

The *Kāludāyi-Theragāthā* as transmitted in the Pali commentaries*

Aruna Gamage

SOAS University of London

632280@soas.ac.uk

For Ven. Dr Dodamkumbure Dhammadassi

Abstract

While the *Theragāthā* contains only ten verses attributed to the Elder Kāludāyi, the Pali commentaries ascribe a further two sets of verses to him. The present article aims to carry out a detailed survey of these verses, which have so far received no scholarly attention, as a contribution to the understanding of the formation of Kāludāyi's verses in the canon and their paracanonical legacy. In this paper, the additional verses of Kāludāyi that appear in the commentaries are critically analysed in light of all other utterances attributed to him, in the canon as well as in the commentaries. The style, syntax, and wordings of specific stanzas of both series will be taken into consideration so as to evaluate their antiquity and their literary quality. When dealing with the rhetorical devices adapted in the stanzas, some Sanskrit poems are also taken into account.

Keywords: Pali canon, Pali commentaries, *Kāludāyi*, Preservation, Contamination

1. Commentaries and the formation of the canon

Pali commentaries are helpful in examining the textual formation of the Pali canon. The commentaries that have come down to us were composed between the fifth and fifteenth centuries in Sri Lanka and south India. A remarkable feature of these works is that they preserve a number of scriptures that were purposely excluded from or could not be included in the canon. As these sources say, some of the scriptures appear to have been deliberately shunned on the grounds that they were not rehearsed during the three communal recitations (*saṅgīti*), which are said to have been held in the fourth–third centuries BCE, and furthermore they did not suit the doctrines of the Mahāvihāra fraternity.¹ I wonder whether some of the early scriptures, though they did not deviate from the Mahāvihāra viewpoint regarding the Buddha's word, could not be included in the canon because it had already been closed. Many of that kind

* I am immensely grateful to Dr Vincent Tournier, for his precious guidance, valuable advice, and corrections. I also wish to thank Professor Ulrich Pagel for encouraging me to submit this work to the *Bulletin*, the two anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments and corrections, and Jacob Mortimer for his assistance with polishing my English.

1 See von Hinüber 1996: 202; Skilling 2010: 1–47; Hayashi 2013: 21–46; Gamage 2013: 63–83; Silk 2015: 21.

of scripture would have continued to be transmitted alongside the canon as “apocryphal” or “peripheral”² texts, before they fell into complete oblivion over the course of time, while others have partially survived in the Pali commentaries. The commentators cite passages from such peripheral discourses from time to time in order to support their exegeses.³ A careful examination of such paracanonical passages recorded in the Pali commentaries is of great importance in tracing the formation and gradual development of the canon.

2. Kāludāyi in the Pali canon

References to the Elder Kāludāyi are limited in the canon. As far as I know, there is no reference to this Elder in the *Vinaya-piṭaka*, nor can a single discourse preached to him or preached by him be attested in the *Sutta-piṭaka*. Apart from one reference in the *Aṅguttara-nikāya*, which presents him as foremost among the disciples who inspire confidence in families,⁴ no other attestation can be found in the first four *Nikāyas*. However, three texts of the *Khuddaka-nikāya* contain several references to Kāludāyi. For instance, the *Theragāthā* preserves ten verses ascribed to him.⁵ It is interesting to note here that ten verses of the *Mahāvastu*, itself a part of the *Vinaya-piṭaka* of the Mahāsāṅghika-Lokottaravādins, closely resemble the aforementioned verses of the *Theragāthā*.⁶ Furthermore, the *Jātaka* mentions him in passing only to say that he was born as the king of the gods (Sakka) in a previous existence.⁷ Interestingly, the *Apadāna* contains two starkly dissimilar “accounts of meritorious deeds” (*apadānas*) ascribed to Kāludāyi. According to the concluding remarks of both these *apadānas*, which were obviously added by the redactors of the canon (*saṅgītikāras*), the verses were uttered by Kāludāyi,⁸ yet the first *apadāna* as a whole has no specific details about him.⁹ On the other hand, the second

2 In this article, the term “peripheral” refers to scriptures that are accepted by the Mahāvihāra lineage but were not incorporated into the Mahāvihāra canon and preserved in the Pali commentaries.

3 Dhs-a 65: *svāyam attho imassa saṅgītiṃ anārūḥassa suttassa vasena vedītabbo*. Tr. Nyānaponika 2005: 141: “Die Bedeutung hiervon hat man aufgrund der folgenden, in der »Rezitation« nicht enthaltenen Lehrrede zu verstehen”. The *Sāratthappakāsinī* refers to a *Pasūrasutta* not found in the canon. See S-a I 63: *ayaṃ panattho Pasūrasuttēna vibhāvetabbo* “This meaning is indeed to be understood by means of the *Pasūrasutta*”. After this introductory sentence, the commentary quotes three stanzas from this unknown *Pasūrasutta*. These three stanzas also appear in the exegesis of the *Pasūrasutta* of the *Suttanipāta* (see Sn-a II 538–40). The latter source develops the account as a narrative adding some prose sections; see also Bodhi 2017, 1095–1097. This apocryphal *Pasūrasutta* obviously differs from that of the *Suttanipāta* (Sn 161–3).

4 A I 25: *kulappasādakānaṃ yadidaṃ Kāludāyi*. See also Bodhi (2012: 110).

5 Th I 56–7.

6 Mvu III 93, 108–9. Norman (1995: 205–8) has noted these equivalents with notable variations.

7 J IV 314: *Kāludāyi tadā Sakko*.

8 Ap I 86: *itthaṃ sudam āyasmā Kāludāyi thero imā gāthāyo abhāsithā ti*. See also Ap II 502; Clark 2015: 261–2; Walters 2017: 156 and 955. The first *apadāna* consists of 16 verses while the latter comprises 29 verses.

9 Ap I 85–6. This *apadāna* offers little detail about Kāludāyi. It presents only tropes shared with many accounts of the Elders in the *Apadāna*, such as the offering of flowers and

apadāna is highly informative, and moreover corroborates the statement in the *Aṅguttara-nikāya*.¹⁰ In addition, the second *apadāna* contains four important details about Kāludāyi: 1. In his previous life, in the presence of the Buddha Padumuttara, he made an aspiration to become the foremost of disciples who inspire confidence in Gotama Buddha's dispensation among families;¹¹ 2. Kāludāyi and prince Siddhattha were born on the same day;¹² 3. Kāludāyi was sent to Gotama Buddha by Suddhodana to receive ordination; 4. Kāludāyi, after the attainment of arahantship, persuaded the Buddha to visit the city of Kapilavatthu.¹³ These details, to some extent, agree with Kāludāyi's verses in the *Theragāthā*.

3. Kāludāyi's verses in the commentaries

Although mentions of Kāludāyi are confined to these four accounts, commentarial sources preserve a wealth of references to him. Many of the commentators show a special care when they describe Kāludāyi's role – perhaps because he was conceived of as one of seven characters born at the same time (*sahajātā*) as prince Siddhattha.¹⁴ Buddhaghosa offers a folk etymology for his name: Kāludāyi was initially called “Udāyi”, since he was born on a day when all the city's inhabitants were joyful, yet he subsequently became popular as “Kāludāyi” on account of his darker complexion.¹⁵ As we noted in the preceding passage, Kāludāyi prompted the Buddha to visit Kapilavatthu. On that occasion, as a number of commentarial accounts state, he praised the beauty of the season as well as the attractiveness of the road from Rājagaha to Kapilavatthu, reciting “sixty *gāthās*”.¹⁶ As already indicated, the *Theragāthā* preserves only ten verses recited by him. This shows that there is an inconsistency between the *Theragāthā* and commentarial records with regard to the exact number of verses. Furthermore, with the exception of the first four verses, the *Theragāthā* does not appear to be either a request to the Buddha or a eulogy to the road from

food to the Buddha Padumuttara, the destruction of the defilements and the acquisition of the six super-knowledges. Although this *apadāna* does not show anything specific to Kāludāyi, the *Visuddhajanavilāsinī*, being the commentary on the *Apadāna*, also attributes it to him. See Ap-a 358.

10 See n. 4. Cf. Ap II 500–2: *kulappasādakānaggam*.

11 Ap II 501: *Kulappasādakānaggo yo tayā santhuto mune, tādiso hom'ahaṃ vīra Buddhaseṭṭhassa sāsane*.

12 Ap II 501: *yadā ajāyi Siddhattho ... tadaheva ahaṃ jāto*.

13 Ap II 502: *tadā Suddhodenanēhaṃ bhūmipālena pesito, gantvā disvā dasabalaṃ pabbajitvārahā ahaṃ, tadā mahesiṃ yācivā pāpayiṃ Kapilavhayaṃ*.

14 See A-a I 301: *Bodhisattena hi saddhiṃ Bodhirukkho Rāhulamātā catasso nidhikumbhiyo Ārohanīyathatthi Kanthako Channo Kāludāyī ti ime satta ekadivase jātattā sahaajātā nāma ahesuṃ*. See also Th-a I 221, Ap-a II 531–2. Horner (1978: xliii–xliv) comments on these “co-natals” in detail.

15 A-a I 301: *sakalanagarassa udaggacittadivase jāto ti Udāyī tveva nāmaṃ akaṃsu. thokaṃ kālādhātukattā pana Kāludāyī nāma jāto*.

16 *saṭṭhimattāhi gāthāhi*. This number of Kāludāyi's verses is affirmed in at least seven commentarial accounts and two sub-commentaries. See A-a I 303, V-a V 1004, J-a I 87, Bv-a B^o 5; Bv-a C^o (PTS Bv-a 4 *paṭhamattāhi [gāthāhi]* for *saṭṭhimattāhi [gāthāhi]* is seemingly a scribal error of the editor or graphic confusion in early manuscripts), Bv-a 24, Ap-a I 91, II 538.

Rājagaha to Kapilavatthu as enunciated in the commentaries. The thematic coherence of the verses in the *Theragāthā* indeed suddenly collapses after the fourth *gāthā*, and the six verses from the fifth to tenth are disconnected from the first four.¹⁷ The internal inconsistency of these two series of verses suggests that they were poorly stitched together by the redactor compiling verses attributed to Kāludāyi. However, the commentary to the *Theragāthā* attempts to resolve this by seeking to establish a link between the ten verses.¹⁸ Here, one should mention that the commentary to the *Aṅuttara-nikāya*,¹⁹ when describing Kāludāyi's *gāthās* as consisting of "sixty verses", quotes the following stanza, which is absent from the *Theragāthā*:

*nātisītaṃ nāti-unhaṃ nātidubbhikkhachātakaṃ,
saddalā haritā bhūmi esa kālo Mahāmuni.*

It is neither too cool nor too hot, and there is neither extreme famine nor hunger.

The earth is green with grass. O great sage, this is the time.²⁰

The commentaries to the *Jātaka*, the *Buddhavaṃsa*, the *Apadāna* as well as the *Sāratthadīpanī* (itself a sub-commentary to the *Vinaya-piṭaka*) are slightly different in this case. These sources place the first of Kāludāyi's verses in the *Theragāthā* (starting with *aṅgārino dāni dumā bhadante*)²¹ before this *gāthā*, thereby recording two stanzas in this context. Remarkably, in the Burmese *Chaṭṭhasaṅgīti Tipiṭaka* edition (BCS) of the *Madhurattahavilāsini*, the commentary of the *Buddhavaṃsa* inserts another 62 *gāthās* between these two verses. Thus, the BCS records 64 stanzas here. These stanzas are nonetheless not recorded in either the PTS or Sinhalese editions.²² An editorial remark, appearing in the footnote of the BCS of the *Bv-a*, states that these stanzas were preserved in old palm-leaf manuscripts (*porānatālapaṇṇapothakesu*).²³ It is obvious that the motif of 60 verses is close to the 64 verses appearing in the *Bv-a*.

The commentary of Kāludāyi's second *apadāna* in the *Visuddhajanavilāsini* (*Ap-a*), moreover quotes a different series of verses as his eulogy. This series consists of 48 stanzas, and its structure is quite interesting. The poem begins

17 Th 56–7.

18 See Th-a II 224–7.

19 A-a I 303.

20 Unless otherwise stated, translations from Pali in this article are my own. See also Horner 1978: 34.

21 See J-a I 87, Bv-a 23–24, Ap-a I 91, Sd-ṭ III B^c 244–5.

22 See Bv-a 23–4, Bv-a C^c 21. The latter reads the third line of the first verse as *te accimanto viya bhāsanti*.

23 Bv-a B^c 28: *catusaṭṭhimattā imā gāthāyo porānatālapaṇṇapothakesu dissanti. Sī[hala]-lī[glīsh]-mūlesu pana peyyālamukhena niddiṭṭhā ādi-antabhūtā dve yeva gāthāyo dissanti*. "These verses consisting of 'sixty-four' can be seen in old palm-leaf manuscripts. In the Sinhala as well as in English printed versions, however, they are displayed in abbreviated form, there appear only two verses as the first and the last". Here "old" manuscripts apparently refer to the palm-leaf manuscripts collated by the editors of the *Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyanā* in Yangon. Although those manuscripts are specified as "old", they are unlikely to have been very old.

with a series corresponding to the ten stanzas recorded in the *Theragāthā*, but after the fourth *gāthā*, the stanza quoted above is inserted. These 11 stanzas are then followed by another 37 *gāthās* that cannot be traced back to any other Pali canonical or commentarial source.²⁴ It is worth noting here that the *Ap-a* introduces this series of stanzas as being from the *Theragāthā*.²⁵ Both the PTS and SHB editions moreover mention that “further stanzas are found in a couple of”²⁶ manuscripts. The 48 stanzas recorded in the commentary of Kālundāyī’s second *apadāna* are very different from those of the 64 stanzas attested in the BCS of the *Bv-a*.²⁷ For convenience, I shall henceforth apply the label KTh1 to the series of stanzas attested in the *Bv-a*, and KTh2 to those in the *Ap-a*. If we subtract the ten verses attested in the *Theragāthā*, it is clear that there is a total of 100 further *gāthās* attributed to him in both KTh1 and KTh2.²⁸ However, the dates of these two peripheral series are debatable. It should be noted here that the motif of “sixty stanzas” (*saṭṭhimattāhi gāthāhi*) occurs in many commentarial sources. Although the term *mattāhi*, meaning “measuring”,²⁹ can point to slightly fewer or slightly more than sixty stanzas,³⁰ it cannot point to around one hundred. The *Theragāthā* as available to us today does not have any chapter with a hundred stanzas. All the chapters of the text are arranged sequentially, and its final chapter, the *Mahānipāta*, contains only 70 verses.³¹ Although the motif of 60 stanzas of Kālundāyī has numerous attestations in Pali exegetical literature, it is as far as I know foreign to the canonical texts of the non-Theravāda Buddhist schools whose literature is extant in Indic languages. As noted above,³² the *Mahāvastu* records only ten equivalent verses attributed to Kālundāyī in the *Theragāthā*. According to the frame-story of the *Śirīprabhamṛgarājajātaka* of the same work, Chandaka and Kālodāyī were sent by Śuddhodana as messengers (*dūtā*), and were ordained by the Buddha.³³ The *Sanṅhabhedavastu* of the Mūlasarvastivādin *Vinaya* also contains a similar account.³⁴ However, there are no references to the 60 verses associated with him. The antiquity of the two

24 By contrast, the Sinhalese edition records only the first 11 verses in this context. See *Ap-a* II C^e 450–1.

25 *Ap-a* II 532: *vuttañ c’ etaṃ Theragāthāyaṃ*. “Indeed, this was stated in the *Theragāthā*”.

26 *Ap-a* II 534. Cf. *Ap-a* II C^e 451: *katipayapotthakesu ito adhikā pi gāthāyo dissanti*.

27 Nevertheless, the BCS editors of the *Bv-a* have failed to ascertain this difference precisely, thus state that it shares 48 verses with the *Ap-a*. See *Bv-a* B^e 28: *tāsu ca catusaṭṭhimattāsu gāthāsu aṭṭhacattālīsa gāthāyo Apadānaṭṭhakathāyaṃ āgatā*. “Out of those sixty-four, forty-eight verses are handed down in the commentary of the *Apadāna*”.

28 For a translation of both KTh1 and KTh2, see Gamage (*forthcoming*).

29 *D-a* I 35: “*mattā*”*ti pamāṇaṃ vuccati*. See also PTSD, s.v. *matta*.

30 When *matta* occurs after numerals, it does not necessarily specify an exact number. In addition, as the sub-commentators state, a bit less or a bit more than the given number is negligible. See *M-aṭ* II B^e 181: *appakaṃ ūnam adhikaṃ vā gaṇanupagaṃ na hoti*.

31 See *Th* 109–15.

32 See “2. Kālundāyī in the Pali canon”.

33 *Mvu* II 233: *Śuddhodanena Cchandako ca Kālodāyī ca Rājagrhaṃ preṣitā bhagavato dūtā*. This *Jātaka* runs in the *Mvu* II 231–7. The frame story of the *Jātaka* describes the severe austerities (*ugratapaṃ*) of the Gautama Bodhisattva, and how Yaśodharā attempted to follow them at the Royal Palace. This part, to some extent, resembles that of the *Mahāsīhanādasutta* of the *Majjhima-nikāya*. See *M* I 80–1.

34 *SBV* I 183–5.

peripheral series of Kālundāyi's verses appears to be questionable when we consider how commentarial sources recorded them. Both the *Bv-a* and *Ap-a* are relatively late commentaries. The latter text is in fact much later than all the other Pali *aṭṭhakathās*. Idiomatic differences and syntactic anomalies that appear in this work testify to its later origin. As already pointed out by Godakumbura³⁵ and von Hinüber,³⁶ its date is uncertain. According to the colophon of the *Ap-a*, which is slightly confusing, a person named Mahāsāmantagaṇasobhana brought it to Laṅkā.³⁷ Regrettably, the colophon does not state whether this Gaṇasobhana was a monk or a layperson, and further it does not mention whether or not he himself composed this commentary. Although the *Gandhavaṃsa* ascribes the authorship of this commentary to Buddhaghosa,³⁸ scholars have been reluctant to take this late attribution at face value.³⁹

Concerning the *Bv-a* attributed to Buddhadatta, it must be later than the *Atthasālinī*, the commentary to the *Dhammasaṅgaṇī* (fifth century CE) since the latter is referred to in the former.⁴⁰ The exact date and authorship of the *Bv-a*, has been much debated, and in my opinion, no definitive solution has been reached to this day. Up until recently, scholars placed its date between the fifth and eighth centuries CE.⁴¹ Dimitrov, however, in his chapter on “The Madhurattappakāsini”,⁴² has rejected the traditional attribution of the *Bv-a* to Buddhadatta. He argues that it was composed instead by Ratna in the tenth century CE.⁴³ To reach this conclusion, Dimitrov examines a great wealth of primary and secondary sources. While this chapter is no doubt very informative and erudite, it also contains several misinterpretations and unfounded speculations; as a result, the overall argument is unconvincing. In particular, Dimitrov insists that

35 *Ap-a*, Introduction, xvii.

36 Von Hinüber 1996: 147. According to Cousins (1972: 162) the *Ap-a* is “later than the *īkā* attributed to Dhammapāla”. This implies that the commentary belongs to the tenth century CE. However, as von Hinüber estimates (1996: 149), the *Ap-a* was composed between the tenth and fifteenth centuries CE. See also Clark 2015: 14.

37 See *Ap-a* 571. Presumably, Mahāsāmantagaṇasobhana is a respectful appellation of him.

38 *GV* 59.

39 See *Ap-a* xvii, stating that the *Ap-a*'s “compilation may possibly be later than the times of Buddhaghosa, Dhammapāla and Buddhadatta”. See also Pieris 2004: 18, n. 2.

40 See *Bv-a* 106.

41 The *Jinakālamālī* (16th c. CE) and *Gandhavaṃsa* (17th c. CE) attribute the *Bv-a* to Buddhadatta (see Jinak 71, *GV* 59–60). Some of the scholarly views concerning this are as follows: Paññānanda (*Bv-a* ii C^e ii) stated that the *Bv-a* was composed by Buddhadatta. Meisezahl (1944), quoted in Dimitrov (2016: 250), thought that it was composed during the first half of the fifth century CE. Horner (1978: xxx) also stated that the commentary was compiled by Buddhadatta in the same century. Malalasekara (1928: 109) states: “A Ceylon tradition attributes to Buddhadatta the authorship of two other works” including *Bv-a* (See). Norman remarks the *Bv-a* “ascribed to Buddhadatta [...] must have been compiled at a later date, presumably by another Buddhadatta” (Norman 1983: 132). Cousins (1972: 162) infers the date of the *Bv-a* as the eighth century CE and mentions that its authorship is attributed to Buddhadatta (p. 163). Von Hinüber (1996: 127), who accepts the *Bv-a*'s authorship of Buddhadatta, states that the provisional date mentioned by Cousins “is not unlikely”, although it cannot be substantiated (von Hinüber 1996: 146).

42 Dimitrov 2016: 239–326.

43 See Dimitrov 2016: 320.

the *Pūjāvāliya* (13th c. CE), a medieval Sinhalese work, attributes the authorship of the *Buddhavaṃsa* to Buddhadatta, and this source is one of the cornerstones of his dismissal of the traditional attribution of the work.⁴⁴ The *Pūjāvāliya*, however, does not support this interpretation, but instead clearly credits the commentary of the *Buddhavaṃsa* to Buddhadatta.⁴⁵ In Dimitrov's lengthy chapter, I do not see any decisive evidence that would suggest that the author of the Bv-a was not a Buddhadatta,⁴⁶ but was instead the tenth-century polymath Ratna. Although I am unable to date precisely the Bv-a, it seems to me that a closer examination of the sources transmitted in this commentary is necessary before the date of the work can be revisited.

The *Manorathapūraṇī* of Buddhaghosa (5th c.) records only the single stanza of Kālundāyī that I discussed above. This stanza is in fact reminiscent of the first two lines of the great disciple's second verse in the *Theragāthā*.⁴⁷ One could thus suppose that Buddhaghosa himself rephrased these two lines when

44 Dimitrov 2016: 300, 302, 304, 307–9, 313, 317.

45 PJv 45: *visuddha vū buddhīn prasiddha vū Buddhadatta nam mahā arthakathācārīn veyiyo pavā Vanavinisa-Buddhavaṃsa-Abhidharmārthasaṃgraha-arthakathāsaṅkhyāta vū dharmakathā upadavannāhu Sumati nam mahatēra kēṇēkun hā Kaṇhadāsa nam amāyayāge ārāhanāyēn ma kaḷaha*. See also PJv² 41. I would translate as follows: “Even great teachers of commentaries, such as the one by the name of Buddhadatta, who were well known due to their utterly pure intelligence, producing explanations on *dhamma*, which are reckoned as the exposition (*arthakathā*) [titled] *Vanavinisa*, exposition [of] *Buddhavaṃsa* and the exposition [titled] *Abhidharmārthasaṃgraha*, indeed did [them] on the invitation of a senior Elder named Sumati and the minister named Kaṇhadāsa”. The term *arthakathā* applies here distributively to the three texts, and not only to the later one, as mistaken by Dimitrov. Moreover, by examining the use of *arthakathā* here and elsewhere in the work, it is clear that it has a broader meaning than Pali *aṭṭhakathā* (see PJv 17, 19; see also PJv² 15, 17). In the context of the quotation under discussion, the term is used to label two independent treatises on the Vinaya and the Abhidhamma, but also to point to the *Buddhavaṃsa-aṭṭhakathā*. Dimitrov's misinterpretation of the PJv leads him to speculate that the *Buddhavaṃsa* is in fact an authored text composed in the fifth century CE, and not a canonical work. Accordingly, he attempts to justify the term *saṃvaṇṇanā* (explanation) as applying to canonical text, which is the *Buddhavaṃsa* in this case (Dimitrov 2016: 308). This interpretation of *saṃvaṇṇanā* is highly unconvincing – this part of his argument is frankly bizarre, and does not account for the unproblematic canonical status the *Buddhavaṃsa* had gained by the fifth century at the latest. Dimitrov (2016: 304–6, 313) moreover attempts to establish that the author of the *Vinayavinicchaya* and *Abhidhammāvatāra* is different from the commentator of the Bv-a. Concerning this point, he interprets Buddhāsīha, the initiator of the *Vinayavinicchaya* (Vin-vn 229), as different from the namesake appearing in the opening verses of the Bv-a (Bv-a 1). According to Dimitrov, Buddhāsīha in Vin-vn was a pupil (*saddhivihārikaṃ*) of Buddhadatta whereas the one in the Bv-a was senior to him (Dimitrov 2016: 304–5). Here too Dimitrov makes a serious blunder. Both texts obviously refer to the same Buddhāsīha, i.e. the fellow monk of Buddhadatta. The term *saddhivihārika* is used in the Vin-vn to refer to a fellow monk. For canonical usage of this term in this sense, see Vin IV 121, 127: *bhātuno saddhivihārikassa bhikkhuno*. Tr. Horner (1940: II 411): “to a monk who shared his brother's cell”. See also PTSD, s.v. *saddhivihārika*; DPL, s.v. *saddhivihārī*. On the other hand, there is no evidence that Buddhāsīha in the Bv-a was senior to the commentator. Accordingly, I do not presently see any reason to exclude Buddhadatta as the author of these three works.

46 As noted by Horner (1978: vii) and Norman (1983: 132), there likely existed “more than one Buddhadatta”.

47 Cf. Th 56: *nevāsisītaṃ api nāti-uṇhaṃ, sukhā utū addhaniyā bhadante*.

recording Kāludāyi's account,⁴⁸ and that the KTh1 and KTh2 were composed in a later period, as a means to reach the figure of 60 stanzas attributed to Kāludāyi in earlier Pali commentaries, such as the *Manorathapūraṇī* and *Samantapāsādikā*. This seems to suggest that the verses of Kāludāyi underwent diverse developments and changes during the process of transmission in Theravāda Buddhist history. The disparity of the phraseology employed in the KTh1 and KTh2 hints at their different authorship and autonomous developments. Nevertheless, one might suspect that the KTh1 and KTh2 pre-date both the *MadhurattHAVilāsini* and the *Visuddhajanavilāsini* since these two commentaries rely on earlier commentaries from which the two series were borrowed.⁴⁹ It is within these early commentaries that the KTh1 and the KTh2 have most probably been preserved. As will be made clear in the following discussion, the stanzas of KTh1 are likely to have been composed after those of KTh2. For the sake of clarity, I shall here discuss these two series of stanzas one after the other in the following two sections.

Part one

4. Kāludāyi's verses in the *MadhurattHAVilāsini*

The KTh1 offers a beautiful eulogy to the environment of India in spring.⁵⁰ It begins by describing the trees with red shoots and sprouts, and then proceeds to illustrate various well-fruited and well-flowered trees and creepers standing on both sides of the road, and divergent species of birds with charming cries and antelopes with diverse behaviours. The author is keen to describe the meadows, shiny sand, ponds endowed with pure water and beautiful lotuses, the mountains, sky, peacocks, bees, fountains of water, rivers, woodlands, and so forth. Ascetics who bring terror to the mental defilements frequent the forest.⁵¹

48 This phenomenon can be observed elsewhere. For instance, the verse *kikī va aṇḍaṃ camarī va vāladhiṃ, piyaṃ va puttaṃ nayanam va ekakaṃ, that'eva sīlam anurakkhamānakā, supesalā hotha sadā sagāravā* (Vism 36 and D-a I 56) does not appear in the canon. I believe that Buddhaghosa has rephrased this, based on *kikī va aṇḍaṃ rakkheyya camarī-r-iva vāladhiṃ, nipako sīlasampanno mamaṃ rakkhi mahāmuni* appearing in the Ap I 61.

49 According to the epilogue of the *Bv-a*, the author employs the exegetical methods described in the early commentaries (Bv-a 299: *Porāṇatṭhakathāmaggaṃ Pāli-atthappakāsakaṃ*). The author of the Ap-a, as its prologue says, relies on the early commentaries written in Sinhalese (Ap-a 2: *purā Sīhaḷabhāsāya Porāṇatṭhakathāya ca*). A principle in textual criticism says *Recentiores non deteriores*, "more recent copies are not [necessarily] worse ones". As this principle suggests, even a very young text may be derived from an early text, thus no text should be neglected just because of its modernity (see Browning 1960: 11). However, more systematic study of these two commentaries should uncover more precisely their sources.

50 Bv-a 23: *vasantasamayo anupatto*.

51 KTh1 43: *kilesasaṅghassa bhitāsakehi, tapassisaṅghehi nisevitaṃ vanam, vihāra-ārāmasamidhībhitam, samayo mahāvīra Aṅgīrasānam*. "The forest frequented by the groups of ascetics who bring terror to the multitudes of [mental] defilements is prosperous with monasteries and gardens. O great hero, it is the time of *Aṅgīrasas*". The reading in the BCS – *kilesasaṅghassa bhitāsakehi* – does not make sense. To me,

In particular, the forest, as this description shows, is conducive to the rapture of mental concentration.⁵² However, some of the stanzas offer mildly titillating sentiments to the reader. The following stanza⁵³ illustrates how the poet adds a romantic beauty to the work.

*latā anekā dumanissitāva
piyeḥi saddhiṃ sahitā vadhū va,
palobhayantī hi sugandhagandhā
samayo mahāvīra Aṅgīrasānaṃ.*

Indeed, numberless creepers attached to the trees, just as damsels united with [their] beloved male partners, perfumed with fragrance, indeed seduce [the sentient beings]. O great hero, it is the time of *Aṅgīrasas*.

4.1. Special features

Repetition is one of the ubiquitous features of the KTh1. The poet uses the same word in many stanzas to characterize different flora and fauna seen along the road and in the forest. For instance, *vicitta* and *vicitra* are used to qualify

this is a misreading that would have come into existence in the process of transcribing this series from palm-leaf manuscripts to printed text. As we know, palm-leaf manuscripts are copied in *scriptio continua* (Porter 1848: 25). The editor might have not recognized the correct division of some compounds in these manuscripts, and furthermore not considered the meaning. This would have resulted in dividing compounds inaccurately. This *pāda* is apparently a clear illustration of this. I presume *kilesasaṅghassa+abhitāsakehi* is the original reading, of which the contraction is *kilesasaṅghassa+abhitāsakehi*, as I have translated accordingly above. Here *abhitāsaka* can mean “one who terrifies”.

- 52 KTh1 44: *samiddhinānāphalino vanantā* [...] *samādhītiṃ abhivaḍḍhayanti*. “The borders of the forest that are replete with various fruits enhance the rapture of the concentration”, KTh1 55: *vanañ ca sabbaṃ suvicittarūpaṃ, sumāpitaṃ nandanakānanāṃ va, yaṭīna pītiṃ satataṃ janeti, samayo mahāvīra Aṅgīrasānaṃ*. “The forest that is completely variegated just as the well-created grove of *Nandana* always produces monks’ rapture. O great hero, it is the time of *Aṅgīrasas*”. As Winternitz pointed out, forest hermits had their own poetry. This ascetic poetry comprised many aspects such as aphorisms, doctrines of renunciation, contempt of the world and so forth (see Winternitz 1927: 320; Norman 1983: 82). Many of the utterances in the *Theragāthā* highlight that the charming environment with variegated flora and fauna is highly supportive for one to reduce the mental defilements, and thereby attain final liberation, i.e. *nibbāna*. For instance, not only are the peacock scream (Th 4, 27), crow’s caw (Th 62), elephant’s trumpet (Th 54–5), supportive for the meditative absorption of the Elders, but also rainfall (Th 27, 103) and wind (Th 57). The *Mahāgosiṅgasutta* lends support to the notion that the forest that is adorned with well-flowered trees with agreeable fragrance is an instrumental factor in the cultivation of insight meditation (see M I 213). The majority of the stanzas in the present series of Kālundāyī praise the forest, as well as the various species of birds and so forth dwelling therein.
- 53 KTh1 8. This verse is reminiscent of the RS VI: 17 and Subhā 371–373 in the *Therīgāthā*. See Thī 159. Both these Sanskrit and Pali poems depict how the trees and flowers are conducive to develop romantic sentiment to the mankind.

trees,⁵⁴ foliage,⁵⁵ forest,⁵⁶ lotuses,⁵⁷ ponds,⁵⁸ colours,⁵⁹ feathers of birds,⁶⁰ and so forth. Similarly, he indicates a strong preference to collocate *virājamāna* and *svirājamāna* (shining) with divergent things in a variety of contexts such as trees,⁶¹ creepers,⁶² ground,⁶³ meadows,⁶⁴ rivers,⁶⁵ antelopes,⁶⁶ ornaments,⁶⁷ and so forth. These two adjectives are not attested in the Pali canon.⁶⁸ Modern scholarship has identified the recurrence of the similar terms throughout a poem as a rhetorical device called “concatenation”.⁶⁹

4.2. Metres

The last two stanzas of the KTh1 are octosyllabic (*Anuṣṭubh*),⁷⁰ and the fourth *pāda* (line) of every stanza, from 1 to 62, is constant, being always *samayo mahāvīra Aṅgīrasānaṃ*. This recurring *pāda* is dodecasyllabic (*Jagatī*). The second *pāda* of the first stanza, *phalesino chadanaṃ vippahāya* is hendecasyllabic (*Triṣṭubh*) and the first line of the fifty-eighth stanza, *vicittapākāraṇ ca toraṇaṇ ca*, is also *Triṣṭubh*. It is worth noting that prosodic works such as *Vṛttaratnākara* and *Vuttodaya* do not identify the cadences (*vṛtta*) of these two-verse *pādas*. Notably, the latter *pāda*, which is closer to a prose sentence than to a part of a poem, is more likely to be the result of distortion due to the intervention of “metrically deaf scribes”.⁷¹ The corresponding stanza in the *Theragāthā* reads this *pāda* as *samayo mahāvīra Bhagīrasānaṃ*, which corresponds to the *Kamalā* cadence of the *Jagatī* metre. The first three *pādas* of the majority of the stanzas from 1 to 62 are mixed with popular cadences of the *Triṣṭubh* (*Indravajrā* and *Upendravajrā*) and *Jagatī* (*Vaṃśastha* and *Indravamśā*) metres. Interestingly, the first *pāda* of the sixtieth stanza,

54 KTh1 2a: *dumā vicittā*.

55 KTh1 32a: *vicitranīlacchadanenaṅkaṅkaṭā*. “[Trees] adorned with charming blue foliage.”

56 KTh1 27b: *vanaṃ vicittaṃ*.

57 KTh1 31b: *vicitranānāpadumehi channā* “covered with variegated various lotuses”.

58 KTh1 15a *sarā vicittā*.

59 KTh1 29b *vicittavaṇṇā*.

60 KTh1 22b: *dijā...vicittapattehi virājamānā* “the birds that are shining with variegated wings”.

61 KTh1 2a: *dumā...svirājamānā*.

62 KTh1 7b: *latā...svirājamānā*.

63 KTh1 29a: *virājītā āsi mahī*.

64 KTh1 11b: *virājamānā...saddalā*.

65 KTh1 24c: *najjo svirājamānā*.

66 KTh1 10a: *mīgā...svirājamānā*.

67 KTh1 59b: *virājamānā varabhūsanehi*.

68 *virājeti* typically occurs in the canon to denote detaching one’s mind from defilements. See M I 185, III 241.

69 Langer, referring to Schubring, states that the Sanskrit poets use the repetition of words “to interlace verses and promote poetic continuity” (see Langer 1981: 185). Salomon, reviewing numerous instances in the *Meghadūta* and some other works of Kālidāsa, insists that the “concatenation”, i.e. “the linking of successive verses of a poem by the repetition of the same or similar words” (Salomon 2016: 48) as “a literary device” (Salomon 2016: 50). However, Schubring identifies these kinds of examples as inevitable repetitions: *unvermeidlichen Wiederholungen* (Schubring 1955: 335. See also Salomon 2016: 72–3), DLD 108.

70 KTh1 63–4.

71 See Lang (2001: 232).

Suddhodano munivaram abhidassanāya, with 14 syllables, belongs to the *Vasantatilakā* cadence of the *Śakvarī* metre. The third *pāda* of the fifty-sixth stanza⁷² is in the *Sumukhī* cadence of the *Triṣṭubh* metre. Both the third *pāda* of the seventeenth stanza⁷³ and the third *pāda* of the fifty-seventh stanza⁷⁴ belong to the *Jagatī* metre. These two *pādas*, however, can be recognized as slight deviations on *Indravajrā* and *Upendravajrā* cadences. With the exception of the *Vasantatilakā* cadence, many of the metres and cadences stated here are common in the Pali canon. The poet's metrical licence also involves several unique features as we see in the following passage.

4.3. Peculiarities in wording

Some syllables are artificially lengthened⁷⁵ while some are shortened⁷⁶ *metri causa*. Similarly, it can be deduced that some syllables were intended to be pronounced as shortened although they are long. For instance, the second syllable of *passesu*⁷⁷ appears to be articulated as a short syllable.⁷⁸ On the contrary, some short syllables might have been expected to be pronounced as long. The first syllable of the thirty-fifth stanza *bahu*,⁷⁹ for example, could be included under this category. *Moḷini*⁸⁰ and *maṇimayehi*,⁸¹ which perhaps crept into the poem because of graphic confusion from the copyists, deviate from the *Upendravajrā* cadence. The *pādas* of certain stanzas are quite incoherent, due to the lack of necessary syntactic components in the stanza. For example, *saman-tato gandhaguṇatthikānaṃ*⁸² requires an object. Yet, sometimes the clipping of words in the stanzas is discernible. For instance, 61*a* reads *n'evāgataṃ passati neva vācaṃ*. The careful reader, however, is able to identify the ellipsis of *suṇāti*,⁸³ which needs to be supplied for the stanza to make sense.⁸⁴

