

Three Pāli Works Revisited

Since it came into existence 125 years ago, the Pāli Text Society has kept editing works belonging to the Tipiṭaka in its narrow sense as well as other texts of all kinds. Some of those, however, have perhaps not attracted as much attention as they deserve, partly because the interests of Pāli scholars and the fashion of scholarship have not been in their favour. My modest purpose here is to awaken two of these somnolent works which are fully entitled to have corresponding entries in any history of Pāli literature: (1) the Buddhaghosuppatti (Bu-up) and (2) the Paṭhamasambodhi (Paṭh).¹ Finally, I would like to collect some preliminary information on a third work, this time unpublished, (3) the Vidaddhamukhamaṇḍaṇa (Vid),² with the hope that the Pāli Text Society could include it on its agenda, thus contributing to fulfilling one of the desiderata for further Pāli studies mentioned by K.R. Norman: “The biggest deficiencies in Pāli publications in the West, however, are in editions of *ṭīkā*s and of Pāli texts composed in South-East Asia” (1994: 13–14 = 1996: 80–81).

1. The Buddhaghosuppatti or Buddhaghosanidāna

As the author of the Visuddhimagga and the famous commentator of the Tipiṭaka, Buddhaghosa is a highly venerated figure in the Buddhist world, especially in South-East Asia. The recent reprint by the Pāli Text Society (in 2001) of the edition and translation of the so-called Buddhaghosuppatti by James Gray, originally published in 1892, is an occasion to have a new look at the way the Pāli tradition at some point, in some

¹Both of them were read *in toto* or in part with students during classes held at the Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes (“Philologie moyen-indienne”) in 2001–2002 and 2004–2005. Brief preliminary remarks are available in the annual reports (*Livret-Annuaire*) and, for Bu-up, in Balbir 2001. — I am grateful to Dr Peter Skilling who provided Thai editions of these two works and a Burmese edition of the Jinālaṅkāra (Jināl, see below section 2).

²See below, n. 21.

place, looked at Buddhaghosa. Although Gray does not stand among the most famous representatives of Pāli philology, he did some useful work in the field during the years he spent in Burma where he taught Pāli in schools and translated some works which were of current use among Buddhists of Burma at the end of the nineteenth century.³ His interest in biographical and hagiographical works was materialised by his edition and translation of two works: the *Jināḷankāra* (see below, section 2) and the *Buddhaghosuppatti*, for which he expressed his strong liking in unambiguous terms: “The narrative is intensely interesting.... It reads in fact like an Arthurian romance.... The story in its entirety will be found highly diverting as well as instructive” (Bu-up 1892, 1981: 2, 9). But he was aware of the historical limitations of the work: “Facts of historical value cover only a limited space on the comparatively broad canvas of the narrative, and will probably add very little to what is already known of Buddhaghosa. The story, however, brings the personality of that eminent man vividly before our minds and enforces a greater interest in him than ever; and if it does this only, it can be safely said that it was not written in vain” (Bu-up 1892, 1981: 9). Indeed, given the interests of Buddhist studies of those times in chronology, this brief work of thirty pages had less to bring than the Sinhalese *vamsas* since it does not mention any king’s name or any date which could be cross-checked. But it certainly contributes to constructing “la légende de Buddhaghosa”, to quote the title of Louis Finot’s stimulating article (1921), and could well have been included among the sources studied by the contributors to the volume *Sacred Biography in the Buddhist Traditions of South and Southeast Asia* (ed. Schober 1997).

Like other works dealing with Buddhaghosa, the present account is organized around his pivotal rôle in the transmission and renewal of the scriptures and their original language. It starts with his birth on earth as a reincarnation of a god sent by Sakka for the special mission of “translating” the teachings from their original “Sinhalese”, which could

³See Balbir 2001, n. 2.

no longer be understood, into “the language of Magadha”.⁴ This narrative frame, which has been clearly drawn along the lines of Nāgasena’s career as sketched in the *Milindapañha* (see Finot 1921: 113; Bu-up 1892, 1981: 69; Law 1923: 25–47), sets Buddhaghosa in the broad perspective of an *avatāra*. The biography extends “before the Cradle and past the Grave”, in the way traditional Burmese biographies do (*at-htok-pat-ti*, Houtman in Schober 1997: 311): before his advent on earth Buddhaghosa is a god, after his death on earth he will be Maitreya’s disciple. In between, the eight brief chapters which recount his life are meant to show that in order to become a great man one requires more than intellectual qualities.

If several episodes are viewed from this perspective, they do not appear to be secondary or simply entertaining. On the contrary, they play a part in providing the biography with meaning. The emphasis laid on Buddhaghosa’s childhood is a part of the plan meant to show that the intellectual brightness which is his outstanding characteristic has always been there. The utterance of a paradoxical assertion which cannot be understood by the audience first provokes derision, then a respect which leads to an inversion of the ordinary social rôles when Buddhaghosa’s father admits, “You are my father and I am like your son” (40,27ff.). In the fifth chapter, which could seem a diversion, Buddhaghosa is a witness to a dispute which has come up between two ladies and takes note of the insults they throw at each other. These notes will have a determining rôle to play in solving the matter at a later stage. They are one of the several cases in this biography where the written document appears to be of importance as a reserved, discrete testimony which can be used when the situation arises. Such episodes underline both the lucidity and modesty of the teacher and his connection with transmission in general. The question of learning and the use of languages is also dealt with in narrative disguise: apart from the initial replacement of Sinhalese by Pāli, the competition between Pāli and Sanskrit, and the

⁴On this question see Granoff 1991.

status of Sanskrit in the context of Buddhism are salient: as the son of a Brahman working as a royal chaplain, the young Buddhaghosa is probably conversant with Sanskrit. After his conversion to Buddhism, he seems to leave it in the background and follows a purely Buddhist curriculum sketched out in the story through selected technical terms. But the idea that no education could be complete without a knowledge of Sanskrit seems to be stressed when Buddhaghosa has to prove that he masters this language in front of monks who thought he was ignorant of it by reciting a few Sanskrit stanzas (rather badly treated in the manuscripts: Bu-up 1892, 1981: 72–73).

The origin and diffusion of the text need further investigation. Gray's edition is based on four manuscripts in Burmese script, for which no details are given. On the other hand, on the basis of the ascription of the text to a Thera Mahāmaṅgala found at the end, Gray was of the opinion that the text could have come from Ceylon or could be dated "to the thirteenth century as the period when the Piṭakas and their commentaries were taken to Ceylon from Burma" (Bu-up 1892, 1981: 33). A little more can be said now that more documentation is available. First, no manuscript seems to have emerged from Ceylon, whereas a rather large number are to be found in South-East Asian collections, whether they are kept in Burma, Thailand, or the West.⁵

The title Buddhaghosanidāna is largely prevalent over the title °*uppatti* (which, anyway, is a sort of synonym, and could remind us of the term used in Burma). The text is often provided with a *nissaya* and was sometimes equated to a Jātaka (in the broad acceptance of the term). References to it or summaries are met with in late Pāli historical texts written in Burma (Jinakālamāli, Gandhavaṃsa, Sāsanavaṃsa), where it seems to have become the standard for other works on Buddhaghosa.⁶ As for Thailand, the Pāli scholar Sammot Amarabandhu (1860–1915), who wrote an introduction in Thai to an edition of the Pāli

⁵See Balbir 2001, n. 28 for further details.

⁶See, respectively, PTS ed., p. 71, line 17; Minayeff 1886, pp. 65 and 75; B.C. Law's translation (London, 1923), pp. 32–33 (text, pp. 29–30).

text and its Thai translation, mentions the fact that people liked very much to have sermons on this subject, which was called *Thet Phra Phuttakhosa*, and that it was considered to convey benefits (*ānisaṃsa*). He also indicates that the verses, which are interspersed at several places in the text, are borrowed from the *Vaṃsamālinī*, that the style of composition does not resemble older texts and that it is likely that the work was composed in Thailand, Laos, or Burma, since it is not in the style of old texts from Lanka.

In Burma, the Pāli Bu-up has served as a basis for retellings in Burmese.⁷ I would also suggest that Bu-up seems to exhibit a combination of canonical and local elements. Some technical details seem to be in tune with what is known otherwise from South-East Asian traditions and practices, although any interpretation should be done with great caution. The narrative of Ghosa's conversion to Buddhism, which could be inspired by the *Milindapañha*, is not a mere reproduction of it. The ordination ritual is different from canonical narratives as well. After the first stage, the removal of hair and beard expressed through the well-known formula *kesa-massuṃ ohāretvā*, the next one is to "take off the layman's smell through moist sandal powder" (*alla-candana-cuṇṇehi gihi-gandhaṃ jhāpetvā*, 44.27). This feature does not seem to be mentioned before the commentary on the Vinaya and the texts based on it. More relevant, the candidate wears white clothes and receives as the ordination formula the five topics of meditation (*pañca kammaṭṭhāna*), i.e. the list of the first five body elements (*kesā, lomā, nakhā, dantā, taco*, 44.26ff.). This process recalls the traditions of the *pabbajjā* as they have been observed in South-East Asia.

