

# PURIFYING THE *PĀTIMOKKHA*: PALI GRAMMAR AND BUDDHIST LAW IN 17TH-CENTURY HĀMSĀVATĪ

ALEIX RUIZ-FALQUÉS

*Shan State Buddhist University (Taunggyi)*  
*arfalques@cantab.net*

**Abstract:** The present article examines a Pali legal text called the *Purification of the Pātimokkha (Pātimokkhavisodhana)*, an unedited 17th-century commentary on the Pali *Bhikkhu-Pātimokkha*, the code of rules of conduct for Buddhist monks. According to its author, this work was composed in Hāmsāvātī, present-day Bago in lower Myanmar. Following a careful survey of *Pātimokkha* manuscripts from different regions of the Southeast Asian peninsula, mainly Haripuñja (northern Thailand) and Rāmañña (the Mon country), and drawing from earlier *vinaya* commentaries and grammatical treatises, the *Purification* provides a series of original philological and text-critical arguments in order to purge discrepancies, errors and interpolations in the *Pātimokkha*. By resorting to elaborate grammatical reasonings, the author establishes a supposedly flawless text that is suitable for a legally valid recitation. The *Purification* can be perceived as a rarity, for it does not directly touch on legal matters, yet its position amidst other *vinaya* works seems undisputed. This article discusses the methodology of the *Pātimokkhavisodhana* and problematizes the categorization of this treatise by considering both its grammatical and its historical background.

**Keywords:** *Pātimokkha*, *Pātimokkhavisodhana*, Pali Grammar, Buddhist Law, Buddhist Philology, Hāmsāvātī, Myanmar.

## 1. Introduction: The Overtones of Legalistic Pali

And if these two [senses] apprehended only what was close to them, then [the eye] should see the colour of the eye and the roots of the eyebrows, and determining the direction and the location of a sound would not be possible, and the archer would shoot the arrow at his own ear.

*Vibhāvīnī-ṭīkā*<sup>1</sup>

In Theravāda Buddhism, the legal validity of any ritual act involving speech—for instance, the ceremony of higher ordination (*upasampadā*) or the consecration of a monastic boundary (*sīmā*)—relies on the precise recitation (*anussāvanā*) of a Pali performative text.<sup>2</sup> If there is a mistake in the recitation, the act is not valid. That is why the monks officiating over an ordination, for example, have the text in front of them, even though they know it by heart. Such a stipulation is particularly challenging in countries that are not familiar with the Indic phonetic system.<sup>3</sup> In Myan-

<sup>1</sup> Abhid-s-mhṭ 157,<sub>32-35</sub>:

*yadi c'etaṃ dvayaṃ attasamīpaṃ yeva gaṇhati,  
akkhivaṇṇaṃ tathā mūlaṃ passeyya bhamukassa ca.  
disādesavavattānaṃ saddassa na bhaveyya ca,  
siyā ca saravedhissa sakaṇṇe sarapātanan ti.*

These two verses are the conclusion of a longer versified passage that could well be Sumaṅgala's own summary of the prose section that precedes it. For the translation I have slightly edited R. P. Wijeratne and R. Gethin, *Summary of the Topics of Abhidhamma (Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha) by Anuruddha. Exposition of the Topics of Abhidhamma (Abhidhammatthavibhāvīnī) by Sumaṅgala, being a commentary on Anuruddha's Summary of the Topics of Abhidhamma* (Lancaster: Pali Text Society, 2007), 235.

<sup>2</sup> Oskar von Hinüber, "Buddhist Law and the Phonetics of Pāli," in *Selected Papers on Pāli Studies* (Oxford: Pali Text Society, 1994), 198ff. I use the term *performative* in the sense given by J. L. Austin, *How to do things with words* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), 12–13: "These have on the face of them the look—or at least the grammatical make-up—of 'statements'; but nevertheless, they are seen, when more closely inspected, to be, quite plainly, *not* utterances which could be 'true' or 'false'. Yet to be 'true' or 'false' is traditionally the characteristic mark of a statement. One of our examples was, for instance, the utterance 'I do' (take this woman to be my lawful wedded wife), as uttered in the course of a marriage ceremony. Here we should say that in saying these words we are *doing* something—namely, marrying—, rather than *reporting* something—namely, *that* we are marrying."

<sup>3</sup> For a brief explanation regarding its influence in the phonetic fluctuation in Southeast Asian Pali manuscripts, see François Bizot and Oskar von Hinüber, *La guirlande de Joyaux* (Paris: École Française d'Extrême-Orient, 1997), 31. The title of a modern manual for

mar, clarity and distinctness in ritual speech-sounds is so important that preliminary training in Pali pronunciation is required for novices before their first ordination.<sup>4</sup>

The oral performance of a Pali “formula for legal transactions”<sup>5</sup> (*kammavācā*) and the written version that is preserved in manuscripts are mutually dependent. An example of this interdependence is found in the work that I am going to examine in this article, namely the *Purification of the Pātimokkha* (*Pātimokkhavisodhana*), written in early 17th century in Haṃsāvātī (Pegu/Bago), in Southern Myanmar. As the legal performative text is both an object of the ear and of the eye, its preservation depends on a reproduction system that involves the organs of sight and audition. These organs being fallible, errors of reproduction occur with certain regularity. To prevent and to restore such errors, Theravāda scholar-monks such as the author of the *Purification* have traditionally resorted to the discipline of Pali grammar.<sup>6</sup> Indeed, grammar has been the concern of *vinaya* scholarship since Buddhaghosa’s times (ca. 5th century CE).<sup>7</sup>

---

pronunciation of *vinaya* texts in Thailand is found in Anatole-Roger Peltier, *La littérature Tai Khoeun* (Bangkok: Editions Duang Kamol, 1987), 40.

<sup>4</sup> I would like to thank Venerable Nandobhāsa, an M.A. student at the Shan State Buddhist University, for informing me about these practices.

<sup>5</sup> I follow von Hinüber’s translation, cf. von Hinüber, “Buddhist Law,” 200.

<sup>6</sup> See von Hinüber, “Buddhist Law”; Alastair Gornall, “Buddhism and Grammar: The Scholarly Cultivation of Pali in Medieval Lan̄kā,” (PhD diss., Cambridge University, 2013); Alastair Gornall, “How many sounds are in Pāli? Schism, Identity and Ritual in the Theravāda *saṅgha*,” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 42/5, (2014). I will use the expression “Pali grammar” to conflate the concepts of *byākaraṇa* (“word/sentence analysis”), *nirutti* (“semantic analysis”), *saddasattha* (“linguistics”) and *abhidhāna* (“lexicography”) in a generic label.

<sup>7</sup> Von Hinüber, “Buddhist Law,” 219: “The legal consequences of mispronunciation are discussed in the short introduction, Sp 1399,14–17, and again following the section on phonetics, Sp 1400,1–36. Thus the teachings on phonetics have been linked with the commentary on Buddhist Law”; Kate Crosby, “The Origin of Pāli as a Language Name in Medieval Theravāda Literature,” *Journal of the Centre for Buddhist Studies, Sri Lanka* II (January 2004): 78: “By the time of the commentaries [i.e. ca. 5th C.E.], the attitude towards language held by preservers of the *vinaya* differed from the attitude held by the preservers of the *Suttapiṭaka*. The latter emphasized the preservation of meaning, *attha*, while the former also emphasized the preservation of correct phonetics, *vyañjana/akkhara*. This is because in *vinaya* correct pronunciation, wording and word order were regarded as essential for the correct performance of the liturgy required in legal procedures, *kammavācā*.” For the cardinal role of Pali grammar in 12th-century Sri Lankan monastic reformism see Gornall, “How many sounds.”

The *Purification* is of particular importance because of its focus on the written text and its philological discussions. By studying this text, we can also deepen our understanding of local manuscript practices in Myanmar. In so far as these practices may have influenced our reception of the Pali Tipiṭaka and its commentaries, they may be of special interest to those scholars who are interested in knowing how the oldest strata of the literature have been transmitted up to the present day.<sup>8</sup>

For scholars interested in Buddhist Law, this paper offers a clear example of the importance of the grammatical discourse in pre-modern Southeast Asian legal literature. The relationship between grammar and *vinaya* is particularly conspicuous in the Buddhist scholastic tradition of this region, where some authors analyze the grammatical *surface* of the text with such prolixity that they seem to have forgotten the *content*. Von Hinüber goes to the point of considering such commentaries a sort of denaturalization of the genre:

Ñāṇakitti explains the grammar of the Samantapāsādikā to such an extent that it is at times hard to see that he has before him a text on Buddhist law. The sophisticated legal discussions found in the works of his predecessors seem to be almost completely absent.<sup>9</sup>

Petra Kieffer-Pülz has also suggested that some *Pātimokkha* commentaries such as the *Purification* do not deal with “legal aspects.”<sup>10</sup> There is definitely something to say about the exact genre to which these works belong. As von Hinüber himself has explained, the idea that some sort of magic, performative power is embedded in Dhamma speech-sounds is well documented in Theravāda literature.<sup>11</sup> According to this idea, when the *akkhara*, the speech-sound, becomes the substance of the teachings of the Buddha, it is no longer conceived as a superficial or external element, but as a powerful, indestructible core that embodies the ultimate Truth

<sup>8</sup> See Oskar von Hinüber, *Notes on the Pāli Tradition in Burma* (Beiträge zur Überlieferungsgeschichte des Buddhismus in Birma, I), Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, I. Philologisch-historische Klasse, Jg. 1983, No. 3, 68.

<sup>9</sup> Oskar von Hinüber, “Lān<sup>2</sup> Nā as a Centre of Pāli Literature During the Late 15th Century,” *Journal of the Pali Text Society* XXVI (2000): 128.

<sup>10</sup> Petra Kieffer-Pülz, “Vinaya Commentarial Literature in Pali,” in *Brill’s Encyclopedia of Buddhism*, vol. I. *Literature and Languages*, ed. Jonathan Silk et alii (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 434.

<sup>11</sup> Von Hinüber “Buddhist Law,” 228ff; Bizot and von Hinüber, *Guirlande*, 41–42; Aleix Ruiz-Falqués, “The Role of Pāli Grammar in Burmese Buddhism,” *Journal of Burma Studies* 21, no. 1 (2017): 53ff.

contained in the teachings. This is expressed in the stock definition of *akkhara* “speech-sound” in Vimalabuddhi’s *Mukhamattadīpanī* (or *Nyāsa*), which is one of the most influential grammatical texts in Southeast Asia and one of the sources of the *Pātimokkavisodhana*:

They do not (*na*) wane (*khīyanti*), that is why they are called “speech-sounds” (*akkharā*). What this means is that, being forty-one in number, once they have fallen into the Tipiṭaka, they are not destroyed.<sup>12</sup>

The performative power of the oral speech-sound is extensive to the written texts of the Dhamma. In Lan Na and other regions of Southeast Asia some scripts are exclusively used for the Dhamma.<sup>13</sup> In Myanmar, gilded *kammavācā* manuscripts are still copied using the archaic tamarind-seed script, a practice that reflects the same belief in the immutability of

---

<sup>12</sup> Mmd 8,<sub>18–19</sub>: *n’ akkharantī ti akkharā. pamāṇato ekacattālisamattā piṭakattayam pi patvā na khīyanti ti attho*. See also Sadd 604,<sub>25ff</sub>. Sometimes *akkharas* are also conceived as “seeds” (*bījas*), e.g. in the Burmese *Lokaṇīti* (ca. 14th–15th centuries) we read:

One becomes a learned person  
by treating the books  
and other supports, as fields,  
the stylus as a plough  
and the letters as seeds.

Ln 390; cf. Ujjwal Kumar, “A Historical Study of Pāli Nīti Literature” (PhD diss., University of Pune, 2015): 119:

*pothakādīni khettaṃ va, lekhāni yuganaṅgalam;  
akkharāni bījaṃ katvā, caranto paṇḍito bhava.*

Schnake’s French translation:

*Après avoir fait des lettres les graines,  
Les écritures le joug et la charrue,  
Ainsi que des livres, etc., le champ,  
On devient un sage.*

[cf. Javier Schnake, “Le Dhamma par le jeu d’esprit et de la langue: le *Vajirasāratthasaṅgaha*, texte pāli du Nord de la Thaïlande (xvi<sup>e</sup> siècle). Volume III. Étude” (PhD diss., École Pratique des Hautes Études, 2018), 85].

