

Reuse of Text in Pāli Legal Commentaries

PETRA KIEFFER-PÜLZ

ACADEMY OF SCIENCES AND LITERATURE, MAINZ, GERMANY

petra.kieffer-puelz@adwmainz.de

ABSTRACT

We will examine three types of reuse represented in Pāli legal literature: (1) unacknowledged borrowings of authoritative opinions and definitions adapted (such as by dropping the references given in the source text) and rearranged (*Samantapāsādikā* > *Kaṅkhāvitarāṇī*; fourth to fifth century CE); (2) unacknowledged borrowings of largely unchanged selected text portions being rearranged (*Samantapāsādikā* > *Vinaya-saṅgha*; twelfth century CE); and (3) unconnected extracts of unchanged text portions lined up in the sequence of the source text (for instance *Pātimokkha-padattha-anuvaṇṇanā* > *Vinaya-lakkhaṇa-rāsi*; eighteenth (?) century CE).

KEYWORDS

Pāli commentarial legal literature, *Samantapāsādikā*, *Kaṅkhāvitarāṇī*, *Pālimuttaka-vinayavinicchaya-saṅgha*, *Vinaya-lakkhaṇa-rāsi*, *Pātimokkha-padattha-anuvaṇṇanā*

On cross-language reuses in Pāli literature

The reuse of text is a common phenomenon in ancient Indian literature.¹ Pāli literature is no exception to this.² Acknowledged and unacknowledged borrowings from a broad range of sources written in Pāli, but also in Sanskrit and Sinhalese, can be observed in a variety of types of Pāli texts. The only book on rhetoric in Pāli, Saṅgharakkhita's *Subodhālaṅkāra* (thirteenth century CE), consisting of 367 stanzas, for example, was written with the unacknowledged inclusion of sixty stanzas from Daṇḍin's *Kāvyādarśa* in Pāli translation,³ and the auto-commentary on this book, the *Subodhālaṅkāra-purāṇaṭṭhikā* called *Mahāsāmi*, with the unflagged inclusion of twenty-two to twenty-five stanzas from the same work.⁴ For the

1. For more general reflections, see Freschi 2015; for several types of reuse in a variety of Sanskrit texts, see *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 43(2–5), 2015.
2. See: Kieffer-Pülz 2014, 2015a; Neri 2015; Ruiz-Falqués 2015.
3. Dimitrov 2016, 100. The editor of the *Subodhālaṅkāra* and its commentaries, Jaini, identified three stanzas of the *Subodhālaṅkāra* as adaptations of *Kāvyādarśa* stanzas (Subodh xvi).
4. Dimitrov 2016, 100, n. 26 'twenty-two'; Subodh xvi 'twenty-five'.

auto-commentary Saṅgharakkhita, in addition, resorted without acknowledgement to Ratna's *Ratnaśrī-ṭīkā* (ca. tenth century CE), a Sanskrit commentary on the *Kāvyaādarśa*.⁵ Or another example: the only work on Pāli prosody, Saṅgharakkhita's *Vuttodaya*, is largely based on Kedārabhaṭṭa's Sanskrit work *Vṛttaratnākara*.⁶

In legal literature borrowings from Sanskrit texts are to be expected to a lesser degree, since the Buddhist texts transmitted in Sanskrit belonged to different Vinaya schools, and their texts are not, therefore, relevant for the Theravāda tradition. Nevertheless, even here we find quotations from general Indian Sanskrit sources, grammatical texts, dictionaries, and so on.⁷ Hardly known until now, it seems, is the fact that in the late sixth to seventh century CE representatives of the Theravāda in Sri Lanka, such as Jotipāla, at least partly wrote their works in Sanskrit.⁸ Lance Cousins traced a larger number of Sanskrit stanzas in Parakkamabāhu II's Sinhalese paraphrase to the *Visuddhimagga* (between ca. CE 1258 and 1270⁹) as coming from Jotipāla's works.¹⁰ Some of these stanzas are found again, translated into Pāli, in Sumaṅgala's commentaries to the *Abhidhammāvatāra* and the *Abhidhammattha-saṅgaha* (twelfth/thirteenth century CE).¹¹

Borrowings from Sinhalese literature, translated into Pāli, are even more likely to occur, since there are close relationships between texts in Sinhalese and Pāli. Pāli texts were translated into Sinhalese, commented upon in Sinhalese, and authors of Pāli works relied on earlier Sinhalese texts.¹² Sumaṅgala, who wrote his *Abhidhammattha-saṅgaha-mahāṭīkā* in only twenty-four days, could resort not only to his own earlier and fuller Pāli commentary on the *Abhidhammāvatāra*, but also

5. See for example Subodh-pṭ 50,15–17 [ad Subodh vs. 32]: *tesaṃ vikappānaṃ sambhedo saṅkaro missattam uccāraṇappakāro yoni pabhavo yesaṃ te sambhedayoniyo bheda pakāra accantabahavo atisayena bahulā yathāvuttanayena sambhavanti*. Compare Rś-ṭ 103,7–8 [ad Kāvyaādarśa 3.3]: *teṣāṃ sapṭānāṃ vikalpānāṃ sambhedāḥ saṅkaro miśratvam uccāvacaprakāraḥ yoniḥ prabhavo yeṣāṃ te sambhedayonayaḥ | bhedaḥ prakāraḥ atyantabahavo bhūyāṃso bhavanti*. For another example see Dimitrov 2016, 101, n. 29 (Subodh-pṭ 16,3–6 [ad Subodh vss. 6–7] = Rś-ṭ 11 [ad Kāvyaādarśa 1.15c]).

6. Fryer 1877, 369; Kieffer-Pülz (in preparation).

7. For instance in the *Vajirabuddhi-ṭīkā*, the first sub-commentary on the *Vinaya*, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013, I, 100–102, 129–131, 173–174.

8. Cousins 2011; Cousins 2013.

9. According to Paranavitana (1960, 625) Parakkamabāhu II (1236–1271 CE) in his twenty-second year (1258 CE) 'was afflicted with an incurable disease which made him stammer in speech,' and which led to his entrusting the actual control of affairs to a minister, and later (ca. 1262 CE) to his eldest son. This information is based on a text probably written after the sixteenth century CE, the *Alutnuvara Dēvālaya Karavīma* (Jayatilaka 1965, 63, 70–71), the reliability of which is uncertain (Obeyesekere 2013, 8 and n. 11). It is normally this later time of life to which Parakkamabāhu's literary activities are attributed, because it is considered the life period in which he had time for such tasks. We can, however, not exclude that he wrote his commentary on the *Vinayavinichaya* in his early years, when he was educated within the Buddhist *saṅgha*. At least this is the period of his life when he most probably came into contact with this text.

10. Cousins 2013, § 4.

11. Kieffer-Pülz 2015b, Appendix B 3.2.1; 3.2.3; 3.3.5.

12. The reuse of text also works vice versa, that is from Pāli to Sinhalese texts. Probably some of these borrowings were translated into Sinhala, but we also have references for a simple transfer of the Pāli text to the Sinhalese commentary, sometimes also openly marked as a quotation, as can be seen in the *Kudusikapurātana-vistara-sannaya* (Kieffer-Pülz 2013, I, 205–206) and the *Kaikhāvitaraṇi-piṭapota* (Kieffer-Pülz 2013, I, 24–26 and n. 52).

to his teacher's Sinhalese paraphrase on Anuruddha's *Abhidhammattha-saṅgaha*,¹³ that is on Sāriputta's *Abhidharmartha-saṅgraha-purāṇa-sannaya*.¹⁴ The dominant role of Sinhalese texts in addition is documented by the large number of quotations from Sinhalese commentaries preserved in Pāli translations in Pāli legal literature. Since the earliest known commentaries, such as the *Sihalaṭṭhakathā* (from around the first century BCE onwards), quoted in extant commentaries and subcommentaries, as well as most of the Sinhalese glossaries (*gaṇṭhipada*, sgh. *gāṭapadaya*; from about the fifth or sixth century CE onwards) quoted in the subcommentarial literature (*ṭīkā*, from around the tenth century CE onwards¹⁵), are no longer extant, it is impossible to determine the degree to which they were silently reused, but that this was the case, can be proved by an isolated example. The *Vanavinisa* called *Nissandeha*, a Sinhalese paraphrase on Buddhaddatta's *Vinayavinicchaya* (ca. sixth century CE) ascribed to Parakkamabāhu II,¹⁶ who is reported to have written it in the latter part of his life (ca. CE 1258–70, see n. 9), is lost. But, in addition to seventeen explicit quotations from this text preserved in Pāli translation in the *Vinayavinicchaya-ṭīkā*,¹⁷ we have at least one quotation in Sinhalese transmitted in the anonymous and undated *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī-piṭapota*, to be dated after the *Nissandeha* and before the *Vinayavinicchaya-ṭīkā*.¹⁸ The *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī-piṭapota* is a Sinhalese glossary to the *Pātimokkha* containing Pāli and Sinhalese quotations.¹⁹ The Sinhalese quotation from the *Nissandeha* traced in the *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī-piṭapota* clearly proves that the author of the *Vinayavinicchaya-ṭīkā*, in addition to openly marked translated quotations from the *Nissandeha*, also silently borrowed from this text, since the portion in the *Vinayavinicchaya-ṭīkā*

13. Wijeratne and Gethin 2002, xvi–xvii.

14. For the *Abhidhammattha-saṅgaha-mahā-ṭīkā*, Sumaṅgala more or less translated the Sinhalese prose portions of the *Abhidharmartha-saṅgraha-purāṇa-sannaya* into Pāli. The Sinhalese commentary is interspersed with Pāli stanzas, most of which Sumaṅgala took over without any change. From the 111 stanzas of the *Abhidh-s-mhṭ* (this includes 12 stanzas for the introduction and the colophon), 69 stem from the *Abhidh-s-sn*. For five examples, see Kieffer-Pülz 2015b: B 3.3. As an example of the translation of the prose, here the beginning of the *Abhidh-s-sn* and the *Abhidh-s-mhṭ* is given: *Abhidh-s-sn* 1,6–10: *parama vicitra naya samanvita vū svasamaya samayāntara gahanayehi bāsagānmaṭa samartha vū, atīṣaya nirmala vipula prandāpāṭava janaka vū mē prakaraṇaya karanu kāmāti Anuruddhācāryapādasō paḷamu koṭa ratnatraya praṇāmābhidheya karaṇa prakāra prakaraṇābhidhāna prayojanaya yata mē pañcārthaya dakvana piṇisa, sāmmā**; *Abhidh-s-mhṭ* B° 53,13–17: *parama-vicitta-naya-samannāgataṃ sakasamaya-samayantara-gahana-viggāhaṇa-samatthaṃ suvimala-vipula-paññāveyyatti-yajanaṇaṃ pakaraṇaṃ idam ārabhanto 'yaṃ ācariyo paṭhamam tava ratanattaya-paṇāmābhidheyya-karaṇa-ppakāra-pakaraṇābhidhāna-payojanāni dassetuṃ sammāsambuddhan ty ādim āha*. [Unitalicised are *pratikas*].

15. The first *ṭīkā*s are as early as the late sixth or early seventh century CE (Ananda's *Mūla-ṭīkā*). But in the frame of legal literature the *Vajirabuddhi-ṭīkā* (ca. tenth century CE) is the earliest.

16. Wickremasinghe 1900, xvii; Hettiaratchi 1960, 772. Malalasekera 1994, 214, wrongly states that the *Nissandeha* is a Sinhalese translation of the *Vinayavinicchaya*.

17. Kieffer-Pülz 2013, I, 52.

18. In Kieffer-Pülz 2013, I, 24, n. 50, I still gave two alternative datings for this text after tenth and before twelfth century CE or after the late twelfth and before the second third of the thirteenth century CE, since I had not yet traced the quotation from the *Nissandeha*. If the ascription of the *Nissandeha* to Parakkamabāhu II. is correct, then only the latter of the two dates is possible.

19. Kieffer-Pülz 2013, I, 24–26, n. 50–52.

given below clearly is a translation from the Sinhalese commentary (unitalicised words are *pratīkas*).

Vinayavinicchaya-ṭikā II 278,8–15 (vs. 2770) *Nissandeha in Kkh-pīpo* 131,27–34

ettha gūḷhasalākaggāho nāma
dhammavādisalākā ca
adhammavādisalākā ca viṣuṃ viṣuṃ
cīvara-kaṇṇe pakkhipitvā puggalānaṃ
santikaṃ viṣuṃ viṣuṃ upasaṅkamitvā
salākā viṣuṃ viṣuṃ dassetvā ‘īto tava
ruccanakaṃ gaṇhāhi’ ti raho ṭhatvā
gāhāpanaṃ.

vivaṭakaṃ nāma dhammavādināṃ
bahubhāvaṃ ṇatvā sabbesu jānantesu
puggalānaṃ santikaṃ gāhāpanaṃ.

kaṇṇajappanaṃ nāma evaṃ eva
kaṇṇamūle raho ṭhatvā gāhāpanaṃ.

‘gūḷhasalākagāha nam
dharmavādī lahapat da
adharmavādī lahapat da <ven> ven koṭṭā
sivuru kaṇā evā geṇā puṅgulaṃ
karā vena vena eḷaṃbā
lahapat ven ven koṭṭā pā “min
risiyena lahapatak ganva” yi rahasin kiyā
gānvīm.

vivaṭaka nam dharmavādīn
bahutara sē dākā hāmadenā gannā sē
dākā hāmadenā dannā sē gānvīm.

sakaṇṇajappaka nam mesē mā bumunā
kiyā gānvīm’ yānu NISSANDEHA yi.

The Pāli legal commentarial literature²⁰

Before we turn to the examples of reuse to be discussed in more detail here, I have to shortly sketch the situation of the preserved Pāli legal commentarial literature. The starting point is the monastic law code (*Vinaya*) consisting of the *Suttavibhaṅga* centred around the *Pātimokkha*, the *Khandhakas* grouped around the formulas for carrying out legal acts (*kammavācā*), and the *Parivāra*, a systematical handbook. By and large, this *Vinaya* extends to over 2250 standard pages.²¹ The commentary on the whole *Vinayapiṭaka*, the *Samantapāsādikā* (ca. 1400 standard pages), ascribed to Buddhaghosa by tradition,²² is the largest and most important commentary written on legal topics. It contains numerous quotations from earlier lost commentaries and sayings of *Vinaya* specialists. Slightly younger is the *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī* (ca. 274 standard pages), a commentary on the separately transmitted *Pātimokkha*, also ascribed to Buddhaghosa by tradition, but certainly not written by the same author as the *Samantapāsādikā*.²³ Both commentaries were subsequently commented upon in a number of sub-commentaries written in what are now known as Sri Lanka, Burma, and Thailand. Leaving aside the ones preserved in quotations only, we know of five still extant subcommentaries to the *Samantapāsādikā* and six or more to the *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī*, all dating from between the tenth and nineteenth centuries CE.

20. See Appendix 1–3; for a more detailed overview see Kieffer-Pülz 2015c.

21. One standard page consists of 1500 characters.

22. For a discussion of this ascription, see von Hinüber 1996a, §220.

23. That this commentary is younger can be seen from its more developed classification system. Some other passages also show a further development compared to the *Samantapāsādikā*. In this regard, see Kieffer-Pülz 2012, 20–24. Its author sometimes uses a terminology slightly deviating from that used in the *Samantapāsādikā* (von Hinüber 1996a, §223).

The extensive nature of the *Vinaya* and *Samantapāsādikā* led to the creation of a number of *Vinaya* condensations in around the fifth or sixth century CE, written in verse or predominantly in verse, namely Mahānāma's *Mūlasikkhā* (ca. eight standard pages), Dhammasiri's *Khuddasikkhā* (ca. 34 standard pages), and Buddhaddatta's *Vinaya-* and *Uttaravinicchaya* (ca. 240 standard pages). They are followed in the twelfth century CE by Sāriputta's prose digest, the *Vinaya-saṅgaha* or *Pālimuttaka-vinayavinicchaya-saṅgaha* (ca. 537 standard pages), belonging to the genre of *saṅgaha*-literature. These *saṅgahas* seem to generally consist of unchanged reused text.²⁴ Further *saṅgahas* on *Vinaya* matters survived in traces or are still hidden in unread manuscripts.²⁵ All these condensations and digests were commented upon. For the *Mūlasikkhā* three subcommentaries are attested, of which two are accessible in editions at present; for the *Khuddasikkhā* we have two edited commentaries, for the *Vinayavinicchaya* one, although reportedly there existed four. The *Pālimuttaka-vinayavinicchaya-saṅgaha* was commented upon twice. Since all these texts deal more or less detailed with the same regulations, their authors made ample use of the other available texts and commentaries, whether written on the *Vinaya-piṭaka*, the *Pātimokkha*, or on one of the various *Vinaya* condensations and digests. Accordingly an extraordinarily large intertextuality is to be observed in these commentaries.

Last but not least, a type of literature is to be mentioned that originated in Burma, namely the *lakkhaṇa-rāsi-* or *mhat cu*-literature. These are books consisting in collections of phrases extracted from earlier Pāli texts. Such *lakkhaṇa-rāsi* texts include ones for the *Vinaya*. Two such compilations are known up to now in manuscript form, namely Nāṇinda's *Vinaya-lakkhaṇa-rāsi* (ca. eighteenth (?) century CE)²⁶ and the anonymous and undated *Vinaya-saṅkhepa-rāsi* (after the thirteenth century CE).²⁷ They assemble excerpts from the *Vinaya* and from various subcommentaries.