Bu-up is a vivid example of the way religious instruction is provided. Conversion of both Ghosa's father (chapter 3) and Ghosa himself is achieved through a teaching with practical or immediate purpose, not through any elaborate doctrinal discussion, and the Buddha's teaching is called a *manta* (43.5, 44.4 ff.). Strikingly, the *iti pi*

⁷See Braun and Myint 1985, No. 222.

so formula is one of the media in use.⁸ Finally, the way Buddhaghosa as an enthusiastic new convert proceeds with his father, putting him for a time in a *gabbhakuṭī* (46,24) carefully locked (cf. *yanta*, 47,2) is reminiscent of the “embryogénie sacrée visant à fournir à l’adepte un modèle dans sa quête du Nibbāna qui passe par une régression utérine”.⁹

On the other hand, it remains to be seen whether any conclusion can be drawn from the analysis of the verses scattered in Bu-up and from their identification or available parallels. In some cases, they are helpful for a better establishment or understanding of the text. One of the most striking cases is provided by the technically elaborated passage of chapter 2 (43,16*-23*), the edition of which is unsatisfactory but can be improved through recourse to the *Abhidhammāvatāra* and its commentary (chapter 1, stanzas 29, 31, 62).¹⁰

2. THE PAṬHAMASAMBODHI

The Paṭthamasambodhi (Paṭh) can be described as a biography of the Buddha coming from South-East Asia, and even more precisely from Thailand, where the nineteenth-century version written by the prince-monk Paramanuchit-chinorot (= S^c) is a well-known text: “[The Pathamasambodhikatha] is a series of sermons intended for ritual recitation at events such as the *Wisakha Buuchaa*, which are held all night in commemoration of the Buddha’s birth, enlightenment, and decease. It represents a Thai version of the standard biography of the Buddha, which is based on canonical and Sinhalese commentarial works and written in ornate prose style” (Taylor 1997: 292). Although the Pāli Text Society edition was published only a few years ago, the interest in this work is not new. It was brought to light by the French scholar George Cœdès (1886–1969) who published two articles on this work (1916A and 1968) and had prepared its text using a large number of

⁸For bibliographical references regarding these two elements see Balbir 2001, nn. 18 and 19.

⁹Bizot 1980, p. 222.

¹⁰See Balbir 2001, pp. 350–51 for further textual details.

manuscripts. This text is the basis of the PTS edition (= E^c), finalized for publication by Dr Jacqueline Filliozat. Reading Paṭṭh through this edition leaves the reader in a rather confused state, facing a large number of variants which are not really helpful. On the other hand, the tools which could be of use in understanding what Paṭṭh is or is meant to be are missing. Given the form of the work where prose and verses alternate, an index of stanzas, for instance, with a concordance would have been appropriate; instead the concordances to the verses of the Nidānakathā (Nidāna-k),¹¹ to which the Paṭṭhasambodhi is obviously connected, when mentioned, are buried among the variants. The stanzas other than those examined below are either difficult to identify or come from canonical works of wide circulation.¹²

Both George Cœdès and Jacqueline Filliozat were rightly puzzled by the varying structure and contents of the work as evidenced by the manuscripts. The number of chapters, for instance, is not always the same. But one may go further into the textual history of the Paṭṭhasambodhi and its composition. In many ways the form of Paṭṭh is reminiscent of a prose commentary to a verse text. Narrative prose passages of varying lengths end with formulas of the type *tena dassento āha*, accusative + *dassento āha*, or *tena vuttaṃ*, followed by one or

¹¹Ja I 2–94.

¹²For instance Paṭṭh (references are to verse numbers) 70 = Nidāna-k (references are to verse numbers) 271; Paṭṭh 106 = Nidāna-k 272; Paṭṭh 184–85 = Sn 544–45; Paṭṭh 190–91 = Dhp 153–54 and Nidāna-k 278–79; Paṭṭh 160 = Dhp 179 and Nidāna-k 280; Paṭṭh 198–99 = Vin I 3,27–30 and Ud 10,18*–21* (my attention was drawn to these two stanzas by Thī Phumthapthim, *Kānsuksā prīapthīap kamphī lalitwisatara ke khamphī pathomsomphōi. A comparative study of the Lalitavistara and the Pathamasambodhi*, Bangkok, Silpakorn University, 2543 [2000], who on p. 6 draws a parallel between two Paṭṭh stanzas and Lalitavistara, p. 380, lines 16–19 (Lefmann edition), p. 276 (Vaidya edition), but does not mention their old Pāli occurrences. The parallel is interesting but is it conclusive for any connection between the Pāli and the Sanskrit biographies of the Buddha?); Paṭṭh 224 = Nidāna-k 289; Paṭṭh 225 = Nidāna-k 290; Paṭṭh 226 = Dhp 168 and Nidāna-k 292; Paṭṭh 227, 228 = Dhp 169 and Nidāna-k 293.

several stanzas. Their total number is 254 in E^c, but for a right assessment of the situation it is better to take into account only the part of the text going up to the end of the chapter *Dhammacakkaparivatta* which is common to E^c and S^c, i.e. the first 223 stanzas of E^c, to which nine stanzas wrongly not printed as verses (see n. 14) should be added.¹³ Fifty-nine of them, i.e. approximately one fourth, are similar to or identical with stanzas found in the Jinālaṅkāra (Jināl; see Table below). This starts almost at the very beginning :

dasa-pāramī-dasa-upapāramī-dasa-paramattha-pāramiyo sabba-sama-tīsa-pāramiyo pūresi. idāni evaṃ bodhisatto pāramī pūrento yathā ambarrukkhā-sadisā jana-chāyā phala-paribhoga-puñña-bīja-ropita-kkhaṇe yeva taṃ upamaṃ saṃsando imā gāthā āha (text quoted as in S^c, p. 24; compare E^c, p. 2)

tath' eva saṃsāra-pathe janānaṃ ... (= Jināl 30)

yo sāgare jalam adhika-rudhiraṃ adāsi ... (= Jināl 31)

buddhā lokāloke loke jāto ... (= Jināl 172)

Here, the verse concordance is not the only sign of the presence of the Jinālaṅkāra. The preceding prose sentence (“like the shade for people similar to the mango tree even at the time of sowing the seed of merit for the enjoyment of the fruit”) is already a somewhat terse and elliptic rewriting of verse 29 of this text preserving its important words with a loose syntactic connection between them :

*yo magga-passe madhur'-amba-bījaṃ
chāyā-phal'-atthāya mahā-janānaṃ
ropesi tasmīṃ hi khaṇe va tena
chāyā-phale puññaṃ aladdham uddhaṃ* (Jināl 29)

He who has sown the seed of a sweet mango on the roadside with the object of providing shade and fruit, even in the very moment of sowing it, in virtue of the shade and the fruit [he intends to provide], there is acquired by him whatever merit had not been obtained before (Gray's translation, p. 85).

¹³S^c represents an amplified version in 29 chapters (Cædès 1968 in PTS edition: lvi–lvii) where, after this point, a great deal of additional material in prose and verse is found.

In one case, the verses are precisely introduced with reference to their literary form (*yamakagātham āha*, Paṭh E^c 73,12), unmistakably pointing to the Jinālaṅkāra, which is well known as a unique composition replete with *tours de force*, especially *yamakas* (see Paṭh 74 = Jinā 73). In another case, the sophisticated style of the stanza which makes use of alliterations and paradoxical statements speaks for itself:

*bhajitaṃ cajitaṃ pavanaṃ bhavanaṃ
jahitaṃ gahitaṃ samalaṃ amalaṃ
sugataṃ agataṃ sugatiṃ agatiṃ
namitaṃ (v.l. namāmi) amitaṃ namatiṃ sumatiṃ*

Paṭh 53 [= 136,19–37,2 not printed as verse in E^c] = Jinā 173

In a single case, an author's name is explicitly mentioned: *taṃ dassento Buddharakkhitācariyo āha* (E^c 114,12; S^c p. 87), followed by a verse (numbered 145 in E^c) which is identical to Jinālaṅkāra 115 (E^c). This suggests that the connection between the two works was clear to the redactor of the Paṭhamasambodhi himself and that the implied grammatical subject of *āha* in many other cases is also the author of the Jinālaṅkāra. This gives support to the identity of Buddharakkhita as the author of the Jinālaṅkāra, a fact which was not unanimously admitted in the tradition.¹⁴ The evidence of the Paṭhamasambodhi confirms what we know for certain from the statements found at the end of the commentary on the Jinālaṅkāra and from the colophons (Norman 1983: 157; von Hinüber 1996 §407), that the author of the Jinālaṅkāra was indeed Buddharakkhita, a Thera born in Rohaṇa (Ceylon) who wrote it in 1156 C.E.

On the other hand the distribution of the fifty-nine stanzas common to the Paṭhamasambodhi and the Jinālaṅkāra is not without significance. They are not spread over the fourteen chapters which build Paṭh in its most complete form. They are found only in the part narrating the life of the Buddha from his last incarnations in the Tusita heaven up to his

¹⁴See the conflicting evidence of the Gandhavaṃsa (Buddhadatta) and of the Saddhammasaṅgaha (Buddharakkhita) quoted in I.B. Horner's foreword to the reprint of the Jinālaṅkāra.