One of the lost grammars quoted in Saddhammajotipāla’s *Kaccāyanasuttaniddesa* seems to be named *Bījākhya* which could perhaps mean “Explanation of the Seed[-Syllables]” (Kacc-nidd 177,<sub>26</sub>).

<sup>13</sup> See, for instance, Michel Lorrillard, “Scripts and History: The case of Laos,” *Written Cultures in Mainland Southeast Asia*, ed. Masao Kashinaga, *Senri Ethnological Studies* 74 (2009); Christian Lammerts, “Notes on Burmese Manuscripts,” *Journal of Burma Studies* 14 (2010); David Wharton, “Language, Orthography and Buddhist Manuscript Culture of the Tai Nuea—An Apocryphal Jātaka Text in Mueang Sing, Laos” (PhD diss., University of Passau, 2017).

the sounds and letters of the Dhamma.<sup>14</sup> It is very likely that such ideas about the effectiveness and purity of speech-sounds influenced the composition of the *Purification of the Pātimokkha*, for it is only when the power of speech-sounds is taken into account that abstruse disputations regarding minute textual divergences become crucial in terms of the ritual effectiveness.

Of course, the *visodhana* as a traditional philological practice is not necessarily confined to aspects of legal validity (see section § 2.5). Any compilation of text-critical notes on a Pali work can be called a *visodhana* “purification” of that text. But it is also true that, in the specific case of the *Purification of the Pātimokkha*, the grammatical and philological discourses are subservient to the legal discourse. We shall keep in mind that the *Pātimokkha* is a text to be recited, to be performed orally. Grammar and philology provide certain analytical tools to ascertain the correct spelling of the *Pātimokkha* speech-sounds. The fact that some of the textual problems discussed in the *Purification* have nothing to do with meaning, but only with the shape of speech-sounds, suggests that the main concern of the author was not to clarify the meaning of the text, but to chisel its shape.<sup>15</sup>

Since the Purification is a very little-known text, the primary goal of this article is to offer a general view at the contents and methods. At the present stage of our research, calibrating the historical influence of the *Purification* in the transmission of the *Pātimokkha* text is a difficult task. The distribution of manuscript copies of this text is not well known. Alexey Kirichenko informs me that he has found this text in several collections. I have located two Mss. in the University Central Libraries, Yangon; five in the Fragile Palm Leaves collection (FPL 2738; 5443;

---

<sup>14</sup> According to my colleague Ven. Kodaññakitti’s report, it seems that the resistance for not transitioning into modern script/s in some areas is due to the belief that the Old Script possesses a superior power. For more details on the peculiarities of the tamarind-seed script, see Anne Peters, “Ergänzendes zur Pāli-Quadratschrift,” in *Studien zur Indologie und Buddhismuskunde. Festgabe des Seminars für Indologie und Buddhismuskunde für Professor Dr. Heinz Bechert*, ed. Reinhold Grünendahl et alii. Indica et Tibetica, 22. (Bonn: Indica et Tibetica, 1993); William Pruitt and Roger Bischoff, *Catalogue of the Burmese-Pāli and Burmese Manuscripts in the Library of the Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine* (London: The Wellcome Trust, 1998), 4; Lammerts, “Notes,” 235.

<sup>15</sup> The metaphor of the shape (*rūpa*) of sound is very common in Pali grammar. Two similar sounds are described as *sarūpa* “having the same shape” (cf. Kacc 13). When a word is completely derived according to the rules of grammar, it attains its “complete shape” (*rūpasiddhi*) (Mmd, *passim*).

5636; 8204; 10179); one in the U Pho Thi Library of Thaton (UPT 509). So far, it has never been printed and it awaits a critical edition.<sup>16</sup> I have been unable to find secondary literature on this work in English. A Burmese gloss (*nissaya*) to this text is listed in Piṭ-sm §770,<sup>17</sup> but I have not been able to find a copy. The present article is primarily based on two manuscripts in Burmese characters, B and F, described in the references. Although the text has by no means been established, these two testimonies provide a fairly acceptable reading.<sup>18</sup>

## **2. The Purification of the *Pātimokkha* (*Pātimokkhavisodhana*)**

### **2.1. Subject matter**

The *Purification of the Pātimokkha (Pātimokkhavisodhana)* is a commentary on the Pali *Bhikkhu-Pātimokkha*. In the 19th-century *Catalogue* of U Yan, the *Purification* appears in the section of “Little Finger Manuals on the Vinaya” and it has retained this category in present-day manuscript catalogues.<sup>19</sup> The word *visodhana* in the title indicates that the work consists of a philological purging, a sort of compilation of text-critical notes.<sup>20</sup> The purification or edition of a Pali text is traditionally understood in Southeast Asia as part of the major reform called *sāsanavisodhana* “Purification of the Teaching”<sup>21</sup> or “Purification of the Buddhist Religion.”

<sup>16</sup> The present study is meant to be a first step towards the edition of the Pali text.

<sup>17</sup> Peter Nyunt, *Catalogue of the Piṭaka and Other Texts in Pāli, Pāli-Burmese, and Burmese (Piṭakat-tō-samuiṅ.)* by Mañ-krī: Mahāsirijeya-sū (Bristol: Pali Text Society, 2012), 113.

<sup>18</sup> For the introductory stanzas and the colophon I have also consulted G and H (see *References*).

<sup>19</sup> Kieffer-Pülz, “Vinaya Commentarial Literature,” 434; Piṭ-sm § 274. For a study on *Pātimokkha nissayas* (Burmese glosses), see William Pruitt, *Étude linguistique de nissaya birmans. Traduction commentée de textes bouddhiques* (Paris: École Française d'Extrême-Orient, 1994).

<sup>20</sup> Another example is Ariyavaṃsa's *Jātakavisodhana* (15th century), a brief compilation of philological notes on the ten major *Jātakas*. It combines Pali and Burmese in the commentary and is written in a highly grammaticalized style. At present, Ven. Kondaññakitti, PhD candidate at the Shan State Buddhist University, is working on a critical edition and English translation of this text.

<sup>21</sup> For the complex meaning of *sāsana* as “community, religion, teaching” see Alexey Kirichenko, “From Thatanadaw to Theravāda Buddhism: Constructions of Religion and Religious Identity in Nineteenth- and Early Twentieth-Century Myanmar,” in *Casting*

As it has been shown by many scholars, the “*sāsana* reform” is not only a mechanism for the Sangha to purify itself from elements that are perceived as impure or heterodox, but it usually involves an attempt by the central political power to establish effective control over the concession of non-taxable monastic land and properties, and also to ensure ideological uniformity in the monastic ranks.<sup>22</sup>

## 2.2. *An imperial Pātimokkha?*

According to its Pali colophon, the *Purification of the Pātimokkha* dates to 1631/2 C.E.<sup>23</sup> and was composed in the city of Hamsāvati, present-day

---

*Faiths: Imperialism and the Transformation of Religion in East and Southeast Asia*, ed. Thomas DuBois (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009).

<sup>22</sup> Michael Aung-Thwin, “The Role of Sasana Reform in Burmese History: Economic Dimensions of a Religious Purification,” *Journal of Asian Studies* 38, no. 4 (August, 1979); Patrick A. Pranke, “The ‘Treatise on the Lineage of Elders’ (*Vamsadīpanī*): Monastic Reform and the Writing of Buddhist History in Eighteenth-Century Burma,” (PhD diss., University of Michigan, 2004), 17ff. In 15th-century Hamsāvati the term “purifier of the religion” (*sāsanavisodhaka*) is used as an epithet for the king and a treatise known as “Illustrator of the rules to purify the Religion” (*Sāsanasodhanavidhidīpakam*) is brought to Rāmañña, cf. Jason Carbine, “How King Rāmādhipati Handled His Boundary Case: *Śīmā*, *Sāsana*, and Buddhist Law,” *Buddhism Law and Society* 1 (2015): 116. The concept has still been used in post-colonial times, see for instance Ledi Sayadaw, *Thathanawithodani* (*Sāsanavisodhanī*), vol. 1 (Yangon: Hanthawaddi Press, 1954). The term *sāsanavisodhaka* was also a title given to the highest monk, since in the introduction to the *Śīmāvivādavinicchaya* the autor Ñeyyadhamma states that at this time (i.e. 1858) he was *sāsanasodhaka* and *saṅgharājā*, cf. J. P. Minayeff, “*Śīmā-vivāda-vinicchayā-kathā*,” *Journal of the Pali Text Society* (1887): 18,30–31: *tasmim kāle ca ahaṃ sāsanasodhako saṅgharājā ahoṣim*. “Also at that time I was the Purifier of the Sāsana and the Patriarch (*rājā*) of the Community” (my translation). I thank Petra Kieffer-Pülz for this reference.

<sup>23</sup> B gi-r-gu-v; F phī-v:

*sambuddhaparinibbānā dvinnam dasa satānaṃ ca  
pañcasattati vīsādhisatassā pi ca mattake,  
tenavutādhike navasate tu sakkarājako,  
hamsāvativhapūrassa pūrasetthassa uttare,  
nātidūre n’ accāsanne, janasaṅkaravajjite,  
ramme chāyodasampanne nānācetyābhimaṇḍite,  
pariyattibahusutatherādivāsasammate  
āyatane gahaṭṭhānaṃ dānasilābhīyoginaṃ  
dhammasavanasamghuṭṭhe hamsapūrādhībhusane.*

“Two thousand one hundred ninety-five years after the *parinibbāna* of the Perfectly Enlightened One—or, in Sakkarāja [calendar]: nine hundred and ninety-three [years]—, in the north of Hamsāvati, foremost among cities, not too far and not too near [from the city,



Bago (Pegu) in southern Myanmar. The authorship of this treatise is uncertain. It has been falsely attributed to the Burmese scholar-monk Chapaṭa Saddhammajotipāla, who lived in Sri Lanka and Pagan during the 15th century.<sup>24</sup> Even though some sources affirm that the work is anonymous,<sup>25</sup> the presence of the name “Ariyālaṅkāra” (“Ornament of the Noble Ones”) in the colophon presumably identifies the author of the *Purification*, who styles himself as a dweller (*vasatā*) of a monastery in the northern section of the city of Haṃsāvati.<sup>26</sup> The name “Ariyālaṅkāra” is quite common. It was also the honorary title of an accompanying monk, perhaps the teacher, of King Thalun,<sup>27</sup> and a certain monk named Ariyālaṅkāra accompanied Tipiṭakālaṅkāra to Haṃsāvati around 1608, during the rule of Thalun’s predecessor, King Anaukphetlun (r. 1605–28).<sup>28</sup> Whether the identity of our author has anything to do with other roughly contemporary Ariyālaṅkāras is a matter for further investigation.

The *Purification* was written in rather turbulent times. Haṃsāvati, formerly the capital city of an independent kingdom of Rāmañña, had become part of the Burmese Empire (or Toungoo Empire), which still had its official seat in Ava.<sup>29</sup> The Burmese king Thalun (r. 1629–48) had settled in Haṃsāvati in the aftermath of his victorious campaign to pacify

---

there is] a place not crammed with people, pleasant, with shade and water, adorned with many pagodas. Well respected on account of its dwellers, Theras that have mastered the *pariyatti*, it is a centre for householders intent on generosity and morality, and constantly resounding with the recitation of the Dhamma, [it appears as] the most splendid jewel of Haṃsapura.” If this reading of the text is correct, the first date, B.E. 2195 would give us 1652 C.E., which does not match the *sakkarāja* date. It seems that the word *vīsa* is superfluous. Perhaps a fault in the Ms. The Burmese *sakkarāja* 993 (= 1632 C.E.) seems to be clear.

<sup>24</sup> Gv 64,<sup>23–24</sup> see Kieffer-Pülz, “Vinaya commentarial literature,” 434; Aleix Ruiz-Falqués, “A Firefly in the Bamboo Reed: The *Suttaniddesa* of Saddhammajotipāla and the Grammatical Foundations of Theravāda Buddhism in Burma” (PhD diss., University of Cambridge, 2015), 106.

<sup>25</sup> In Piṭ-sm § 234 the work is recorded as “written by an unknown Mahā-thera of Haṃsāvati city,” Nyunt, *Catalogue*, 66.

<sup>26</sup> See § 2.3.

<sup>27</sup> Pruitt, *Étude*, 21. The same title was given to the famous Ariyālaṅkāra Dakkhināvan Charā-tō, b. 1617.

<sup>28</sup> Christian Lammerts, *Buddhist Law in Burma: A History of Dhammasattha Texts and Jurisprudence, 1250–1850* (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2018), 121, 122–124, 126.

<sup>29</sup> Victor Lieberman, “The Transfer of the Burmese Capital from Pegu to Ava,” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* no. 1 (1980): 64.

the eastern and southern rebellions. He was crowned at that very city in 1633/34.<sup>30</sup> Thus, despite its being composed in Hamsāvati, the extent to which the *Purification* may represent indigenous Mon Pali scholarship remains unclear.

The country of Lan Na in northern Thailand, which had been an important focus of Pali scholarship during the 14th to 16th centuries, was now under Thalun's imperial administration as well. Veidlinger has suggested that the Burmese imperial power aimed at the replacement of local manuscript cultures,<sup>31</sup> and if that is true, the *Purification* could constitute a witness of a centralized project of imposing textual uniformity. At present, however, we lack any evidence that supports any such claim for 17th-century Southern Burma. The type of characters in which the *Purification* was originally written is unknown, but its sources, as we will see, include Mon and Lan Na manuscripts. Given the proximity of the dates, the possibility that the compilation of the *Purification* was part of the ceremonial preparations for Thalun's coronation should not be dismissed.

### 2.3. Comparing Pātimokkha Manuscripts

As is customary in Pali scholastic works, the main aim of the treatise is stated in the opening stanzas:

Having bowed down to the Foremost (*pāmokkha*) of all the world [i.e. the Buddha], I will purify the *Pātimokkha* taught by him, [making it] flawless both in words and speech-sounds. In some manuscripts, discrepancy (lit. multiplicity) of speech-sounds is found, and in some places there are extra words as well. I will

---

<sup>30</sup> Victor Lieberman, *Burmese Administrative Cycles. Anarchy and Conquest, c. 1580–1760* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), 57: “The elaborate formal coronation that he [King Tha-lun] held at Pegu [= Hamsāvati] on the conclusion of his eastern expedition was designed to impress the Mon population with his claim to sovereignty over the south, lately the scene of an unusually bitter succession dispute. Tha-lun also spent the years 1633–34 strengthening military and administrative arrangements at Pegu and at Syriam.”

<sup>31</sup> Daniel M. Veidlinger, *Spreading the Dhamma: Writing, Orality, and Textual Transmission in Buddhist Northern Thailand* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2006), 136ff, discusses the impact of Burmese annexation of Lan Na in the local manuscript culture; see also Christian Lammerts, “Review: ‘Spreading the Dhamma: Writing, Orality, and Textual Transmission in Buddhist Northern Thailand’,” *H-Buddhism*, May 2011. <https://networks.h-net.org/node/6060/reviews/16089/lammerts-veidlinger-spreading-dhamma-writing-orality-and-textual> (last accessed 27/03/2019).

purify<sup>32</sup> the text without missing any of these cases, carefully observing the words and letters used by the great masters of the past in purified manuscripts, and comparing both [words and letters] with the rules of practice and the word-for-word commentary that are handed down in the *Vibhaṅga* and [also comparing them] with the commentaries.<sup>33</sup>

As this introduction points out, the confusion produced by the proliferation of variant readings and interpolations observed in manuscripts (*pothakas*) of the *Pātimokkha* is the main reason for composing this treatise. The term *anākulam*, that we translate as “flawless,” literally means “not (*an*<sup>o</sup>) confused (<sup>o</sup>*ākula*).” This word bears significant ritual connotations, for a ritual boundary (*sīmā*) that is *ākula* (“flawed” “confused”), for instance, is not fit for legal proceedings.<sup>34</sup>

The colophon offers more details regarding the actual circumstances that led the author into this legal and philological enterprise:

A dweller of that excellent place, Ariyālaṅkāra<sup>35</sup> by name, with the intention of having the *Pātimokkha* written onto a gilded manuscript, carefully examined numerous *Pātimokkhas* originating from different regions. In some of them he found a multiplicity in words and letters, or extra [words and letters], and wrong spellings as well. As if carving monumental letters on a rock pillar, he has carried out the purification of the [text] so that it may last long. This treatise receives its descriptive name in accordance with the tetrad of grammarians. It is called *Purification of the Pātimokkha* because it purifies the *Pātimokkha*, or because by means of it [the text] is purified; and furthermore, because it contains the

<sup>32</sup> Lit. “I will make the purification.” I read *kāsaṃ* as 1st person singular = *karissāmi*, cf. Ja IV 287 *kathaṃ kāsaṃ ti kiṃ karissāmi*.

<sup>33</sup> B kha-v; F pi-v:

*pāmoḁkhasabbalokassa vanditvā tena desitaṃ  
pātimokkhaṃ visodhessaṃ padakkharaṃ anākulam.  
katthaci pothake vaṇṇanānattaṃ dissate, kvaci  
atirekapadaṇ cā pi; taṃ sabbam avirādhayaṃ  
pubbācariyasīhehi yuttaṃ sodhitapothake,  
padakkharaṃ nisāmetvā vibhaṅge āgatehi ca  
sikkhāpadehi tampaḁabhājanīyehi c’ ubhayaṃ  
samsanditvā vaṇṇanāhi kāsaṃ pāthavisodhanaṃ.*

<sup>34</sup> See, for example, Sv II 524,15–16: *asukavihārasīmā ākulā, uposathapavāraṇā pi ṭhitā* “a certain monastery boundary (*vihārasīmā*) is confused (*ākulā*), even the rituals of observance (*uposatha*) and invitation (*pavāraṇā*) have been stopped.”

<sup>35</sup> Given that the text is in verse (*gāthā*), the word *ariyālaṅkāranāmikā* could, and perhaps should be an exceptional instr. sg. (?); cf. Thomas Oberlies, *Pali Grammar. The Language of the canonical texts of Theravāda Buddhism. Part I: Phonology and Morphology* (Bristol: Pali Text Society, 2019), §35.2: “It is only in *pādā* ‘with the foot’, which is formed in analogy with (petrified) *padā*, that the instr. sg. ends in *o*.”

purification of words and letters. By repeatedly pondering with care the letters of the words, the literal meaning and the implied meaning that are found in the *Vibhaṅga*, its Commentary (= *Samantapāsādikā*) and Sub-Commentaries (i.e. *Vajirabuddhiṭṭikā*, *Sāratthadīpanī* and *Vimativinodanīṭṭikā*), in the *Commentary on the Mātikā*, [i.e. the *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī*,] etc., and also in the *Vīmaticchedanī* [= *Vimativinodanī*] as well as in other scholastic treatises, may good people study this treatise that relies on previous masters.<sup>36</sup>

The author compares his work to the writing of a stone inscription, which symbolizes a perennial text, something supposedly indestructible, as the speech-sounds of the Tipiṭaka are believed to be. A fine example of legal treatise carved in stone is the 15th-century *Kālyāṇī Inscriptions* in Hamsāvati itself.<sup>37</sup> The simile reminds of the legends about ancient sages who discovered the Law inscribed in the walls that encircle the Universe (*cakkavāḷa*). These legendary, semi-divine sages supposedly copied those laws in manuscripts and handed them down to humans.<sup>38</sup> In the case of the *Purification*, however, what is meant to be durable is not the physical support (as palm-leaves are known to be perishable) but the quality of the

<sup>36</sup> This is the continuation of the verses given in p. 7 n. 1. B gu-v; F phī-v:

vasatā varaṭṭhānamhi, ariyālaṅkāranāmikā,  
sovaṇṇapotthake pātimokkhalēkhāpanāya ti  
pātimokkhesv anekesu nānādesappavattisu  
nānattaṃ padavaṇṇānaṃ adhikattaṃ ca katthaci  
viparitakkharaṇī cā pi nisametvā visodhanaṃ  
yaṃ abhisāṅkhattaṃ tassa ciraṭṭhiti-y-idaṃ kataṃ,  
silāthambhamhi saññāṅakkharalekhanakaṃ viya.  
pātimokkhaṃ visodheti visodhiyyaty anena vā  
padakkharassa vā tatha visodhanan t' idaṃ tathā  
yaṃ neruttacattukkena pātimokkhavisodhanaṃ  
laddhānvatthasamaññaṃ taṃ [v.l. ti] pubbācariyakassitaṃ  
vibhaṅga-aṭṭhakathā-ṭṭikā mātikāṭṭhakathādīsu  
vīmaticchedanīyaṇī ca tathā satthantaresu ca  
padakkharaṃ padatthaṇī ca 'dhippāyaṇī ca punappunaṃ  
yoniso upadhāretvā samapekkhantu sajjanā ti.

<sup>37</sup> Carbine, "How King Ramādhipati," 115ff.

<sup>38</sup> This passage from the *Dhammavilāsa Dhammasat* has been studied and translated in Lammerts, *Buddhist Law in Burma*, 63–64: "Manu travelled by means of his superpowers to the boundary wall of the universe (*cakravāḷā*). There he transcribed the letters (*akkharā*) of the *dhammasat* treatise, each as big as a cow, which had been written [on the wall] since the beginning of the world. He gave the treatise to Mahāsammata." Some sources date the compilation of the *Dhammavilāsa* to the early 17th century, cf. Lammerts, *Buddhist Law in Burma*, 54–55.

edition. What is compared to the durability of the stone is the authenticity of the text.

#### 2.4. *The three meanings of the title*

As for the brief explanation of title in the colophon, it follows three “means of accomplishing an action” (*sādhana*)<sup>39</sup> that are known to the Pali grammarians. We may paraphrase it as follows: (1) the book is called *Pātimokkha-visodhana* (Pāt-vis) because it is a purifier of the *Pātimokkha*, it is an agent (*kattusādhana*), that is to say, the Pāt-vis itself purifies the Pāt; (2) it is called Pāt-vis because, by means of it, the Pāt is purified; in this case the title expresses an instrument or means (*karaṇasādhana*)—some agent purifies the Pāt by means of the reasonings of the *Purification*; (3) the third explanation highlights the bare action of purifying (*bhāvasādhana* “complete verbal activity”<sup>40</sup>) that is the content of the *Purification*.

I provisionally translate *neruttacatuṅka* as “tetrad of grammarians.”<sup>41</sup> To judge from the context, this concept seems to refer to four grammarians: Kaccāyana (ca. 6th century, India), author of an eponymous grammar; Aggavaṃsa (ca. 12th century, Myanmar), author of the *Saddanīti*; Moggallāna (12th century, Sri Lanka), author of an eponymous grammar; and Vimalabuddhi (10th century, India/Sri Lanka), author of the *Mukhamattadīpanī*.<sup>42</sup> These four authorities are consulted in the elucidation of the textual problems of the *Pātimokkha* (see below). The *Abhidhānappadīpikā*, which is also quoted in the *Purification*, is probably not counted as a separate grammar because it was traditionally, but wrongly, ascribed to Moggallāna.<sup>43</sup>

<sup>39</sup> DSG s.v. *sādhana*. See also Mahesh A. Deokar, *Technical Terms and Technique of the Pali and the Sanskrit Grammars* (Varanasi: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, 2008), 310ff.

<sup>40</sup> DSG s.v. *bhāvasādhana*.

