

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

BRAḤ MĀLEYYADEVATTHĒRAVATTHU

I

In 'L'Origine Cinghalaise du P'rah Malay' (*Felicitacion volume of Southeast Asian Studies Presented to H.M. Prince Dhaninivat*, Vol. 2, Bangkok, 1965, pp. 329–38), the late Eugène Denis S.J. (1921–86) stated that the École Française d'Extrême-Orient was to publish his 1963 Sorbonne doctoral thesis, which was entitled 'Brah Māleyyadevatthēravatthūṃ, Légende bouddhiste du saint therā Māleyyadeva. Texte établi d'après des manuscrits inédits en caractères cambodgiennes, accompagné d'une introduction et d'une traduction, avec une traduction du P'rah Malay siamois qui en est dérivé'. Unfortunately this did not happen, and the article remains his only publication on the topic to date. Very few primary sources for the story — better, stories — of Māleyya¹ are yet available in the West, and Denis' thesis has proved elusive to a number of scholars who have tried to find it: even those in Paris, including Denis' Directeur de travaux, André Bareau, seem to have had some difficulty in locating a copy. The Pali Text Society has acquired one through Professor O. von Hinüber, itself taken from a copy in the library of the University of Göttingen. It seemed to us that it would be useful to make available here Denis' text, accompanied by a translation of it into English.² The story of Māleyyadeva is known to have been very important in the practice of traditional Thai Buddhism; but the text is also relevant to the matters of linguistic and literary history with which the JPTS is more specifically

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

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

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

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

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

II

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

III

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

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

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

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

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

It is, however, certain that some elements of the story — the pool of signifiers — can be traced back to Sri Lanka, and this is the subject of Denis' section II, on the Sinhalese sources for the elder Māleyyadeva. The lack of reference to Sīh story III renders this section somewhat out-dated. Denis refers to previous discussions of monks called by various similar names, by T.W. Rhys Davids, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1901, pp. 889 foll., and by A.P. Buddhadatta, in the introduction to his Sinhala script edition of the *Sahassavatthu*, concluding that it is impossible to tell whether all the uses of the name concern one and the same person; he thinks that there was an original historical figure to whose name legendary elements were added. The texts which deal with Maliya/Māleyya etc. are, in the order treated²: Mp I 38–39, Ps V 101–03, Vism 241–42 (= HOS ed. VIII 49), Ja IV 490, VI 30, Mhv XXXII 49–50, Mhv-ṭ 606. Although it is by no means clear that the similarity of names shows that we are dealing here with a single figure, historical or legendary, it is true that many of the stories concern excellence at preaching, which is one of Māleyya's characteristics in Mth-v. Denis discusses only story 41 of Sīh, which is quite different from Mth-v, although the name Māleyyadeva does appear in it and it does have a generic resemblance to Mth-v in so far as it concerns the

¹ K.R. Norman, *Pāli Literature*, p. 154.

² Abbreviations used are those of the Critical Pāli Dictionary.

value of giving.¹ He then describes three stories found both in the *Sahassavatthu* and *Rasavāhīnī*; the former text is mentioned in the same inscription of 1442 mentioned above, and the latter is dated to the 13th or 14th centuries A.D.² The first resembles story 41 of Sīh; the second concerns giving, and has Maliyadeva (as the name appears there) conversing with Sakka on that subject. The faint analogy to the Māleyya story found in these stories is much stronger in the third, Sah story 77 and Ras Chapter 10, 1. Here Maliyadeva visits the Cūlāmaṇi shrine in heaven with a layman, sees various gods and explains to the layman the good deeds done by them on earth which resulted in their rebirth there. At the end Metteyya appears³ and gives the layman a celestial robe; the latter returns to earth, and thereafter dies and is reborn in the Tusita heaven. (Ras is more elaborate than Sah, but the essentials of the story are the same.)

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

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

² K.R. Norman, op. cit., p. 155.

³ The Ras version given by Denis contains the very surprising phrase *anekasatapaccekabuddhabodhisattehi ca parivuto*, used of Metteyya.

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

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

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

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

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

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

² Denis cites G.H. Luce, *Inscriptions of Burma* (n.d.), Portfolio I Plate XXII lines 1–7.

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

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

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

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

IV

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

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

1. A manuscript in the Bibliothèque Nationale de Bangkok (Mss Pali No. 147), of which we have a photocopy. It is written in 'mūl' characters engraved on ola-leaves. There are 24 ola-leaves, thus 48 pages, with 5 lines per page. The first page contains only the title: 'Brah Māleyyadevatthera- vatthum, 1 ph'uk (1 bundle). This is without doubt the best preserved manuscript, and we reproduce it as the main text. We refer to it as M1.

2. A manuscript in the Institut Bouddhique de Pnom-Penh [*sic*], given to the Institut in 1930 by the Damnap monastery in Kampong Chhnang [*sic*] province. It is written in 'mūl' characters on 26 ola-leaves, thus 52 pages, with 5 lines per page. The Ven. Brah Grū Saṅghasatthā P.S. Dharmārāma, of the Lycée Boudhique of Pnom-Penh, has been kind enough to copy this text for us in 'mūl' characters and to send us the copy. We had asked him to transcribe it faithfully without standardising the Pali. He writes that the manuscript cannot be old, as it is easily legible. We have ascertained that the text of this manuscript is very similar to that of the Bangkok manuscript, with only one interpolation [see text p. 26 note 2]. We refer to it as M2.

3. A manuscript in the Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris (cf. A. Cabaton, *Catalogue sommaire des manuscrits Pali de la Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris*. 2e fasc. No. 326) (gift of the Société des Missions Étrangères). It is written in 'mūl' characters on ola-leaves. There are 18 ola-leaves, thus 36 pages, with one line per page, but the last ola leaf is for protection only and the first carries only the title: *Brah Māleyya Sutra* [sic]. The text is written in a good, regular hand. The title is in different handwriting and seems to have been added afterwards. Notes in Cambodian have been added on the first and second pages. This manuscript contains quite significant variations from M1. We have had to reproduce entire passages at the end of the notes [Appendices A, B, C]. We refer to it as M3.

4. A manuscript in the Bibliothèque de Paris, No. 658 in A. Cabaton's *Catalogue*. It is in 'mūl' script on ola-leaves. There are 12 ola-leaves, thus 24 pages, with 5 lines per page. The first page has the title: *Brah Māleyya devathera* [sic]. The text is incomplete and only covers the first part (the arrival of the 12 Junior Gods) and the beginning of the second part, finishing in the middle of a sentence. We refer to it as M4.

5. A manuscript in the Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris, No. 659 in A. Cabaton's *Catalogue*. It is written in 'mūl' characters on ola-leaves. There are 13 ola-leaves, but five are for protection only at the end, and the first carries only the title: *Brah Māleyya devathera atthavaṇṇanā* [sic]. There are therefore only 7 ola-leaves left, thus 14 pages, with 5 lines per page. It is the shortest text; it is very incomplete, only covering the last part, and even the beginning of this part is missing. It begins in the middle of a sentence. This is not a continuation of No. 658 [i.e. M4], as one might think. The writing is neat and regular, very different from the preceding manuscript. Moreover the texts are not continuous. We refer to it as M5.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Chicago

Steven Collins