Enlightenment (Abhisambodhi, chapter VIII in E^c; chapter XI in S^c), not in the later chapters. This fact could be additional evidence to support the hypothesis made by Cœdès about the progressive development of Paṭh in three stages starting around a core corresponding to this period of the Buddha's life:

The Paṭhamasambodhi originally may have included eight chapters which traced the life of the Buddha from his life in the Tusita heaven to his awakening... A little later, the addition of two or three chapters continued the story up to the sermon in Benares. This stage corresponds to the Yuon translation in the manuscript of Copenhagen. Later still, the story was continued up to the *parinirvāṇa*. This stage included about fifteen chapters and is represented by the eighteenth-century manuscripts (Paṭh E^c lx).

As for the first stage, one can now state that the Jinālaṅkāra stands among its main sources. The table of correspondences (below) shows that verses from the Jinālaṅkāra are often quoted in blocks so that some sections of the Jinālaṅkāra are incorporated *in toto* or in part in the Paṭhamasambodhi. Thus both works have a close intertextual relation. This observation also gives weight to the chronological deductions proposed by Cœdès on the basis of two other converging facts: (1) the oldest sculptures that depict the Earth wringing out her hair in order to inundate Māra's army date from the twelfth century; (2) a stanza of the Paṭh found in an inscription from Nakhon Pathom in Thailand also appears in the Sāratthasamuccaya, which also dates from the twelfth century. Since the Jinālaṅkāra also dates back to the same period, and since the quotations from the Jinālaṅkāra appear precisely in the same part of the work, we could be slightly more assertive than Cœdès, who wrote, "We should not go as far as to imply that the Paṭhamasambodhi itself dates from this period, even if the two chapters that include the legend of the Earth and the stanza are part of the oldest part of the text" (Paṭh E^c lxiv).

Trying to read the verses of Paṭh through the PTS edition is not an easy task. First, there are passages which have been printed as prose

while they should have been printed as verses,¹⁵ or incorrect word separations. Despite the considerable number of manuscripts used, the text is often unsatisfactory, even in cases where it offers no special difficulty. Both the Thai edition of Paṭh reflecting the full modern version prepared by Prince Paramanujit in 1845 (= S^c, pp. 278–79 for the colophon verses already quoted in Cœdès 1916B: 4, n. 1) and the editions of the Jinālaṅkāra have to be called on for help. On the other hand, the establishment of the text of the latter would also benefit from a comparison of the two texts (see Table below).

It is not only in the verses that the connection between the Paṭhamasambodhi and the Jinālaṅkāra is clearly seen. Comparing the prose of the former with the commentary on the latter underlines their mutual affinity. Although Paṭh is not strictly speaking a commentary, it has some formal features of the genre: the style of the introductory formulas preceding the quotation of stanzas is one of them (see above). Another one is the typical device of singling out a word of a stanza just quoted for explanation:

sayam Nārāyanabalo abhiññābalapāragū
jetuṃ sabbassa lokassa Bodhimaṇḍam upāgamī ti (Paṭh E^c 148, S^c p. 88,
 v.l. *pāramibalapāragū* = Jināl 118)
tattha “Nārāyanabalo” ti ... tattha Nārāyanabalo nāma dassento āha:
kāḷāvakaṃ ca Gaṅgeyyaṃ
paṇḍaraṃ tāmba-piṅgalaṃ
gandhaṃ maṅgalaṃ hemaṃ ca
uposathaṃ chaddan t’ ime dasā ti (Paṭh E^c 149, S^c p. 88; Jināl-ṭ B^c p. 275)
tattha “dasā” ti ...

The wording of the commentary on *Nārāyanabalo* in Paṭh and in the Jinālaṅkāra-ṭikā (Jināl-ṭ, B^c) are almost identical, and the stanza listing the ten powers is also found at the same place in this commentary. A

¹⁵The following passages should be printed as verses: E^c 23,8–10 (S^c p. 40); E^c 79,11–13 (*Māra ... atthiko*) and 79,13–14 (*sabbaṃ ... anuttaro*) are two anuṣṭubhs (S^c p. 69); E^c 95,5–7 (S^c p. 77); E^c 111,14–15 is the continuation of the stanza numbered as 142 (S^c p. 86); E^c 128,15–17 (S^c p. 96); E^c 136,15–137,2 (3 stanzas, see below; S^c pp. 100–101).

full fledged comparison of the prose of both texts, which cannot be undertaken here, would easily show that this is just an instance out of many where prose passages in both works have the same wording and where stanzas incorporated in Paṭh are quoted at the same place in the Jināl-ṭ.¹⁶ The ultimate source of these common stanzas could well be a third text: the five stanzas listing the bad omens appearing before Māra's army in Paṭh (E^c 161–65) are also found (with variant readings) in the Jināl-ṭ (B^c pp. 277–78), where they are introduced with the sentence: *vuttaṃ h' etaṃ porāṇe ti*. Needless to say, great benefit could be taken from such a comparison for improving the often deficient or unclear text of Paṭh as given in E^c (despite the impressive critical apparatus). The interrelation with Jināl, however, is rather complex. The passage where the goddess Earth (*Vasundharā vanitā*) wrings out her hair in order to inundate Māra's army and cause his final defeat (Paṭh E^c 134,17ff.), made famous by Coëdès's article (1916A) is specific to the Paṭhamasambodhi, and appears to be deliberately so, as the version of the Jinālaṅkāra is in conformity with the classical depiction with the earth shaking, the terrestrial noise, and the roaring noise in the sky caused by a thunderbolt.¹⁷ Except for these few lines, the rest of the prose of Paṭh is rather close to what can be found in the corresponding Jinālaṅkāra-ṭīkā (B^c p. 285): what comes before this episode is a commentary on stanza 181 (= Jināl 138) similar to Jināl-ṭ and what comes after it (135,11ff.) is similar to Jināl-ṭ on Jināl 140–41 (not quoted in Paṭh).

¹⁶Compare, for instance, Paṭh E^c p. 137 and Jināl-ṭ quoted in Jināl E^c p. 63 (B^c p. 289); Paṭh E^c 136,15–19 (not printed as verses!) = S^c p. 86 = Jināl-ṭ B^c p. 286 as stanzas 161 and 162.

¹⁷The Earth as a beautiful lady who appeared in front of the Buddha is given at an earlier stage of the narrative as told in Paṭh, at the time of the Great Renunciation: *tadā Dharaṇī varavanitā Bodhisattassa vitakkaṃ ñatvā*, etc. (E^c 80,8).

Table¹⁸

Paṭhamasambodhi verse number in E ^c (chapter) ¹⁹	Jinālaṅkāra verse number in E ^c (chapter)
3 (Tussita); b reads differently in S ^c : <i>atthāya attānam achādayanto</i> ; c has been transmitted differently in Path and Jinā ²⁰	30 (Bodhisambhāradīpanīgāthā)
4 (Tussita); read <i>jaladhikarudhiraṃ</i> in a E ^c	31 (Bodhisambhāradīpanīgāthā)
5 (read <i>ko nu mmatto</i> ; <i>bho</i> prob. to be read as <i>ko</i>) = 54 (Tussita)	172 (Abhisambodhidīpanīgāthā)
6 (Tussita)	32 (Gabbhokkantidīpanīgāthā)
7 (Tussita)	33 (Gabbhokkantidīpanīgāthā); superfluous <i>ca</i> in c
13 (Gabbhābhiniikkhamana); d is unmetrical in all versions (<i>dasa-sahassī pakampītha</i> Jinā).	34 (Gabbhokkantidīpanīgāthā)
14 (Gabbh.)	35 (Gabbhokkantidīpanīgāthā)
18 (Gabbh.); note <i>Lumbali / Lumbani</i> in b; read <i>vijāyi taṃ</i> in d E ^c	36 (Vijāyanamaṅgaladīpanīgāthā)
19 (Gabbh.)	39 (Vijāyanamaṅgaladīpanīgāthā)
20 (Gabbh.); c <i>vivattanti</i> ; d <i>na dissare cāmarachattagāhakā</i>	38 (Vijāyanamaṅgaladīpanīgāthā); c <i>vipatanti</i> E ^c ; <i>vijenti</i> B ^c ; d <i>kha-jjimsu bherī ca nadimsu saṃkhā</i>
46 (Gabbh.); d <i>te devā dātā</i> E ^c is strange (no v.l.); S ^c <i>te devā tadā</i> makes more sense.	178 (Navaguṇadīpanīgāthā); d <i>te devā brahmā</i>
48 (Lakkhaṇapariggaha); b E ^c <i>subhattā</i> , S ^c <i>subhuttā</i>	44 (Vijāyanamaṅgaladīpanīgāthā); b <i>subhuttā</i>
53 (Lakkhaṇa.)	173 (Abhisambodhidīpanīgāthā)

¹⁸Based on the comparison of Paṭhamasambodhi E^c with Jinālaṅkāra E^c.

¹⁹Chapter division as in E^c.

²⁰Only the most significant variants are recorded here; incorrect word separations are not taken into account. For a full critical edition of the verses all available documents would have to be taken up systematically and their readings considered in view of the metrical constraints.