<sup>41</sup> Kār-ṭ ad Kār 81: *neruttikā ti niruttijanantā ācariyā* “The *neruttikas* are the masters who know *nirutti*.”

<sup>42</sup> For the dates and places of these grammars, see Ole H. Pind, “Pāli Grammar and Grammarians from Buddhaghosa to Vajirabuddhi: A Survey,” *Journal of the Pali Text Society* XXXI (2012); Alastair M. Gornall and Aleix Ruiz-Falqués, “Scholars of Premodern Pali Buddhism,” in *Brill’s Encyclopedia of Buddhism*, vol. II. *Lives*, ed. Jonathan Silk et al. (Leiden: Brill, 2019).

<sup>43</sup> Gornall and Ruiz-Falqués, “Scholars,” 5.

Another possibility is to understand the term *nerutta* as “method of interpretation.”<sup>44</sup> The problem with this rendering is that the conventional number or *niruttis* (not *neruttas*) is not four, but five: insertion of a sound (*vaṇṇāgamo*), metathesis of sounds (*vaṇṇavipariyāyo*), modification of a sound (*vaṇṇavikāra*), deletion of a sound (*vaṇṇanāsa*), extension of the meaning of a verbal root (*dhātussa atthātisayena yogo*).<sup>45</sup> It could well be, however, that our author refers to a different list of only four *neruttas* (= *niruttis*).

### 2.5. *The Purification and the gaṇṭhipada literature*

In the Pali literature, the so-called *gaṇṭhipadas* or “books of difficult words” have been used as philological companions to preserve and understand the authentic readings of the Pali legal texts.<sup>46</sup> Although the *Purification* is not classified as a *gaṇṭhipada* in any catalogue that we know, there are little things that differentiate this treatise from a *gaṇṭhipada* treatise. *Gaṇṭhipadas* approach the difficult words in a straightforward manner, clarifying the meaning of difficult words and passages, elaborating etymologies, giving grammatical analysis, and variant readings, as well as background stories and so on.<sup>47</sup> That the *visodhana* genre is a sub-genre of the *gaṇṭhi* can be corroborated by the fact that Ariyavaṃsa’s *Purification of the Jātaka* (*Jātakavisodhana*) is known in some catalogues as *Jāt[aka]gaṇṭhi*.<sup>48</sup> If we compare Ñāṇakitti’s [*Pātimokkha*]gaṇṭhidīpanī with the *Purification*, however, we observe that Ñāṇakitti’s work is not so much focused on the actual readings of the manuscripts, but on gramma-

<sup>44</sup> Sadd 878<sub>27</sub>. I would like to thank Alastair Gornall for pointing this out to me.

<sup>45</sup> Mmd 396<sub>4-6</sub>:

*vaṇṇāgamo vaṇṇavipariyāyo, dve cāpare vaṇṇavikāranāsā,  
dhātussa atthātisayena yogo, tad uccate pañcavidhaṃ niruttī ti.*

See also Sadd § 1343.

<sup>46</sup> The study of reference is Petra Kieffer-Pülz, *Verlorene Gaṇṭhipadas zum buddhistischen Ordensrecht. Untersuchungen zu den in der Vajirabuddhiṭikā zitierten Kommentaren Dhammasiris und Vajirabuddhis*. Veröffentlichungen der Indologischen Kommission, 1. (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2013).

<sup>47</sup> Kieffer-Pülz, *Verlorene Gaṇṭhipadas*, 8.

<sup>48</sup> For instance, Ms. UCL 9795 has the title *Jāt-gaṇṭhi* and contains the *Jātakavisodhana*. It is also called “*gaṇṭhi* treatise” in the *Sāsanālaṅkāra*, a 19th-century Burmese monastic chronicle (see the *Nidāna* of the printed edition of *Jātakavisodhana*).

tical derivations. The same applies to the *Pātimokkhapadatthānuvaṇṇanā*, written in the 18th century by the Burmese monk Vicittālaṅkāra.<sup>49</sup>

A work that is much closer to the *Purification* is the *Method to Write the Pātimokkha* (*Pātimokkhalekhananaya*), attributed to Ñāṇavāra (1705–1753).<sup>50</sup> This work refers to the *Purification* for further explanations and also disagrees with it at times.<sup>51</sup> Another interesting feature of the *Method* is that it refers quite often to the *Vinayālaṅkāra*, a late commentary composed in the middle of the 17th century.<sup>52</sup> Both the *Purification* and the *Method* are manuals whose primary aim is to offer proper readings for the written text of the *Pātimokkha*.

As it has been stated in the introduction, the concern with the shape of the letters and sounds of the *Pātimokkha* text probably derives from the fact that it is a performative text to be recited, and the validity of this legal recitation does not depend on the understanding of the reciter, but on the proper execution of the sounds.

### 3. Method and style of the *Purification*

#### 3.1. Manuscript sources

From the introduction and the colophon of the *Purification* we understand that the author had the intention to produce a gilded manuscript of the Pāt. With this project in mind, he decided to compare different manuscripts of this text from different regions, perhaps being aware of discrepancies in the (oral?) transmission of the text. These regions are Rāmañña, that is to say the Mon country corresponding to southern Myanmar, and Hariṇṇa, which corresponds to the city of Lamphun in Lan Na, today in Northern Thailand, but in the 17th century could simply refer to territories east of

<sup>49</sup> Kieffer-Pülz, “Vinaya commentarial literature,” 434.

<sup>50</sup> Kieffer-Pülz, “Vinaya commentarial literature,” 434.

<sup>51</sup> *Pātimokkhalekhananaya* FPL 8204 phe-v 1.9: *vitthāratthikehi pātimokkhavisodhanato gahetabbaṃ* “those who need a more detailed explanation should obtain it from the *Purification of the Pātimokkha*”; phe-v 1.10: *tividham uccāraṇam api yuttaṃ. kasmā? imassa kriyāvīsesanattā tassa ca muduṃ pacati sammā bujjhati sukhaṃ sayati ty ādinā diṭṭhattā. pātimokkhavisodhane pana...* “All three expressions [*āvī*, *āvī* and *āvīṃ*] are correct. Why? Because it [the word *āvīṃ*] can function as a qualifier of the verb (i.e. adverb, *kriyāvīsesa*), as it is seen in examples such as ‘he cooks softly’ ‘she awakens completely’ ‘he sleeps well’, etc. In the *Purification of the Pātimokkha*, however... ”

<sup>52</sup> Kieffer-Pülz, “Vinaya commentarial literature,” 438.

Rāmañña. The *Purification* provides an internal nomenclature or system of abbreviations in order to distinguish different textual families of the *Pātimokkha*, much in the same way that a modern critical edition may refer to different recensions:

Now here [i.e. in this treatise], when it is stated “in some places” (*katthaci*), it has to be understood that it refers to the manuscript that has been purified by Dhammadhaja Thera, a resident of Rāmañña; when we say “somewhere” (*kvaci*) it means: in the manuscript(s) of the *Pātimokkha* produced in Haripuñja; furthermore, when we say “in some [manuscripts]” (*kesuci*) it means: in *Pātimokkha* manuscripts of undetermined origin; and when we say “everywhere” (*sabbattha*) it means: in all of the previous three.<sup>53</sup>

The mention of a former editor of the *Pātimokkha*, Dhammadhaja Thera, is certainly intriguing. We lack more detailed information about this Mon scholar-monk whose textual authority suggests that he could have been an important figure of the Buddhist Sangha in Rāmañña during the 16th or 17th century. The short philological prelude on the manuscript sources sets the *Purification* project in a cosmopolitan scenario.

### 3.2. Method of analysis

The methodology of the purification serves three main purposes: (1) to decide the right reading when there is a discrepancy, (2) to remove extra words and (3) to correct misspellings. The default attitude of the scholiast is to treat every variant as grammatically viable, but to select only one as correct. The form in which the *Purification* reviews the opinions of authorities, including grammatical works such as the *Kaccāyana* and the *Saddanīti*, often reaches the status of a proper scholastic debate. The virtual opponent may retort: “But does not the *Kaccāyana* [grammar] say that...?”<sup>54</sup>, giving an occasion for the teacher to clarify the matter: “Yes, but...”<sup>55</sup> This is the style of most medieval Pali commentaries. In general, however, the *Purification* tends to sequences of contrasted arguments without developing a full debate with turns of speech.

<sup>53</sup> B khā-v; F pī-r: *ettha ca katthacī ti vutte rāmaññaraṭṭhavāsīnā dhammadhajatherena visodhitapātimokkhapothake ti gahetabbaṃ. kvacī ti vutte haripuñjaraṭṭhasañjāte pātimokkhapothake ti gahetabbaṃ. kesuci ti vutte pana aniyamītesu pātimokkhapothakesū ti gahetabbaṃ. sabbathā ti vutte pana yathāvuttatīdhapātimokkhapothake ti gahetabbaṃ.*

<sup>54</sup> B khā-r; F pī-v: *nanu kaccāyane.*

<sup>55</sup> B khā-r; F pī-v: *saccaṃ, taṃ pana.*



At the very beginning of the treatise we find a long discussion of the word *uddiseyya* “would proclaim” (Pāt 4,10).<sup>56</sup> The contentious point here is that some manuscripts read *uddisseyya* “would be proclaimed.” The commentator does not dismiss this reading directly. Rather, he explores ways in which it could make sense given the specific context. He puts forward the working hypothesis that the extra *s* corresponds to the affix *y* to express passive, thus reading *uddisseyya* as “would be proclaimed.” Soon the discussion on *uddiseyya/uddisseyya* moves to semantics. The author observes that verbal roots can take more than one meaning, but the *Kaccāyana* only teaches the form, not the possible meanings (“In the *Kaccāyana* grammar a division of the meanings of the verbal roots is not made”).<sup>57</sup> This poses a problem in the commentator’s attempt to clarify the sense of the verbal root, in this case *disa* preceded by the preverb *ud°*. The debate is extended and the author resorts to inference in order to prove that *uddiseyya* must be active and the root *disa* must be understood in the sense “to show” (*pekkhana*)<sup>58</sup> and not “to be perceived” (*paññāyana*), which would be the passive of “to show.”

At this point we seem to have reached a conclusion: “Therefore,” states the commentator “the word ‘he should proclaim’ (*uddiseyya*) must be in the sense of ‘he should show’ (*pakāseyya*). And this is stated according to the reasoning (*naya*) of the *Saddanīti*.”<sup>59</sup> When the problem seems to be solved, the commentator decides to approach it from a different angle (*atha vā...* “alternatively...”) and he explores the possibility of the root *disa* meaning “*atisajjana* in the sense of making known, giving instruction or explaining.”<sup>60</sup> Two Abhidhamma sources, namely Buddhaghosa’s<sup>61</sup> *Aṭṭhasālīnī* and Ānanda’s *Mūlaṭīkā*, are scrutinized.

<sup>56</sup> For a discussion on the specific meaning of the verb *uddis*, see Kate Crosby, “*Uddis* and *Ācikkh*: Buddhaghosa on the inclusion of the *sikkhāpada* in the *pabbajjā* ceremony,” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 28 (2000).

<sup>57</sup> B khi-v; F pī-v: *kaccāyane pana dhātuvatthavibhāgam akatvā*. The meanings of the verbs in the *Kaccāyana* are traditionally learnt in the *Dhātupāṭha*, the *Dhātumañjūsā* or similar works (Andersen and Smith 1921).

<sup>58</sup> Sadd 444,<sub>5ff</sub>; Dhātup § 302; Dhātum § 455. This is a Class I verb (*bhūvādigāṇa*).

<sup>59</sup> Sadd 444,<sub>5ff</sub>. B khi-r; F pu-r: *tasmā uddiseyyā ti ettha pakāseyyā ti atthena bhavitabbaṃ ayañ ca yathā saddanīti nayaṃ gahetvā vutto*.

<sup>60</sup> Sadd 453,<sub>2-3</sub>; Dhātup § 303, § 493; Dhātum § 475, § 572. This is a Class VI verb (*divādigāṇa*). B khi-r; F pu-r: *atisajjanañ ca nāma pabodhanaṃ desanaṃ kathanaṃ vā*.

