

Sutta Nipāta: The Muni Sutta¹

I

THE Muni Sutta portrays certain characteristics of the *muni*—the sage. The poem agrees in theme with the Uraga and Khaggavisāṇa Suttas². These three suttas together with Moneyya Sutta (i.e. Nālaka excluding its *vatthugāthā*) can be considered as the proper “Muni—ballads”, though there is constant mention of the attributes of the muni in the greater part of the Sabhiya Sutta and many suttas of the Aṭṭhaka Vagga such as Jarā, Tissametteyya and Māgandiya. It has already been noted³ that the Uraga Sutta resembles this sutta in many respects. While the Uraga Sutta describes the ideal *bhikkhu*, the Muni Sutta gives a descriptive definition of the *muni*. Generally speaking, there appears no fundamental difference between the *muni* and the *bhikkhu* in early Buddhism, and the terms are interchangeable, except when *muni* specifically refers to the Buddha. The qualities attributed to the *muni* are often associated with the *bhikkhu*, and sometimes with *brāhmaṇa*, *khattiya*, *vedagu* and *sottiya* in a strict Buddhist sense⁴. Although *bhikkhu* and *muni* are virtually synonymous there seems to be a subtle difference between the two. While renunciation, *pabbajjā* (becoming a religious mendicant), detachment and *ekacariyā* (life of solitude) are emphasised of the *bhikkhu*, the *muni* is described as a person who plays a more important rôle. This is quite evident from his description in the Muni and Moneyya Suttas, and the type of epithets used about him. In addition to the possession of all the characteristics of the *bhikkhu*, there appears something nobler and more positive about him than about the *bhikkhu*. He is a more evolved being (*bhāvitatta*) who has reached spiritual attainments and instructs others as well. The term *muni* in Sn. is used in a much wider meaning than *bhikkhu* in Th. 1.

As regards the epithets, the *muni* is called a *mahesi* (Sn. 208^d) and is described as *tādī* (Sn. 219^b), *yatatta* (Sn. 216^b), *saññatatta* (Sn. 216^a) and *ṭhitatta* (Sn. 215^a). Besides the eight references⁵ where Buddha is called *mahesi*, the true *brāhmaṇa* (in the strict Buddhist sense) is spoken of as *mahesi* at Sn. 646^b, also the *khīṇāsava* is referred to as a *mahesi* at Sn. 82^a, and 481^a,

1. Extract from *A Critical Analysis of the Pāli Sutta Nipāta Illustrating its Gradual Growth*. Ph.D. Thesis, University of London, November, 1947.

2. *Vide* University of Ceylon Review, VII, 1, 2.

3. *Ibid.* VII, 1.

4. See Sabhiya Sutta Sn. III, 6.

5. Sn. 176^d, 177^d, 915^b, 1054^a, 1057^a, 1061^b, 1067^b, and 1083^a.

though the allusion is to the Buddha. The epithet *tādī* is rather puzzling as it cannot be easily differentiated from *tādī* (Sk. *tādīk* also P. *tādīso*) the demonstrative adjective. Yet, there are sufficient instances in Sn. itself where *tādī* is clearly used in the pregnant sense of *ecce homo*. The *muni* is *ubhayeneva tādī* at Sn. 712^c (unchanged under both circumstances) in the Nāḷaka Sutta. Paramatṭhaka speaks of the bhikkhu as, *pāraṃgato na pacceti tādī* (gone over yonder such—a steadfast one—is he who returns not ;—Sn. 803^d). The Buddha is called *asitaṃ* and *tādīṃ* at Sn. 957^a, (cp. Sn. 219^c, *asitaṃ anāsavaṃ*). The *maggajīna* is called *tādī* at Sn. 86^d in the Cunda Sutta. The *brāhmaṇa*, *khettaḷḷajīna* (cp. Sk. *kṣetraḷḷā*), *vedagu*, and *sottiya*—all of them in a Buddhist sense—are called *tādī* in the Sabhiya Sutta (Sn. 519-532). Another attribute of the *muni*—*yatatta* (self-restrained)—is repeated at Sn. 723^a in the Moneyya Sutta. Homeless recluses are called *yatattā* at Sn. 490^b. It is practically the same idea conveyed by the term *saññatatta* (self-subdued). The brahmins of old are referred to as *saññatattā* at Sn. 284^b (Brāhmaṇadhammika Sutta), and *susaññatattā* occurs at Sn. 464^b (Sundarikabhāradvāja Sutta). The *muni* is known to be *ṭhitatta* (steadfast), so also is the virtuous monk described in the Kimsīla Sutta (Sn. 328^d), the *bhikkhu* who renounces the world in the proper manner (Sn. 370^c) and the good *brāhmaṇa* (Sn. 519^b). Further, it is used as an attribute of the Tathāgata at Sn. 477^b. The *muni* is also called *asitaṃ* and *anāsavaṃ* (independent and free from the banes). The Buddha is described as *asito* at Sn. 251^d and 957^a. The true *brāhmaṇa* (*brahmā* in the text) is called *asito* at Sn. 519^d. Again the monk who has drawn out the dart is described as *asito* at Sn. 593^a and so is the *muni* in the Moneyya Sutta. The “*māṇava*” Dhotaka begs for instruction so that he may lead a life of peace and independence ; (*iḍheva santo asito careyyaṃ*—Sn. 1065^d).

