kitajima
235 Koizumi-cho
Yamatokoriya City
Nara Prefecture 639-11

Yoshiaki Kitayama
Knowledge Industry Japan Ltd
Kouei Bldg 3F
2-1-13 Awaji-machi
Chuo-ku
Osaka 541

H Matsubara
c/o Yakushi-in
2-18 Togyacho
Okayama-shi
Okayama 700

Dr Junko Matsumura
Kobe International University
5-1-1 Manabigaoka
Zarumi-ku
Kobe 655

Prof Dr Egaku Mayeda
No 56 Mayeda
Nakagawa-ku
Nagoya 454

Michael McDonald
103 High Maison Takamatsu
3-10-11 Takamatsu
Toshima-ku
Tokyo 171

Ian Megil
1-5242-32 Suito-cho
Niigata-shi
Niigata 951

Prof Sodo Mori
17-5 Niiza I-chome
Niiza-shi
Saitama 352

Kazuo Ngai
Komatsuri-cho 928
Kishiwada-shi
Osaka-fu 596

Kevin F E Purell
1-66-7-B Shiraitodai
Fuchi-Shi
Tokyo 183

Dr Junko Sakamoto-Goto
2-31 Shogetsucho
Moriguchishi
Osakafu 570

Kaya Sawada
1-6-13 Chiyogaoka
Asao-ku
Kawasaki-Shi
Kanagawa-Ken 215

Takagi Shigeru
Kato Apartment 10
2 220-1 Kamisato-Kuroda
Iida-shi
Nagano-ken 395

Dr G A Somaratne
Professor of Religion
Miyazaki International College
1405 Kano Kiyotake
Miyazaki 889-16

Kim Jae Sung
Takinokawa 4-22-2
Jotokuji Temple Kitaku
Tokyo 114

Professor J Takasaki
Professor Emeritus
University of Tokyo
1-20-1 Akadane
Nishi Kita-Ku
Tokyo 115

Ven Ryu Takeda MA
No 264 Hanamasa
Miwa-Cho
Ama-Gun
Aichi-ken 490-12

Kudo Toshihide
Kuroba House-Issha-205
2-217-2 Kameno I
Meitoku
Nagaya-shi

Yoko Tsuda
6-14-7 Shimosakamoto
Otsu-City Shiga

Kenji Watanabe
4-7-2 Nishi Motomachi
Kokubunji-shi
Tokyo 185

M Yamazaki
5-150-449 Kunimiga-oka
Aoba-ku
Sendai 989-32

Dr Akira Yuyama
3-5-12 Zengyo
Fujisawa 251

KOREA

The Calm Voice Society
Attn Mr Yudong
172 Kwanhun-Dong
Chongno-ku
Seoul

M H Kim
No 1202, 503 Dong
Samho Garden Mansion
Banpo-1 Dong
Sedcho-gu
Seoul 137-040

Don Yon Sunim
Kang Won Do
Jungsungunng
Chongro-ku
Imkye Myan
Ka-Mok-Ri 88-7

LUXEMBOURG

Prof Robert Koch
34 Avenue Guillaume
L-1650 Luxembourg

Jacques Leider
3 Route de Bissen
L-9173 Michelbuch

Pierluigi Reghellin
232 Val des Bons Malades
L-2121 Luxembourg/Kirchberg

Gisèle Reuter
4 rue Tony Neuman
L-2241 Luxembourg

MALAYSIA

Chin-Han See
11A Halaman Free School
Penang 11600

Lau Kong Beng
3 Jalan 55 1/36
47300 Petaling Jaya

Yogi Dhammaloka
7T Jalan Delima
Island Glades
11700 Penang

Bhikkhu Dhammavuddho
c/o 49C Jalan Batu Jantan
11500 Ayer Itam
Penang

Wee Ye Kew
463 Jalan Dato 'Nik Mustapha
17500 Tanah Merah
Kelantan

Siew Im Khoo
c/o 11A Halaman Free School
11600 Penang

Hsiang Sheng Kiang
92 Jalan Tengku Kelana
41000 Klang

Ng Chuh Mei
39 SS 23/39
Trmn Sea
47400 Petaling Jaya
West Malaysia

Wee Keat Ng
254D Semabok Garden
Lorong 1
75050 Melaka

Hon Secretary
The Penang Buddhist Association
168 Jalan Anson
Penang 10400

Chang Poon-Min
11 Medan Trengganu
11600 Penang

MYANMAR

Prof U Ko Lay
Guest Professors' Villa
State Pariyatti Sasana University
Kaba Aye
Mayangon
Yangon

Ven Ashin Nyanissara
30 Bo Gyoke Aung San Pya Taik
Shwe Gon Daing P.O.
Rd Bahan Township
Yangon

NETHERLANDS

The Librarian
Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit
te Leiden
Postbus 9501
NL-2300 RA Leiden

G M Blok
Slikkergeerstraat 75
P O B 1107 UL
NL-Amsterdam

N van Gorkum
Korna Lijnhorst 108
NL-2592 HZ The Hague

A Griffiths
Pieterskerk Choorsteeg 19
NL-2311 TR Leiden

Dr A C M Kurpershoek-Scherft
Bornsestraat 61
NL-7556 BC Hengelo (o)