54 (Lakkhaṇa); not in S ^c at this place; see above 5	172 (Abhisambodhidīpanīgāthā)
55 (Lakkhaṇa); wrong divisions of some words in E ^c ; not in S ^c at this place	180 (Navaguṇadīpanīgāthā)
56 (Rājābhiseka); b E ^c <i>ābhāyikaṃ</i> ; S ^c <i>abbhāyikaṃ</i> , compare Gray Jināl p. 56.	45 (Vijāyanamaṅgaladīpanīgāthā)
57 (Rājābhiseka); d E ^c S ^c <i>devaputtam upāgami</i>	43 (Vijāyanamaṅgaladīpanīgāthā); d <i>devaputtattam āgami</i>
58 (Rājābhiseka)	47 (Agāriyasampattidīpanīgāthā)
59 (Rājābhiseka); minor variants	48 (Agāriyasampattidīpanīgāthā)
73 (Mahābhiniikkhamana); d <i>itthiyo</i> in E ^c to be cancelled as indicated in the note.	72 (Pādudhāravimhayadīpanīgāthā)
74 (Mahābhiniikkhamana)	73 (Pādudhāravimhayadīpanīgāthā)
75 (Mahābhiniikkhamana)	74 (Pādudhāravimhayadīpanīgāthā)
76 (Mahābhiniikkhamana); d E ^c S ^c <i>saṃghuṭṭhā</i>	75 (Pādudhāravimhayadīpanīgāthā); d <i>ghuṭṭhā</i> .
79 (Mahābhiniikkhamana); b E ^c <i>jiṇṇavirūpāni raticchidāni</i> but S ^c <i>thīnaṃ virūpāni ratacchidāni</i>	81 (Apunarāvattigamanadīpanīyamakagāthā); b <i>thīnaṃ virūpāni ratacchidāni</i>
81 (Mahābhiniikkhamana)	50 (Nekkhammajjhāsayaḍipānīyamakagāthā)
82 (Mahābhiniikkhamana); c E ^c <i>paccamukhe</i> but S ^c <i>maccumukhe</i>	52 (Nekkhamma.); c <i>maccumukhe</i>
83 (Mahābhiniikkhamana)	53 (Nekkhamma.)
84 (Mahābhiniikkhamana); c E ^c <i>payāte</i> ; S ^c <i>mayā te</i> ; d <i>vinay(y)ā</i>	54 (Nekkhamma.); c <i>mayā te</i> ; d <i>vineyya</i>
85 (Mahābhiniikkhamana); d E ^c <i>sutaṃ sutan</i> ; S ^c <i>sutaṃ sutantaṃ</i>	59 (Nekkhamma.); d <i>sutaṃ sutantaṃ</i>
87 (Mahābhiniikkhamana); c E ^c <i>Gāyābhirūpaṃ pi Yasodhara-varaṃ</i> ; S ^c <i>tāyābhirūpaṃ pi Yasodharaṃ varaṃ</i>	88 (Dvipādabyāsayamakagāthā); c <i>tāyābhirūpaṃ pi Yasodharaṃ varaṃ</i>

88 (Mahābhiniikkhamana); c to be emended: the pun on the verb <i>riñcati</i> which is the main point of the verse is lost in the text as it is printed; compare Jināl	89 (Dvipāda.)
91 (Mahābhiniikkhamana); c is different in Path and Jināl	68 (Pāduddhāravimhayadīpanīgāthā)
92 (Mahābhiniikkhamana); b the correct reading should be <i>bhābhānibhāni</i>	85 (Apunarāvattigamanadīpanīyamakagāthā)
93 (Mahābhiniikkhamana); d E ^c S ^c <i>yāto tato hi nimittehi surissarehi</i>	86 (Apunarāvatti.); d <i>yāto tato hi mahito purissarehi</i>
94 (Mahābhiniikkhamana); minor variants	69 (Pāduddhāra.)
95 (Mahābhiniikkhamana); to be fully reconsidered	70 (Pāduddhāra.)
97 (Mahābhiniikkhamana)	78 (Apunarāvatti.)
98 (Mahābhiniikkhamana)	79 (Apunarāvatti.)
99 (Mahābhiniikkhamana)	80 (Apunarāvatti.)
100 (Mahābhi.)	81 (Apunarāvatti.)
101 (Mahābhi.)	82 (Apunarāvatti.)
102 (Mahābhi.)	83 (Apunarāvatti.)
103 (Mahābhi.)	84 (Apunarāvatti.)
145 (Buddhapūjā); c <i>Bodhim parājītāsane</i> ; d E ^c S ^c <i>yuddhāya Māre niccalo nisīdi</i>	115 (Māraparājayadīpanīgāthā); c E ^c <i>bodhimhi parājītāsane</i> ; B ^c <i>bodhim uparājītāsane</i> ; d <i>yuddhāya Mārenacalo nisīdi</i>
146 (Buddhapūjā)	116 (Māraparājaya.); a read <i>mānusam</i> (not <i>maṃsam</i> as printed in E ^c ; but the translation is right).
147 (Buddhapūjā)	117 (Māraparājaya.)
148 (Buddhapūjā); S ^c <i>pāramibala-pāragū</i>	118 (Māraparājaya.)
166 (Māravijaya); b E ^c S ^c <i>chaddetha chedakam imaṃ</i>	120 (Māraparājaya.); b <i>chattetha cetakam imaṃ</i>
170 (Māravijaya); a E ^c <i>āsinno</i> ; S ^c <i>āsi no</i>	123 (Māraparājaya.); a <i>kasmā āsi nu</i> E ^c , no B ^c

171 (Māravijaya)	124 (Māraparājaya.); read <i>dayāparo</i> instead of <i>daya°</i> in E ^c
172 (Māravijaya); d E ^c S ^c <i>balō</i>	125 (Māraparājaya.); d <i>khaḷo</i>
173 (Māravijaya); c E ^c <i>ekapārimissā pi</i> ; S ^c <i>ekapāramissā pi</i>	127 (Māraparājaya.); c <i>ekapāramiyā</i>
174 (Māravijaya)	128 (Māraparājaya.)
175 (Māravijaya); d E ^c <i>anumato sacetano</i> ; S ^c <i>anumatto</i>	129 (Māraparājaya.); d <i>anummatto sacetano</i>
176 (Māravijaya)	130 (Māraparājaya.)
177 (Māravijaya)	131 (Māraparājaya.)
178 (Māravijaya)	132 (Māraparājaya.)
181 (Māravijaya)	138 (Māraparājaya.)
p. 136,19–37,2 (wrongly not printed as a verse in E ^c) = 53	173 (Abhisambodhidīpanīgāthā)

3. THE VIDADDHAMUKHAMANĀḌANA²¹

A solid hint as to the existence of this work in Burma is supplied in Aggavaṃsa's *Saddanīti* (see Kraatz 1968 1: xvi):

mā vuccati sirī; tathā hi Vidaddhamukhamaṇḍana-ṭīkāyāṃ mālinī ti pādass' atthaṃ vadatā “mā vuccati Lakkhī, alinī ti bhamarī” ti vuttaṃ, lakkhī saddo ca sirī-saddena samān'-attho, tena “mā vuccati sirī” ti attho amhehi anumato (244,19ff.).

mā means “prosperity”. In fact, when giving the meaning of the word *mālinī*, the commentary on the Vidaddhamukhamaṇḍana says, “*mā* means

²¹At this stage I can only collect a few preliminary remarks. More details on the text will follow on another occasion. I am grateful to all those who, in addition to Dr Peter Skilling, helped me to progress in this research during my stay in Bangkok (August 2007): Peter Nyunt, who is cataloguing the Fragile Palm Leaves Manuscripts; Venerable Mahathiab Malai of Wat Jetuphon (Wat Pho), who granted permission to see the manuscripts kept there; Jacqueline Filliozat, who kindly sent the relevant information contained in her unpublished catalogue of the manuscripts at Wat Jetuphon (Wat Pho) and accompanied me there during our brief visit on 29 August; Mr Dokrak Payaksri and Mr Wisithisak Sattapan (EFEO, Bangkok), who kindly devoted a few hours to the reading of parts of the two Tham manuscripts, photocopies of which were kindly provided by Dr Peter Skilling (see below).

prosperity, *alinī* means bee.” The word *lakkhī* has the same meaning as the word *siri*. This is why we have admitted the statement “*mā* means prosperity”.

This passage occurs within a section devoted to the discussion of monosyllables (*ekakkhara*, 239,6–46,8) in the context of nominal declension and the establishment of grammatical gender of the words considered. They are reviewed in alphabetical order, just as a specialized lexicon of the class *Ekakkharakosa* would do. Starting with *ko* meaning “Brahmā, wind, and body” (239,6ff.), the list ends with *saṃ* (245,4ff.). Compounds formed with monosyllables are treated along the way (such as *vindo*, “lord of the birds”, *vi + indo*, 240,4–5). As always with Aggavaṃsa, the discussion is substantiated by examples and quotations taken from various texts.

The presence of this quotation in the *Saddanīti* implies that not only the work itself but a corresponding commentary were known at the time of Aggavaṃsa, that is to say, in the second half of the twelfth century C.E. The question of its origin and diffusion, however, have not yet been solved. *Vid* is not specifically a Pāli work; there is a *Vid* in Sanskrit, which, in four chapters, presents both definitions and illustrations of various types of riddles, and was widely disseminated in India. It is a sophisticated work which calls for knowledge of grammar and vocabulary (especially monosyllable words or rare words) in all their niceties. Therefore in addition to manuscripts and editions containing the verses only, there are many where an elucidating commentary is also provided. The religious affiliation of the author, a certain Dharmadāsa, about whom nothing reliable is known, has been debated: was he a Buddhist, a Jain (*Vid* is highly popular in Jain circles, where other authors have also composed similar works), or neither? His date is also very uncertain: near the seventh century (Kraatz 1968: xviii) or much later (the eleventh, thirteenth, or fifteenth century).