It is evident that these standard epithets of the *muni* definitely speak of the positive side of his life. Many of these terms are not employed to describe the *bhikkhu* though he may possess the qualities which these epithets attribute to the *muni*. There is some implied superiority of the *muni* over the *bhikkhu* though the ideal of the *bhikkhu* is in no way to be understood as falling short of that of the *muni*.

There are various other attributes of the *muni* enumerated in the sutta. He has no fixed abode and he is free from any acquaintanceship (Sn. 207). He has eradicated all sin ; and is the lonely wanderer (cp. Sn. 35-75) who has visioned the state of peace (Sn. 208). He sees the ultimate destruction of birth, leaves reasoning behind and is under no limitations of time and space (Sn. 209). He is free from covetousness and has reached the Beyond—*ḷāra*—(Sn. 210). He is *sabbāḷhibhu*—one who overcomes every obstacle and is superior to all others ;—he has perfect knowledge and is unsmearred by the worldly phenomena and is emancipated. (These are the attributes of the Bhagavā

SUTTA NIPĀTA : THE MUNI SUTTA

mentioned at M. I. 171, S. II. 284, Vin. I. 8 and Dh. 353)—(Sn. 211). He is wise and composed, and is free from the mental obsessions ; he delights in meditation, wanders alone and leads others (Sn. 212-213). He is firm and straight, discerning, free from lust and he shrinks from sin. His senses are serene and he is endowed with propriety of speech (Sn. 214-215). He is self-restrained and self-subdued (Sn. 216). He knows the world and sees the highest *attha* (well-being). He has crossed the *ogha* (flood) and the *samudda* (ocean), has cut off all knots, has nothing to lean on and is steadfast.

The sutta in every respect is Buddhistic and the terms and values in it bear ample testimony to that effect. The simple allegory taken from the uprooting of a tree or of not sowing the seed (of *taṇhā*) developed to a considerable extent in Sn. 208-209, the shunning of resting places of the mind (*nivesanāni*)—Sn. 210, cp. also Aṭṭhaka Vagga, remaining unsullied by worldly phenomena, and such other central concepts of early Buddhism, prove that the sutta contains very early Buddhist sayings and there is much evidence to show that the subject-matter of this sutta is very old. The theme of the sutta (as well as that of many other poems of Sn.) is closely connected with the Yogic ideal. The *muni* chooses with stoic indifference the middle way between self-mortification and attachment to worldly enjoyment. This ideal as current in pre-Asokan times coincides with the Yogic ideal promulgated in the Gītā (Bhg. II-VI. cp. Bhg. II, 56 ; II, 69 ; V, 6 ; V, 28 ; VI, 3, etc., where the *muni* is mentioned in similar words).

II

The stanzas themselves need a close examination before the internal, external and indirect evidence is taken up for discussion. A simple analysis of the sutta shows that its stanzas fall into three groups ; viz.—

Group I. Sn. 207-210,

Group II. Sn. 211-219, and

Group III. Sn. 220-221.