<sup>61</sup> Buddhaghosa is traditionally considered the name of the author of this text, but the ascription is problematic, cf. Oskar von Hinüber, *A Handbook of Pali Literature*. Indian Philology and South Asian Studies, vol. 2. (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1996), 151.

These sources are then compared to the *Kaṅkhāvitarāṇī*. At the end of this long and circuitous discussion, the author reaches the following conclusion:

The meaning “showing” and similar [meanings] in great measure fit and agree with the root [*disa*] in the sense of giving instruction (*atisajjana*) which is inferred from within the word *uddiseyya*. Therefore this meaning should be stated as essential.<sup>62</sup>

But even this conclusion is not completely satisfactory and the author brings up the opinion of some ancient masters (*porāṇācariya*) who defend a different analysis on the basis of the suitability of sound (*saddayutti*) and the suitability of meaning (*atthayutti*), and also because of not contradicting what has been stated in the textual tradition (*āgama*): they read the verbal root as *disī* in the sense of “to utter” (*disī uccāraṇe*)<sup>63</sup> instead of the root *disa* in the sense of “to show” (*pekkhaṇe*). This alternative interpretation leads exactly to the previous corollary: “Therefore, the word *uddiseyya* derived from the root *disī* should be considered [as authentic].”<sup>64</sup> The absolute final conclusion seems to be based on the statements of the grammarians, who are called here “ancient masters.” The main purpose of this grammatical discussion is simply to establish that the word *uddiseyya* should be written with one *s*, not with two. It is about spelling, not about meaning.

### 3.3. Scriptural matters

An interesting excursus involving script is found in the commentary on the variant *anigataratanake/aniggahitaratanake/anibhataratanake* (Pāt 78,8: *anigataratanake*) “treasure that has not been withdrawn.” In this case the commentator observes that *bha* could be a misreading of *ga* “in a manuscript written in the *maṃsi* [script]” (*maṃsilekhāpotthake*).<sup>65</sup> The meaning

<sup>62</sup> B khī-r; F pu-v: *ayaṅ ca ācikkhanādi-attho uddiseyyā ti ettha antonitena* [read *ṅītena?*] *atisajjanasaṅkhātena dhāvatthena atīviya saṃsandatī sameti. tasmā ayam attho sārato vaccetabbo.*

<sup>63</sup> The *Pātimokkavisodhana* reads with Sadd 568,13; Dhātup § 627 and Dhātum § 869 read *disa uccāraṇe*, which seems to be the *Kaccāyana* model, cf. Sadd 568 n.3: Mmd C° *disa uccāraṇe*; but Mmd B° *disī* throughout: 66,27; 403,23; 426,7.

<sup>64</sup> B khī-r; F pu-v: *tasmā uddiseyyā ti imassa disīdhātunipphannabhāvo vicāretabbo.*

<sup>65</sup> There are occasional variants to this word in the four manuscripts that I have consulted, for instance *dhaṃsi*, *dhaṃsa*, *maṃsa*. But in most cases all Mss. read *maṃsi*-ī.

of the word *maṃsi* is obscure. It does not seem to be a Pali word<sup>66</sup> and we may speculate that it could be a Mon/Khmer loanword. It also sounds very similar to the Burmese word for “tamarind-seed”: *man kyaññh̃*<sup>67</sup> (pronounced today *ma jī*):

In the manuscript written in *maṃsi* script there is doubt regarding the readings *ga* and *bha*, for *ga* looks like *bha*, and in the same way, *ca* looks like *va*, and *da* looks like *ra*.<sup>68</sup>

Indeed, these features remind us of the Old Burmese script known as “tamarind-seed script,”<sup>69</sup> which is found still today in gilded *Kammavācā* bundles (see §1). In the *Purification*, regular incised palm-leaf manuscripts are simply called *lekhanalekhāpotthakas* “inscribed manuscripts.”<sup>70</sup>

In a subsequent passage the author reports that *maṃsi* manuscripts are not available in Haripuñja and that may have influenced their transmission of the *Pātimokkha* text:

In some places, in inscribed manuscripts, the letter *s* is observed [instead of *g*], but in all the manuscripts of the monks of Haripuñja only *bh* is observed. As there are no *maṃsi* manuscripts in that country, the people who live there have to rely on inscribed manuscripts, and they would have considered as authentic the form that they observe in them.<sup>71</sup>

When confronting the variant *ga/bha* the commentator resorts to semantics and infers the correct reading by matching the meaning with the gloss given in the commentary.<sup>72</sup> In this case we can see how the shape of

<sup>66</sup> Unless it means the plant *maṃsī* PED s.v. *maṃsi*: “(f.) [cp. Sk. *māmsī*] a certain plant *Nardostychnus jatamansi*, J vi.535.” To the best of my knowledge, no paper or ink are produced from this plant.

<sup>67</sup> မန်ကျဉ်း

<sup>68</sup> B *ga-r*; F *pha-r-pha-v*: *maṃsilekhāpotthake ca gākārabhakāresu samsay’ uppatti sambhavati. gākāro hi bhakāro viya khāyati, bhakāro ca gākāro viya. tathā cakāravakāradakārarakādayo ca.*

<sup>69</sup> See Lammerts, “Notes,” 235.

<sup>70</sup> I translate *lekhanalekhā* and *lekhanalikhita* as “inscribed” *vis à vis* the inked *maṃsi* or “tamarind-seed” manuscripts. The term *lekhanalikhita* refers to regular carved, inscribed palm-leaf manuscripts. In tamarind-seed manuscripts ink is used.

<sup>71</sup> B *ga-v-gā-r*; F *pha-r*: *katthaci lekhanalikhitaṭṭhake pi sakāro diṭṭho yeva. haripuñjaratṭhāvāsīnaṃ pana bhikkhūnaṃ sabbapothhakesu bhakāro yeva diṭṭho. tasmīṃ ratṭhe maṃsilekhāpotthakassa abhāvato tannivāsīnañ ca lekhanalikhitaṭṭhake yeva kataparicāyattā tatha diṭṭhākāro yeva sacco siyā.*

<sup>72</sup> B *ga-v*; F *pha-r*: *tasmā nikkhantaṃ ti atthavaṇṇaṃ upanidhāya nigatasadden’ eva bhavitabban ti kappavā nigantaṃ ti likhitaṃ siyā* “Therefore, based on the gloss *nikkhantaṃ*

the letters is also dependent on the semantic value that is given in the commentarial literature. But, again, the discussion here is about the correct reading of the text, not about the meaning of a reading that has already been established.

### 3.4. Reconstruction of scribal errors

The reconstruction of some mistakes and interpolations is another salient feature of the *Purification*. In one passage the author informs us that, in *māṃsi* manuscripts, the only reading that he finds is *nibbhatam*,<sup>73</sup> “with consonantal cluster” (*sasaññoga*), that is to say with the consonant cluster °*bbh*°, which he considers a wrong spelling—one should write it with *bh* only: *nibhatam*. To justify his view, he recreates the mental process that caused the misspelling:

The person who was writing (*lekhakena*) or the reciter [of the text] (*bhaṇantena*) did not see any contingency (*pasāṅga*) when he would observe the word *nibbhatam*, with consonant cluster, in a *māṃsi* manuscript, for he would not imagine that [the conjunct *bbh*] could [actually] derive from [a single] *g*. But only when the word *nibhatam*, without consonant cluster (*nissaññoga*), was observed, there one would imagine, following the method that we have explained, that it could actually be *g*, [the reading *bh* being] caused by the contingency of the similarity between *bha* and *ga*. That is why everywhere in the old manuscript only the word *nibhatam*, without consonant cluster, is there. This is how [this matter] is understood.<sup>74</sup>

The spelling with double consonant in the *māṃsi* manuscript seems to serve the purpose of reducing the risk of confusion for the reader/reciter.

When dealing with interpolation, the author imagines possible ways in which *vinaya* passages could have contaminated the *Pātimokkha* text. On one occasion, for instance, he speculates that the scribe, having seen the

---

[that we find in the commentary], considering that it should be the word *nigata* [and not *nibhata*], *nigatam* should be written.”

<sup>73</sup> This is part of a long discussion on the compound *aniggataratanake* (Pāt 78,8), where variants of °*niggata*° are analyzed.

<sup>74</sup> B gā-r-gā-v; F phā-r: *māṃsilekhāpotthake pana sabbattha nibbhatan ti sasaññogapade yeva dīṭṭhe sati lekhakena vā bhaṇantena vā tasmim gākārasaññinā na bhavitabbaṃ tappasaṅgābhāvato. nibhatan ti nissaññogapadassa dīṭṭhattā yeva pana te tasmim gākārasaññino siyuṃ vuttanayena bhakāragakārānaṃ sadisabhāvappasaṅgasambhavato. tasmā porāṇapotthake sabbattha nibhatan ti nissaññogapadam eva atthi ti viññāyati.*

word *iti* in the chapter of the *uposatha*, must have thought that it applies in another passage too, and he would have written it down again.<sup>75</sup>

A similar case is related to an interpolated passage at the end of the *pārājika* section of the *Pātimokkha*:

But now [this expression, i.e. the one mentioned before, namely *tattha sabbeḥ' eva samaggehi sammodamānehi avivādamānehi sikkhitabban* “There, it (= the Pāt) is to be studied by all, being united, in agreement, not disputing”] is written, by virtue of habit, for the sake of easy grasping at the moment of recitation, because after two recitations have been performed, the rest is mostly treated as if heard (*savitabhāvassa iva*) by the word(s)/sentence(s) [actually] heard. In a very well purified old manuscript such a reading is not found. Therefore, this [extra passage] is not an old reading.<sup>76</sup>

Sometimes a mistake is explained as the result of the “carelessness” (*pamāda*) of the scribe. Another similar expression is “lacking of attention” (*satisammuṭṭha*). These two terms are the opposite of *apamāda* and *sati*, two doctrinally charged concepts that cannot but resonate in the mind of any Theravādin: the last words of the Buddha were *appamādena sampādettha* “work diligently.”<sup>77</sup> As is well known, *sati* means, apart from “mindfulness,” “memory,” a word that in oral or residually oral cultures is a synonym of “knowledge.”<sup>78</sup>

Scribal errors such as the ones that we have mentioned are considered a sort of impurity that needs to be removed. Anything that has been added to the original old text is an impurity that may ultimately compromise the validity of the recitation. The commentator is forced to provide convincing arguments before he expunges an error from the *textus receptus*. Some-

<sup>75</sup> B khu-r; F pū-r: *so pana uposathakkhandhake anujānāmi bhikkhave pātimokkham uddisitum eva ca pana bhikkhave uddisitabban ti vatvā suṇātu me bhante saṃgho || pa || āvikatā hi 'ssa phāsu hotī ti ettha vuttaṃ iti-saddaṃ disvā idhā pi so adhippeto ti kappetvā likhito siyā*. For the full Pali text and English translation see Appendix 2.

<sup>76</sup> B khu-r; F pū-v: *so pana idāni uddesadvayam eva uddisitvā avasesassa sutapadena sāvītabhāvass' eva yebhuyyena katattā, idāni āciṇṇanavasena uddesakāle sukhaḡaḡaḡatthaṃ likhito. suparisuddhe porāḡapotthake īdiso pāḡho n' atthi. tasmā n' eso porāḡapāḡho*. I would like to thank Petra Kieffer-Pūlz for her decisive assistance in understanding this passage.

<sup>77</sup> D II 120,14.

<sup>78</sup> Cf. Patrick McCormick, “Writing a Singular Past: Mon History and ‘Modern’ Historiography in Burma,” *Sojourn: Journal of Social Issues in Southeast Asia* 29, no. 2 (July 2014): 313: “Members of residually oral societies see knowledge as something finite that an individual either grasps completely or not; memorization is the same as mastery of a subject.”

times the arguments come from his own reasoning. At other times, however, it is necessary to invoke certain authorities.

### 3.5. *Authorities*

The idea that some sources are more authoritative than others is reflected in the term “measure” or “yardstick” (*pamāṇa*)<sup>79</sup> applied to some books. The term *pamāṇa* is often used in other legal commentaries, and it generally refers to specific passages, not to entire books.<sup>80</sup> Given the grammatical and scholastic background of our author, the term *pamāṇa* has important connotations on account of its philosophical charge. In Indian Philosophy, the Sanskrit word *pramāṇa* (“means of correct knowledge”) is in the centre of any epistemological debate.<sup>81</sup> As we have seen in the colophon, the author of the *Purification* distinguishes four main sources of authority: (1) the *Vibhaṅga* of the *Vinaya*, together with its commentary (the *Samantapāsādikā*) and its sub-commentaries; (2) the *Mātikāṭṭhakathā*, that is to say, the *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī*; (3) the *Vimaticchedanī*, which seems to refer to the *Vimativinodanī*; and (4) “other disciplines” (*sathhantaresu*). By other disciplines the author most probably means grammatical texts. The following is a provisional list of titles explicitly named in the *Purification* (excluding Introduction and Colophon):

TITLE	TIMES QUOTED
[ <b>Vinaya</b> ]	<b>40</b> <sup>82</sup>
<i>Vibhaṅga</i>	31
<i>Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī</i>	5
<i>Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī-ṭīkā</i>	2
<i>Vimativinodanī</i>	2

<sup>79</sup> B khau-v; F paṃ-r: *ettakam eva pamāṇabhūtesu potthakesu vibhaṅge ca sandissati* “so much is observed in authoritative manuscripts and in the *Vibhaṅga*.”

<sup>80</sup> I thank Petra Kieffer-Pülz for this information.

<sup>81</sup> For an elaborate study on logic and epistemology, including *pramāṇa* theory, in the Theravāda tradition, see Ven. Hegoda Khemananda, *Logic and Epistemology in Theravāda (Theravāda Nyāya)*. Translated from Sinhala by Asanga Tilakaratne. Colombo: Karunaratne and Sons, 1993.

<sup>82</sup> There are twenty allusions to *aṭṭhakathā*/s and four to *ṭīkā*/s, they all seem to correspond to *vinaya* texts of some sort. Sometimes the expression collectively refers to a set of commentaries, but at other times they refer specifically to passages of *Samantapāsādikā*, *Sāratthadīpanī*, etc. I do not have a complete record of the references at this moment.

<b>[Grammar]</b>	<b>39</b>
<i>Kaccāyana</i>	5
<i>Saddanīti</i>	23
<i>Moggallāna</i>	1
<i>Mukhamattadīpanī</i>	4 <sup>83</sup>
<i>Abhidhānappadīpikā</i>	1
<i>Abhidhānappadīpikā-ṭīkā</i>	5
<b>[Abhidhamma]</b>	<b>3</b>
<i>Atthasālini</i>	1
<i>Mūlaṭīkā</i>	2

Another important authority, mentioned but once, is the *Kammavācā*, whose exact content is difficult to ascertain:

With regard to the word *bhikkhusaṅgho* (Pāt 2,7ff.), many manuscripts read it with the class consonant *ṇ* [i.e. they read *bhikkhusaṅgho*]. In the *Kammavācā* [corpus], however, it is seen with *m*. This reading only should be accepted, because [the *Kammavācā*] has been completely purified by those who have extinguished their cankers, those whose insight (*paṭisambhidā*) [into the Dhamma] has blossomed and have obtained the fruits of linguistic knowledge (*nirutti*).<sup>84</sup>

The words *saṅgha* or *saṃgha* are semantically equivalent, and even phonologically there is not much that can distinguish them. It is to be noted that in Burmese pronunciation this distinction bears important implications on the oral performance of the text, as *saṅgha* is pronounced “thin-ga” whereas *saṃgha* is pronounced “than-ga.”<sup>85</sup> The standard treatise on Pali grammar for Burmese monastics, however, makes clear that *saṅgha* and *saṃgha* are virtually identical, the only difference being in the quality of the final nasalization.<sup>86</sup> Yet the author of the *Pātimokkavisodhana* feels the need to justify the right sound on the basis of the spiritual attainments of ancient reciters (redactors?), whose identity remains unclear.

<sup>83</sup> One of these references is only to Vimalabuddhi, author of Mmd.

<sup>84</sup> B khū-v; F pe-v: *bhikkhusaṅgho ti vaggantasahitapadaṃ bahūsu potthakesu dissati. kammavācāyam pana saniggahitapadass’ eva diṭṭhattā tam eva gahetabbaṃ niruttito phalapattehi pabhinnapaṭisambhidehi khīnāsavehi suvisodhitattā. tato va saṃghādiseso ti padam saniggahitam eva sambhavati.*

<sup>85</sup> I thank Christian Lammerts for pointing this out to me.

<sup>86</sup> Cf. Kacc 32 *vaggantaṃ vā vagge* “[*niggahīta* = *m*, may] optionally [adopt] the class nasal before [any other consonant of the same] class.” For a detailed examination of different pronunciation-traditions in Southeast Asia, I refer to François Bizot, *Les traditions de la pabbajjā en Asie du Sud-Est. Recherches sur le bouddhisme khmer IV* Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse, Folge 3, 169. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1988).

Occasionally, words are accepted on the grounds of meaning and not only because of the form.<sup>87</sup> And in a few cases the author of the *Purification* may accept two possibilities as equally valid if they are properly defensible in grammatical terms.<sup>88</sup> This is an interesting point given the fact that Pali grammarians may accept more than one form as equally valid,<sup>89</sup> which seems to mean that they must be equally effective in ritual settings. Recitative perfection, therefore, does not necessarily imply uniformity.

In one case the author of the *Purification* resorts to the principle of the majority reading: “Now, it is not possible to determine with absolute certainty whether this [word] ends in short or long vowel, but the ending in short vowel is observed in many manuscripts.”<sup>90</sup>

### 3.6. Dealing with discrepancy

In the *Purification*, grammarians do not always project their authority as a collective. As is well known, grammarians may disagree or approach textual problems in different manners. The term that the *Purification* uses for such types of discrepancies is “variety of theories of the masters” (*ācariyānaṃ nānāvādo*). “Variety of theories” (*nānāvāda*) is a strong word that is found in canonical *vinaya* literature as a synonym of “quarrel.”<sup>91</sup> This term is used once in the *Purification*, regarding what appears to be an insignificant point in the commentary of the *nava paṭhamāpattikā* (“nine offences at once”).<sup>92</sup> Some *ācariyas* such as Vimalabuddhi read it as a

<sup>87</sup> B kho-r; F po-v: *evamatthe gayhamāne yeva saddhiṃ-saddo sāthako hoti* “Only if it is understood in this [aforementioned] sense does the word ‘together’ become meaningful.”

<sup>88</sup> B gā-v; F phā-r: *sattame tūlonaddhan* (Pāt 80,7 v.l. *tūlonaddham*) *ti ettha keci onaddhan icc eva adhippetan ti vadanti. keci pana onandhan icc eva paṭhanti. mayam pana tesam dvinnam pi yuttabhāvaṃ vadāma* “In the seventh [rule] in the context of “*tūlonaddham*” some say it is intended only as *onaddham*. Others, however, read *onandham* only. As for us, we say that both forms are correct.”

<sup>89</sup> For a discussion on optionality and variation in Pali grammar, see Aleix Ruiz-Falqués, “Two Levels of Optionality in the *Kaccāyana* Pali Grammar,” [forthcoming].

<sup>90</sup> B khu-r; F pū-r: *rassasaraḍḍiḥḥasarantabhāvo pana ekamsikavasena na sakkā gahetuṃ. rassasaraṇtabhāvo pana bahūsu potthakesu dissati.*

<sup>91</sup> Vin II 88,28; 91,6; see also V 111.

<sup>92</sup> Pāt 22,2 *nava paṭhamāpattikā*. I quote in full a note by Petra Kieffer-Pülz that clarifies the background of this passage: “Unlike in the Saṅghādisesa rules unique to *bhikkhūnīs*, the differentiation into *paṭhamāpattika* and *yāvattiyaka*-rules is not explicitly stated in the *bhikkhus’ Saṅghādisesa* rules, but only summarized at the end of the entire *Saṅghādisesa*



dental *paṭhamā*, with dental aspirate *th*, while others, like Aggavaṃsa, read *paṭhamā*, with retroflex aspirate (*ṭh*). Although the meaning of the word does not suffer the slightest change, the disagreement regarding its sound is still considered *nānāvāda*.<sup>93</sup> The commentator examines both options and concludes that Vimalabuddhi’s view is not sufficiently restrictive and therefore cannot solve the dilemma: “In the *Mukhamattadīpanī*, however, the derivation of the form is explained as we have just shown. The [way of deciding the right] speech-sound (*akkhara*) seems indeed confused (*ākula*<sup>94</sup>) and perplexing.”<sup>95</sup> The author of the *Purification* chooses the retroflex reading of the *Saddanīti* because the spelling *paṭhamā* is consistently observed in this work, both in the rules as well as in the examples from the literature: “Therefore,” concludes the *Purification*, “the theory of the teachers who expect retroflex *ṭha* seems to be correct. It has to be accepted after careful examination (*vimamsivā*).”<sup>96</sup>

#### 4. Conclusion

After this short survey of the *Purification of the Pātimokkha*, one wonders whether the view of *vinaya* specialists such as von Hinüber or Kieffer-Pülz, namely, that a work like this one is not related to legal matters in a strong sense of the term, might not be incorrect after all. For there is virtually no line written in the *Purification* that addresses questions of monastic law in a straightforward manner. This short commentary mainly

---

section (Vin III 186,11ff.; see already I.B. Horner (trans.), *The Book of Discipline*, vol. III (London: Oxford University Press, 1942), xxxiiiiff., and Ute Hüsken, *Die Vorschriften für die buddhistische Nonnengemeinde im Vinaya-Piṭaka der Theravādin* (Berlin: Reimer Verlag, 1997), 108ff. Nevertheless, the classification as a *yāvattiyaka*-rule is implicit from the relevant *Pātimokkha* rules themselves (Sgh 10–13 M; Vin III 173,2; 175,26ff.; 178,15ff.; 184,29ff.), since it is expressly mentioned in them that the offence entailing a formal meeting of the Saṅgha (*Saṅghādisesa*) comes into being only after the third (*yāvattiyaka*) ineffective admonition (Pāt 16,14–20,31). See Horner, *Book of Discipline*, xxxiv ff.; Hüsken, *Vorschriften*, 109 and n. 234” (Petra Kieffer-Pülz, “The Arrangement of the Rules in the Theravāda *Bhikkhunīpātimokkha*,” *ARILAB* XIX (2016), 65 n. 40).

<sup>93</sup> B khū-r; F pe-r: *ettha paṭhamasadde dantajathakāro vādhippeto ti ca muddhajaṭhakāro vādhippeto ti ca ācariyānaṃ nānāvādo hoti*.

<sup>94</sup> See § 2.3.

<sup>95</sup> B khū-v; F pe-v: *mukhamattadīpanīyam pana yathāvuttaṃ akkharasampatti nidiṭṭhā* [v.l. *na diṭṭhā*], *ākulabyākulakkharam eva dissati*.

<sup>96</sup> B khū-v; F pe-v: *tasmā muddhajaṭhakāram icchantānaṃ ācariyānaṃ vādo yutto viya dissati. vimamsivā gahetabbo*.

focuses textual problems. Indeed, it provides correct readings for the *Pātimokkha* text, which is to be recited in the fortnightly ritual of the *uposatha*. As it deals with a legal text, it makes sense to categorize it as a Vinaya manual (§ 2.3.). But it is not at all clear whether the grammatical method of the *Purification* is intrinsically part of the legal discourse, because similar grammatical reasonings are found in scholastic works outside the Vinaya discipline.