The passage quoted by Aggavaṃsa refers to a stanza which reads as follows in Sanskrit:

urasi Mura-bhidaḥ kā gāḍham āliṅgītāste ?
sarasija-makarandāmoditā nandane kā ?
giri-sama-laghu-varṇair arṇavākhyātisaṃkhyair
gurubhir api kṛtā kā chandasāṃ vṛtti-ramyā ?
mālinī. mā = lakṣmīḥ ; alinī = bhramarī ; mālinī nāma chando vṛttam
 (2.36).

Which lady remains closely embraced to Mura's murderer ?

In the Nandana who (fem.) is rejoiced in the pollen of the lotuses ?

Having a number of light syllables identical to [the number of] mountains, and heavy syllables numbering the word "ocean", which among the metres is pleasant ?

The answer to the first question is *mā*, a monosyllabic designation for Lakṣmī, the answer to the second one is *alinī* "a bee", whereas the addition of both produces the answer to the third question, *mālinī*, as the name of the famous metre having eight light and seven heavy syllables (4 × ◡◡◡◡◡◡◡◡, ◡◡◡◡◡◡◡). The stanza is meant to illustrate the variety of riddles known as *vṛttanāmajāti*, where the answer to be found is the name of a metre. It is the second example of this variety: in the preceding stanza, 2.35, the name of the metre to be guessed through a similar method is *śikhariṇī*. An additional nicety: although Dharmadāsa's definition does not state it explicitly, both his examples show that the riddle verse is written in the metre to be discovered.²²

This parallel suggests that the Pāli and the Sanskrit Vid are closely interrelated. Further, Aggavaṃsa's quotation could make one expect that manuscripts of a Pāli Vid with commentary following the Sanskrit model could be found in Burma. There are serious hints, indeed, to suggest that the tradition relating to Vid was kept alive in Burma even later than Aggavaṃsa's time. At a later period there are stray references found in historical documents or lists of books. For instance, *Vidagdha*, rightly understood by Bode (1909: 108, No. 265) as the abbreviation of *Vidagdhamukhamaṇḍana*, is mentioned among the non-canonical works found in the Pagan inscription dated 1442 A.D. which gives the contents

²²This additional feature is made clear in the Jain reworking of the definition in Mahākavi Ajitasena's *Alaṃkāracintāmaṇi*, see Balbir 2004, p. 299.

of the library (Luce & Tin Htway 1976: 246, No. 268). The Gandhavaṃsa mentions Vid in a discussion relating to Vepulabuddhi's works (see below). The Piṭakat-tō-samuiṇḥ (= Piṭakatthamain, Nos. 1065 and 1066) mentions a manuscript of the text of Vid (the language of which is not given) and a manuscript of a commentary composed by Vimalabuddhi, described as a monk from the Mahāvihāra in Anurādhapura, a fact which suggests that the commentary could have been written before 1017 (Kraatz 1968: xvi–xvii).

So far no manuscript evidence of Vid seems to be available from Sri Lanka. The only manuscripts of Vid which have been traced come from South-East Asia.

The only Burmese manuscript of Vid which could be traced and consulted so far is not a Pāli work (Ms 510 belonging to the Fragile Palm Leaves collection, “Manuscript House”, Pakkret, Bangkok). It is a very clearly written manuscript of the Sanskrit work by Dharmadāsa in Burmese script, with the usual signs for noting Sanskrit phonemes.²³ Vid occupies folios *ka* to *khi* (8 lines per page) and is at present in a bundle containing the following works: *Sandhikālāp pāṭh*, *Paroparissabheda nī pat nisya*, *Abhidhammavibhāvanī-ṭikā* and *Ṭikākyo*.

Beginning: *namaḥ sarvvaññāyaḥ* || ||

siddhausadhāni bhava-duḥkha-mahāgadānām, etc. (= Skt VMM 1.1)

End: *iti Dharmmadāsa-kīte Vidaggamukhamaṇḍane caturthaḥ paricchedaḥ* || *Vidagga-granthaṅ niṭṭhitaṅ* || || |||

akkharā ekkam ekañ ca Buddha-rūpaṃ samaṃ siyā

tasmā hi paṇḍīto poso likheyyā piṭaka-ttayaṃ ||

Marginal title on the last folio: *Vidag kwyam mrat*.

This is a manuscript of the *mūla* only without any commentary. The four chapters of the work as distributed as follows: 1 ends on *kī* verso, line 7; 2 on *kai* recto, line 1; 3 on *kaḥ* recto, line 1. The author's name is consistently written throughout as *Dharmmadāsa*. The verses are numbered, starting from 1 at the beginning of a new chapter, but not

²³See Bechert 1979, p. xxi (“Table of Transliteration”).

throughout. The verse to which Aggavaṃsa refers is found on fol. *kū* recto and verso :

urasi muda (sic)-bhidā kā gādhyam āliṅgitāste?
sarasija-makarandānanditā moditā kā?
gīri-sama-laghu-varṇair aṅṅavākhyāta-saṅkhye (sic)
garubhir api kūtā kā cchandasā (sic) vīttir agrā? || mālini || vīttanāma-jāti ||
 |||

A few lines above (*kū* recto, line 5) the verse occurs which successively gives the definitions of two varieties of riddles, the second of which is the *vīttanāma-jāti* (see below). On the whole, the manuscript is correct. Neither Vid nor the rest of the manuscript have any date or place of copying. As is well known, the position of Sanskrit learning in Burma was very different from that of Ceylon. Pāli and Burmese were the common languages in monastic education. Sanskrit, however, was not absent and remained associated with specialized traditional disciplines of knowledge (*śāstras*). Vid, which combines knowledge of grammar, lexicography, metrics, poetics, etc., belongs to such a sphere. In particular, “King Bodawpaya (1781–1819) ... sent a number of missions to collect Sanskrit works in Varanasi and other places in India and Ceylon. These books were transliterated into Burmese script and many of them were translated into Burmese language or into Pāli” (Bechert and Braun 1981: xxxix). The manuscript of Vid could date from this period and could belong to this Sanskrit renaissance, although the work does not appear in the rich list of “Sanskrit texts imported into Burma between 1786 and 1818” (Than Tun 1960: 132–41). Thus, this idea is only a mere hypothesis for the time being. Given the small number of Sanskrit works in Burmese script, it is certainly remarkable :

The scope of Sanskrit studies in Burma remained, however, a quite limited one so that today not many Sanskrit works can be found in manuscripts written in Burmese script (Bechert and Braun 1981: xxxix).²⁴

²⁴See *loc. cit.* for examples : “only eight Sanskrit manuscripts in Burmese script with 14 different works, mostly grammatical and lexicographical texts, can be traced” in the unpublished catalogue of the Mandalay collection.

As for the presence of Vid in other South-East Asian countries, the situation is the following: no manuscript seems to be available today in Cambodia.²⁵ A manuscript from Laos has been reported long ago.²⁶ The existence of vernacular versions, however, has been reported (Skilling and Pakdeekham 2002, 2004).

Nevertheless, the existence of a Pāli Vid is not a myth. It is attested in several manuscripts from Siam, all of which have not yet been collected.²⁷ On the other hand, the list of works making an extensive “painted Tipiṭaka” found on the walls of the main hall in Wat Thong Noppakhun (Thonburi; end of the nineteenth century) shows that Vid was known among works dealing with language (*Saddāvisesa*), both in its Pāli and in its Sanskrit versions until late: sixty titles are listed in this category. No. 27 is *Pāḷi-Bidakdha* and No. 55 is *Pāḷi-Bidakdha-sakaṭa* (Skilling, forthcoming).

My preliminary investigation of the Pāli Vid is based on the following material:

One manuscript in Khom script kept at Wat Jetuphon (Wat Pho). No. 6/40. See Jacqueline Filliozat, “EFEO DATA Filliozat 2005, fichier 108”. The whole bundle concerns Vid. The Pāli version (*Brah pāli vidagdhāmukhamaṇḍana*) is found on fol. *ka* to *gū* and was the only one I could see briefly during my visit. The next ms (7 *phūks*) is the *Vidagdhāmukhamaṇḍana-dīpanī-ṭīkā*, followed by the *Vidagdhāmukhamaṇḍana-yojanā* (4 *phūks*) and the *Mukhamaṇḍanavidagdha-upadesa*.²⁸

Two photocopies made on the basis of the microfilms of two manuscripts in Tham script from Wat Sung Men, Phrae Province. These manuscripts

²⁵Information kindly given by Dr Olivier de Bernon (EFEO ; letter dated 7 May 2001). But see Coedès 1912 : 178 who saw a manuscript of the *ṭīkā*.

²⁶Finot 1917 : 214 : R 676 (= Luang Prabang Royal Library) containing 6 *phūks*.

²⁷It would be important for a further study to have access to the ms kept in the Royal National Library.

²⁸For other manuscripts, including some containing vernacular renderings or explanations, see Skilling & Pakdeekham 2002 under 4.49, 4.72 (*Nissaya-Vidagdhāmukhamaṇḍana-Phadet*), 4.99 (*Yojanā-Vidagdhāmukhamaṇḍana* “composed in Pukām [Pagan] by Dhammakitti Thera Lokarājamoli”), 4.110 and 111 ; Skilling & Pakdeekham 2004 under 5.101–104.

were microfilmed under the “Preservation of Northern Thai Manuscripts Project” (a Thai–German undertaking on which see Hundius 1990: 15ff.). Reference is to the *phūk* number and the Arabic numbers added on each page of the microfilmed manuscripts.