Examples of reuse

Three examples of reuse are to be presented in the following, (1) the unacknowledged borrowing of text from the *Samantapāsādikā*, changed, adapted and supplemented in the *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī*; (2) the unacknowledged borrowing of text from the *Samantapāsādikā*, unchanged, but rearranged in the *Vinaya-saṅgaha*, and (3) the collection of unconnected extracts of text portions lined up in the sequence of the source text illustrated by excerpts from the *Pātimokkhapadatta-anuvaṇṇanā* in the *Vinaya-lakkhaṇa-rāsi*.

Reuse of text from the *Samantapāsādikā* in the *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī*

As stated above (p. 12), the *Samantapāsādikā* and *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī* do not stem from one author, and the *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī* is slightly younger. Regarding the length of the texts, the portion of the *Samantapāsādikā* largely corresponding to the

24. For the *Sārasaṅgaha*, see Neri 2015.

25. Jayawickrama 1972–73, 171–172 No. 67, where a *Vinayālaṅkāra-saṅgaha* is attributed to Vācissara; Kieffer-Pülz and Peters 2002, *Vinaya-saṅkhepaṭṭhakathā* which is a shorter and differently structured version than the *Vinaya-saṅgaha*.

26. Kieffer-Pülz and Peters 2002, 117–127.

27. Peters forthcoming, no. 1599.

Kaṅkhāvitarāṇī – namely the sections on the *Pātimokkha* and *Suttavibhaṅga* – is more than three times longer.²⁸

A comparison of the first two chapters of the *Kaṅkhāvitarāṇī* with the *Samantapāsādikā* shows the degree of matching.²⁹ In its *Nidāna* chapter, which is 31,753 characters long, amounting to 21.16 standard pages, 27.5% of the text is drawn from the *Samantapāsādikā*: 8753 characters = 5.83 standard pages. In the *Pārājika* chapter, which is 37,874 characters long = 25.25 standard pages, 30.5% of the text is drawn from the *Samantapāsādikā*: 11,543 characters = 7.7 standard pages.

Despite the numerous parallel passages, the *Kaṅkhāvitarāṇī* is not a pasticcio, but a skillfully woven text. Whereas the *Samantapāsādikā* contains a multitude of opinions, arguments and statements from a variety of sources, of which the one considered authoritative is quoted last,³⁰ the author of the *Kaṅkhāvitarāṇī* solely gives the relevant, that is the authoritative opinion, definition, and so on, without mentioning the source.³¹ The definition of a ‘village’ and the ‘vicinity of a village’ from the commentary on *Pārājika* 2 for monks (see opposite page) dealing with theft may serve as an example (parallel passages are put in italics, names of sources in small caps, *pratīkas* are underlined).

As this example shows, the author of the *Kaṅkhāvitarāṇī* used the *Samantapāsādikā* as a treasure chest. In our example he took over the definition for defining the boundary of an unenclosed village from the *Mahā-Aṭṭhakathā*, quoted as the last and, therefore, the authoritative source in the *Samantapāsādikā* (see n. 30). Since the author of the *Kaṅkhāvitarāṇī* only quoted this, but none of the preceding definitions, there was no need for him to keep the source marker (*Mahā-Aṭṭhakathāyaṃ ti vuttaṃ*), which he accordingly dropped. From another passage of the *Samantapāsādikā* he borrowed the information regarding an enclosed village while dropping the rest. In the last sentence he added to this information explaining how one should act in case an enclosed village has two thresholds. For that he borrowed parts from the *Samantapāsādikā*’s explanation to the *pratīka indakhīle thitassa*, skipping the *pratīka*.

This is the standard method of how the author of the *Kaṅkhāvitarāṇī* tackles text passages from the *Samantapāsādikā*. It, however, does not prevent him from occasionally also taking over longer unchanged passages.³² The example given above clearly shows that he did not blindly copy the source. text, but rather selected passages without acknowledgement, adapting and supplementing them. He reused opinions and definitions considered authoritative generally dropping the source markers, ignored opinions considered insignificant, and omitted *pratīkas* without parallel in the *Pātimokkha*, and so on.

28. Although the *Kaṅkhāvitarāṇī* comments on the *Pātimokkha* it also deals with topics such as the performance of the observance ceremony (*uposatha*), the determination of a monastic boundary (*sīmā*), the various types of probation (*parivāsa*), and so on, dealt with in the *Khandhaka* sections of Sp. In the Kkh these topics are discussed in the introduction and in the concluding sections to the various classes of offences.

29. For the list of parallels see Appendix 4.

30. Sp II 300,8–9, see von Hinüber 1996b, 107; Kieffer-Pülz 2013, I [Z 36] [2].

31. The only exception is Kkh 189,7–8, where the *Mahāpaccarī* is quoted with a deviating designation, namely *antovuttham* for *mukhasannidhi*, see Kieffer-Pülz 2013, III [Z 354] [1].

32. For instance Kkh 83,27–84,16 = Sp VI 1176,16–1177,14; Kkh 84,17–85,10 = Sp VI 1177,14–1178,8; etc.

Kaṅkhaṅvitarāṇī 41,21–42,1

leḍḍussa patanaṭṭhānabbhantaram gāmo nāma.

tato aññassa leḍḍupātassa abbhantaram gāmūpacāro nāma. (Kkh 41,21–23)

[the space] within [the range of] the falling place of a [thrown] clod of earth ... means ‘village’. [The space] within [the range of] another throw of a clod of earth [thrown] from there means ‘vicinity of a village’.

patitassa pana leḍḍuno pavattitvā gataṭṭhānaṃ na gaheṭṭabbhaṃ. (Kkh 41,23–24)

The place where the clod rolls after it has fallen is not to be taken into consideration.

parikkhittassa pana gāmassa parikkhepo yeva gāmassa paricchedo. (Kkh 41,24–25)

In the case of an enclosed village, however, only the enclosure [constitutes] the exact determination of a village.

tassa sace dve indakhilā honti abbhantarime indakhile ṭhitassa leḍḍupātabbhantaram gāmūpacāro nāma. (Kkh 41,25–42,1)

If [such an enclosed village] has two thresholds, [the space] inside [the resting place] of the fallen clod [thrown by someone] standing by the innermost threshold means ‘vicinity of a village’.

Samantapāsādikā II 299,24–300,7.19–21; 299,5–7

‘...’ ti KURUNDAṬṬHAKATHĀYAM vuttaṃ.

MAHĀPACCARIYAM pi tādīsam eva.

MAHĀ-ATṬHAKATHĀYAM pana (Sp II 299,24–25)

‘...’ is said in the KURUNDAṬṬHAKATHĀ.

Just such like [is the statement] in

the MAHĀPACCARĪ too. But in the MAHĀ-

ATṬHAKATHĀ it is said:

“*leḍḍupātabbhantaram gāmo nāma.*

tato aññassa leḍḍupātassa abbhantaram gāmūpacāro nāmā’ ti vuttaṃ. (Sp II 300,5–7)

‘[the space] within [the range of] one throw of a clod of earth means ‘village’. [The space] within [the range of] another throw of a clod of earth [thrown] from there means ‘vicinity of a village’.

idam ettha pamāṇaṃ. (Sp II 300,7).

This is the right measure in this context.

idha gāmo nāma duvidho hoti: parikkhitto ca aparikkhitto ca. (Sp II 300,19–20)

Here the village is of two types: enclosed and not enclosed.

tatra parikkhittassa parikkhepo yeva paricchedo. (Sp II 300,20–21)

There in the case of an enclosed [village] only the enclosure [constitutes] the exact determination.

indakhile ṭhitassā ti (Vin III 46,28) *yassa gāmassa Anurādhapurasseva dve indakhilā, tassa abbhantarime indakhile ṭhitassa, tassa hi bāhiro indakhilo.* (Sp II 299,5–7).

Of one standing on the threshold, means: if an [enclosed] village like Anurādhapura has two thresholds, [the throw] of [someone] standing by the innermost threshold [indicates the ‘vicinity of a village’*].

* The additions in this paragraph are based on the Vinaya passage commented upon here.

Sometimes he also referred explicitly to the *Samantapāsādikā* for a more detailed analysis.³³ In this manner he unobtrusively and prudently wove together different threads of reused text, and created a concise and clearly structured systematic commentary on the *Pātimokkha*.

Reuse of text in Sāriputta's *Pālimuttaka-vinayavinicchaya-saṅgha* or *Vinaya-saṅgha*

The second example for the unacknowledged reuse of a text is the 'Digest of Vinaya rulings independent of the canonical text' (*pālimuttaka-vinayavinicchaya-saṅgha*), also called the 'Vinaya Digest'³⁴ (*Vinaya-saṅgha*) written by Sāriputta of Poḷonnaruva (twelfth century CE).³⁵ As the title indicates, the *Vinaya-saṅgha* is

33. There are sixteen explicit references (see Kkh 580 'Index of Words') to the *Samantapāsādikā* for a more elaborate discussion of the respective topic (*vitthārato/vithāro Samantapāsādikāyaṃ vuttā'o*, etc., Kkh 86,10–11.23–24; 100,22; 106,6–7, etc.).

34. Pālim 1,5–8:
vatthuttayaṃ namassivā saraṇaṃ sabbapāṇinaṃ
Vinaye pāṭavathāya yogāvacarabhikkhunaṃ
vippakiṇṇaṃ anekattha pālimuttavinicchayaṃ
samāharitvā ekattha dassayissaṃ anākulaṃ.

'Having payed homage to the three [sacred] objects (i.e. Buddha, Dhamma, and Saṅgha) [which are] the refuge for all breathing beings, having assembled the regulation[s] strewn all over [the text] in various places independent from [their arrangement in] the text, I will give [them] in one place unconfused, for the skill in the Vinaya of the monks who are practitioners of spiritual discipline.'

Pālim 468,7–12:
ajjhesito narindena so 'haṃ Parakkamabāhunā
saddhammatthitikāmena sāsanujjotakārīnā
ten' eva kārite ramme pāsādasatamaṇḍite
nānādumaṇḍakīṇe bhāvanābhīratālaye
sitalūdakasaṃpanne vasaṃ Jetavane imaṃ
Vinaya-saṅghaṃ saraṇaṃ akāsi yoginaṃ hitaṃ.

'At the request of Parakkamabāhu, king of men, who desires the duration of the true Doctrine [and] causes the illumination of the religion, while residing at the delightful Jetavana which he alone had caused to be built, adorned with a hundred terraces, surrounded by different types of trees, a place enjoyed in meditation, furnished with cool waters, I composed this most excellent *Vinaya-saṅgha* ('Digest of the Vinaya') for the benefit of practitioners.' (Based on Crosby 2006: 53).

This colophon is nearly identical with the colophon to Sāriputta's auto-commentary *Anuttānapadavaṇṇana*, insofar the translation by Crosby could be relied on also for this colophon.

Sāriputta's *Pālimuttaka-vinayavinicchaya-saṅgha-purāṇa-ṭīkā* (Kieffer-Pülz 1992; Crosby 2006) also mentions the *mūla*-text by the title *Vinaya-saṅgha*, and declares that it was written 'out of compassion for practitioners' (*anukampāya yoginaṃ kate Vinaya-saṅgahe | karissāmi samāyena Anuttānatthadīpaniṃ*, Pālim-pt 1,6–7).

35. The author is not mentioned in the text itself, but his authorship is beyond doubt, since the name of the author, and his work, the *Vinaya-saṅgha*, are mentioned in the colophon of Sāriputta's *Abhidhammattha-saṅgha-sannaya* (Abhidh-s-sn 283,8–9: *Sārisutena yatinā gurunā guṇena, yoginaṃ upakārāya kato Vinaya-saṅgho*. 'By the monk Sārisuta ('son of Sāri' = Sāriputta), the teacher, possessed of good qualities, the *Vinaya-saṅgha* has been made for the benefit of the practitioners.' We do not know whether this colophon originally belonged to the *Abhidhammattha-saṅgha-sannaya* or whether an original colophon was extended, or whether the entire colophon was added later. The fact that this *nigamana* of a Sinhalese text is written in Pāli, however, is itself no reason to doubt its authenticity. This is a practice

a summary of the *Vinaya* as a whole, and it is independent of any canonical text. Therefore, the author was not forced by a *mūla* text to discuss specific topics, but could choose his themes freely, and handle them in any desired order. This, in fact, is the stated purpose of the *Vinaya-saṅgaha* as expressed in its introductory stanza. From this stanza we, further, learn that the digest is intended for the benefit of monks who are practitioners of spiritual discipline (that is meditation) (*yogāvacara-bhikkhūnaṃ*).³⁶

The digest begins with a list (*mātikā*) of thirty-four keywords. Each of them is dealt with in their own chapter.³⁷ The first twenty-one chapters treat aspects of the daily life of monks.³⁸ Chapter twenty-two onwards describe how various ceremonies of the Buddhist community should be carried out,³⁹ how a monk was to be accused (*codeti*; ch. 31), how offences were to be removed (*āpattivuṭṭhāna*, ch. 32), what types of legal acts existed (*kammākamma*, ch. 33), and so on.⁴⁰ The chapters stretch from two and a half standard pages for meat eating to sixty-two standard pages regarding the removal of grave offences (*garukāpatti-vuṭṭhānavinicchaya-kathā*, ch. 32).

also found elsewhere, for instance in Gotama's *Sambandhacintā-sannaya* (Sbc-sn 98,17–29), thirteenth century CE. The ascription to Sāriputta is further confirmed by the colophon of Dhammakitti's *Dāṭhavaṃsa* (first quarter of the thirteenth century CE). There Dhammakitti mentions his teacher, Sāriputta, and several of his works, among them the *Vinaya-saṅgaha* written 'for the benefit of the self-controlled community exerting itself in meditation', *Dāṭh* vss. 409–410:

yo Candagomiracite varasaddasatthe
 ṭikaṃ pasattham akarittha ca Pañcīkāya
 buddhappabhāvajananīṃ ca akā Samanta-
 pāsādikāya Vinayaṭṭhakathāya ṭikaṃ. [409]
 Aṅguttarāgamavaraṭṭhakathāya ṭikaṃ
 sammohavibbhamavighātakarīṃ akāsi
 atthāya saṃyamigaṇassa padhānikassa
 ganthaṃ akā Vinayasāṅghanāmadheyyaṃ. [410]

'He who composed a highly praised sub-commentary on the Pañcīkā [being itself a sub-commentary] on the excellent grammar written by Candragomin, and [who also] composed a sub-commentary on the *Samantapāsādikā*, the commentary on the *Vinaya*, that causes the promotion of knowledge, (409) [and who also] composed a sub-commentary on the excellent commentary on the *Aṅguttarāgama* (i.e. *Aṅguttaranikāya*), that removes confusions and errors, for the benefit of the self-controlled community exerting itself in meditation compiled the book named *Vinayasāṅgaha*.' (Translation of vs. 409 based on Dimitrov 2010, 34).

The ascription to Sāriputta is further confirmed by Gv 61,31 and Sās 33,38.

36. Pālim 1,5–8, see n. 34. The purpose of the *Vinaya-saṅgaha* in addition is also mentioned in *Abhidh-s-sn* (n. 35) and in *Dāṭh* (n. 35).
37. Other numberings of the chapters result from a further subdivision of single chapters. See Kieffer-Pülz and Peters 2002, 121 and n. 28.
38. It begins with the regulations concerning a monk's day sojourn (ch. 1), followed by those for requisites (ch. 2), medicine (ch. 3), the carrying out of *paritta* ceremonies (ch. 3), the reception of guests (ch. 3), hinting at objects one wants (ch. 4), winning over families (ch. 5), eating meat and fish (ch. 6), rules for objects not to be touched (ch. 7), for the allotting and assigning objects (ch. 8), for not being separated from the robes (ch. 9), for locking up things (ch. 10), for bartering (ch. 11), for accepting money (ch. 12), and so on.
39. 'Novice ordination' (*pabbajjā*), ch. 22; 'observance' (*uposatha*) and 'invitation ceremony' (*pavāraṇā*), ch. 25, and so on.
40. The final chapter assembles scattered material and begins with its own *mātikā* listing the topics.

The whole *Vinaya-saṅgaha* consists of reused text,⁴¹ except for: some connectives necessary to link passages borrowed from various locations; Śāriputta's judgements with respect to opinions quoted in the *Samantapāsādikā* (see below); and eventually some *kammavācās* (formulas for legal acts) that have not been traced elsewhere. The *Samantapāsādikā* is clearly the main source of the *Vinaya-saṅgaha*. Complete chapters of the latter consist of continuous text borrowed from a single location within the *Samantapāsādikā* (ch. 1, 4, 7, and so on), others are composed of passages from different parts (ch. 2, 3, 5, 6, 28, and so on). But Śāriputta has also drawn material from the *Kaṅkhāvitarāṇī*. Since the *Kaṅkhāvitarāṇī* often has the same text as the *Samantapāsādikā*, it can be identified as the source only where the text in the *Vinaya-saṅgaha* as a whole is given in an identical manner in the *Kaṅkhāvitarāṇī*, whereas the same passage is scattered over various places in the *Samantapāsādikā* or has some minor variants. This is the case in at least two chapters.⁴² At least once Śāriputta has also borrowed text from the *Sumaṅgalavilāsini*, Buddhaghosa's commentary on the *Dīghanikāya*.⁴³ Furthermore, the *Vinaya* is used as a source, among others for the *kammavācās* which Śāriputta adds to the explications borrowed from the *Samantapāsādikā*. But from the thirty-five *kammavācās* transmitted in the *Vinaya-saṅgaha*, only twelve stem from the *Vinaya*.⁴⁴ The other twenty-three *kammavācās* could not

41. Oskar von Hinüber (1996a, §334) mentions *Vinaya* and *Samantapāsādikā* as sources. According to Kate Crosby (2006, 55–56) 'The Pālimuttakavinayavinicchayaśaṅgaha, as has been described above, is a compilation of the legalistic content of the *Samantapāsādikā* rearranged according to subject matter. As such it contains no material not found within the *Samantapāsādikā* itself, with the exception of a few connectives. These are added where two excerpts from Sp on a related topic are extracted from different narrative locations. Simple connectives replace the narrative framework so that it can be used as a straightforward legal handbook that reads smoothly in complete sentences.' Crosby (2006, 56, n. 22), however, admits that she only checked chapter twenty-two on *pabbajjā*.

