

2

Truth and Scripture in Early Buddhism: Categorical Reduction as Exegetical Method in Ancient Gandhāra and Beyond

Stefan Baums

THE REDISCOVERY OF GĀNDHĀRĪ LITERATURE

Recent years have witnessed a recovery of early Buddhist manuscript treasures from South Asia that, in scale and significance, can only be compared to the early twentieth-century discovery of a flourishing medieval Buddhist culture in monasteries and settlements along the Silk Roads in what is now Xinjiang (China), and to the discovery, in the 1930s, of a Buddhist manuscript deposit near Gilgit (Pakistan). Like the latter, the recent discoveries hail from the borderlands of Afghanistan and Pakistan, and, in many cases, predate previously known textual traditions by centuries. Many of the new manuscripts are in Sanskrit and written in varieties of the Brāhmī script, but the very earliest layer among them, dating from as early as the first century BCE to the second century CE is written in the Kharoṣṭhī script and in the local Middle Indo-Aryan language, Gāndhārī, with varying degrees of substrate influence from other dialects and, later, increasing Sanskritisation. At the outset of this paper, it will be useful to give a brief overview of Gāndhārī manuscript discoveries and of the currently known corpus of Gāndhārī literature since the available overviews have already been outdated by the rapid pace of events.¹

Until the 1990s, the only substantial Gāndhārī manuscript known to scholarship was the so-called *Gāndhārī Dharmapada* (now referred to as the *Khotan Dharmapada*), discovered in 1892 near Khotan on the southern Silk

Road. This long birch-bark scroll apparently contained the complete text of a previously unknown version of the *Dharmapada* but only two-thirds of it survive and are now preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris and in the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts of the Russian Academy of Sciences in Saint Petersburg. After a long series of preliminary studies, the *Khotan Dharmapada* was definitively edited by John Brough in 1962.² Our only other sources for early Gandhāran Buddhism consisted of a limited number of Gāndhārī inscriptions (some containing literary and doctrinal references),³ archaeological and art-historical evidence, and the reports and translations of early Chinese pilgrims.

The situation changed radically when, in 1994, the British Library acquired a collection of twenty-nine birch-bark scroll fragments, and the Early Buddhist Manuscripts Project was established at the University of Washington to study these earliest remains of Buddhist and South Asian written literature.⁴ But just as work had commenced on the British Library collection, the discovery of another deposit of twenty-five Gāndhārī scroll fragments – the Senior collection – was announced, and these new manuscripts, likewise, came under the purview of the Early Buddhist Manuscripts Project.⁵ Soon after this, the discovery of a large Buddhist manuscript deposit in Bamiyan (Afghanistan) – most of it in Sanskrit but also containing around 200 palm-leaf fragments in Gāndhārī⁶ – came to the attention of the scholarly world; the University of Washington Libraries acquired one Gāndhārī birch-bark scroll⁷ and the Library of Congress acquired another;⁸ and most recently, two further large collections of Gāndhārī manuscripts (the Bajaur and Split collections) were discovered in Pakistan and studied at the Freie Universität Berlin.⁹ Finally, in 2012 a long-term centre for Gāndhārī manuscript studies was established at the Bavarian Academy of Sciences and Humanities and the Ludwig Maximilian University of Munich. The new centre works with the Early Buddhist Manuscripts Project on the edition and study of the British Library collection, continues the edition of the Bajaur and Split collections, and compiles comprehensive reference works on Gāndhārī literature and the history of Buddhism in Gandhāra.

Stepping back and surveying the corpus, the immediate questions are: how many Gāndhārī manuscripts are now known, how many different texts are preserved in these manuscripts and which genres of Buddhist literature are represented among them? The poor state of preservation of much of the material – together with the fact that several different texts can be collected in one manuscript, while some long texts span more than one scroll – makes it quite difficult to give a precise answer but a recent attempt by the present author found seventy-seven Gāndhārī birch-bark scrolls and more than eight Gāndhārī palm-leaf manuscripts among the various collections listed above. These manuscripts contain more than 105 individual Gāndhārī texts (counting

each sūtra separately and the British Library *avadāna* material as one item). Breaking this figure down by genre, one arrives at the following: thirty-eight mainstream sūtras; six mainstream-canonical verse collections; four Vinaya texts; five scenes from the life of the Buddha; one treatise on past and future buddhas; two series of *avadāna* (and *pūrvayoga*) stories; four *stotras*; four commentaries on mainstream-canonical texts; thirteen scholastic texts that do not appear to be commentaries; four Mahāyāna sūtras; two magical texts; an abecedary with mnemonic verses; and three non-Buddhist texts (a text inventory, a business document and a *rājanīti* text); eighteen texts have resisted genre identification so far.

COMMENTARIES AND SCHOLASTIC TEXTS IN GĀNDHĀRĪ

By any measure, the commentarial and scholastic works form one of the most important parts of the rediscovered Gāndhārī literature. They surpass other represented genres by the sheer volume of preserved text, the two longest of them (see below) amounting to over 400 lines each. (Only one known Gāndhārī text, a Mahāyāna sūtra in the Bajaur collection, is longer at over 600 lines.) They also represent one of the few categories of texts (some *avadānas* and Mahāyāna texts among them) that may represent original creations of early Gandhāran Buddhism rather than merely being translated into Gāndhārī from other languages of mainland India. But, in spite of this great importance, only three of the commentarial and scholastic texts have been studied in any detail so far. The first of these is a treatise discussing the “nature of existence in the different times” with possible relations to the Sarvāstivādins.¹⁰ The other two, to be discussed in detail below, are one commentary (out of a group of three) on a selection of mainstream-canonical verses and another on a version of the *Saṅgītisūtra*.

Hardly anything is known yet about the other Gāndhārī scholastic treatises. Of the three such texts in the British Library collection (BL 10, 17 and 20 + 23), one (BL 17) mentions dependent origination (*paḍīcasamupāda*)¹¹ and another (BL 20 + 23) is concerned with meditational states (*jaṇa*). The University of Washington scroll appears to discuss the dissolution of the empirical person at the moment of death. Among the eight scholastic texts in the Bajaur collection (BC 4, 6, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16 and 18),¹² one group (BC 4, 6 and 11) refers to the types of pleasure (*sukha*) and pain (*dukkha*), and to the perfection of understanding (*prañāpāramitā*). Another text (BC 9) discusses the nature of the mind (*cita*) and its relation to the form element (*rupadhatu*) and formless element (*arupadhatu*), citing opinions of “some” (*ke yi*) and “others” (*apare*). Yet another text (BC 12) concerns the perception of form (*ruasaṇa*) and the notion of purification (*śudha*, *śujadi*). Most of these concepts, with the notable exception of the perfection of understanding, are quite

generic, and much work will be needed to establish the precise intellectual background and arguments of these scholastic texts. It is conceivable, though currently speculative, that the interests and doctrinal content of the non-commentarial texts differed from those of the commentaries since the primary concern of the latter appears to have been the elucidation of mainstream-canonical texts by cross-reference to canon-internal material (see below), rather than an engagement with new intellectual currents. The three major known manuscript deposits differ markedly in the types of scholastic texts they include: the Senior collection – apparently a made-to-order set of sūtra copies¹³ – contains none; the British Library collection is the only one with commentaries on known root texts in addition to other scholastic treatises; and, while the Bajaur collection does not contain any clear commentaries, among its large number of scholastic texts is at least one with a reference to a Mahāyāna feature (alongside at least one Mahāyāna sūtra).

The British Library Verse Commentaries

The British Library collection contains three Gāndhārī commentaries on selections of canonical verses (*nideśa*). Based on linguistic and formal features as well as its state of preservation, BL fragment 4 appears to be the oldest of the group and has, therefore, been named Verse Commentary I. It draws its root material from a variety of verse collections, including, at least, a Dharmapada or Udāna, and one sūtra with a Pāli parallel in the Cūḷavagga of the *Suttanipāta*. British Library Verse Commentary II will be discussed in detail in the remainder of this section. Verse Commentary III consists of forty preserved lines added at the end of BL fragment 13, explaining six verses that all appear to be drawn from a Dharmapada or Udāna.

Verse Commentary II (Nird^{L2}) comprises 413 lines of preserved text on at least three original scrolls (BL fragments 7, 9, 13 and 18).¹⁴ It contains thirty-nine unnumbered sections, each of which comments on one or – in two cases – two and three verses. As in the case of Verse Commentary I, the root material of Verse Commentary II is drawn from a wide variety of sources shown in Table 2.1.

TABLE 2.1
Sources for the Root Verses of Nird^{L2}

Pārāyaṇa	8 verses (sections 7, 13, 15, 16, 17 and 18)
Dharmapada or Udāna	13 verses (sections 1, 5, 9, 10, 14, 21, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31 and 33)
Ityuktaka	2 verses (sections 3 and 4)
Sabhikasūtra	2 verses (sections 12 and 37)
Samyakparivrajanyasūtra	1 verse (section 32)
Unknown sources	8 verses (sections 2, 11, 23, 24, 28, 29, 35 and 39)

In the longest preserved scroll (BL fragment 9), two groups of ten verse-commentary sections each are bundled together by *uddānas* (summary sections) citing one keyword or phrase from each of the preceding root verses. Each section of the commentary begins with an identifying lemma, most often the first *pāda*, for the verse under discussion. None of the verses are given in full and an acquaintance with them is presupposed by the commentary. The identifying lemma is, in all cases, followed by the formula *sutro tatra ṇideṣo* “(the preceding is) the (root) text, the explanation on it (follows).” The body of each commentary section usually begins with a discussion of difficult words and the general meaning of the verse, followed by one or more detailed doctrinal analyses structured by the function words *asa va* (“or,” Skt. *atha vā*) and *sakṣeva* (“in brief,” Skt. *saṃkṣepāt*), as well as the attributive labels *ke yi* (“some,” Skt. *ke cit*) and *avare* (“others,” Skt. *apare*). More often than not, the parts of one verse are run through more than once and explained from a different perspective each time.

In its word explanations, Verse Commentary II shows clear similarities with the early commentary preserved in Pāli under the title Niddesa (in most external references to it) or Suttaniddesa (in its own colophon). The Pāli Niddesa explains a total of 369 verses corresponding to the Pāli Aṭṭhakavagga, most of the Pārāyanavagga, and the Khaggavisāṇasutta, and thus overlaps in its coverage of root material with Gāndhārī Verse Commentary II. The main exegetical building blocks of the Pāli Niddesa are stereotyped passages triggered by specific words or phrases in the verse to be explained and repeated in any other place where the word or phrase in question occurs. These stereotyped passages employ a variety of explanatory techniques, including strings of synonyms and explanation by categorisation. Two of the explanatory parallels between Verse Commentary II and the Pāli Niddesa are illustrated in the following:

*maṛiṣa garavaasivayaṇaṃ edo*¹⁵ Nird^{1,2} section 14 (l. 9:121) : *māṛisā ti piyavacanaṃ garuvacanaṃ sagāravasappatisādhivacanaṃ etaṃ* Nidd II 31.26; cf. *bhagavā ti gāravādhivacanaṃ* Nidd II 22.20 et passim.

[*e*]labuyo · elo vucadi · subho · abuyo vucadi · pad[u](*m)[o]¹⁶ Nird^{1,2} section 18 (ll. 9:182-83) : *elambujam* . . . *elaṃ vuccati udakaṃ, ambu vuccati udakaṃ* (B^p S om.), *ambujam vuccati padumam* Nidd I 202.27-29.

It is further possible, though difficult to prove, that there are connections between the explanatory structure of the Pāli Niddesa and the particular selection of verses presented in Verse Commentary II. No less than fifty of the exegetical building blocks of the Niddesa in turn incorporate canonical verses in their explanation, resulting in a pattern of associations between verses containing a triggering word and verses used in its explanation. In two such cases, both verses of an associative pattern are contained as root material in

Verse Commentary II. The word *bhāvitatto* triggers a Niddesa explanation containing a block of verses that includes Sn 516:

<i>bhāvitatto</i> (Sn 1049 = Nird ^{1,2} section 13)	<i>dantaṃ nayanti samitiṃ</i> (Dhp 321–323) + <i>vidhāsu na vikappanti</i> (SN III 84) + <i>yassindriyāni bhāvitāni</i> (Sn 516 = Nird ^{1,2} section 12)
--	---

and the word *bhikkhū* triggers an explanation containing the verse Sn 514:

<i>bhikkhū</i> (Sn 783, 1015, 1039 = Nird ^{1,2} section 16, 1041)	<i>pajjena katena attanā</i> (Sn 514 = Nird ^{1,2} section 37)
--	--

The occurrence of parallels to Sn 1039 and Sn 514 as sections 16 and 37 of Verse Commentary II could easily be dismissed as coincidence, but it seems significant that the parallels to Sn 1049 and Sn 516 occur directly adjacent to each other as sections 13 and 12 of Verse Commentary II, and a further three of the verses explained in Verse Commentary II (section 21 = Ud I 6, section 25 = Sn 741 and section 28 = Sn 740) are themselves used in the explanatory material of the Pāli Niddesa. One further exegetical parallel is provided by a verse cited in explanation of Sn 516 = Nird^{1,2} section 12 in Paramatthajjotikā II:

<i>yassindriyāni bhāvitāni</i> (Sn 516 = Nird ^{1,2} section 12)	<i>yassāha therō . . . nābhikaṅkhāmi maraṇaṃ</i> <i>nābhikaṅkhāmi jīvitaṃ</i>
--	--

The intended verse in Th 196, 606, etc., uses the verb *abhinandāmi* instead of *abhikaṅkhāmi*, and Gāndhārī Verse Commentary II provides an exactly corresponding quotation:

<i>ya[s a i]driaṇ < *i > subhavidani</i> (Nird ^{1,2} section 12)	<i>ya vuto nabhinadami marano navinadami</i> <i>jivido</i>
---	---

While the above points of contact with the tradition represented by the Pāli Niddesa provide an important clue towards a common stock of inherited exegetical material, the most prominent and distinctive service of Verse Commentary II lends it an overall character that is very different from that of the Niddesa. This commentarial service consists in the systematic equation of each part of a root verse with corresponding members of fundamental doctrinal categories. More than one category is regularly employed in the explanation of each verse, and the members of each of the categories enter into complex relationships. The following passage from section 32 = Sn 366 may serve as an example:

(**va*)*d[a]di ma ṇa ṇa ṇamea* (*) *mohaprahaṇo* [·] *akrotho ca · ṇa satrasea · doṣaprahaṇa ·*
[ladha] (*)*pa*)*rabho[ya]ṇo · ṇa maje[a] · ragaprahaṇ[a] · eṣa saūadiṣeṣa · same so* (*)*loge*
pari[vaye]a · aṇuadiṣeṣa · asa va ṇidaṇakṣayeṇa · kileṣakṣayo [· kama]kṣayo · loge parivaye

dukhakṣayo · avaro [ho] ṇidaṇaprahaṇeṇa samudeaprahaṇ[a] · [sa](^{}m)[e](^{*}tve)[ṇa] · dukhapariṇa · parivayaṇae · ṇirosa<^{*}sa>kṣia ॐ¹⁷*

The categories employed in this example are: (1) *raga*, *doṣa*, *moha* (Skt. *rāga*, *dveṣa*, *moha*; = the three *ṇidaṇa*, Skt. *nidāna*); (2) *saüadiṣeṣa* and *aṇuadiṣeṣa* (Skt. *sopadhiṣeṣa* and *anupadhiṣeṣa*; = the two *ṇivaṇadhātu*, Skt. *nirvāṇadhātu*); (3) *kileśa(vata)*, *kama(vata)*, *dukha(vata)* (Skt. *kleśavartman*, *karmavartman*, *duḥkhavartman*); and (4) *dukhapariṇa*, *samudeaprahaṇa*, *ṇirosa<^{*}sa>kṣia* (Skt. *duḥkhoparijñā*, *samudayaprahāṇa*, *nirodhasākṣātkriyā*; = three of the Four Truths). Their relationship to the parts of the root verse and to each other is illustrated in Figure 2.1.

FIGURE 2.1
Categorical Reduction in Section 32 of Nird^{L2}

			<i>asa va</i>	<i>avaro ho</i>
yo vadadi ma ṇa uṇamea	mohaprahaṇa	saüadiṣeṣa	ṇidaṇakṣaya	ṇidaṇaprahaṇa
akroṭho ca ṇa satrasea	doṣaprahaṇa		→ kileśakṣaya, kamakṣaya	→ samudeaprahaṇa
bhikhu	ragaprahaṇa			
ladha parabhoṇa ṇa majea		aṇuadiṣeṣa	dukhakṣaya	dukhapariṇa
same so loge				ṇirosa< [*] sa>kṣia
parivayea				

The example passage thus provides three separate, alternative categorial reductions of the root verse. The first unlabelled run of the verse equates its parts with the two *nirvāṇadhātus* by way of the three *nidānas*. The second run of the verse, marked by *asa va* (Skt. *atha vā*), reduces its parts to the three *vartmans*, employing a back-reference (*ṇidaṇakṣayeṇa*) to the first reduction as a technical device for grouping together the first three *pādas* of the verse. The third and last run of the verse, marked by *avaro ho* (Skt. *aparaḥ khalu*), reduces its parts to three of the Four Truths, again employing a back-reference (*ṇidaṇaprahaṇeṇa*) as a technical device for grouping together the first three *pādas*.

Thirteen categories are used regularly in Verse Commentary II for this method of categorial reduction (numbers in parentheses indicate their frequency of occurrence):

1. Four Floods (*oha*): flood of desire (*kamoha*), flood of view (*driṭṭhoha*), flood of ignorance (*avijoha*), flood of existence (*bhavoha*) (4)
2. Four Barbs (*śala*): barb of lust (*ragaśala*), barb of hate (*doṣaśala*), barb of view (*driṭṭhiśala*), barb of conceit (*maṇaśala*) (4)
3. Four Actions (*kama*): dark (*kriṣa*), bright (*śukra*), dark and bright (*kriṣaśukra*), neither dark nor bright (*akriṣaśukra*) (2)
4. Three Sources (*ṇidaṇa*): lust (*raga*), hate (*doṣa*), delusion (*moha*) (10)
5. Three Painfulnesses (*dukhada*): painfulness of pain (*dukkhadukkhada*),

- painfulness of determination (*sakharadukkhada*), painfulness of change (*vipariṇamadukkhada*) (1)
6. Three Categories (*kadha*): virtue category (*śilakadha*), concentration category (*samasikadha*), understanding category (*prañakadha*) (8)
7. Three Courses (*vaṭa*): course of defilement (*kileśavaṭa*), course of action (*kamavaṭa*), course of suffering (*dukkhavaṭa*) (12)¹⁸
8. Two Roots (*mula*): craving (*taṣā*) and ignorance (*avijā*) (18)¹⁹
9. Lust for sense-pleasure (*kamaraga*) and malice (*vavada*) (2)
10. Fondness (*aṇuṇea*) and resentment (*paḍia*) (2)
11. Two Paths (*maga*): quiet (*śamasa*) and insight (*vivaśaṇa*) (18)
12. Two Outcomes (*ṇisada*) or Liberations (*vimuti*) (18)²⁰
13. Two Extinction Elements (*ṇivaṇadhatu*): with fuel remaining (*saūadiśeṣa*) and without fuel remaining (*aṇuadiśeṣa*)

The Four Truths occupy a special and superordinate position in the system of categorial reduction because, in contrast to the preceding categories, they combine the aspects of defilement, path and liberation. It is due to this special nature of the Four Truths that only three and not the complete set were used in the above example:

14. Four Truths (*saca*): diagnosis of suffering (*dukkhapaṇiṇa*), abandoning of the origin (*samudeaprahāṇa*), the path (*maga*),²¹ realisation of the cessation (*ṇirosa < *sa > kṣia*) (12)

Another special place in the system is occupied by the following two groups, each of which represents stages on the path to liberation:

15. Four Planes (*bhumī*): plane of seeing (*daśaṇabhumi*), plane of development (*bhavaṇabhumi*), plane of immediacy (*aṇatariabhumi*), state of having accomplished (*kridaṇida*) (4)
16. Five Makers of a Teacher (*śastugaraga*): state of having raised oneself (*uṭṭhaveda*), state of being established (*pradīṭhaveda*), state of knowing (*ñāṇida*), mastery (*vriṣaṇida*), state of liberation (*vimutida*) (4)

The commentarial service of categorial reduction is combined with that of explanatory quotation in one section (no. 16) that, among other reductions, equates each part of its root verse (a parallel of Sn 1039) with one key expression from a parallel of the Paṃsudhovahakasutta (AN I 253-58). Two other sections (nos. 25 and 28) similarly interweave each part of their root verses with the second chain (starting with *taṣā = tṛṣṇā*) of the formula of Dependent Arising.

The British Library *Saṅgītisūtra* Commentary

Besides the Verse Commentaries and other scholastic texts, the British Library collection contains a Gāndhārī commentary on a version of the *Saṅgītisūtra* corresponding, with very minor deviations, to the Chinese translation

contained in the *Cháng āhán jīng* 長阿含經 (T 1) and attributed to the Dharmaguptakas. This *Sanḅitisūtra* commentary also uses categorial reduction as one of its exegetical methods but differs from the Verse Commentaries in the precise inventory of categories that it employs and in other details. The following categories are used where categorial reduction is carried out explicitly as illustrated above:

1. Four Perversions: perception of beauty in the body (*kaesūhasamñña*), perception of happiness in feelings (*vedānasūhasamñña*), perception of permanence in the mind (*citenicasamñña*), perception of a self in the dharmas (*dhameṣuapasaṃñña*)
2. Four Bases for Supernormal Power: energy concentration (*viriasamaṣi*), will concentration (*chamdasamaṣi*), inquiry concentration (*vimaṃsamaṣi*), mind concentration (*citasamaṣi*)
3. Four Bonds (*yoa*): bond of sensual desires (*kamayoa*), bond of existence (*bhavayoa*), bond of views (*driṭhiyoa*), bond of ignorance (*avijayoa*)
4. Three Categories (*kamḍha*): virtue category (*ṣilakamḍha*), understanding category (*praṃñākamḍha*), concentration category (*samaṣikamḍha*)
5. Three Bad Roots (*akuṣālamula*): greed (*lobha*), hate (*doṣa*), delusion (*moha*)
6. Three Sources: lust (*raḁa*), hate (*doṣa*), delusion (*moha*)
7. Two Roots (*mula*): craving (*taṣā*) and ignorance (*avija*)
8. Two Paths (*maga*): quiet (*śamaṣa*) and insight (*vivaṣaṇa*)
9. shame (*hiri*) and conscience (*otrapa*)

One category with five members is used in the same way as the above:

10. Five Faculties (*idria*): energy faculty (*viridria*), faith faculty (*ṣadhidria*), understanding faculty (*praṃñidria*), mindfulness faculty (*ṣpadidria*), concentration faculty (*samaṣidria*).

As in Verse Commentary II, two groups representing stages on the path to liberation are used in the *Sanḅitisūtra* commentary. The now familiar

11. Five Makers of a Teacher occur in the following expression (in the section on the four *sodavatiamaṅga*):

*ariha d[i] vimutida sammasaṃbudho di ṇanida puruṣadaṃmasaraṣi di dhammeṇa <<vi>> uḥav[i]da [sa]raṣiṇa pradithaved[i] budho bhaka(*va) śasta devamanuṣaṇa di viṣavi)[da]*²²

However, in an interesting departure from Verse Commentary II, the *Sanḅitisūtra* commentary employs the group of seven *śrāvakabhūmi* known from Buddhist Sanskrit literature:

12. Seven Planes (*bhūmi*): plane of insight into the bright (*śukravivaṣaṇabhūmi*), plane of the religious community (*gotrahubhūmi*), plane of the *aṣṭamaka* (*aṭhamaabhūmi*), plane of seeing (*daṣaṇabhūmi*), delicate plane (*taṇubhūmi*), plane of development (*bhavaṇabhūmi*), plane of having accomplished (*kidavibhūmi*).

As pointed out above, the Four Truths by their nature occupy a special superordinate position in the system of categorial reduction and this is made explicit by their employment in the *Sanġitisūtra* commentary. Every group of ten items of the root text is bundled together by an *uddāna* (introduced by the expression *saṃkṣitamamtro* = Skt. *saṃkṣiptamantraḥ*) listing a keyword or phrase for each item, but the *uddāna* itself is then subjected to categorial reduction converging on the Four Truths. The following *uddāna* occurs after the tenth item of the chapter of fours (the four *yoṇi*):

[saṃ]kṣitama[mtr]o ducari[dehi] aṇariehi voharehi ahare[hi] · d[uehi sama]daṇehi · gramthehi · śalehi uvadaṇehi · samu[dao] (*vuto · yoṇihi duho vuto su)[ca]rid[e]h[i] duehi [ca] samaḍaṇehi mago v[u]to · caḍuhi ariehehi voharehi niroso vuto°

Only once are the Three Rounds (*kileśavaṭa*, *kaṃmavaṭa*, *dukkhavaṭa*) employed in this fashion in an *uddāna* and they are not otherwise used in the *Sanġitisūtra* commentary.

Among other peculiarities, the *Sanġitisūtra* commentary frequently points out categories without actually carrying out the reduction in detail (e.g. in the section on the three *cakhu*: *vistaro trihi vijahi*) and it differs from the Verse Commentaries in the form (but not the system) of its function words (*avaro payao* = Skt. *aparāḥ paryāyaḥ* instead of *asa va*, *aṃṇa* = Skt. *anye* instead of *avare*, *saṃkṣitamamtro* = Skt. *saṃkṣiptamantraḥ* instead of *sakṣeva*). It is noteworthy that its categorial reductions are much less complex than those of Verse Commentary II, with hardly an example of multi-level coordination and back-reference. But since the *Sanġitisūtra* root text itself consists of abstract categories, some of which are themselves used in categorial reduction, and since the special reductions within the *uddāna* sections provide an additional layer of relations, the overall complexity of the *Sanġitisūtra* commentary may, in fact, be no less than that of the Verse Commentaries.

PEṬAKOPEDESA AND NETTIPPAKARAṆA

The closest parallel to the Gāndhārī commentaries' system of categorial reduction is afforded by two exegetical manuals preserved in Pāli, the *Peṭakopadesa*²³ and the *Nettippakaraṇa*.²⁴ A detailed comparison between the Gāndhārī commentaries and these manuals allows further conclusions about their historical relationship and provides a key towards understanding the purpose of the method of categorial reduction.

The *Peṭakopadesa* is, by all appearances, the older of the two Pāli texts and will form the basis of the subsequent presentation, while the *Nettippakaraṇa* represents a later rearrangement of the same subject matter and the form in which it became productive in Theravāda Buddhism.²⁵ Both texts are addressed to experts in the transmission of the Buddhist canon (Pāli *piṭakadhara*, Bharhut *peṭaki*) and teach a method for determining the basic truths underlying any

of the varied utterances of the Buddha, and for establishing any utterance's place in the context of the Buddha's teaching as a whole. One function of this method is to verify the authenticity of a given text; this is in line with the Mahāpadesasutta's (DN II 123-26, AN II 167-70) prescript that teachings need to be "confronted with the *sūtra*" (*sutte otāretabbāni*) and "compared with the *vinaya*" (*vinaye sandassetabbāni*).²⁶ Another function of the method is to establish the intended audience of a given utterance and to identify equivalent formulations suitable for other types of audiences.

The *Petakopadesa* presents this method in four main chapters. The Sāsana-paṭṭhāna (Peṭ 23-59; cf. Nett 127.25-193) contains a typology and classification of utterances of the Buddha; the Hāravibhaṅga (Peṭ 81-111; cf. Nett 5.9-84) introduces and illustrates sixteen "kinds of deducing" (*hāra*) of the basic terms of a given utterance;²⁷ the Hārasampāta (Peṭ 141-241; Nett 85-109.19) shows how the sixteen *hāra* can be used in conjunction by applying all of them to sixteen sample utterances of the Buddha, following the classification established in the Sāsana-paṭṭhāna; the Nayasamuṭṭhāna (Peṭ 242-60; cf. Nett 109.20-127.24) teaches a set of "guidelines" (*naya*) or mappings between basic terms, and from basic terms to their meaning and purpose (namely the conveyance of different types of audiences to liberation).

The Nayasamuṭṭhāna and its system of mappings between terms and meanings is most relevant for the understanding of the Gāndhāri commentaries and their categorial reduction. Three *naya* (*sihavigīlita*, *tipukkhalā* and *nandiyāvatta*) provide overall frameworks for mappings that involve sets of four, three and two terms, respectively. One *naya* (*disālocanā*) establishes the meaning equivalence of terms on the negative and positive side, respectively, and provides the connection with the intended audience, on the one hand, and with the purpose of liberation, on the other. The fifth and last *naya* (*aṅkusa*) performs the conversion between negative and positive terms. Tables 2.2-2.4 provide an overview of this mapping procedure as set out in the *Petakopadesa* (the *Nettipakaraṇa* differs significantly in its inventory of terms). *Sihavigīlita*, *tipukkhalā* and *nandiyāvatta* are illustrated by one chart each. Within the charts, vertical arrows indicate the operation of *disālocanā* and horizontal arrows the operation of the *aṅkusa*.

It is immediately apparent that many (but not all) of the sets of terms laid out in the Nayasamuṭṭhāna correspond to the overlapping sets of terms employed by the Verse Commentaries and by the *Saṅgītisūtra* commentary in their categorial mappings. Beyond the negative and positive terms of the Nayasamuṭṭhāna (representing suffering and the path), two Nayasamuṭṭhāna sets of liberation terms (the four *sāmaññaphala* and the two *vimutti*) are used in the Gāndhāri commentaries, and the basic sub-classification of the audience into *taṇhācarita* and *diṭṭhicarita* likewise occurs in both the Verse Commentaries and the *Saṅgītisūtra* commentary. Several peculiar expressions in the Gāndhāri

TABLE 2.2
Categorical mapping in the *Petaḥkopadesa* (Sihavikīlita)

	taṇhācarito mudindriyo	taṇhācarito tikkhindriyo	diṭṭhacarito mudindriyo	diṭṭhacarito tikkhindriyo	⇒	cattāro paṭipadā	dukkhā dandhā- bhinnā	dukkhā khippābhinnā	dukkhā dandhā- ābhinnā	sukhā dandhā- ābhinnā	sukhā khip- pābhinnā
<i>cattāro āhārā</i>	↓	phasso	manosañcetan- āhāro	↓	⇒	<i>catasso paṭipadā</i>	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
<i>cattāro vipallāsā</i>	asubhe subham	↓	dukkhe sukham	↓	⇒	<i>cattāro paṭipadā</i>	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
<i>cattāri upādānā</i>	kāmapā- danam	↓	siḷabbat- upādānam	↓	⇒	<i>cattāro paṭipadā</i>	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
<i>cattāro yogā</i>	↓	<*kāmayogo>	↓	<*diṭṭiyogo>	⇒	<i>cattāro vihārā</i>	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
<i>cattāro gaṇthā</i>	abhiññhā	byāpādo	paramāso	idamsac- cābhiniveso	⇒	<i>cattāro samma- ppadhānā</i>	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
<i>cattāro āsavā</i>	kāmasavo	byāpādasavo	bhavasavo	diṭṭhāsavo	⇒	<i>cattāro acchariyā abbhuta- dhammā</i>	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
<i>cattāro oṇhā</i>	kāmogho	bhavogho	avijjogho	diṭṭhogho	⇒	<i>cattāro adhiṭṭhāna</i>	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓
	↓	↓	↓	↓	⇒	<i>cattāro adhiṭṭhāna</i>	↓	↓	↓	↓	↓

<i>cattāri sallā</i>	rāgasallam	dosasallam	mohasallam	diṭṭhisallam	\Rightarrow <i>cattāro samādhino</i>	chandasamādhi	viriyasamādhi	cittasamādhi	vīmaṃsā-samādhi
\downarrow	\downarrow	\downarrow	\downarrow	\downarrow	\Rightarrow	\downarrow	\downarrow	\downarrow	\downarrow
rūpupagā	vedanūpagā	saññūpagā	saṅkhārūpagā	saṅkhārūpagā	\Rightarrow <i>cattāro dhammā sukhabhāgiyā</i>	indriyasamvaro	cattāro iddhipāda	bojjhaṅgā	sabbanissaggo
\downarrow	\downarrow	\downarrow	\downarrow	\downarrow	\Rightarrow	\downarrow	\downarrow	\downarrow	\downarrow
chanda	dosā	mohā	bhaya	mettā	<i>cattāri appamāṇāni</i>	karuṇā	muditā	upekkhā	arahatta-phalam
<i>cattāri agatigamanāni</i>						sotāpatti-phalam	sakadāgāmi-phalam	anāgāmi-phalam	ariyasānaṃ pariyosānaṃ

TABLE 2.3
Categorical Mapping in the *Petakopadesa* (Tipukkhalā)

	neyyo	vīpañcitāṇṇu	ugghaṭṭitaṇṇu	⇒	tiṇi kusalamūlāni	alobho	adoso	amoho
<i>tiṇi akusala-mūlāni</i>	lobho		moho	⇒	<i>tiṇi kusalamūlāni</i>			
<i><* tiṇi āramma-ñāni></i>	↓ manāpikam	↓ amanāpikam	↓ upekkhāhāṇīyaṃ	⇒	<i>tiṣso pañña</i>	↓ suramayaipaṇṇā	↓ cintāmayipaṇṇā	↓ bhāvaṇāmayaipaṇṇā
<i>tayo phassā</i>	↓ sukhavedanīyo	↓ dukkhavedanīyo	↓ adukkhamasukha-vedanīyo	⇒	<i>tayo samādhi</i>	↓ savitakko savicāro	↓ avitakko vicāramatto	↓ avitakko avicāro
<i>tiṣso vedanā</i>	↓ sukhā	↓ dukkhā	↓ adukkhamasukhā	⇒	<i>tiṣso sikkhā</i>	↓ adhicitasikkhā	↓ adhisīlasikkhā	↓ adhipaññāsikkhā
<i>tayo upavicārā</i>	↓ somanas-sopavicāro	↓ domanassopavicāro	↓ upekkhopavicāro	⇒	<i>tiṇi nimittāni</i>	↓ samathanimittam	↓ upekkhānimittam	↓ paggahanimittam
<i>tayo sankilesā</i>	↓ rāgo	↓ doso	↓ moho	⇒	<i>tayo vitakkā</i>	↓ nekkhamma-vitakko	↓ abyāpādavitakko	↓ <* vihiṃsā-vitakko>
<i>tayo vitakkā</i>	↓ kāma-vitakko	↓ byāpādavitakko	↓ vihiṃsāvitakko	⇒	<i>tiṇi indriyāni</i>	↓ anaññātāññassām-īndriyaṃ	↓ aññīndriyaṃ	↓ aññātāvino indriyaṃ
<i>tayo paridāgha</i>	↓ rāgaḷo	↓ dosajo	↓ mohaḷo	⇒	<i>tayo upavicārā</i>	↓ nekkhamm-ūpavicāro	↓ abyāpādapavicāro	↓ avihiṃsūpavicāro
<i>tiṇi saṅkhatalakkaḷhā-ñāni</i>	↓ uppādo	↓ ṭhitassaññānathattam	↓ vayo	⇒	<i>tiṣso esana</i>	↓ kāmesanā-pahānaṃ	↓ bhavesanā-pahānaṃ	↓ brahmacariyesanā
<i>tiṣso dukkhatā</i>	↓ viparīṇama-dukkhatā	↓ dukkhadukkhata	↓ saṅkhatadukkhata	⇒	<i>tayo khandhā</i>	↓ samādhikkhandho	↓ silakkhandho	↓ paññākkhandho
					apanihitam vimokkha-mukhaṃ	apariyosānaṃ	suññatā vimokkha-mukhaṃ	animittam vimokkha-mukhaṃ
					pariyosānaṃ	pariyosānaṃ	pariyosānaṃ	pariyosānaṃ

TABLE 2.4
Categorical mapping in the *Peṭakopadesa* (Nandiyāvatta)

diṭṭhicarito	taṇhācarito			
avijjā	taṇhā	⇒	samatho	vipassanā
=	=		=	=
ahirikam	anottappam	⇒	vijjā	caraṇam
=	=		=	=
asati	asampajaññam	⇒	sati	sampajaññam
=	=		=	=
nīvaraṇāni	samyōjanāni	⇒	hiri	ottappam
=	=		=	=
ajjhosānam	abhiniveso	⇒	ahaṅkārapahānam	mamaṅkārapahānam
=	=		=	=
ahaṅkāro	mamaṅkāro	⇒	sammāvāyāmo	yoniso manasikāro
=	=		=	=
asaddhiyam	dovacassam	⇒	sammāsati	sammāsamādhi
=	=		=	=
kosajjam	ayoniso	⇒	paññā	nibbidā
=	manasikāro		=	=
=	=		=	=
vicikicchā	abhijjhā	⇒	samāpatti	saddhammasavanam
=	=		=	=
asaddhammasavanam	asamāpatti	⇒	somanassam	dhammānuddham-
				mapaṭipatti
			rāgavirāgā	avijjāvirāgā
			cetovimutti	paññāvimutti
			pariyosānam	pariyosānam

texts also find an explanation in the *Peṭakopadesa* method as set out above: the Verse Commentaries, for instance, repeatedly stress that “the Makers of a Teacher and the Truths are to be known” (*śastugaraga ṇadava saca ca*), a reference to the reduction of any given utterance to basic terms and meanings and, ultimately, the Four Truths of the noble; and the *Saṅgītisūtra* commentary uses the word *haṭave* (Skt. *hartavyam*) in expressions such as *cadu[hi] paḍivadahi haṭave* “one should deduce by means of the Four Ways,” i.e. “the Four Ways should be deduced as basic terms underlying the text,” with a likely reference to the *Peṭakopadesa* notion of *hāra*. A substantial number of other technical terms is also shared between the *Peṭakopadesa*, the *Nettipakaraṇa* and the Gāndhāri commentaries, such as, for example, the compound *attabhāvaavatthu* “matter of selfhood,” which, in Pāli, is not attested outside the exegetical manuals.

Most telling, however, is a stylistic comparison between the Gāndhāri commentaries and an explicit application of the *Peṭakopadesa* method. The Pāli *Aṭṭhakathās* and *Ṭīkās* appear to have been composed on the background of an acquaintance with the *Peṭakopadesa* (or rather the *Nettipakaraṇa*) method,²⁸ and Dhammapāla, in particular, took a strong interest in it, composing a commentary on the *Nettipakaraṇa* itself and adding example applications of the method to the first *sutta* explanation of each of his three

Nikāya sub-commentaries.²⁹ Stylistically, however, the Pāli *Aṭṭhakathās* and *Ṭīkāṣ* are very different from the Gāndhārī commentaries and do not provide a convenient basis for literary comparison. Rescue comes in the form of a series of sixteen short sample commentaries embedded within the Hārasampāta chapter of the *Peṭakopadesa* itself, between each scriptural example and the explicit application of each *hāra* to it. These sample commentaries conclude with the words *ayaṃ suttaniddeso* or equivalent expressions, recalling the formula *sutro tatra ṇideṣo* at the beginning of each Verse Commentary section. One such sample commentary is reproduced in the appendix to this article, and even though detailed comparison with the Verse Commentary sample given above (pp. 26-27) will have to be left to the reader, it is worth pointing out one striking formal similarity between the two texts: the words *dānena* and *silena* in part [C] of the Pāli text are used to establish a back-reference by way of *dānamayikapuñṇakiriyavatthu* and *silamayikapuñṇakiriyavatthu* in part [A] to the first and second *pāda* of the root verse in a way precisely corresponding to the operation of back-references in Verse Commentary II as illustrated above.

CONCLUSION

Much work remains to be done on the Gāndhārī commentaries and the tracing of their exegetical and literary connections. The present paper purposely restricted itself to a comparison with Pāli material that is roughly contemporary with the first-century CE Gāndhārī commentaries. Once the historical background of the Verse Commentaries is more securely established, it will become necessary to compare them in greater detail to later works, and here, in particular, the Śārīrārthagāthā in the *Yogācārabhūmi* and Vasubandhu's *Gāthārthasaṃgraha*, both of them commentaries on selections of canonical verses like the Gāndhārī Verse Commentaries, and to Vasubandhu's *Vyākhyāyukti*, the first Buddhist exegetical manual preserved after the *Peṭakopadesa* and *Nettipakaraṇa*.

The following picture emerges from the investigations summarised above: the Gāndhārī Verse Commentaries and *Sanḡitisūtra* commentary share a certain stock of exegetical material with the Pāli Niddesa, on the one hand, and an unknown source of Paramatthajjotikā II, on the other. It may be presumed that this shared stock goes back to a very early period of Buddhist exegesis that predates all available commentaries and that was based in mainland India. The method of categorial reduction, on the other hand, is characteristic of the Gāndhārī commentaries investigated so far and appears to have been a living tradition in first-to-second-century-CE Gandhāra. There are several strong indications that the Gāndhārī method of categorial reduction implements exegetical principles and specific tools later set out in the family of manuals

preserved for us in the Pāli *Peṭakopadesa* and *Nettipakaraṇa*, as well as in the *Yīnchirū jīng* 陰持入經 (T 603), which was recently identified as a treatise corresponding to chapter six of the *Peṭakopadesa*.³⁰ The *Peṭakopadesa* had independently been suspected to be of north Indian origin and, in view of the new Gāndhārī and Chinese evidence, it seems not unlikely that the Pāli *Peṭakopadesa* is a translation of a north Indian and possibly Gāndhārī original. Even its title appears to indicate this: Nāṇamoli's rendering "Piṭaka-Disclosure" leaves the *guṇa/vrddhi* grade of *peṭaka* unexplained, and "disclosure" is not the usual meaning of *upadesa*. Already in 1908, Rudolf Fuchs wondered whether the first member of the compound might not be *peṭaki* "piṭaka student" (or rather "piṭaka master")³¹ and our newfound knowledge of Gāndhārī grammar shows that the expected regular form of a compound *peḍagi* + *uadeśa* would, in fact, precisely be *peḍagoadeśa* (cf. *spadoaṭṭhaṇa* ← *spadi* + *uāṭṭhaṇa*), which on superficial phonetic transposition would explain the curious Pāli form *peṭakopadesa* with unexpected *o* (if from *peṭaki* + *upadesa*) instead of regular *ū*.

APPENDIX: SAMPLE SUTTANIDDESA FROM THE PEṬAKOPEDESA

*dadato puññaṃ pavaḍḍhati saṃyamato veraṃ na ciyati
kusalo ca jahāti pāpakaṃ rāgadosamohakkhayā sa nibbuto*
(Ud VIII 5)

[237.5] **dadato puññaṃ pavaḍḍhati** ti gāthā. [A] **dadato** dānamayikapuññaṃkiriya-vatthu vuttaṃ. **saṃyamato veraṃ na ciyati** ti sīlamayikapuññaṃkiriya-vatthu vuttaṃ. **kusalo ca jahati pāpakan** ti lobhassa ca mohassa ca byāpādassa ca pahānaṃ āha. **rāgadosamohakkhayā sa nibbuto** ti lobhassa ca mohassa ca byāpādassa ca chandarāgavinayaṃ (Ee chandarāgaṃ vinayaṃ) āhā ti. [B] **dadato puññaṃ pavaḍḍhati** ti {gāthā} alobho kusalamūlaṃ bhavati. **saṃyamato veraṃ na ciyati** ti adoso kusalamūlaṃ bhavati (Ee bhavati ti). <***kusalo ca jahati pāpakan** ti amoho kusalamūlaṃ bhavati. **rāgadosamohakkhayā**> [234.11] **sa nibbuto** ti maggaphalaṃ anupādisesaṃ ca nibbānadhātum manteti. [C] **dānena** olārikānaṃ kilesānaṃ pahānaṃ manteti. **sīlena** majjhimānaṃ. paññāya sukhumakilesānaṃ manteti. **rāgadosamohakkhayā sa nibbuto** ti katāvibhūmi (Ee katācibhūmi). [D] **dadato puññaṃ pavaḍḍhati, saṃyamato veraṃ na ciyati, kusalo ca jahati pāpakan** ti maggo vutto. **rāgadosamohakkhayā sa nibbuto** ti maggaphalam (Ñā aggaphalam) āha. [E] **dadato puññaṃ pavaḍḍhati, saṃyamato** ti tihi padehi lokikaṃ kusalamūlaṃ vuttaṃ. **rāgadosamohakkhayā sa nibbuto** ti lokuttaraṃ kusalamūlaṃ vuttaṃ. [F] **dadato puññaṃ pavaḍḍhati, saṃyamato veraṃ na ciyati** ti puthujjanabhūmiṃ manteti. **kusalo ca jahati pāpakan** ti sekkhabhūmiṃ manteti. **rāgadosamohakkhayā sa nibbuto** ti asekkhabhūmi

vuttā. [235] [G] **dadato puññaṃ pavaḍḍhati, saṃyamato veraṃ na ciyaṭi** ti saggagāmini (Ee magganiyā) paṭipadā vuttā. **kusalo ca jahati pāpakan** ti sekkhavimutti. **rāgadosamohakkhayā sa nibbuto** ti asekkhavimutti. [H] **dadato puññaṃ pavaḍḍhati, saṃyamato veraṃ na ciyaṭi** ti dānakathaṃ sīlakathaṃ saggakathaṃ (Ee maggakathaṃ) lokikānaṃ dhammānaṃ desanaṃ āha. **kusalo ca jahati pāpakan** ti loke ādinānupassanā. **rāgadosamohakkhayā sa nibbuto** ti “sāmuḁkaṃsikā dhammadesanā” (Ee: sāmuḁkaṃsikāya dhammadesanā ye pi paṭividdhā). [I] **dadato puññaṃ pavaḍḍhati** ti pāṇānaṃ abhayaḁānena pāṇātipātā veramaṇi sattānaṃ (Ee sattannaṃ) abhayaṃ deti. evaṃ sabbāni sikkhāpadāni kātabbāni. **saṃyamato veraṃ na ciyaṭi** ti sīle paṭiṭṭhāya cittaṃ saṃyameṭi, tassa saṃyamato pāripūriṃ gacchati. **rāgadosamohakkhayā sa nibbuto** ti dve vimuttiyo. ayaṃ suttaniddeso.³²

NOTES

1. Most notably, Salomon, *Ancient Buddhist Scrolls*, pp. 56-68 and Glass, “Kharoṣṭhi Manuscripts,” pp. 138-42. See Allon, “Recent Discoveries,” for a detailed discussion of the significance of recent manuscript discoveries, and Baums, “Gandhāran Scrolls,” forthcoming, for a manuscriptological survey of the currently known corpus.
2. Brough, *The Gāndhārī Dharmapada*.
3. See Baums, “Catalog”.
4. See Salomon, *Ancient Buddhist Scrolls*, pp. xv-xvii.
5. Allon, “The Senior Manuscripts.”
6. See Allon and Salomon, “Kharoṣṭhi Fragments,” and Salomon, “Thirty-Two Fragments,” forthcoming.
7. Glass, “Kharoṣṭhi Manuscripts.”
8. See Salomon and Baums, “Sanskrit Ikṣvāku.”
9. See Strauch, “The Bajaur Collection.”
10. Salomon, *Ancient Buddhist Scrolls*, pp. 29-30. This text is being edited by Collett Cox.
11. Salomon, *Ancient Buddhist Scrolls*, pp. 49-50.
12. Strauch, “Bajaur Collection,” p. 119.
13. Allon, “Senior Manuscripts,” p. 4.
14. Baums, “A Gāndhārī Commentary.”
15. “**Dear sir**: this is a respectful form of address.”
16. “**Water lotus** (*elabuya*): Water is called *ela*. A lotus is called *abuya*.”
17. “**He does not rise (when he thinks) ‘someone honors me’**: abandoning of delusion. **When reviled he is not frightened**: abandoning of hate. **Receiving food from others he does not exult**: abandoning of lust. That is (the extinction element) with fuel remaining. **That one wanders about right (in the world)**: (the extinction element) without fuel remaining. Or: By abandoning of the sources, there is exhaustion of defilement, exhaustion of action. **Wanders about in the world**: exhaustion of pain. Now somebody else: By **abandoning of the motives** (is meant) abandoning of the origin. By **rightness** (is meant) the diagnosis of pain. By **wandering about** (is meant) realization of the cessation.”

18. The three courses are also called *vatāṇi* (Pāli *vattāṇi*, Skt. *vartāṇi*); this appears to be a dialect variant of the more common *vaṭa* (Pāli *vaṭṭa*, Skt. *vartman*).
19. The roots, paths and outcomes or liberations are usually referred to in conjunction with each other and are, therefore, counted together.
20. These are *cedovimutti* (Skt. *cetovimukti*) and *prañāvimutti* (Skt. *prajñāvimukti*).
21. Short for *magabbhavaṇa* (Skt. *mārgabhāvanā*).
22. “**Worthy one:** the state of liberation. **Completely enlightened:** the state of knowing. **Driver of humans who need to be tamed:** the state of having raised oneself by the dharma; he establishes as a driver, the **Lord Buddha, teacher of gods and men mastery after men.**”
23. The *Peṭakopadesa* has been edited by Fuchs, “Specimen des *Peṭakopadesa*,” Ph.D. dissertation, Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin, 1908 and Barua, *The Peṭakopadesa*. It has been translated by Ñāṇamoli, *The Piṭaka-Disclosure*.
24. The *Nettipakaraṇa* has been edited by Hardy, *The Nettipakarāṇa*. It has been translated by Ñāṇamoli, *The Guide*. A study of its method is presented in Bond, “*The Word of the Buddha*.”
25. Ñāṇamoli, *The Guide*, pp. xiii-xxviii; see also Hinüber, *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*, 1996, p. 81.
26. This prescript is discussed in Lamotte, “La critique d’authenticité dans le bouddhisme.”
27. In the translation of Ñāṇamoli, *The Guide* and Ñāṇamoli, *The Piṭaka-Disclosure*, the *hāra* concerns are: teaching, investigation, construing, footings, characteristics, fourfold array, conversion, analysis, reversal, synonyms, descriptions, ways of entry, clearing up, terms of expression and requisites.
28. See Ñāṇamoli, *The Guide*, pp. liii-liv.
29. The twelfth-century commentator Śāriputta imitated his famous predecessor in adding such a section to the first *sutta* explanation of his *Aṅguttaranikāya* sub-commentary.
30. Zacchetti, “An early Chinese Translation,” and Zacchetti, “Inventing a New Idiom.” Ñāṇamoli, *The Guide*, p. xx already pointed out: “*Pe* ch. vi is a kind of ‘omnibus chapter.’ Its position is unexplained, though it can be taken to introduce ch. vii. It is the only one which contains some exemplifying material definitely not found in the *Netti*.” In view of the discovery of a separate Chinese translation, it is possible that *Peṭakopadesa* chapter six was originally an independent text of the “*Peṭakopadesa* family” that became part of the *Peṭakopadesa* as we have it at a later stage.
31. Fuchs, “Specimen,” p. 6.
32. The text follows the edition of Barua, *Peṭakopadesa* with emendations from Ñāṇamoli, *The Piṭaka-Disclosure*.

REFERENCES

- Allon, Mark. “The Senior Manuscripts.” In *Four Gāndhāri Saṃyuktāgama Sūtras: Senior Kharoṣṭhī Fragment 5*, edited by Andrew Glass, pp. 3-25. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2007.
- . “Recent Discoveries of Buddhist Manuscripts from Afghanistan and Pakistan and their Significance.” In *Art, Architecture and Religion on the Silk Road and Across Inner-Asian History*, edited by Ken Parry, pp. 153-78. Turnhout: Brepols, 2008.

- Allon, Mark and Richard Salomon. "Kharoṣṭhī Fragments of a Gāndhārī Version of the Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra." In *Buddhist Manuscripts*, vol. I, edited by Jens Braarvig, pp. 243-73. Oslo: Hermes Academic Publishing, 2000.
- Barua, Arabinda. *The Peṭakopadesa*. London: Pāli Text Society, 1982.
- Baums, Stefan. "A Gāndhārī Commentary on Early Buddhist Verses: British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragments 7, 9, 13 and 18." Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Asian Languages and Literature, University of Washington, 2009.
- . "Catalog and Revised Texts and Translations of Gandharan Reliquary Inscriptions." In *Gandharan Buddhist Reliquaries*, edited by David Jongeard, Elizabeth Errington, Richard Salomon and Stefan Bamus, pp. 200-51. Seattle: Early Buddhist Manuscripts Project, 2012.
- . "Gandhāran Scrolls: Rediscovering an Ancient Manuscript Type." In *Manuscript Cultures: Mapping the Field*, edited by Jörg Quenzer and Jan-Ulrich Sobisch. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, forthcoming.
- Bond, George D. *"The Word of the Buddha": The Tipiṭaka and its Interpretation in Theravada Buddhism*. Colombo: Gunasena, 1982.
- Brough, John. *The Gāndhārī Dharmapada*. London: Oxford University Press, 1962.
- Falk, Harry. "The 'Split' Collection of Kharoṣṭhī Texts." *Sōka daigaku kokusai bukkuyōgaku kōtō kenkyūjo nenpō* 創価大学国際仏教学高等研究所年報 14 (2011): 13-23.
- Fuchs, Rudolf. "Specimen des Peṭakopadesa." Ph.D. dissertation, Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin, 1908.
- Glass, Andrew. "Kharoṣṭhī Manuscripts: A Window on Gandhāran Buddhism." *Nagoya Studies in Indian Culture and Buddhism* 24 (2004): 129-52.
- Hardy, E. *The Netṭi-pakaraṇa with Extracts from Dhammapāla's Commentary*. London: Henry Frowde, 1902.
- von Hinüber, Oskar. *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1996.
- Lamotte, Et. "La critique d'authenticité dans le bouddhisme." In *India Antiqua: A Volume of Oriental Studies Presented by his Friends and Pupils to Jean Philippe Vogel, C.I.E., on the Occasion of the Fiftieth Anniversary of his Doctorate*, pp. 22-31. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1947.
- Ñāṇamoli. *The Guide (Nettipakaraṇam) According to Kaccāna Thera*. London: Luzac & Company, 1962.
- . *The Piṭaka-Disclosure (Peṭakopadesa) According to Kaccāna Thera*. London: Luzac & Company, 1964.
- Salomon, Richard. *Ancient Buddhist Scrolls from Gandhāra: The British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragments*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1999.
- . "Thirty-Two Fragments Written by Bamiyan Kharoṣṭhī Scribe 7." In *Buddhist Manuscripts*, vol. IV, edited by Jens Braarvig. Oslo: Hermes Academic Publishing, forthcoming.
- Salomon, Richard and Stefan Baums. "Sanskrit Ikṣvāku, Pāli Okkāka, and Gāndhārī Iṣmaḥo." *Journal of the Pāli Text Society* 29 (2007): 201-27.
- Strauch, Ingo. "The Bajaur Collection of Kharoṣṭhī Manuscripts: A Preliminary Survey." *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 25 (2008): 103-36.
- Zacchetti, Stefano. "An Early Chinese Translation Corresponding to Chapter 6 of the Peṭakopadesa: An Shigao's Yin Chi Ru Jing T 603 and its Indian Original: A Preliminary Survey." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 65 (2002): 74-98.
- . "Inventing a New Idiom: Some Aspects of the Language of the Yin Chi Ru Jing 陰持入經 T 603 Translated by An Shigao." *Sōka daigaku kokusai bukkuyōgaku kōtō kenkyūjo nenpō* 創価大学国際仏教学高等研究所年報 10 (2007): 395-416.