WS 010408801 (= A), 6 *phūks*, 5 lines, complete, dated C.S. (= Cūḷasakarāja) 1198 = 1836 C.E.

WS 010409203 (= B), 6 *phūks*, 5 lines, complete.

Both manuscripts are additional documents attesting the brilliant activity of the senior monk Venerable Gruu Paa Kañcana Araññavāsīn whose personality emerges from the colophons of the manuscripts he had copied, and came to light through the superb study of the colophons of Pāli manuscripts from Northern Thailand conducted by Hundius (1990, especially 34–36). In the 1830s this monk was greatly instrumental in preserving and restoring Northern Thai culture in Lanna. His home monastery, Wat Sung Men, “rose to become a centre of Pāli and Buddhist studies. Manuscripts were systematically collected and numerous copying campaigns covering Phrae, Nan, Chiang Mai, Chiang Saen, Rahaeng and Luang Prabang were pursued” (Hundius 1990: 34). Together with the ruler of Phrae he had ms A copied. His name also appears in the colophon located at the end of each *phūk* of ms B. Under his leadership, and with the cooperation of his disciple, this ms was copied in Luang Prabang and brought to Lanna.

The Khom manuscript contains the root text of the Vid in Pāli: definition verses, illustrative verses followed by the answers to the riddles. It is the work of Vipulabuddhi Thera, disciple of Sāgarabuddhi Thera:

iti Sāgarabuddhithera’-antevāsika-Vipulabuddhithera-viracite Vidatthamukhamaṇḍane catuttho paricchedo ... pāḷi Vidatthamukhamaṇḍanaṃ niṭṭhitaṃ (fols. *gū-ge*).

This should be compared with the Gandhavaṃsa of Nandapañña, admittedly a modern work, where the number of works composed by Vepullabuddhi Ācārya (either five or six as there seem to be conflicting opinions) is discussed. Among them is one Vidadhimukhamaṇḍanaṭṭikā

(Minayeff 1886: 64 and 74–75). The variant spelling *vidadhi* is no hindrance to the identification. But the work available in the Khom manuscript is not a commentary.

The two Lanna manuscripts are identical to each other and contain the *Vidagdhāmukhamaṇḍana-dīpanī* (= Vid-d; cf. *Vidagdhāmukhamaṇḍana-dīpaniṃ vakkhāmi*, B I,1, line 3; A I,1, line 3). It is an extensive Pāli commentary on the Pāli Vid. The verses of the *mūla* are quoted pāda by pāda. They are identical to the work represented in the Khom manuscript. Vid-d ends: *iti varamati- seṭṭhagaruna vajjirapañño ti vihita-nāmadheyyena para-hitesinā uttama-dhamma-gavesi tena nibbānālambaṇa-cittena therena racitā Vidaggamukhamaṇḍana-dīpanī nāmāyaṃ ṭīkā anantarāyena samattā* (B VI,30, line 5).²⁹

The author of the Pāli Vid explicitly considers himself to be a translator of Dharmadāsa's work at the outset:

... *karissāmi sa-mātikaṃ ahaṃ Magadha-bhāsāya Vidagdhāmukhamaṇḍanaṃ.*

The verses that follow, ending with the conclusion *ti mātikā* (Wat Pho ms, fol. *ki* recto), list all the varieties of riddles which will be treated in the work. These verses are Pāli translations of the corresponding verses found in Dharmadāsa's work (1.9–18) with minor adjustments in the use of particles. The technical designations are identical. The verses supplying the definitions also conform to their Sanskrit model. The definition of the first variety discussed in the Pāli Vid reads:

*siyā pada-vibhāgena kevalen' eva pucchitaṃ
yaṃ byatthaṃ taṃ samatthaṃ yaṃ samudāyena pucchitaṃ* (fol. *ki* recto,
line 2)

²⁹The *Vidagdhāmukhamaṇḍana-dīpanī-ṭīkā* in Khom script (Wat Pho ms, see above) has the same end and is the same work.

cf. Dharmadāsa:

*piṣṭaṃ pada-vibhāgena kevalenaiva yad bhavet
vidur vyastaṃ samastaṃ yat samudāyena picchayate* (1.19).

This is just one instance to illustrate an overall conducted method. The *vitta-nāma-jāti*, which I focus on here because of Aggavaṃsa's quotation, is defined along with the *viśama-jāti* in the same verse. In Dharmadāsa's version:

*yatra bhaṅgasya vaiśamyam viśamaṃ tan nigadyate*³⁰
vittanāmottaraṃ piṣṭaṃ bhavet tad vittanāmakaṃ (2.32)

variant: *vittaṃ nāmottaraṃ yatra praśnaṃ tad vitta-nāmakaṃ*
(Kraatz 1968: 32).

... [Where] the question has as its answer the name of a metre it would be a *vittanāmaka*.

In Dharmadāsa as found in the Burmese manuscript (No. 510 see above) it reads :

*yatra bhaṅgasya veśamaṃ viśamaṃ ti nigadyate
yatra praśnāsthitaṃ s tan nāmottarāda (?) vitta-nāmakaṃ.*

In the Pāli Vid (ms B III,25, line 2):

*yatra pabandhe bhaṅgassa vesamaṃ atthi taṃ visamaṃ ti nigadyate
yatra pabandha (for: -e) nāmottaraṃ pañhā-ṭṭhitam (sic) taṃ vutta-
nāmakaṃ.*

Thus, the general plan of both the Pāli and the Sanskrit versions goes along the same line. The fourth and last section, for example, also deals with the same varieties as the Sanskrit model in the same sequence. It relates to varieties where one has to discover a hidden verb, a case form, a compound or a ending: *kriyā-guttaṃ, katta-guttaṃ, kamma-guttaṃ, karaṇa-guttaṃ, sampadāna-guttaṃ, apadāna-guttaṃ, adhikarāna-guttaṃ, sambandha-guttaṃ, ālapana-guttaṃ, samāsa-guttaṃ, etc.*³¹

³⁰Cadence of an even pāda in a.

³¹Ms B *phūk* 6 fols. 4-15 ; compare Vid in Skt. chap. 4 vv. 33ff.

If the matter stopped here, it would be very artificial to speak of a Pāli Vid. The originality of the Pāli tradition regarding this work lies in the illustrative verses. This is not surprising as the riddles are highly dependent on linguistic constraints, which are partly different for Sanskrit and Pāli. No generalization is possible without a complete reading of the work (not done so far). But the section concerning the “metre name variety” shows that the examples are utterly different from those in Dharmadāsa’s Vid. Therefore, up to now, Aggavaṃsa’s reference remains the only available trace of a Pāli commentary on Vid where the illustrative verse is supposed to be the same as in the Sanskrit version.

Dharmadāsa had two examples for this variety (2.35 *sikhariṇī* and 2.36 *mālinī*). The Pāli Vid as represented in our Khom and Tham manuscripts also supplies two. But the metres they select are *rucirā* and *ketumatī*.

Example 1³²

- (i)³³ *jinassa kā jalati varassa bhuvane?*
- (ii) *pahanti ’kena ’ghika-pajāya tena ke?*
- (iii) *abhiñña pañca garu lahu ’ttha sānikā*
- (iv) *muni’-gga-vaṇṇa-ghaṭṭita-bandha-vutti kā? — rucirā*

Commentary: aññaṃ lakkhaṇassa lakkhaṇam āha jinass’ icc-ādinā. tattha rucirā ti.

(i) *varassa jinassa kā bhuvane jalati? ruci. tattha bhavanti*³⁴ *sattā ettha bhavana(m?)*³⁵ *loko “bhū sattāyan” [= Dhātupāṭha I.1] ti ti vā tu*

³²Ms A *phūk* III, 35–37; ms B *phūk* III, 28–30. My aim is to give a sample of the text because so far no discussion of the Pāli Vid has been based on any textual evidence. The present transliteration and translation, however, are highly tentative and have gaps. Unfortunately, the relevant pages of the photocopies are of rather poor quality and, at some places, hardly legible.

³³These numbers refer to the question in the riddle. In Example 2 one of them does not correspond to the pāda boundary.

³⁴B: bhavanta.

³⁵A: etthā ti bhavanaṃ.

yu-ssa³⁶ anattaṃ u-kārassa³⁷ uvattañ ca.³⁸ rucati attano guṇena virocati ti ruci raṃsi.

(ii) **tena ekena**³⁹ **aghika-pajāya ke pahanti**⁴⁰ ti. arā. arā. tattha pahanti 'kenā ti pahiyante ekena seṭṭhena.⁴¹ **aghika-pajāyā** ti dukkhita-sattassa. arā ti kilesā saṃsāra-cakkāro vā.