Group I.—The four opening *stanzas* seem to form an independent unit—a short poem by itself. Unlike the nine stanzas that follow, these verses do not contain the refrain (*taṃ vā pi dhīrā munim vedayanti*); but it is quite significant that the word *muni* occurs at least once in every stanza of the whole sutta. Sn. 207 furnishes the introduction to the independent unit as well as to the whole poem. A noteworthy feature of this stanza is that it is in Anuṣṭubh śloka whereas the rest of the poem is in Triṣṭubh. The stanza itself cannot, on this account, be brushed aside as a late introductory verse, for it was obviously known to have belonged to the Muni Sutta at least some time prior to

the compilation of the Milinda Pañha⁶. The stanza itself breathes the same tone as the opening verses of the Khaggavisāra Sutta—cp. *etaṃ bhayaṃ santhave pekkhamāno*, Sn. 37^c. *Gāme akubbaṃ muni santhavāni* at Sn. 844^b is also reminiscent of the opening *pāda*. The same idea is expanded at Dh. 212-216, viz.—Dh. 212 *Piyato jāyatī soko piyato jāyatī bhayaṃ* (from what is pleasant arise grief and fear)—, Dh. 213 *peṃmato . . .* (from affection . . .), Dh. 214 *ratiyā . . .* (from lust . . .), Dh. 215 *kāmato . . .* (from sense-pleasures . . .) and Dh. 216 *tanhāya . . .* (from avarice . . .). All these causes of suffering or sorrow seem to be embraced by the term *santhava*, cp. also J. IV. 312.

The next stanza (Sn. 208) introduces the familiar Buddhist allegory (already referred to) in which *santhava* (Comy. *tanhā*) is the tree that has to be uprooted. What has arisen has to be annihilated (eradicated), it should not be allowed to grow anew (lit. not replant it), and it should not be allowed to grow up when it has sprung. This allegory is further worked out in the next stanza (Sn. 209). The *vatthūni*—lit. fields or bases—have to be reckoned, and the seed (Comy. *abhisāṅkhāravīññāṇa*—“storing intellect”) has to be destroyed (Comy. *hiṃsitvā, vadhitvā*—Sk. *pramārya* from $\sqrt{mr.}$ *mṛāti*)—and it is not to be watered with *sineha* (desire). Sn. 210 forms the conclusion of this independent unit. Judging by the ideas in them these four stanzas, taken by themselves, appear to be very old. This is further strengthened by the Commentator's testimony. He says that the *uppatti* (origin) of the whole sutta is not the same (SnA. 254). He gives the same *uppatti* for these four stanzas, but gives separate *uppattis* for each succeeding stanza. The Commentator's introduction seems rather strained and reports a somewhat incredible incident found also at A. III. 67-69 (Mātāputtika Sutta // to A. III. 559). This tradition though as late as cc. 5th century A.C. cannot be totally ignored, as it is supported by the Aṅguttara Nikāya. On the other hand even if there is no connection between the incident narrated in SnA. 254 ff. and these four stanzas, the very fact of the existence of the strong tradition that these four stanzas were found together, the internal evidence of the subject matter, and the recurrence of the opening stanza four times in Milp. attest to their great antiquity.

Group II.—The refrain is found in all these stanzas and all of them are uniform except Sn. 213 which contains seven *pādas* instead of four. The three additional *pādas* are the same as Sn. 71^{abc} in the Khaggavisāra Sutta. The influence of the Khaggavisāra Sutta is felt in *ekaṃ carantaṃ munim appamattaṃ* at Sn. 213^a and, *taṃ āhu ekaṃ muninaṃ carantaṃ* at Sn. 208^c, besides the repeated *pādas* Sn. 213^{cd}. The four lines would have been complete and

6. Milp. 385 quotes this stanza thus :—*Bhāsitaṃ-peṭaṃ mahārāja Bhaṇavatā devā-tidevena Suttani-pāte*, and quotes Sn. 207. The stanza is the topic of a *pañha* at Milp. 212 ff. and is quoted several times there.

the stanza would have passed without special notice, but for these additional *pādas* which in all probability were interpolated later. It is very unlikely that the whole stanza was an interpolation, although the ideas contained in it are closely related to the Khaggavisāṇa Sutta. Similarly Sn. 211 cannot be considered as an interpolation though the first three *pādas* occur elsewhere in connection with the Buddha's meeting with the *ājīvaka* Upaka⁷. In all these instances these words are put into the mouth of the Bhagavā making him utter a boastful statement, which is quite contrary to his usual reticence about himself. It is quite probable that this was the original occurrence of these lines and that other texts may have drawn upon this stanza in reporting the incident between the Buddha and the mendicant Upaka. The repetition of the simile, *tasaram va ujjuṃ* (like a shuttle that is straight) at Sn. 464^b and 497^b does not indicate that the idea has been borrowed in any of these instances, but that it was the common property of the poetical language.

These nine stanzas form, as it were, the body of the Muni Sutta. They constitute the ballad proper, with the emphasis on the *muni* clearly brought out by the refrain and the similes at Sn. 213^{cd}, 214^a and 215^a. These stanzas form a homogeneous unit, just as the first four stanzas form a unit by themselves. The chief ideas of this section are seen to occur again in other ballads of Sn. as well as in other metrical works. *Pādas* and lines of many stanzas are also repeated in other metrical works⁸.

According to Buddhaghosa the 11 stanzas beginning with Sn. 211 were uttered on various occasions by the Buddha and these sayings were gathered from various isolated instances and knitted together into a composite sutta. The *uṣpallīs* (origins) given by him are :—

Sn. 211—uttered on the occasion of Buddha's meeting the *ājīvaka* Upaka. (SnA. 258) cp. Comy. on Dh. 353. Sn. 212—uttered about Khadirāvaniya Revata. (SnA. 261) cp. Comy. on Dh. 98 and Dh. 412. Sn. 213—preached to Suddhodana. (SnA. 262). Sn. 214—uttered after Ciñcāmānavikā's attempt to malign the Buddha. (SnA. 263) cp. Comy. on Dh. 176 and Sn. 780. Sn. 215—preached to the girl who was inspired by the straightness of the movement of the shuttle. (SnA. 265). Sn. 216—preached on the occasion of the weaver girl's solution of the Buddha's riddle. (SnA. 266) cp. Comy. on Dh. 174. Sn. 217—preached to the Pañcaggadāyaka-brāhmaṇa. (SnA. 270) cp. Comy. on Dh. 367. Sn. 218—preached to the monks, announcing the attainment of arahatship of a monk who had fluctuated four times between home and homelessness. (SnA. 272). Sn. 219—preached to the monks, announcing Nanda's attainment of arahatship. (SnA. 273) cp. Comy. on Dh. 15. Sn. 220—preached to the monks, announcing the arahatship of a monk who was

7. Vide Ariyapariyesana Sutta, Vinaya Introduction etc.

8. Vide E. M. Hare : Woven Cadences, p. 190.

alleged to have aided a hunter. (SnA. 275). Sn. 221—preached on the occasion when the Sakiyas argued that a Sotāpanna, even if he is a householder, should be honoured by another who reaches that stage subsequent to him. (SnA. 276).

It is not at all probable that these stanzas were “ independent utterances ” made on “ various occasions ” as Bdhgh. says. The coherence of thought and the inter-dependence between the succeeding verses and those preceding, indicate to what extent these stanzas are connected with one another. In all probability these nine stanzas (and perhaps Sn. 207-210) were the work of a single poet though it is very doubtful whether the two concluding stanzas too belonged to him. The significance of the diversity of the *upphattis* of these stanzas given by Bdhgh. is that the verses themselves were so well-known that there were separate stories appended to them by Commentarial tradition. This perhaps speaks of the popularity that these verses enjoyed.

Group III.—The last two stanzas of the poem stand out as a class by themselves as (*a*) they contain no refrain (*b*) point out the difference between the householder and the *muni*. Although these two stanzas are similar to the rest of the poem in language, metre and style, the change of values and the contrast made between the householder and the *muni* (emphasising the latter's superiority in the simile at Sn. 221^{ab}) are indicative of an effort made by a monastic editor to usher in to this poem of lofty theme and ideals, an idea of comparative insignificance. Their position as the last two stanzas of the final sutta (of the *vagga*) suggests that they may as well have been intended to form the very conclusion of the *wholè* *vagga*. In view of their decidedly late characteristics and the indirect evidence from the position of the sutta it is clear that these two stanzas were added when the sutta was re-edited before its inclusion in Sutta Nipāta⁹.

III

The language of the sutta is old and all the stanzas are composed in the archaic poetic dialect often called “ *gāthā-Pāli* ”. There are many linguistic forms in the sutta that belong to an early stratum of Pāli, and forms which may be classed as late are totally absent. The usual historical verbal forms like Optative 3 sg. P. pada in —*e*, A. pada in —*etha*, the historical sibilant Aorist (*addakkhi*, Sn. 208^d), absolutives in —*ya* (7 of them), old present participles in —*aṃ* (*anikāmayam* Sn. 210^b), and old infinitives (like *thutum* Sn. 217^c) as well as nominal forms such as *rajo* (Sn. 207^b), *muninam* (Sn. 208^c), *gedha*

9. The composite character of the Muni Sutta may suggest the existence of different recensions before it took its final shape in Sn. At present it is not possible to decide to what recension of it the title Muni-gāthā was applicable. (The possibility of the name referring to all poems in praise of the Muni-ideal as suggested by Max Walleser, also needs consideration). The inclusion of the sutta in Sn. is relatively late as compared with the date of its composition.

(Sn. 210^c), and *ubho* (Sn. 220^a), dialectal or local forms such as *anup̄pavecche* (Sn. 208^b, 209^b) and *ujjum* (Sn. 215^a), and historical particles like *ve* (Sn. 207^d; Vedic *vai*) etc. show that the language of the sutta is old. The linguistic forms of interest in this sutta are:—**ropayeyya**, Sn. 208^a; The causative is formed after verbs of class X, and *-eyy-* is added. This is a pure Pāli form. **Assa**, Sn. 208^b; This should be interpreted as a dative, as in Comy. i.e., as “*assa jāyantassa*” with elipsis—(SnA. 256). The two lines would then read:—*Yo jātaṃ ucchiṃja, jāyantam na ropayeyya, assa (jāyantassa) nānup̄pavecche. Anup̄pavecche*, Sn. 208^b, 209^b. (Comy. *anup̄paveseyya, samodhāneyya*—should permit entry or fulfilment). There are three possible explanations to this curious form:—1-(Trenckner). $\sqrt{yam} yaccha > *yeccha- > veccha-$ cp. *y > v* in *āyudha > āvudha* etc. (vide Geiger, § 46), and the vowel change *-a- > -e-* cp. *sa-yathā > seyyathā, (pavekkh^o etc.)* 2- $\sqrt{viś} >$ Caus. *veśyet* (Opt.) $> vesse- > -cche$. cp. *-ts- > -ss- // -cch-* (Sk. *utsaṅga. P. ussaṅga // ucchaṅga*).¹⁰ (If it could be established that *-ś- > -cch*, just as *ś- > ch-* (initially) as in *chakana, chava, chāpa* or *cheppā*, the form might as well be derived from opt. of $\sqrt{viś}$, i.e. **veśyet* on the analogy of class IV verbs). 3-The optative of the future base of $\sqrt{viś}$ i.e. **vek-* $> *vekkhe$ (// E. Pkr.) or **vecche* (// to W. Pkr.), would be the same as this form.¹¹ **Thambho-riva**, Sn. 214^a; This is an inorganic sandhi with the artificial replacement of the historical *-h* which, with the preceding *a* i.e. *-ah*, has already become *-o*; *iva* is retained as in Sk. **Ubho**, Sn. 220^a; $< ubhau$, the Vedic dual. It is a historical form. **Ujjum**, Sn. 215^a; dialectal or Prākritic. *rju > *i/u-rju* (with epenthesis) $> ujju$. **Nālaṃ thutaṃ**, Sn. 217^c; the old construction with *alaṃ* and the infinitive; Sk. *stautuṃ > *thotuṃ > P. thutuṃ*.

Metre.—The difference in metre between the opening stanza and the rest of the poem has already been commented on. This difference of metre in the introductory verse is quite similar to that in the opening verse in Kiṃsīla Sutta. It was probably on verses like these that the practice of prefacing suttas with *vattugāthā* was based. The opening stanza is a regular Anuṣṭubh śloka with an odd quarter in line c. The rest of the poem is in Triṣṭubh metre with Jagatī *pādas* at Sn. 212^c, 214^{ac}, 218^b, 219^c and 220^a-221^d. The caesura after the 7th syllable is not reckoned in Sn. 210^c and 221^a (Jagatī). There are two difficult *pādas* (Sn. 214^a and 215^b), and Professor Helmer Smith (SnA. 639) suggests *yōgāhane* and *kammahi* for *yo ogahane* and *kammehi* respectively. There is metrical lengthening in *santhavāto* (Sn. 207^a), *muni* (Sn. 209^c, 210^c, 216^b, and 220^d. v.l. *muni*), *nāyūhatī* (Sn. 210^d v.l. *-i*), *anūpalītaṃ* (Sn. 211^b v.l. *-u-*) and *satīmaṃ* (Sn. 212^b). Both forms *gihi* (Sn. 220^a v.l. *-i*) and *gihī* (Sn. 220^c and 221^c v.l. *-i*) occur. Though metre, as a rule, is

10. Vide Müller; Pali Grammar, p. 120.

11. Vide Geiger, § 152, note 3.

no sound criterion, the old metres employed in this sutta further support other evidence which shows that the poem is old.

Style.—There is nothing extraordinary as regards the style of the sutta. Throughout the poem the diction of the stanzas is purely poetic, and figurative speech is freely used, e.g. Sn. 209^d, 219^{bc} etc. Simile and metaphor play an important part. In addition to the popular similes mentioned already there is a simile at Sn. 221^{ab}. The allegory at Sn. 208-209 also enhances the poetic effect. E. M. Hare (p. 218) considers that *paṃāyu* (Sn. 209^a) is a *śleṣa* (pun) i.e. from $\sqrt{mā}$ and \sqrt{mr} . There are a few instances of alliteration (Sn. 211) and assonance (Sn. 219^b—*atitariya tādīm*). These poetical devices which are not too frequently employed in the sutta do not in any way mar the style as in late artificial poetry. The refrain in Sn. 211-219, the popular similes used, and the perfect rhythm and cadence, all point to a literary style which is essentially that of the ballad, and therefore popular.

Doctrinal Developments.—Besides the epithets used for the *muni*, which have definite values and an underlying technical significance there are a few terms in the sutta which show a transition from the general meaning to a more restricted connotation indicating a gradual development in doctrine. The word *santhava* (Sn. 207^a) implies not only acquaintances but also all forms of ties, attachments and worldly bonds arising out of the association with them (cp. Khaggavisāṇa Sutta). The words *vatthūni*, *bījaṃ* and *sinehaṃ*, though allegorically used have a faint technical significance; and these words in course of time came to be looked upon as synonyms for the various objects they stood for. This process is easily discernible in the case of *sineha* on account of the semantic development of the word (*sineha* = liquid and affection), and became most pronounced in the Commentarial epoch. Neumann¹² suggests that *takkaṃ* and *saṅkhaṃ* at Sn. 209^d were references to popular philosophical systems Tārkyam and Sāṅkhyam. It is not at all likely that *takka* and *sankha* were references to any definite philosophical system so much as to any speculative doctrine which professed to achieve salvation by way of knowledge—*jñāna* as opposed to *yoga*¹³. *Saṅkhaṃ* cannot be an allusion to the philosophical system known as Sāṅkhya originated by Kapila, before Buddhism, but developed centuries later. It has been rightly pointed out by Neumann (ibid) that the *muni* seeks no resting place as the *yogi* as stated at Mbh. Śāntiparvan 302, *pratyakṣahetavo yogāḥ, sāṅkhyāḥ śāstraviniścayāḥ*. The phrase *saṅkhaṃ na upeti*, however, is intrinsically connected with *na saṅkhaṃ gacchati* (does not enter the category of, or, is not reckoned as) occurring often in Canonical Pāli. The only point worth investigating

12. Die Reden Gotamo Buddhos, p. 437.

13. Vide Franklin Edgerton: Sāṅkhya and Yoga in the Epics—American Journal of Philology, 1924.

SUTTA NIPĀTA: THE MUNI SUTTA

here is to what category (lit. number) the *muni* does not belong. The explanation of this phrase in the Comy. (SnA. 257) that the *muni* does not enter the category of " a divine being or an (ordinary) man " or even of " a person of lustful temperament or of malicious temperament " sheds some light. In short, the idea implied is that the *muni* is beyond worldly limitations—an idea quite in harmony with the conception of a perfect *muni*.