42. Chapter 24 on the monastic boundary (*sīmā*), see Kieffer-Pülz 1992, 183–184, n. 70, and chapter 32 on the removal of grave offences. Whether this is valid also for other chapters needs investigation.

43. Namely for the manner in which to carry out *Paritta* ceremonies (ch. 3). Whether or not this is the only instance of a borrowing from a non-Vinaya text needs further investigation.

Interestingly, Śāriputta takes over the whole explanation from the *Sumaṅgalavilāsini-purāṇa-ṭīkā* ascribed to Dhammapāla in his auto-commentary – for the most part a rearranged *Sāratthadīpanī* – on this passage (Pālim-pt 10,14–38 = Sv-pt III 208,19–209,16). According to Pecenko, Śāriputta not only wrote a sub-subcommentary on the *Āṅuttaranikāya* (partly edited by Pecenko 1996–99), but also on the other three collections of the *Suttapiṭaka* (Pecenko 2002). It is, however, conspicuous that in the various enumerations of Śāriputta's works only the *Āṅuttara-ṭīkā* is mentioned (Abhidh-s-sn, Dāth, n. 35), but nowhere do we find a reference to a *ṭīkā* by him on the *Dīgha*-, *Majjhima*-, or *Samyuttanikāya*. From that point of view Pecenko's assumption seems not to be very probable. A comparison of Śāriputta's *nava-ṭīkā* on the *Āṅuttaranikāya* with the *purāṇa-ṭīkā* ascribed to Dhammapāla made obvious that Śāriputta took over the entire *purāṇa-ṭīkā* simply adding several portions mostly borrowed from one of the other *purāṇa-ṭīkā*s. Thus Śāriputta definitely was familiar with the *purāṇa-ṭīkā*s on the *Dīgha*-, *Majjhima*-, and *Samyuttanikāya* (Kieffer-Pülz forthcoming).

44. Chapter 12 (*kāyavikkaya*): Pālim 67,9–16 = Vin III 238,29–36 [Niss 19 M]; chapter 19 (*kappiyabhūmi*): Pālim 110,19–26 = Vin I 239,12–19 [Mv VI 33.2]; chapter 24 (*sīmā*): Pālim 184,26–185,6 = Vin I 106,9–19 [Mv II 6.2]; Pālim 185,12–24 = Vin I 109,12–22 [Mv II 12.2]; Pālim 193,7–16 = Vin I 110,16–25 [Mv I 12.5]; Pālim 193,18–194,3 = Vin I 27–36 [Mv II 12.6]; chapter 28 (*catupaccayabhājanīya*): Pālim 243,28–244,6 = Vin I 283,25–33 [Mv VIII 5.2]; Pālim 244,17–24 = Vin I 284,6–14 [Mv VII 6.2]; Pālim 260,5–15 = Vin I 304,6–16 [Mv VII 27.2]; chapter 29 (*kathina*):

be traced in the *Vinaya* or any commentary. All twenty-three are transmitted in chapter thirty-two where the methods for removing *saṅghādisesa* offences are dealt with.⁴⁵ Either Sāriputta wrote these *kammavācās* himself or he borrowed them from some unknown *kammavācā* collection.⁴⁶ In the light of the fact that in his other Pāli works Sāriputta mainly borrowed from other texts, the latter is the most probable.⁴⁷

Sāriputta's own contributions⁴⁸ are few. In addition to the connectives alluded to by Crosby,⁴⁹ and the *kammavācās* just mentioned, he definitely appended judgements to the various opinions quoted in the *Samantapāsādikā*. But these are not so much his own judgements as rather explicit expressions of information only implicitly related in the *Samantapāsādikā* via the position the respective opinion has in a sequence of opinions. Knowing that as a rule the author of the *Samantapāsādikā* presents the authoritative opinion last, but not applying that same rule when composing his text, Sāriputta had to pass judgement on the opinions for the reader of the *Vinaya-saṅgaha*, and this he did at least in some chapters (ch. 1, 7). As an example the seventh chapter may serve (Pālim 28,1–31,16 ≠ Sp III 541,27–544,2). In both texts the paragraphs given below are found in a single location. The portions identical in both are put in italics. Underlined we have Sāriputta's judgements added to the *Samantapāsādikā* text⁵⁰:

Pālim 298,29–299,8 = Vin I 254,14–25 [Mv VII 1.4]; chapter 33 (*kammākamma*): Pālim 410,20–411,4 = Vin II 125,24–34 [Cv V 20.4]; Pālim 411,18–412,4 = Vin II 127,1–12 [Cv V 20.7])

45. For some of the remaining twenty-three *kammavācās* we do have parallels in the *kammavācā* collections published by Baynes 1892 and Clauson 1906–1907. Pālim 335,4–20; 337,20–338,13; 340,19–341,13; 341,28–342,16; 343,10–27; 344,14–345,10; 346,12–347,9; 348,26–349,16; 350,9–351,3; 352,2–28; 354,17–355,12; 355,28–357,2; 358,6–359,13; 360,22–361,30; 362,20–363,16; 364,13–365,15; 366,19–367,22; 368,13–369,8; 369,22–370,23; 371,24–372,26; 374,2–26; 375,22–376,19; 377,16–378,15.
46. It is very probable that there existed *kammavācā* collections containing not only the basic *kammavācās* for confessing offences, as did those published by Baynes and Clauson (see n. 45). Depending on the number and type of offences, on the question whether they were concealed, and if so, how long, the *kammavācās* for the probationary period (*parivāsa*), and so on, became more and more complicated. The commentaries (Kkh 84,5–86,24; Sp VI 1181,5–1184,22) only give guidelines how to formulate such *kammavācās*. This presupposes some knowledgeable person to create the correct formulas, and most probably explains why the *Vinaya-saṅgaha* contains a large number of ready made *kammavācās* for such cases. These are very valuable, since they are earlier (twelfth century CE) than any *kammavācā* collection handed down in manuscript form.
47. For his subcommentary on the *Aṅguttaranikāya* see Kieffer-Pülz forthcoming; in his subcommentary on the *Vinaya* he, in addition to the sources explicitly mentioned by him, took over large portions from Dhammapāla's *Purāṇa-ṭīkā*s on the *Suttaṭīpaka*.
48. We leave aside here minor points such as a change of gender (so *pi Mahāpaccariyaṃ paṭikkhitto*, Sp III 543,20–21 – *tam pi Mahāpaccariyaṃ paṭikkhittam*, Pālim 29,22), different sequences of words (*aṭṭhakathāvādo vā theravādo vā*, Sp II 300,8–9 – *theravādo vā aṭṭhakathāvādo vā*, Pālim 3,4–5), connectives, omission or addition of particles, and so on.
49. Crosby 2006, 55–56, see above n. 41.
50. As a base for the comparison Pālim could be used in the Burmese Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana edition only. A Sinhalese edition at my disposal only covers the first three chapters. Regarding Sp, I did not have access to the Siamese and Sinhalese editions but compared the PTS edition (E°) with the Burmese (B°), and the Nālanda edition (N°). The latter does not represent a specific country's tradition but rather contains a selection of readings from the Burmese, Siamese, Sinhalese, and the PTS editions.

40. 'anāmāsan' ti (Pālim 1,12) na parāmasitabbam. tatrāyaṃ vinicchayo: yasmā mātā vā hotu dhītā vā bhaginī vā, itthi nāma sabbāpi brahmacariyassa pāribanthikā (Pālim; Pālim v.l., Sp E° v.l. °bandhikā; Sp B° E° N° °panthikā) va anāmāsā ca, tasmā 'ayaṃ me mātā, ayaṃ me (Sp N° v.l.; Sp B° E° N° om.) dhītā, ayaṃ me (Sp B° E° N° v.l.; Sp E° N° om.) bhaginī' ti gehassitapemena (Sp B°; Sp E° N° gehasita°; Sp E° v.l. °tappemeṇa) āmasato pi dukkaṭam eva vuttaṃ. imaṃ pana bhagavato āṇaṃ anussarantena sace pi (Sp E° v.l. om.) nadīsotena vuyhamānaṃ mātaraṃ passati, n' eva hatthena parāmasitabbā, paṇḍitena pana (Sp E° v.l. om.) bhikkhunā nāvā vā phalakaṃ vā kadalikkhandho vā dārukkhandho vā upasaṃharitabbo (Sp B°; Sp E° N° °ā). tasmim̐ asati kāsāvaṃ pi upasaṃharitvā purato ṭhapetabbam, 'ettha gaṇhāhi' ti pana na vattabbā. gahite 'parikkhāraṃ kaḍḍhāmi' ti kaḍḍhantena (Sp B° N°; E° khaḍḍhen°) gantabbam. sace pana bhāyati, purato purato gantvā 'mā bhāyī' ti samassāsetabbā. sace bhāyamānā (Sp B° E° v.l. N°; Pālim v.l. miyyamānā; Sp E° miyyamānā, Sp E° v.l. N° v.l. vuyhamānā) puttassa sahasā khandhe vā abhiruhati (Sp B° E° v.l. N° v.l.; Sp E° N° abhirūhati) hatthe vā gaṇhāti, na 'apehi mahallike' ti niddhunitabbā (Sp E° v.l. nidhū°), thalaṃ (Sp E° ad vā) pāpetabbā. kaddame laggāya pi kūpe patitāya pi es' eva nayo. tatrāpi (Sp B° N° v.l. tatra pi) hi yottaṃ vā vatthaṃ vā pakkhipitvā hatthena gahitabhāvaṃ ṇatvā uddharitabbā, na tv eva āmasitabbā. na kevalaṃ ca mātugāmassa sarīraṃ eva anāmāsaṃ, nivāsanaṃ pārupanaṃ (Sp N° v.l.; Sp E° N° °pāpuraṇaṃ; Sp B° E° v.l. N° v.l. °pāvuraṇaṃ) pi ābharaṇabhaṇḍam pi antamaso tiṇaṇḍupakaṃ (Sp E° tiṇaṇḍū°) vā tālapaṇṇamuddikam (Sp E° v.l. N° v.l.; B° E° N° tāla°) vā upādāya anāmāsaṃ eva. taṃ ca kho nivāsanaṃ pāvuraṇaṃ (Sp B° N° °pārupanaṃ; Sp E° °pārupaṇaṃ) pi landhanatthāya (Sp B° E° v.l. N° v.l.; E° N° pila°) ṭhapitaṃ eva. sace pana nivāsanaṃ vā pārupanaṃ (Sp B° E° v.l. N°; Sp E° N° v.l. °ṇaṃ) vā parivattetvā cīvaraṭṭhāya pādamaṇḍale ṭhapeti vaṭṭati. ābharaṇabhaṇḍesu pana sisapasāḍhanadantasūci-ādikappiyabhaṇḍam (Sp B° E° v.l. Ne v.l. sisapasāḍhanaka°; Sp N° sisapasāḍhanakaṃ dantasuci-ādikappiyabhaṇḍam; Sp E° °kaṃ dantasūci°) 'imaṃ, bhante, tumhākaṃ (Sp E° v.l. N° v.l. tumhe) dema, gaṇhathā (Sp B° E° N°; Sp E° v.l. N° v.l. gaṇhā°) ti diyamānaṃ (Sp B° E° v.l. diyya°) sipāṭikāsūci-ādi-upakaraṇatthāya (Sp E° v.l. sippaṭikā°) gahetabbam. suvaṇṇarajatamuttādimayaṃ pana anāmāsaṃ eva, diyamānaṃ (Sp B° diyya°) pi na gahetabbam. na kevalaṃ ca etāsaṃ sarīrūpagam eva anāmāsaṃ, itthisaṇṭhānena (Sp E° itthi°) kataṃ kattharūpaṃ pi dantarūpaṃ pi ayaṇrūpaṃ pi loharūpaṃ pi tipurūpaṃ pi potthakarūpaṃ pi sabbaratanarūpaṃ pi antamaso piṭṭhamayaṇrūpaṃ (Sp E° N° v.l. °mayaṃ rūpaṃ) pi anāmāsaṃ eva. paribhogatthāya pana 'idaṃ tumhākaṃ hoti' ti labhitvā ṭhapetvā sabbaratanamayaṃ avasesaṃ bhinditvā upakaraṇārahaṃ upakaraṇe, paribhogārahaṃ (Sp E° N° v.l. ad ca) paribhoge upanetuṃ vaṭṭati.

41. yathā ca itthirūpaṃ (Sp E° N° v.l. itthi°), evaṃ sattavidhaṃ (Sp E° v.l. N° v.l.; Sp B° E° N° ad pi) dhaññaṃ pi (Sp N° v.l.; Sp B° E° N° om.) anāmāsaṃ eva. tasmā khet-tamajjhena gacchantena (Sp B° E° N° gacchatā) tatthajātakaṃ pi dhaññaphalaṃ na āmasantena gantabbam. sace gharadvāre vā antarāmagge (Sp E° v.l. N° v.l. magge) vā dhaññaṃ pasāritaṃ hoti, passena ca maggo atthi, na maddantena gantabbam (Sp B° N°; Sp E° N° v.l. °tabbo). gamanaṃ magge asati maggaṃ adhiṭṭhāya gantabbam. antaraghare dhaññaṃ upari āsanaṃ paññāpetvā (Sp E° v.l.; Sp B° E° N° paññā°) denti, nisīdituṃ vaṭṭati. keci āsanāsālāya (Sp B° N° v.l. °aṃ) dhaññaṃ ākiranti, sace sakkā hoti harāpetuṃ, harāpetabbam. no ce, ekamantaṃ dhaññaṃ amaddantena piṭṭhakaṃ paññāpetvā (Sp N° paññā°) nisīditabbam. sace okāso na hoti, manussā dhaññaṃ majjhe yeva (Sp B° E° v.l. N° ad āsanaṃ) paññāpetvā (Sp E° N° v.l. paññā°) denti, nisīditabbam (Sp E° v.l. N° v.l. ad

nāvattṭhesu pi es' eva nayo). *tatthajātakāni muggamāsādini aparāṇṇāni* (Sp E° v.l. N° v.l. °rannāni) *pi tālapanasādini* (Sp B° E° v.l.; Sp E° N° tāla°) *vā phalāni kīlantena na āmasitabbāni. manussehi rāsikatesu pi es' eva nayo. araṇṇe pana rukkhato patitāni phalāni* (Sp E° v.l. om.) *'anupasampannānaṃ dassāmī' ti gaṇḥitum vaṭṭati.*

42. *muttā maṇi veḷuriyo saṅkho silā pavālaṃ rajataṃ jātārūpaṃ lohitaṅko masāragallan ti imesu dasasu ratanesu muttā adhotā aviddhā* (Sp B° E° N° anividdhā; Sp E° v.l. N° v.l. adhotaviddhā) *yathājātā va āmasitum vaṭṭati, sesā anāmāsā ti VADANTI. taṃ na gahetabbam. MAHĀPACCARIYAṃ pana 'muttā dhotāpi adhotāpi anāmāsā, bhaṇḍamūlatthāya ca sampācchitum na vaṭṭati, kuṭṭharogassa bhesajjathāya pana vaṭṭatī' ti vuttaṃ. taṃ yuttaṃ. antamaso jātiphalikaṃ* (Sp E° v.l. N° v.l. phalī°) *upādāya sabbo pi nilapitādavaṇṇabhedo maṇidhotaviddhavaṭṭito anāmāso, yathājāto pana ākaramutto pattādibhaṇḍamūlatthaṃ sampācchitum vaṭṭatī ti vuttaṃ* (Sp B° E° N° vutto), *tam* (Sp B° E° N° so) *pi MAHĀPACCARIYAṃ paṭikkhittaṃ* (Sp B° E° N° °kkhitto). *pacitvā kato kācamaṇi yev' eko vaṭṭatī ti vuttaṃ* (Sp B° E° N° vutto), *veḷuriye pi maṇisadiso va vinicchayo. saṅkho dhamanasāṅkho ca dhotaviddho ca ratanamisso* (Sp E° v.l. N° v.l. ad ca) *anāmāso, pāṇiyasaṅkho dhotō pi* (Sp E° v.l. om.) *adhoto pi āmāso va. sesaṇ ca* (Sp B° E° v.l. N° v.l.; Sp E° N° om. ca) *añjanādibhesajjathāya pi bhaṇḍamūlatthāya pi sampācchitum vaṭṭati. silā dhotaviddhā ratanasamyuttā muggavaṇṇā va anāmāsā, sesā sathakanighaṃsanādiatthāya* (Sp B° E° N° °kanisānādi°, E° v.l. N° v.l. °kanisādādi°) *gaṇḥitum vaṭṭati. ettha ca ratanasamyuttā ti suvaṇṇena saddhimi yojetvā pacitvā katā ti VADANTI. pavālaṃ dhotaviddhaṃ anāmāsaṃ, sesaṃ āmāsaṇ ca* (Sp B° E° v.l. N° v.l. om.) *bhaṇḍamūlatthaṇ ca sampācchitum vaṭṭatī* (Sp B° E° N° °ti) *ti VADANTI. taṃ na gahetabbam. MAHĀPACCARIYAṃ pana 'dhotam pi adhotam pi sabbaṃ anāmāsaṇ ca na ca sampācchitum vaṭṭatī' ti vuttaṃ. taṃ yuttaṃ.*

As can be seen from this specimen, there are only minor variants between the two texts. They may be partly due to transmission and partly due to the limited number of editions consulted. Only few real variants remain, and these may even diminish when a higher number of editions and manuscripts is consulted for both texts. The entire paragraph corresponds to a continuous passage in the *Samantapāsādikā*, with the exception of the judgements appended after each opinion by Sāriputta.

