

Shan-Chien-P'i-P'o-Sha

or The Chinese version of the *Samanta-pāsādikā*, the Pali Commentary on the *Vinaya*, translated by SAṄGHABHADRA (A.D. 489)*.

NANJIJO in his Catalogue of the Chinese Tripiṭaka gives this text Shan-chien-p'i-p'o-sha-lüh¹ under No. 1125 and gives the Sanskrit name of the same as Sudarśana-vibhāṣā-Vinaya. Prof. J. Takakusu has reviewed this text in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1896, pp. 415-439 and has shown that it is a Chinese version of the Pali *Samanta-pāsādikā*, the Commentary on *Vinaya*. The translator Saṅghabhadra came from a foreign country, the western region, and only this work which was translated by him in the year 489 A.D. is put to his credit. As much new material has come to light since Prof. Takakusu reviewed it more than 50 years ago, it is proposed in this article to review the text in comparison with the Pali Commentary and submit for the consideration of scholars the data available from the same.

§ 2. This Chinese text consists of 18 fascicules, the limit of a fascicule being determined more by the size than by the proper division according to the topics of the contents. The same thing was noticed in connection with the Chinese version of the *Vimuttimagga*. (See Introduction, p. xx of my *Vimuttimagga* and *Visuddhimagga*). Sometimes this division seems to be extremely ridiculous as at the end of Chapter II. It is observed that the corresponding Pali sentence is divided into two different chapters. The sentence of *Samantapāsādikā*, i, p. 81: *Nandanavane Anamataggiyāni kathesi* is split up, *Nandanavane* being put up in Chapter II and the remaining in Chapter III. The references in this article are to the P.T.S. edition of the *Samantapāsādikā*, (occasionally, for the first three chapters, to Kosambi's edition of the *Bāhira-nidāna-vaṇṇanā* in Devanāgarī characters) and to the bold-type block-print edition of the Chinese text printed, in the 12th year of the Chinese Republic (1923 A.D.) at the temple of T'ien Ning (Heavenly Peace) at Ch'ang in the province of Kiang-su.

§ 3. It is noted in general, that though there may be occasional differences in details of the earlier part of the Chinese version, it follows very closely the Pali version. As the text advances, we begin to notice a greater and greater difference. The opening stanzas in the Chinese version correspond to the first five stanzas of the Pali text. For each of the first three stanzas in Pali, there are six lines in Chinese, while in the last two the number of lines is the same. The author pays respects to the Buddha, Dhamma and Saṅgha and then later says that he will explain the meaning of the *Vinaya* in order that the Law may

* A list of Chinese characters marked in this article is given at the end in an appendix.

SHAN-CHIEN-P'I-P'O-SHA

last long and that it may do good to many living beings. With the merit therefrom he craves to remove all kinds of evil, as one who observes rules of conduct becomes free from all kinds of suffering.

§ 4. Before we go into details, it would be worth while giving a comparative table indicating the comparative portion of the Pali text corresponding to each of the books or fascicules of the Chinese text :—

Book of the Chinese text. Samanta-pāsādikā (P.T.S. edition).

Bāhira-nidāna-vaṇṇanā

1. From the opening stanzas to Asoka's granting permission to Mahinda and Saṅghamittā to accept the pabbajjā .. i. 1-51
(Kosambi's edition, pp. 1-48, line 10, para. 68)
2. Ends with the gift of Mahāmeghavana and preaching in Nandanvana .. i. 51-81
3. Ends with the end of para. 138 (King's visit to Thūpārāma) of Kosambi's ed. i. 81-102
4. Up to 4.3a.4—End of the Bāhira-nidāna-vaṇṇanā i. 102-05

Sutta-Vibhaṅga

- To the end—Ends with the section on the Third Trance i. 106-153
5. From the section of the Fourth Trance to the statement about Gotama's accepting the invitation of Verañjā Brahman i. 153-199
 6. End of Catubbidha-Vinayakathā Vinaya-dharassa ca lakkhaṇādikathā i. 199-238
 7. Ends with the conclusion of the Padabhā-janīya-vaṇṇanā i. 238-270
 8. Ends with the proper evaluation of offences or non-offences (āpattiṃ vā anāpattiṃ vā...yathāthāne ṭhapeyya) i. 270-ii. 308
 9. Ends with Saṅketakamma-kathā niṭṭhitā ii. 308-368
 10. Ends with the beginning of the explanation of gaṇanā ii. 368-419
 11. End of the discussion on paṭṭhamo Mahā-coro ii. 419-483
 12. Ends with Paṇḍakavatthu ca Titthiya-vatthu ca pākaṭameva ii. 483-iii. 545
 13. Ends with the close of dubbaca-sikkhā-pada-vaṇṇanā (Comment on Saṅghā-disesa 12) iii. 545-613