The term **nivesana** (Sn. 210^a) as ' a resting place for the mind, a dogma ' is a word adapted by early Buddhism giving it a special meaning. It has no special doctrinal significance, apart from the fact that this specialised meaning was attached to it from very early times. The idea of being free from such *nivesanāni* (or *-nivesā* 785^a) occurs also at Sn. 470^{ab}, 801^c, 846^d, and 1055^e. Sn. 785 describes the nature of dogmatic beliefs. The term **pāra** and the idea of ' going beyond ' (*pāra* + $\sqrt{\text{gam}}$)—Sn. 210^d—have been discussed in the introduction to the Pārāyana Vagga.¹⁴ The words *ogha* and *samudda* Sn. 219^b are used to signify the ills of the world in much the same way as *vatthūni*, *bījāni* and *sineha*, but *ogha* seems to have already acquired a technical significance as seen from its occurrences in Sn.¹⁵

The doctrinal emphasis of this sutta is on the conduct of the *muni*. This itself shows that the sutta reflects an early period. Most of the terminology of the sutta, apart from the basic concepts such as *saṅga*, *santhava*, etc. is not fixed. The terms used in the allegory of the seed and that of reaching the further shore of the *samudda* (ocean) are seen gradually to acquire a technical significance. This sutta furnishes a great deal of data for the development of early Buddhist terminology. All the available evidence from doctrinal grounds too shows that the sutta appears early.

IV

External evidence.—References made to the Muni Sutta in other works show that the sutta was known before the compilation of these respective works. The Muni-gāthā are mentioned as one of the sections recited by Śroṇa Koṭikarṇa at Divy. 20, and by the merchants at Divy. 35. The Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādins and the Tibetan Dulva include the Muni-gāthā among the sections recited by Śroṇa.¹⁶ As Rhys Davids¹⁷ has pointed out, by Muni-gāthā was meant the Muni Sutta. In one of the places where Milp. (i.e. p. 385) quotes the opening stanza of the Muni Sutta (i.e. Sn. 207) the name of the sutta itself is not mentioned, though reference is made to the Sutta Nipāta, (see note 6). Usually the author of Milp. refers to the whole work rather than to a particular sutta when he makes his quotations ; e.g.

14. *University of Ceylon Review*, Vol. VI, 4.

15. *ibid.* See also the introduction to the Pārāyana Vagga.

16. Sylvan Lévi, J. A., 1915, p. 401 ff.

17. Rhys Davids, J. P. T. S., 1896, p. 95.

Saṃyuttanikāyavare, Suttanipāte, etc. Altogether he makes five references to Sn. in quoting stanzas taken from it.¹⁸ There are other quotations from Sn. with no references to it whatsoever, and at one place (Milp. 36) he quotes Sn. 184 and acknowledges it as a stanza of the Saṃyuttanikāya (S.I. 214). It is only in one instance (Milp. 369) that a sutta in Sn. is mentioned by name ; viz. in quoting Sn. 29 he says, *Vuttam' p'etam Mahārāja, Bhagavatā devātidevena Suttanipāte Dhaniyagopālakasutte*. Now, the only occurrence of Sn. 207 in the whole work is as the opening verse of the Muni Sutta, and it may be said with certainty that the author of Milp. knew the Muni Sutta as belonging to Sn. Although Milp. is a comparatively late work (cc. 80 B.C.),¹⁹ all these quotations show that Sn. was perhaps known to its author as it is found to-day.

The earlier inscriptional evidence from the Bhābru Minor Rock Edict of Aśoka shows that the Muni Sutta was a popular piece even as early as the third century B.C. The fact that the Pāli versions of the episode of Soṇa do not include the Muni Sutta among the pieces recited by him does not in any way prove that the sutta was not known to the compilers of these respective works. It is only in the more enlarged versions of the episode that the Muni Sutta as well as other well known sections of the Scriptures are mentioned. However, the testimony of the Bhābru edict is sufficient to show that the sutta was known in comparatively early times.

The **indirect evidence** from the position of the sutta in the vagga has been discussed earlier. Yet, it should be observed that the inclusion of the Muni Sutta in Sn. had taken place at least a good many years before the final edition of Milp. Thus, all these isolated references to Muni-gāthā and quotations from the Muni Sutta strongly support the internal evidence from all sources to establish that the sutta is of great antiquity.

N. A. JAYAWICKRAMA

18. viz. Milp. 369, 385, 411, 413-414, and 414.

19. Mrs. Rhys Davids, *Outlines of Buddhism*, p. 103.