Regarding the whole text of the *Vinaya-saṅgaha*, Sāriputta in compiling his digest also had to skip passages of the *Samantapāsādikā*, since the digest's length is only little more than a third of the former. The skipped passages are generally sections containing simple word commentaries, lengthy discussions irrelevant for daily practice,⁵¹ and to a smaller degree also narrative material.⁵²

All in all the *Vinaya-saṅgaha* is a comprehensive *Vinaya* digest for practical usage consisting of rearranged but essentially unchanged reused text from earlier

51. In the chapter on allocating and assigning objects he, for instance, omits a longer and sophisticated passage (Sp III 646,4–647,20) on the destruction of the allocation of a robe because of a fissure in the fabric.

52. Narrative material plays a minor role, since the *Samantapāsādikā* does not contain much narrative material except in the historical introduction, the chapter on ordination, and the two chapters on the councils (*saṅgītis*). Crosby explains for the whole *Vinaya-saṅgaha* that 'peripheral material such as narrative framework is excluded' (Crosby 2006, 56). This, however, only fits the chapter on ordination which served as the basis for Crosby's investigation (Crosby 2006, n. 23), and which contains biographical details of the Buddha's life.

sources.⁵³ Hence, unlike the *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī*, it also keeps the various opinions and the source markers given by the earlier authors. From a modern perspective, a text consisting of reused text only, with no original ideas expressed by the author, might seem to be of little value. This, however, does not do justice to this text. Besides its value for practical purposes, the text reflects the facets of Buddhist monastic law current in twelfth century Sri Lanka, and its author had to be well versed in the sources used, and knowledgeable in order to be able to prudently select what to include in his digest.

Reuse of text in Nāṇinda's *Vinaya-lakkhaṇa-rāsī*

As the third and last example, the reuse of text in *lakkhaṇa-rāsī*-literature shall be dealt with. *Lakkhaṇa-rāsī* means 'collection of phrases or definitions'. Works belonging to this category of text consist entirely of extracts from earlier texts, without the addition of a single contribution by the authors themselves. They are neither summaries nor rearrangements, but collections of extracted passages. The extracts are strung in one line corresponding to their succession in the original text without any connectives or adjustments.

Nāṇinda's *Vinaya-lakkhaṇa-rāsī* (eighteenth or nineteenth century CE) contains such collections of excerpts from altogether nine *Vinaya* texts.⁵⁴ The choice of the extracts seems to have been guided partly by the relevance of the respective sentences for a given topic.⁵⁵ But in our present example the sorting principle behind the selection seems arbitrary (see below). Thus to arrive at a conclusive judgement regarding Nāṇinda's principle of selection, his extracts have to be compared with the sources on a wider scale.

53. Sāriputta often rearranges the material found in the *Samantapāsādikā* corresponding to the topic, but does not omit any parts of those blocks selected by him. Chapter 3, for instance, deals with medicine, *paritta*, and welcoming of guests. Here Sāriputta begins with Sp II 469,10–472,22. From this Sp II 469,10–471,31 deals with the application of medicine, then follows Sp II 472,1–22 dealing with *paritta* as a medicine. He proceeds with Sp II 476,22–26, a passage dealing with *paritta* as a means to prevent harm. Thereafter he inserts a passage from the *Sumaṅgalavilāsini* (Sv III 969,14–970,8) also dealing with *paritta*, and finally in the section of welcoming guests, he presents the passage formerly omitted (Sp II 472,24–475,4).

54. *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī*; Vicittālaṅkāra's *Pātimokkhapadattavaṇṇanā* (seventeenth or eighteenth century CE); Saṅgharakkhita's *Khuddasikkhā-abhinava-ṭīkā* (first half thirteenth century CE); Tipiṭakālaṅkāra's *Vinayālaṅkāra-ṭīkā* (seventeenth century CE); the *Vinaya-saṅkhepa-aṭṭhakathā* (thirteenth century CE or later); the *Samantapāsādikā*; the *Vajirabuddhi-ṭīkā* (ca. tenth century CE); Sāriputta's *Sāratthadīpanī* (twelfth century CE); Coliya Kassapa's *Vimativinodanī-ṭīkā* (twelfth to thirteenth century CE). The selection of *Vinaya* texts is eclectic and may reflect which texts were actually used in eighteenth or nineteenth century Burma. For the *Pātimokkha*, for instance, only the *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī* (ca. fifth century CE) and the *Pātimokkhapadattavaṇṇanā* were taken into account, ignoring the *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī-purāṇa-ṭīkā* (tenth to twelfth century CE) and the *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī-abhinava-ṭīkā* (twelfth to thirteenth century CE); from the condensations (*Mūlasikkhā*, *Khuddasikkhā*, *Vinayavinicchaya*, *Uttaravinicchaya*) and their commentaries only the younger subcommentary on the *Khuddasikkhā*, the *Khuddasikkhā-abhinava-ṭīkā*, was evaluated but neither the earlier commentary on the *Khuddasikkhā* nor any of the commentaries on the other condensations.

55. This at least is what a survey of the commentary on the first ten *pācittiya* rules in the *Samantapāsādikā* (Sp IV 737,29–759,20) with the extracts given in the *Vinayalakkhaṇarāsī* (foll. ññū v1–ñño v2) made me assume. This genre of texts has, however, not been investigated to date except to some extent in Kieffer-Pülz and Peters 2002.

Since the *Samantapāsādikā* and *Kaṅkhāvitarāṇī* are only incompletely transmitted in the manuscripts at hand,⁵⁶ Vicittālaṅkāra's *Pātimokkhapadatta-anuvaṇṇanā* has been chosen for comparison. This is a *Pātimokkha* commentary on the meaning of the words of the *Pātimokkha*, written in seventeenth or eighteenth century Burma, and is available in a Burmese edition. The *Vinaya-lakkhaṇa-rāsi* is as yet unedited. The passage containing the extracts from the *Pātimokkhapadatta-anuvaṇṇanā* to be compared here was transliterated from a Burmese manuscript in the possession of the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek.⁵⁷ For comparison the chapter on *Pārājika* 2 for monks dealing with theft has been selected. The text of this chapter from the *Pātimokkhapadatta-anuvaṇṇanā* is given in Appendix 5, and the passages extracted from it in the *Vinaya-lakkhaṇa-rāsi* are marked there by underlining. Such a small text base, naturally, does not suffice for a general statement regarding the methods for the selection of the extracts applied in the *lakkhaṇa-rāsi* texts. But it may give a first impression.

Pārājika 2 roughly extends over twelve standard pages in the *Pātimokkhapadatta-anuvaṇṇanā*. The extracts from this chapter in the *Vinaya-lakkhaṇa-rāsi* amount to about nine and a half percent of this which corresponds to about one page (see Appendix 5).

Pāt-pa-av, Pārājika 2 for monks

Pāt-pa-av 84,18–94,12

Pāt-pa-av in *Vinaya-lakkhaṇarāsi*

ca. 15709 characters = 100 %

1477 characters = 9.4 %

In the *Pātimokkhapadatta-anuvaṇṇanā* the commentary begins with a word commentary on the *Pātimokkha* rule (*Pāt-pa-av* 84,18–90,4 [1]). Thereafter Vicittālaṅkāra inserts a *mātikā* with the seven cases in which no offence arises, a literal borrowing from the *Kaṅkhāvitarāṇī* (*Pāt-pa-av* 90,5–6 [2]), of which the first six terms are commented upon in the following (*Pāt-pa-av* 90,7–30 [2]). The next five lists contain the keywords for the twenty five types of theft (*Pāt-pa-av* 91,1–13 [3–7]).⁵⁸ Thereafter each of the terms is explained in short (*Pāt-pa-av* 91,14–93,9 [8]). Finally, Vicittālaṅkāra offers a concise statement regarding the matters to be considered in deciding such cases (*Pāt-pa-av* 93,10–18 [9]), and adds word explanations for some of the terms used in that summary (*Pāt-pa-av* 93,18–94,3 [10]). Finally he presents fragments of the classification of the offence as contained in the *Kaṅkhāvitarāṇī* (*Pāt-pa-av* 94,4–7 [11]) and explains part of the words (*Pāt-pa-av* 94,7–12 [12]). The explanations of words are partly from a grammatical viewpoint, and partly refer to the meaning of words or phrases. Rarely the author adds objections and responses to matters of content. As a whole Vicittālaṅkāra's commentary itself is an interesting example of various types of textual reuse.⁵⁹

56. The fact that the extracts of some texts contained in the *Vinayalakkhaṇarāsi* cover the complete texts makes one assume that for Kkh and Sp a complete representation was intended too.

57. *Vinaññiḥ mhat cu* (Pāli *Vinayalakkhaṇarāsi*), Cod. birm. 299, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, München, Germany. See Peters 2000, catalogue number 857. The text was transliterated by Anne Peters (Göttingen), and kindly placed at my disposal.

58. See for that Kieffer-Pülz 2012, 15–20.

59. He uses manifold sources, which he quotes explicitly. But for the rest he also borrows wordings from the *Samantapāsādikā*, the *Kaṅkhāvitarāṇī*, and other texts, which he uses

In the extracts of this chapter as assembled by Ñāṇinda in the *Vinaya-lakkhaṇa-rāsi*, nearly all grammatical explanations of words, and mere word explanations are omitted. The topics dealt with here are as follows:

1. The definition of a *pāda* and a *kaḥāpaṇa*, two coins of different values. This is an important matter for the rule, since the value of a stolen object is decisive for the offense a monk commits in stealing an object (Appendix 5, [1] towards the end).
2. This definition is followed by explanations of the words *dukkāṭa* and *thullaccaya*, which designate two types of offences. Why it was thought necessary to extract these definitions is unclear. We cannot exclude the possibility that this short sentence was taken over by accident when copying the longer preceding definition of the two coins. This is made plausible since part of the definition has not been taken over (Appendix 5, [1] towards the end).

All further extracts come from different places within the commentary on *Pārājika* 2, and are unrelated.

3. A definition of the phrase ‘if it is taken [with the knowledge] that [the one from which it is taken], will be pleased’. This phrase is used in the second of the seven cases of non-offences, namely taking something on trust (*vissāsaḡāha*; Appendix 5, [2] (2.1–3)).
4. An explanation from the same section, defining how something is well given and well received (Appendix 5, [2] (2.1–3)).
5. A statement in the frame of the eighth type of theft, namely theft by appointment (*saṃvidhāvahāra*) according to which all monks involved in that appointment become guilty, even if only one carries out the theft (Appendix 5, [8] (8)).
6. A definition of the means for checking the validity of a statement according to *sutta*, *suttānuloma*, *ācariyavādo* and *attanomati* (Appendix 5, [10]). The whole definition is borrowed by Vicittālaṅkāra from the *Samantapāsādikā*, but is not openly marked as a quotation. He quotes it in the *Pātimokkhapadattha-anuvaṇṇanā* as a word commentary on the words used in his concluding summary to the twenty-five types of theft. This relation is no longer discernible in the excerpt.
7. A word-commentary of the word *antarāpatti* describing an offence one commits while still being under probation or *mānatta* penance for another offence (Appendix 5, [10]). This word is used by Vicittālaṅkāra in his summary to the twenty-five types of theft, and explained thereafter. As an extract it seems quite senseless, since the passage in which it is used is not extracted, and the word *antarāpatti* appears otherwise neither in the *Pātimokkha* nor in the *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī* on *Pārājika* 2.

freely to create new sentences. Despite the fact that he often explains the same words as the *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī*, the commentary is by no means repetitive, since its author partly emphasizes different aspects, and assembles explanations from different contexts.

The excerpts from the *Pārājika* 2 section of the *Pātimokkhopadatta-anuvaṇṇanā* contained in the *Vinaya-lakkhaṇa-rāsi* do not give an overview of *Pārājika* 2. On the contrary it seems to be a whimsical selection which leaves one quite perplexed. The criteria for Ñāṇinda's selection remain completely incomprehensible for the time being. On the basis of these excerpts a monk would not even have got the slightest idea of the most basic systematization of theft or of Vicittālaṅkāra's presentation. Whether the excerpts of that same rule from the other eight Vinaya texts assembled in the *Vinaya-lakkhaṇa-rāsi* add to what we learn here, and thus — seen altogether — give a complete picture of the rule on theft, or whether or not the selection from the other texts and chapters is similarly unorganized, needs investigation.

Different from the *Vinaya-lakkhaṇa-rāsi*, where the excerpts from one text are presented, followed by those of the next text, and so on, another *rāsi*-text, this time a *saṅkhepa-rāsi*, 'collection of summarizations (?)', namely the *Vinaya-saṅkhepa-rāsi* is differently organized.⁶⁰ Here excerpts of one portion of the *Vinaya* are followed by the excerpts from the corresponding passages of the various *ṭīkā*s. Then follows another passage of the *Vinaya* with its commentaries, and so on. The arrangement of the excerpts, therefore, seems to follow a different system.

Conclusion

The three examples of textual reuse in Pāli legal literature discussed here only offer a glimpse into the methods of reuse applied by the authors of Pāli commentarial literature. The first example, namely the reuse of text from the *Samantapāsādikā* in the *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī*, shows unacknowledged borrowings of authoritative opinions and definitions adapted and rearranged. It falls in the period in which for the first time extensive Pāli commentaries to the canon came into being (fourth to sixth century CE). The author of the *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī* aimed at creating a concise and up-to-date explanation of the *Pātimokkha* for practical usage. The second specimen, namely the reuse of text in Sāriputta's *Vinaya-saṅgaha*, shows unacknowledged borrowings of largely unchanged selected paragraphs in a text of the *saṅgaha* category. The reused text is selected and arranged by an individual in later times, but otherwise kept mainly unchanged. In our case Sāriputta of Poḷonnaruva (twelfth century CE) selected and compiled material from the *Vinaya* and the *aṭṭhakathās* (ca. fourth to sixth century CE) with the aim of creating a comprehensive handbook of the Buddhist legal decisions and cases relevant for twelfth century Sri Lankan monks. The third example is a quite uncommon type of open reuse of unchanged text, which may be restricted to Burma.⁶¹ It consists of unconnected extracts of text portions lined up in the sequence of the source text in texts called *rāsi*. It is not yet known whether these extracts are chosen as a representation of the source text or what were the criteria for their selection. We cannot exclude the possibility that such *rāsi* texts reflect the private choices of individual monks.

60. The text consists of 260 folios and contains quotations from *Mahāvagga*, *Cullavagga* and *Parivāra* with corresponding portions from *aṭṭhakathās* and *ṭīkā*s (information courtesy Anne Peters), see Peters forthcoming, catalogue number 1599.

61. Whether similar types of literature exist in present day Thailand or Sri Lanka is as yet unknown.

As has been shown in the present contribution, reuse of text in Pāli legal literature has various faces dependent on the purpose of the texts in which the reused text is presented. Its investigation can be considered an important tool for relatively dating texts, since it may reveal the way in which one text depends on one or more other; it can be considered a valuable means for showing us the range of texts used by Buddhist communities at later times and in different places, simultaneously revealing which works were considered authoritative or not; last but not least it can throw light on what the role of authors was, and how they conceived of themselves.

Appendices

The following Appendices present overviews of the commentarial literature (Appendices 1 to 3), list the parallel passages of *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī* and *Samantapāsādikā* (Appendix 4), and give an example for the reuse of text in the *Vinaya-lakkhaṇa-rāsi* (Appendix 5).

Appendix 1: Overview of the extant commentaries on the *Samantapāsādikā*

Samantapāsādikā, Vinaya-commentary, ca. fourth/fifth cent. CE

Title	Author	Region	Date
<i>Vajirabuddhi-ṭīkā</i>	Anonymous ⁶²	Sri Lanka/South India	tenth cent.
<i>Sāratthadīpanī</i>	Sāriputta	Sri Lanka	twelfth cent.
<i>Vimativinodanī-ṭīkā</i>	Coliya Kassapa	South India	twelfth/ thirteenth cent.
<i>Samantapāsādikā-atthayojanā</i>	Ñāṇakitti	Lan Nā (northern Thailand)	before 1492/93
<i>Pācityādiyojanā</i>	Jāgara	Burma	1869

Appendix 2: Overview of the extant commentaries on the *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī*

Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī, Pātimokkha-Commentary, ca. fifth cent. CE

Title	Author	Region	Date
<i>Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī-purāṇa-ṭīkā</i>	Anonymous	Sri Lanka/South India	ca. tenth to twelfth cent.
<i>Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī-abhinava-ṭīkā</i>	Buddhanāga	Sri Lanka	twelfth/ thirteenth cent.
<i>Pātimokkhagaṇ-ṭhīdīpanī</i>	Ñāṇakitti	Lan Nā (northern Thailand)	1492/3
<i>Pātimokkhavi-sodhanī</i>	Chapaṭa Sammajotipāla	Burma	fifteenth cent.
<i>Pātimokkhapada-ttha-anuvaṇṇanā</i>	Vicittālaṅkāra	Burma	seventeenth/ eighteenth cent.
<i>Pātimokkha(vi)lekhana</i>	Ñāṇavara	Burma	eighteenth cent.