Unlike the commentaries of Ñāṇakitti on *vinaya* texts, the *Purification* is not concerned with the meaning of the words. Meaning is only taken into consideration before the final text is established, not afterwards (as customary in commentarial literature). The stress on right spellings is a distinctive mark of Ariyālaṅkāra's project to establish a flawless (*anākula*), pure (*visodhita*) and perpetual (*ciraṭṭhitika*) *Pātimokkha*. The purity of the text is also achieved by removing elements that are considered alien to the original redaction. It is not clear to what degree the importance of correct recitation in legal texts such as the *Kammavācā* has influenced the composition of the *Purification*. One is tempted to think that the Theravāda grammatical doctrine on the power of speech-sounds that conform with the words of the Buddha is immanent throughout the entire commentary.

In any case, the *Purification* constitutes a very fine example of pre-colonial textual criticism applied to manuscripts of legal relevance. It is a well-planned purging of the *textus receptus*. It examines different scripts, and manuscripts from different origins, systematically labelling them in different ways. Ariyālaṅkāra's outstanding display of grammatical skills attests to the importance of this hermeneutic discipline in late Pali scholastic literature of all sorts. An expert in Buddhist Law was expected to understand such treatises as the *Purification*.

As stated in the Introduction, the historical relevance of this treatise is difficult to measure. If we look back to the time when the *Purification* was written—a tumultuous and dangerous period from what we know—ceremonies and rituals occupied a central role in the preservation of the declining and fragile *buddhasāsana*. Kirichenko has highlighted the fundamental role of action, rather than belief, in pre-colonial Myanmar:

A comparison of any contemporary work meant to serve as an introduction to Buddhism for beginners with texts used for such introduction historically would reveal that difference. While the former mainly discuss Buddhism as a set of

propositions about reality, the latter present precepts, observances and passages for recital.<sup>97</sup>

The *Purification* is a project to restore one of these passages for recital. It was composed a year or two before the coronation of King Thalun and was meant to be copied onto a golden manuscript, which means that it was probably sponsored by the king himself, or some member of the royal family. In such circumstances, purifying the *Pātimokkha* on the basis of manuscripts from different provinces of the empire may have been an attempt to produce a cosmopolitan text that would, literally and symbolically, transcend localisms. It is almost as if the levelling of the textual discrepancies was a metaphor for the ongoing administrative unification. But more research on the Pali Burmese legal literature of the period will be needed if we aim at a clear comprehension of the social role of legal-philological treatises such as Aryālaṅkāra's *Purification of the Pātimokkha*.

## APPENDIX 1

### The Grammatical Style of the *Purification*

The following extract is given in Pali and English as an illustration of the grammatical reasoning in the *Purification*<sup>98</sup>. Note that the meaning of the word remains exactly the same:

*pannaraso*<sup>99</sup> ti ettha dantajanakāro yeva gahetabbo || katthaci pana pātimokkhapotthake paṇṇaraso ti muddhajaṇakāro likhito || so nādhippeto || bahūsu hi pātimokkhapotthakesu tadaññesu ca thānesu dantajanakāro yeva diṭṭho || saddanītiyañ ca pañcato dasassa dassa ro ramhi pañcassa panno niccam<sup>100</sup> [ti] iminā suttena pañcasaddassa pannādesakaraṇamhi dantajanakāro yeva diṭṭho || paṇṇavīsati paṇṇāsan ti ettha pana muddhajaṇakāro adhippeto || ten' eva saddanītiyaṃ paññattipaññāsānaṃ ññassa ṇṇo<sup>101</sup> ti suttaṃ thapetvā paññatti paññatti vā paññāsaṃ paññāsaṃ vā<sup>102</sup> ti vuttaṃ || tathā

<sup>97</sup> Kirichenko, "From Thathanadaw to Theravāda," 29.

<sup>98</sup> B khā-r; F pi-v.

<sup>99</sup> Pāt 4,8; n.4: Nā, S<sup>c</sup>: -ṇṇ- (throughout).

<sup>100</sup> Sadd § 814: pañcato dasassa dassa ro, ramhi pañcassa panno [v.l. C<sup>c</sup> paṇṇo] niccam; cf. Sadd 297,11: pannarasa, but C<sup>c</sup> paṇṇarasa.

<sup>101</sup> Sadd § 89.

<sup>102</sup> Sadd § 89.

*pañcavīsatiyā pañcassa paṇṇo*<sup>103</sup> *ti suttam ṭhapetvā paṇṇavīsati pañcavīsati vā pañcisati vā*<sup>104</sup> *ti vuttam || moggalāne pi vīsatidasesu pañcassa paṇṇapannā*<sup>105</sup> *ti suttam ṭhapetvā paṇṇavīsati pañcavīsati pannarasa pañcadasā*<sup>106</sup> *ti vuttam || tasmā va dantajanakāro yev' ettha gahetabbo || ||*

With regard to the word *pannaraso* “fifteenth,” only a dental *n* should be apprehended. In some places in the *Pātimokkha* manuscript, however, it is written *paṇṇaraso*, with retroflex *ṇ*. This is not intended, for in many *Pātimokkha* manuscripts, and in places other than these, only the dental *n* is observed. Furthermore, in the *Saddanīti*, it is stated: “always after the word *pañca* (‘five’), the syllable *da* of *dasa* (‘ten’) becomes *ra*, and before *ra*, *pañca* becomes *panna*,” and according to this rule, in the replacement of *pañca* that is *panna*, only the dental *n* is observed. In examples such as *paṇṇavīsati* (“twenty-five”) or *paṇṇāsam* (“fifty”), however, the retroflex *ṇ* is intended. For the same reason, in the *Saddanīti*, after establishing the rule “of the words *paññatti* (‘concept’) and *paññāsa* (‘fifty’), *ñña* is replaced by *ṇṇo*,” it is stated: “*paññatti* or *paṇṇatti* [both are valid]; *paṇṇāsam* or *paññāsam* [both are valid].” Similarly, after establishing the rule: “in the word *pañcavīsati* (‘twenty-five’), *paṇṇo* replaces *pañca*” it is stated: “*paṇṇavīsati* or *pañcavīsati*, or [even] *pañcisati* [are all valid].” In the *Moggalāna* [grammar], too, after establishing the rule: “before the words *vīsati* (‘twenty’) and *dasa* (‘ten’), *pañca* is replaced by *paṇṇa* and *panna*,” it is stated: “*paṇṇavīsati* [or] *pañcavīsati* (‘twenty-five’); *pannarasa* [or] *pañcadasa* (‘fifteen’).” That is why only the dental *n* [in *pannaraso*] should be approved.

## APPENDIX 2

### A Case of Contamination

(*Pātimokkhavisodhana* B khu-r; F pū-r)

This discussion refers to the Introduction (*nidāna*) of the *Pātimokkha* (Pāt 6,2), where a passage from the *Vinaya* (Vin I 102,33–103,11) is quoted. This passage ends with the sentence *āvikatā hi 'ssa phāsu hoti*, that

<sup>103</sup> Sadd § 90.

<sup>104</sup> Sadd § 90.

<sup>105</sup> Mogg III 99.

<sup>106</sup> Mogg-v III 99.

Norman translates: “when revealed, it is good for him.”<sup>107</sup> The *Purification* tells us that some Mss. read *phāsu hotī ti*.

“*phāsu hotī*” *ti ettha iti-saddo kesuci potthakesu likhito. so pana uposathakkhandhake “anujānāmi bhikkhave pātimokkhaṃ uddisitum. evañ ca pana bhikkhave uddisitabbaṃ: vyattena bhikkhunā paṭibalena saṃgho ñāpetabbo: suṇātu me bhante saṃgho. [...] yo pana bhikkhu yāvatiyaṃ anussāviyamāne saramāno santiṃ āpattiṃ n’ āvikareyya, sampajānamusāvād’ assa hoti. sampajānamusāvādo kho pan’ āyasmanto antarāyiko dhammo vutto bhagavatā. tasmā saramānena bhikkhunā āpannena visuddhāpekkhena santī āpatti āvikātabbā,] āvikatā hi ’ssa phāsu hotī’ ti ettha vuttaṃ iti-saddaṃ disvā idhā pi so adhippeto ti kappetvā likhito siyā.*

Concerning “*phāsu hotī*” the word *iti* is written (i.e. added?) in some books. This [*iti*], however, may have (*siyā*) been written after assuming that it is intended here too, having previously observed the word *iti* in a passage [of the Vinaya] where it is said: “I order, monks, to recite the *Pātimokkha*. And thus, monks, should it be recited”, [that is in the passage]: «Venerables, let the Community listen to me. [...] Whatever monk remembering while it is being proclaimed up to the third time that there is an existent offence should not reveal it, there comes to be conscious lying for him. Now, conscious lying, venerable ones, is a thing called a stumbling-block by the Blessed One. Therefore, the existent offence should be revealed by a monk who remembers that he has fallen [into an offence] and who desires purity;] for when it is revealed there comes to be comfort for him (*phāsu hotī ti*)».”

### Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the assistance and valuable comments provided by Petra Kieffer-Pülz, William Pruitt, David Wharton, Alastair Gornall, Christian Lammerts, Javier Schnake, Alexey Kirichenko, Ven. Nyanasami Alaṅkāra, Ven. Kondañṇakitti and Ven. Nandobhasa, and last but not least, the two anonymous peer reviewers.

<sup>107</sup> Norman, K. Roy (trans.) and William Pruitt (ed.). *The Pātimokkha*. (Oxford: Pali Text Society, 2001), 7.

### Abbreviations

- Abhidh-s-mhṭ = Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha-vibhāvinī-ṭīkā  
 ARIRIAB = Annual Report of the International Research Institute for  
 Advanced Buddhology at Soka University  
 Be = Burmese edition  
 Ce = Sri Lankan (Ceylonese) edition  
 CPD = Critical Pali Dictionary  
 D = Dīgha Nikāya  
 DSG = Dictionary of Sanskrit Grammar (Abhyankar 1961)  
 Ee = European Edition  
 FPL = Fragile Palm Leaves Foundation (<http://fpl.tusita.org/>)  
 Gv = Gandhavamsa  
 Ja = Jātaka  
 Kacc = Kaccāyana  
 Ln = Lokanīti  
 Mmd = Mukhamattadīpanī  
 Mogg = Moggallāna  
 Mogg-v = Moggallāna-vutti  
 Ms. = Manuscript  
 Mss. = Manuscripts  
 MW = Monier Williams (online version: <https://www.sanskrit-lexicon.uni-koeln.de/scans/MWScan/2014/web/webtc2/index.php>)  
 Pāt = Pātimokkha  
 Pāt-vis = Pātimokkhavisodhana  
 PED = Pāli-English Dictionary  
 Piṭ-sm = Piṭakat-tō-samuiṅ (Nyunt 2012)  
 Sadd = Saddanīti  
 Sn = Suttanipāta  
 Sp = Samantapāsādikā  
 Sv = Sumaṅgalavilāsīnī  
 UPT = U Pho Thi Collection

## References

### *Primary Sources*

#### Manuscripts

##### *Pātimokkavisodhana/-ṭ:*

B = UPT 509.2 foll. kha<sup>v</sup>–gu<sup>r</sup>. cf. William Pruitt, Yumi Ousaka and Sunao Kasamatsu, *The Catalogue of Manuscripts in the U Pho Thi Library, Thaton, Myanmar* (Bristol: Pali Text Society, 2019), 203.

F = FPL 8204 foll. pi–phu. Category: Vinayapiṭaka. Pāli language; Burmese script. Complete. Scribe and place of origin: unknown. Date 1912.

G = FPL 10179 fols. phā:–bhā:. Category: Vinayapiṭaka. Pāli language; Burmese script. Complete. Scribe, Place of Origin and Date: unknown.

H = FPL 2738 foll. ka–khō. Category: Other (!). Pāli language; Burmese script. Scribe and Place of Origin: unknown. Date: 1767. Note in the catalogue: “this text is unknown to other catalogues at the time of this cataloguing.”

##### *Pātimokkhalekhana[naya]:*

FPL 8204 fols. phū–bi. Category: Vinayapiṭaka. Pāli language; Burmese script. Complete. Scribe and place of origin: unknown. Date 1912.