N Moonen
St Pieterstraat 52
NL-6463 CV Kerkrade

Randolph S Whitfield
Tinnegieterstrasse 9
NL-1825 DS Alkmaar

J A Wibier
Post Box 3287
NL-4700 GG Roosendaal

NEW ZEALAND

Auckland Theravada Buddhist
Association
29 Harris Road
Mt Wellington
Auckland

Dr P Harrison
Department of Philosophy &
Religious Studies
Private Bag 4800
University of Canterbury
Christchurch

Robert Kirkpatrick
1 Te Kauwhata Road
Te Kauwhata

J Luxford
Burnside Road
RD 3 Kaukapakapa

Royce Wiles
16 Ratcliffe Street
Matamata 2271

POLAND

S Gil
ul Grunwaldzka 24/58
72600 Świnoujście

Dr Piotr Klafkowski
Adam Mickiewicz University
Inst of General & Applied Ling
ul Miedzydhodzka 3/5
60-371 Poznan

SINGAPORE

Gina Lim
13 Highland Walk
Singapore 1954

Song Teng Lim
Serangoon North
Avenue 1
No. 08-127
Singapore 1955

The Hon Secretary
Mangala Vihara
30 Jalan Eunus
Singapore 1441

Dr Yuen Yen Ng
35 Tham Soon Avenue
Singapore 2195

Ven Pannananda
c/r Mr C T Leong
Block 4 Marine Vista
S 449028 No.21-59
Republic of Singapore

Lim Song Teng
Block 125
Serangoon North
Avenue 1 No 08-127
Singapore 1955

Gerald Y L Yong
Block 405 04-625
Jurong West Street 42
Singapore 2264

SRI LANKA

Nanda Amarasinghe
10 Layards Road
Colombo 5

Ven Analayo Bhikkhu
Lewella Meditation Centre
150 Dharmasoka Mawatha
Kandy

Buddhist Cultural Centre
125 Anderson Road
Nedimala
Dehiwala

Buddhist Publication Society
Attn Bhikkhu Bodhi
54 Sangharaja Mawatha
Kandy

Ven Guttasila
C/o Nissarana Vanaya
Mitirigala - 0521

Ven Dr B A Maitreya
Shri Nandarama
Udumulla
Balangoda
21 Lanka

P Mapatuna
32 Tenth Lane
Colombo 3

Nanadassani Bhikkhuni
Dhammajivaramaya
239 Pansala Para
Bangalawatta
Kottawa/Pannipitiya

M D S Perera
9 Havelock Road
Colombo 5

Sydney F Perera
50/1 S De S Jayasinghe Mawatha
Kohuwela
Nugegoda

Rev Fr Aloysius Pieris
Tulana Research Centre
Gonawala Kelaniya

The Library
Polgasduwa
The Island Hermitage
Dodanduwa

Ven Dr Rahula BA PhD DLitt
126 Buddhist Institute Avenue
Parliament Road
Kotte

Sunil Wettimuny
62 Veherakande Road
Baddegana
Kotte

Gamini Wijesuriya
Nirmana Associates
380 Baudhdhaloka Mawatha
Colombo 7

SWEDEN

Kirdar Bror Bagwandin
Box 183
S-69401 Hallsberg

Prof Per-Arne Berglie
Poppelvagen 15
S-135 52 Tyreso

Gunnar Gällmo
Box 5158
S-10244 Stockholm

Klemens Karlsson
Solhemsvagens
S-13740 Vasterhaninge

Lund University Library
Box 3
S-22100 Lund

Bo Nilsson
Viderupsgatan 3
S-216 22 Malmö

Uppsala Univ Bibliothek
Forvarvsavdelningen Periodica
Box 510
S-751/20 Uppsala

Uppsala Univ
Dept Asian & African Languages
Section of Indian Philology
Box 513
S-751/20 Uppsala

SWITZERLAND

Jean Claude & Natasha Brutsch
6 Rue de Lyon
CH-1201 Genève

Pierre Alain Brutsch
62 Rue de Vermont
CH-1202 Genève

Buddhist Order Support Fund
Wildenbühlstr 28
CH-8135 Langnau a.A.

Peter Denger
Therwilerstrasse 40
CH-4054 Basel

Dhammapala Buddhist Monastery
Attn Bhikkhu Thiradhammo
Am Waldrand
CH-3718 Kandersteg

Valeria Fonseca
Schafisheimerstr 15
CH-5502 Hunzenschwil

Marianne Heim
33 Rue de Contamines
CH-1206 Genève

Terence Maung Hpay
10 Rue Pedro Meylan
CH-1208 Genève

Sayagi U Ba Khin Gesellschaft
Greyerzstrasse 35
CH-3013 Bern

Alois Leutenegger
Alte Zürichstr 6
CH-8124 Maur

Madras Yoga
Reto Zbinden - Direktor
Seilerstrasse 24
CH-3011 Bern

Dr Joy Manné
9 Chemin des Roches
CH-1009 Pully

Prof Jacques May
68 Avenue Rumine
CH-1005 Lausanne

E M Place
Wildenbühlstrasse 28
CH-08135 Langnau a/A

M Shannon-Huber
Lochmatt 4
CH-3504 Oberhuenigen

TAIWAN

Ven Chih Chung
Ling Shan Temple
163 Yuan Chi Rd
Shing Ming Village
Ming Chien Hsiang
Nantou Hsien 55102

Chung-Hwa Institute
Buddhist Studies Library
276 Kwang Ming Road
Peitou 11244
Taipei

The Secretary
Fa-Kung Institute of Buddhist
Studies
20 Lane 60
Kuang-Fu N Road
Taipei 10594

Library of Hsiang Kuang Nuns
Buddhist College
49-1 Hsiychao Nei-pu
Chu-chi
Chia-I

J-Y Lin
40 Shin-Shin Lane
Jian-Ping Village
Fang-Iuan Town
Chang-Hua 528

C L Tsai
No 11 4F Alley 3
Lane 339 Footeh Street
'Nan-Kang' District 115
Taipei

K F Wang
7F no.10 Lane 39
Section 2 Chung-Hua Road
Taipei

Lisn Wong
No 11-1 Alley 17
Lane 131 Wolung Street
Ta-an District 106
Taipei

Ying Hong Wang
119 Chien Yen Road
Hsin Ying City 73005

THAILAND

Ven Asabho Bhikkhu
c/o Wat Phra Phirian
Vorachak Street
Bangkok 10100

Donald A Chapman
P O Box 17
Mae Rim Post Office
Chiang Mai 50180

Wat Phra Dhammakaya
23/2 Moo 7 Klong Sam
Klong Luang
Pathum Thani 12120

Tan Chao Khun Dhammapitaka
Wat Phra Phiriah
Vorachak Street
Bangkok 10100

Louis Gabaude
6 Soi 9 Nimanhem Road
T Suthep
Chiang Mai 50200

François Lagirarde
27 Sukhumvit Soi 8
Bangkok 10110

Wat Pah Nanachat
Bahn Bung Wai
A Warin Chamrap
34190 Ubon Ratchathani

H H Somdet Phra Nyanasamvara
248 Wat Bovornives Vihara
Phra Sumain Road
Bangkok 10200

Phra Payutto Bhikkhu
c/o Wat Phra Phirian
Vorachak Street
Bangkok 10100

Dr Waldemar C Sailer
Aree Condominium
Rm 242 9th fl
Pahol-Yothin
No.3 Aree 7
Phaya-Thai
Bangkok 10400

Peter Skilling
68/123 Prachanivet 4
Prachachun Road
T Tasai A Muang
Nonthaburi 11000

Bhikkhu Sukhemo
c/o Mr Sompote Sekhanand
1494 Charoen Krung Road
Bangkok 10500

UNITED ARAB EMIRATES

Thomas Wood
Basic University Education
Centre
United Arab Emirates University
PO Box 17172 (English Unit)
Al Ain

UNITED KINGDOM

Mark Allon
c/o Susan Madigan
Dept of Indian Studies
S.O.A.S.
Thornhaugh Street
London WC1H 0XG

Dharmacari Amoghavamsa
Friends of Western Buddhist
Order
354 Crookesmoor Road
Sheffield S10 1BH

An Y-G
Wolfson College
Oxford OX2 6UD

Philip Anderson
1 Hunters Terrace
Springwell Village
Gateshead
Tyne & Wear NE9 7RU

Dharmachari Aryadeva
Blaenddol House
Treddol
Nr Corwen
Clwyd LL21 0EN

Ven T Bandula
London Buddhist Vihara
The Avenue
Bedford Park
London W4 1UD

A Barratt
13 Macclesfield Road
Whaley Bridge
Stockport SK12 7DG

Dr J D Bastow
Department of Philosophy
The University
Dundee DD1 4HN

T A Baugh
6 The Furlongs
Tresham
Nr Wooton Under Edge
Glos GL12 7RW

Dr F Beresford
10 Manor Road
Whalley Range
Manchester M16 8DX

David Brazier
53 Grosvenor Place
Jesmond
Newcastle-upon-Tyne NE2 2RD

Bristol Buddhist Centre
9 Cromwell Road
St. Andrews
Bristol BS6 5HD

British Library
Oriental & India Office
Collections
197 Blackfriars Road
London SE1 8NG

J Browne
Resugga
St Erme
Truro
Cornwall TR4 9BL

M Buckland
6 Greenwood Way
Shipdham
Norfolk IP25 7NR

Buddhist Group of Kendal
(Theravada)
c/o Fellside Alexander School
Low Fellside
Kendal
Cumbria LA9 4NJ

Buddhist Society
58 Eccleston Square
London SW1V 1PH

Paul Burton
13 Rhosberse Road
Coedpoeth
Wrexham
Clwyd LL11 3BT

Maria Grazia Cantoreggi
IMC
Splatts House
Heddington
Nr Calne
Wilts SN11 0PE

D Chan
10 Stamford Cottages
Billing Street
London SW10 9IP

Chaskalson
Madhyanaloka
30 Chantry Road
Moseley
Birmingham B13 8DH

S Y Chen
Wolfson College
Linton Road
Oxford OX2 6UD

Chithurst Buddhist Monastery
Chithurst
Nr Petersfield
Hants GU31 5EU

J L Collins
237 Oxford Road
Reading
Berkshire RG1 7PX

Dr M Cone
Oriental Faculty
University of Cambridge
Sidgwick Avenue
Cambridge CB3 9DA

L S Cousins MA
35 Burlington Road
Withington
Manchester M20 4QA

Richard Cox
5 West Court
Blennerhasset
Aspatria
Carlisle CA5 3RH

Robert A D Cran
253 East End Road
East Finchley
London N2 8AY

Kate Crosby
Dept of Sanskrit
University of Edinburgh
7 Buccleuch Place
Edinburgh EH8 9LW

Sam & Sally Cutler
20 Alden Crescent
Barton
Headington
Oxford OX3 9LT

Simon Davison
35 Wolvercote Green
Upper Wolvercote
Oxford OX2 8BD

Dr S A W Dissanayake
Ashworth Hospital
Parkbourn
Maghull
Liverpool L31 1HW

Paul Dundas
Dept of Sanskrit
University of Edinburgh
7 Buccleuch Place
Edinburgh EH8 9LW

Edinburgh University Library
University of Edinburgh
George Square
Edinburgh EH8 9LJ

Dimitry Egorenkov
84 Alderney Street
London SW1 4EY

Martin Ellis
37 Laurier Road
London NW5 1SH

Roger Ellis
23 Sandyside
Firth Mossbank
Shetland ZE2 9TE

Kyoko Emery
IMC
Splatts House
Heddington
Nr Calne
Wilts SN11 0PE

Elizabeth English
Wolfson College
Linton Road
Oxford OX2 6UD

John English
100 Norfolk Gardens
Littlehampton
West Sussex

A M Entwistle
IMC
Splatts House
Heddington
Nr Calne
Wilts SN11 0PE

Dr G A Evison
2 Terrington Close
Abingdon
Oxon OX14 1PQ

R W Farrington Esq
77 Marsham Court
Marsham Street
London SW1P 4LA

M H T Flisher
27 Whites Lane
Kessingland
Lowestoft
Suffolk NR33 7TF

Forest Hermitage
Lower Fulbrook
Warwick CV35 8AS

Richard Fox
4 Swell Court
Gandhi Close
Walthamstow
Talbot Square
London WC 1TT

Sara Freeman
IMC
Splatts House
Heddington
Nr Calne
Wiltshire SN11 0PE

Friends of Western Buddhist
Order
FAO John Hunter
30 Chantry Road
Moseley
Birmingham B13 8DH

Dr R C C Fynes
The Jain Academy
School of Arts & Humanities
De Montfort University
The Gateway
Leicester LE1 9BH

Sean D Gaffney
56 Weald Road
Hillingdon
Middlesex UB10 0HQ

Gambhiravajra
97 Park Hill Rise
Croydon CR0 5JH

Revd J A Gardiner
Kirkettle Mill
near Roslin
Midlothian EH25 9QB

Dr R M L Gethin
Univ of Bristol
Dept of Theology & Religious
Studies
36 Tyndall's Park Road
Bristol BS8 1PL

Prof R F Gombrich MA Dphil
15 Church Street
Kidlington
Oxon OX5 2BA

T & J Gomes
Buddhist Group of Kendal
c/o Fellside Alexandra School
Low Fellside
Kendal
Cumbria LA9 4NJ

Dr Peter Gray
45 Pinewood Park
New Haw
Weybridge KT15 3BS

Ven Sunanda
L V Gray
98 Milford Avenue
Stoney Stratford MK11 1HE

Arthur Grieves
Roseneath Cottage
Overwater
Nemthead
Alston
Cumbria CA9 3NP

Ursula Haeckel
5 Glenluce Road
Liverpool L19 9BX

Dr S Hamilton
4a Abbeville Road
London SW4 9NJ

J D Hardcastle
6 Milton Crescent
Lupset
Wakefield
W Yorks WF2 8AE

Costel Harnasz
217 Burton Road
West Didsbury
Manchester M20 8NA

Harnham Vihara
Harnham Hall Cottages
Belsey
Northumberland NE20 0HF

Dr E Harris
Westminster College
Oxford OX2 9AT

Ian Harris
Castle Cottage
Leeming Lane
Burton-in-Lonsdale
Via Carnforth
Lancs LA6 3LD

Shirley Harris
6 Lydden Road
Ellesmere Port
South Wirral L6S 2HG

Dr B P Harvey
Woodlea
13 North Crescent
Durham DH1 4NE

Jennifer Haswell
Dept of Religious Studies
University of Stirling
Stirling FK9 4LA

B Hemensley
85 Goldcroft Road
Weymouth
Dorset DT4 0EA

K J Hill
56 Oldeglis Road
Dungannon
Co Tyrone
N Ireland BT71 7PA

H P Ho
12 Radegund Road
Cambridge CB1 3RL

Peter Hope
349 South End Road
South Hornchurch
Essex RM12 5NP

C M Hunter
5 Pera Place
Camden
Bath BA1 5NX

Institute of Oriental Philosophy
European Centre
Taplow Court
Taplow
Maidenhead
Berks SL6 0ER

Peter Jackson
39 Armitage Way
King's Hedges
Cambridge CB4 2UE

Gary James
49 Upper Whatcombe
Frome
Somerset BA11 3SA

David J Jarvis
Windlestone
Bath Road
Littlewick Green
Berkshire

Dr Raja La Jayaweera
4 Connaught Drive
London NW11 6BJ

L N Jewell Esq
37 Ben Rhydding Road
Ilkley
West Yorkshire LS29 8RL

John Rylands University Library
Deansgate
Manchester M3 3EH

John Rylands University Library
Oxford Road
Manchester M13 9PP

Andrew Jones
Flat 11B The Danes
Goat Lane
Basingstoke
Hants RG21 1PQ

Anthony Jones
528 Mather Avenue
Allerton
Liverpool L19 4UG

Richard Jones
178 Westbury Avenue
London N22 6RU

Dr E G Kahrs
Faculty of Oriental Studies
University of Cambridge
Sidgwick Avenue
Cambridge CB3 9DA

Ven Karuniko Bhikkhu
Chithurst Buddhist Monastery
Chithurst
Nr Petersfield
Hants GU31 5EU

E A Keen
31 Mallard Place
Twickenham
Middlesex TW1 4SW

David Kelly
Apt.2 Rockville
70 Princetown Road
Bangor
Co Down BT20 3TN

Dr D V Keown
Dept of Historical & Cultural
Studies
Goldsmiths College
London SE14 6NW

Phra Ajahn Khemadhammo
Santidhamma Buddhist
Monastery
Lower Fulbrook
near Sherbourne
Warwickshire CV3S 8AS

Wan Doo Kim
Holywell Manor
Manor Road
Oxford OX1 3UH

R Komtipayarat
Flat 13 Block G
Peabody Estate
Stamford Street
London SE1 8AW

Dhammacari Kulamitra
18 Shanklin Road
London N8 8TJ

Dharmachari Kulananda
Madhyamaloka
30 Chantry Road
Moseley
Birmingham B13 8DH

D Lewis
c/o Mr & Mrs J T Lewis
7 Rochester Avenue
Netherfield
Nottingham NG4 2PL

Colin Locock
39A Brick Lane
London E1 6PU

London Buddhist Centre
51 Roman Road
London E2 0HU

London Buddhist Vihara
Dharmapala Building
The Avenue
Bedford Park
Chiswick
London W4 1UD

Tom Lowenstein
49 Queen Elizabeth's Walk
London N16 5UG

James Lumsden
40 Duchess of Bedford House
Duchess of Bedford's Walk
London W8 7QW

Steve Mansell
32 Norfolk Road
Shirley
Southampton SO15 5AS

John McConnell & Erica Cadbury
72 Sun Street
Haworth
West Yorkshire BD22 8AH

Lee Morris
12 Brambledown Road
Sanderstead
Surrey CR2 0BL

Mike Murray
112 Hinton Road
Herne Hill
London SE24 0HU

H Nicholson-Dh Dhruvasimha
Raw Green Cottage
Raw
Whitby
North Yorks YO22 4PP

Prof K R Norman MA FBA
6 Huttles Green
Shepreth
Royston
Herts SG8 6PR

Ven U Nyanika
Tisarana Vihara
357 Nelson Road
Whitton
Twickenham TW2 7AG

Vernon H Oldfield
Pencae Newydd Nebo
Caernafon
Gwynedd LL54 6ED

Isabel Onians
Wolfson College
Linton Road
Oxford OX2 6UD

Isabel Pack
180 Divinity Road
Oxford OX4 1LR

Ulrich Pagel
1 F Wilmington Square
London WC1X 0ES

Phra Maha Laow Panyasiri
The Buddhapadipa Temple
14 Calonne Road
Wimbledon Parkside
London SW19 5HJ

Ray Parkin
'Sunnyside'
Shaw Green
Euxton
Chorley
Lancs PR7 6EQ

Dr R B Parsons
44 Montagu Mansions
London W1H 1LD

S C Paton
7D Dalmeir Court
Clydebank G81 4AB
Scotland

C M Paulsen
10 Alderwood Parc
Penryn
Cornwall TR10 8RJ

James Peel
2A Chivalry Road
London SW11 1HT

Michael Peterssen
Blaenddol House
Treddol
Nr Corwen
Clwyd LL21 0EN

Duc V Pham
Allied Dunbar Plc
9-15 Sackville Street
London W1A 2JP

Garry Phillipson
12 Elms Crescent
Clapham
London SW4 8RB

Ven Galayaye Piyadassi
Sri Saddhatissa
International Buddhist Centre
311 Kingsbury Road
London NW9 9PE

Prof Michael Pye
Dept of Religious Studies
Lancaster University
Lancaster LA1 4YG

Andrew Quernmore
12c Deanshanger House
Chiltern Grove
London SE8 5EE

Tom Radcliffe
203 Waller Road
New Cross Gate
London SE14 5LX

Steve & Gabrielle Rann
Dhamma Dipa
Harewood End
Hereford HR2 8NG

Andrew Redhead
26 Birchdale Road
Paddington
Warrington
Cheshire WA1 3ER

D S Reeves
7 Paarl Road
Canvey Island
Essex SS8 9BT

Rosemary Rose
9 Westfield Road
Chorlton-cum-Hardy
Manchester M21 0SW

Mark Rowlamds
13 Cross Road
Chorlton-cum-Hardy
Manchester M21 9DH

Prof D Seyfort Ruegg
15 Cadogan Square
London SW1X 0HT

Bhikkhu Anil Sakya
Room 290 Mill Hall
Brunel University
Uxbridge
Middlesex UB8 2TL

The Samatha Centre
Attn the Librarian
Greenstreete
Llangunllo
Nr Knighton Powys LD7 1SP

School of Oriental & African
Studies
The Librarian
University of London
Thornough Street
Russell Square
London WC1H 0XG

C M M Shaw
Manor Barn
Elsfield Manor
Oxford OX3 9SP

Dr Clive Sherlock
32 Bowness Avenue
Oxford OX3 0AL

Dominique Side
Wolfson College
Cambridge CB3 9BB

P de Silva
Dept of Psychology
Institute of Psychiatry
de Crespigny Park
Denmark Hill
London SE5 8AF

HRH Princess Maha Chakri
Sirindhorn
Crown Princess of Thailand
c/o Royal Thai Embassy
30 Queens Gate
London SW7 5JB

Andrew Skilton
Wolfson College
Linton Road
Oxford OX2 6UD

Dr T Skorupski
36 King Street
Tring
Herts HP23 6BJ

S E Smith
2 Gree Lane
Maghull
Liverpool
Merseyside

Prof Janice Stargardt
Director, Cambridge Project
Ancient Civ in S E Asia
Dept. of Geography
University of Cambridge
Cambridge CB2 3EN

Nigel Staton
Highfield
Sledgates
Fylingthorpe
Whitby
North Yorks YO22 4TZ

C J Stevens
96 Dorrington Close
Luton LU3 1XR

Stephen Strange
Dhamma Dipa
Harewood End
Hereford HR2 8NG

Ven Sucitto Bhikkhu Abbot
Chithurst Buddhist Monastery
Chithurst
Nr Petersfield
Hants GU31 5EU

Sumana Ratnayaka
Wolfson College
Linton Road
Oxford OX2 6UD

Natalia Szczucka
Plater College
Pullens Lane
Headington
Oxford OX3

Wong Mit Ta
15 Dunelm Grove
West Norwood
London SE27 9JD

Joel Tatelman
Flat 131 Summertown House
369 Banbury Road
Oxford OX2

Dr R Söhnen-Thieme
Indology Dept
SOAS
Thornaugh Street
London WC1H 0XG

Saya U Chit Thin
IMC
Splatts House
Heddington
Nr Calne
Wilts SN11 0PE

Fiona Thomas
28 Chatham Grove
Withington
Manchester M20 8HS

B J Thompson
133 Wick Road
Homerton
London E9 5AE

Anthony Tribe
34 Cornwallis Crescent
Clifton
Bristol BS8 4PH

Ho-Yu Tseng
St Hilda's College
Cowley Place
Oxford OX4 1DY

Steve Upton
45a Weston Park Avenue
Shelton Lock
Derby DE24 9ER

Vajrakuta Buddhist Study Centre
Blaenddol House
Treddol
Corwen
Clwyd LL21 0EN

Dharmacari Vajranatha
87 Sommerville Road
St Andrews
Bristol BS7 9AE

Paul Waldau
Christchurch College
Oxford OX1 1DP

Prof Maurice O'C Walshe
8 Kings Court
Lower Kings Road
Berkhamstead HP4 2AS

David Webster
35 Vale Street
Eden Vale
Sunderland
Tyne & Wear SR4 7NB

Douglas S H Welch
"Ahimsa"
14 The Vista
Eltham
London SEQ 5RP

Alan V Weller
43 Drakefield Road
Tooting Bec
London SW17 8RT

Dr Karel Werner
32 Etchingam Park Road
Finchley
London N3 2DT

S Werner-Weaver
77 Sandy Lane
Garden City
Deeside
Clwyd CH5 2JF

Christopher Westrup Esq
39 Ripley Avenue
Great Moor
Stockport SK2 7JS

O Weys
79 Rowlands Avenue
Hatch End
Pinner
Middlesex HA5 4BX

Simon Wickham-Smith
56 Elmbourne Road
London SW17 8JJ

T M Wijesuriya
Flat 16 Tudor Hall
Branksome Park Road
Camberley
Surrey GU15 2AE

N D Wilby
Radley College
Radley
Abingdon OX14 2HR

Freda Wint
50 Park Town
Oxford OX2 6SJ

Wolfson College
The Floersheimer Library
A Hale
Linton Road
Oxford OX2 6UD

Nigel D A Wray
46 Ladbroke Grove
London W11 2PA

Phra Maha Somporn Yanavaro
c/o 14 Calonne Road
Wimbledon Parkside
London SW19 5HJ

R G A Youard Esq
Director
Office of Investment Referee
6 Frederick's Place
London EC2 8BI

D & D Young
IMC
Splatts House
Heddington
Nr Calne
Wilts SN11 0PE

USA

Todd S Anderson
241 Sixth Avenue (9B)
New York NY 10014

E Andrew
4630 NW 12th Place
Gainesville
Florida 32605

Arizona State University Library
Library Periodicals
Tempe
Arizona 85287-1006

Stephen Ascue
450 Rincon Avenue
Sunnyvale CA 94086

Marvin L Bernstorm
8611 Red Oak Drive
Eden Prairie
Minnesota MINN 55347

Dr G D Bond
Northwestern University
Department of Religion
1940 Sheridan Road
Evanston IL 60201

Anthony Bucci
16 Stanford Avenue
West Orange
New Jersey 07052-2034

University of California
Serials Department A1581 URL
Los Angeles CA 90024-1575

California Inst of Integral Studies
- The Library
765 Ashbury Street
San Francisco CA 94117

Prof J Ross Carter
Chapel House
Colgate University
13 Oak Drive
Hamilton NY 13346-1384

Marian Caudron
833 Hamlin Street
Apt 2C
Evanston IL 60201

Beatrice Chrystall
27 Prescott St #2
Somerville MA 012143

Prof S. Collins MA DPhil
Dept South Asian Languages and
Civilisations
University of Chicago
Foster Hall
1130 East 59th St
Chicago IL 60637

Columbia University
Libraries Book Acquisitions Dept
535 West 11th St
New York NY 10027

J Dawson
8300 Cave Creek Road
Redwood Valley CA 95470

Prof Dr S N Desai
Department of Theology
St Johns University
Grand Central & Utopia Parkway
Jamaica NY 11432

Dhammapala Monastery TKA Inc
43155 Isle Royal St
Fremont CA 94538

Dwight B Waldo Library
Serials Dept
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo MI 49008-5080

Mark Foote
P O Box 642
Mendocino CA 95460

Gregory Fung
789 Vallejo Street
San Francisco CA 94133

Richard A Gard
P O Box 2866
Setauket
New York NY 11733-0866

Iris Givol
2149 Wainwright Ct Apt 2C
Frederick MD 21702

Walter E Gross
32-33 90th Street
Apt 405
Jackson Heights
New York 11369-2303

A W P Guruge
8252 Terry Drive
Huntington Beach CA 92647

C Hallisey
Committee on Study of Religion
Phillips Brooks House
Third Floor
Harvard University
Cambridge MA02138
Venerable Dr Henepola
Gunaratana Maha Thera
Bhavana Society
Box 218-3
High View WV 26808

Leland G Hoover
7730 N Rain Valley Road
Flagstaff AZ 86004-1411

C Hopson
3762 Glacier Hwy
Juneau AK 99801

Jonathan Horvath
2010 Stadium Road No. 6
Charlottesville
Virginia 22903

Michael M Hynes
651 Donax Street
Sanibel
Florida 33957

Prof S Insler
Department of Linguistics
Yale University
P O Box 208236
New Haven CONN 06520-8236

Prof Norman Jacobs
Dickinson College
Carlisle
Pennsylvania 17013

Stephen Jenkins
45 Brewster Street
Cambridge MA 02138

Aaron Jones
P O Box 187
Rockey Point NC 28457

Barbara Ann Kipfer PhD
40 Sycamore Drive
Milford CONN 06460

Prof Yuet K Lo
Institute of Languages & Lit
180 Klaeber Court
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis MN 55455

Mehrdad Massoudi
P O Box 175
Library PA 15129

Philip S Miller
Friends of Western Buddhist
Order
2410 E Interlaken Blvd
Seattle WA 98112

Terry C Muck
Assoc Prof of Comparative
Religion
Austin Presbyterian Seminar
100 East 27th Street
Austin TX 78705

John R Newman
New College Div of Humanities
5700 North Tamiami Trail
Sarasota
Florida 34243-2197

Dat Nguyen
312 Pamela Kay Lane
La Puente CA 91746

Malcolm P Nichols
300 4th Ave. So. Apt 9
Franklin TN 37064

G Olivar
IMC USA
438 Bankard Road
Westminster MD 21158

Dante C Pavone
105 Charles Street
Box 529
Boston MA 02114

Richard Paw U
46-150 Hilinama Street
Kaneohe
Hawaii 96744

University of Pennsylvania
Library Serials Department
3420 Walnut St CH
Philadelphia PA 19104

Noah Peryam
954 Merrimac Way
Lawrenceville GA 30244-7102

Richard W Pier
1143 24th Street
San Diego CA 92102

Dr Glenn Post
5902 Dorchester Way
Rockville MD 20852

Patrick Pranke
1598 David Street
St. Paul MN 55119

Charles S Prebish
Religious Studies Program
Pennsylvania State University
211 Sparks Bldg PA16802-5201

Dr William Pruitt
438 Bankard Road
Westminster MD 21158

Dr V Rajapakse
35950 Timberlane Drive
Solon
Ohio 44139

Dr Geoffrey P Redmond
13600 Shaker Blvd
Cleveland
Ohio 44120

Andrew Scheffer
923 Fifth Avenue Apt. 12a
New York NY 10021

William E Scheffer
923 Fifth Ave Apt 12a
New York NY 10021-2649

C Schlatman
6042 No 21 Chef Menteur Hwy
New Orleans LA70126

Norman Schmitz
54409 Sequoia Cir
North Fork CA 93643

Jeffrey Schoening
6817 27th Avenue NE
Seattle
Washington 98115

Jeffrey M Schwartz MD
12304 Santa Monica Blvd
Suite 210
Los Angeles CA 90025-2551