UNIVERSITY OF CEYLON REVIEW

14. Ends with aññātaka-viññatti-sikkhāpada-
vaṇṇanā iii. 613-668
15. Ends with the close of the Comment on
Pācittiya 21 iii. 668-iv. 801
16. 1-19a, Ends with the close of the Comment
on Bhikkhuni-Vibhaṅga iv. 801-end
- Khandhakas*
(a) *Mahāvagga*
- 19a-end. Ends after the close of Dāsa-
vatthukathā of the first chapter of the
Mahāvagga v. 951-1003
17. Comment on the remaining part of the
1st chapter and on chapters on (2) Upo-
sattha, (3) Vassūpanāyikā, (5) Camma,
(8) Cīvara and (6) Bhesajja. No
comment on (4) Pavāraṇā is traceable. v. 1004-1105
18. 1-4b. Comment on (7) Kaṭṭhinakkhand-
dhaka, discussion on Parivāsa and
Mānatta, comment on Kosambik-
khandhaka (chapter 10) and at the end
a remark is made: Campeyyakkhand-
dhaka (chap. 9) needs no explanation. v. 1105-end
- (b) Cullavagga*
- 4b-6a. Extremely brief comment on
portions from (4) Samathakkhandhaka,
(10) Bhikkhunikkhandhaka and (8)
Vattakkhandhaka vi. 1191-99, 1290-96, 1280-86
- Parivāra*
- 6a-15b. 32 questions and answers in the
form of gāthās, 1-29 being identical with
those in Dutiyagāthā-saṅgaṇikā (chap.
xvii of Parivāra), 30th in Chin. is
equal to 32nd in Pali, 31st in Chin. is
equal to 35th in Pali and 32nd is
equal to the last (54th) in Pali .. Nothing Corresponding
- 15b-22b. Comment on the first 31
questions and answers given above, but
no comment on the last one, i.e. 32nd
here equal to the last one (54th) of the
Parivāra vii. 1380-1390

The end appears to be very abrupt without any concluding remark either of the author or the translator.

§5. Thus we have a general idea of the contents of the Chinese version. In the chapters on the Bāhiraṇidāna-vaṇṇanā, the agreement between both the texts is very close, the difference being limited to minor points. The list of the Teachers of the Vinaya given in Smp. i. 62-63 differs slightly from that in the Chinese version, the Pali text revealing some additional names inserted in the list. We do not get in the Chinese list (2.10a-10b) the names Nāgatthera (coming after Kāla-sumana), Phussa (coming after Upatissa), Upāli (coming after Puppha), and Tissa, Puppha, Cūḷābhaya and Tissa (between Abhaya and Cūḷadeva towards the end of the list). For Buddharakkhita (after Nāgatthera), the Chinese text reads Dhammarakkhita (or Dhammagutta). In the list of the Kings of India and their reignal years, the only difference that is noted is that the Chinese does not mention (2.16a-b) the number of reignal years of Ajātasattu and Udayabhadra and that the reignal years of Anuruddha and Muṇḍa are eight in *each* case, while the Pali text reads (P.T.S. wrongly reads aṭṭhārasa, eighteen i. 73) eight for both the kings. The account of the three councils (Saṅgīti) and Missions sent by Asoka agrees with that in Pali.

§6. In this part, however, we find frequent mention in the Pali text of the names of Indian months. The Chinese text mentions only the numerical order of the month and we find some confusion in this respect. For Vesākha, in one place (1.1b.7) we have the 2nd month, and in another place, we have the 3rd month (2.21a.4). Jeṭṭha is referred to as the fourth month (15.3b.5). The day after the Full-moon day of Āsāḷha is called the 16th day of the fifth month (17.12a.7). Pubba-kattika (i.e. Assayuja) is called the 8th month (3.11b.10). Kattika is called in one place (3.2a.2) the 8th month, while in other places (3.12a.2, 15.13b.4-5) it is referred to as the 9th month. Kattika-nakkhattakīḷā is mentioned on the 9th day of the 9th month (6.3b.9) and Full-moon day of Kattika is mentioned as the 15th day of the 9th month (5.27b.10), while in 5.27b.6-7, it is said that the Buddha, finishing the Pavāraṇā ceremony (the Festival of Confession before departing for touring in the country), goes out on the first day of the 9th month. Kattika is mentioned as the last month of the (Chinese) summer, i.e. the period of Vassa (14.14a.10). Phussa is called the 11th month. It appears that according to this text, the month commenced with the first day of the bright-half (17.12a.7), as the first day after the Full-moon day of Āsāḷha is mentioned in the same place as the 16th day of the fifth month and the day after the next Full-moon day is the 16th day of the sixth month. The Chinese text observes that according to the basic text of the Indian Vinaya, these days are the days of (the commencement of) Pubba-vassāvāsa and Pacchimavassāvāsa. The bright-half of Kattika is mentioned as the first fortnight of the 9th month. Barring the mention of Vesākha as the 2nd month and of Kattika as the 8th month in one place (given above), shall we say that the Chinese translator took the beginning

of the year in Phagguna (Phālguna)—which, according to S. B. Dikshit's History of Indian Astronomy,* is justified—or shall we say that this confusion was due to the different ways of calculating the commencement of the month in India and Ceylon? The writer of Vimativinodanī, who was an inhabitant of South India (Cōla), while commenting on Paṭhama-pāṭipadadivase (p. 31) refers to the commencement of the month in India after the Full-moon day, while in Ceylon it commenced after the New-Moon day. But as far as the Chinese translator was concerned, we have seen above, that he understood the commencement of the month to be after the New-moon day.

§7. In the Sutta-vibhanga, the Chinese translator has taken only such rules as he considered important and so he has nothing to say on, for instance, Nissaggiya-pācittiya 25-28, Pācittiya 23-28, 30-31, and several others. He adds that no comment is needed on Pācittiya rule No. 91. There is no mention of Pāc. 92. Some of these rules are omitted in the Pātimokkha of a few schools.† The Comment on Sekhiyas, etc. and on Bhikkhunī-vibhanga is very scanty. The same thing, as will be later on shown, is found in the chapters dealing with the Mahāvagga, Cullavagga and Parivāra. Only a few chapters are selected for the comment in the Chinese version.

§8. But there are important differences revealed by this Chinese version. In the first place, it is noted that towards the end of the Samanta-pāsādikā, there are so many passages quoted from the Andhaka-Aṭṭhakathā, or details given from other Commentaries like Mahāpaccarī, Kurumdī or Mahā-Aṭṭhakathā, or decisions of the various Commentaries or traditions to which there is nothing corresponding in the Chinese version.†† The order of the Chapters in the Mahāvagga is not the same as in the Pali Text. The Chapter on Cīvaras (garments) is put between the fifth and sixth of the Pali Mahāvagga, while the Chinese version makes a remark after its comment on the Kosambi-khandhaka that the Campeyyakhandhaka needs no comment. The Comment on the Cullavagga is limited to the explanation of some terms and of the Samathakhandhaka (Chapter IV), Bhikkhunī-khandhaka (Chapter X) and then of the Vatta-khandhaka (Chapter VIII). The Comment on the Parivāra is restricted to only a few gāthās in the Chapter XVII, Dutiyagāthā-saṅgaṇikā. The Chinese version gives only 32 questions and answers. 1-29 are identical. No. 30 in Chin. is 32 in Pali, 31 in Chin. is 35 in Pali and No. 32 is the con-

* pp. 135-136, ed. of Bhāratīya Jyotiḥśāstra in Marathi.

† An interesting study in this connection has been made by my friend and erstwhile colleague at Shantiniketan, Dr. Pa Chow,—now Lecturer in Chinese in Allahabad University—in his Doctorate Thesis submitted to the University of Bombay (1948): 'A Comparative Study of Prātimokṣa in relation to the Chinese Vinayapiṭaka'.

†† See for instance passages in the Pali Text (P.T.S.ed.) iii. 615-16, 616—630 (we fail to get any reference to Sivalinga-worship corresponding to that in iii.626), iii. 698-99, iv. 747-49, iv. 843-854, v. 951—958, etc.

cluding one in Pali. Then follows the comment on these questions and answers, except that there is no comment on the question and answer that comes last. And the Chinese text ends abruptly, without any concluding remark either of the author or the translator.

§ 9. There are differences in items of enumerated technical terms. The ascetic practices of purification (dhutaḡaṇas) are given in this text (6.18a.10) as only twelve, while the Pali tradition is of thirteen.* The Kammatṭhānas in this text (6.25b.6) are given as 30 instead of Pali 32. The ārammaṇas are given here as 38 instead of 40 of the Pali Visuddhimagga. The number of chapters of the Khandhakas of the Vinaya is given here (1.9a.5) as 23 instead of Pali 22. Books of the Khuddakanikāya are here (1.9b.3) given as 14 while the Pali text gives the number as 15. The number of sūtras of the Dīrghāgama and the Madhyamāgama are here respectively given (1.9a.6-7) as 44 and 252 instead of Pali 34 and 152. The Dhammakkhandhas are here (1.8a.9) given as 80,000 instead of 84,000 according to Pali tradition. The Mahāvattas are here (10.24a.10) given as only four instead of Pali fourteen (ii.415), Pali has (ii.312) ekādasasu samanubhāsanāsu, while the Chinese has only ten (yü-she-pai chung², 9.3b.7).

§ 10. It is also often noticed that where the Chinese gives a smaller number, the Pali gives an exaggerated number. In one place (4.1a.3), the number of Bhikṣus given in the Chinese text is only one thousand, while the Pali has 68,000 (i.102). The same thing is noted with regard to the measurements of the various world-systems, or of the mountains, or of the earth (4.10b-11a, i.102). The period of years of recollection by the 84 Mahāśāvakas and the two foremost disciples (agga-sāvakā) is 10,000, while Pali has 100,000 (5.6a, i.161). The smallest maṇḍala of the Janapada-cārikā of the Buddhas is according to the Chinese text 100 yojanas, while the Pali text reads 300. In another place, the Chinese text reads (15.7b.8) ten yojanas while Pali has more than a hundred (iii. 686). Even the measurements of a room as given in the Pali text are 60 × 3 or 4 (iii. 568), while the Chinese has only 6 × 4 cubits, which the context shows (13.8a.8-9) to be more reasonable. The Pali list of the terms of accusation against a mendicant ascribed to Mahāpadumatthera (iii.596) is wider than that in Chinese (13.19a.9-19b.2).