#### Editions

For the detailed bibliographical references not given here, see below “Secondary Sources.”

Abhidhammatthasaṅgahavibhāvinī-ṭikā = Saddhātissa 1989.

Dhātumañjūsā = Andersen and Smith 1921.

Dhātupāṭha = Andersen and Smith 1921.

Gandhavaṃsa = Minayeff 1886.

Jātakavisodhana = *Jāti-visodhana-kyam*. Yangon: Piṭaka Byūha Press, 1978.

Kaccāyana = Pind 2013.

Kaccāyanasuttaniddesa = *Kaccāyanasuttaniddesa*. Colombo: Vidyabhū-sana Press, 1915.

Lokanīti = Kumar 2015.

Moggallāna(-vutti) = *Moggallāna-vyākaraṇa* CSCD Tipiṭaka (Roman).

Mukhamattadīpanī B<sup>e</sup> = *Nyāsapāṭh*. Yangon: Sudhammavati Press, 1933.

Mukhamattadīpanī C<sup>e</sup> = *The Mukhamattadīpanī with the Kaccāyana Vutti, Revised and Edited by Welivitiye Dhammaratana Terunnanse*, Colombo: H. C. Cottle, 1898.

Pātimokkha = Norman and Pruitt 2001.

Pātimokkhagaṇṭhidīpanī = *Bhikkhupātimokkha sametā Gaṇṭhidīpanī*, Payiyāgala Vimalaraṃsi Tissa (ed.). Alutgama: Saddhammappakāsa Press.

Pātimokkhapadatthānuvaṇṇanā = *Pātimokkhapadattha-anuvaṇṇanā-pāṭh*, Saya U Phye (ed.). Yangon: Pitaka Mundine Press, 1908.

Saddanīti = Smith 1928–1956.

### *Secondary Sources*

Abhyankar, Kashinath Vasudev. *A Dictionary of Sanskrit Grammar*. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1961.

Andersen, Dines and Helmer Smith. *The Pāli Dhātupāṭha and the Dhātumañjūsā, Edited with Indexes*. Copenhagen: Danish Academy of Sciences, 1921.

Aung-Thwin, Michael. “The Role of Sasana Reform in Burmese History: Economic Dimensions of a Religious Purification.” *Journal of Asian Studies* 38, no. 4 (August 1979): 671–688.

Austin, J. L. *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.

Bizot, François. *Les traditions de la pabbajjā en Asie du Sud-Est. Recherches sur le bouddhisme khmer IV*. Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse, Folge 3, 169. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1988.

Bizot, François and Oskar von Hinüber. *La guirlande de Joyaux*. Paris: École Française d’Extrême-Orient, 1994.

Carbine, Jason. “How King Rāmādhipati Handled His Boundary Case: *Sīmā*, *Sāsana*, and Buddhist Law.” *Buddhism Law and Society* 1 (2015): 105–164.

Crosby, Kate. “The Origin of Pāli as a Language Name in Medieval Theravāda Literature.” *Journal of the Centre for Buddhist Studies, Sri Lanka*, Volume II (January 2004): 70–116.



- “*Uddis* and *Ācikkh*: Buddhaghosa on the inclusion of the *sikkhāpada* in the *pabbajjā* ceremony.” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 28 (2000): 461–477.
- Deokar, Mahesh A. *Technical Terms and Technique of the Pali and the Sanskrit Grammars*. Varanasi: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, 2008.
- Gornall, Alastair M. “How many sounds are in Pāli? Schism, Identity and Ritual in the Theravāda saṅgha.” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 42/5 (2014): 511–550.
- “Buddhism and Grammar: The Scholarly Cultivation of Pali in Medieval Laṅkā.” PhD diss., University of Cambridge, 2013.
- Gornall, Alastair M. and Aleix Ruiz-Falqués. “Scholars of Premodern Pali Buddhism.” In *Brill’s Encyclopedia of Buddhism*, vol. II. *Lives*, edited by Jonathan Silk, Richard Bowring, Vincent Eltschinger, and Michael Radich (Leiden: Brill, 2019): 420–436
- von Hinüber, Oskar. *Notes on the Pāli Tradition in Burma* (Beiträge zur Überlieferungsgeschichte des Buddhismus in Birma, I), Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, I. Philologisch-historische Klasse, Jg. 1983, No. 3, 68.
- “Buddhist Law and the Phonetics of Pāli.” In *Selected Papers on Pāli Studies*, edited by O. von Hinüber, 198–232. Oxford: Pali Text Society, 1994. [German original: “Das buddhistische Recht und die Phonetik des Pāli.” *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 13/14 (*Festschrift für Wilhelm Rau*) (1987): 101–127]
- *A Handbook of Pali Literature*. Indian Philology and South Asian Studies, vol. 2. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1996.
- “Lān<sup>2</sup> Nā as a Centre of Pāli Literature During the Late 15th Century.” *Journal of the Pali Text Society* XXVI (2000): 119–138.
- Khemananda, Ven. Hegoda. *Logic and Epistemology in Theravāda (Theravāda Nyāya)*. Translated from Sinhala by Asanga Tilakaratne. Colombo: Karunaratne and Sons, 1993.
- Kieffer-Pülz, Petra. “The Arrangement of the Rules in the Theravāda *Bhikkhunīpātimokkha*.” *ARIRIAB* XIX (2016): 57–80.
- “Vinaya Commentarial Literature in Pali.” In *Brill’s Encyclopedia of Buddhism*, vol. I. *Literature and Languages*, edited by Jonathan Silk, Oskar von Hinüber and Vincent Eltschinger (Leiden: Brill, 2015): 430–441.
- *Verlorene Gaṇṭhipadas zum buddhistischen Ordensrecht. Untersuchungen zu den in der Vajirabuddhiṭikā zitierten Kommen-*

- taren Dhammasiris und Vajirabuddhis*. Veröffentlichungen der Indologischen Kommission, 1. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2013.
- Kirichenko, Alexey. “From Thathanadaw to Theravāda Buddhism: Constructions of Religion and Religious Identity in Nineteenth- and Early Twentieth-Century Myanmar.” In *Casting Faiths: Imperialism and the Transformation of Religion in East and Southeast Asia*, edited by Thomas DuBois, 23–45. London, Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.
- Kumar, Ujjwal. “A Historical Study of Pāli Nīti Literature.” PhD dissertation, Savitribai Phule Pune University, Pune, 2015.
- Lammerts, D. Christian. “Notes on Burmese Manuscripts: Texts and Images.” *Journal of Burma Studies* 14 (2010): 229–254.
- . “Review: ‘Spreading the Dhamma: Writing, Orality, and Textual Transmission in Buddhist Northern Thailand’.” *H-Buddhism* (2011) [<https://networks.h-net.org/node/6060/reviews/16089/lammerts-veid-linger-spreading-dhamma-writing-orality-and-textual> (last accessed 27/03/2019)].
- . *Buddhist Law in Burma. A History of Dhammasattha Texts and Jurisprudence, 1250–1850*. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2018.
- Ledi Sayadaw. *Thathanawithodani (Sāsanavisodhanī)*, vol. 1. Yangon: Hanthawaddi Press, 1954.
- Lieberman, Victor B. “The Transfer of the Burmese Capital from Pegu to Ava.” *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* no. 1 (1980): 64–83.
- . *Burmese Administrative Cycles. Anarchy and Conquest, c. 1580–1760*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.
- Lorrillard, Michel. “Scripts and History: The Case of Laos.” In *Written Cultures in Mainland Southeast Asia*, edited by Masao Kashinaga, 33–49. Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology, 2009.
- McCormick, Patrick. “Writing a Singular Past: Mon History and ‘Modern’ Historiography in Burma.” *Sojourn: Journal of Social Issues in Southeast Asia* 29, no. 2 (July 2014): 300–331.
- Minayeff, J. “The *Gandhavamsa*.” *Journal of the Pali Text Society* II (1887): 54–80.
- Norman, K. R., Petra Kieffer-Pülz and William Pruitt (trans.). *Overcoming Doubts (Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī)*. Vol I: *The Bhikkhu-Pātimokkha Commentary*. Bristol: Pali Text Society, 2018.

- Norman, K. Roy (trans.) and William Pruitt (ed.). *The Pātimokkha*. Oxford: Pali Text Society, 2001.
- Nyunt, Peter (trans.). *Catalogue of the Piṭaka and Other Texts in Pāli, Pāli-Burmese, and Burmese (Piṭakat-tō-samuñ:) by Mañ-krī: Mahāsiriṇṇya-sū*. Bristol: Pali Text Society, 2012.
- Oberlies, Thomas. *Pali Grammar. The Language of the canonical texts of Theravāda Buddhism. Part I: Phonology and Morphology*. Bristol: Pali Text Society, 2019.
- Peltier, Anatole-Roger. *La littérature Tai Khoeun*. Bangkok: Editions Duang Kamol, 1987.
- Peters, Anne. “Ergänzendes zur Pāli-Quadratschrift.” In *Studien zur Indologie und Buddhismuskunde. Festgabe des Seminars für Indologie und Buddhismuskunde für Professor Dr. Heinz Bechert*, edited by Reinhold Grünendahl et alii. Indica et Tibetica, 22. 221–28. Bonn: Indica et Tibetica, 1993.
- Pind, Ole H. “Pāli Grammar and Grammarians from Buddhaghosa to Vajirabuddhi: A Survey.” *Journal of the Pali Text Society XXXI* (2012): 57–124.
- (ed.). *Kaccāyana and Kaccāyanavutti*. Bristol: Pali Text Society, 2013.
- Pranke, Patrick Arthur. “The ‘Treatise on the Lineage of Elders’ (*Vamsadīpanī*): Monastic Reform and the Writing of Buddhist History in Eighteenth-Century Burma.” PhD diss., University of Michigan, 2004.
- Pruitt, William. *Étude linguistique de nissaya birmans. Traduction commentée de textes bouddhiques*. Paris: École Française d’Extrême-Orient, 1994.
- Pruitt, William and Roger Bischoff. *Catalogue of the Burmese–Pāli and Burmese Manuscripts in the Library of the Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine*. London: The Wellcome Trust, 1998.
- Ruiz-Falqués, Aleix. “A Firefly in the Bamboo Reed: The *Suttaniddesa* of Saddhammajotipāla and the Grammatical Foundations of Theravāda Buddhism in Burma.” PhD diss., University of Cambridge, 2015.
- “The Role of Pāli Grammar in Burmese Buddhism.” *Journal of Burma Studies* 21, no. 1 (2017): 1–96.
- “Two Levels of Optionality in the *Kaccāyana* Pali Grammar.” [forthcoming]

- Saddhātissa, Hammalawa (ed.). *The Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha of Bhadantācariya Anuruddha and the Abhidhammatthavibhāvinī-ṭikā of Bhadantācariya Sumaṅgalasāmi*. Oxford: Pali Text Society, 1989.
- Schnake, Javier. “Le Dhamma par le jeu d’esprit et de la langue: le Vajirasāratthasaṅgaha, texte pāli du Nord de la Thaïlande (xvi<sup>e</sup> siècle). Volume III. Étude.” PhD diss., École Pratique des Hautes Études, 2018.
- Smith, Helmer. *Saddanīti: La grammaire palie d’Aggavaṃsa*. Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1928–1956.
- Veidlinger, Daniel M. *Spreading the Dhamma: Writing, Orality, and Textual Transmission in Buddhist Northern Thailand*. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2006.
- Wharton, David. “Language, Orthography and Buddhist Manuscript Culture of the Tai Nuea—An Apocryphal Jātaka Text in Mueang Sing, Laos.” PhD diss., University of Passau, 2017.
- Wijeratne, R. P. and Rupert Gethin (trans.). *Summary of the Topics of Abhidhamma (Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha) by Anuruddha. Exposition of the Topics of Abhidhamma (Abhidhammatthavibhāvinī) by Sumaṅgala, being a commentary on Anuruddha’s Summary of the Topics of Abhidhamma*. Lancaster: Pali Text Society, 2007.