62. Traditionally ascribed to Vajirabuddhi. The earliest testimony for this ascription stems from the thirteenth century. Dimitrov (2016) assigns the *Vajirabuddhi-ṭīkā* to Ratna(matī)/Upa-tissa.

Appendix 3: Overview of the Vinaya handbooks and their commentaries (edited)

Mūlasikkhā (Mahānāma, Sri Lanka, ca. 5th/6th century CE)

Title	Author	Region	Date
<i>Mūlasikkhā-ṭikā</i>	pupil of Sāriputta	Sri Lanka	12th/13th cent.

Khuddasikkhā (Dhammasiri, Sri Lanka, 5th/6th century CE)

Title	Author	Region	Date
<i>Khuddasikkhā-purāṇa-ṭikā</i>	Anonymous	Sri Lanka	before 13th cent.
<i>Khuddasikkhā-abhinava-ṭikā</i> named <i>Sumaṅgalapasādinī</i>	Saṅgharakkhita	Sri Lanka	2nd quarter 13th cent.

Vinayavinicchaya (Buddhadatta, South India, ca. 6th century CE)

Title	Author	Region	Date
<i>Vinayavinicchaya-ṭikā</i> called <i>Vinayatthasāra-sandīpanī</i>	Pupil of Sāriputta	Sri Lanka	2nd third 13th cent.

Pālimuttaka-vinayavinicchaya-saṅgaha or Vinaya-saṅgaha (Sāriputta, Sri Lanka, 12th cent. CE)

Title	Author	Region	Date
<i>Pālimuttaka-vinayavinicchaya-saṅgaha-purāṇa-ṭikā</i> called <i>Anuttānattha-dīpanī</i>	Sāriputta	Sri Lanka	12th cent.
<i>Pālimuttaka-vinayavinicchaya-saṅgaha-abhinava-ṭikā</i> called <i>Vinayālaṅkāra</i>	Tipiṭakālaṅkāra	Burma	1639–1651 CE

Appendix 4: List of parallels between *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī* 1–56 (chapters 1 and 2) and the *Samantapāsādikā*⁶³

Kkh	beginning and end of the parallels	Sp
6,8–11	uposatho ... vuccatī	= V 1063,10–13
7,3–4	yattha ... sakkonti	= VII 1401,5
7,4–21	atimahatī ... sammata	≠ VII 1401,8–28
7,20–8,6	sīmāya ... hoti	≠ V 1056,9–17
8,7–10	sīmāya ... sammannati	≠ V 1056,18–21
8,17–18	puratthimāya ... nimittan ti	≠ V 1035,33–34
9,1–2	pāsāṇanimitte ... pāsāṇo	≠ V 1036,31–1037,1
9,3–4	hetṭhima° ... khuddakataro	≠ V 1037,3–5
9,9–10	antamaso ... pi	= V 1037,28–29
9,12–13	jaṅghamaggo ... gacchati	≠ V 1038,7–9
9,13–14	jaṅgha° ... yeva	≠ V 1038,11–12
9,16–18	hetṭhima° ... vaṭṭati	≠ V 1038,28–30
10,1–2	āvāṭa° ... ṭhitaṃ	= V 1040,1–2
10,2–4	taṅkhaṇe ... kammavācāpariyosānā	≠ V 1040,7–9
10,21–24	agāmakam ... honti	≠ III 655,11–15
10,23–24	majjhe ... honti	≠ V 1052,13–14
10,25	tattha ... hoti	= V 1052,12–13
10,27–11,2	sace ... ṭhapetabbam	≠ V 1052,14–16
11,8–12	yassā ... pacchijjati	≠ V 1038,32–1039,5
11,17–18	kenaci ... tiṭṭhati	= V 1052,23–25
11,22–12,3	yam ... nāma	≠ V 1052,28–34
12,7–8	yattakam ... ottharati	≠ V 1054,14–15
12,8–9	yasmiṃ ... saṇṭhahanti	≠ V 1055,3–4
13,3–7	ettha ... vaṭṭati	≠ V 1064,11–14
13,20–22	desitā ... aññamaññaṃ	= V 1064,15–18
17,2–3	sammajjani ... vuccati	= V 1063,3–4
17,4–5	chanda° ... vuccati	= V 1063,6–7
18,4–8	sace ... āgacchati	≠ V 1062,10–14
18,19–21	bhikkhuni° ... °ūpasaṅkamanan ti	= IV 795,10–13
19,1–9	tena ... n'	≠ IV 795 13–21
19,10–11	ko ... ussahati	= IV 795,23–24

63. This list combines the list of parallels in the edition of Kkh by Norman and Pruitt (Kkh 381; with corrections by me) and further parallels traced by me.

19,12–20,25	vattabbo ... ovādūpasāṅkamanan ti	≠ IV 795,25–796,27
21,1–10	tenāpi ... ovādūpasāṅkamanan ti	≠ IV 796,33–797,5
21,14–17	upasaṅkamatu ... vattabbaṃ	≠ IV 797,14–20
22,25–23,2	alajjitā ... satisammosā	= IV 872,8–10
23,3–16	kathaṃ ... khādati	≠ IV 872,10–22
23,16	vikāle ... bhuñjati	= IV 872,23–24
23,16–19	evaṃ ... khādati	≠ IV 872,25–27
23,19	kāle ... bhuñjati	= IV 872,28–29
23,19–21	evaṃ ... āpajjati	≠ IV 872,30–31
23,21–22	sahaseyya° ... āpajjati	≠ IV 872,31–32
26,4–10	pana ... ti	≠ V 1035,1–7
28,19–22	ehibhikkhu° ... ti	≠ I 241,10–14
29,10–15	liṅgattthenako ... samāno	≠ V 1016,26–32
29,20–28	samāno ... nāma	≠ V 1016,32–1017,10
30,3–6	rāja° ... vuccatī ti	= V 1017,14–17
30,17–19	yo ... nāma	= V 1024,8–10
30,19–22	yo ... nāma	= V 1024,11–14
30,22–23	itthi° ... ubhato	= V 1024,18–19
33,25–34,1	jānanti ... sikkhā	≠ I 250,4–6
34,12–13	antamaso ... pi	= I 258,20–21
34,15	pārājiko ... āpanno	≠ I 259,17
35,24–25	vinaya° ... ti	≠ VII 1302,24–25
39,11–12	bhikkhuṃ ... paṭiseveyyā	≠ VII 1302,32–33
39,18–19	anaṭṭhakāyappasādaṃ ... vā	≠ I 257,31–32
39,19–20	naṭṭhakāyappasādaṃ ... vā	≠ I 257,32–33
39,22–23	vaṇasaṅkhepavasena thullaccayaṃ	= I 264,31
39,25–27	tiracchānānaṃ ... dukkaṭaṃ	≠ I 265,15–16
39,27	upakaccha° ... dukkaṭaṃ	≠ I 265,6
40,8	yo ... sādiyati	= I 269,18–19
40,13	yo ... ādibhūto	≠ I 270,12
41,12–18	nibbakosassa ... nāma	≠ II 299,27–300,4
41,22–23	tato ... nāma	= II 300,6–7
41,24–25	parikkhittassa ... pariccheto	≠ II 300,20–21
41,25–26	dve ... ṭhitassa	≠ II 299,6–7
42,9–17	theyyasaṅkhātan ... veditabbaṃ	≠ II 302,3–12
42,19–21	sādhukaṃ... ti	= II 303,31–304,1

43,1–15	ādiyeyya ... pārājikaṃ	≠ II 302,22–303,6
43,16–19	sassāmikassa ... veditabbaṃ	≠ II 303,12–15
43,20–23	katamaṃ ... nāma	≠ II 304,10–14
43,24–44,2	atthasādhako ... pārājikaṃ	≠ II 304,16–19
44,4–5	dhuranikkhepo ... veditabbo	≠ II 304,20–21
44,6–7	idaṃ ... pubbapayogapañcakaṃ	= II 304,21–22
44,7–9	pubbapayogo ... °vasena	= II 304,23–25
44,13–14	saṅketakammaṃ ... sañjānanakammaṃ	≠ II 367,23
44,21–22	katamaṃ ... ti	≠ II 304,27–29
44,22–45,15	sandhicchedādini ... bhaṇḍadeyyaṃ	≠ II 375,20–376,14
45,15–17	tattha ... veditabbo	= II 376,26–28
45,18–22	kiñci ... atikkantamatte	≠ II 376,31–377,4
45,23–27	pavatto ... bhikkhu	= II 377,17–22
46,1–3	paṃsunā ... pana	≠ II 377,25–27
46,3–8	vicinantā ... eva	≠ II 377,28–378,5
46,10–13	yasmā ... avahāro	≠ II 378,5–8
46,14	kusaṃ ... kusāvahāro	= II 378,9
46,14–47,2	so ... avahāro	≠ II 378,10–22
48,6–7	para° ... theyyacittaṃ	≠ II 370,30–371,1
48,23–25	jīvita ... viyojeyya	= II 438,2–4
48,26–49,2	imassa ... jīvitindriyaṃ	= II 439,10–13
49,2–8	pāṇātipāto ... paharaṇaṃ	≠ II 439,14–21
49,8–10	nissaggiyo ... nissajjanaṃ	= II 439,22–24
49,10–14	tattha ... °baddho	≠ II 444,1–7
49,17–19	vatthu ... ti	= II 446,12–14
50,3–4	thāvaro ... upanikkhipanaṃ	≠ II 439,24–25
50,8	kammavipākajāya ... payojanaṃ	= II 440,11–12
50,9–17	satthahāraṇaṃ ... vā	≠ II 441,16–24
50,24	marañatthāya ... gāhāpeyya	= II 442,9–10
51,3–5	iti° ... vuttaṃ	≠ II 442,14–16
51,7	itisaddo āharitabbo	≠ II 442,20–21
51,8	saṃvidhanamattass° ... nāmaṃ	≠ II 442,25
51,9–10	tañ ca ... tasmā	= II 442,25–27
52,5–7	tattha ... anāpatti	≠ II 463,9–11
52,7–9	ajānantassa ... anāpatti	≠ II 463,12–14

52,9–10	na ... upakkamena	≠ II 463,15–16
52,27–53,1	uttari° ... upaneti	= II 489,1–3
53,2	attānaṃ ... upaneti	= II 489,3
53,2	upaneti ... samudācaranto	≠ II 489,11
53,3–4	taṃ ... sambandho	= II 489,3–4
53,5–12	alam° ... °dassanaṃ	≠ II 489,12–19
53,12–14	samudācareyyā ... āroceyya	≠ II 489,25–26
53,14–15	iti ... etaṃ	≠ II 489,29–30
54,2–5	āpatti° ... vuttaṃ	≠ II 490,1–5
54,7–9	visuddhā° ... adhigantaṃ	≠ II 492,10–13
54,9–13	icc ... hoti	≠ II 492,16–20
54,15–16	evaṃ ... āvuso	= II 492,23–24
54,17–19	tucchaṃ ... hoti	= II 492,28–493,1
54,20–21	tilakkhaṇaṃ ... āraddhavipassakassa	= II 488,13–14
55,23–26	uddiṭṭhā ... aṭṭha	= II 515,4–7
55,29	bhikkhuniyā ... vīsati	≠ II 515,21–22
55,29–56,3	aparāni ... vadanti	= II 515,23–26
56,3–14	iti ... evā ti	≠ II 516,3–18

Appendix 5: The chapter on *Pārājika* 2 for monks in Vicittalaṅkāra's *Pātīmokkhapadattha-anuvaṇṇanā* (84,18–94,12) and its reuse in *Ñāṇinda's Vinaya-lakkhaṇarāsi* (fols. ṇṇaṃ r5 to ṇṇāḥ r3)⁶⁴

bold = *Pratīkas* from the Pāt, Kkh, and – within quotations – from the respective *mūla* texts

italic = parallels in texts for which the reference in round brackets is given at the end of the parallel

underlined = portion of the Pāt-pa-av that is given as an excerpt in the Vin-l-r

SMALL CAPS = names of sources given in the text

[1] evaṃ uddesena methunapārājikaṃ dassetvā idāni **adinnādānapārājikaṃ** dassetuṃ **yo pana bhikkhu gāmā vā araṇṇā vā** ty (Pāt 8,9 [Pār 2 M]) ādim āha ||
tatttha **bhikkhūnaṃ sikkhāsājīvasamāpanno** (Pāt 8,4 [Pār 1 M]) **yo pana bhikkhu** (Pāt 8,9 [Pār 2 M]) **sikkhaṃ appaccakkhāya dubbalyaṃ anāvikatvā** (Pāt 8,5 [Pār 1 M]) **adinnaṃ ādiyeyya** (Pāt 8,9–10 [Pār 2 M]) | **ayam pi bhikkhu pārājiko hoti** ti (Pāt 8,13 [Pār 2 M]) sambandho || idha viya ito paresu pi

64. Page numbers of the Burmese edition are given in bold and within square brackets. References to sources are added in round brackets. The text is roughly structured by adding paragraph numbers in square brackets, and within those paragraphs partly by numbers in round brackets.

bhikkhūnaṃ sikkhāsājjivasamāpanno sikkhaṃ appaccakkhāya dubbalyaṃ anāvikatvā ti (Pāt 8,4–5 [Pār 1 M]) padānaṃ adhikāro savambhati | ayaṃ nadisota-adhikāro ti veditabbo ||

gāmā vā araññā vā ti (Pāt 8,9 [Pār 2 M] = Kkh 41,7) idaṃ vacanaṃ chabbaggiye bhikkhū ārabba rajakattharaṇaṃ gantvā rajakabhaṇḍikaṃ avaharaṇavattusmiṃ paññattā anupaññatti || ettha ‘antamaso atirekacātumāsaniṇiṭṭho yo koci sattho pi “gāmo”’ (Kkh 41,8–9) nāma || ettha ca ‘sattho’ ti jaṇghavāṇija-sakaṭavāṇijesu yo koci vāṇi[85]jo | bhaṇḍamūlena vāṇijattāya desantaraṃ gacchanto janasaṃmūho ti vuttaṃ hoti || ‘ṭhapetvā gāmaṃ ca gāmūpacāraṃ ca avasesaṃ “araññaṃ” nāma’ (Vin III 46,30–31 = Kkh 41,9–10) || **gāmā vā** ti (Pāt 8,9 = Kkh 41,7) hi *desanāmattam ev’ etaṃ*⁶⁵ etena ghara-gharūpacāro gāma-gāmūpacāro pi saṅghahito | buddhāhi sāvasesaṃ pārājikaṃ na paññapenti ti || **gāmā vā araññā vā** ti (Pāt 8,9 = Kkh 41,7) dukavacanato pana ṭhapetvā araññaṃ avasesaṃ nagaram pi nigamam pi gāmaṃ eva saṅghahitaṃ || nanu ca parasantakassa ṭhitaṭṭhānattā ‘gāme vā araññe vā’ ti ādhārapadena vattabbaṃ | atha kim atthaṃ **gāmā vā araññā vā** ti (Pāt 8,9 = Kkh 41,7) apādānapadaṃ vuttan ti || ṭhānācāvanadassanattā || **gāmā vā araññā vā** ti (Pāt 8,9 = Kkh 41,7) idaṃ ca vacanaṃ ekadesūpacārena vuttaṃ || **gāmā** ti (Pāt 8,9 = Kkh 41,7) gāme || bhaṇḍaṭṭhapanatṭhānā adinnaṃ cāvetvā ādiyeyyā ti attho || gacchanti tiṭṭhanti janā etthā ti **gāmo** (Kkh 41,22) | janānaṃ nivāsokāsabhāvena gamyate nāyate ti vā **gāmo** (Kkh 41,22) || tena tena vatthunā atthikehi gantabbo ti vā **gāmo** (Kkh 41,22) || gāvo amanti kiṇanti vikkiṇanti janā etthā ti vā **gāmo** (Kkh 41,22) || ariyate gamyate ti **araññaṃ** (Kkh 42,4) | pavanaṃ || aradhātuto aññāpacayaṃ katvā rūpasiddhi veditabbā ||

adinnaṃ ti (Pāt 8,9 = Kkh 42,8) sāmikehi kāyena vā vācāya vā na dinnaṃ aññassa manussajātikassa *santakaṃ* (Kkh 42,8) || na yidha appaṭiggahitakasikkhāpade viya vinayapariyāyena appaṭiggahitavattu **adinnaṃ** nāma | atha kho parasantakaṃ **adinnaṃ** nāma ti daṭṭhabbaṃ || dātabban ti dinnaṃ || na dinnaṃ **adinnaṃ** || idha a-kāro Nyāsanayena dasasu atthesu Ekakkharakosanayena dvādasasu atthesu aññattho ti vādānakriyāya virahattā virahattho ti vā veditabbo || dvīsu paṭisedhesu ca aññavattuvantattā pariyudāsavāci ti veditabbo ||

theyyasaṅkhātan ti (Pāt 8,9–10 = Kkh 42,9.12) *karaṇatthe paccattavacanaṃ* (≠ Kkh 42,13–14) | *theyyasaṅkhātenā* ti (Kkh 42,14) attho || anekabhedesu cittesu theyyacittasaṅkhātena ekena cittakoṭṭhāsena adinnaṃ ādiyeyya | na sakasaññāyā ti yojanā || cittaṃ hi vinā avahāro natthi ti || *yo ca theyyasaṅkhātena ādiyati* | *so yasmā theyyacitto hoti* | *tasmā byañjanaṃ anādiyivā attham eva bhāvattam eva dassetuṃ* **theyyasaṅkhātan** ti *theyyacitto avaharaṇacitto ti padabhājanaṃ vuttaṃ* (≠ Kkh 42,14–17) || atha vā **theyyasaṅkhātan** ti bhāvanapūṃsakaniddeso || theyyacittakoṭṭhāsavanto hutvā pañcaviṣati-avahā[86]resu aññatarena adinnaṃ ādiyeyya | na manodvārenā ti yojanā || ayaṃ nayo Vinicchayaṭikāmatena (Vin-vn-ṭ I 129, vs. 237) sameti || theneti coreti ti **theno** (Pāt 8,12 = Kkh 42,9) || yathā sumana-saddo cittavācanakāle vedanaṃ | puggalavācanakāle vedanaṃ vā cittaṃ vā pavattanimittaṃ katvā vācako hoti | evaṃ thena-saddo cittaṃ ca sāmāññākārājātiṃ ca thenanakriyāṃ ca pavattanimittaṃ katvā coradabbavācako ti veditabbo || ‘*thenassa bhāvo theyyam*’ (Kkh 42,9–10) || vedanaṃ somanassaṃ

65. ≠ Kkh 42,5.

nāma hoti | na cittaṃ viya avaharaṇacittasaṅkhātassa dabbass' etaṃ nāmaṃ | na jātikriyāya | bhāvavācakataddhitaviggaho 'yaṃ || bhavanti buddhi-saddā ekasmā | etenā ti vā 'bhāvo' | pavattanimittaṃ || tañ ca dabbā-guṇa-kriyā-nāma-jātivāsena pañcavidhaṃ hoti | tena vuttaṃ || ||

yena yena nimittena buddhi saddo ca vattate ||
taṃ taṃ nimittakaṃ bhāvapaccayena udīritan ti⁶⁶ || ||

saṅkhāta-saddo *papañcasaññāsaṅkhā* ty (Kkh 42,11) ādisu viya koṭṭhāse vat-tati | na ñāṇa-paññatti-gaṇanādisu || samsāraṃ papañcenti vitthārenti ti 'papañcā' | tañhā-māna-diṭṭhinam etaṃ nāmaṃ || papañcehi sampayuttā saññā 'papañcasaññā' || saṅkhāta-saddo ca saṅkhā-saddo ca atthato samāno || *theyyañ ca taṃ saṅkhātāñ cā ti theyyasaṅkhātāṃ* (Kkh 42,12) | avaharaṇacittass' etaṃ nāmaṃ || aparo nayo: theyyaṃ eva saṅkhātāṃ yassā ti 'theyyasaṅkhāto' || bhikkhuss' etaṃ adhivacanāṃ || ||

ādiyeyyā ti (Pāt 8,10 = Kkh 42,18) *pañcaviṣatiyā avahārānaṃ aññataravasena* gaṇ-heyya | *hareyyā* ti (≠ Kkh 42,18) adhippetattho ||

hareyyā ti (Kkh 43,4) padena ca theyyasaṅkhātāṃ theyyacittakoṭṭhāsena ārammaṇakaraṇavasena gahaṇaṃ nivatteti || ||

yathārūpe adinnādāne || pa || *tathārūpan* ti (Pāt 8,10–12 ≠ Kkh 47,5–15) pāṭho *adinnan* ti (Pāt 8,9 = Kkh 42,8) padassa vitthāro ti pi vuttaṃ yujjati || visuṃ aṅgadassanapāṭho ti daṭṭhabbo || tattha *yathārūpe* ti yādisse (Kkh 47,5) || ya-saddattho hi yathā-saddo | na anurūpavicchādy-atthavācako | rūpa-saddo evarūpāya ty ādisu viya sabhāve vattati | na jātarūpan ty ādisu viya vaṇṇādi-atthe || yathā yo rūpo sabhāvo etassā ti 'yathārūpaṃ' | adinnass' etaṃ adhivaca-naṃ || na ādānassa || *adinnādāne* ti (Pāt 8,10 = Kkh 47,6) nimittasattamā niddeso | lakkaṇavanta-kattunide[87]so vā || sāmikehi kāya-vācāhi adinnassa parassa manussa jātikassa pādassa vā pādārahassa vā santakassa gahaṇe ti attho || *adin-nassa parasantakassa ādānaṃ gahaṇaṃ* (≠ Kkh 47,6) 'adinnādānaṃ' | saddana-yavasena pana yu-paccayayogato *yathārūpe adinnādāne* ti (Pāt 8,10) padassa yathārūpassa adinnassa ādāne ti attho veditabbo || *yathārūpe* ti (Pāt 8,10) padaṃ hi *adinnādāne* ti (Pāt 8,10) pade adinna-saddena tulyādhikaraṇabhāvena sambandhitabbaṃ | tena vakkhati *tathārūpaṃ bhikkhu adinnaṃ ādiyamāno* ti (Pāt 8,12–13 = Kkh 47,15) | evaṃ yathārūpa-saddāpekkho pi adinna-saddo vākye viya atthassa gammakattā anapekkhattena ādāna-saddena samāso hoti | tathā nāmānaṃ samāso yuttattho ti vutte pi ahosikammaṃ, ehibhikkhu-anaññātaṃ

ñassāmi iti evaṃ paṭipannassa pavattaṃ indriyaṃ *anaññātañ ñassāmi tin-driyan* ty (Pm-vn vs. 391, and so on) ādisu ekatthibhāvalakkaṇattā eva-sadda-iti-saddalopavasena ca iti-saddabyavahitavasena ākhyātena pi samāso hoti ti veditabbaṃ || *samassiya* ti saddavasena vā atthavasena vā vibhattilopaṃ katvā vā akatvā vā ekapadattakaraṇena saṅkhipiyatī ti *samāso* || samasitānañ hi nānāpadānaṃ ekapadattupagamaṇaṃ *samāsalakkaṇaṃ* || 'KECI pana 'bhinnatthānaṃ ekatthibhāvo *samāsalakkaṇaṃ*' ti VADANTĪ' ti (?⁶⁷) SADDANĪTIYAM

66. Source not identified. The same verse is quoted in Sv-anṭ I 18, where it is introduced with *tathā hi vadanti* suggesting an earlier source. The quotative (*tena vuttaṃ*) used in the Pāt-pa-av generally also refers back to an older source, see Kieffer-Pülz 2015a, §2.3.

67. Not traced in Sadd, also not by the Burmese editor. But the identical quotation, without the source marker *keci pana ... ti vadanti*, is found in Rūp 178 and Mmd 257,7.

vuttaṃ || SADDASĀRATTHAJĀLINIYA⁶⁸ pana ‘niddhāraṇa-asamānādhikaraṇādisu ekādasasu ṭhānesu samāso na hoti’ ti (?⁶⁹) vuttaṃ ||

rājāno ti (Pāt 8,10 = Kkh 47,7) aparādhānurūpaṃ anusāsako Bimbisāro viya rājāno || dhammena samena paresaṃ rañjanti ti **rājāno** | sammutidevā | tividho hi **devo** sammutideva-upapattideva-visuddhidevavasena ||

bibban ti *suvaṇṇaṃ* || *sārasuvaṇṇasadisavaṇṇatāya* ‘bimbisāro’ ti *vuccati* (≠ Sv I 280,7–8 ≠ Sp-ṭ II 123,4–5, and so on) ||

coran ti (Pāt 8,10) pañcamāsādi-avaharaṇavasena ādiyamānaṃ janaṃ || paresaṃ dhaṇaṃ coreti theneti ti **coro** (Pāt 8,11) ||

gahetvā ti (Pāt 8,11) idaṃ upalakkhaṇamattaṃ || etena hi pakkosāpetvā ti kriyam pi saṅgahitaṃ || atha vā **gahetvā** ti (Pāt 8,11) sayamaṃ gahetvā parehi gāhāpetvā || nipātattā tvā-paccayo ekavacana-bahuvacanasādhāraṇo hoti ||

haneyyumaṃ vā ti (Pāt 8,11 = Kkh 47,9) *hatthādihi vā potheyyumaṃ satthena vā chin-deyyumaṃ* ||

bandheyymaṃ vā ti (Pāt 8,11 = Kkh 47,19) *rajjubandhana-addubandhana-saṅkhalikabandhana-gharabandhanādihi bandheyymaṃ* ||

pabbājeyyumaṃ vā [88] ti raṭṭhato *nīhareyyumaṃ vā* (Kkh 47,9–11) || raṭṭhato ti raj-jato |

coro ‘sī’ ti (Pāt 8,11–12 = Kkh 47,12) ettha tvaṃ ti paṭṭhānakattupekkanavasena majjhimapurisavibhatti hoti || **theno** ‘sī’ ti (≠ Pāt 8,12 = Kkh 47,12) ettha iti-saddo nidassane vā pakāratthe vā ādyatthe vā vattati || tassa iti-saddassa **paribhāseyyumaṃ** ti (Kkh 47,12–13) pāṭhasesakriyāpadena sambandho ||

paribhāseyyumaṃ ti (Kkh 47,12–13) padassa ca pāṭhasesabhāvo **coro** ‘si’ ty ādi akkosavacanena viññāyati || tvaṃ coro asi tvaṃ bālo asi tvaṃ mūlho asi tvaṃ theno apanidhāno asi || iti evaṃ vā iti imehi pakārehi vacanehi vā iti ādihi *vacanehi* vā *paribhāseyyumaṃ* ti (Kkh 47,12–13) yojanā ||

haneyyumaṃ vā ty (Pāt 8,11 = Kkh 47,9) ādi pāṭhesu samabhinivittṭho vā-saddo aniyamattho ti veditabbo || **haneyyumaṃ** | ahanante **bandheyymaṃ** | abandhe **pabbājeyyumaṃ** | apabbajante **paribhāseyyumaṃ** ti vuttaṃ hoti ||

ditṭhadhammika-samparāyikasāṅkhāte dve atthe lunāti chindatī ti bālo (Sadd 501,5–6) || assāsa-passāsa-mattena balati jīvati ti vā **balō** || so pana *duccintitacinti ca dubbhāsitaḥāsī ca dukkaṭakammakārī* (≠ M III 163,9–10) cā ti tilakkhaṇo hoti ||

muyhatī ti **mūlho** (Pāt 8,12 = Kkh 47,12) || imehi dvīhi padehi corabhāvassa kāraṇaṃ dasseti ||

tathārūpan ti (Pāt 8,12 = Kkh 47,15) tādisaṃ | iminā padena pādaṃ vā pādārahaṃ vā dasseti || nanu atitehi vā anāgatehi vā sabbabuddhehi sāvakānaṃ dosānurūpaṃ pādena vā pādārahena vā paññatto mahāpathabhūto pārājikaparicchedo hatthatale ṭhapitaṃ āmalakaṃ maṇirātanaṃ pasādacakkhunā passati viya sabbaññutaññānacakkhunādittṭho | atha kim atthaṃ **yathārūpe adinnādāne** || pa || **tathārūpan** ti (Pāt 8,10–12) lokavohārappamāṇena saṃsanditvā paññatto ti || sabbaññutaññānubhāvaṃ ajānitvā upavādanena mahoghapakkhandesu

68. Written by Nāgita, Khaṇḍakakhipa Thera (1357 CE).

69. The source is not traced by the Burmese editor. There is no literal correspondence, but see Sadd-sār-j vs. 433 *ekādasasu ṭhānesu samāsasaññā vajiṭṭā* || *niddhāraṇe pūraṇe ca guṇavacane suhitatthe*; vs. 434 *santatthe abyasatthe ca tabba-paccayayoge pi* || *asamānādhikaraṇe tta-paccayantike pi ca*.

sattesu mahākaruṇāsamāyuttabhāvadassanattamaṃ | karuṇāpaṭṭhānaṃ hi Vinayaṇṇaṃ || Abhidhammapiṭakaṃ pana pañṇāpaṭṭhānaṃ | Suttantapiṭakaṃ ubhayappaṭṭhānaṃ || ||

ādiyamāno ti (Pāt 8,13 = Kkh 47,15) hetumantavisesanāniddeso | pañcaviṣāṭiṇi avahārehi ādiyaṇṇaṃ gaṇhātī ti **ādiyamāno** | bhikkhuss’ etaṃ adhivacanaṃ ||

ayam pī ti (Pāt 8,13) ettha ayan ti idaṃ ima-saddassa kāriyabhūtasāmaññavācīrūlhisabbanāmapadaṃ || api-saddo sampiṇḍanatto || etena hi na kevalaṃ methunasevanattā yeva pārājiko | atha kho adinnādānattāpī [89] ti dasseti || **tathārūpaṃ adinnaṃ ādiyamāno ayam pi** bhikkhu **pārājiko hoti** ti (Pāt 8,12–13 = Kkh 47,15) sambandho || ||

tattha ca **pādo** (Vin III 45,11) nāma *kaḥāpaṇassa catuttho bhāgo* (Sp II 297,24) || ‘*kaḥāpaṇo*’ pana duvidho hoti suvaṇṇakahāpaṇo missakakahāpaṇo cā ti | tesu hi kālākavirahitassa niddhantasuvaṇṇassa viṣatimāsā ‘*suvaṇṇakahāpaṇo*’ nāma || pañcamāsā suvaṇṇassa | *tathā rajatassa* | *dasamāsā tambassā*⁷⁰ ti ete viṣatimāse missetvā bandhatthāya⁷¹ vihimattaloḥaṃ pakkhipitvā akkharāni ca hatthipādādināṃ⁷² aññataraṇ ca rūpaṃ dassetvā kato ‘*missakakahāpaṇo*’ nāma || so yeva niddosattā ‘*nilakahāpaṇo*’ nāma || || *suvaṇṇakahāpaṇa-vinicchayaṃ* VIMATIVINODANĪTĪKĀYAM⁷³ vuttaṃ || *missakakahāpaṇa-vinicchayaṃ* UTTARAVINICCHAYATĪKĀYAM⁷⁴ vuttaṃ || || *sāmaṇerānaṃ dasikasuttenāpi pārājiko hoti* | *upasampannānaṃ pana suvaṇṇassa viṣativihimattena*⁷⁵ (Utt-vn-ṭ II 409,18–20⁷⁶) || etthāpi viṣativihimattaṃ nāma suvaṇṇamāsakavasena *addhatiyamāsakaṃ*⁷⁷ hoti (Utt-vn-ṭ II 409,22) || *ayam sihaḷācariyavādo* | tena vuttaṃ ABHIDHĀNAPPADĪPIKĀYAM⁷⁸ || || ‘*cattāro vihayo guṇjā*⁷⁹ | *dve guṇjā māsako bhavē*’ ti (Abh 479) || ||

*māsakaṃ vā unāmāsakaṃ vā ādiyantassa pana dukkaṭaṃ*⁸⁰ || atirekamāsakaṃ vā unāpañcamāsakaṃ vā⁸¹ *thullaccayaṃ*⁸² (Kkh 47,24–25) ||

duṭṭhu katan ti ‘*dukkataṃ*’ || ācāravipattisu ‘*thūlaṃ*’ mahantaṃ ‘*accayaṃ*’ aparādhō etassāpattiyaṃ ti ‘*thullaccayaṃ*’ || ‘*anum thūlan* ti khuddakaṃ vā mahantaṃ vā’ ty (Sv II 393,3–4) ādisu viya hi idha thūla-saddo mahante vattati || ||

70. Vin-l-r *tampassa*

71. Vin-l-r ‘*attāya*

72. Vin-l-r *hatthipādādināṃ*

73. Traced by the Burmese editor; this refers to Vmv I 169,19–26, where Coliya Kassapa passes accordant information not matching literally.

74. Source not traced by the Burmese editor. This refers to Utt-vn-ṭ II 405,3–409,13, where the *nilakahāpaṇa* is defined.

75. Vin-l-r *ññaṃ v1 viṣativihimattena*

76. Quotation from the *Sāmaṇerasikkhā* in the *Uttaravinicchaya-tīkā*.

77. Vin-l-r ‘*māsakā*

78. Vin-l-r *Abhidhānadīpakāyaṃ*

79. Vin-l-r *guṇicā* (allover)

80. Vin-l-r ad *āpajjati*

81. Vin-l-r ad *ādiyantassa*

82. Vin-l-r ad *āpajjati*

imasmim sikkhāpade aññassa manussajātikassa vasena parapariggahitaṃ, parapariggahitasaññitā, pādapādārahaparikkhāro⁸³, theyyacittam, pañcavisatiyā avahārānaṃ vasena avaharaṇaṃ cā ti imāni pañcaṅgāni honti (Kkh 48,6–8) ||

tattha **adinnan** ti (Pāt 8,9 = Kkh 42,8) padena ārammaṇassa ārammaṇikena avinābhāvato parapariggahita-parapariggahitasaññibhāvasaṅkhātāṃ aṅgadvayaṃ dasseti | ‘avinābhāvo hi ādhāra-ādheyya-ārammaṇa-ārammaṇika-pahātabba-pahāyakesu labbhati’ ti (?⁸⁴) NIRUTTIMAÑJUSĀTĪKĀYAM vuttam ||

theyyasaṅkhātān ti (Pāt 8,9–10 = Kkh 42,9) padena theyyacittasaṅkhātāṃ ekaṃ aṅgaṃ dasseti || **ādiyeyyā** ti (Pāt 8,10 = Kkh 42,18) padena pañcavisatiyā avahārānaṃ [90] vasena avaharaṇasaṅkhātāṃ ekaṃ aṅgaṃ dasseti (≠ Kkh 42,18) || **yathārūpe adinnādāne** || pa || **tathārūpan** ti (Pāt 8,10–12) pāṭhena pādapādārahaparikkhārasaṅkhātāṃ ekaṃ aṅgaṃ dasseti | taṃ dassanabhāvo ca **haneyyun** ti (Pāt 8,11) vacanena anumānitvā ca nidānapadabhājanipāḷisaṅkhātāgamaṇa ca viññāyati || ||

[2] (1) sakasaññissa, (2) vissāsagāhe, (3) tāvakālike, (4) petapariggahe, (5) tiracchānagatapariggahe, (6) pamsukūlasaññissa, (7) ummattakādīnaṃ ca anāpatti (Kkh 48,3–4) ||

ettha ca (1) **sakasaññāya** gahitaṃ parabhaṇḍaṃ sace sāmikehi dehī ti vutto na deti | tesam dhuranikkhepena pārājikaṃ ||

(2) sasaṇaṃ himsaṇaṃ sāso || ‘vigato sāso etasmā gāhā ti **vissāso**’ (Palim-nṭ I 155,21–22) tena gahaṇaṃ ‘vissāsagāho’ || so ca pana tīhi aṅgehi rūhati (Sp II 372,5) || kathaṃ |

(2.1) sandiṭṭho jīvati gahite attamano, (2.2) sambhatto jīvati gahite attamāno⁸⁵, (2.3) ālapito jīvati gahite attamāno ti (Sp II 372,5–7) ||

(2.1) tattha **sandiṭṭho** ti diṭṭhamattakamitto ||

(2.2) **sambhatto** ti dālhamitto ||

(2.3) **ālapito** ti mama santakaṃ yaṃ icchasi taṃ gaṇheyyāsi | āpucchitvā gahaṇe kāraṇaṃ natthi ti vutto ||

(2.1) **jīvati** ti anuṭṭhānaseyyasayito pi yāva jīvitindriyupacchedaṃ na pāpunāti ||

(2.1–3) **gahite attamano** ti gahite tuṭṭhacitto || evarūpassa santakaṃ gahite me attamano bhavissati ti jānantaṃ gaḥetaṃ vaṭṭati || || (Sp II 371,26–372,3)

na rūhat’ accaye dānaṃ | pañcannaṃ sahadhammiṇaṃ ||

saṃghass’ eva ca taṃ hoti | gihinaṃ pana rūhati || ||⁸⁶

tattha ‘na rūhat’ accaye dānaṃ’ ti (Khuddas vs. 378) mayi accaye sati gaṇhāhi ti dānaṃ na rūhati || sace pana idaṃ⁸⁷ tuyhaṃ dammi⁸⁸ ti vutte ahaṃ gaṇhāmī ti vadati | sudinnaṃ ca suggahitaṃ ca hoti ||

(3) **tāvakālike** (Kkh 48,3) pana saṃghasantakaṃ paṭidātum eva vaṭṭati (Sp II 372,24–25) ||

83. Kkh garuparikkhāro

84. Not traced by the Burmese editor; I do not yet have access to an edition of this text.

85. Pāt-pa-av attano

86. Khuddas B^e vs. 378 = Khuddas E^e XLI 48.

87. Vin-l-r ad santakaṃ

88. Vin-l-r damhi

(4) **petapariggahe** (Kkh 48,3) ārakkhehi pariggahitaṃ gahetuṃ na vaṭṭati || petaggahaṇena sakkadevarājādayo gahitā || ||

(5) **tiracchānagatapariggahe** ti (Kkh 48,3–4) nāga-supañṇādīnaṃ tiracchānagatānaṃ pariggahe || sace pi hi devo vā nāga-supañṇo vā manussarūpena āpaṇaṃ pasāreti | tato ca tesam̐ santakaṃ koci dibbacakkhuo bhikkhu gahetvā gacchati | vaṭṭati (≠ Sp II 373,4–7) ||

(6) **paṃsukūlasaṇṇāya** (≠ Kkh 48,4) gahitabhaṇḍaṃ sace sassāmikaṃ hoti | āharāpente dātabbaṃ (≠ Sp II 373,14) || [91]

[3] (1) **sāhatthiko**, (2) **āṇattiko**, (3) **nissaggiyo**, (4) **atthasādhako**, (5) **dhuranikkhepo** (Kkh 43,20–21) cā ti idaṃ **sāhattikapañcakaṃ** (Kkh 43,20) || ||

[4] (6) **pubbapayogo**, (7) **sahapayogo**, (8) **saṃvidhāvahāro**, (9) **saṅketakammaṃ**, (10) **nimittakammaṇ** (Kkh 44,7–8) cā ti idaṃ **pubbapayogapañcakaṃ** (Kkh 44,7) || ||

[5] (11) **theyyāvahāro**, (12) **pasayhāvahāro**, (13) **parikappāvahāro**, (14) **paṭicchannāvahāro**, (15) **kusāvahāro** (Kkh 44,21–22) cā ti idaṃ **theyyāvahārapañcakaṃ** (Kkh 44,21) || ||

[6] (16) **abhiyuñjanāvahāro**, (17) **haritabbāvahāro**, (18) **upanikkhittāvahāro**, (19) **iriyāpathavikopanaṃ**, (20) **ṭhānācāvanaṇ** cā ti idaṃ **nānābhaṇḍapañcakaṃ** (Kkh 42,24) || idaṃ saviññāṇakāviññāṇakamissakavasena dattṭhabbaṃ (Kkh 42,25) || ||

[7] (21) **abhiyuñjanāvahāro**, (22) **haritabbāvahāro**, (23) **upanikkhittāvahāro**, (24) **iriyāpathavikopanaṃ**, (25) **ṭhānācāvanaṇ** cā ti idaṃ **ekabhaṇḍapañcakaṃ** (Kkh 42,20) || idaṃ saviññāṇakavasena dattṭhabbaṃ || iti pañcaviṣati avahāro veditabbo || ||

[8] tatrāyaṃ saṅkhepattho:

(1) **sāhatthiko** ti (Pāt-pa-av 91,1 = Kkh 43,21) parabhaṇḍassa sahatthena nibbatto avahāro || sako hattho ‘sahattho’ ||

(2) **āṇattiko** ti (Pāt-pa-av 91,1 = Kkh 43,22) aññaṃ āṇattiyānibbatto avahāro ||

(3) **nissaggiyo** ti (Pāt-pa-av 91,1 = Kkh 43,23) suṅkaghāta-parikappitokāsānaṃ anto ṭhatvā bhi nissajjanaṃ nipātanaṃ | iya-paccayo svattho || rañño suṅkaṃ hananti vināsenti etthā ti ‘suṅkaghātaṃ’ | suṅkaṭṭhapanatṭhānass’ etaṃ nāmaṃ ||

(4) **atthasādhako** ti (Pāt-pa-av 91,1 = Kkh 43,24) puretaram eva pārājikasāṅkhātassa atthassa payojanassa sādhako yadā sakkosi avaharituṃ tadā avaharā ti kālaṃ aparicchinditvā āṇattisaṅkhāto avassaṃ avahāro (Sp II 304,17) || ettha hi āṇāpakassa āṇattikkhaṇe yeva pārājikaṃ (Sp II 304,19) || parassa kevalakumbhiyaṃ pādagghanakaṃ telaṃ avassaṃ pi vanakāni upāhanādini pakkhipantassa pi hatthato muttamatte yeva pārājikaṃ āpajjati || puretaram eva pārājikasāṅkhātaṃ atthaṃ sādhetī ti **atthasādhako** ||

(5) **dhuranikkhepo** ti (Pāt-pa-av 91,1–2 = Kkh 44,4) ārāmābhīyogā-upanikkhittabhaṇḍesu ca tāvakālikabhaṇḍadeyyesu ca ubhinnaṃ dhuranikkhepanaṃ ||

pañcannaṃ avahārānaṃ samūho **pañcakaṃ** || pañcaparimāṇaṃ assā ti vā **pañcakaṃ** (Kkh-nt 197,15) || sāhatthikena upalakkhitaṃ pañcakaṃ **sā**[92] **hatthikapañcakaṃ** || api ca sāhatthiko va pañcakaṃ **sāhatthikapañcakaṃ** | ādipadavasena c’ etaṃ nāmaṃ || ||

(6) **pubbapayogo** (Pāt-pa-av 91,3 = Kkh 44,9) nāma āṇattipayogo | bhaṇḍaggaṇassa pubbabhāge pavattattā ||

(7) **sahapayogo** (Pāt-pa-av 91,3 = Kkh 44,10) nāma ṭhānā cāvanāḍipayogo | avaharaṇakriyāya saha pavattattā ||

(8) **saṃvidhāvahāro** ti (Pāt-pa-av 91,3 = Kkh 44,10) saṃvidhā eva avahāro | saṃvidhasaṅkhāto vā avahāro || VINICCHAYAṬĪKĀYAM pana ‘saṃvidahitvā manthetvā avaharaṇaṃ **saṃvidhāvaharaṇaṃ** (Vin-vn vs. 42) | niruttinayena saddasiddhi veditabbā’ ti (Vin-vn-ṭ I 55,1–2⁸⁹) vuttaṃ || saṃvidahitesu hi bhikkhūsu ekena pi parabhaṇḍe ṭhānā cāvite sabbesaṃ avahārā honti ||

(9) **saṅketakamman** ti (Pāt-pa-av 91,3–4 = Kkh 44,13) purebhaddādisu yaṃ kiñci kālaṃ paricchinditvā saṅketakaraṇaṃ (≠ Kkh 44,13–15) | taṃ yeva avaharaṇaṃ nāma || idaṃ hi saṅketakārahikkhum eva sandhāya vuttaṃ | na avahārakabhikkhum | sāhatthikena gahitattā || evaṃ idisesu pi veditabbaṃ ||

(10) **nimittakamman** ti (Pāt-pa-av 91,4 = Kkh 44,17) saññuppadanattaṃ akkhinikkhana-gīvunnamanādinimittakaraṇaṃ (Kkh 44,17–18) || ||

(11) **theyyāvahāro** ti (Pāt-pa-av 91,5 = Kkh 44,24) theyyacittena avaharaṇaṃ | rattibhāge vā divasabhāge vā adissamānena gabbhasandhiṃ chinditvā vā tulakūṭa-mānakūṭa-kahāpaṇakūṭādihi vañcetvā vā avahāro ti vuttaṃ hoti || ‘bhikkhupaṭipāṭiyā kūtavassāni gaṇetvā gaṇhanto bhaṇḍagghena kāretabbo’ ti (Pālim 150,21–22⁹⁰ = Sp V 1020,30–32) VINAYASĀNGAHE vuttaṃ || ‘kūṭaṇ’ ti vañcanaṃ || ‘theno’ ti vuccati coro || thenassa bhāvo ‘theyyaṃ’ | avaharaṇacittass’ etaṃ adhivacanaṃ (Sp II 302,3–4) || ettha na-kāralopo niruttinayena dāṭṭhabbo | na-kārassa vā ya-kārādeso veditabbo || theyyena avaharaṇaṃ **theyyāvahāro** ||

(12) **pasayhāvahāro** ti (Pāt-pa-av 91,5 = Kkh 45,2) gāmaghātakacora-rājabhaddādayo viya abhibhavitvā balakkārena vā santajjetvā bhayaṃ dassetvā vā attano pattabalito adhikassa gahaṇavasena vā avaharaṇaṃ || **pasayhā** ti abhibhavanatthe nipāto ||

(13) **parikappāvahāro** ti (Pāt-pa-av 91,5 = Kkh 45,16) bhaṇḍokāse paricchinditvā avaharaṇaṃ ||

(14) **paṭicchannāvahāro** ti (Pāt-pa-av 91,5–6 = Kkh 45,26) tiṇa-paṇṇādihi yaṃ kiñci aṅgulivedhanāḍibhaṇḍaṃ ṭhānā acāvanena paṭicchādetvā pacchā ṭhānā cāvetvā tassa paṭicchannassa bhaṇḍassa avaharaṇaṃ ||

(15) **kusāvahāro** ti (Pāt-pa-av 91,6 = Kkh 46,14) kusaṃ saṅkāmetvā attano koṭṭhāsato adhikassa vā ūnassa vā samassa vā parakoṭṭhāsassa avahara[93]ṇaṃ || kusena avahāro **kusāvahāro** || kusassa saṅkamaṇaṃ eva vā avahāro **kusāvahāro** || ||

(16/21) **abhiyuñjanāvahāro** ti (Pāt-pa-av 91,7.10) āramāḍibhaṇḍaṃ musā bhaṇitvā aṭṭakaraṇena avaharaṇaṃ ||

(17/22) **haritabbāvahāro** ti (Pāt-pa-av 91,7.10) attanā haritabbassa para-bhaṇḍassa avaharaṇaṃ ||

(18/23) **upanikkhittāvahāro** ti (Pāt-pa-av 91,7–8.10–11) attani upanikkhipi-tassa parabhaṇḍassa avaharaṇaṃ ||

89. Reference not traced by the Burmese editor.

90. Reference not traced by the Burmese editor.

(19/24) **iriyāpathavikopanan** ti (Pāt-pa-av 91,8.11) bhaṇḍahārakassa janassa iriyāpathassa vikopanam | pakati-iriyāpathato dutiyapādātikkamana-saṅkhāta-iriyāpathassa karanan ti vuttam hoti ||

(20/25) **ṭhānācāvanan** ti (Pāt-pa-av 91,8.11) parabhaṇḍassa ṭhitatṭhānato cāvanan ti || ||

[9] ete **pañcavīsati avahārā** (Pāt-pa-av 91,13) vacanabheden' eva bhinnā | sabhāvato pana abhinnā || tesu kusalena vinayadharena sahasā avinicchitvā sutta-suttānuloma-ācariyavāda-attanomatīhi tulayitvā sutte ca vatthu-mātikā-padabhājanī-tikapariccheda-antarāpatti-anāpattisaṅkhātāni chaṭṭhānāni ca sassāmikāsāmika-appaggha-mahagghādivasena vatthu-kāla-desā-aggha-paribhogasaṅkhātāni pañca ṭhānāni oloketvā va vinicchitabbam || sukhumo hi adinnādā namanussaviggahavatthuvītikkamo | so ca cittalāhukattā sukhumen' eva āpajjati rakkhati |

[10] ettha ca **suttan** ti (Pāt-pa-av 93,11-12) *sakale Vinayapītake*⁹¹ *pāli* || (≠ Sp I 230,32)

suttānuloman ti (Pāt-pa-av 93,12) *cattāro mahāpadesā* || (≠ Sp I 230,32-33)

ācariyavādo ti (Pāt-pa-av 93,12) *dhammasaṅgāhakehi pañcahi arahantasatehi thapitā pālīvinimuttā okkantavinicchayappavattā atṭhakathā-tanti* (≠ Sp I 231,9-11) ||

attanomatī ti (Pāt-pa-av 93,12) *sutta-suttānuloma-ācariyavāde muñcivā anumānena attano buddhiyā nayaggāhena upatṭhitākārakathanam* || *api ca*⁹² *Suttantābhīdhamma-Vinayatṭhakathāsu āgato sabbo pi theravādo attanomatī nāma* || (≠ Sp I 231,9-15)

tattha 'yaṃ bhikkhave mayā 'idaṃ na kappati' ti appaṭikkhittam | tañ ce akappiyaṃ anulometi kappiyaṃ paṭibāhati | tam vo na kappati || yaṃ bhikkhave mayā 'idaṃ na kappati' ti apaṭikkhittam | tañ ce kappiyaṃ anulometi akappiyaṃ paṭibāhati | tam vo kappati || yaṃ bhikkhave mayā 'idaṃ kappati' ti ananuññātam | tañ ce akappiyaṃ anulometi kappiyaṃ paṭibāhati | tam vo na kappati || yaṃ bhikkhave mayā 'idaṃ kappati' ti ananaññātam | tañ ce kappiyaṃ anulometi akappiyaṃ paṭibāhati | tam vo [94] kappati' ti (Vin I 250,36-251,6 = Sp I 230,33-231,9) vuttavacanam mahāpadeso nāma || mahante atthe padisati uddisati ettha | etenā ti vā **mahāpadeso** (Pāt-pa-av 94,1) ||

antarāpatti ti (Pāt-pa-av 93,13) *sikkhāpadantare*⁹³ *aññasmiṃ vatthusmiṃ paññattā*⁹⁴ *āpatti* (Vmv I 23,27-28) || ||

[11] idaṃ Rājagahe Dhaniyattheram ārabha rañño dārūni adinnam ādiyanavatthusmiṃ paññattam || idaṃ sāṇattikam | (≠ Kkh 47,20-22) adinnādānasamuṭṭhānam | kriyam | saññāvimokkham | sacittakam | lokavajjam | kāyakammaṃ | vacīkammaṃ | akusalacittam | tivedanam || (Kkh 48,9-10)

[12] ettha ca 'adinnam ādiyissāmi'⁹⁵ ti saññāya abhāvena muccanato **saññāvimokkham** (Sp II 373,26-27) || idaṃ abhidhammapariyāyena kāyakamme samāne pi sāṇattikavasena **vacīkammaṃ** ti vuccati || **sāhatthikam** kāya-cittato

91. Sp sakala°

92. Vin-l-r ad aparo nayo mayā vuccate

93. Vin-l-r, Vmv °antaresu

94. Vin-l-r paññattam

95. Sp ādiyāmi, v.l. ādiyissāmi

samuṭṭhāti || **āṇattikaṃ** vācā-cittato samuṭṭhāti || mahābhāraharāṇe pavattaṃ
sāhatthikāṇattikaṃ kāya-vācā-cittato samuṭṭhāti (Kkh-nt 210,4–6) || ||
dutiya⁹⁶pārājikavaṇṇanā niṭṭhitā ||

Acknowledgments

This article, given as a paper at the IABS conference in Vienna, 2014, is an outcome of my work on *Wissenschaftliches Pāli* (Scholastic Pāli) at the Academy of Sciences and Literature, Mainz, promoted by Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (German Research Foundation). Anne Peters (Göttingen) provided me with her transliteration of the *Vinaya-lakkhaṇa-rāsi*, Alastair Gornall (Singapore) with a scan of the *Sambandhacintā-sannaya*. The latter in addition corrected and improved my English. Mudagamuwe Maithrimurthi (Heidelberg) kindly checked my transliterations of the Sinhalese. Elisa Freschi (Vienna) read various ‘final’ versions and made many valuable comments. Peter Harvey meticulously copy edited the article, and provided me with further suggestions and corrections. My thanks go to all of them.

