Lost in Translation?
Canonical Languages and Linguistic Diversity of Early Versions of the *Prātimokṣasūtra*

Ingo Strauch (Université de Lausanne)

1. Introduction

Our notion of the formation and early development of Buddhist literary traditions has largely changed in the last decades. Ongoing discoveries of manuscripts and their detailed studies reveal patterns that sometimes seem to diverge from many settled views on how Buddhists transmitted their texts and in which way they defined their relation to what they call *buddhavacana* "Word of the Buddha." It is well known that the early transmission of Buddhist texts was accompanied by various processes of linguistic adaptation and translations. These translational activities were mainly caused by the spread of Buddhism within the Indian subcontinent and beyond and the changing linguistic environments of the Buddhist communities in the course of their history. While the earliest Indic versions were transmitted in different varieties of Middle Indic, the Buddhist literature participated quite early and to a large extent in the movement that I once called "Sanskrit revolution."[1] Many traditions, but not all, translated their texts into Sanskrit. The degree of "Sanskritization" is hereby quite diverse. It is almost impossible to say why certain traditions refused to participate in this process and why the Sanskritization reached such different levels in the participating traditions. But as a matter of fact, by the period of the first centuries of the Common Era we face a significant linguistic diversity within Buddhist literature.

Usually, the diversification of the Buddhist literary tradition, both with regard to the form and the language, is connected with the

[1] Strauch 2012.

division of the Buddhist community into different Buddhist schools or lineages (*nikāya*). The identity of these lineages is mainly determined by their adherence to a distinct Vinaya tradition.

Among the Vinaya texts, the *Prātimokṣasūtra* is generally regarded as one of the oldest.[2] Due to its importance for the identity and the organisation of the order, a great number of versions of this text were preserved in different Buddhist traditions. Even the notion of a "canonical language" is frequently associated with the *Prātimokṣasūtra*. Consequently, these versions are usually considered as characteristic and typical for a specific Buddhist *nikāya*. As the general agreement between the different versions of the *Prātimokṣasūtra* shows, its formation as a coherent text took place at a very early stage in the history of Buddhist literature, certainly within the first hundred years after the *parinirvāṇa* of the Buddha. Our manuscripts date from a much later period and can therefore only circumstantially refer to the complex processes that characterized the formation of this text and the emergence of school specific versions. But even the extant manuscript material shows that our notion of school specific "canonical" versions needs to be reconsidered. Recent scholarship has demonstrated that even within a school tradition different versions of the *Prātimokṣasūtra* were transmitted and acknowledged.[3]

Given this diversity, we are facing several problems: Is there an interrelation between the linguistic diversity and the multiplication of Vinaya lineages (*nikāya*)? In what terms can we define this interrelation, if it really exists? Or in other words: did the identity of a Buddhist community in terms of its affiliation to a specific lineage affect the way it translated its Vinaya texts into a specific language? What strategies of translation were chosen in order to preserve the specific character of the text on the one

[2] For the genesis of the Theravāda version of this text, see von Hinüber 1999.

[3] For more information, see the conclusion below.

hand, and to make it usable and comprehensible in a new linguistic environment, on the other hand?

In this article, I present some new data from my research on an early manuscript of a *Prātimokṣasūtra* from Gandhāra that might contribute to this discussion. After a short introduction to the manuscript itself, I will concentrate on two aspects:

- The diversity of versions of the *Prātimokṣasūtra* and the notion of a canonical language
- Strategies of translation: between conservatism and innovation

2. The *Prātimokṣasūtra* Manuscript from the Bajaur Collection of Kharoṣṭhī Manuscripts

Until recently, we had no access to ancient manuscripts of the *Prātimokṣasūtra* that would predate the earliest Chinese translations of Vinaya texts of about the fourth century CE. Fortunately, with further studies and new discoveries of manuscripts from ancient Gandhāra this situation has changed. We have now at least two manuscripts that contain portions of Gāndhārī versions of the *Prātimokṣasūtra*. One of them was only recently identified, it contains the first nine *saṃghādisesa*/*saṃghātiśeṣa* rules of a Gāndhārī *Prātimokṣasūtra*.[4] The second of them is the birch-bark fragment BC 13 from the Bajaur Collection of Kharoṣṭhī manuscripts. [5]

The manuscript BC 13 is a rather well preserved birch-bark scroll 16 cm wide and 23 cm high, inscribed on both sides with 23 (*recto*)

[4] The manuscript is currently studied by Mark Allon (Sydney) who presented it at the Third Gāndhārī Workshop in Lausanne (August 2019). I am very grateful to Mark Allon for allowing me to share this information in the present article. Other manuscripts of the same collection were recently published by Harrison, Lenz & Salomon (2018) and Allon (2019).

[5] For more information on this collection, see Strauch 2008a, 2008b, and Falk & Strauch 2014.

and 25 (*verso*) lines. Both sides are inscribed with two different versions of the beginning of the *Naiḥsargika pācittiya* (NP) rules.

The 30 NP rules form the fourth major part of all extant *Prātimokṣasūtra*s. They cover offences related to the monks' property. Their first part, called in Pāli *cīvaravagga*, deals with matters concerning the monks' robes. The obverse contains the first nine rules, while the reverse remained incomplete. Due to the lack of space, the text stops in the middle of rule 8. It is possible that the scroll was intentionally planned as part of a larger composite scroll that would have contained the entire *Prātimokṣasūtra*. The empty space on the top of the obverse could indicate the space that was left blank for gluing the pieces together. Either this plan was never realized or the composite scroll was soon destroyed—in any case, the same scribe used the reverse of the scroll to inscribe a second version of the same text, this time beginning at the very top. Due to the bigger script that was necessary on the rough surface of the reverse he could not complete the entire set of rules.

Consequently, this manuscript offers us a view not only to one, but even to two *Prātimokṣasūtra*s written in Gāndhārī. Since the texts on both sides are not identical, they clearly represent two different versions of this part of the *Prātimokṣasūtra.* It can be shown that these two versions relate to other extant versions of the text. Although they are not identical with any of these preserved texts, the version on the obverse is closely related to the *Prātimokṣasūtra* of the Theravāda and Dharmaguptaka *nikāya*s, while the version on the reverse shares a number of features that are restricted to the Sarvāstivāda and Mūlasarvāstivāda traditions.[6] In an earlier publication, I was also able to show that this manuscript helps us to better understand how the oral and written ways of transmission possibly interacted:[7]

[6] For further details on this relationship, see Strauch 2008b: 26–33 and Strauch 2014: 817–825.

[7] Strauch 2014: 825.

> The Bajaur Prātimokṣasūtra fragment obviously represents an intermediate state in the development of codified canonical texts – a state when a living oral tradition, which was rooted in a distinct local or probably regional context, was confronted with a growing production of written texts, which somehow petrified these local versions and distributed them into different contexts. The process of harmonisation had of course to take place between the oral versions and the written texts and between the different written texts themselves. Only such a process could eventually result in the emergence of generally accepted and supraregionally used canons with a codified and authoritative textual shape.

In that publication, I mainly dealt with structural aspects and the wording of some of the rules. At the same time, it was obvious that both versions displayed some orthographical and phonological variants that led to the assumption, "that both versions of the Bajaur manuscript represent distinct regional or local varieties of the Prātimokṣasūtra current in 'Greater Gandhāra.' They were copied by the scribe in exactly the same form as he listened or – more probably – read them, without showing any effort to harmonise them in the process of redaction."[8]

In the present contribution, I want to further explore this aspect and add some observations on the linguistic shape of the Gāndhārī *Prātimokṣasūtra*s in the context of the early transmission of this text.

[8] Strauch 2014: 821.

3. The *Prātimokṣasūtra* and the Notion of a "Canonical Language"

Oskar von Hinüber described the role of the Vinaya language with the following words:[9]

> The centre piece of a Buddhist *saṃgha* and of Buddhist literature is the Vinaya-Piṭaka, and within this text the Prātimokṣasūtra [...]
>
> If the legal consequences that might arise from the choice of a certain linguistic form used in the legal proceedings is taken into account, the Prātimokṣasūtra may be considered as fundamental in determining the language of a Vinaya school. From these considerations it may be deduced at once that at a certain date and at a certain place the members of a *saṃgha* must have made up their minds, which language to adopt for their Prātimokṣasūtra and for their *karmavācanā*. This language became the standard for the Vinaya and for the canonical texts as a whole.

As von Hinüber showed, language choices were made at different places and in different periods. This was not always final, but followed by "updates," "thus moving nearer to Sanskrit step by step."[10] It is not easy to determine, what exactly are these "certain date and [...] certain place," when the members of a specific *saṃgha* made these decisions. For most of the *nikāya* traditions we lack any data in this regard. The only exception in the Indian subcontinent is the Pāli Canon as redacted by the Mahāvihāra branch of Theravāda Buddhism in Sri Lanka. Here we clearly observe the conscious development of a canon and the emerging notion of Pāli as a canonical language that eventually led to a high degree of linguistic consistency in the literary traditions of Theravāda Buddhism. But such a development is unique and exceptional and as far as we know rather unlike other Buddhist

[9] Von Hinüber 1989: 352.

[10] Von Hinüber 1989: 353.

traditions.[11] Thus we might wonder whether many of our recent ideas about canonical languages are influenced by this rather singular development, given the predominant status the Pāli Canon occupied in the history of Buddhist Studies well into the 20th century.

Another source for our notion of "canonical languages" are ideas that were expressed much later by authors that associate the emergence and existence of *nikāya*s with canons composed in different languages. These later authors, such as Śākyaprabha, Bu ston or Tāranātha, are well aware of the linguistic differences between the canons of the various schools.[12] As subsumed by Skilling:[13]

> In both textual transmission and ritual practice (performance of *karmavākya*), language mattered. The (probably) eight-century North-Indian scholar Śākyaprabha (representing a Sarvāstivāda tradition) and the later Tibetan polymaths Bu-ston (1290–1364) and Tāranātha (1575–1635) hold that the use of regional dialects affected the transmission of the *buddhavacana* from an early date, starting from the second century after the Parinirvāṇa, and that this led to the birth of the various schools [...]
>
> The language used by an order or school was a key component of the package that constituted its identity. By the mediaeval period, North Indian tradition described what we now might call "monastic Buddhism" in terms of "the four *nikāya*s," which subsumed the eighteen *bheda*s. These were:
>
> Sarvāstivāda, who used Sanskrit;
> Mahāsāṃghika, who used Prakrit;
> Sāṃmitīya, who used Apabhraṃśa;

[11] See Skilling 2010: 10–15.

[12] For an extensive discussion on these passages, see Skilling 1997: 89–10 and Skilling 2010.

[13] Skilling 2010: 7–8.

Sthavira, who used Paiśācī.

Based on the extant versions of Vinaya and other texts mainly from later East Indian and Chinese Central Asian manuscript discoveries, it seemed indeed possible to associate the specific linguistic shape of a text to a particular school tradition. Thus, texts of the Sarvāstivādins and Mūlasarvāstivādins were composed in Sanskrit, the Mahāsāṃghika-(Lokottaravādins) used a characteristic type of Buddhist (Hybrid) Sanskrit, and the Theravādins considered Pāli as their canonical language.

Peter Skilling (1997) suggested a further convincing and broadly accepted school affiliation for the so-called *Patna Dharmapada*, written on a single manuscript, which was discovered by Rahul Sankrityayan in the 1930s in Tibet, but written in a script that can be attributed to 12th-century Eastern India. The text of this *Dharmapada* is written in a language that can most properly be described as a slightly sanskritized Middle Indic—distinctively different from the much more sanskritized Buddhist Sanskrit that was used by the Mahāsāṃghika-(Lokottaravādins). According to Skilling, it has to be attributed to the Sammatīyas, a school that was extremely influential in Northern India up to the 12th century CE. According to the *Patna Dharmapada* evidence, this school fossilized another variety of Middle Indic as their canonical language, a variety that was obviously used throughout their history in India.

However, this rather schematic perspective suddenly collapses when we take into account the variety of linguistic forms as attested in the extant manuscript evidence when seen in a historical and geographical perspective.

It has to be noted that our growing data represents the "tip of the iceberg." But what has been discovered already challenges our notion of a consistent transmission of canonical texts within the boundaries of a *nikāya*. In the case of the *Prātimokṣasūtra*, we have now access to a variety of Indic versions, either in the form of separate *Prātimokṣasūtra* texts (for monks and nuns) or in the form of a *Prātimokṣasūtra* embedded in a Vibhaṅga (see table 1). As usual, their school affiliation is based on indirect evidence, the

majority of the manuscripts refrain from any reference to a *nikāya*, no matter in what language they are composed. As the table below shows, these manuscripts—often perceived as representatives of a "coherent Vinaya tradition"—have a rather diverse geographical and historical background.

School	**1st–3rd cent. CE**	**4th–7th cent. CE**	**After 11th cent. CE**
Mahā(-L)		***North-West India*** • Schøyen Collection manuscripts (Karashima 2000, 2002, 2006; Shōno 2016) • "Bamiyan" manuscript (Karashima 2008, 2013)	***East India*** • Tibet manuscripts (Tatia 1975; Roth 1970; Nolot 1991)
Sarv		***Central Asia*** • von Simson 2000 • Rosen 1959 • Waldschmidt 1926	
Mūl		***North-West India*** • Gilgit manuscripts (Banerjee 1977)	***East India*** • Beijing manuscript (Hu–von Hinüber 2003)
Dharm		***Central Asia*** • Kucā fragments (SHT 656)	

Unspecified school 1		***Central Asia*** • Khādaliq/ Khotan manuscripts (Wille 2009)	
Unspecified school 2	***North-West India*** • BC 13 • "New manuscript"		

As the table clearly shows, our picture is less than complete, both with regard to the geographical distribution of manuscripts and with regard to their chronological distribution. Thus, the majority of early manuscripts (i.e., up to the 7th cent. CE) hail from North-West India and Central Asia. Moreover, almost all of them date to a period when the process of Sanskritization had affected most of the *nikāya* traditions. The evidence confirms that the Mahāsāṃghika-(Lokottaravādins) only partially sanskritized their texts and preserved a Buddhist Sanskrit that is still heavily influenced by Middle Indic morphology and phonology. Both the Sarvāstivādins and Mūlasarvāstivādins use an almost classical Sanskrit, as did the Dharmaguptakas in their only clearly attributable manuscript fragment. The table also shows that we know next to nothing about the period preceding this *status quo*, the period that was constitutive for the formation of Buddhist texts. Our only witness of this period is the evidence from Gandhāra, now attested in the Bajaur manuscript BC 13 and the hitherto unpublished "new manuscript" that contains a portion of the *saṃghādisesa*/*saṃghātiśeṣa* rules.

Historical philology of course allows us to go beyond the physical appearance of a text in manuscript form and to reconstruct a text's history on the basis of phonological or text historical considerations. In the case of the *Prātimokṣasūtra* and its linguistic form, Oskar von Hinüber drew our attention to the legal term *pācittiya* that can be used as a kind of "key term" in order to

reconstruct the translation history of the *Prātimokṣasūtra*. Fortunately, the Bajaur manuscript contains a part of the *Prātimokṣasūtra* where this term repeatedly occurs in the variants *payati* and *payatie.*

Based on the idea of a "canonical language," the variants of this term were also considered as indicator of an assumed *nikāya* affiliation of a text.[14] The texts usually show a rather peculiar distribution of the different variants, which seems to indicate its distinctive use within a given Vinaya tradition. As Oskar von Hinüber showed, this picture is, however, largely due to the rather late date of the extant manuscripts and hardly reflects the state of affairs in the early time of the transmission of the *Prātimokṣasūtra* text.[15] These later manuscript traditions usually contain the following forms:[16]

Theravāda:	*pācittiya*
Sarvāstivādin:	*pātayantika*
Mūlasarvāstivādin:	*pāyattika*
Dharmaguptaka:	*pācittika*
Mahāsaṃghika-Lokottaravādin:	*pācattika*

As shown by von Hinüber, the Pāli form *pācittiya* has to be derived from the Brahmanical Sanskrit term *prāyaścitta* "atonement." While in Eastern Prakrits the word occurs as *pāyacchitta* or *pacchitiya*,[17] the Pāli kept the long vowel and deaspirated the intervocalic *ch*, which cannot be found in this position according to Pāli phonology.[18]

---

[14] The following discussion resumes and updates Strauch 2008b: 26–27.

[15] See von Hinüber 1985: 63–66.

[16] Further variants are attested in the *Mahāvyutpatti* (see BHSD, s.v. *pātayantika*), which can be reduced to the following variants: *pāyattikāḥ, pāyattikāḥ* (v.l. *pādayattikāḥ*), *śuddhaprāyaścittikāḥ, snānaprāyaścittikam, pāyattikā* (v.l. *pāṭayattikā*). See von Hinüber 1985: 64.

[17] For these forms, see Pischel 1900: 206, §301 (*pāyacchittiya, pacchitta*).

[18] Cf. von Hinüber 2001: 163, §192.

As the explanations of later commentators show, this origin was no longer understood. The translators thus had the choice between either preserving the shape of the term or by replacing it by an etymologically transparent substitute. As far as the Indic *Prātimokṣasūtra* texts show, only the Sarvāstivādins opted for the second way, by inventing a form that was based on Skt. *pātayati* "to cause to fall"—a meaning, that seems appropriate for a class of offences. [19] The variant *pātayantika* was also used in a *Prātimokṣasūtra* fragment from Khotan/Khādaliq, whose *nikāya* affiliation could not be determined.[20]

Other traditions transmitted the term into their own language by applying the respective phonological rules. Thus the Gāndhārī variant *payati(e)* is a more or less direct adaptation of an inherited Middle Indic *pācitti(ka).* The form with *y* < *c* is only explicable on the basis of a Western form as preserved in Pāli with a deaspirated *c*.[21]

As von Hinüber rightly suggests, the Mūlasarvāstivāda form *pāyattika* is also based on this Gāndhārī form. Moreover, von Hinüber also points to the Chinese transcriptions of this term, which clearly transcribe a form like *pāyattika*.[22]

Recent manuscript studies have shown that the Gāndhārī variant of this term was not confined to the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya and to Chinese translations. Thus von Hinüber pointed to the Turfan fragment SHT 39/40 of the *Prātimokṣasūtra* showing the forms *pāyitti* and *pātti.* Although this text can be attributed to the Sarvāstivāda school, it shows a series of linguistic peculiarities, which distinguish it considerably from the other recensions, and

[19] See also Waldschmidt 1926: 116–117 (= 1979: 120–121).

[20] Wille 2009: 51–66.

[21] This once more indicates that the Middle Indic underlying the source language of the Gandhāran manuscripts, is rather closely related to the Pāli language.

[22] For different phonetic renderings in the Chinese Vinayas, cf. Heirman 2002: 141–142.

which prevented its incorporation into the critical edition of the Sarvāstivāda *Prātimokṣasūtra*.[23]

But the occurrence of this North Western form in Sarvāstivāda Vinaya texts is not restricted to the peculiar manuscript SHT 39/40. It is also attested in some of the older *Prātimokṣasūtra* manuscripts where we find the variants *pāyitti*, *pātti*, *pāyattikā*, and *pāyttika*. [24] The popularity of these and related forms in Sarvāstivāda circles is also confirmed by the Kuchean rendering of the term as *pāyti* attested in a *Prātimokṣasūtra* fragment from Kucā.[25]

A recently published *Prātimokṣasūtra* fragment written in the script "Gilgit-Bamiyan type 1" and datable to the sixth or seventh century CE shows the same North-Western form as *pāyattikā*.[26] According to Seishi Karashima this fragment belongs to a Mahāsāṃghika-(Lokottaravāda) tradition, although its text is not completely identical with either the known Sanskrit version or the Chinese translations of the Mahāsāṃghika *Prātimokṣasūtra*.[27] The same form (*pāyattikaṃ*) was also used in a much earlier Gupta period *Prātimokṣa-Vibhaṅga* manuscript from the Schøyen Collection, which was edited by Masonori Shōno.[28]

The only clearly attributable Dharmaguptaka text of a *Prātimokṣasūtra* (SHT 656)[29] shows the form *pācittika* that is clearly related to the Western variant of the term. Von Hinüber explained this form as a secondary sanskritization of an earlier North-

[23] For a complete transcription and description of this manuscript, see von Simson 1997.

[24] See Wille 2009: 50 n. 67.

[25] Lévi 1913: 110–111.

[26] Karashima 2008 and 2013; e.g., Karashima 2008: 72, fol. 7v, l. 2.

[27] Karashima 2008: 71–72. For the relation of both Sanskrit versions, see now Ñāṇatusita 2017.

[28] Shōno 2016: 323 n. 25.

[29] Cf. Waldschmidt 1980: 164–167.

Western form, such as *pāyattika*.[30] He based this explanation mainly on the Chinese translations, which presuppose a form with internal *-y-*. Since the Chinese translations almost always use this form when they transcribe this term, this evidence cannot really help us to reconstruct an underlying Indic version of a *Prātimokṣasūtra* text. Unless other evidence turns up, we have to accept that this Western form was also used by a Dharmaguptaka Vinaya tradition.

It is, however, impossible to say, if the occurrences of these forms are really proof of a pre-existing version of these texts in the respective languages, since a single term can be easily borrowed from one tradition to another without implying the translation of the entire text. But the cited evidence is sufficient to show that the above mentioned distinctive distribution among school versions does not correspond to the manuscript data.

The preserved versions rather attest traces of the translational processes this term underwent in the course of transmission. Instead of ascribing a particular form to a specific school, we should rather determine this form as representative of a certain linguistic shape of the text in its textual history *or* as a witness of a contact of various linguistic versions.

The above given list arranged according to aspects of school affiliation should therefore be further differentiated ("standard" forms indicated in bold print):

[30] See von Hinüber 1985: 66. Similar variants are also attested in other manuscripts whose school affiliation is unclear, such as the *Prātimokṣasūtra* fragments SHT I 44 m Vc (*pāca[tt]i*) and P(elliot) Skt. Bleu 46 and 47 (*pācattikā*). See Wille 1997: 311; Heirman 2002: 28–34. For further fragments of a Dharmaguptaka *Bhikṣuvinayavibhaṅga*, see Chung & Wille 1997. These fragments do not contain this term.

Version	**Western Middle Indic**	**North-Western Middle Indic**	**Sanskritized**
Ther	*pācittiya*		
Mah-(L)	***pācattika***	*pāyattikā*	
Dhar	*pācittika*		
Sarv		*pāyatti* *pāyitti* *pāytti*	***pātayantikā***
Mūl		***pāyattika***	
Undef.			*pātayantikā*
Gāndhārī		*payati/payatie*	

This observation already casts into doubt the assumption of a canonical language that would be valid for the entirety of texts of a single school, irrespective of the historical and linguistic environment in which the monastery that used these texts was located. This of course considerably enlarges our perspective on the linguistic plurality of Buddhist texts and the multiple processes of translation and mutual influences between different local and regional versions composed in different formats and languages. The following discussion will add some further evidence for this transitory phase of Buddhist canonical texts.

4. Strategies of Translation: Between Conservatism and Innovation

As stated above, the linguistic diversity of early Buddhist literature is the result of a highly complex process of translation and adaptation. Since very little material evidence survived, its traces have to be identified by means of philological investigation. There is nowadays a general agreement that the ancient core of Buddhist canonical texts was initially composed in a language of the Indian East, the region where the historical Buddha lived and

worked. In his monumental study *Beobachtungen über die Sprache des buddhistischen Urkanons*, posthumously published in 1954, Heinrich Lüders provides comprehensive data that confirm this hypothesis. According to him, the language of this "Urkanon" was very close to the language of the Aśokan Pillar edicts, the so-called *Kanzleisprache* of the Mauryan Empire.[31] Given the assumed very early date of the *Prātimokṣasūtra*, it is surprising that Lüders' monograph contains virtually no references to this text. As we saw in the case of the term *pācittiya*, all attested forms go clearly back to a Western prototype that is distinctively different from its Eastern parallel attested in Ārdhamāgadhī Jaina texts. Is it therefore possible that the text of the *Prātimokṣasūtra* was especially carefully edited when transferred to another linguistic environment and therefore lacks many of the Magadhisms met with in other textual genres? This would explain what Gustav Roth, an excellent specialist in the field of Vinaya literature, wrote many years ago: "the Prakrit of the Prātimokṣa, as we find it in the Pāli and the M[ah]ā[sāṃghika]-L[okottaravādin] documents, was based on a more supra-regional type of standard Prakrit […] There are hardly any traces of M[ā]g[adhī] or A[rdha]m[ā]g[adhī] to be noted." [32]

Nonetheless, we observe of course numerous traces of translational activities in the extant *Prātimokṣasūtra* texts. In the following paragraph, I want to present two examples—based on the preserved portions of the Gāndhārī *Prātimokṣasūtra* fragment—that illustrate the different strategies of translation.

4.1 The Pāli Phrase *abhihaṭṭhum pavāreyya*

The Naiḥsargika Pāyatti rule 7 of the two Gāndhārī *Prātimokṣasūtra* versions runs as follows:

---

[31] Cf. the preface by Ernst Waldschmidt, who edited the work posthumously (Lüders 1954: 5–11).

[32] Roth 1980: 92.

Gāndhārī version A (PMS-G^{A}) (BC 13r, lines 11–13)

achiṇacivaro yavi bhikhu bhodi ṇaṭhacivara dadhacivare [v](u)[ḍhacivare ◦] tacaṇa añadia grahavadi va gra[ha]vadiaṇi va ***avihaṭha*** *bahua civara* ***pravarea*** *satarutaraparamo tade civare sadidave tadutvari sadiea ṇesagi ◦*

"When a monk's robe has been stolen, has been destroyed, has been burned [or] washed away, if an unrelated householder or householder's wife were to offer [him] many [pieces of] robe [material], he must accept thereof robe [material] for at most an under robe and an upper robe. If he should accept more than that, it is a Naiḥsargika pāyattika offence."

Gāndhārī B (PMS-G^{B}) (BC 13v, lines 13–18)

*achiṇaci[var](eṇa) (bh)[i](khuṇa) [ṇa]ṭhacivare[ṇa] dadhacivareṇa vuḍhacivareṇa agakṣamaṇa añadae grahava[di] gra[ha]vadaṇi [va] [u]vaṣakrama[i]ta civare viñavidave tamena <<se>> [ṣadha b]ra(*maṇa) [g]ra[havadi va* ***avihaṭhu****] sabahala civara* ***pravarati*** *agakṣamaṇabhikhuṇa satar[u]taratapa(*rama) [civara] [sa](dida)[ve] tadutvara sadiea ṇesagi ◦*

"When a monk's robe has been stolen, has been destroyed, has been burned [or] washed away, he may approach an unrelated householder, if he wishes, or householder's wife and ask for a robe. [If] this faithful *brāhmaṇa* or householder were to offer him many [pieces of] robe [material], the monk—if he wishes—must accept robe material for at most an under robe and an upper robe. If he should accept more than that, it is a Naiḥsargika pāyattika offence."

As the highlighted passages above show, both Gāndhārī versions contain the words *avihaṭha pravarea* (A) / *avihaṭhu pravarati* (B). This phrase is parallel to Pāli *abhihaṭṭhuṃ pavāreyya*, which in Pāli literature is regularly used in the sense of "present, offer." Usually the obscure term *abhihaṭṭhuṃ* is taken as an absolutive form of *abhiharati* "offers, presents," following T.W. Rhys Davids' note in

her translation of the Pāli Vinaya.[33] This explanation became widely accepted[34] and was also repeated by the CPD, which furthermore points to its irregular spelling as influenced by *daṭṭhu(ṃ)* < *dṛś*.[35] This interpretation was not at least provoked by a number of later commentaries—among them the *Samantapāsādikā*—which explain *abhihaṭṭhuṃ* as "*abhiharaṇaṃ kṛtvā*," "*abhiharitvā*," etc. (cf. CPD, s.v.).

Most scholars refer to these commentaries as authoritative source for the etymology of the term. Of special importance, however, is a first look at how the old Vibhaṅga commentary perceived this phrase. As already highlighted by Rhys Davids, all three occurrences in the *Prātimokṣasūtra*—that is, Nissagiya Pācittiya rule 7 and Pācittiya rules 34 and 36—are explained by the phrase:

> *abhihaṭṭhuṃ pavāreyyāti yāvatakaṃ icchasi tāvatakaṃ gaṇhāhīti*
>
> "'*Abhihaṭṭhuṃ pavāreyya*' means [if one says]: Take as much as you want!"

Rhys Davids also noticed that the Vibhaṅga commentary on Pāc. 36 uses the word *abhiharati* in its explanation of the term *āsādanāpekkho*, which concludes this rule. It is therefore possible that already the Vibhaṅga somehow associated the phrase *abhihaṭṭhum pavāreyya* with this verb. Much more explicit, however, are the later commentaries. Both the *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī* (Kkh, ed. 65) and the *Samantapāsādikā* (Sp, ed. 668) comment on the rules containing this expression in very similar words. They explain the word *abhihaṭṭhum* as infinitive of the compound verb *abhiharati* (*abhīti upasaggo, haritun ti*) and paraphrase the whole expression according to the Vibhaṅga commentary as "saying

---

[33] Rhys Davids 1882: 440. Rhys Davids' interpretation was also accepted by I.B. Horner in her new translation of the Pāli *Vinayapiṭaka*, again with reference to the commentators' paraphrases as *abhiharitvā*. See 1957: 51 n. 1.

[34] See, for example, PTSD, s.v. *abhihaṭṭhuṃ*; von Hinüber 2001: 315, §498; and Oberlies 2001: 266; PD, s.v. *abhihaṭṭhuṃ.*

[35] Cf. CPD with a reference to AMg. *abhihaṭṭu*; Pischel 1900: 391, §577.

'take as much as you want'" (Kkh: *yāvattakaṃ icchasi, tāvattakaṃ gaṇhāhīti evaṃ nimanteyyāti attho*, Sp: *abhihaṭṭhuṃ pavārentena pana yathā vattabbaṃ taṃ ākāraṃ dassetuṃ yāvatakaṃ icchasi tāvatakaṃ gaṇhāhīti*). The relation to *abhiharati* is further strengthened by both commentaries when they distinguish between two types of offerings (*abhihāra*), a material and a verbal one (*kāyena*, *vācāya*).

As indicated some time ago by K.R. Norman in his "Survey on the Grammar of Early Middle Indo-Aryan," this is not the only and perhaps not even the most plausible solution. Instead, Norman suggested to interpret *abhihaṭṭhuṃ* as an infinitive of *abhi-hṛṣ*. Consequently, the whole phrase *abhihaṭṭhuṃ pra-vṛ* should, according to Norman, be translated as "invite with [food, etc.] to enjoy oneself."[36]

Norman refers in this regard to the *Prātimokṣasūtra* text of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins where the parallel to our rule NP 7 seems to contain the reading *abhihṛṣṭo samāno*, also indicated by von Hinüber as parallel to Pāli *abhihaṭṭhuṃ* and interpreted by him as absolutive form of *abhiharati*.[37] Von Hinüber cautiously added an exclamation mark behind this quotation, perhaps in order to show that this form is not really parallel to what his explanation of the term *abhihaṭṭhuṃ* would suggest. On the other hand, this Mahāsāṃghika form would perfectly confirm Norman's suggestion. Both scholars used the text of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin *Prātimokṣasūtra* as edited by Tatia (1975: 14).[38] However, as the readings by Gustav Roth (1970: 166) and Edith Nolot (1991: 161) suggest, this form is probably not attested. According to them, the Patna manuscript seems to read instead *abhibhāṣṭo samāno*,[39] a phrase that should be translated as

[36] Norman 2002: 243 (=2007: 358f).

[37] Von Hinüber 2001: 315, §498.

[38] The rule NP 7 is not preserved in the "Bamiyan manuscript" edited by Seishi Karashima (2008 and 2013).

[39] A related reading was suggested by the edition princeps of this manuscript: *-abhibhāṣṭo (sic !) sammato* (Pachow & Mishra 1956).

"being addressed." A new check of the manuscript showed that this reading is also not beyond doubt. As Vincent Tournier suggested to me, a reading *abhi[tu]ṣṭo samāno* seems to be more likely. Although such a reading cannot confirm the etymological derivation of *abhihatthuṃ* from *abhihṛṣ*—as suggested by K.R. Norman—its semantic scope is quite close to what we expect.

It is therefore quite possible that the original term was no longer understood in the linguistic environment of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin *Prātimokṣasūtra* and was thus replaced by a comprehensible one.

The rule NP 7 is not the only occurrence of this phrase. Interestingly, in another instance, the Pāyattika rule 34 (35), the Mahāsāṃghika-(Lokottaravādin) text replaced the phrase corresponding to Pāli *abhihaṭṭhuṃ pavāreyya* by *upanimantreya* (Tatia 1975: 22, Pāy. 34) or *(u)panimantraye* "he should invite" (Karashima 2013: 57, Pāy. 35). The Sarvāstivādins sanskritized this to *yāvadarthaṃ pravārayed* (von Simson 2000: 213, Pāt. 35[40]), the Mūlasarvāstivādins to *atyartham pravārayed* (Hu–von Hinüber 2003: 42, Pāt. 35). Similarly, in rule Pāy 38 (39) the phrase was altered in the Mahāsāṃghika-(Lokottararvādin) tradition either to *tathāpravāritena* (Tatia 1975: 22, Pāy. 38) or *tataḥ pravāritena* (Karashima 2013: 58, Pāy 39),[41] whereas the Sarvāstivādins show again *(yāva)darthaṃ* (von Simson 2000: 212, Pāt. 33) and the Mūlasarvāstivādins *'tyartham* (Hu–von Hinüber 2003: 42, Pāy. 33).

A similar strategy of adaptation can be observed in the parallel versions of the NP rule 7:

[40] The manuscripts GV and probably HG (both part of the Pelliot Collection and probably from Duldur Aqur near Kucā) show the variant *(a)tyarthaṃ* that is otherwise typical for the text of the Mūlasarvāstivādins.

[41] This expression was probably borrowed from the rule NP 7 where it directly follows the words *abhi[tu]ṣṭo samāno* discussed above.

Sarvāstivādins (von Simson 2000: 186)

(taṃ ced bhi)kṣu(ṃ) śrā(d)dh(o) gṛhapatir gṛhapatipatnī vā saṃbahulaiś cīvaraiḥ ***pravārayed***

Mūlasarvāstivādins (Hu–von Hinüber 2003: 24)

tañ cec chrāddhā brāhmaṇagṛhapatayo ***'tyarthaṃ*** *sambahulaiś cīvaraiḥ* ***pravārayeyur***

The following table resumes the different representations of the phrase *abhihaṭṭhuṃ pavāreyya* in the Indic versions of the *Prātimokṣasūtra*:

Version	**A**	**B**	**C**
Pāli	NP 7 *abhihaṭṭhuṃ pavāreyya*	Pāc. 36 *abhihaṭṭhuṃ pavāreyya*	Pāc. 34 *abhihaṭṭhuṃ pavāreyya*
Mah-Lok 1	NP 7 *abhi[tu]ṣṭo samāno*	Pāc. 34 *upanimantreya*	Pāc. 38 *tathāpravāritena*
Mah-Lok 2	--	Pāc. 35 *(u)panimantraye*	Pāc. 39 *tataḥ pravāritena*
Sarv	NP 7 *pravārayed*	Pāt. 35 *yāvadarthaṃ pravārayed*	Pāt. 33 *(yāva)darthaṃ pravārayeyuḥ*
Mūl	NP 7 *'tyarthaṃ [...] pravārayeyur*	Pāy. 35 *-ātyartham pravārayed*	Pāy. 33 *-tyartham pravārayeyur*
Gāndhārī 1	NP 7 *avihaṭha [...] pravarea*	--	--

Gāndhārī 2	NP 7 *[avihaṭhu] […] pravarati*	--	--

Contrary to what Norman suggested, an assumed "Sanskrit tradition" regarding a derivation from *abhi-hṛṣ* cannot be referred to. But still, Norman's suggestion remains a serious alternative to the generally excepted interpretation of *abhihaṭṭhuṃ* as absolutive form of *abhiharati*.

It seems that already the editors of the PTSD had this derivation in mind when they added the form *abhihaṭṭhuṃ* under the entry *abhihaṃsati* < *abhi-hṛṣ*. However, both passages from the *Suttapiṭaka* cited there (AN V 350 and SN IV190) contain the usual combination *abhihaṭṭhuṃ* + *pavār-*. It is not clear to me on which basis this entry was made, since the commentaries on both passages give the same explanation referring to *abhiharitvā* that is found elsewhere.

In her discussion of the various versions of this phrase, Ann Heirman (2002: 493) has shown that some of the Chinese translations reveal a closely related understanding while rendering this phrase[42] as 自恣請, where 自恣 "usually means 'as one pleases'." It seems to me that both the explanation of the old Vibhaṅga commentary and the Chinese translations point to a connection of *abhihaṭṭhuṃ* with *abhi-hṛṣ* "to satisfy, to make happy." Based on this explanation, the entire phrase could be literally translated as "to offer to satisfy / to satisfaction."

Of course the term remains problematic.[43] It is therefore not excluded that the previous explanation based on *abhi-hṛ* is correct, but it seems to be not as certain as the CPD wants us to believe.

[42] Heirman takes this Chinese expression as equivalent to *pravārayati*, but I extend her statement to *abhihaṭṭhuṃ*, which is usually met with in this formula.

[43] The expected infinitive of this verb is of course *abhiharṣitum* / Middle Indic *abhihassituṃ*.

None of the Vinaya traditions was really able to identify this inherited form. Unfortunately, the Gāndhārī text seems to be no exception. It did not translate or alter the inherited form, but preserved it largely. Both Gāndhārī forms (*avihaṭha*/*avihaṭhu*) are based on a Middle Indic *abhihaṭṭhum*. The aspirated *ṭh* in both versions shows that this feature was obviously already present in the old text. It cannot be stated with certainty that this Middle Indic form goes back to an Eastern dialect. But it seems obvious that in all Western translations this form was probably no longer understood. Most redactors preferred to replace this term by an equivalent expression, since a mere phonetical transformation as done in the Gāndhārī and Pāli versions, did not result in a comprehensible word. If we were to describe the strategies applied in this case, we observe two different approaches: conservatism by mere phonetical transformation (Pāli, Gāndhārī) versus innovation by substitution (Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin, (Mūla)-Sarvāstivādin).

4.2. The Phrase *anyatra pallaṭṭakena* in the *Prātimokṣasūtra* of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins

In the last part of my discussion, I want to present a similar case that adds another aspect to the application of these strategies. In two rules of the *Prātimokṣasūtra* we find the expression "except by exchange." While most of the versions translate this phrase into their respective dialect, [44] both rules of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravāda *Prātimokṣasūtra* of the late Eastern "Patna manuscript" represent this expression by the phrase *anyatra*

[44] Gāndhārī A: *añatra parivaṭeṇa* (PMS-G^{A}, line 7); Gāndhārī B: *añatra [pa]rivaṭeṇa* (PMS-G^{B}, lines 8–9); Pāli: *aññatra pārivattakā* (NP 5, Vin III 209.34); Sarvāstivāda: *anyatra parivartakena* (von Simson 2000: 185); Mūlasarvāstivāda: *anyatra parivarttakān* (NP 5, Hu–von Hinüber 2003: 23), Unidentified text: /// *p]ari[v]artake[n](a)* (Wille 2009: 56). The preserved parallel texts of the Pāyattika rule 25 (= Pāli version) are identical in all cases.

pallaṭṭakena.[45] This is clearly an Eastern form with *l* for *r* and can be compared with the numerous examples for the prefix *pali* = *pari* listed by Lüders.[46] A related form based on Skt. *pari-vṛt* (*pallaṭṭa-nto*) is attested in the *Abhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ*, another Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravāda Vinaya text that has been preserved in a manuscript from Eastern India.[47] Although this particular Eastern form of *pari-vṛt* seems to be restricted to texts of the Mahāsāṃghika-(Lokottaravāda) tradition, it is not consistently used in its texts. Thus the "Bamiyan manuscript" of the *Prātimokṣasūtra*, which most likely belongs to the same tradition, uses in rule Pāy. 28 the expected Western form *anyatra parivartake*.[48]

Again the versions vary between innovation, this time by translating into their language, and conservatism by preserving the word in its inherited form. That this particular Eastern form is restricted to manuscripts from East India—even of a late date—may be no coincidence. It is possible that the language of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins from this region preserved more Eastern features than other regional branches.[49]

5. Conclusion

The numerous manuscripts of Indic versions of the *Prātimokṣasūtra* clearly show that for a long time in the history of

[45] This is the correct reading of the manuscript according to Karashima 2012: 239, commentary ad 30.9. The edition reads in both instances *anyatra pallaṭṭhakena* (Tatia 1975: 13 and 21).

[46] Lüders 1956: 56–63, §§58–71.

[47] See the discussion of this term by Karashima 2012: 239, commentary ad 30.9. Beside this clearly Eastern form, the *Abhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ* use also the regular Western equivalent *parivartanto.*

[48] Karashima 2013: 55, corrected to *parivartake«na»*.

[49] Cf., for example, Gustav Roth's remarks on the Eastern features of the *Abhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ* (1980: 92).

Indian Buddhism the transmission of this fundamental text was accompanied by a continuous process of translations and adaptations that did not stop at the boundaries of *nikāya*s. If there ever was the notion of a canonical language as such, it must have changed constantly, and these changes were certainly different from region to region. There is absolutely no need to assume that Sarvāstivādins in Gandhāra ever used a *Prātimokṣasūtra* that was identical with that of their co-brethren in Mathurā or in South-India. As far as we can see, the distinctiveness of the texts that finally resulted in specific *nikāya* versions is rather characterized by certain redactional changes that were made by a certain community and became later accepted by others. The linguistic form in which such redactional changes came across is of secondary importance. Thus the two Gāndhārī versions of the *Prātimokṣasūtra* use nearly the same Middle Indic language, but represent quite distinct versions of the text.

There is good reason to believe that our ideas about the existence of canonical languages and their status are heavily influenced by the Theravāda tradition. The Theravādins were and are very conservative in language issues. At an early period they preserved their canonical texts in an archaic linguistic form. Despite certain attempts to normalize this inherited Western Indian language, there can be no doubt that the Pāli Canon is the most authentic representation of the ancient linguistic form of the Buddhist canonical scriptures. This was clearly facilitated by the notion of Pāli as a canonical language, considered as identical with Māgadhī, the mother tongue of Lord Buddha. It seems that other Buddhist communities, in India and elsewhere, never had this kind of concerns, or at least not at this early period.

Accepting a canonical language presupposes the existence of a canon, properly defined by Richard Salomon as "a comprehensive, organized, and standardized body of authoritative scriptures defined by a religious or secular authority."[50] As far as we can judge from the available evidence,

[50] Salomon 2006: 365.

the Theravādins in Sri Lanka were the first and the only Buddhist community in India that made this attempt.[51] This explains the high degree of consistency of their language, but also of their textual transmission. No other Buddhist *nikāya* in India is reported to have ever compiled in a systematic way a collection of texts that would comprise the whole *Tripiṭaka*. The manuscript evidence rather points to a highly dynamic situation with a multitude of different versions in different languages and texts and textual corpora that influenced each other within and beyond *nikāya* boundaries. These dynamics did also affect the "core text" of each Buddhist community, the *Prātimokṣasūtra*. As the recent studies by von Simson (2000) and Emms (2012) show, there is also no single Sarvāstivāda or Mūlasarvāstivāda *Prātimokṣasūtra*. As many other texts, the *Prātimokṣasūtra* existed in different recensions. Rather than speaking categorically about *the Prātimokṣasūtra* or *the* Vinaya of a certain lineage, we should therefore speak qualifiedly about *a Prātimokṣasūtra* or *a* Vinaya of this lineage. Strictly speaking, even such a statement is only possible if the text is explicitly marked as belonging to a specific

[51] For the diverging views about the formation of early Buddhist canons, see now Allon 2018. Despite Allon's criticism, I clearly subscribe to the ideas expressed earlier by Richard Salomon (2006, 2011) and Gérard Fussman (2012). As rightly remarked by Fussman (2012: 197), "[i]t is possible that there were efforts to achieve a closed collection with a final or fixed internal arrangement and immutable wording. The legend of the Council of the Kashmir Sarvāstivādins held under the patronage of Kaniṣka reflects both this desire and a tradition indicating that there was no common canon for all Sarvastivādins before Kaniṣka. We have nothing like it for other *nikāyas* [...]." According to him (id. 2012: 198), "every monastery must have had manuscript collections slightly different from those of neighbouring monasteries, whether belonging to the same *nikāya* or not. As it was always the Word of the Buddha (*buddha-vacana*), it hardly mattered, except for the Vinaya, which maintained the differentiation between schools." In view of our present study on *Prātimokṣasūtra* versions, it seems possible to extend Fussman's statement to the entirety of "canonical" texts.

lineage. If this is not the case, we should perhaps even avoid a reference to a clear school affiliation.

The more manuscript evidence we access, the more our idea of "canonical versions" and "canonical languages" collapses. The reality was probably a different one: There existed the text of a *Prātimokṣasūtra* that was recited during the regular *uposatha* ceremonies in a specific monastery, at a specific place and at a specific time. At the same time there existed countless "concurrent" versions, in oral form and later on also in the form of written manuscripts, in both the same and other places. Given the technical character of the *Prātimokṣasūtra*, the differences of these versions were of course mainly marginal and concerned either the sequence of the rules, the exact wording or—as we saw—the language. But the idea that on this basis a clear *nikāya* affiliation can be assigned has probably to be given up. In his edition of The British Library Sanskrit fragments from the Hoernle Collection, published in 2009, Klaus Wille introduced two *Prātimokṣasūtra* manuscripts. They can be dated to the fifth century CE and hail from Khādalik/Khotan at the Southern branch of the Silk Road. Wille tried to establish their relationship to one of the known *Prātimokṣasūtra* texts, but evidently the text on these fragments did not match any of them. Wille was forced to conclude: "We probably have to question the validity of our criteria for sectarian affiliation and their general applicability to this text. We do not know yet, to what extent compilers of the monks' rules felt free to redact the text at this comparatively late stage and in this region."[52]

An answer to this question is only possible on the basis of a large number of detailed studies of the available manuscript evidence that rather try to reconstruct the history of the texts in a specific geographical environment than to establish "critical editions" of texts that probably never existed in the form they are reconstructed.

[52] Wille 2009: 51.

The question of the *nikāya* affiliation—even for Vinaya texts—becomes more and more obsolete against this background. As shown, even within a school tradition we have to consider a certain variety of textual and linguistic features that cannot in themselves serve as distinctive markers of a certain school affiliation, but instead reflect the fluidity and diversity of the inner-school textual transmission. There is of course no doubt that school specific differences existed and that the versions transmitted within one school are more closely related to each other than to versions of another school. But the boundaries are fluid and the texts open to redactional changes in a way that makes it sometimes difficult to determine where exactly the boundaries that distinguish the texts of one school from that of another are. When and even whether one of these versions became canonized for a certain school is hard to determine. Such a canonization can only be stated for traditions that compiled a canon, such as the Theravāda tradition and the Chinese and Tibetan traditions.[53]

---

[53] Cf. also my earlier remarks on "canonical" Āgama *sūtra*s that seem to a considerable degree to be extendable to the Vinaya literature: "it seems to me it is a more fruitful methodological approach to perceive these representations of a text rather as regional recensions or versions than as school specific variants of a given text. A specific version could of course have become the authoritative text of a certain school, when this school decided to fix a 'canonical version' in a written or oral Tradition [...] the strictly text critical approach can help to liberate our view on early Buddhist texts from the too narrow perspective of school affiliation and widen it to equally important factors in the genesis of texts, such as their geographical, linguistic and historical contexts. Processes that are related to the specific modes of text preservation, transmission and performance, be it in oral, written or in a mix of oral and written ways, must have played a decisive role in the genesis of texts. It can be assumed that the change from oral to written modes largely influenced the shape of texts and finally also contributed to the genesis of rather stable and homogeneous literary forms. At the same time, the new support material also allowed a much greater circulation of texts and could promote harmonizing processes between monastic communities in far-away locations all over the Buddhist cultural sphere. It is by then

that school affiliation might have become a more determining factor rather than geographical location, by enabling monks to compare their respective versions of *Āgama sūtra*s and agree on a commonly accepted, 'canonical' shape." See Strauch 2017: 366–368.

References

1. Abbreviations

Abbreviations of Pāli texts refer to the list of abbreviations of the CPD. Citations of Pāli texts are from editions of the Pali Text Society, if not otherwise indicated.

BC	Bajaur Collection of Kharoṣṭhī Manuscripts, manuscript no.
PTSD	Rhys Davids, T. W. & William Stede (eds.). 1921–25. *The Pali Text Society's Pali-English Dictionary*. London.
CPD	*A Critical Pāli Dictionary*. Online version: https://cpd.uni-koeln.de/intro/.
NP	Naiḥsargika Pācittiya
Pāc.	Pācittiya
Pāy.	Pāyantikā, Pāyattika
PD	Cone, Margaret. 2001. *A Dictionary of Pāli*. Parts I. Oxford: The Pali Text Society.
SHT	Waldschmidt, Ernst et al. (eds.), *Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden*. Wiesbaden/Stuttgart: F. Steiner, 1965– (Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Bd. 10), T. 1–.

2. Bibliography

Allon, Mark. 2018. "The Formation of Canons in the Early Indian *Nikāyas* or Schools in the Light of the New Gāndhārī Manuscript Finds." *Buddhist Studies Review* 35: 225–244.

——. 2019. "A Unique Gāndhārī Monastic Ledger Recording Gifts by Vima Kadphises. (Studies in Gāndhārī Manuscripts 2)." *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 42: 1–46.

Banerjee, A. Ch. 1977. *Two Buddhist Vinaya Texts in Sanskrit: Prātimokṣa Sūtra and Bhikṣukarmavākya*. Calcutta: The World Press Private Limited.

Chung, Jin-il & Klaus Wille. 1997. "Einige Bhikṣuvinayavibhaṅga-Fragmente der Dharmaguptakas in der Sammlung Pelliot." In Heinz Bechert et al. (eds.), *Untersuchungen zur buddhistischen Literatur II, Gustav Roth zum 80. Geburtstag gewidmet*. Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden, Beiheft 8. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 47–94.

Emms, Christopher. 2012. *Evidence for Two Mūlasarvāstivādin* Vinaya *Traditions in the Gilgit* Prātimokṣa-sūtras. M.A. thesis. McMaster University.

Falk, Harry & Ingo Strauch. 2014. "The Bajaur and Split Collections of Kharoṣṭhī Manuscripts within the Context of Buddhist Gāndhārī Literature." In Paul Harrison & Jens-Uwe Hartmann (eds.), *From Birch-Bark to Digital Data: Recent Advances in Buddhist Manuscript Research: Papers Presented at the Conference 'Indic Buddhist Manuscripts: The State of the Field,' Stanford, June 15–19 2009*. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse, Denkschriften, 460. Band / Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens 80. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 51–78.

Fussman, Gérard. 2012. "Review of Andrew Glass (2007). *Four Gāndhārī Saṃyuktāgama Sūtras: Senior Kharoṣṭhī Fragment 5*. (Gandhāran Buddhist Texts 4). Seattle: University of Washington Press." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 55: 189–200.

Harrison, Paul, Timothy Lenz & Richard Salomon. 2018. "Fragments of a Gāndhārī Manuscript of the *Pratyutpannabuddhasaṃmukhāvasthitasamādhisūtra* (Studies in Gāndhārī Manuscripts 1)." *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies* 41: 117–143.

Heirman, Ann. 2002. *"The Discipline in Four Parts" Rules for Nuns according to the Dharmaguptakavinaya.* Parts 1–3. Buddhist Tradition Series 47. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

von Hinüber, Oskar. 1985. "Die Bestimmung der Schulzugehörigkeit buddhistischer Texte nach sprachlichen Kriterien." In Heinz Bechert (ed.), *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hīnayāna-Literatur. Erster Teil.* Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, philologisch-historische Klasse, dritte Folge 149 / Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung III, 1. Göttingen: Vandhenhoeck & Ruprecht, 57–75.

——. 1989. "Origin and Varieties of Buddhist Sanskrit." In Colette Caillat (ed.), *Dialectes dans les littératures indo-aryennes*. Publications de l'Institut de civilisation indienne, série in-8º, fascicule 55. Paris: Institut de civilisation indienne, 341–367.

——. 1999. *Das Pātimokkhasutta der Theravādin. Studien zur Literatur des Theravāda-Buddhismus II.* Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur. Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse. Jahrgang 1999. Nr. 6. Mainz: Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur & Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

——. 2001. *Das ältere Mittelindisch im Überblick*. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte 467. Band / Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Südasiens, Heft 20. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Horner, I.B. 1957. *The Book of the Discipline (Vinaya-Pitaka). Volume II. (Suttavibhaṅga).* Sacred Books of the Buddhists 20,2. London: Pali Text Society (reprint of Oxford 1940).

Hu–von Hinüber, Haiyan. 2003. *Das Bhikṣu-Prātimokṣasūtra der Mūlasarvāstivādins anhand der Sanskrit-Handschriften aus Tibet und Gilgit sowie unter Berücksichtigung der tibetischen und chinesischen Übersetzungen kritisch herausgegeben*. Online publication of the Universität Freiburg from 2014 at

https://freidok.uni-freiburg.de/fedora/objects/freidok:9535/datastreams/FILE1/content.

Karashima, Seishi. 2000. "A Fragment of the Prātimokṣa-Vibhaṅga of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins." In Jens Braarvig et. al. (eds.), *Buddhist Manuscripts*, vol. 1. Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection 1. Oslo: Hermes Publishing, 233–241.

——. 2002. "Two More Folios of the Prātimokṣa-Vibhaṅga of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins." In Jens Braarvig et. al. (eds.), *Buddhist Manuscripts*, vol. 2. Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection 3. Oslo: Hermes Publishing, 215–228.

——. 2006. "The Prātimokṣa-Vibhaṅga of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins in Early Western Gupta Script." In Jens Braarvig et. al. (eds.), *Buddhist Manuscripts*, vol. 3. Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection. Oslo: Hermes Publishing, 261–276.

——. 2008. "Fragments of a Manuscript of the *Prātimokṣasūtra* of the *Mahāsāṃghika-(Lokottara)vādins* (1)." *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 11: 71–90.

——. 2012. *Die* Abhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ. *Verhaltensregeln für buddhistische Mönche der* Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins, *herausgegeben, mit der chinesischen Parallelversion verglichen, übersetzt und kommentiert, unter Mitwirkung von Oskar von Hinüber*. Band 1–3. Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica 13. Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University.

——. 2013. "Manuscript Fragments of the *Prātimokṣasūtra* of the Mahāsāṃghika(-Lokottaravādin)s (2)." *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 16: 47–90.

Lévi, Sylvain. 1913. "Tokharian Pratimokṣa Fragment." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*: 109–120.

Lüders, Heinrich†. 1954. *Beobachtungen über die Sprache des buddhistischen Urkanons. Aus dem Nachlass herausgegeben von*

Ernst Waldschmidt. Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst. Jahrgang 1952 Nr. 10. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Ñāṇatusita, Bhikkhu. 2014. *Analysis of the Bhikkhu Pātimokkha*. Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society.

——. 2017. "The Bāmiyān *Prātimokṣasūtra*: a 'Buddhist Hybrid Text'." *Journal of Buddhist Studies* 16: 183–226.

Nolot, Édith. 1991. *Règles de discipline des nonnes bouddhistes: Le* Bhikṣuṇīvinaya *de l'école Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin. Traduction annotée, commentaire, collation du manuscrit*. Collège de France, Publications de l'Institut de civilisation indienne, fascicule 60. Paris: Edition-diffusion de Boccard.

Norman, K.R. 2002. "A Survey of the Grammar of Early Middle Indo-Aryan." *Acta Orientalia* 63: 221–248 (= 2007. *K.R. Norman's Collected Papers*. Volume 8. Oxford: The Pali Text Society, 333–365).

Oberlies, Thomas. 2001. *Pāli: A Grammar of the Language of the Theravāda Tipiṭaka: With a Concordance to Pischel's Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen*. Indian Philology and South Asian Studies 3. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Pachow, W. & R. Mishra. 1956. *The Prātimokṣa-Sūtra of the Mahāsāṃghikas: Critically Edited for the First Time from the Palm-Leaf Manuscripts Found in Tibet.* Allahabad: Ganganatha Jha Research Institute.

Pischel, Richard. 1900. *Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen*. Grundriss der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde 1. Band, 8. Heft. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner.

Pruitt, William (ed.) & Kenneth Roy Norman (tr.). 2001: *The Patimokkha*. Sacred Books of the Buddhists 39. Oxford: The Pali Text Society.

Rhys Davids, T.W. & Hermann Oldenberg. 1882. *Vinaya Texts. Part II. The Mahāvagga, V-X. The Kullavagga, I-III*. Sacred Books of the East 17. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press.

Rosen, Valentina. 1959. *Der Vinayavibhaṅga zum Bhikṣuprātimokṣa der Sarvāstivādins. Sanskritfragmente nebst einer Analyse der chinesischen Übersetzung*. Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden 2. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Roth, Gustav. 1970. *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya. Including Bhikṣuṇī-Prakīrṇaka and a Summary of the Bhikṣu-Prakīrṇaka of the Ārya-Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin. Edited and Annotated with Introduction, Two Indexes and Four Addenda*. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 12. Patna: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute.

——. 1980. "Particular Features of the Language of the *Ārya-Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins* and their Importance for Early Buddhist Tradition." In Heinz Bechert (ed.), *Die Sprache der ältesten buddhistischen Überlieferung. The Language of the Earliest Buddhist Tradition (Symposien zur Buddhismus-forschung II).* Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philologisch-Historische Klasse. Dritte Folge. Nr. 117. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 78–135.

Salomon, Richard. 2006. "Recent Discoveries of Early Buddhist Manuscripts and Their Implications for the History of Buddhist Texts and Canons." In Patrick Olivelle (ed.), *Between the Empires: Society in India 300 BCE to 400 CE*. New York: Oxford University Press, 349–382.

——. 2011. "An Unwieldy Canon: Observations on Some Distinctive Features of Canon Formation in Buddhism." In Max Deeg, Oliver Freiberger & Christoph Kleine (eds.), *Kanonisierung und Kanonbildung in der asiatischen Religionsgeschichte*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 161–207.

Shōno, Masanori. 2016. "More folios of *Prātimokṣa-Vibhaṅga* of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins in Early Western Gupta Script." In Jens Braarvig et al. (eds.), *Buddhist Manuscripts*, vol. 4. Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection. Oslo: Hermes Publishing, 321–327.

von Simson, Georg. 1997. "Eine Prātimokṣasūtra-Handschrift in hybrider Sprache." In Petra Kieffer-Pülz & Jens-Uwe Hartmann (eds.), *Bauddhavidyāsudhākaraḥ. Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert. On the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Indica et Tibetica 30. Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica Verlag, 583–604.

——. 2000. *Prātimokṣasūtra der Sarvāstivādins. Teil II: Kritische Textausgabe, Übersetzung, Wortindex sowie Nachträge zu Teil I.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Skilling, Peter. 1997. "On the School-Affiliation of the 'Patna *Dhammapada*'." *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 23: 83–122.

——. 2010. "Scriptural Authority and the Śrāvaka Schools: An Essay towards an Indian Perspective." *The Eastern Buddhist* 41: 1–47.

Strauch, Ingo. 2008a. "The Bajaur Collection of Kharoṣṭhī Manuscripts – A Preliminary Survey." *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 25: 103–136.

——. 2008b. *The Bajaur Collection: A New Collection of Kharoṣṭhī Manuscripts. A preliminary Catalogue and Survey*. Online version 1.1. http://gretil.sub.uni-goettingen.de/gretil_elib/Str007__Strauch_Bajaur_Collection-Preliminary_Catalogue_and_Survey_v_1-1_2008.pdf (last accessed 20.4.2020).

——. 2012. "The Character of the Indian Kharoṣṭhī Script and the 'Sanskrit Revolution': A Writing System between Identity and Assimilation." In Alex de Voogt & Joachim Friedrich Quack (eds.), *The Idea of Writing: Writing across Borders*. Leiden: Brill, 131–168.

——. 2014. "Looking into Water-Pots and over a Buddhist Scribe's Shoulder – On the Deposition and the Use of Manuscripts in Early Buddhism." *Asiatische Studien* 68: 797–830.

——. 2017. "The Indic Versions of the **Dakṣiṇāvibhaṅga-sūtra*: Some Thoughts on the Early Transmission of *Āgama* Texts." In Dhammadinnā (ed.), *Research on the Madhyama-āgama*.

Dharma Drum Institute of Liberal Arts Research Series 5. Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation, 327–373.

Tatia, Nathmal. 1975. *Prātimokṣasūtram of the Lokottaravādimahāsāṅghika School*. Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 16. Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute.

Waldschmidt, Ernst. 1926. *Bruchstücke des Bhikṣuṇī-Prātimokṣa der Sarvāstivādins. Mit einer Darstellung der Überlieferung des Bhikṣuṇī-Prātimokṣa in den verschiedenen Schulen*. Kleinere Sanskrit-Texte, Heft 3. Leipzig: Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft in Kommission bei F.A. Brockhaus (= 1979. *Kleinere Sanskrittexte III und IV*. Monographien zur Indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie, Band 2. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1–191).

——. 1980. "Central Asian Sūtra Fragments and Their Relation to the Chinese Āgamas." In Heinz Bechert (ed.), *Die Sprache der ältesten buddhistischen Überlieferung. The Language of the Earliest Buddhist Tradition (Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung II).* Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philologisch-Historische Klasse. Dritte Folge. Nr. 117. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 136–174 (= 1989. *Ausgewählte Kleine Schriften*. Glasenapp-Stiftung Band 29. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden, 370–408).

Wille, Klaus. 1997. "Zwei kleine Fragmente aus dem Bhikṣuṇīprātimokṣasūtra." In Heinz Bechert et al. (eds.), *Untersuchungen zur buddhistischen Literatur II, Gustav Roth zum 80. Geburtstag gewidmet*. Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden, Beiheft 8. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 307–314.

——. 2009. "Buddhist Sanskrit Sources from Khotan." In Seishi Karashima & Klaus Wille (eds.), *The British Library Sanskrit Fragments: Buddhist Manuscripts from Central Asia.* Volume 2.1: *Texts*. Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University, 25–72.

Evolution of Scriptures, Formation of Canons

The Buddhist Case

Edited by

Orna Almogi

INDIAN AND TIBETAN STUDIES 13

Hamburg • 2022

Department of Indian and Tibetan Studies, Universität Hamburg

Evolution of Scriptures, Formation of Canons

INDIAN AND TIBETAN STUDIES

Edited by Harunaga Isaacson, Dorji Wangchuk, and Eva Wilden

Volume 13

Hamburg • 2022

Department of Indian and Tibetan Studies, Universität Hamburg

Evolution of Scriptures, Formation of Canons

The Buddhist Case

Edited by

Orna Almogi

INDIAN AND TIBETAN STUDIES 13

Hamburg • 2022

Department of Indian and Tibetan Studies, Universität Hamburg

Published by the Department of Indian and Tibetan Studies, Asien-Afrika- Institut, Universität Hamburg, Alsterterrasse 1,
D-20354 Hamburg, Germany
Email: indologie@uni-hamburg.de

ISBN: 978-3-945151-12-9

Almogi, Orna: Evolution of Scriptures, Formation of Canons: The Buddhist Case

First published 2022

Printing and distribution:
Aditya Prakashan, 2/18 Ansari Road, New Delhi, 110 002, India.
Email: contact@bibliaimpex.com
Website: www.bibliaimpex.com

Printed and bound in India by Replika Press Pvt. Ltd.

This publication has been supported by the Khyentse Center for Tibetan Buddhist Textual Scholarship (KC-TBTS), Universität Hamburg.