§ 11. The difference between these two texts is also noted in connection with the interpretation of words or expressions. The Pali terms sātthaṃ sa-byañjanaṃ are explained after the Buddhist Sanskrit texts as su-arthaṃ and sa-vyañjanaṃ, although the Pali interpretation of sa-arthaṃ is also given as an alternative one (4.16b.4-6). The famous stanza from the Dhammapada (153),
 anekajātisamsāraṃ sandhāvissaṃ anibbisāṃ

quoted in the Smp. i. 17 is found in the Chinese version, but the reading for anibbisāṃ is anibbidāṃ (wu-yen huan³, 1.8b.5). The Chinese text does

* See my article in this connection in Indian Historical Quarterly, Vol. xiii pp. 44-51.

not give the scholastic interpretations of the word *samaya* as given in the Smp. i.106-08. In the interpretation of the word *Bhagavā* (i.125), we fail to notice anything corresponding to 'mehanassa khassa mālā ti vattabbe mekhalā ti vuccati'. All the learned discussion about the use of the word 'eva' in 'vivicceva kāmehi' found in Smp. i.141-43 is not found. There is no mention of 'Peṭaka' (4.21b-22a) in connection with the passage 'Samādhi kāmacchandassa paṭipakkho, pīti byāpādassa...vicāro vicikicchāya' (i.143). The Chinese text (4.22b.10) seems to observe in connection with the interpretation of pīti and sukha—'if there is pīti, there is sukha; and if there is sukha, there is pīti also', which seems to be inconsistent with Pali 'yattha sukhaṃ tattha na niyamato pīti' (i.145). The Chinese word corresponding to *sampasādana* (i.147) is given as Ching⁴ which is explained as without impurity (wu-k'eu⁵), while the Pali explanation is 'faith'. Instead of Pali *Kalandaka-nivāpa*, this text uses the Chinese expression which is given in the *Mahāvīyutpatti* (4138, ed. of Sakaki) as an equivalent of *Kalandaka-nivāsa* (13.21a.5, 13.24b.6), although in another place (6.3a.10—6.3b.4), the text gives the story, as given in other Pali commentaries like that on *Majjhima-nikāya* (Sutta 24), of *Kalandaka-nivāpa*. The Chinese text explains the word *kalandaka* (kia-lan-t'ō) as a mountain-rat (6.3a.5), which appears to be the same as a squirrel. This, however, shows that it does not support the other reading *kalantaka-nivāsa* adopted in other traditions like the Tibetan. The Chinese translation of *Arthapada-sūtra* also accepts the reading *kalantaka-nivāsa*, where the word *kalantaka* is explained as a bird.* While explaining the word *Dhamma*, the Chinese text limits (15.16a.3) it to what was recited in the first council (*sangīti*), while the Pali text (iv.742) refers to all the three *sangītis*. This is said in connection with reciting the *Dhamma* to an un-initiated person.

§12. Similarly, we fail to notice anything in the Chinese text (6.23a.2) corresponding to the discussion on *sangīti-ārūḥa-sutta* or *bāhiraka-sutta* (i.232). There is also no reference to *Vaṇṇa-paṭṭhāne āgataṃ nāma-sahassaṃ* (i.251), though the Chinese text mentions what corresponds to *Upāli-gāthāsu nāma-sataṃ*, which follows in the Pali text immediately afterwards. We notice another important variation, which perhaps is an indication of the school to which the original of the Chinese text or the Chinese translator belonged. It is in connection with the rule about accepting gold or silver. In Smp. iii. 676, we have the passage which says clearly that gold and silver are not to be received by a mendicant in any form, while the Chinese seems to suggest that 'there is no harm in accepting gold and silver in an emergency like this; excepting this, he should not take gold and silver' (15.3b.9). Later (15.5b.9), also, we find that in the Chinese text, permission is given to receive gold and silver, if it is made *kappiya* (chin-yin-ching-wu-tê-sheu)⁷, while the Pali text definitely

* See the introduction to my edition of the *Arthapada-sūtra* (now in press and will shortly be published) as well as Rockhill's *Life of the Buddha*, pp. 43-44.

prohibits (iii.678) it (na kevalaṃ hirañña-suvannaṃ, aññaṃ pi...akappiyaṃ na sampaticchitabbaṃ). This text does not refer to the compilation of the Kathāvatthu at the time of the Third Sangīti during the reign of Aśoka as the Pali text does (i.61). It does not refer to the controversy between the Mahāvihāra and the Abhayagiri-vihāra at the time of the Ceylonese King Bhātiya over 'kim pana Bhagavatā Mettiyā bhikkhunī paṭiññāya nāsitā, apaṭiññāya nāsitā ti' (iii.582-83), and appointing the Brahman Dīgha-kārāyaṇa to preside over the discussion. There is also no reference (II.13a.2-4) to the Ceylonese King Dāṭhā-kaṭhina killing by his miraculous power a householder Cūla-sumana, nor any reference to King Aśoka's powers (ii.440-41). Though the name Parivāra is found to be used in the Chinese version occasionally (Po-li-p'o-lo, 7.5a.4, Po-li-p'o, 7.15b.9), we fail to trace any quotations from the same text (iii.558, 574) in the corresponding Chinese version (13.6a.5, 13.9b.10). For Parivāra in ii.366, the Chinese rendering is 'in a book of questions and answers' (yu-wen-nan-chung⁸, 9.24b.8). Though the Chinese version refers occasionally to the famous Ceylonese masters like Mahāsumma or Mahāsumana, and Mahāpaduma (10.9a.2, 10.9a.4, II.21a.3, 5.29b.10, 8.9a.8), there are scores of passages where we fail to notice any reference to the same, although occasionally the views of theirs are referred to. So also Kurundī is referred to in places (8.8a.9, 8.9a.7) by name, while the views in other commentaries like Aṭṭhakathā (yi-su 6.22b.7) or Mahā aṭṭhakathā (Tā-yi-su⁹, 7.20a.8-9, or Quang-yi-su¹⁰, 7.19a.2, or Quang-shuo¹¹, 8.2a.8, 8.7b.5) are given either by names or without any specific mention of their names. The 'explanation of one school' (yi-chia-chie)¹² is found to be used in one or two places (9.2a.10, 9.2b.3) for Mahā-aṭṭhakathā.

§13. The Chinese version takes (13.13b.2-3, 13.19b.9) Mettiya-Bhummajaka as one person, while according to Smp. iii.579 and Pali tradition, they are two different persons. The same thing is noted in connection with Mettiya-Bhummajakā bhikkhunī (13.14a.10-14b.1; 13.20a.1-3) taken as one person in Chinese. The characters used are two, meaning 'compassion'¹³ and 'earth'¹⁴, and it seems they are really abbreviations of two names, which fact, however, was forgotten. Similarly, Paṇḍu-Lohitaka, another pair from Chabbaggiya mendicants, is taken as one individual (14.1b.3, 5). The mischievous group of six mendicants consists, according to Pali tradition, of three pairs of Assaji-Punabbasukā, Mettiya-Bhummajakā and Paṇḍu-Lohitakā (iii.614). Mahāvvyutpatti, however, gives (947-76) the following six:—Nanda, Upananda, Punarvasu, Chanda, Aśvaka and Udāyī. Another Chinese translation of a Hīnayāna Vinaya text (Shanghai ed. 3rd Vol., p. 23a.1-2 of the Chinese Tripiṭaka) gives the name Mi-to-lo-Fu-mo¹⁵ (perhaps the same as Metteyya-Bhummajaka) apparently as of one mendicant. The 5th Vol. of the same Vinaya edition, 31st Chapter, 1.3a gives two separate names P'an-ch'a¹⁶ and

Lu-chia¹⁷ for Pāṇḍu and Lohitaka. Thus, it appears, traditions varied in this respect and the original of the Chinese or the Chinese translator was influenced by a tradition different from that of Pali.

§ 14. The Chinese text reveals some other variations which are obviously through misunderstanding of the original meaning. Satta anusayā (seven latent evil tendencies) is wrongly translated (4.14b.4) as chung-sheng-fan-nao¹⁸, which corresponds to Sanskrit sattva-anuśayāḥ, the Pali word satta being misunderstood in the sense of a living being (sattva), instead of seven (sapta). The context makes it quite clear that the expected word is 'seven'; for, the previous words belong to the category of six and the later to that of eight (i.123). In the expression nava-sattapātubhāva-diṭṭhi (the heresy of the birth of a *new* being), the Chinese translator misunderstands the word *nava* in the sense of *nine* (chü¹⁹ 5.7a.10). Similarly, the Pali word 'pesakāra' a basket-maker is misunderstood in the sense of a receiver of messages, a messenger, neng-seu-she.²⁰ 7.7b.8). For makkaṭaka-sutta in ii.427 (where the faulty reading makkaṭa is accepted in the P.T.S. ed., although the reading makkaṭaka-sutta is given in the foot-note), the Chinese translator uses the word mi-hu²¹, a word for a monkey (11.5a.3). Evidently, the translator misunderstands that word as a makkaṭa (monkey) instead of the proper sense of a 'spider'. So instead of the 'thread of a spider's cob-web', the translator uses simply a word for a monkey, the word for sutta being altogether omitted. For Aṭṭhamāse-rukkhamūlika-vatthū (iii.604), the Chinese translator gives (13.21b.8) pan-yue-shu-shia²² which suggests that perhaps the translator read 'addha' or 'addha' for 'atṭha'—a mistake quite possible in Sinhalese books.

§ 15. It is noted that the Chinese version contains some material not found in the Smp. The account of the foundations of Sāvatti and Vesāli not given in the Smp. is found to be given in the Chinese version in detail (12.16a.6ff, 10.11b.10—10.13b.10), obviously taken from the source of other commentaries. Similarly, the story of Cūla-panthaka is given in full (16.1a.3ff). Passages not found in the Smp. but found in the original Vinaya are also traced here. For instance, we find here (16.4b.3-4) the mention of Devadatta, Khaṇḍa-deviyā putta, Kokālika, Kaṭamora-tissaka in the introductory story of Pācittiya 29 of the Bhikkhu-Pātimokkha. Also in 16.14b.1ff, we find a passage which corresponds to that in the Sutta-vibhanga on Pācittiya 83 about ten defects (ādīnavā). First four defects and the last three (8-10) in both the texts are the same. The Chinese does not specifically mention the sixth. Apparently, 5th and 6th are taken together and correspond to the 6th and 7th in Pali. Seventh in Chinese is equal to the fifth in Pali. In the section on the Sekhiyas, the Chinese translator remarks (16.16a-b) that there are some rules (24 in all, about one's behaviour towards the stūpas) which are not found in the original Indian text, because the stūpa did not exist at the time of

the framing of these rules which were put together by the Buddha. These rules are rules No. 60-85 (except 64 and 69) of the same class of the Dharmagupat Pātimokkha. It may also be noted in this connection that this text does not give any comment on the Pācittiya rules 23 and 82, the last one being in connection with transferring to an individual the gains that accrue to the Sangha. The translator often refers to the Indian words, which he says are foreign, and he gives the explanation of the same in Chinese language (han-yen²³). Ho-sa²⁴ is a foreign word* and in Chinese it means 'one who knows right or wrong' (lit. fault or no fault, 17.9b.1-2). Lo-yue²⁵ (Rājagaha) and Mo-kie²⁶ (Magadha) are, he remarks (17.9b.9), foreign sounds. A similar remark is made with regard to Chie-po²⁷ (Jīvaka, 17.13a.7) and he adds that it means a 'living prince'. While speaking about Rājagaha, he remarks, Lo-yue-ch'en²⁸, or Wang-she-ch'en²⁹ or Mo-kie-kuo³⁰, all mean the same thing, although the terms are different. He refers to the practice of kneeling or falling prostrate as practised in the foreign land (India, 14.10b.6, 16.20b.9). While discussing the various plants or medical herbs, he often remarks that some of them are available in Indo-China (15.19b.7), Canton (15.19b.7), Quang-tseu (17.17b.10, 17.18a.7, 15.19b.8) in the district of Canton, or not seen in the land of the Han people (China, 17.18a.2) in general. Sometimes some interesting remarks are found in the Chinese text. In one place (17.15b.9-10), it is said: 'If a dāna is to be given to two Sanghas, one in India and another in Ceylon, then the Indian Sangha, even though it consists of only five people, is entitled to half a share like the Ceylonese Sangha consisting of a hundred-thousand men'. The corresponding Pali text is different (v. 1137). Elsewhere (10.5b.4-5), it is remarked:—'If there is a solitary house with no one inside and if a mendicant notices a tree laden with fruit which he likes to eat, he should go to the house and knock on the wooden block (? gaṇḍī). If there is no wooden block which he can knock, he should at least clap the palms of his hands three times (before the house), and then take the fruit which he wants to eat. Is it not a far cry from the time when it was thought necessary to appoint a kappiya-kāraka?

§ 16. We find references in this text to places or persons in Ceylon. There is a reference to the island of Ceylon and Anurādhapura, and Abhaya, thief, who had a following of five hundred (11.22a.10). There is a reference to Cetiya-giri (8.23b.8) and to Cittala-pabbata (15.5a.10). The text refers to the incident of Mahā-paduma curing the wife of King Vasabha (11.21a.5). King Bhātiya (P'o-ti-ye, 203-227, A.D.) is referred to (8.24a.6) and his contemporary Godattatthera is also mentioned. Great masters like Mahāsumma, Mahāpaduma (10.9a.2-4), Cūlābhaya-sumanatthera (abridged into Cūlasumana in Chinese, 8.22b.1) are also alluded to. Besides the Āgamas and the texts of the Vinaya and Abhidharma, there are references to Paṭisambhidā (Po-tse-san-p'i-t'o-chin³¹ 11.8a.8, San-p'i-t'o³² 11.8b.8, San-p'o-t'o³³ 10.23a.

* Upajjhāya (Upādhyāya in Skt.)

10), Chatta-māṇavaka-vimāna, and commentaries like Sūdanī-vibhāṣā (Papañca-sūdanī, 5.13b.2), Aṭṭhasālinī (along with Dhammasaṅgani), Visuddhi-magga (Chin-tao-tao³⁴ 4.25b.5-6), also sometimes called Chin-tao-chin³⁵ 4.23b.7, Chin-tao-p'i-p'o-sha³⁶ 5.4b.2, 5.5b.2, 5.7a.2), P'i-ni-P'i-p'o-sha³⁷ (Vinayavibhāṣā, 4.23b.9) and Abhidharma-vibhāṣā (4.23b.8, 5.13a.7). It may be remarked here in passing that the author of this text is credited with observing that the topic of dhyāna-samādhi has been given by him in detail in the Visuddhi-magga (Chin-tao-chin, 4.23b.7). The Commentaries like the Aṭṭhakathā, Mahā-aṭṭhakathā, Kurundī have been already mentioned above as being referred to in this text. The Andhaka-Aṭṭhakathā, Mahāpaccaṇī, Sankhepa-Aṭṭhakathā (9.2a.10, 9.2b.1) seem to have been drawn upon, though their names are not specifically mentioned. Even Pali-muttaka-vinicchaya is drawn upon (8.13a.3). Jātakas or Parittas like Ratana-paritta, Dhajagga-paritta, Mora-paritta, etc. are also referred to (2.13b.10, 5.5a.8-9).

§ 17. It may, however, be noted that we fail to get any mention of Peṭaka, although the quotation ascribed to the same is found here (i. 143) in connection with the contraries of the five hindrances of the trances (Smp. i. 143). The Chinese text does not refer to Upāli-pañcaka (13.17a.10), one of the last chapters of Parivāra, referred to in Smp. iii. 589.

§ 18. There are hundreds of words scattered throughout the book which are transliterations of Indian words—proper names of persons, places, rivers, mountains, gods, demons, books, technical terms found in Buddhist books about the articles of daily use, terms used in the Vinaya about offences and disciplinary measures, flowers, fruits, medical herbs or plants, etc. The transliterations seem to point to the original form of Pali as well as Sanskrit. A-p'i-kan (suggested emendation)- to (abhikkanta, 1.10b.9), I-sa-ki-li³⁸ (Isigili, 8.10b.6, with the explanation of ki-li³⁹ as 'swallow'), kia-sa-na-a-lan-mo-na⁴⁰ (kaṣiṇa-ārammaṇa, 4.23a.6), Li-che-fi (Licchavi, 6.10a.9), Siu-t'o (sudda, 7.1a.8), Kiu-na-han⁴¹ (Koṇāgamana, 5.23b.8), Le-kiu-niu (Lakkhaṇa⁴² 12.11a.10), ki-pei (kappāsa, 11.4a.10, 11.4b.2), o-p'u-ha-na⁴³ (abbhāna, 6.25a.3, 14.3b.5), T'u-ki-lo⁴⁴ (dukkaṭa), T'eu-lan-che (Thullaccaya, 10.1a.10, 10.1b.1), p'o-na⁴⁵ (bhaṇe, 8.15b.10), T'an-mo-le-ki-to (Dhamma-rakkhita, 10.1a.8), Mo-no-to (mānatta, 14.3b.3), seng-ho-lo (sankhāra, 11.8b.5, 8), kia-t'i (Kattika, 17.17a.9), a-lan-jo⁴⁶ (arañña, 9.13b.10), kia-p'u-t'o⁴⁷ (gāvuta, 10.18b, 8), etc. all point to the Pali form. On the other hand, the Chinese translator, perhaps because he was much influenced by the Sanskrit form with which he was more familiar in Buddhist Sanskrit books, uses An-t'o-lo⁴⁸ (Āndhra, 7.13b.5), Po-lo-t'i-mo-cha⁴⁹ (Prātimokṣa, 7.5b.8), Po-ye-t'i (pṛayaścittika, 9.2b.5), Po-lo-t'i-t'i-se-ni (pratideśaniya, 16.16a.1), T'an-ni-kia (Dhanika instead of Pali Dhaniya 8.11a.6), Kia- (or ki-) li-sa-p'an⁵⁰ (kāṛṣāpaṇa, 8.17b.8, 9.1a.5) leu-t'o-lo (for rudra in Rudradāmaṇa, 8.17b.6), Seu-lung-ne (Śroṇa or Śravaṇa, 17.12b.1) which point to the Sanskrit form. In the use of the word Seng-kia-

p'o-se-sa^{50a}, the translator seems to be vacillating between the explanation of the term in the Pali form Sanghādisesa (p'o is explained as ādi—ch'u⁵¹ in Chinese, 12.18b.4-5 and se-sa as extra or remainder (ch'ang⁵² 8.5b.3 12.18b.5), and the Sanskrit form sanghāvaśeṣa. Similarly, for the Pali term, uposatha, Chinese Pu-sa⁵³ (13.17a.2, 23b.8, 24b.7) is used which points not to the earlier form upavasatha, but to the later form poṣadha used in Buddhist Sanskrit books. The proper names are sometimes wholly transliterated or partly transliterated and partly translated. For Assaji-punabbasukā the Chinese text reads Ma-she⁵⁴ and Mang-shüi⁵⁵ (14.1a.4). It must be noted that the present pronunciation of the Chinese word has considerably changed from what it was at the time of the translator and this is noticed in the sound 'mu' or 'mo'⁵⁶ which has now changed into 'wu'⁵⁷. This is observed in the transcription of the words namo (1.1a.4), Dhamma (7.1a.9), Padumuttara (13.11b.4), Samudda-datta (13.21a.6), kumuda (17.18b.19), mora (5.5a.9) etc.

§ 19. This text often reveals the use of some very literal translations which to an ordinary Chinese reader give no sense. It is only the Pali original which throws light upon the same. Ku-er⁵⁸ (14.15a.5), sheng-shiang⁵⁹ (16.21b.10), tsan-she-che⁶⁰ (13.4b.9), shui-tê-che⁶¹ (13.5b.3-4) are a mystery to the Chinese reader, unless he knows the original Indian words, purāṇa-dutiyikā, jātarūpa, taṃ-khaṇikā, odapattakinī respectively. Pei-er-kie-mo⁶² (1.3a.10) stands for ñatti-dutiya-kamma. Similarly there are so many words which are found only in these earlier translations of technical Buddhist terms which are different from those used in later translations of the 7th century onwards. As in other Buddhist Chinese books, in this text also, we have several mistakes which are due to the use of wrong characters with the same pronunciation.

§ 20. The translation of several words and expressions in Pali as given in this text often confirms the interpretation according to the Pali school or sometimes clarifies the same. The interpretation of sankha-likhita brahmācariya as 'holy life that is pure and polished' is supported by this text (6.4b.6ff).* The interpretation of the word antara-ghara as (a village) which is the residence of the householders as against the residence of the mendicants is confirmed in 14.5a.4, 16.16a.4, where we have the words pei-i-chia.⁶³ (See New Indian Antiquary, Vol. I, pp. 81-82). Paccūsa-samaya is explained quite truly as 'when the sky is on the point of being bright' (14.13b.3). Cīvara-cetāpana is explained as managing or providing money required for the garment of a mendicant (15.1a.9-10). The expression 'no saññā-vimokkho' in Smp. i. 270, iii. 574, 650, 662 is rather tricky. In 14.11b.9, the Chinese words pu-yi-hsiang-t'o⁶⁴ are an exact equivalent of that expression. But, elsewhere (15.6a.9, 15.9a.4-5, 16.7a.3, 16.6a.8-9), a clear interpretation is given—pu-yi-pu-chih-ku-tê-t'o⁶⁵ 'because he does not know (the offence), he is not absolved

* See my article on the same in the Silver Jubilee Volume of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, pp. 61-66.

from the same'. This is confirmed by the explanation of Vimati-vinodanī (pp. 127, 247, Sinh. ed. of Coliya-Kassapa-Mahāthera) which explains saññā as saññāya abhāvo (saññāya abhāvena vimokkho, saññāya abhāvena muc-canato). Smp. iii. 650, also paraphrases 'saññāya pi na muccati' as 'ajānanto pi āpajjatī ti no saññā-vimokkho'. This corresponds to the expression found in Buddhist Sanskrit texts like the Vinayavastu (Gilgit Manuscripts, Vol. III, Part iii. p. 63): Naiva ajñānān muktiḥ. Ignorance of Law is no excuse and does not entitle one to exemption from penalty.

§21. The analysis given above will, it is hoped, give a general idea of this Chinese work and the data available from the comparative study of both the texts will be found to be interesting. The relation of this text with the other Chinese Vinaya texts or other Buddhist schools and its importance for determining the literary questions of the authorship of the Samanta-pāsādikā and its gradual growth are questions which need further investigation. It is hoped that the writer of this paper will be able to present them in the form of a book, sometime later. †

P. V. BAPAT

† I hereby gladly acknowledge the help received by me from the Chinese Republican Govt. through Shantiniketan-authorities, which enabled me to make a comparative study of these two voluminous texts at Cheenabhavan, Shantiniketan, West-Bengal.

APPENDIX

1 善貝思婆沙律. 2 於十白中.

3 無厭患. 4 清. 5 無垢. 6 以此
因緣方便可得受金銀; 除此無受

金銀法. 7 金銀淨物得受.

8 於問難中. 9 大義疏. 10 廣

義疏. 11 廣說. 12 一家解.

13 怒. 14 地. 15 彌多羅摩

16 般茶. 17 盧伽. 18 眾生煩惱.

19 大. 20 能受使. 21 彌提.

22 半月樹下. 23 漢言. 24 和尚.

25 羅闍. 26 摩竭. 27 善婆.

- 28 羅闍城. 29 王舍城. 30 摩
 竭國. 31 波致三毘陀經.
 32 三毘陀. 33 三跋陀. 34 淨道
 道. 35 靜道經. 36 淨道毘婆沙.
 37 毘尼毘婆沙. 38 伊私耆耆.
 39 耆耆. 40 迦師那阿耨摩那.
 41 拘用舍. 42 革佉菟. 43 阿淨訶那.
 44 突吉羅. 45 婆那. 46 阿蘭
 若. 47 伽摩陀. 48 穿陀羅.
 49 波羅提木叉. 50 迦(或訖)
 利沙槃. 50a 僧伽婆尸沙.

51 初 . 52 殘 . 53 布薩 .

54 馬師 . 55 滿宿 . 56-57 Namo

南無 (nan-wu); 拘物頭

(kiu-wu-tou = kumuda).

58 故 = . 59 生像 60 暫時者

61 水得者 . 62 白 = 羯磨 .

63 白衣家 . 64 不以想脫 .

65 不以不知^得故脫 .