Jonathan Silk
Dept of Comparative Religion
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo MI 49008-5013

Prof Ninian Smart
Religious Studies
UCSB
Santa Barbara CA 93106

D & W Snyder
330 Acoma St #1200
Penthouse
Denver CO 80223

Gail Hinich Sutherland
Program in Religious Studies
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge
Louisiana LA 70803-3901

Prof Donald K Swearer
Dept of Religion
Swarthmore College
Swarthmore PA 19081

J K Thomas
315 North Newton Lake Drive
Collingwood
New Jersey 08108

Paola Tinti
1770 Mass. Avenue #632
Cambridge MA 02138

Truong Upakara
3838 Ellis Lane
Rosemead CA 91770

Dr Jonathan Walters
Whitman College
Division of Humanities & Arts
Walla Walla
Washington 99362

John R Watson
4704 Aukai Avenue
Honolulu Avenue
Hawaii 96816

Thomas Whitehead
3 Lane Circle
Carson City
Nevada 89703

Michael E Yoho
1245 Coles Blvd 13
Portsmouth OH 45662

Julie Zirlin
4620 North Park Avenue #1610E
Chevy Chase MD 20815

ZAMBIA

Dr E D T Kularatne
School of Education
Dept of Library Studies
P O Box 32379
Lusaka

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS VOLUME

Margaret Cone
51 Mawson Road
Cambridge CB1 2DZ

Professor Dr. O. v. Hinüber
Orientalisches Seminar
Albert-Ludwigs-Universität
D-79085 Freiburg i. Brsg.
Germany

Jinadasa Liyanaratne
31 rue de Séquigny
F-91700 Ste-Geneviève-des-Bois
France

Édith Nolot
Institut de Civilisation Indienne
du Collège de France
52, rue du Cardinal-Lemoine
75005 Paris
France

Peter Skilling
68/123 Prachanivet 4
Prachachun Road
T. Tasai, A. Muang, Nonthaburi
Thailand 11000

NOTICE FROM THE COUNCIL
RESEARCH FELLOWSHIPS IN PALI STUDIES

The Council of the Pali Text Society invite applications for research Fellowships from suitably qualified persons, working in the field of Pali studies. Applicants will usually be in the fourth year of a course of graduate research, or its equivalent. The course of research will be expected to lead to publishable material, on the publication rights of which the Pali Text Society will have first option.

Fellowships will be tenable for one year in the first instance, with a possibility of renewal. When fixing the value, account will be taken of the appropriate level for a comparable research worker in the applicant's country of domicile. Letters of application and requests for information should be sent to:

The President,
Pali Text Society,
73 Lime Walk,
Headington,
Oxford OX3 7AD.

EDITORIAL NOTICE

The Council of the Pali Text Society plan to continue publication of the *Journal* on an *ad hoc* basis, as and when sufficient material of a publishable standard is received.

The *Journal* will publish short Pali texts, translations, and commentaries on texts, catalogues and handlists of Pali books and manuscripts, and similar material.

Papers should be sent to the President, at the above address.

To reduce printing costs, contributors are urged, whenever possible, to present their papers in a camera-ready copy form.

W
G

**Walter de Gruyter
Berlin • New York**

Oskar von Hinüber

A Handbook of Pali Literature

1996. 23,0 x 15,5 cm. XIII, 257 pages. Cloth DM 195,- ISBN 3-11-014992-3
(Indian Philology and South Asian Studies, Vol. 2)

The Handbook deals with the whole of the literature in Pali, the liturgical language of Theravada Buddhism, which is still alive in Ceylon and South East Asia. In addition to reviewing the canonical texts (Tipitaka), which form the oldest body of extant Buddhist literature, and their commentaries, the Handbook presents the later Pali literature, written after the 12th century, much of which is only available in Oriental prints. The account not only summarises the findings of earlier research, but extends the scope of a handbook by demonstrating new methodological approaches to the canonical literature, for example by showing how the strict formal structure of the Sutra texts is determined in part by their oral transmission. Questions of the authorship of the commentaries on the canon (post-5th century AD) are revisited and the chronology of the texts critically examined. By comparing parallel commentaries, insights are gained into the structure of this comprehensive yet unexplored area of Pali literature. Access to the Handbook is provided by a number of indexes.

The author holds the Chair in Indic Studies at the University of Freiburg and is a full member of the Academy of Science and Literature in Mainz.

Pali Text Society members who request a copy of the Handbook directly from the publisher will be able to purchase it at the special price of DM 148.

Price is subject to change

Walter de Gruyter & Co • Berlin • New York • Genthiner Straße 13
D-10785 Berlin • Phone: (030) 2 60 05-0 • Fax: (030) 2 60 05-2 22
Please visit us in the World Wide Web at <http://www.deGruyter.de>