Abbreviations

- Abh = *Abhidhānapadīpikā* (CSCD).
 Abhidh-s-mhṭ = [Sumaṅgala, *Abhidhammattha-saṅgaha-mahā-ṭikā*] *Ṭikā kyō pāṭh*. Rankun mrui Jambū mit chve piṭakat puṃ nhip tuik, 1912.
 Abhidh-s-sn = [Sāriputta, *Abhidharmāthasaṅgraha-purāṇa-sannaya*] *Anuruddha's Abhidharmātha Saṅgrahaya saha Sāriputta's purāṇa sannaya*, ed. Toṭagamuvē Paññāmolī Tissa, rev. fifth edition by Valagedara Somāloka Tissa. Colombo: Anula Press, 1960.
 CSCD = *Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana* CD-ROM, Version 3.0 (Igatpuri: Vipassana Research Institute, 1999).
 Cv = *Cullavagga*.
 Dāṭh = ‘The Dāṭhavaṃsa,’ [eds. T. W. Rhys Davids and R. Morris], *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 1884: 109–151.
 fol.(l). = folio(s)
 Gv = ‘[Nandapañña] The Gandhavaṃsa,’ [ed. Ivan P. Minayeff], *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 1886: 54–80.
 Khuddas = *Dhammasiri, Khuddasikkhā*
 B° = CSCD [according to verses – counted continuously].
 E° = ‘*Khudda-sikkhā* and *Mūla-sikkhā*,’ [ed. Edward Müller], *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 1883: 88–121 [according to chapter and verse number; verses counted anew in each chapter].
 Kkh = *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī* by *Bhadantācariya Buddhaghosa*, ed. K. R. Norman, William Pruitt. Oxford: Pali Text Society, 2003.
 Kkh-nt = *Buddhanāga, Vinayattamañjūsā nāma Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī-abhinava-ṭikā*. Rangoon: Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana edition, 1961, 118–489.
 Kkh-pipo = *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī-piṭapota*, ed. Kalukondayāvē Paññāsekhara. Colombo: Mahābodhi Press, 1936.
 Kudus-sn = *Kudusika hā purātana vistara sannaya*, ed. Moragallē Siri Nānabhāsa Tissa. Colombo: Guṇasēna, 2498/1954.

96. fn. Vin-l-r *dutiyaṃ*

M = monks (in connection with the Pātimokkha rules).

M = *Majjhima-Nikāya*, ed. V. Trenckner, R. Chalmers, 3 vols. London: Pali Text Society, 1888–1899.

Mmd = [Vimalabuddhi/Vajirabuddhi, *Mukhamattadīpanī*] *Nyāsa pāṭh*. Rangoon: Sudhammavati Press, 1933.

Mv = Mahāvagga.

Niss = Nissaggiya rule.

Pālim = Sāriputta [of Poḷonnaruva], *Pālimuttaka-vinayavinicchaya-saṅgaha* (*Vinaya-saṅgahaṭṭhakathā*). Rangoon: Chatṭhasaṅgāyana Edition, 1960.

Pālim-pt = Sāriputta [of Poḷonnaruva, *Pālimuttaka-vinayavinicchaya-purāṇa-ṭikā*] *Pālimuttaka Vinaya Vinicchaya Saṅgaha-ṭikā*, rev. K. Pannasara. Matara: Sudarsana Press/Colombo Jinālaṅkāra Press, 1908/2451.

Pār = *Pārājika* rule.

Pāt = *The Pātimokkha*, ed. William Pruitt, trans. K. R. Norman. Oxford: Pali Text Society, 2001.

Pāt-pa-av = [Vicittālaṅkāra, *Pātimokkhapadatthānuvaṇṇanā*] *Vinayapiṭaka. Pātimokkhapadattha-anuvaṇṇanā pāṭh*, ed. pālī charā Ūḥ Phre (edited by the Pālī scholar Ūḥ Phre) 1270 praññiṇḥ, tan-choṇ-munḥ la (Tan-choṇ-munḥ 1270, October/November 1908 CE).

Pm-vn = 'Paramatthavinicchaya by Anuruddha,' [ed. A. P. Buddhadatta], *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 10, 1985: 155–226.

Rś-ṭ = [Ratnaśrījñāna, *Ratnaśrī-ṭikā*] *Kavyalakṣaṇa* (sic) of Daṇḍin (also known as *Kāvyādarśa*). With commentary called *Ratnaśrī of Ratnaśrījñāna*, ed. Anantalal Thakur and Upendra Jha. Darbhanga, 1957.

Rūp = Buddhappiya, *Rūpasiddhi*, CSD.

Sadd = [Aggavaṃsa, *Saddanīti*] *Saddanīti La Grammaire Palie d'Aggavaṃsa*, 3 vols., ed. Helmer Smith. Oxford: Pali Text Society, 2001 [original 1928–1954].

Sadd-sār-j = Nāgita, *Saddasāratthajālīnī*, in: Thvanh Sinh Ūḥ, Cin 'Up Ūḥ, et alii [eds.], *Saddā nīy 15 coṇ pāṭh*. Rangoon: Icchāsaya piṭakat cā puṇ bhīp tuik, 1964, 65–108 [text no. 6].

Sās = Paññasāmi, *Sāsanavaṃsa*, ed. Mabel Bode. London: Pali Text Society, 1897.

Sbc-sn = [Gotama, *Sambandhacintā-sannaya*] *The Sambandha-cintā by the Venerable Sthavira, Sri Saṅgharakshita together with its Sinhalese paraphrase by the Venerable Gotama Mahasami*, ed. Kalutara Sārānanda Sthavira. Colombo: K. D. Simon Appuhāmi, A.B. 2431.

Sp = *Samantapāsādikā, Vinayaṭṭhakathā*

B° = *Samantapāsādikā, Vinayaṭṭhakathā*, CSD.

E° = *Samantapāsādikā, Vinayaṭṭhakathā*, 7 vols., ed. J. Takakusu, M. Nagai (and K. Mizuno in vols. 5 and 7). London: Pali Text Society, 1924–1947.

N° = [Nālanda Edition] *Samantapāsādikā nāma Aṭṭhakathā*, 3 parts, ed. Nathmal Tatiya, Birbal Sharma, et alii. Patna: Nava Nālandā-Mahāvihāra, 1964, 1965, 1967 (Nava-Nālandā-Mahāvihāra-Granthamālā).

Sp-ṭ = Sāriputta [of Poḷonnaruva], *Sāratthadīpanī-ṭikā*, 3 vols. Rangoon: Chatṭhasaṅgāyana Edition, 1960.

Subodh = [Saṅgharakkhita, Subodhālaṅkāra, in:] *Subodhālaṅkāra. Porāṇa-ṭikā* (*Mahāsāmi-ṭikā*) by Saṅgharakkhita Mahāsāmi. *Abhinava-ṭikā* (Nissaya) (anonymous), ed. Padmanabh S. Jaini. Oxford: Pali Text Society, 2000.

- Subodh-pt = [Saṅgharakkhita, *Subodhālankāra-purāṇa-ṭikā* named *Mahāsāmī* in:] see Subodh.
- Sv = Buddhaghosa, *Sumaṅgalavilāsini*, *Dīghanikāyaṭṭhakathā*, 3 vols., ed. T. W. Rhys Davids, J. E. Carpenter, W. Stede. London: Pali Text Society, 1886–1932.
- Sv-pt = Dhammapāla, *Dīghanikāyaṭṭhakathā-ṭikā Līnatthavaṇṇanā* [*Līnatthapakāsini I*, *Sumaṅgalavilāsini-purāṇa-ṭikā*], 3 vols., ed. Lily de Silva. London: Pali Text Society, 1970.
- Utt-vn-ṭ = *Uttaravinicchaya-ṭikā*, in: *Vinayavinicchaya-ṭikā* (*Vinayatthasārasandīpanī*), vol. 2. Rangoon: Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana Edition, 1977, 401–430.
- Vin = *Vinaya Piṭaka*, 5 vols., ed. Hermann Oldenberg. London 1879–1883.
- Vin-l-r = *Vinayalakkhaṇārāsī* (*Vinaññi mhat cu*), Manuscript Cod. Birm. 299 in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, München (Bavarian State Library, Munich); described Peters 2000: catalogue number 857.
- Vin-vn = Buddhadatta, *Vinayavinicchaya*, in: *Buddhadatta's Manuals*, pt. 2: *Vinayavinicchaya and Uttaravinicchaya, Summaries of the Vinayapiṭaka*, ed. A. P. Buddhadatta. London: Pali Text Society, 1927, 1–230.
- Vin-vn-ṭ = *Vinayavinicchaya-ṭikā* (*Vinayatthasārasandīpanī*), 2 vols. Rangoon: Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana Edition, 1977.
- v.l. = varia lectio.
- vs. = verse.
- Vmv = Coliya Kassapa, *Vimativinodanī-ṭikā*, 2 vols. Rangoon: Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana Edition, 1960.

Sigla

- = identical parallels
 ≠ slightly deviating parallels

Bibliography

- Baynes, Herbert. 1892. 'A collection of Kammavācās'. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*: 53–75, 380. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0035869X00021511>
- Clauson, G. L. M. 1906–1907. 'A new Kammavācā'. *Journal of the Pali Text Society* V: 1–7.
- Cousins, L. S. 2011. 'Abhidhamma Studies I. Jotipāla and the Abhidhamma Anuṭikā'. *Thai International Journal of Buddhist Studies* II: 1–36.
- . 2013. 'Abhidhamma Studies II: Sanskrit *abhidharma* literature of the Mahāvihāravāsins'. *Thai International Journal of Buddhist Studies* IV: 1–61.
- Crosby, Kate. 2006. 'Sāriputta's three works on the Samantapāsādikā'. *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 28: 49–59.
- Dimitrov, Dragomir, 2010. The Bhaikṣukī manuscript of the Candrālankāra: Study, script tables, and facsimile edition. Cambridge, MA (Harvard Oriental Series, 72).
- . 2016. *The Legacy of the Jewel Mind. On the Sanskrit, Pali, and Sinhalese Works by Ratnamati. A Philological Chronicle (Phullalocanavaṃsa)*. Napoli (Università degli studi die Napoli 'L'Orientale', Dipartimento Asia Africa e Mediterraneo, Series Minor, LXXXII).
- Freschi, Elisa. 2015. 'The reuse of texts in Indian philosophy: Introduction'. *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 43(2): 85–108. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10781-014-9232-9>
- Fryer, G. E. 1877. 'Pāli Studies. No. 2. Vuttodaya (Exposition of Metre) by Saṅgharakkhita Thera'. *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* 46(1–4): 369–410.

- Hettiaratchi, D. E. 1960. 'Civilisation of the period (Continued): Literature and art'. In: *UCHC I.2: 770–778*.
- von Hinüber, Oskar. 1996a. *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter (Indian Philology and South Asian Studies, vol. 2).
- . 1996b. 'Zu einer Göttinger Dissertation über das buddhistische Recht'. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 40: 101–113.
- Jayatilaka, D. B. 1965. *Siṃhala Sāhitya Lipi*. Colombo: Gunasēna.
- Jayawickrama, N. A. 1972–73. 'Pali manuscripts in the John Rylands University Library of Manchester'. *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 55: 146–76.
- Kieffer-Pülz, Petra. 1992. *Die Sīmā. Vorschriften zur Regelung der buddhistischen Gemeindegrenze in älteren buddhistischen Texten*. Berlin: Reimer Verlag (Monographien zur indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie, 8).
- . 2012. 'The law of theft: Regulations in the Theravāda Vinaya and the law commentaries'. *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 31: 1–56.
- . 2013. *Verlorene Gaṇṭhipadas zum buddhistischen Ordensrecht. Untersuchungen zu den in der Vajirabuddhiṭikā zitierten Kommentaren Dhammasiris und Vajirabuddhis*, 3 Bde. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag (Veröffentlichungen der Indologischen Kommission, 1).
- . 2014. 'Quotatives indicating quotations in Pāli commentarial literature, II: Quotatives with āha'. *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University for the Academic Year 2013, XVII*: 61–76.
- . 2015a. 'Quotatives indicating quotations in Pāli commentarial literature, I. Iti/ti and quotatives with vuttaṃ'. *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 43(4): 427–453. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10781-014-9243-6>
- . 2015b. "'And there is this stanza in this connection": The usage of hoti/honti/bhavanti c' ettha in Pāli commentarial literature'. *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 32: 15–161.
- . 2015c. 'Vinaya commentarial literature in Pāli'. *Brill Encyclopedia of Buddhism*, Vol. I, ed. Jonathan A. Silk, 430–441. Leiden: Brill.
- . Forthcoming. [Review to:] P. Pecenko (Ed.), *Āṅguttaranikāyaṭīkā Catutthā Līnatthapakāsinī*, Bristol, 2012, *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*.
- . In preparation. 'Who is Who. "Lord of the Speech" (Vācissara) and "Protector of the Buddhist community" (Saṅgharakkhita)'.
- Kieffer-Pülz, Petra and Peters, Anne. 2002. 'The Vinayaśaṅkhepaṭṭhakathā. An unknown Vinaya handbook?'. In *Buddhist and Indian Studies in Honour of Professor Sodo Mori*, ed. Publication Committee for Buddhist and Indian Studies, 117–127. Tokyo: Kokusai Bukkyoto Kyokai.
- Malalasekera, G. P. 1994. *The Pāli Literature of Ceylon*. Colombo [original 1928].
- Neri, Chiara. 2015. 'The case of the Sārasaṅgaha. Reflection on the reuse of texts in medieval Sinhalese Pāli literature'. *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 43(4): 335–388. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10781-014-9241-8>
- Obeyesekere, Gananath. 2013. 'The coming of Brahmin Migrants: The Śūdra fate of an Indian elite in Sri Lanka'. Lecture in the Lecture Series – 2013 'Contributions to Contemporary Knowledge' at the Faculty of Social Sciences, South Asian University, New Delhi, 31st January 2013: <http://www.sau.ac.in/downloads/obeyesekereFull-Text.pdf>. [Last access 18.03.2015].
- Paranavitana, S. 1960. 'The Dambadeni Dynasty'. In: *UCHC I.2: 613–635*.

- Pecenکو, Primoz. 1996–99. *Āṅuttaranikāyaṭīkā. Catutthasāratthamañjūsā*, vols. I–III. Oxford: Pali Text Society, 1996, 1997, 1999.
- . 2002. ‘Linatthapakāsinī and Sāratthamañjūsā: The *Purāṇaṭīkā*s and the *Ṭīkā*s on the Four Nikāyas’. *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 27: 61–113.
- Peters, Anne. 2000. *Burmese Manuscripts 4, Catalogue numbers 736–900*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag (Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, XXIII, 4).
- . Forthcoming. *Birmanische Handschriften 9*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag (Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, XXIII, 9).
- Ruiz-Falqués, Aleix. 2015. ‘The creative erudition of Chapāṭa Saddhammajotipāla, a 15th century grammarian and philosopher from Burma’. *Journal of Indian Philosophy*, 43(4): 389–426. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10781-014-9242-7>
- UHC 1.2 = University of Ceylon. *History of Ceylon*, vol. I: *From the earliest times to 1505*, part 2: *from the Coḷa Conquest in 1017 to the arrival of Portuguese in 1505*, edited by Nicholas Attygalle, et al. Colombo: Ceylon University Press, 1960.
- Wickremasinghe, Don Martino de Silva. 1900. *Catalogue of the Sinhalese Manuscripts in the British Museum*. London: Gilbert and Rivington.
- Wijeratne, R. P. and Gethin, Rupert, Trans. 2002. *Summary of the Topics of Abhidhamma (Abhidhammattha-saṅgaha) by Anuruddha [and] Exposition of the Topics of Abhidhamma (Abhidhammatthavibhāvinī) by Sumaṅgala being a commentary to Anuruddha’s Summary of the Topics of Abhidhamma*. Oxford: Pali Text Society.