(iii-iv) **abhiñña pañca garu laṭṭha sānikā**⁴² **muni-'gga-vaṇṇa-ghaṭṭita-bandha-vutti kā?** rucirā. tattha **abhi. la. sānikā** ti abhiññā-saṃkhātehi pañca-garuhi ceva⁴³ sānika jhāte samāpatti-saṃkhātehi ca atṭhahi lahuhi ti samāno. **muni. la. vutti** ti agga-munino guṇena **ghaṇṭita-bandha-gāthā. kā?** ti, kā nāmā? **rucirā** ti evaṃ-nāmakā⁴⁴ gāthā abhivisesena ra-guṇaṃ⁴⁵ jānāti ti. abhiññā gāraviyate alahukaraṇa ca sena bhaṇiyate ti garu, lahu ...⁴⁶ guṇiyate ti garu-nirutti-nayena,⁴⁷ sānati⁴⁸ vā ...⁴⁹ karotī ti sāna samāpatti tāya sānāya sampannā sānikā gāthā. vaṇṇiyate saṃsiyate⁵⁰ ti vaṇṇo,⁵¹ guṇā sa garu

³⁶A: yussā.

³⁷A: u-kārass' uvattañ ca.

³⁸Indigenous etymology of *bhavana/bhuvana* with reference to the root *bhū* and grammatical formation of the word: *yu* is the technical name of the suffix *-ana-* (cf. Kaccāyana 549 *nandādīhi yu* and 624 or Sadd 859,23); *-u-* *uv-* in words having this suffix.

³⁹So A; B: *te jīnena na ekena aghika*°.

⁴⁰B: *panti*.

⁴¹B: written as *sebbena*.

⁴²A: *samānikā* (here, but later: *sānikā*).

⁴³B: *cava*.

⁴⁴A: *evaṃ-nāmikā*.

⁴⁵So in both mss. Read: °*gaṇaṃ* ?

⁴⁶Very uncertain reading: *ke vyaddhi vya* (??).

⁴⁷Indigenous etymology of the word *garu*.

⁴⁸Any connection with Sadd 398,5 *sāna tejane. tejanaṃ nisānaṃ, sānati* ?

⁴⁹Too uncertain.

⁵⁰So A; B: *pasiyate*.

⁵¹B: *vaṇo*. Indigenous etymology of the word *vaṇṇa*.

*lahu hi rucati dippati ti*⁵² *rucirā*.

(i) What is it (fem.) of the excellent Jina that shines in the world? — His brightness (*ruci* ; i.e. his rays, see *cty raṃsi*).

(ii) What are those (plural masc.) of a suffering creature that he alone kills? — The spokes (*arā*).

(iii–iv) Five higher knowledges [are] heavy, eight light ...⁵³ which is the syllabic verse arrangement produced by the best of the sages? — The (metre) *rucirā*.

The metrical structure of this metre is as follows: 4 × ∪ - ∪ - ∪ - ∪ - ∪ - ∪ - ∪ - ∪ - ∪ - (thus eight light and five heavy syllables; cf. Sadd 8.3.2.4 and Vutt 89). As per Dharmadāsa's model, the riddle verse itself is composed in the metre to be discovered. It is a *rucirā*.

Example 2

(i) *kissa vidhassa jantu muni bhaṅgo*

(ii) *loka-varo 'ssa dhamma-vidutā kā?*

(iii–iv) *vutti lahu ccha pañca garu bandha*

nātha-guṇaṅga-vaṇṇa-racitā kā? — ketumatī.

Commentary: aññam āha: *kiss' icc-ādinā. tattha ketumatī* ti.

(i) *loka-varo muni jantu kissa vidhassa bhaṅgo* (?) ti. *ketu. tattha kissa vidhassā ti kidisassā mānassa, jantu ti jantuno. ketu hi unnati-bhāvena dhaja-sadisassa mānassa ...*⁵⁴ *māno kināti*⁵⁵ *unnamati ti ki unnamati ketu*⁵⁶.

(ii) ⁵⁷*as(s)a dhamma-vidutā kā?* ti *mati. tattha dhamma-vidutā ti dhamma vijānana-bhāvo, mati ti.*

(iii–iv) *pañcāsanāthaguṇaṅgavaṇṇa-racitā lahu ccha pañca garu*

⁵²Indigenous etymology of *rucirā* as the name of the metre, meaning “pleasing, shining, illuminating”.

⁵³Despite the commentary I am at a loss to understand the word *sānikā*.

⁵⁴Uncertain: *vidhati ettha naṃ vidahati ti vivo* (?) in B; A is illegible.

⁵⁵Compare Abhidhamma-avatāra 2 : *kināti vināseti vā para-dukkhan ti karuṇā*.

⁵⁶Etymology of *ketu* connected with the root *ki, kināti*.

⁵⁷This part not in A.

*bandha-vutti kā? ti sa ketumati. tattha akkharehi vutti ti gāthā. lahu pañca (ga?)ru bandha ti saha lahuhi, .. pañca garuhi ca bandha nāma guṇaṅga-vaṇṇa-racitā ti. nāthassa guṇa aṅga ..ehi vaṇṇehi racitā ketumatī ti, evaṃ-nāmikā gāthā akitabbā lakkhittabbā ti akāte yeva aṅgā, garu lahu li una. tatthā ketu viyā ti ketu. .. asā atthi ti ketumati. vutta-nāmaṃ tassa jāti ti.*⁵⁸

(i) A being (?) of which type does the sage, the best in the world, break?⁵⁹ — The banner (i.e. conceit) (*ketu*).

(ii) What is it (fem.) belonging to him that enables him to know the Dhamma? — The intellect (*mati*).

(iii–iv) A metre with six light and five heavy syllables. ...⁶⁰

According to Vutt 111 (and Sadd 8.7.2.16), the metrical structure of the *ketumatī* metre, which belongs to the *visama* category where odd and even quarters are different is as follows: 2 × ○○○○○○○○ -- || ○○○○ ○○○○ --.⁶¹ Five is the number of heavy syllables in the even ones. In our verse, however, this pattern seems to be reversed. The quarters with five heavy syllables are a and d.

The general pattern of the riddles is the same as in the Sanskrit examples: the first two or three questions relate to any topic, but the last one always gives an indication about the structural pattern of the metre to be guessed (number of light and heavy syllables, indicated in an indirect manner to make the matter more attractive!). The first two

⁵⁸This is the text as in B. A (III,36, line 4 to 37, line 2) reads (with some repetitions): *lahu ccha pañca garu bandha-vutti kā? ketumati. tattha vutti ti gāthā. lahu ccha pañca garu bandha ti va lahuhi ceva pañca garuhi bandhā nāma guṇaṅgavaṇṇa racitā ti nāthassa guṇaṅgavaṇṇa racitā. la. pañca garu bandha vutti kā? ketumati. tattha vutti ti gāthā. lahu pañca garu bandha se lahu ceva pañca garuhi bandha nātha guṇaṅgavaṇṇa racitā ti nāthassa guṇaṅgavaṇṇa racitā ketumatī ti eva(ṃ)-nāmakā gāthā akatabba va .a.itabbā va akāte yeva aṅgā va garu lahu ti ti una tatthā ketu viyā ti ketu assā atthi ti ketumati. vutta-nāma-jāti vuttaṃ.*

⁵⁹The syntax is not clear to me.

⁶⁰Not fully clear.

⁶¹*visame sa-jā sa-guru-yuttā ketumatī same bha-ra-na-gā go* (Vutt).

questions are a *charade*: Answer 1 + Answer 2 are components of the complete word (*ruci+arā > ruci'rā*; similarly *ketu+mati > ketumati*).

As could be expected, in contrast with Dharmadāsa's riddles the cultural references of which are Hindu mythology (and this could be a clue to his religious affiliation), the universe of the Pāli Vid is a Buddhist universe. The questions concern the Buddha's personality, his physical and intellectual features.⁶² The answers presuppose a knowledge of the tradition, which is expanded in the commentary. Thus, (ii) of Example 1, where *hanti* "to kill" occurs in the question and *arā* in the answer (equated with *kilesā* in the commentary), is a reference to some of the etymologies of the word *arahaṃ* where two components are distinguished:

arā saṃsāra-cakkassa hatā nāṇāsina yato
loka-nāthena ten' esa arahāna ti pavuccatī ti (quoted in Sadd 579,9-10) or
saṃsāra-cakkassa vā arā kilesā hatā anenā ti arahā .

(Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha)

Similarly, the metrical structure of the *rucirā* with five heavy and eight light syllables is also understood at a doctrinal level and connected with the five *abhiññās* and the eight *samāpattis*. These qualities are ascribed to the Buddha in several passages (e.g. *Mahāvagga-aṭṭhakathā* II 632: *mahāpuriso pana sabbā pi aṭṭha samāpattiyo, pañca abhiññāyo ca nibbattetvā...*; Ja I 30,11). Finally the equation *ketu/māna* (Example 2, i) is common in traditional exegesis, where the two words are synonyms (*māno ahaṃkāro unnati ketu paggaḥo avalepo ti pariyāyā*, Sadd 485,14) or where *ketu-hā* is explained as *māna-ppahāyī* in the commentary on Th 64 (a stanza revolving around the manifold meanings of *ketu*).

On the other hand, the *genre* of learned riddles such as those of Dharmadāsa or his Pāli counterpart implies a special usage of the language where all its niceties and rarities are called for. Monosyllables

⁶²A similar tendency can be observed in Jain riddles whether they are adapted or not from Dharmadāsa's work: the personality of the Jinās is a source of the questions asked. See Balbir 2002.

are one such extreme case. They are not used in our Pāli illustrative verses. Rare words or formations are, however, present. Pāli *aghika* (example 1, ii) seems to be based on *agha* or, at least, seems to be understood in this way by the commentator when he equates *aghika-pajāya* with *dukkhita-pajāya*. This equivalence is similar to Aggavaṃsa's discussion of the word *agha* (Sadd 527,3off.): *aghan ti dukkhaṃ ... agho ti kilesa, tena aghena arahā anagho*. The abstract noun *vidutā* (in *dhamma-vidutā*, example 2, ii) is a secondary derivative from a well-known compound and shows the productivity of the suffix *-tā*.

In brief: for a correct appraisal of the diffusion of Pāli literature, for the understanding of its making and for the establishment of the texts, the intertextual Pāli (or Sanskrit) network to which a given work belongs should not be put aside. For works combining prose with verses, no edition should be published without the basic tools that make it possible to assess the place and possible sources of these verses. This is a necessary stage in the process of any critical edition, as relevant as the consultation of a large number of manuscripts.

Nalini Balbir

REFERENCES

PRIMARY PĀLI SOURCES RELATING TO THE WORKS UNDER CONSIDERATION

Buddhaghosuppatti (Bu-up)

Buddhaghosuppatti or The Historical Romance of the Rise and Career of Buddhaghosa, ed. and trans. by James Gray, Pāli Text Society, 1892, reprinted 2001

(The Burmese edition *Buddhaghosuppatti pāṭh nisya kyam*, Rankun: Praññ krī: mit chve piṭakat Press, 1270 B.E./1908 A.D., mentioned in Braun and Myint 1985: no. 50 could not be consulted.)

Jinālaṅkāra (Jināl)

Jinālaṅkāra or “Embellishments of Buddha” by Buddhārakkhita, ed., with introduction, notes, and trans. by James Gray, Pāli Text Society, London, 1884, reprinted 1981 (Sacred Books of the Buddhists, Vol. XXXVI)

Jinālaṅkāraṭṭikā pāṭh, Rangoon: Sudhammavati Press, 1302 = 1940

(The Sinhalese edition mentioned in von Hinüber 1996 §406 could not be consulted.)

Paṭhamasambodhi (Paṭh, references are to verse numbers in E^c)

E^c = *The Paṭhamasambodhi*, ed. by George Cœdès, edition prepared by Jacqueline Filliozat, Oxford: Pāli Text Society, 2003

S^c = Paṭhamasambodhi composed by Somdet Phra Mahāramaṇa Chao Krom Phra Paramānūjita Jinarasa, transcribed from palm-leaf manuscript in Khom script, first printing, Bangkok, B.E. 2537

Transcription of the Paṭhamasambodhivithara typed by Nai Dad Puñña Bibhida in 1925 made for Sylvain Lévi by order of Son Altesse Royale le Prince de Chandaburi, 408 pages (original kept in the Library of the Institut d’Etudes Indiennes du Collège de France, Paris; shelfmark BUD.PAL.P I.1a and I.1b).

Vidaddhamukhamaṇḍana (Vid)

Manuscripts: see above, section 3.

The Sanskrit version has been published very often. See for instance: *Vidagdhamukhamaṇḍanam of Dharmadāsa Sūri*, with ‘Chandrakalā’ Commentary and Hindi translation, ed. and tr. by Āchārya Śeṣarāja Śarmā, Varanasi, Chaukhambha Orientalia, 1984 (Chaukhambha Prachyaividya Series No. 7). See below, Kraatz 1968.

SECONDARY SOURCES

- Balbir, Nalini, 2001. "À propos d'une *Vie de Buddhaghosa*" in *Bulletin d'Études Indiennes* 19, pp. 342–52
- 2002. "Théorie et pratique de la devinette en milieu jaina: I. Les *Cent soixante et une devinettes* de Jinavallabha; II. Devinettes en contexte", *Bulletin d'Études Indiennes* 20.2, pp. 83–243
- 2004. "Grammatical Riddles from Jain works" in *Jambū-jyoti (Munivara Jambūvijaya Festschrift)*, edited by M.A. Dhaky, J.B. Shah, and Shresthi Kasturbhai Lalbhai Smarak Nidhi, Sharadaben Chimanbhai Educational Research Centre, pp. 269–309
- Bechert, Heinz, 1979. *Burmese Manuscripts*, Part 1, compiled by Heinz Bechert, Daw Khin Khin Su, and Daw Tin Tin Myint, Wiesbaden: F. Steiner (Verzeichnis der Or. Handschriften in Deutschland, Band XXIII, 1)
- and Heinz Braun, 1981. *Pāli Nīti Texts of Burma*, Critical Edition and Study by Heinz Bechert and Heinz Braun, London: Pāli Text Society, 1981 (Text Series No. 171)
- Bizot, F., 1980. "La grotte de la naissance", *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient* 67, pp. 222–73
- Bode, M., 1909. *The Pāli Literature of Burma*, London
- Braun, Heinz, and Daw Tin Tin Myint, 1985. *Burmese Manuscripts*, Part 2, Stuttgart, 1985 (VOHD XXIII,2)
- Cœdès, George, 1912. "Rapport sur une mission d'études philologiques et archéologiques au Cambodge", *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient* 12, 1912, pp. 176–79
- 1916A. "À propos d'une stèle sculptée d'Angkor Vat", *Mémoires concernant l'Asie orientale*, II (1916), pp. 117–22
- 1916B. "Note sur les ouvrages palis composés en pays thai", *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient* 15, 3, 1916, pp. 1–21
- 1968. "Une vie indochinoise du Buddha: la Paṭhamasambodhi", *Mélanges d'indianisme à la mémoire de Louis Renou*, Paris: Publications de l'Institut de Civilisation Indienne 1968: 217–27 (English translation in the PTS ed. of the Paṭhamasambodhi, pp. lv–lxvii)
- Finot, Louis, 1917. "Recherches sur la littérature laotienne", *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient* 17, pp. 1–219

- 1921. “La légende de Buddhaghosa”, in *Cinquantenaire de l’Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes*, Paris, 1921, pp. 101–19
- Gandhavaṃsa, ed. by J. Minayeff, *Journal of the Pāli Text Society* II (1886), pp. 54–80
- Granoff, Phyllis, 1991. “Buddhaghōṣa’s Penance and Siddhasena’s Crime: Remarks on Some Buddhist and Jain Attitudes Towards the Language of Religious Texts”, in *From Benares to Beijing: Essays on Buddhism and Chinese Religion*, ed. by Koichi Shinohara and Gregory Schopen, Oakville, N.Y.: Mosaic Press: 17–33
- von Hinüber, Oskar, 1996. *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter (Indian Philology and South Asian Studies, Vol. 2)
- Hundius, H., 1990. “The colophons of 30 Pāli manuscripts from Northern Thailand”, *Journal of the Pāli Text Society* XIV, pp. 1–173
- Kraatz, Martin, 1968. *Das Vidagghamukhamaṇḍana des Dharmadāsa* (ein Lehrbuch der Rätselkunde 1. und 2. Kapitel), Teil 1 Einleitung, Text und Übersetzung; Teil 2 Kommentare, Anmerkungen. Inauguraldissertation zur Erlangung der Doktorwürde der Philosophischen Fakultät der Philipps-Universität zu Marburg, Marburg/Lahn, 1968
- Law, Bimala Charan, 1923. *The Life and Work of Buddhaghosa*, with a Foreword by Mrs C.A.F. Rhys Davids, Calcutta and Simla (Calcutta Oriental Series No. 9.E.3)
- Luce, G.H., and Tin Htway, 1976. “A 15th Century Inscription and Library at Pagán, Burma” in *Malalasekera Commemoration Volume*, ed. by O.H. De A. Wijesekera, Colombo, 1976, pp. 203–56
- Minayeff, I.P., 1886. See Gandhavaṃsa
- Norman, K.R., 1983. *Pāli Literature Including the Canonical Literature in Prakrit and Sanskrit of All the Hīnayāna Schools of Buddhism*, Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden
- 1994. “The Present State of Pāli Studies, and Future Tasks”, in *Memoirs of the Chūō Academic Research Institute*, No. 23, Dec. 1994: 1–19 = *Collected Papers*, Vol. VI, Oxford: Pāli Text Society, 1996, pp. 68–87
- Saddanīti: La grammaire palie d’Aggavaṃsa*, ed. by Helmer Smith, Lund, 1928–1966

- Schober, Julian, ed., 1997. *Sacred Biography in the Buddhist Traditions of South and Southeast Asia*, University of Hawai'i Press 1997; 1st Indian edition, Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass, 2002
- Skilling, Peter, forthcoming. "'Painted Tipiṭaka' from Wat Thong Noppakhun"
- and Santi Pakdeekham, 2002. *Pāli Literature Transmitted in Central Siam*, Bangkok
- and Santi Pakdeekham, 2004. *Pāli and Vernacular Literature Transmitted in Central and Northern Siam*, Bangkok
- Taylor, James L., 1997. "The Textualization of a Monastic Tradition: Forest Monks, Lineage, and the Biographical Process in Thailand" in Schober 1997, pp. 289–309
- Than Tun, 1960. "The influence of occultism in Burmese history with special reference to Bodawpaya's reign 1782–1819", in *Bulletin of the Burma Historical Commission* Vol. I, Part I, pp. 117–45
- Vutt = *Samgharakkhita's Vuttodaya*. A Study of Pāli Metre. Pāli text and translated into English by R. Siddharatha, with a preface by J.W. de Jong, Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications