

# PĀLI MANUSCRIPTS OF CANONICAL TEXTS FROM NORTH THAILAND—A PRELIMINARY REPORT

OSKAR VON HINÜBER\*

The arrival of Pāli in the area that is now Thailand dates back to a remote past even before the Thai peoples started to move into this territory. As it seems, Theravāda Buddhism, the vehicle of which is the language now called Pāli, was embraced first by the Mon [P. Dupont : La version mône du Nārada-Jātaka. PEFEQ XXXVI. Saigon 1954. p. 9 ff.]. Although very little, rather next to nothing, is known about the early history of the Mon canon in Pāli, its origin appears to have been South Indian rather than Ceylonese, which would account for the canonical quotations cited by Aggavaṃsa in his Saddanīti composed 1154 in a wording deviating sometimes considerably from the text as transmitted in Ceylon [O.v. Hinüber : Notes on the Pāli Tradition in Burma, Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. I. Philologisch-Historische Klasse. Jahrgang 1983, Nr. 3. Göttingen 1983].

When Theravāda finally took firm roots among the Thai people, they also became engaged in the transmission of canonical Pāli writings. Besides they translated the canon into Thai or composed text in Pāli [G. Coedès : Note sur les ouvrages palis composés en pays thai. BEFEQ 15. 1915. 39–46], about which very little is known yet, at least as long as the eagerly awaited thesis on Pāli literature in Thailand by Dr. Likhit Likhitanand (University of Chiang Mai), a complement since a long time overdue to M. Bode : The Pali Literature of Burma. London 1909 [repr. London 1966, cf. J.W. Bollée, IJ 11. 1969. 311–318] and G.P. Malalasekera : The Pāli Literature of Ceylon. London 1928 [repr. Colombo 1958] remains unpublished.

As is well known, the broad stream of literary activities in Thai as well as in Pāli suffered a most unfortunate setback by the devastation of Ayudhyā in 1767, when an unknown but very high number of manuscripts perished and many texts were lost once for all. Shortly before this disaster, in about 1750, many Pāli texts had been sent to Ceylon at the request of king Kīrtisiddhi [Dupont as above, p. 14]. Afterwards it took nearly a century to reassemble and reestablish the Pāli canon in Thailand by the help of the Sinhalese and the Burmese traditions, and it was only during the Fifth Reign in 2436 [1893] that the first printed edition of the canon could appear, which has been reset and completed for the second print in 2470 [1927], and which was reprinted recently as “*syāmaratthassa tepītakam*” in 2523 [1980].

---

\* Prof. Dr. Oskar von Hinüber, Orientalisches Seminar-Indologie, Universität Freiburg, West Germany.

As far as the text is concerned, it holds an intermediate position somewhere between the Sinhalese and the Burmese text traditions [A. Taylor : *Paṭisambhidāmagga*. Vol. I London 1905 (repr. 1979). Preface p. VII and F.R. Hamm : *Zu einigen neueren Ausgaben des Pāli-Tiṭṭaka*. ZDMG 112. 1962, 353-378]. Being used by European scholars working in the field of Pāli at the beginning of this century, it has been superseded gradually either by the critical editions of the Pāli Texts Society, and, as far as oriental editions are concerned, which are still being used to control the not always reliable PTS editions, the Simon Hewavitane Bequest Series, Colombo 1917 ff. among other prints represents the Sinhalese, and the excellent *Chatṭhasamgāyana* Edition, Rangoon 1957 ff. the Burmese branch of the Pāli tradition. Both series also include the *aṭṭhakathā* and the *īkā* texts. Here this Burmese edition marked as Be following the system of abbreviations as laid down by Helmer Smith in the *Epilegomena* to Vol. I of V. Trenckner : *A Critical Pāli Dictionary* (CPD). Copenhagen. I (1924-1948); II. 1-12 (1960-1982) has been used besides the print of SN by the Hamsavati Press, Rangoon 1939 referred to as Be 1939. B is used for the Burmese manuscript used by L. Feer in his edition of the *Samyuttanikāya* (SN), London 1884 (repr. 1960), SS for his Sinhalese manuscripts, and finally BB marks those instances where the whole Burmese tradition agrees. As far as further printed editions are concerned, Se stands for the Siamese, and Ee for the English, i.e. PTS editions, respectively.

As the Thai edition (Se) printed under King Chulalongkorn is mostly but by no means entirely dependent upon the Ceylonese and Burmese traditions, it was frequently, and not altogether without justification, regarded as secondary to those local traditions, and consequently rarely made use of when establishing a critical text, for the superimposed imported readings from Ceylon and Burma did not allow the formation of a clear and distinct picture of the truly indigenous Thai Pāli tradition. Manuscripts, on the other hand, which would have allowed a better insight into Pāli as preserved in Thailand, were not readily accessible. Moreover, in Central Thailand, not many Pāli manuscripts older than 1767 seem to have survived, as far as one can estimate, if the palm leaf books kept in the National Library, Bangkok, are any standard. Only about a dozen manuscripts predating the destruction of Ayudhya are found in the Library today as far as Pāli is concerned. This figure, which is as impressive as it is depressing, shows the enormous loss of material given the number and size of monasteries in the old capital.

Most fortunately, this rather gloomy picture, showing a situation very much uninviting to the Pāli scholar, brightens considerably when turning towards North Thailand. First hints to a surprisingly good and evidently old tradition of Pāli from this region can be gathered from the *Critical Pāli Dictionary*. The manuscript L<sup>k</sup> not

found in G. Coedès : Catalogue des manuscrits en Pāli, Laotien et Siamois provenant de Thailand, Copenhagen 1966 (Catalogue of of Oriental Manuscripts, Xylographs etc. in Danish Collections. Vol. II. 2), and therefore probably acquired in Laos, has been used when referring to the Jātaka by the CPD and by Helmer Smith in his edition : Saddanīti. La grammaire Pāli d'Aggavaṃsa. Lund 1928–1966 (Sadd). For instance, the manuscript L<sup>k</sup> reads a correct *ślokapāda* in : *tatth' assaṃ mahesī piyā*, Ja VI 483, 6\* against *tattha assaṃ mahesiyā* found in all manuscripts used by Ee and quoted in this wording in the Saddanīti. Although *mahesiyā* seems to be a correct reading at a first glance at least, it actually destroys the cadence of the verse, for, as L. Alsdorf : Les études jaina. Paris 1965. p. 59, has shown, *mahesī* scans—in old Pāli. Further instances, at which the Thai tradition may have preserved a text better than other local traditions are listed in the CPD s.vv. *ajjha* (at the end) and *atha* under “Rem.” from L<sup>k</sup>. Under *appabhīta* quoted from Se Majjhimanikāya (MN), Majjhimaṇṇāsa Vol. 13, 77, 2\* corresponding to Ee *appahīna*, MN I 326, 25\*, the the CPD suspects a Siamese conjecture. However, the Sanskrit parallel edited recently by E. Waldschmidt from Central Asian fragments found at Turfan has *aprabhīta*, which proves Se to be correct against the rest of the tradition [O. v. Hinüber : Upāli's verses in the Majjhimanikāya and in the Madhyamāgama. In : Indological and Buddhist Studies. Volume in Honour of Prof. J.W. de Jong. Canberra 1982. 243-251]. Long ago, W. Stede, JRAS 1927. p. 886 pointed out the superiority of *paṭipucchā*, *vinānā* MN III 19, 20 in Se against *paṭicca vinīā* found in Ee (cf. SN III 104, 1). A further example from Se, *upakkita*, may be found in the CPD s.v. *apacināti*, These instances collected more or less at random draw the attention to the possibility of finding valuable text material in Thailand. The manuscript L<sup>k</sup> may rather point to the north because of its Laotian origin, as the whole historical situation does : this area suffered much less during the political upheaval in the second half of the 18th century. Moreover, there has been a council held at Chiang Mai under King Tilaka during 1475-1477 [Ratanapañña Thera : Jinakālamālīpakaraṇa, trsl. by N.A. Jayawickrama. London 1968 p. 164 note 5] with the explicit purpose to establish and edit the text of the canon. Thus the presupposition to detect traces of an old tradition in the Chiang Mai area does not seem to be altogether unfounded.

To confirm this idea, it is not possible to start with any text casually selected from the Tipiṭaka. To find out on which side of the tradition, either Sinhalese or Burmese, a Thai manuscript stands, it is necessary to choose a text transmitted with local traditions clearly distinct from each other. At the present state of our knowledge, not many texts are found to fulfil this condition. Only rarely we can find a pure Sinhalese tradition. In many cases, the basis of the text is rather Burmese and mostly both traditions are contaminated to a degree that does not allow any conclusions as to which

local tradition a text or manuscript can be assigned with any confidence [O.v. Hinüber : Notes on the Pāli tradition in Burma, note 4]. A rare exception and consequently a highly suitable text is the Saṃyuttanikāya, in which the readings of the Sinhalese and Burmese manuscripts are wide apart from each other as stated by L. Feer (1884) in the introduction to the PTS edition [see also: O.v. Hinüber : On the Tradition of Pāli Texts in India, Ceylon and Burma. In: Buddhism in Ceylon and Studies on Religious Syncretism in Buddhist Countries ed. by H. Bechert. Goettingen 1978. 48–57, esp. 55f.].

At the beginning, the search for a certain text, in this particular case the Saṃyuttanikāya, in monastery libraries in North Thailand seemed to pose a serious and rather complicated problem. A series of unforeseeable lucky coincidences, however, greatly facilitated this task. First of all, quite a few scholars and colleagues in Chiang Mai took the trouble upon themselves to extend every help to me whenever necessary and possible. In the first place, I have the pleasure to thank Dr. Hans Penth, Chiang Mai, who not only introduced me to the Institute of Social Research, University of Chiang Mai, but who also drew my attention to the unpublished mimeographed survey of manuscripts: A Catalogue of Palm Leaf Texts in Wat Libraries in Chiang Mai (Thailand). Part I-IV. 1974–1975 by Sommai Premchit in collaboration with Puangkam Tuikeo, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Faculty of Social Sciences, Chiang Mai University. This important list proved to be a highly useful tool when trying to get a first impression about the texts available and where to find them, for, although this catalogue had been planned primarily as a guide for collecting Lanna literature to preserve it by microfilming, the authors most fortunately made the highly reasonable decision also to include Pāli texts whenever they came across old and rare manuscripts. Fortunately, a Saṃyuttanikāya manuscript preserved in Wat Phra Singh (Chiang Mai) has been listed as no. 3/93 in Vol. I. The date given on the cover leaf of this manuscript, Cūlaśakarāj 964 corresponding to AD 1602 is quite considerable for a Pāli manuscript, if one bears in mind the fact that most of the surviving manuscript material is hardly older than the late 18th century. As far as the Saṃyuttanikāya is concerned, the Catalogue of Palm Leaf Manuscripts in the Library of the Colombo Museum by W.A. de Silva, Volume I, Colombo, 1938, registers as no. 70 an extremely old manuscript dated as early as AD 1412. If this date is correct, this would be the oldest dated Pāli manuscript known so far. The manuscript found in Wat Phra Singh marked here as C was examined by myself in October 1981 thanks to the extraordinary liberality of the Venerable Abbot of the monastery ท่านเจ้าคุณพระราชาสีททอาจารย์ถาวร, who readily granted access to the treasures of his library, and due to the help of Mr. Puangkam (ปวงคำ ตัญเชียว) in tracing the manuscript in that library.

Although the catalogue by Sommai and Puangkam lists eight fasciculi of the Saṃyuttanikāya, Sagāthavagga, only five have been found so far in the library, viz. nos. 1, 5, 6, 8a, 8b (the number 8 occurs twice). Again out of these five only three actually belong to the old Saṃyutta-nikāya manuscript C copied in Chiang Saen, viz. nos. 1, 5, 8a. No. 8b comprising 38 leaves with five lines of writing and measuring 5,1 by 53 cm, also belongs to the Sagāthavagga corresponding to SN I 198, 12–240, 25. Written fairly carelessly in a hand clearly different and more modern than C and showing quite a lot of mistakes, it is consequently of rather limited value. Here it will be referred to as C<sup>b</sup>. Fasciculus no. 6 contains passages from the Vinayapitaka, Bhesajja- and Kaṭṭhina-Vaggas of the Mahāvagga corresponding to Vinaya I 244, 35–259, 5. It comprises 18 leaves measuring 5,1 by 56,5 cm with 5 lines of writing.

Thus unfortunately only fasciculi nos. 1, 5, 8 (a) measuring 5 by 52,5 cm of this highly valuable manuscript are available. Fasc. no. 1 comprises 25 leaves corresponding to SN I 1, 1–43, 12; fasc. no. 8 (!) has 20 leaves corresponding to SN I 73, 33–96, 5; fasc. 5 (!) has 24 leaves corresponding to SN I 98, 12–124, 12. If this manuscript is compared to the printed edition it becomes clear at once that the numbering of fasciculi is wrong probably because the front leaves have been misplaced. The gap of 30 printed pages between fasc. nos. 1 and 8 shows that no. 8 should be corrected to 3, fasc. no. 2 is lost and no. 5 should be no. 4. On the other hand there are no indications that these three fasciculi should be attributed to three different manuscripts.

A first examination of C on the spot at once revealed its high value not only because of its age, but also on account of its quality. Carefully written and sometimes corrected by the same and then again by a later hand, it offers quite a few new and interesting variants as will be shown below. However, the time at my disposal in Chiang Mai was not sufficient for the time-consuming thorough collation of the whole manuscript. Therefore I gladly accepted an offer by Acharn Balee Buddharaṅga of the Social Research Institute to provide a microfilm, which proved to be of excellent quality. At the invitation forwarded by Professor Kasem Burakasikorn, Head of the Social Research Institute, I got the opportunity to work at the Institute and to go through the index cards of the microfilms prepared formerly under the supervision of Acharn Sommai Premchit, now under Acharn Balee. It is a most agreeable duty to thank all these gentlemen for their kind cooperation.

When checking the index cards, a second old manuscript of the Saṃyuttanikāya was traced dated Cūlaśakarāḍḍi 911 corresponding to AD 1549 written at Wat Lai Hin (ไทรหิน) near Lampang. This manuscript, however, was not altogether unknown to me at that time by the kind help of Dr. Harald Hundius, University of Kiel/West Germany, who had microfilmed Lanna manuscripts some years ago in collaboration with the lamented late Acharn Sinkha Wannasai. While concentrating on Lanna

literature, Dr. Hundius also included rare and old Pāli manuscripts in his collection. Luckily, the fasciculi of this manuscript marked here as L filmed by Acharn Balee and by Dr. Hundius respectively supplement each other so that the whole Sagāthavagga is available. There are fasc. nos. 3, 4 in the Hundius collection and nos. 1, 6, 8, 10 plus two fasc. without number marked as A and B in the Social Research Institute. The somewhat confused sequence of leaves and fasciculi has to be rearranged as follows: Fasc. no. 8: 7 leaves=SN I 1, 1-9, 19; fasc. no. 1: leave 7-25 = SN I 9, 20-33, 20; fasc. no. 2: 25 leaves=SN I 33, 20-63, 28; fasc. no. 3 (Hundius collection): 24 leaves=SN I 63, 28-87, 13; fasc. 1: leaves 1-6=SN I 87, 13-92, 26; fasc. no. 4 (Hundius collection): 18 leaves=SN I 92, 26-113, 2; fasc. A (corresponding to fasc. no 5): 24 leaves=SN I 113, 3-141, 16; fasc. no 8 (correctly no. 6): 25 leaves=SN I 141, 16-170, 25; fasc. no. 10 (correctly no. 7): 25 leaves=SN I 170, 25-200, 3; fasc. B (corresponding to fasc. no. 8): 34 leaves=SN I 200, 3-240, 5. Evidently, the cover leaf of fasc. no 8 should be placed on fasc. B, and the seven leaves of fasc. no. 8 should be united with fasc. no. 1. The first six leaves of fasc. no. 1 should be placed at the beginning of fasc. no. 4 (Hundius collection) thus adding up to 24 leaves, the standard number of leaves in one fasciculus (𑖀𑖔). Why and how fasc. no. 8 (correctly no. 6) and no. 10 (correctly no. 7) got their wrong numbers is difficult to guess. Anyway, the total amount of leaves filmed covers the complete Sagāthavagga corresponding to the first volume of the PTS edition. This is particularly fortunate as L written 1549 is still older by half a century than C copied in 1602.

Both manuscripts, C and L, are akin to each other though C is not dependent on L directly. As they are near in time but written at a considerable distance from each other, L in Lampang and C in Chiang Saen respectively, they can be used to form an idea about the Pāli tradition covering a relatively large area. Thus any results reached at may be used with much more confidence than those deducted from manuscripts coming from a single town or worse from a single *Wat* only.

Before using C and L to establish a new critical text of the Sagāthavagga, it is essential to determine the exact relation of these manuscripts to the Sinhalese and the Burmese traditions, and, as far as possible, to investigate their mutual interrelation. This can be achieved with the help of the methods of classical textual criticism looking for common omissions and commissions as well as for additions [O. v. Hinüber: Remarks on the problems of textual criticism in editing anonymous Sanskrit literature. In: Proceedings of the first symposium of Nepali and German Sanskritists 1978. Kathmandu 1980. 28-40]. Here, a few passages selected as examples will be sufficient to clarify the position of C and L. A more detailed study of text-critical problems in the Saṃyuttanikāya making full use of C and L is planned for the future.

To assess the value of C and L it is of first and foremost importance to prove, if possible, that neither of these manuscripts is directly dependent on the Burmese tradition, for that would mean that no new information could be gathered from them beyond what is known already from Burmese manuscripts or printed editions. Although the well known connections between Burma and North Thailand and the geographical vicinity as well as the frequent cultural exchange between both countries, rather more in Lampang where L was written than in far off Chiang Saen, at once raises the suspicion to find just another copy of the Burmese branch of the Pāli tradition. Even at a first glance, however, it is evident that C and L belong to a tradition separate from the Burmese one and that they have much in common in spite of occasional differences.

Of all known manuscripts, only C and L insert the following verses after :  
 . . . . *uparujjhatīti*, SN I 15, 18\* :

*gharā nānīhamānassa gharā nābhanato musā  
 gharā nādinnadaṇḍassa paresaṃ anikrubbato  
 evaṃ chiddaṃ durabhibhavaṃ to gharaṃ paṭipajjati*

Thus L; C writes by mistake : *nāhinihamānassa, padesaṃ, ahinikrubbato, bho* corrected to *ko (?)*, *-diṇṇa-*. This verse, the translation of which is not entirely certain, occurs again once only in the Vacchanakhaṅgā, Ja II 233, 1\*-3\* : “There are no houses for one, who does not exert himself, there are no houses for one, who does not lie, there are no houses for one, who does not punish (*na adinna-*, ct. : *na ādinnadaṇḍassāpi agahitandaṇḍassa*, thus Ee following ms. BP, but read with C<sup>ks</sup> *na adinnna-*), who does not deceive others. Who (read : *ko*) would enter a house so difficult to rule and full of defects?” No trace of this verse is found elsewhere in BB, Ee, Se, neither in Spk nor Spk-ṭ, nor in the *uddāna* referring to this passage. At the same time the *uddāna* shows that these verses can be linked to the preceding ones only, if one checks the catch words given there always referring to the first word of a verse. This again does not make much sense, whereas a connection with the following verses might be possible, if only by a rather forced interpretation. As an obvious reason for inserting these verses here seems to be lacking, they unite C any L so much more so.

The verse :

*dukkaraṃ duttitikhaṅ ca avyattena ca sāmāññaṃ*, SN I 7, 13\* is printed with this wording in Ee, Be 1939, Be, Se with some minor variants. From L on the other hand an older and evidently better reading emerges : *aviyattena sāmāññaṃ* “difficult and hard to endure is ascetism for the untrained”. The second *ca* is uncalled for and consequently replaced by *hi* in Ee following B (Be 1939, Be have *ca*). Moreover *aviyatta* is a form expected within the phonetic pattern of Pāli, where clusters such as *-yy-* or *-by-* seem to be due to a resanskritisation of Pāli, as I have tried to show

elsewhere. Although *avyatta* is by no means a rare word in Pāli, the only metrical passage, where it occurs according to the CPD and the Pāli Tipiṭaka Concordance (PTC), is this verse from the Saṃyuttanikāya. Therefore, the reading of L is of special interest as the only instance where the historical Pāli form has been preserved due to metrics. At the same time L seems to be older—or at least preserving a tradition older than the redaction eliminating *aviyatta*. The date of this redaction or its influence on the North Thai tradition of Pāli might have been the late 16th century. For C has *avibyattena*, a blending of the old and the modern forms.

Similarly: *kiṃ sabbaṃ adanvabhavi*, SN I 39, 2\* (*ślokapāda* a) is transmitted thus in L only, while C agrees with Ee: *kiṃsu sabbaṃ addhabhavi*. For the obscure word *addhabhavi*, discussed in the CPD s.v. *addhābhavati*, *anvabhavi* is a young though widely spread Sinhalese variant (cf. Spk I 95 note 3, 4 and the note in Be on SN I 39, 2\*), which, however, does not seem to occur in the Sinhalese manuscripts used by L. Feer, from which he quotes *aṭṭhabhavi*. This may rather be a misread *addha-* due to the similarity of the ligatures *ṭṭha* and *ddha* in Sinhalese script (?). Thus *adanvabhavi* found in L looks like a blending of two different forms again.

The details of the interchange of *-ndh-*, *-nv-* and *-ddh-* in Pāli are far from transparent. The CPD explains the form *-nandha-* for *-naddha-* under the headings *apilayhati* and *upanandhati* linguistically as analogous to different forms of derivatives from the root *badh*, which sounds rather convincing at first. However, taking into account further material collected in the CPD under *addhābhavati* and *andhabhūta*, further *nandi*, *naddhi*, *nandhi* developed from Sanskrit *naddhrī* [Saddanīti, Index s.v. *-nandhati*; J. Brough: The Gāndhārī Dharmapada. London 1962 on verse 42], and finally *addhagu* for *anvagu*, SN I 39, 3\* etc. in Be 1939, it does not seem altogether improbable that additional confusion was created by scribes copying Sinhalese manuscripts and mixing up *-ddh-* and *-ndh-*, whereas in South East Asian scripts such as Burmese or Lanna *ya* and *dha* change easily by mistake [K.R. Norman: Four etymologies from the Sabhiyasutta. In: Buddhhist Studies in Honour of Walpola Rahula. London 1980. p. 175 note 11 and : The Elders' Verses II. London 1971 p. 57 on verse 7; further : *vaṅkaḍḍhaṅka*, Ja V 302 note 3, 303 note 6].

The word *addhagu* just mentioned above occurs as *anvagu*, SN I 39, 3\*, 5\*. 8\*. 10\*. 13\*. 15\* without any variants noted in Ee. Be also has *anvagu*, but refers to *addhagu* in 'ka' here evidently signifying older prints such as Be 1939. The Thai manuscripts C and L both have *annagu* throughout. This is indeed the form to be expected in Pāli, where *-nva-* regularly develops into *-nna-*, cf. *samannāgata* < *samanvāgata*. The preservation of the historical correct reading *annagu* once again proves the high value of the manuscripts united in this passage against the rest of the

published tradition. It is all the more remarkable that C and L retain *annagu* in spite of the fact that the Saddanīti already in the 12th century accepts *anvagam* in a passage where the excellent Sinhalese Jātaka manuscript C<sup>k</sup> has *annagā* (CPD s.v. *anugacchati*), In the same way as C<sup>k</sup>, C and L have also not been affected by modernisation. Similarly Be 1939, Be and B have *duravayo*, SN I 19, 4\* against *durannayo* in C, L and Ee following SS here.

The valuation of a further passage, where C and L seem to have preserved an old reading, is rather complicated because the interpretation of the following verse is not without problems:

*ṭhite majjhantike kāle sannisennesu pakkhisu*

*saṇat' eva mahārañṇaṃ*, SN I 7, 2\*-3\* = 203, 28\*-29\* = Ja VI 507, 15\*-16\* "even at midday when the birds are settled down together, the great jungle is full of noise" (Cone). The rather numerous variants of this verse need not concern us here: *majjhanhike* by conjecture in Be (approved the CPD s.v. *antika* ?) for the strange *majjhantike*; *brahārañṇaṃ* in Ja and in SS of SN; *sannisīvesu* in BB supported by Sadd 385, 1; 623, 25 and by the quotation of this verse Sadd 858, 17\* is also found in L at SN I 7, 2\*, but not at SN I 203, 28\* nor in C, Cn in either passage. The more interesting word in this verse is *saṇate* (or *saṇati*) explained as *saṇati viya*, Spk I 34, 25. This rare word reoccurs in canonical Pāli only twice at Sn 720, 721 said of the noise of a small but quickly flowing river. At Sn 720 the Burmese manuscript B<sup>m</sup> has *suṇantā* concurring with *suṇate*, SN I 7, 6\* in L (this line is omitted in C). The reading *suṇate* reoccurs SN I 203, 29\* in C<sup>n</sup>, where C is not extant and L has *saṇate*. In the Saṃyuttanikāya *suṇate/saṇate* has been replaced by *palāte* in Se, while this edition has *suṇate* without variant in the Jātaka, a reading noted neither in Ee nor Be here. However, it seems to be firmly rooted in the Thai Jātaka tradition. For the Mahāvessantaravivarana, a commentary on the Vessantara-Jātaka written in Cūlaśakarāja 1107 = AD 1745 in Khmer script, which I was able to inspect due to the kind permission given by the National Library, Bangkok, where it is kept today, confirms *suṇate*: *bhoti maddi pakkhisu sannisinne [su] rukkhasākhaṇam antare sannipatitesu kāle divākāle majjhantike suriyassa majjha [ṃ] tike ṭhite brahārañṇaṃ mahantaṃ arañṇaṃ suṇate vinadasaddaṃ karoti viya tvaṃ kiṃ icchasi gantu [ṃ] tattha tamhi evarūpe bhyānake (!) arañṇe*. The text of the verse itself is not quoted in full in this commentary. Thus *suṇate* is of a fairly frequent occurrence, by far too frequent to be disregarded as a simple writing mistake. This statement at once provokes the question as to the origin of *suṇate* besides *saṇate* or *saṇati* which is accepted by Sadd 358, 21. If one starts from Sanskrit *svanati/svanate* the form *suṇate* could well be expected in Pāli. For, as H. Berger: *Zwei Probleme der mittelindischen Lautlehre*. München

1955 p. 61 points out, *-va-* after consonant develops into *-u-* in an open syllable, e.g. *tvarita* > *turita*. This development also allows exceptions : *svara* > *sara* (no \**sura* noted). Thus *sunate* may be old, and *-n-* > *-ṇ-*, if not purely orthographic [J. de Lanerolle : The uses of n, ṇ and l, ḷ in Sinhalese orthography. Colombo 1934] could be influenced by *sunāti* (?). As the new Indo-Aryan languages and also Prakrit have *san* as e.g. Hindī [R.L. Turner : A comparative dictionary of the Indo-Aryan languages. London 1966 no. 13 901 *svanā-*], which, however, as Turner suggests, may be onomatopoeic and might have favoured the disappearance of *saṇate* in Ceylon. In South East Asia, on the other hand, and in South India (?), no such pressure from living languages surrounding Pāli could be exercised. In any case, C and L have saved the testimony of an old tradition.

In the sentences : *ahaṃ āvuso navo acirapabbajito adhunāgato imaṃ dhamma-vinayaṃ. na khvaṃ sakkomi vittharena ācikkhituṃ*, SN I 9, 19-21, C and L have *na vo'ham* and Be 1939, Be, B *na t'āham* for *na khvāham*. In the repetition SN I 11, 5 L joins BB : *na t'āham*, while C reads *nāham*. The form *khvāham*, which contradicts the phonetic pattern of Pāli again owes its existence to the Sanskritising redaction of Pāli. The starting point of all variants should be *na khāham*, *na vo'ham*, *na t'āham* or even *nāham*. Without any means to explain these variations palaeographically, it should therefore have arisen from a change in the shape of the text introduced consciously by scribes or redactors. As it is possible to imagine different developments, it is not easy to infer the original wording. The combination *na kho* corresponding to Vedic *na khalu* is currently used in Pāli. Therefore an underlying text *na vāham* could be changed easily into the more common *na khāham*, while the way from *na khāham* to *na vāham* seems to be less obvious, though by no means impossible. This *na vāham* was interpreted in South East Asia as *na vo* (i.e. *vah*)'ham, perhaps even correctly, if *vāham* is not to be derived from *na ve aham*, in case *na ve* < *na vai* should exist. If so, *vo* would have emerged from the not uncommon confusion between *vai* > *ve* and *vah* > *vo*, Eastern Prakrit *ve*, which is attested frequently, e.g. in *kālaṃ vo'ham*, SN I 9, 1\*, where *vo* is considered correctly as a particle : *vo nipātamattam*, Spk-pṭ Be 1961 I 83, 19 [cf. H. Lueders : Beobachtungen über die Sprache des buddhistischen Urkanons. Berlin 1954, 22-24]. The Burmese tradition on the other hand replacing *v-* by *t-* made it clear that a personal pronoun was understood : *na te aham*. Thus the South East Asian tradition is united as far as the opinion about the pronoun in this passage is concerned, but it is not uniform. It is remarkable that L knows both *na vo 'ham* and *na t'āham* in the same way as it has *sannisinna* and *sannisīva* as pointed out above. Traces of Burmese influence in L are found in other passages too. It is rather tempting to ascribe this influence felt in a manuscript written near Lampang to the geographical vicinity of Burma.

Although a closer and more extensive examination of C and L will bring to light almost certainly more evidence of this kind, the passages discussed above may suffice for the time being to demonstrate the independence of these two manuscripts from other local traditions.

There are, however, instances where both C and L or at least one of them share the Sinhalese tradition: *bhagavantam gāthāya ajjhabhāsi*, S I 3, 13f. in SS, C against: *bhagavato santike gathām abhāsi* in BB with L in the middle between both traditions: *bhagavato santi (!) gāthāya ajjhabhāsi*. This is the first occurrence of this formula having *gāthāya* etc. Therefore L simply perseveres the accusative used earlier as the Burmese manuscripts do.

The text *-saṅgātigo*, SN I 3, 16\*. 18\* of BB and L is confirmed by the *prāṭīka* in Spk I 24, 12, where the *pāṭha -saṅgātiko* (misprinted in Ee as *-saṅkātigo*) is referred to, which is the actual text found in SS and C. This somewhat strange situation can only be explained by a long separate tradition of text and commentary [O. v. Hinüber: On the tradition. . . , as above p. 56].

The Sinhalese reading: *sambuddhā sammad-aññaya*, SN I 4, 14\* shared by C and L is confirmed by the commentary (Spk I 25, 33) in Ee, whereas Be has *sammad-añña*, v. l. *-āya* in 'sī, sya' in accordance with the text: *te sambuddhā sammad-aññā* in BB. Further there are two gaps shared by the Sinhalese manuscripts with C and L. In the verse:

*devā manussā idha vā huraṃ vā*

*saggesu vā sabbanivesanesu*, SN I 12, 14\* = 23, 9\* f. the manuscripts SS, C, L omit *saggesu va* in both passages, which is found in BB and Se too. Similarly: *yena naṃ vajjā na tassa atthi*, SN I 11, 25\*, Where *na tassa atthi* is lacking in SS, C, L, but again these words are attested in BB and Se. In both places the commentaries do not support BB and Se. SS, C, L, and Se are united in reading *nājjhagamum* against BB *na ca ajjagamum*, SN 12, 13\*, and C, L and Se have the correct *āgā* (SS *ājā* is faulty), SN I 12. 10\* against *ajjhagā* in BB [on this verse: O. v. Hinüber: Zum Perfekt im Pāli. Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft (KZ) 96.198213.30-32,]. Further instances attaching C and L to the Sinhalese tradition are: *mahesakkhāhi*, SN I 9, 26 = 11, 12, which is repeated in C and S<sup>1-2</sup> while BB, L and Se write this word only once. The correct wording *puccha bhikkhu ayam ahaṃ anupatīā*, SN I 11, 18 "ask, monk, here I (a *devatā*) am" is preserved in C and L; SS have the correct *ayam* (cf. *ayam aham asmi*, SN IV 203, 20) besides the faulty *anupatto*. The Burmese tradition and Se read *yam* for *ayam*.

One of the most distinctive features of the Sinhalese and the Burmese traditions is the use of *jhatvā* or *chetvā* respectively. This has been observed long ago by L. Feer, who unfortunately preferred the Burmese *chetvā* in his text to replace *jhatvā* in the following verses:

*kiṃsu jhatvā sukhaṃ seti kiṃsu jhatvā na socati*

.....

*kodhaṃ jhatvā sukhaṃ seti kodhaṃ jhatvā na socati*, SN I 41, 16\* ff. [*jhatvā ti vadhitvā*, Spk I 97, 2; *vadhitvā ti hantvā vināsetvā*, Spk-pt Be 1961 I 135, 14] = 47, 8\* ff. = 161, 3\* ff. = 237, 9\* ff.; quoted Nett 145, 19\* ff., and :

*dudanti eke visame nivittā jhatvā vadhitvā atha socayivā*, SN I 19, 23\* f. [*chetvā ti pothetvā*, Spk I 60, 9; *chetvā ti piḷetvā. taṃ pana piḷanaṃ pothanan ti dassento pothetvā ti āha*, Spk-pt Be 1961 I 103, 16f.] = Ja IV 67 6\* [ct. : *kilametvā*], and :

*tañ ca jhatvāna gacchati*, Ja IV 57, 8\* [ct. : *hatvā*]

Everywhere *chetvā* eliminates *jhatvā* in the Burmese tradition, as has been discussed in the PTS Pāli English Dictionary and again by J. Brough : *Gāndhārī Dharmapada* p. 265 on the verses 288, 289. As the GDhp has *jatva* in the verses corresponding to *kiṃsu jhatvā*... there cannot be any sensible doubt about *jhatvā* as original, although its etymological explanation poses some difficulties. In Pāli, a connection with *jhāyati* "to burn" seems to be probable [cf. H. Smith : *Saddanīti Index*, s.v. *jhatta*]. In the North West of India there may have been a different though homonymous word *jatva* by coincidence especially in the light of *jatva*, GDhp 12 corresponding to *hantvā*, Dh 294, which would be equivalent to *hatvā* etymologically in the Nūristān languages [Turner : *Comparative Dictionary*, as above no. 13 969 and G. Buddruss : *Nochmals zur Stellung der Nūristān Sprachen des afghanischen Hindukusch*. Muenchner Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft 36. 1977. 23],

However, this etymological question has no relevance for the discussion of the interrelationship of the manuscripts. Manuscript L covering the whole of the *Sagāthavagga* always has *jjhatvā*. C, on the hand, originally had *ññatvā*, SN I 41 corrected into *jhatvā* by a different probably more modern hand as some kind of ink has been used, and as the shape of the *aksara jha* differs from the one found otherwise in C. In SN I 237, the manuscript C<sup>n</sup> is extant and has *ññatva* throughout without and correction. Therefore C<sup>n</sup> might have been copied from C before this manuscript was corrected (?). A possible origin of *ññatvā* is not easy to imagine unless one thinks of the confusion of the somewhat similar Sinhalese ligatures *ñña* and *jjha* at least in handwriting in a rare word. At SN I 19, C probably has *kharitvā*, where the interpretation as *kha* is not quite certain, although the *akṣara* is legible without difficulty.

Anyway neither C nor L ever has *chetvā* as in the Burmese tradition where it seemed to be rooted since quite some time even before C and L were written, for the *Saddanīti* quotes : *kiṃsu chetvā sukhaṃ seti*, Sadd 280, 26 illustrating the use of *kiṃsu*. This means that *chetvā* is not explicitly supported by the context, although there does not seem to be any trace of the manuscript tradition influencing the *Saddanīti*. Many examples rather point to the opposite direction.

Thus *ññatvā* and *jghatvā* found in C and L respectively are a particular strong proof for an old non-Burmese tradition prevailing in North Thailand. This is also felt in Se, which for the better part replaces *jhatvā* by *ghatvā* following the Burmese *chetvā* only occasionally. The word *ghatvā* evidently points to an underlying *jhatvā*. Whenever *chetvā* is found, this indicates a certain degree of contamination of the Thai and the Burmese traditions in Se.

Even if these examples show that the Pāli manuscript tradition in North Thailand is rather independent of Burma, the situation is not that simple that C and L are some kind of a doublet to the Sinhalese manuscripts. Besides the passages quoted above where C and L prove to be close to SS or even nearer to the original wording than SS, they also join Burmese readings in some places. This seems to be the case mostly in those passages where the text has been reshaped in Ceylon, while the unaltered old wording is preserved in Burma. The most evident case is *sukkhāpayamāno*, SN I 8, 20. 10, 6, where C and L have *pubbāpayamāno* also found in the commentary: *pubbāpayamāno ti gattāni pubbasadisāni vodakāni kurumāno*, Spk I 39, 11 ± Ps II 167, 27 on MN I 161, 10, where *sukkhāpayamāno* occurs in one Burmese manuscript only. The situation is the same again at AN V 196, 6, where one Burmese and one Sinhalese manuscript out of five manuscripts and Se used by the editor have *sukkhāpayamāno*, of which there is no trace in the commentary, Mp V 65, 20; similarly AN III 345, 12 with Mp III 368, 16. One commentary explains *pubbāpayamāno* as: *sukkāpayamāno ti attho*, Ps II 167, 27, which makes sense only, if *pubbāpayamāno* correctly preferred by most editors and H. Smith, Saddanīti, Index p. 1619 s. v. really is the original reading. Therefore *pubbāpayamāno* at SN I 8, 20 = 10, 6 cannot be considered as typically Burmese and as such shared by C and L. It is the original text preserved in South East Asia but changed into a lectio faciliior *sukkhāpayamāno* in Ceylon. Correspondingly *nivāraye*, SN I 7, 15\* u-u- in the cadence of a *śloka* preserved in S<sup>1</sup>, printed in Be 1939, Be and in the *pratīka* Spk I 36, 20 and shared by C and L against Ee *nivāreyya* (metre!) is an original old reading and not typical for the Burmese tradition.

One peculiar feature of C and L separates these manuscripts from the Sinhalese tradition, that is the widely spread use of and predilection for *krubbati*, SN I 19, 3\*. 4\* and elsewhere, here against Be 1939, Be, Se, Ee all reading *kubbati*. The form *krubbati*, the possible origin of which is discussed in my article "Notes on the Pāli Tradition in Burma", seemed to be found in Burmese manuscripts only, and that much more frequently than this can be deduced from the PTS editions. The manuscripts C and L now show that *krubbati* is not confined to Burma, but that it spread over a much wider area in South East Asia than one could assume earlier. Whether or not SN I 19 shows that *krubbati* once was used much more often, but was pushed back in course of

time under Sinhalese influence is difficult to ascertain for the moment. For a full evaluation of the difference between BB on one and C and L on the other hand at SN I 19, a more detailed and comprehensive study of C and L seems to be necessary.

Lastly, there are some minor points of agreement between C, L and the Burmese tradition such as : *dadanti heke*, SN I 19, 23\* against S<sup>1,2</sup> *dadanti eke*, S<sup>3</sup> *dadanti ceke*; or ; *hitvā agāraṃ pabbajjīā*, SN I 15, 25\* against SS *pabbajitvā*, which almost certainly is a mistake. There are, however, no decisive readings common to C, L and BB, as far as this can be inferred from about the first twenty pages of the printed edition. If Burmese influence is absent, C and L have many features in common with SS or show characteristics of their own pointing to an old and good tradition. Thus it might not be too far fetched to think that we really can find traces of the Chiang Mai Council in the Thai tradition, even if it is too early to consider this as proved after inspecting only two manuscripts and these in part only as done in this preliminary study. However, the hope is growing and seems to be well-founded now that more material still hidden in *Wat* libraries in North Thailand, when brought to light, will help to re-establish an old and truly Thai Pāli tradition, the value of which for establishing better critical text editions and for the history of Pāli can hardly be rated too high.

#### Abbreviations :

AN	Anguttaranikāya,
BEFEO	Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient
IJJ	Indo-Iranian Journal
JRAS	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society
MN	Majjhimanikāya
Mp	Manorathapūraṇī (commentary on AN)
Nett	Nettipakaraṇa
PEFEO	Publications de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient
Ps	Papañcasūdanī (commentary on MN)
Sn	Suttanipāta
Spk	Sāratthapakāsinī (commentary on SN)
Spk-ṭ	(subcommentary on Spk)
ZDMG	Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft