

THE JOURNAL
OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
BUDDHIST STUDIES

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Roger Jackson
Dept. of Religion
Carleton College
Northfield, MN 55057
USA

EDITORS

Peter N. Gregory
University of Illinois
Urbana-Champaign, Illinois, USA

Ernst Steinkellner
University of Vienna
Wien, Austria

Alexander W. Macdonald
Université de Paris X
Nanterre, France

Jikido Takasaki
University of Tokyo
Tokyo, Japan

Steven Collins
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois, USA

Robert Thurman
Columbia University
New York, New York, USA

Volume 16

1993

Number 1

CONTENTS

I. ARTICLES

1. Religion, Kinship and Buddhism: Ambedkar's Vision of a Moral Community
by Anne M. Blackburn 1
2. Vasubandhu on *saṃskārapratyayaṃ vijñānam*
by Robert Kritzer 24
3. Is It a Crow (P. *dhaṃka*) or a Nurse (Skt. *dhātrī*), or Milk (Skt. *kṣīra*)
or a Toy-Plough (P. *vaṃka*)?
by Stephan H. Levitt 56

II. REVIEW ARTICLE

- Issues on the Field of East Asian Buddhist Studies: An Extended Review
of *Sudden and Gradual: Approaches to Enlightenment in Chinese
Thought*, ed. Peter N. Gregory (T. Griffith Foulk) 93

III. BOOK REVIEWS

1. *Collected Papers, vol. 2*, by K. R. Norman (Nirmala Salgado) 183
2. *The Dating of the Historical Buddha. Die Datierung des Historischen
Buddha*, part I, ed. Heinz Bechert (A. K. Narain) 187
3. *Gender and Salvation: Jaina Debates on the Spiritual Liberation
of Women*, by Padmanabh S. Jaini (Serinity Young) 202

IV. RESEARCH TOOLS

- A Bibliography of Buddhist Materials in the Recorded Sound Collection
of the Library of Congress
by Floyd B. Hooker 209

V. NOTES AND NEWS

- IABS Financial Statement, 1991 245

Is It a Crow (P. *dhamka*) or a Nurse (Skt. *dhātrī*), or Milk (Skt. *kṣīra*) or a Toy-Plough (P. *vamka*)?

by *Stephan Hillyer Levitt*

I

In a recent article Alex Wayman raised the question as to whether in a certain passage found in the *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra*, traditionally attributed in Tibet and China to Asaṅga—the verses of which are comparable to *Suttanipāta* 270-273 and *Samyuttanikāya* I.207-208—the reading of the *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra* as in the Tibetan Buddhist canon (*Tanjur*), Tib. *ma ma* “nurse” (Chinese equivalent in Taishō, “wet nurse”), presumably Skt. *dhatri* “nurse,” was the more original or whether the reading in the Pāli sources, P. *dhamka* “crow,” was the more original.¹ The conclusion drawn was that the Northern Buddhist reading was the more original. The more general conclusion was that here was an example of Northern Buddhist sources clarifying a point regarding the early Buddhist tradition. Of the *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra*'s immediate source for the verses, it was noted that Asaṅga “presumably took the set [of verses] from the Saṃyukta-Āgama in the Sanskrit Buddhist canon.”

I agree with Wayman that a component from the Northern Buddhist tradition should be included with an examination of Pāli materials to place early Buddhism more in focus, but I question whether what he has pointed to here is an example of this. Wayman failed to consider the alternate reading in the Pāli tradition, which is the preferred reading in the 2nd edition of the text of the *Suttanipāta* edited by Andersen and Smith, and he failed to look at a second and earlier reading in the Chinese tradition of the text in question. In the present paper I examine more thoroughly and in detail the tradition of the readings in question and examine more carefully Wayman's

suggestion —which deserves serious consideration, that the original Buddhist reading here should be **uddhānka*, a theoretical form for “lap”, which leads to *dhamka* in the Pāli canon and *dhatri* in the Northern Buddhist canon, intending reference to the *aṅka-dhatri* “a nurse who carries a baby on her lap.” The paper is thus an examination into the textual tradition of this passage. It is hoped that it will clarify the complicated situation regarding the textual tradition of the passage.

It should be added that one of the earlier Chinese translations preserves two lines of verse which appear to have dropped out of the Pāli text of these verses. The Northern Buddhist tradition in this way seems to amplify the Pāli tradition here.

The *Samyuktāgama*, the suggested immediate source of the *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra* for the verses in question, known from fragments and quotations in Sanskrit, from Chinese translations, and translations of individual *sūtras* only in Tibetan, would probably have drawn on the same sources as the Pāli canon, and probably can be dated to some time before the middle of the 2nd c. C.E. Two translations of the *Samyuktāgama* exist in Chinese which in fact include the verses in question. One is a partial translation dating from 350-431 C.E. The other is a full translation dating from 420-479 C.E.

Asaṅga has been dated to the late 3rd c. - mid-4th c. C.E., the 4th c. C.E., the late 4th c. - mid-5th c. C.E., and to the 5th c. C.E. Alex Wayman has accepted a date of 375-430 A.D. for Asaṅga. Against the traditional Tibetan and Chinese ascription of the *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra* to Asaṅga, Hakuju Ui and Giuseppe Tucci have viewed it to be a work of Maitreya, Asaṅga’s alleged teacher, dated by Ui to c. 270-350 C.E. (Asaṅga, c. 310-390 C.E.), by Hariprasad Śāstri to c. 150-265 C.E. More recently, Paul Demiéville has brought into question the historicity of such a personage as Maitreya, and Tucci has bowed to Demiéville’s opinion. (See in this regard G. P. Malalasekera (1966) on Asaṅga.) The earliest Chinese translations of a section of the *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra* were made in 414-421 C.E. and 431 C.E., which indicates that the text was extant by the early part of the 5th c. C.E. The entire *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra*

was translated into Chinese in 646-647 C.E. The Tibetan Buddhist canon (*Kanjur* and *Tanjur*) assumed its present form more or less by the 13th - 14th c. C.E., bringing together translations of Indian Buddhist texts which had been made from Sanskrit since about the 9th c. C.E.

The *Suttanipāta* and the *Samyuttanikāya* are each collections independent of one another in the Pāli tradition. The *Suttanipāta* is in particular noted for the primitive aspects of many of its verses. It has been viewed to be probably the most ancient part of the Pāli *Suttapitaka*. *Suttanipāta* 271 is repeated in *Cullaniddeśa* 420. The verses of *Samyuttanikāya* I.207-208, it can be added, are repeated in *Nettipakarana* 147. There is no collection parallel to the Pāli *Suttanipāta* in the Northern Buddhist tradition, though Anesaki has located over half the *suttas* from this collection in Northern Buddhist texts, and believes there is evidence that the Pāli *Suttanipāta* as such was consulted by the Northern Buddhist tradition. And, A. F. Rudolf Hoernle has drawn attention to a fragmentary Sanskrit version of the *Aṭṭakavagga* of the *Suttanipāta* from eastern Turkestan. According to tradition the Pāli canon, transmitted orally at first, was put in written form in Sri Lanka in the 1st c. C.E. It is the only canon of the various sects which grew up after the Second Council in Vesāli (circa 383 B.C.E.) that has remained preserved complete.

I mention these points so that we can gain clearer focus at the outset on the texts we are dealing with.

II

The variant reading in the Pāli sources for the word in question, which is the *preferred* reading in the Pāli text of the *Suttanipāta* as in the second edition of Dines Andersen and Helmer Smith (1913), accepted in the later printing of the text by Lord Chalmers in the Harvard Oriental Series (1936), is P. *vaṃka*. The 1913 edition of Andersen and Smith is generally accepted as authoritative.

In both V. Fausböll's first edition of the *Suttanipāta* (preface

1885), based only on four manuscripts, and in Buddhaghosa's *Suttanipāta* commentary, *Paramatthajotikā* (II), edited by Helmer Smith (1916-17) and also using four manuscripts, a variant reading, *vaṃka*, is given. The second edition of the *Suttanipāta* by Andersen and Smith adopted this reading, *vaṃka*, as the preferred reading. This second edition was based on eleven manuscripts, including two of Buddhaghosa's *Suttanipāta* commentary. Not all of the manuscripts, though, covered the entire text. At this point in the text use was made by Andersen and Smith of five manuscripts of the *Suttanipāta* and two manuscripts of the *Paramatthajotikā* that is, use was made here fully of seven manuscripts, to which was added also reference to Fausbøll's edition. Lord Chalmers, in the preface to his printing of the text and translation, noted that he had come to the conclusion that "apart from minor matters and a very few real divergences of readings, the text of the Sutta-Nipāta (thanks to this distinguished *paramparā* of Danish scholars) was practically a *textus receptus*."

M. Leon Feer's edition of the *Samyuttanikāya*, which was published early (1884-1904), the volume with the passage in question appearing in 1884, and which was based on only four manuscripts of the text and one of its commentary, does not show this reading. Similarly, the reading does not appear in the manuscripts used for the more recent edition of Buddhaghosa's commentary on the *Samyuttanikāya*, the *Sāratthappakāsini*, edited by Frank L. Woodward (1929-37). This edition uses two Sinhalese manuscripts, Burmese readings in Sinhalese editions, two unfinished Sinhalese editions, and a transcription of a large part of the commentary on the *Sagāthāvagga*, with corrections and variant readings by a Sinhalese scholar. P. V. Bapat's Poona printing of the *Suttanipāta* (1924), which is based in general on adopted readings in Asian and European printings of the text, and which adopts *dhamka* as its reading, will not be considered here. The reason for the adoption of the reading *dhamka* by Smith for his edition of Buddhaghosa's *Suttanipāta* commentary will be discussed below. It should be noted that the reading *vaṃka* is common in the Sinhalese manuscripts of both the *Suttanipāta* and its commentary, and has been recorded to date only in Sinhalese manuscripts. There are two possible reasons, as I see it, why the

reading *vaṃka* does not appear in our editions of the *Samyuttanikāya* and its commentary, but both of these are uncertain until more manuscript work is done on the text of the passage in question. The possibilities will be noted below in their proper context.

A *vaṃka* in the context here is a toy, specifically a toy-plough. While the word for “toy-plough” is listed in T. W. Rhys Davids and William Stede (1921-25) as *vaṃkaka*, the word occurs in several related forms in a listing of toys and amusements, *vaṃka* being a standard one of these forms. For example, *Dīghanikāya* I.6 (*vaṃkaka*), *Dīghanikāya* commentary I.86 (text, *vaṃkaka*; v.l. *vaṃka*), *Vinayapiṭaka* II.10 (text, *vaṃkaka*; v.l. *vaṃgaka*, *vaṃkata*), *Āṅguttaranikāya* V.203 (text, *vaṃka*; v.l. *vaṃkaka*). In the *Dīghanikāya* commentary I.86, Buddhaghosa defines it as “*gāmadārakānaṃ kīlanakakhuddakanamgalam*,” “a small plough (used) for a toy of village youngsters,” and this definition is accepted, for example, by Woodward in his translation of the *Āṅguttaranikāya* ([1936], 41).

Showing the term’s more basic meaning in such an application, Dhammapāla in his *Therīgāthā* commentary 15 uses it in an explanation of *khujja* in *Therīgāthā* 11 to mean “something crooked.” (“*Tiḥi khujjehi muttiyā ti vaṃkakehi parimuttiyā ti attho*.” “The meaning of ‘by 3 *khujja*-s released’ is ‘[from] crooked things set free.’”) From the context here, the 3 *khujja*-s are a quern, a mortar, and the crooked backed lord. But in *Theragāthā* 43 *khujja* is explained to be a sickle, a plough, and a spade. (“*Sumuttiko sumuttiko sāhu sumuttiko mhi tiḥi khujjakehi asitāsu mayā naṅgalāsu mayā khuddakuddālāsu mayā*.” “With gladness set free, gloriously set free with gladness, with gladness I am set free by the three crooked things — that of my sickle, my plough, my trifling spade.”) In both cases the crooked things represent the ills of life. Implied by the use of the expression *khuddakuddāla* is that they are basically trifling and insignificant, perhaps not unlike a *vaṃka* or toy-plough itself.

The term is also used figuratively in reference to crows, with the meaning “crooked, deceitful, dishonest,” in such popular texts as *Jātaka* III.313 (*Vaṭṭakajātaka*), *Jātaka* VI. 524 (*Vessantarajātaka*), and *Petavatthu* IV.1³⁴ (a^o). For instance, in *Vaṭṭakajātaka* we read, “*Niccamaṃ ubbegina kākā vaṃka pāpena kammaṇā, / laddho piṇḍo na*

pīneti, kiso ten' asmi vaṭṭaka." ("Continuously full of anguish because of evil doing, a lump of food obtained does not satisfy deceitful crows. I am lean because of that, O quail.") The commentary notes, "*vaṃka ti kākānam eva nāmaṃ,*" "'Vaṃka' is a name of crows." In *Vessantarajātaka* we read, "*Adassanena mayhaṃ te jinnassa paridevato / bhiiyyo Vaṃka ca palitā bahū hessanti brahmanā ti.*" ("Without seeing the wailing of the infirm, those many brahman teachers would be for me but more grey deceitful ones (i.e., crows)").

It is true that T. W. Rhys Davids and William Stede (1921-25), note that the reading *vaṃka* in Andersen and Smith's edition of the *Suttanipāta* is "probably to be read *dhānka* as SnA 303 [Smith's edition of Buddhaghosa's commentary], =*kāka*." But in context of the usage of the term *vaṃka* as an allusion to crows in Pāli literature—and popular literature at that—the reading *dhamka*, "crow," is a logical, linguistically supportable development from *vaṃka*, "toy-plough." One can posit a logical development here which can explain the two readings in the Pāli sources, "toy-plough" and "crow":

A	→	B	=	B
vaṃka		vaṃka		vaṃka
"toy-plough"	→	"crookedness"	→	"crow"
["something crooked"]		[applied to crows]		
		"'Crooked ones' is a name of crows."		
(D I.6, DA I.86, A V.203,... [Th2A 15/Th1, 43].)				(J III.313 and C., J VI.524, Pv IV.1 ³⁴ (a ^o).

What we have charted here is a process of semantic shift, followed by the substitution of a more common word for a less common synonym. The process of semantic shift can be seen in English, for instance, in the word "bead." This originally meant "prayer." But on account of the use of rosaries it came to refer to a small, round object. Thus, the expression "to count your beads," which originally meant "to count your prayers," on account of the reckoning of prayers by small balls, lost its original sense. Similarly, "boon" originally meant "prayer," but through the use of such phrases

as “ask a boon” and “grant a boon” it came to mean “a favor” or “a good thing received.” With regard to the use of a more common word for a less common word we can look to the usage of such English words as “pens” and “pense,” meaning “thought,” loan-words from the French *penser*, which are now represented only by the English words “pensive” and “pansy,” more common native English usage having taken their place. In this regard, the word “pansy” has taken the place in popular usage for the more native English term “heartsease.”

With regard to the readings *vaṃka* and *dhaṃka* in the *Suttanipāta* the opposite development would not be logical since one would not proceed from a common word for a thing to a rare word for the same thing. From a linguistic standpoint, a popular but infrequent usage might, out of context, readily supplant a usage for something looked down upon, as a toy, and this in turn might easily be replaced by a more common word.

The shift here from *v* to *dh*, is further supported by an orthographic confusion in Brāhmī script which has been recorded by K. R. Norman in the notes to his translations of the *Thera-* and *Therī-gāthā* and the *Suttanipāta*. While the orthographic alternation seems to be recorded as going both ways, it is recorded as usually going from *v* to *dh*. Among the cases reported in the *Suttanipāta*, in all but one case outside the present one it is recorded as going from *v* to *dh*. (K. R. Norman, it should be said, accepts at this point the reading *dhaṃka* as had T. W. Rhys Davids and William Stede (1921-25) noted above, seemingly on the basis of the easiest reading in accordance with the commentary.)²

Further, the reading *vaṃka*, “toy-plough,” makes perfectly good sense here, while the reading “crow,” as Alex Wayman clearly notes, presents difficulties and simply does not work well: “Arising from where, thoughts set loose (release) the mind as children set loose (release) a toy-plough” (Sn 270; Answer in Sn 271 — “Arising from this existence, thoughts...”).

Firstly, we have here a dynamic image which, makes reference to something that sows seeds, a plough, albeit a toy-plough. Compare in this regard *Samyuttanikāya* I.172, where it is said that the

Buddha is a farmer, or *Petavatthu* II.968 where a munificent person is likened to a farmer. In the same vein, *Aṅguttaranikāya* I.239 states that a farmer makes a field into good firewood. *Dīghanikāya* II.353 states that a farmer, having taken a plough with seed, ought enter a forest. And *Majjhimanikāya* I.127 states that man makes the great earth into what is not earth. *Samyuttanikāya* I.21 and *Jātaka* III.472 both make reference to sown seeds as in a good field. And *Samyuttanikāya* V.379 and 380 compare unbroken seeds to a good field and broken seeds to a bad field. The list is long.

Secondly, the image here, compares two things looked down upon in the tradition — 1) a *vaṃka*, an amusement (see, for example, *Dīghanikāya* I.6; or *Aṅguttaranikāya* V. 203, where playing with a toy-plough is one step beyond playing with one's own excrement); and 2) *vitakka*, defined by Buddhaghosa in this context in his *Samyuttanikāya* commentary as “*pāpavitakka*,” “sinful thought,” and in his *Suttanipāta* commentary as “*nava kāmavitakkādaya*,” “the nine beginning with sensual thought” (acc. to *Cullaniddesa* 269 — *kāmavitakka* “sensual thought,” *vyāpādavitakka* “cruel thought,” *vihiṃsāvitaṅka*, “malign thought,” *nātivitaṅka* “thought of family,” *janapadavitakka*, “thought of country,” *amarāvitaṅka*, “thought of immortality,” *par' anuddayatāpatisamyuttavitakka*, “thought in sympathy with those bound to a master,” *lābhasakkārasilokapatisamyuttavitakka*, “thought bound to gain, honor, and fame,” and *anavaññattipatisamyuttavitakka*, “thought bound to pride”).³

The image of a *vaṃka* or “toy-plough” here, allows as an interpretation that just as a child sets aside his toy-plough as he becomes a bit more mature, and goes on to become prey to sensual desires (*Aṅguttaranikāya* V.203-204), so the setting aside of sensual desires and other impure thoughts for more mature ones, such as *buddhavitakka*, *dhammavitakka*, *saṅghavitakka*, etc., can remove the mind from its involvement with the world and lead to the cessation of rebirth. All is in the seeds sown. Such a dual interpretation of the image is in accord with the succeeding two verses, as in the Pāli order of the verses, which expand on each point in turn.

Certainly, one is on firmer ground in taking the allusion to refer to an amusement mentioned not uncommonly in early Pāli

sources, rather than as an amusement not mentioned in Pāli literature until Buddhaghosa. Also, the usage of the word *vaṃka* here is consonant with the context in which it is mentioned in *Anguttaranikāya* V. 203-204 and other sources. And, its usage allows us to understand *vitakka* as sinful on one hand, and as meritorious on the other, which is to say that the verses have a positive didactic value as their context would lead us to suspect, whereas reference to a crow here does not allow this. We cannot have in the Indian context a noble crow. Herein, no doubt, lies Buddhaghosa's emphasis on sinful thought in this context. Further, reference here to a crow runs counter to the compassionate spirit of Buddhism in any period of its history, since such a reference, as understood by Buddhaghosa, involves an amusement in cruelty to creatures, which is against the precept of *ahiṃsā* or non-injury. Can we expect such a reference to be placed on the lips of the Buddha in a very early Buddhist verse, or for such a noble and holy personage as the Buddha to utter such a reference?

The real difficulty here has come from an over-reliance by translators on the reference to a crow introduced by Buddhaghosa in his explanations of the passage in his two commentaries. All translations to date, even when the reading *vaṃka* is accepted by the translator, translate here, "crow," and it is clear from Buddhaghosa's statements here that he most certainly understood "crow." It is simply not clear, however, whether it is the image introduced by Buddhaghosa which led to the reading *dhaṃka*, or whether by Buddhaghosa's time the tradition already had understood *vaṃka* to mean "crow" as in the *Jātaka* usages, and had effected a change in the reading to *dhaṃka*. In other words, it is not clear whether Buddhaghosa read *vaṃka* and understood *kāka* "crow," or read *dhaṃka*.

It must also be added that, since the image is first uttered by a *yakkha*, understood in the Buddhist context to be a demon, it is conceivable that we have in the word *vaṃka* in Sn 270 and 271 an instance of the common Indian predilection for punning. In the mouth of the *Yakkha* the reference is to *vaṃka*, "deceitful one, i.e. crow," whereas when spoken by the Buddha the image is reversed, referring wittily to *vaṃka* "toy-plough." Certainly, there is a *a priori* reason for arguing this, since if I can see the wit here, certainly the Buddha, or

the author of his words here, both of whom most certainly had more wit than I, and a greater familiarity with Pāli or any allied language than I, must have seen it. Further, the verses are filled with wit in that they contain images which can be taken, depending on one's understanding, to lead either to further involvement with sensual desires, etc., or to enlightenment. And, we have the testimony of Buddhaghosa's understanding of the image in question. I have two main difficulties with the image of a crow here: firstly, the lack of testimony to such an amusement prior to Buddhaghosa (though he perhaps can be considered to present an old interpretation); secondly, *vaṃka* as a toy-plough seems to be an older usage from a linguistic standpoint than *vaṃka* as a word for "crow," (though the usage of *vaṃka* meaning "crow" seems to be a popular usage and may perhaps be considered old on this account).

Since the three Sinhalese manuscripts of Buddhaghosa's commentary on the *Suttanipāta* which were used by Smith in his edition are unanimous in reading *vaṃka*, while the single Burmese manuscript used reads *dhaṃka*, we perhaps should adopt this reading simply because it is the less obvious. Smith's adoption of *dhaṃka* in this context would appear to have been because it is the more obvious and easier reading, since what follows refers to a children's game with crows. On the other hand, we may have in *vaṃka* in the Sinhalese manuscripts of Buddhaghosa's commentary a hyper-correct reading. The resolution to the situation must await additional manuscript work with the *Samyuttanikāya* and its commentary. Certainly, we must assume that such a Sinhalese reading as *vaṃka* in *Suttanipāta* manuscripts would not have been unknown to Buddhaghosa, since he spent a number of years studying Pāli texts in Sri Lanka.

With regard to the reading *vaṃka* in general, we must recall that Pāli manuscripts in Southeast Asia in the main are based on those from the Mon kingdom of Dvaravati, whose Theravāda tradition would seem, on the basis of archeological evidence, to have come from Amaravati in South India. While there may have been some contact with Sri Lanka during this period, there is no *clear* indication of major contact with Sri Lanka until the 11th - 12th c. C.E. It is not

unlikely, therefore, that the readings in Pāli manuscripts in Sri Lanka, which according to the *Mahāvamsa*, preserved an archaic Buddhism going back to the mission of Mahinda during the reign of Aśoka in the 3rd c. B.C.E. (though there may have been even earlier Buddhist contact), might reflect archaic readings not incorporated in Burma and elsewhere in Southeast Asia — especially if these readings are not supported by Buddhaghosa, whom Burmese tradition regards as one of its own. It can be emphasized that Sinhalese manuscripts today preserve many old traditions. There are, for example, three Sinhalese manuscripts of a pre-canonical version of a section of the *Apadāna* which treats the former human births of the Buddha.

It is altogether conceivable that *Suttanipāta* manuscripts might reflect an older Sinhalese tradition on the point in question, or perhaps simply an older tradition in general, while *Samyuttanikāya* manuscripts might not. It should be kept in mind that the *Suttanipāta* is generally judged to be older than the *Samyuttanikāya*. On this account, its textual tradition might preserve an older reading not found in the *Samyuttanikāya* tradition, regardless of the Sinhalese factor which appears to be present here.

III

It might be worthwhile to note here Buddhaghosa's statements.

Suttanipāta commentary —

kuto samuṭṭhāya ti kuto uppajjitvā; *mano* ti kusalacittaṃ; *vitakkā* ti Abhayasutte (v.l. B^a Uragasutte) vuttā nava kāmavitakkādayo; *kumārakā dhamkam* (v.l. S^{kg}ⁿ *vaṃkam*) *iv' ossajanti* ti yathā gāmadārakā kilantā kākam suttena pāde bandhitvā ossajanti khipanti, evaṃ kusalamanam akusalavitakkā kuto samuṭṭhāya ossajanti ti pucchati.

“*Kuto samuṭṭhāya*” means “having arisen from where?” “*Mano*” means “pure state of mind (heart).” “*Vitakka*” is called in the *Abhayasutta* (v.l. *Uragasutta*) “the nine beginning with sensu-

ous thought.” “*Kumārakā dhaṃkam iv’ ossajanti*” means “as village youngsters playing, having bound a crow with a string to the foot let (him) loose (*ossajanti*) and throw him forth so, having arisen from somewhere, impure thoughts dismiss (*ossajanti*) pure thought, thus it is questioned.”

Samyuttanikāya commentary —

Kuto nidāna ti, kinnidānā, kiṃ paccayā? ti attho. *Kumārakā dhaṃkam* ⁴ *iv’ ossajanti* ti, yathā kumārakā kākaṃ gahetvā *ossajanti* khipanti, evaṃ pāpavitakkā kuto samuṭṭhaya cittam *ossajanti?* ti pucchati....*Ito samuṭṭhāya manovitakko* (so in text) ti, yathā dīghasuttakena pāde baddhaṃ kākaṃ kumārakā tassa suttapariyantaṃ aṅguliyaṃ veṭhetvā *ossajanti*, so dūraṃ gantvā pi puna tesam pādamūle yeva patati, evam evaṃ ito attabhāvato samuṭṭhāya pāpavitakkā cittaṃ *ossajanti*.

“*Kuto nidāna*,” “what is it tied to,” “what does it rest on,” this is the meaning. “*Kumārakā dhaṃkam iv’ ossajanti*” means, “as children, having seized a crow let (him) loose and throw (him) forth, so having arisen from where sinful thoughts let loose (*ossajanti*) the heart, thus it is questioned.”...“*Ito samuṭṭhāya manovitakko*” means “as children let loose (*ossajanti*) a bound crow with a long string to the foot, having twisted around a toe of it the end of a string, and having gone a distance, just so again it falls to their foot, just so having arisen from one’s own nature from this existence sinful thoughts let loose (*ossajanti*) the heart.”

Buddhaghosa never uses another verb form to define *ossajanti*, and there is no indication that he means by it anything other than the standard meanings for the word which would indicate “let loose, release, dismiss.” The translations of the verses in question are for the most part poetic, and the translators at this point with regard to the verb *ossajanti* are for the most part far from literal. Instead, they are trying to indicate in few words the image presented by Buddhaghosa. The translations here are interpretive. Wilhelm Geiger notes at this

point in his translation (1925-30; vol. 1, 1930, p. 325) that, “Das Original ist dunkel, die Ausdrucksweise äusserst knapp,” but it is not that the words themselves, and the verb in particular, presented trouble, but that the idea spelled out by Buddhaghosa is not spelled out in the text. Thus Geiger, whose rendering here is perhaps the most literal, although not quite literal, translates (*Samyuttanikāya* I.207, equivalent to *Suttanipāta* 270):

Woher sind die Herzensgedanken⁵ aufgetaucht,
(Die da sind), wie (wenn) Knaben eine Kröhe *freilassen* [italics mine]?

Following Geiger closely on this point is Karl Seidenstücker (1931). In a footnote, Seidenstücker quotes from Buddhaghosa’s commentary. Interestingly, he makes reference to the reading *vaṃka*, which he construes as amounting to the same thing as *dhaṃka*. Seidenstücker translates (*Suttanipāta* 270):

Woher erheben sich die Regungen des Denkens, wie Kinder eine Krähe fliegen lassen?

Also somewhat literal in this regard, but clearly based on Buddhaghosa’s commentary and particularly on Buddhaghosa’s usage of the verb *kipanti*, is the recent translation of K. R. Norman (1984-92) (*Suttanipāta* 270):

Whence arising do thoughts toss up the mind, as young boys toss up a (captive) crow.

It might be noted that K. R. Norman’s translation in part seems to be in reaction to Alex Wayman’s emphasis on Mrs. Rhys Davids’ translation; this will be addressed below.

Against these translations, we have the translation of M. Coomāra Swāmy (1874) (*Suttanipāta* 270):

Whence emanating, do thoughts harass the mind, as boys drive

a crow (here and there)?

V. Fausbøll (1881) translated (*Suttanipāta* 270, numbered 273 in translation):

Whence arising do doubts vex the mind, as boys vex a crow?

Lord Chalmers (1932) translated (*Suttanipāta* 270):

Whence thoughts which plague the mind
as boys a captive crow?

Most recently, H. Saddatissa (1985) translated (*Suttanipāta* 270):

From where do evil speculations arise and harass the mind as
do boys a crow?

And, consonant with these translations, yet set off from them, we have Mrs. Rhys Davids' translation (1917?-30; pt. 1, [1917]) (*Samyuttanikāya* I.207, equivalent to *Suttanipāta* 270):

And whence spring thoughts into our minds down sinking,
Like [tethered] crow pulled by boy-captors earthward?

Mrs. Rhys Davids' translation appears to have been influenced greatly by the comment of M. Coomāra Swāmy to his 1874 translation (n. 2, p. 155): "This freak of Hindu boys may even now be witnessed in India. Having captured a crow, and attached a cord to one of its legs, they let him fly here and there, with the sole object of pulling him in repeatedly. Even thus childish thoughts harass one's mind." This is clearly different from the description of Buddhaghosa in which, it would seem, it is the string breaking the crow's flight which causes it to fall. Mrs. Rhys Davids' phrase, "minds down sinking," may perhaps reflect an extension of Buddhaghosa's usage of the verb *patati* here, but with a transference of image, together with Coomāra Swāmy's notice to childish thoughts harassing our minds.

In accord with Mrs. Rhys Davids' translation, and also following M. Coomāra Swāmy's comment, Karl Eugen Neumann (1905; 2nd ed., 1924) earlier had translated (*Suttanipāta* 270):

Woher erheben geistig sich Gedanken,
Wie Kinder nach dem Vogel hinzugaschen?

Lord Chalmers' image of a "captive crow" in his 1932 translation, followed by K. R. Norman, relies on Mrs. Rhys Davids' translation and ultimately on Buddhaghosa's image. And E. M. Hare ([1944]), relying on Mrs. Rhys Davids' interpretation as well, translated (*Suttanipāta* 270):

Whence risen mind-perplexities
Drag down as boys will drag a crow?

It is not that we have a problem with the translation of *ossajanti* here, but rather that we have an *omission* of its translation and a substitution of such English words as "harass," "drive," "vex," "plague," "pull," "drag," and the German "hinzugaschen," in an act of poetic license.

IV

I give here a literal translation of the verses complete, utilizing the reading *vaṃka*:

"Passion and anger have their basis wherefrom?
Aversion, attachment, horripilation [from aversion or attachment] are born wherefrom?
Having risen from where, thoughts set loose the mind
As children [set loose] a toy-plough⁶?"

"Passion and anger have their basis from here.
Aversion, attachment, horripilation [from aversion or attach-

ment] are born from here.

Having risen from here, thoughts set loose the mind
As children [set loose] a toy-plough.”

“Things sprung from desire (punningly, sap) are come into
existence from oneself as if born from the trunk of a
Banyan,

Each clinging to (or, hanging on to) objects of desire, as a
stretched out creeper in a wood or, jungle, as the case
may be.⁷

“From whence the basis the ones who know,
Each dispels.⁸ Hear, O *yakkha* (a being bound by passion and
anger, which on this account exercises control over
them in others, which is to say, has the power to create
aversion and attachment).⁹

They cross this hard to cross flood
Not crossed before, for no renewed existence.”

V

The reading for *vaṃka*, or *dhaṃka*, in the Tibetan *Tanjur* is Tib. *ma ma* “nurse,” and this word is listed in Sarat Chandra Das’ Tibetan-English dictionary with reference to four different types of nurses for which Das has provided Sanskrit equivalents. On one of these forms, *āṅkadhātrī*, Wayman bases his argument that the Pāli original form from which *dhaṃka* developed was **uddhāṅka*, theoretical form for “lap,” which the Sanskrit Buddhist canon is supposed to have replaced with a word for “nurse,” intending reference to the *āṅkadhātrī*. The Chinese equivalent in Taisho at this point is “wet nurse.”

Wayman notes that these verses in the *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra* are probably taken from the *Samyuktāgama* of the Sanskrit Buddhist canon. They are not contained in the Tibetan *Kanjur*, though. They do, however, occur four times in the Chinese Buddhist canon, twice in Nanjio 544 translated by Guṇabhadra, dated 420-479 C.E., Taishō

vol. 2 (Agon Bu 2), pp. 361ab (No. 99(1314)) and 363b-364a (No. 99(1324)); and twice in Nanjio 546, an anonymous partial translation dated 350-431 C.E., Taisho vol. 2 (Agon Bu 2), pp. 479bc (No. 100(313)) and 481c-482a (No. 100(323)). In the later Chinese translation (No. 99), the reading in both places is that the child relies on a "wet nurse," as the text reads also in the Chinese translation of the *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra*. But in the earlier translation, the text of No. 100(313) reads that the child grasps, or seizes the "mother's milk," the verb being different and the two characters used later for "wet nurse" being here in the opposite order; and in No. 100(323) the text reads that the child grasps, or seizes the "milk," no character for "mother" being used here. There is, in short, not just one Northern Buddhist reading. There is the reading "nurse" in the Tibetan version of Asaṅga's text, the reading "wet nurse" (literally, "milk mother") in the Chinese version of Asaṅga's text and in both versions of the text in the later complete Chinese translation of the *Samyuktāgama*, and the readings "mother's milk" and "milk" in the two versions of the text in the earlier incomplete Chinese translation of the *Samyuktāgama*. The verb in the earlier translation of the *Samyuktāgama* is "seize, or grasp", not "rely on" as in the later translation and the translation of Asaṅga's text.

There are two other differences found in Chinese texts of the verses as in the *Samyuktāgama* which are significant. Firstly, the *Yogācārabhūmiśāstra* reverses the order of *Suttanipāta* 271 and 272. However, in all the Chinese translations of these verses in the *Samyuktāgama*, *Suttanipāta* 271 is simply dropped. It would seem that in the text given by Asaṅga, verse 271 was *reinserted*. This presents the very strong possibility that it was reinserted in a different position than its original position. Secondly, the translation of the verses in No. 100(313) appears to contain two extra lines of verse for *Suttanipāta* 272 between the first and second lines of verse. Since *Suttanipāta* 272 contains two fewer lines of verse than do *Suttanipāta* 270, 271, and 273, it is entirely possible that we have preserved here two lines of verse which dropped out in the Pāli version and most Northern Buddhist presentations of these verses. Wayman argues that the Northern Buddhist reading "nurse" in these verses clarifies

a point regarding early Buddhism, an argument this writer questions. But here, on the other hand, the reading of these two lines of verse may well amplify and make a correction to the tradition of early Buddhism against that preserved in the Pāli canon.¹⁰

But let us return to the list of nurses. What is the source for this?

The list occurs toward the very beginning in the 'dul-ba section of the *Kaṅjur*, which is to say the section on *vinaya*. The Sanskrit equivalents as given by Das would be based on a listing in the Sanskrit-Chinese dictionary *Mahāvvyutpatti*, entries no. 9478-9481 as in Sakaki's edition (Kyoto, 1916), nos. 283.1-4 in Wogihara's 1959 edition and in the 1910-11 2nd ed. of Minaev's edition in *Bibliotheca Buddhica*, provided with an index and prepared for press by Mironov.

These terms, with only two exceptions, occur only in Buddhist Sanskrit literature: in the *Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya* (which would no doubt be the source of the *Kaṅjur* list), in the *Avadānaśataka* (2nd c. C.E.) T. Thich draws on the (itself perhaps not completed before the 3rd c. C.E.), and in the *Divyāvadāna* (4th c. C.E., with some passages prior to the 3rd c. C.E.), which draws on the *Avadānaśataka* and the *Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya*. I must add that while in general the *Avadānaśataka* is seen to draw on the *Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya*, and the *Divyāvadāna* is seen to draw on the *Avadānaśataka* and the *Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya*, considering the dates involved, it may well be that the *Avadānaśataka* and *Divyāvadāna* are simply drawing on the same tradition as or a parallel tradition to the *Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya*. The forms occur in Buddhist Sanskrit literature only in a cliché list (see Edgerton [1953], 200a).

Further, the form in currency in the literature for the *āṅkadhātrī* the specific nurse on which Wayman focuses, is *aṃśadhātrī* also written *aṃśadhātrī* and in manuscripts *atsadhātrī* not *āṅkadhātrī* itself. *Āṅkadhātrī* occurs in its stead in Buddhist literature only in the *Mahāvvyutpatti* and in an aberrant listing in *Divyāvadāna* 475.12-18, which contrasts with the six other listings in *Divyāvadāna*, as also with the listings elsewhere in the literature (Edgerton [1953] cites two instances in the *Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya* and four instances in the

Avadānaśataka, and indicates that there are other instances as well), in substituting as well *stanyadhātrī* (1. 16; 1. 13 *stanadhātrī* is printed) for *kṣiradhātrī*, in substituting *kriḍāpanikādhātrī* (1. 13 *kriḍāpanikā*) for *kriḍānikā* (*onakā*), with or without *dhātrī* following, and in providing only one of each sort of nurse instead of two as elsewhere. The aberrancies of *Divyāvadāna* 475.12-18 can be attributed to the list's providing descriptions of each type of nurse and using in the name of the nurse the word used in the description. For instance, *kṣiadhātrī*, "a nurse for milk," is described as "yā dāraḥ stanyaṃ pāyayati," "she who has an infant drink the milk of her breast," and so in this passage she is called the *stanyadhātrī*. Just so, the *aṃsadhātrī* (*aṃśa*^o) is described, with less ambiguity than the terms *aṃsa* or *aṃśa* in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit allow, as "yā dāraḥ aṅkena parikarṣayaty aṅgapratyaṅgāni ca saṃsthāpayati," "she who carries by the side an infant and places the limbs and minor limbs," and she is called the *aṅkadhātrī*.

With regard to the forms *aṃsadhātrī* (*aṃśa*^o) and *aṅkadhātrī*, Edgerton's mind on this matter was divided. While he notes that *aṅkadhātrī* "a nurse who carries a baby on her hip" would seem to be the original form "since in India babies are carried on the hip" (p. 5b), he also notes that this is not supported by *Mūlasarvāstivādinaya* 3.134.12, which reads "*dhātryaṃsagato niṣaṅḡo*" (p. 1a), and that in any event it is *aṃsadhātrī* and *aṃśadhātrī* for which currency is supported. Edgerton's judgment on the seeming primacy of *aṅkadhātrī*, though, is no doubt due to his interpretation of the term *aṃsadhātrī* as meaning "shoulder nurse," instead of viewing this form to be a Prakritization of the equally common *aṃśadhātrī*. This would be a "nurse who carries a baby on her side," a "nurse for the side." (See T. W. Rhys Davids and William Stede [1921-25], p. 1a under *aṃsa*, "(b) a part (lit. side)" and such usages as given s.v. as *ekena aṃsena* ... *ekena aṃsena*.) Thus, it would be, as indicated above, synonymous with *aṅkadhātrī* of *Divyāvadāna* 475.12-18 since, strictly, *aṅka* refers to "the curve in the human, especially the female, figure above the hip (where infants sitting astride are carried by their mothers, hence often = 'breast' or 'lap')," though such a curve is a curve of the *side*, or to "the side or flank" (Monier-Williams [1899], 7a). Strictly, in

English usage, the lap is the front side of the lower trunk and the thighs of a *seated* person. A standing person has no lap (see the *Oxford English Dictionary* 6.64, usage 5). “Lap,” strictly, is not intended here.¹¹ The form on which Wayman is focusing his argument for his reinterpretation of the reading *dhamka*, *anikadhātrī*, never had early currency in India. In short, its first occurrence, and only citable occurrence in Buddhist literature proper, can be explained on the basis of its context in the passage in question in the 4th. c. C.E. *Divyāvadāna*.

It can be seen from context, and as Edgerton notes, that these types of nurses are the kinds regularly provided for princes and rich men’s sons, two of each kind being provided. The reading *vaṃka*, though, refers to what Buddhaghosa in his *Dīghanikāya* commentary defines as a “plaything of village children,” and the reading *dhamka* is taken by Buddhaghosa in his *Suttanipāta* commentary to refer here to “village children playing”—and the text itself in its simple usage of *kumāraka* gives no indication that we have here a reference to princes and the sons of rich men only. Indeed, the image would lose force if this were the case. It must also be remembered that it is later Buddhism in India which came to be associated especially with the wealthy. Such a reference might well be incongruent in earlier Buddhist material, in which this association did not obtain.

Perhaps more important, the word *kumāraka* used in the verses does not refer to infants, who would use the services of these nurses, but to young children, especially young boys. For instance, *Aṅguttaranikāya* V.203-4 refers to a *dahara kumāra* who, when he has grown older is referred to as *kumāra*, and when still older and his sense faculties have come into play is referred, to as *kumāra*. In Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit, *Divyāvadāna* 475.12-18 refers to such infants as *dāraka*. To be sure, the usage and import of usage of such terms in the different languages concerned has not been studied fully, but it appears that *kumāraka* in normal usage refers to children beyond the tenderest of ages.

There are only two other mentions of these types of mentioned in Buddhist Sanskrit literature which I have been able to find.

One is in the instance of the *kriḍanikā* (*°nakā*) *dhatri* or just

krīḍanikā, “a nurse who plays with an infant,” a comparable nurse to which, the *kīḷaṇadhāī*, is mentioned in the sixth *aṅga* of the Śvetāmbara Jain *Siddhānta*, *Nāyādharmakahāsutta* 1.1. The language here, as of the entire Jain *Siddhānta*, is Ardha-Māgadhī. According to Jain tradition, the authority of their *Siddhānta* does not reach back before the 5th c. C.E. (though it seems certain that much of it is older, and that at least parts of it may go back as far as the earliest disciples of Mahāvīra, or at latest to the 2nd c. after Mahāvīra’s death probably in 468 B.C.E.).

The other reference is in fact to the *aṅkadhātrī* as such in *Abhayadevasūri’s Jñātādharmakathāvṛtti*, Abhayadevasūri’s Sanskrit commentary on the sixth *aṅga* of the Śvetāmbara Jain *Siddhānta*. This reference no doubt rests ultimately on the aberrant listing in *Divyāvadāna* 475.12-18, but speaks to a late currency for this form which might explain its usage in the *Mahāvvyutpatti*.¹²

There are no references to any such nurses in Sanskrit literature proper, or in Pāli literature.

While we do appear to have an instance or instances of the single usage of the name of one of these nurses in Jain tradition, as opposed to Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit tradition, shouldn’t we however on the basis of the translations in the Chinese Buddhist canon expect such a reference—if it were to occur in Buddhist tradition—to be the *ksīradhatrī* (*Divyāvadāna* 475.12-18, *stanyadhātrī*)? Of possible note in this regard is that the term *dhātrī* alone also occurs in the *Mahāvvyutpatti* at a different location in a list headed by words for “father” and “mother,” preceded by word for “mother,” and followed by words for a “pregnant woman” and for a “woman who has reached puberty.” It would seem that “wet nurse” is the intended purport for *dhātrī* alone.

Leaving aside specific points regarding the usage of this list of nurses, in interpreting very early Pāli verses such as those here, ought one not rely primarily on the Pāli tradition, and only secondarily and when there is support for this from within the Pāli tradition, on other Indic traditions? Can one read into this material part of a later Buddhist Sanskrit tradition without internal justification for it in the Pāli material itself?

It is not clear whether we have in the terms for these nurses a late tradition of the early centuries C.E., or an earlier tradition which does not surface in the literature until the early centuries C.E. The existence of a comparable form for one of these terms in Ardha-Māgadhī, and the form *aṃsadhātri* standing beside *aṃśadhātri*, suggest a tradition with a Prakritic basis — a tradition with its basis in the popular traditions of the Prakrit-speaking segment of Indian society. The tradition, further, is a tradition of the wealthy, who as time passed became more and more associated with Buddhism in India. The tradition is not mentioned in standard Sanskrit literature, is only hinted at, perhaps, in standard Prakrit material, and is not mentioned in the Pāli tradition. This point has been alluded to before, but it is worth repeating. Can we expect such a tradition of the privileged few to appear in early Buddhist literature which was directed toward a general audience? On what basis can it be read into early Buddhist material?

If I might follow another historical line of argument for a moment, so as to put more flesh on the bones, it is to be considered in this regard that of the list of toys given in *Aṅguttaranikāya* V.203, only one finds mention either in Sanskrit literature or in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit literature. *Vaṃka*, for instance occurs in the *Mahāvvyūtpatti* as meaning “crooked” only. The Sanskritic tradition looks down, on toys and playthings. This is because the brahman purveyors of the Sanskritic tradition did not see such pastimes to be conducive to spiritual progress. Even in the Pāli tradition, which mentions toys and playthings more openly, they are mentioned with scorn. For instance, as noted, in *Aṅguttaranikāya* V. 203 playing with a *vaṃka* or other toys is one step beyond playing with one’s own excrement. If the Theravāda tradition of the early centuries C.E. and earlier was feeling pressure to omit such references, can we not expect that a stray reference such as that here might not be explained away or altered? While conjecture, this may in part explain the variation between *vaṃka* and *dhaṃka* in our *Suttanipāta* manuscripts. Certainly in this context we would not expect such a reference to a *vaṃka* in this text to be preserved in the Sanskrit Buddhist canon. This is not to say that there are not occasional references to toys in



Mahāyāna literature of the early centuries C.E. See, for instance, the reference to *vaṃśaghaṭikā*, a bamboo stick as a kind of toy, in *Divyāvadāna* 475.19, which may or may not reflect the game of *vaṃsa* mentioned in *Dīghanikāya* I.6. Given Buddhaghosa's understanding of the reference to "crow" here, it is further understandable that this would not fit well in a tradition, such as the Mahāyāna, which emphasizes *bodhisattvas* and compassion toward fellow creatures. In such sources, is it not therefore likely that a reference to cruelty toward crows might in its turn be altered?

It should be emphasized, though, that Wayman's logic, modified, works well with regard to a development Skt. *kṣīra* or Skt. *stanya* > Skt. *dhātri* on the mediating basis of the form Skt. *kṣīradhātri* or Skt. *stanyadhātri*. The impetus for such a change would have come from the development in India of ideas regarding the innate purity of children, which we can see for instance in the development of adoration for Kṛṣṇa as a baby. Allusion to a child setting free, which is to say initially grasping, the mother's milk does not fit well with this.

The initial Northern Buddhist reading of "grasp" for the verb here is probably in accord with the Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit interpretation of *ossajati* as *apotsrjati* (*apa-ut-√srj*) in *Divyāvadāna* 203. While in *Divyāvadāna* 203 this form carries the same force as *avasrjati*, *apa-* as a prefix can be constructed sometimes to change the direction of action of a verb (as it does for instance in the case of *√srj*), and before nouns it is sometimes equivalent to the negative prefix. See Monier-Williams (1899). It is not at all inconceivable that Northern Buddhist writers here might have construed *apa-ut-√srj* as the opposite of *ut-√srj* or *ava-√srj* "let loose," i.e., as "seize, grasp." This would be in accord with the data we have for this passage.

We seem in the Northern Buddhist tradition to be left with substitution pure and simple. P. *vaṃka* → P. *dhamaṃka* in Pāli tradition. But both are found to be unacceptable in the Buddhist Sanskrit tradition, perhaps in part in conjunction with a Buddhist Sanskrit interpretation of *ossajati* as *apotsrjati*, and so Skt. *kṣīra* or Skt. *stanya* is substituted, this leading perhaps to a late reading Skt. *dhātri* on the basis of Skt. *ksīra* or Skt. *stanya* suggesting Skt. *ksīradhātri* or

stanyadhātri (using Wayman's line of reasoning) when this reading, itself is found to be unacceptable.

In other words, we may indeed have substitution pure and simple on account of the Buddhist Sanskrit interpretation of the verb and on account of philosophical difficulties, be they from reference here to a children's toy, traditionally looked down on in Indic and particularly in Sanskrit thought; or from comparing thoughts to something innately "crooked" as a crow; or from a reference here to what was understood to be a children's game which had as its nature an element of cruelty toward life on the part of children. This leads to a reading Skt. *ksīra* or Skt. *stanya*, which is not inconsistent with the image in *Suttanipāta* 272. This is followed, on account of a comparatively late idea regarding human development, by a second substitution of Skt. *dhātri*, perhaps in accord with a line of reasoning outlined by Wayman, but utilizing the form *ksīradhātri* or *stanyadhātri* as the mediating form between the two readings. The dating with regard to this latter change, even using the late form *stanyadhātri*, would be feasible. We must remember, though, that Skt. *dhātri* alone as listed in *Mahāvvyutpatti* 188.49 (Minaev's 2nd ed.; Sakaki's ed., entry no. 3926) seems to carry the purport "wet nurse." It is conceivable that the listing of four different types of nurses for wealthy infants could have been bypassed completely.

This may not be the whole story, though. Hand-in-hand with the above, it may be that the Pāli reading *dhāṃkaṃ*—as it appears in its accusative singular form in the verses in question—was consulted and construed to read P. *dhātri*, "nurse," as well, on the basis of orthographic confusion. While the period from which we first have evidence of the reading Skt. *dhātri* is before the development of *Nāgarī* script, there is a linear development for northern Indian scripts. Certain orthographic practices and confusions in *Nāgarī* scripts no doubt predate *Nāgarī*. From the vantage point of *Nāgarī* scripts, the vowel "-a" is sometimes indicated by a hook above the line. This is sometimes confused as an *anusvāvara*. This can be seen, for example, in the manuscripts of Virādevaganin's *Mahīpālacarita*, on which I worked with Dr. W. Norman Brown. Similarly, *anusvāra* is sometimes indicated in a comparable fashion—this can be seen in

some of the manuscripts in the University of Pennsylvania Library's collection. There is also the possibility here for a confusion between it and the ligature used for “-ī”. Such confusion is in evidence, for example, in readings for the *Pāṭiyagrāmanirṇaya*, the text I edited for my doctoral dissertation. The confusion of “-k-” for “-t-” would be part and parcel of the confusion of “-kaṃ” for “-ti”, and would rest on the way in which “-k-” is drawn. It is entirely conceivable that hand-in-hand with the historically demonstrable substitution of Skt. *dhātri* for Skt. *ksira* or *stanya*, which can be seen in the Chinese translations of the *Samyuktāgam*, there was a consultation of Pāli texts which read P. *hdaṃkaṃ*, or other texts which read *dhaṃkaṃ*, and that this was construed in such fashion as to reinforce interpretation of the reading here as Skt. *dhātri* on the basis of a Pāli form *dhāti*. Certainly, the reinsertion of *Suttanipāta* 271 in Asaṅga's text, which is otherwise dropped in Northern Buddhist versions of the verses, suggests possible consultation of Pāli texts. Of note, of course, is that Anesaki has suggested that the Pāli canon may have been consulted by the Northern Buddhist tradition. An such a consultation of a Pāli reading may help explain in part why we seem to have used as a mediating form in the Northern Buddhist tradition a form which otherwise occurs in Northern Buddhist tradition only in listings with its related forms. Reliance on the form is being suggested in part through consultation of a tradition outside the Northern Buddhist tradition itself.

VI

The point of the argument in the recent article under discussion is that we have in the instance discussed an example in which Northern Buddhist sources throw light on Pāli materials. While this is sometimes the case, and while certainly Northern Buddhist materials must be considered in the study of early Buddhism, the situation with regard to the reading here is not an instance of such a case. The problematic reading; *dhaṃka* “crow” can be explained perfectly well from within Pāli materials themselves, and

an earlier reading *vaṃka* “toy-plough” can be seen. And just as Pāli tradition here preserves two readings, so also does Northern Buddhist tradition, *kṣīra* or *stanya* “milk,” and *dhātri* “nurse,” which appear to be later. In fact, as just noticed, the Pāli material here may help in part explain the second of these Northern Buddhist readings. We do, however, have an instance in which the Northern Buddhist tradition appears to throw light on the Pāli tradition in the preservation of the two lines of verse which may have dropped out of *Suttanipāta* 272 in one of the Chinese translations of these verses, that at Taishō vol. 2 (Agon Bu 2), p. 479bc (No. 100(313)). All of this gives us a very full idea of the development within the Buddhist tradition of the passage in question, with its various readings.

NOTES

1. See Alex Wayman, “Is it a crow (P. *dhamka*) or a nurse (S. *dhātri*)?”, in *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 102.3 (July-October 1982), 515-16. All references to Pāli texts here are to the editions cited in T. W. Rhys Davids and William Stede, *The Pāli Text Society's Pāli-English Dictionary* (1921-25; Rpt. London and Boston, 1972). References to Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit texts are to the editions cited in Franklin Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*, 2 vols. (1953; 1st Indian ed. New Delhi, 1970). Statements given in Sarat Chandra Das, *A Tibetan-English Dictionary with Sanskrit Synonyms*, rev. and ed. by Graham Sandberg and A. William Heyde (1902; Rpt. Alipore, West Bengal, 1960) are so indicated. When no editions exist, this is so indicated. When specific editions or translations of texts are the focus, or when Chinese texts are referred to, fuller bibliographical data is given.

I would like to thank Mr. Francis Parr of the Oriental Division of the New York Public Library, Mr. Thompson Cha of Flushing, New York, and my neighbor Mr. Paul Chu for their help with the text of the Chinese versions of *Suttanipāta* 270-273 in the *Samyuktāgama* after I had located these. I note that this paper was originally penned in the spring of 1983. Additions and revisions had to be made, though, and these could not be researched until the spring of 1985, when they were started and in the main completed. Before they could be finished, though, circumstances intervened, and I could not get back to this paper till the summer of 1988. After that another period intervened till I could get to making further revisions on this paper. In 1992 it was further revised in line with the comments of an anonymous reader for *JIAS*.

During this period, on January 24, 1987, Dr. Royal Weiler, my *ādiguru* and a true scholar and humanist, passed on. I would, with humility, like to dedicate this article to his memory.

2. Earlier, Tilak Raj Chopra (1966), 96n. similarly refers to such an alternation for a passage in the *Kuśajāṭaka* on the basis of a similarity in Nepāli script between *v* and *dh*. Here, it would seem, *dh* > *v*. In the notes to K. R. Norman (1969) see the notes for v. 1083 (*v* > *dh*). In the notes to K. R. Norman (1971) see the notes for v. 7 (*v* > *dh*), v. 419 (*dh* > *v*), v. 464 (*v* > *dh*). K. R. Norman also refers to T. W. Rhys Davids and William Stede (1921-25), under *dhanayati* for an instance of *v* > *dh*. K. R. Norman (1984-92) and (1987) note for the *Suttanipāta*, aside from the instance in question, v. 44 (*v* > *dh*), v. 165 (*v* > *dh*), v. 349 (*v* > *dh*), v. 531 (*v* > *dh*), v. 646 (*v* > *dh*), v. 684 (*dh* > *v*), v. 910 (*v* > *dh*), vv. 1071-72 (*v* > *dh*), v. 1114 (*v* > *dh*). K. R. Norman (1984-92) also notes an alternation between *dhamka* and *vaṅka* in E. Hardy (1901), 338. The reading here is *dhamka*, *vaṅka* being listed as a v.l., though *vaṅka* appears earlier in the verse. The new edition, N. A. Jayawickrama (1977), 126 and 132, reads *vaṅka* here instead, and lists *dhamka* as the v.l. The translation, I. B. Horner, assisted by N. A. Jayawickrama (1974), 148 also lists *vaṅka* as the preferred reading. *Vaṅka* is translated in this verse as “crooked” and as “uncertainty.” See their n. 1 and n. 3 regarding a possible explanation for the reading *dhamka*, utilizing the commentary to J III.313 noted above. The reading *dhamka* in N. A. Jayawickrama (1950), 41, mentioned by Norman (1984-92), is without doubt a misprint for *dhamka*.

3. In this regard, from a comparative standpoint, see Sir Thomas More’s *Four Last Things* on “fantasy” with regard to the negative attitude toward loose thought in Pre-Elizabethan England.

4. Woodward notes, “So SnA 303; Nett. 147, 244; both texts and MSS. but Sn text vaṅkaṃ.” As noted here, this is not so with regard to *Suttanipāta* commentary manuscripts.

5. Geiger and Seidenstücker, as also Mrs. Rhys Davids below (perhaps followed by E. M. Hare as well), construe *mano vitakkā* of the text as being in composition. This is on account of the way in which M. Leon Feer (1884-1904) construed these words in his printing of the text of the *Samyuttanikāya* in 1884. Both Geiger’s translation and Mrs. Rhys Davids’ translation are translations of the *Samyuttanikāya*. It is clear from Buddhaghosa’s commentaries of both the *Suttanipāta* as well as the *Samyuttanikāya*, though, that *vitakkā* is to be understood as the subject of the verb *ossajanti*, and *mano* the object. Thus, Buddhaghosa’s understanding in his *Samyuttanikāya*, commentary, given above, was “*papāvitakkā* (for *vitakka*) *cittam* (for *mano*) *ossajanti*.”

6. Or conceivably, “...As children (set loose) a ‘crooked one’ (*vaṅka*, i.e. crow)?” The answer in *Suttanipāta* 271, though, “...As children (set loose) a toy-plough (*vaṅka*, ‘something crooked’).”

7. See T. W. Rhys Davids and William Stede (1921-25) on the difference between wood, jungle, and forest in Pāli imagery as a place of pleasures and sport (“wood”), as a place of danger and frightfulness (“jungle”), and as the resort of ascetics noted for loneliness (“forest”).

8. Compare *Samyuttanikāya* III.103 regarding the annihilation of the

khandhas. The *khandhas* remain as long as the knowledge of their true character is not attained, i.e., of their cause and removal. There is a direct allusion and contrast here to the image of birth from the trunk of a Banyan, *nigrodhasseva khandhajā*, in *Suttanipāta* 272.

9. See in this regard, S. H. Levitt, "Kurukh *nād*, Sanskrit *nātha*, Burmese *nat*" in *Haryana Sahitya Akademi Journal of Indological Studies* 1(1986), 119-35. In the most usual usage, the Burmese *nats* correspond to the *yakkhas* of Sri Lanka. See also T. W. Rhys Davids and William Stede (1921-25) on *yakkha*. That it is a *yakkha* here who is the interlocutor, asking for a way out of bondage by passion and anger, presents a forceful image.

10. While it is not a scholarly translation, there may be some utility in giving here the translation of these two lines of verse as these were given to me:

....

Roots born from the earth and after entering into the earth,
Each one having its different place, they go by their own desire,

....

These two lines fit well in *Suttanipāta* 272. I present them here in a footnote only, rather than in the text of the paper, simply to point attention to them, with the hope that at some future date a scholar better qualified than myself to deal with the Chinese text, might present a better translation.

11. It should be added that T. W. Rhys Davids and William Stede (1921-25) and vol. 1 of A. M. Ghatage's *Encyclopaedic Dictionary of Sanskrit* appear to continue the reference to "lap" with regard to defining *anika*. Perhaps it may be done accurately in a number of circumstances.

12. This notice to the *anikadhātri* is perhaps in a listing as in Buddhist Sanskrit literature. My references to these terms have come from lexicons, that to the *anikadhātri* from A. M. Ghatage's incomplete dictionary. I have been unable to consult the printings of the text and its commentary to see if *anikadhātri* occurs in this context in a listing.

References

Texts and Translations

- Andersen, Dines and Helmer Smith, eds. 1913. *The Sutta-Nipāta*, new edition. London: Published for the Pāli Text Society by Henry Frowde, Oxford University Press.
- Bapat, P. V., ed. 1924. *The Sutta-Nipāta*. Poona: P. V. Bapat, Printed by Anant Vinayak Patvardhan at the Arya Bushana Press.
- Chalmers, Lord Robert, ed. and trans. 1932. *Buddha's teachings, being, the Sutta-Nipāta or discourse-collection, edited in the original Pāli text with an English version facing it*. Harvard Oriental Series, 37. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

- Chopra, Tilak Raj, ed. and trans. 1966. *The Kuṣa-Jātaka, a critical and comparative study*. Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien herausgegeben vom Seminar für Kultur und Geschichte Indiens an der Universität Hamburg, 13. Hamburg: Cram, De Gruyter and Co.
- Coomāra Swāmy, M., trans. 1874. *Sutta Nipāta or, dialogues and discourses of Gotama Buddha*. London: Trübner and Co.
- Cowell, Edward Byles and Robert Alexander Neil, eds. 1886. *The Divyāvadāna, a collection of early Buddhist legends, Sanskrit text in transcription edited from the Nepalese manuscripts in Cambridge and Paris, ...* Rpt. Amsterdam: Oriental Press NV, Philo Press, 1970.
- Cowell, Edward Byles, ed. 1895-1907. *The Jātaka, or stories of the Buddha's former births, translated from the Pāli by various hands*. 6 vols. + index. Index, 1913. Cambridge: The University Press.
- Davids, Mrs. C. A. F. Rhys, trans. 1909. *Psalms of the early Buddhists, part I—psalms of the sisters*. Pāli Text Translation Series, 1. London: Published for the Pāli Text Society by Henry Frowde, Oxford University Press.
- _____. 1913. *Psalms of the early Buddhists, part II—psalms of the brethren*. Pāli Text Translation Series, 4. London: Published for the Pāli Text Society by Henry Frowde, Oxford University Press.
- Davids, Mrs. C. A. F. Rhys and Suriyagoda Sumangala thera, trans. [1917]-30. *The book of kindred sayings (Saṃyutta-Nikāya) or grouped suttas*, 5 vols. Pāli Text Society Translation Series, 7, 10, 12, 14, 16. London: Published for the Pāli Text Society by Oxford University Press.
- Davids, T. W. Rhys and J. Estlin Carpenter, eds. 1886. *The Sumaṅgala Vilāsini, Buddhaghosa's commentary on the Dīgha-Nikāya*, 2 vols. Part 1: 2nd ed. London: Published for the Pāli Text Society by Luzac and Company Ltd., 1968. Part 2: Rpt. London: Published for the Pāli Text Society by Luzac and Company Ltd., 1971. [For vol. 3 see W. Stede, ed.]
- _____. 1890-1911. *The Dīgha Nikāya*, 3 vols. London: Published for the Pāli Text Society by Henry Frowde, Oxford University Press.
- Fausböll, V., trans. 1881. *The Sutta-Nipāta, a collection of discourses, being one of the canonical books of the Buddhists*. Sacred Books of the East, 10.2. London: Oxford University Press.
- Fausböll, V., ed. [pref. 1885]. *The Sutta-Nipāta, being a collection of some of Gotama Buddha's dialogues and discourses*. London: Published for the Pāli Text Society by Henry Frowde, Oxford University Press.
- _____. 1877-97. *The Jātaka together with its commentary, being tales of the anterior births of Gotama Buddha*, 7 vols. London: Trübner and Co.
- Feer, M. Leon, ed. 1884-1904. *The Saṃyutta-Nikāya of the Sutta-Piṭaka*, 6 vols. London: Published for the Pāli Text Society by Henry Frowde, Oxford University Press.
- Geiger, Wilhelm, trans. 1925-30. *Saṃyutta-Nikāya, Die Gruppen geordnete Sammlung aus dem Pāli-Kanon der Buddhisten zum ersten Mal ins Deutsche übertragen*, 2 vols. Bd. 1: München—Neubiberg: Benares

- Verlag / Ferdinand Schwab, 1930. Bd. 2: München—Neubiberg: Oscar Schloss Verlag, 1925.
- Hardy, E., ed. 1883-1910. *The Anguttara-Nikāya*, 6 vols. Vols. 1 and 2 ed. by Richard Morris. Vol. 6 (index) by Mabel Hunt, rev. and ed. by Mrs. C. A. F. Rhys Davids. London: Published for the Pāli Text Society by Henry Frowde, Oxford University Press.
- _____. 1894. *Dhammapāla's Paramattha-Dīpanī, part III, being the commentary on the Peta-Vatthu*. London: Published for the Pāli Text Society by Henry Frowde, Oxford University Press.
- _____. 1901. *Dhammapāla's Paramattha-Dīpanī, part IV, being the commentary on the Vimāna-Vatthu*. London: Published for the Pāli Text Society by Henry Frowde, Oxford University Press.
- _____. 1902. *The Netti-Pakaraṇa, with extracts from Dhammapāla's commentary*. London: Published for the Pāli Text Society by Henry Frowde, Oxford University Press.
- Hare, E. M., trans. [1944]. *Woven cadences of early Buddhists (Sutta-Nipāta)*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Homer, I. B., trans., assisted by N. A. Jayawickrama. 1974. *Vimānavatthu: stories of the mansions, new translation of the verses and commentarial excerpts and Petavatthu: stories of the departed*, trans. by H. S. Gehman. Sacred Books of the Buddhists, 30. London: The Pāli Text Society.
- Jayawickrama, N. A., ed. 1977. *Vimānavatthu and Petavatthu, new edition*. Pāli Text Society Text Series, 168. London: The Pāli Text Society.
- Minaev, Ivan Paulovich, ed. 1888. *Petavatthu*. London: Published for the Pāli Text Society by Henry Frowde, Oxford University Press.
- _____. 1910-11. *Mahāvvyutpatti...*, 2nd ed., provided with an index and prepared for press by N. D. Mironov. Bibliotheca Buddhica, 13. Sanktpeterburg: Imperatorskaya akademya nauk.
- Müller, E., ed. 1893. *Paramatthadīpanī, Dhammapāla's commentary on the Therīgāthā*. London: Published for the Pāli Text Society by Henry Frowde.
- Neumann, Karl Eugen, trans. 1905. *Die Reden Gotamo Buddhos, aus der Sammlung der Bruchstuecke, Suttanipato, des Pāli-Kanons*. 2. aufl. München: R. Piper, 1924.
- Norman, K. R., trans. 1969. *The elders' verses I, Therīgāthā*. Pāli Text Society Translation Series, 38. London: Published for the Pāli Text Society by Luzac and Co., Ltd.
- _____. 1971. *The elders' verses II, Therīgāthā*. Pāli Text Society Translation Series, 40. London: Published for the Pāli Text Society by Luzac and Co., Ltd.
- _____. 1984-92. *The group of discourses (Sutta-Nipāta)*, vol. 1 (with alternative translations by I. B. Homer and Walpola Rahula), and vol. 2 (revised translation with introduction and notes). Pāli Text Society Translation

- Series, 44-5. London: The Pāli Text Society.
- _____. 1987. "Notes on the Sutta-Nipāta," in *Sri Lanka Journal of Buddhist Studies* 1, 100-16.
- Ogiwara, Unrai. [1927]. *The Sanskrit-Chinese dictionary of Buddhist technical terms, based on the Mahāvvyutpatti*. Rpt. Tokyo: Sankibo, 1959.
- Oldenberg, Hermann, ed. 1879-83. *The Vinaya Pitakam: one of the principal Buddhist holy scriptures in the Pāli language*, 5 vols. London and Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate.
- Oldenberg, Hermann and Richard Pischel, eds. 1883. *The Thera- and Therī-Gāthā: (stanzas ascribed to elders of the Buddhist order of recluses)*. London: Published for the Pāli Text Society by Henry Frowde.
- Saddhatissa, H., trans. 1985. *The Sutta-Nipāta*. London: Curzon Press.
- Sakaki, Ryōzaburō. [1916]. *Bon-Zō-Kan Wa shiyaku taikō hon'yaku myōgi [Mahāvvyutpatti] taishū*. Kyoto Teikoku Daigaku Bunka Daigaku sōshu, 3 and Supplement (Suppl. [1925]). Kyoto: Shingonshū Kyoto University.
- Seidenstücker, Karl, trans. 1931. "Suttanipāta," in *Zeitschrift für Buddhismus und verwandte gebiete* 9, 23-9, 105-21, 166-84, 260-71, 357-80. [Transl. inc. (through 3.3 only)].
- Smith, Helmer, ed. 1916-18. *Sutta-Nipāta commentary, being Paramatthajotikā II*, 3 vols. London: Published for the Pāli Text Society by Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press.
- Stede, Wilhelm, ed. 1918. *Niddesa, part II: Cullaniddesa*. London: Published for the Pāli Text Society by Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press.
- Stede, Wilhelm, ed. from materials left unfinished by T. W. Rhys Davids and J. Estlin Carpenter. 1931-32. *The Sumaṅgala-Vilāsinī, Buddhaghosa's commentary on the Dīgha-Nikāya*, vol. 3. London: Published for the Pāli Text Society by Oxford University Press.
- Takakusu, Junjirō and Kaikyoku Watanabe, eds. 1924-27. *Taishō shinshū daizokyō (The Tripitaka in Chinese)*, 85 vols. Rpt. Tokyo: The Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō Kankō Kai, [1961-78]. (=Taishō).
- Woodward, Frank Lee, ed. 1929-37. *Sārattha-Ppakāsini, Buddhaghosa's commentary on the Saṃyutta-Nikāya*, 3 vols. London: Published for the Pāli Text Society by Humphrey Milford Oxford University Press.
- Woodward, Frank Lee, trans. 193-6. *The book of gradual sayings (Aṅguttara Nikāya) or more-numbered suttas*, 5 vols. Pāli Text Society Translation Series, 22, 24-7. Vols. 3 and 4 trans. by E. M. Hare. London: Published for the Pāli Text Society by Oxford University Press.

Secondary Sources

- _____. 1933. *The Oxford English dictionary*. Rpt. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1961.

- Anesaki, Mahasaru. 1906. "Traces of Pāli texts in a Mahāyāna treatise," in *Le Muséon* n. s. 7, 33-45.
- _____. 1906-7. "Sutta-Nipāta in Chinese," in *Journal of the Pāli Text Society* [no vol. no.], 50-1.
- _____. 1908. "Some problems of the textual history of the Buddhist scriptures," in *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan*, ser. 1, vol. 35, sec. 2, 81-96.
- _____. 1908. "The four Buddhist Āgamas in Chinese," in *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan*, ser. 1, vol. 35, sec. 3, 1-149.
- Böhtlingk, Otto and Rudolf Roth. 1855-75. *Sanskrit Wörterbuch, herausgegeben von der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 7 vols. Rpt. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1966.
- Brandon, S. G. F. 1972. *A dictionary of Buddhism*, intro. by T. O. Ling. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons .
- Bühler, Johann Georg. [1904]. *Indian paleography*, ed. by John Faithfull Fleet as an appendix to *Indian Antiquary* 33 (1904). Bombay: Bombay Education Society's Press, Byculla.
- Coedès, G. 1966. *The making of Southeast Asia*, English trans. by H. M. Wright. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Das, Sarat Chandra. 1902. *A Tibetan-English dictionary with Sanskrit synonyms*, rev. and ed. by Graham Sandberg and A. William Heyde. Rpt. Alipore, West Bengal: Superintendent, Government Printing, 1960.
- Davids, Mrs. C. A. F. Rhys. 1906-7. "Similies in the Nikāyas, a classified index," in *Journal of the Pāli Text Society* [no vol. no.], 52-151.
- Davids, T. W. Rhys and William Stede. 1921-25. *The Pāli Text Society's Pāli-English dictionary*. Rpt. London: The Pāli Text Society, 1972.
- Demiéville, Paul, Hubert Durt, and Anna Seidel. 1978. *Repertoire du canon bouddhique sino-japonais: édition de Taishō (Taishō shinshū daizōkyō)*. Paris: Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient Adrien-Maisonneuve; Tokyo: Maison Franco-japonaise.
- Edgerton, Franklin. 1953. *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit grammar and dictionary*, 2 vols. Rpt. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1970.
- Geiger, Wilhelm. 1943. *Pāli literature and language*, auth. English translation by Balakrishna Ghosh. Rpt. Delhi: Oriental Books Reprint Corporation, 1968.
- Ghatage, A. M. 1976-82. *Encyclopaedic dictionary of Sanskrit*, 1-3.1. Poona: Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Institute.
- Hoernle, A. F. Rudolf. 1916. "The Sutta Nipāta in a Sanskrit version from Eastern Turkestan," in *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* n.s. 48, 709-32.
- _____. 1917. "The Sanskrit version of the Sutta Nipāta," in *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* n. s. 49, 134.
- Jayawickrama, N. A. 1950. "Sutta Nipāta: the yakkha ballads," in *University of*

- Sri Lanka Review* 8.1, 36-44 (extract from, *A critical analysis of Pāli Sutta Nipāta, illustrating its gradual growth* [London University thesis, 1947]).
- Lancaster, Lewis R. and Sung-bae Park, comp. 1979. *The Korean Buddhist canon: a descriptive catalogue*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Lancaster, Lewis R., ed. 1982. *Buddhist scriptures: a bibliography*. New York and London: Garland Publishing Co.
- Lester, Robert C. 1973. *Theravada Buddhism in Southeast Asia*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Malalasekera, G. P. 1961-67. *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism*, 1-2.3. [Colombo]: Government Press.
- Monier-Williams, Sir Monier. 1899. *A Sanskrit-English dictionary, etymologically and philologically arranged,...*, new ed. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- Nanjio, Bunyiu. 1883. *A catalogue of the Chinese translation of the Buddhist Tripiṭaka, the sacred canon of the Buddhists in China and Japan; compiled by order of the secretary of state for India*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. (=Nanjio).
- Ross, E. Denison. 1910. *Alphabetical list of the titles of works in the Chinese Buddhist Tripiṭaka, being an index to Bunyiu Nanjio's catalogue and to the 1905 Kyoto reprint of the Buddhist canon*. Calcutta: Superintendent of Government Printing, India.
- Śāstrī, Haraprasad. 1925. "The northern Buddhism, 3," in *Indian Historical Quarterly* 1, 464-72.
- Sheth, Pandit Hargovind Das T. 1928. *Pāli-Sadda-Mahāṇavo, a comprehensive Prakrit-Hindi dictionary, with Sanskrit equivalents, quotations and complete references*. Calcutta: Pandit Hargovind Das T. Sheth.
- Trenckner, V. 1990. *A critical Pāli dictionary, begun by V. Trenckner*, vol. 2, fasc. 17. Copenhagen: Munksgaard.
- Turner, R. L. 1966. *A comparative dictionary of the Indo-Aryan languages*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Ui, Hakuju, etc. 1934. *A complete catalogue of the Tibetan Buddhist canons (Bkaḥ-ḥgyur and Bstan-ḥgyur)*. Sendai, Japan: Tōhoku Imperial University aided by Saitō Gratitude Foundation. (=Tōhoku).
- Ui, Hakuju. 1929. "Maitreya as an historical personage," in *Indian studies in honor of Charles Rockwell Lanman*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Wayman, Alex. 1961. *Analysis of the Śrāvakabhūmi manuscript*. University of California Publications in Classical Philology, 17. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- _____. 1982. "Is it a crow (P. dhamka) or a nurse (S. dhatri)?" in *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 102, 515-16.

Winternitz, Moriz. 1927-33. *A history of Indian literature*, vol. 1 trans. by Mrs. S. Ketkar and rev. by the author; vol. 2 trans. by Mrs. S. Ketkar and Miss H. Kohn and rev. by the author. Rpt. New York: Russell and Russell, 1971.