4.4. Infrequent forms

Some erroneous wordings have presumably crept into KTh1 due to aural confusion. Of these, *khuddaṃ*⁸⁵ for *khudaṃ* (hunger),⁸⁶ and *kucanti*⁸⁷ for *kuñcanti*

72 KTh1 56c: *kulanagaraṃ idha sassirikaṃ*.

73 KTh1 17c: *modanti bhariyāhi samaṅgino te*.

74 KTh1 57c: *vicittaparikhāhi puraṃ surammaṃ*.

75 KTh1 56b *Kapīlavatthuṃ* for *Kapilavatthuṃ*.

76 KTh1 20c *rajindā* for *rājindā* (lit. great kings).

77 KTh1 3c, 5c *rukkhā virocanti ubhosu passesu* “the trees are shining on both sides”.

78 See Warder (1967: 82; 28). As Lang shows, these features can also be noted in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit works (see Lang 2001: 235–6).

79 KTh1 35c: *visālasālā ca sabhā ca bahu* “there are vast halls and many assemblies”.

80 KTh1 11c: *moḷini valaṅkatā* “adorned just as females who are wearing crowns”.

81 KTh1 41b *maṇimayehi* “with those made of gems”.

82 KTh1 51c. “Everywhere [is agreeable?] for those who are desirous of the qualities of fragrance”.

83 I.e. lit. “hears” viz. *n'evāgataṃ passati neva vācaṃ [suṇāti]*. “[Suddhodana] neither sees anyone who returned nor [hears] a word”.

84 The commentators assume such ellipses in the canon and label them as *pāthasesa* (see M-a I 222, Sn-a 96).

85 KTh1 4c.

86 “*khudā*” *ti jighacchā* Th-a III 152. See also DOP, s.v. *khudā*.

87 KTh1 53a.

(trumpet)⁸⁸ are especially noteworthy. Nevertheless, one can argue that these types of changes are made by the poet for metrical reasons.⁸⁹ In addition, *piñchā*⁹⁰ for *picchā* (peacock's tale),⁹¹ *narādhipattam*⁹² for *narādhipaṃ tam* (that king), and *madappabāhā*⁹³ for *madappavāhā* can be explained both by graphical or aural confusions. The close resemblance of *ca* and *va*, both in Burmese and Sinhalese scripts, seems to have led the copyists to produce some incoherent readings.⁹⁴

It is apparent that the composer did not take great care with grammatical accuracy. In other words, the author is not eager to follow conventional grammar rules. In some cases, the moods of verbs are changed to fit the metre. The use of *viroci*⁹⁵ instead of *virocati* is a clear example of this.

The use of causative instead of simple active present tense is another notable feature of this series, such as *pabhāsayanti*⁹⁶ (illuminate) for *pabhāsanti* (shine). It should be borne in mind that this feature is not alien to the Pali canon. For instance, this *pāda* also occurs in Kāludāyi's verses in the *Theragāthā*.⁹⁷ The meaning of the causative form is not appropriate here – the poet is seemingly using this form as present active to preserve the metre.⁹⁸ This usage, i.e. the expansion of *e* to *aya*, can be seen in several places in the KTh1.⁹⁹ Perhaps

88 The meaning of *kucati* (DOP, s.v. *kucati*: “mixes, bends, checks, scratches”) does not suit the context. See DOP I, s.v. *kuñca*: “a trumpeting noise”, PTSD, s.v. *kuñcanāda*: “trumpeting [of an elephant]”. However, *kuñcati* or *kuñcanti* are not attested in the canon or commentaries.

89 The “simplification of consonant clusters to single consonant” is a technique for preserving the metre (see Lang 2001: 235).

90 KTh1 53b.

91 See Vp V, s.v. *piccha* “*mayūrapucche*”, Hk, s.v. *picchaṃ*: “*mayūrapucchaṃ*”, PTSD, s.v. *piccha*: “feather, esp[ecially] of the peacock”.

92 KTh1 61c.

93 KTh1 39a.

94 Especially, KTh1 19a: *abhinnanādā varavāraṇā ca* (“just as ruttled elephants with frequent trumpets”) and KTh1 26c: *vibhūsitaggā surasundarī ca* (“just as ornamented supreme celestial females”) most probably show this confusion, i.e. reading of *ca* for *va*. *Ca* (lit. “and”) does not suit the both contexts.

95 KTh1 50a: *candassa raṃsīhi nabhaṃ viroci* “the sky is shining with the beams of the moon”.

96 KTh1 1c: *te accimanto va pabhāsayanti* “they are shining just as those are endowed flames”.

97 Th 56.

98 Dhammapāla apparently realizes the awkwardness of this usage, thus he interprets as follows: Th-a II 223: “*pabhāsayanti*” *tī[...]**obhāsayanti sabbā disā ti adhippāyo*. “*pabhāsayanti* means as [those trees] irradiating all the directions. Interestingly, Norman also preferred to the literal meaning of *pabhāsayanti*” (see Norman 1995: I 54). Buddhaghosa also prefers to justify the causative meaning of some canonical occurrences. For instance, see S I 3: *tarayanti rattiyo* (tr. Bodhi 2000: 91): “The nights swiftly pass”. S-a I 23: “*‘tarayanti rattiyo’ ti rattiyo atikkamamānā puggalaṃ maraṇūpagamanāya tarayanti sīghaṃ sīghaṃ gamayanti*”. “‘The nights swiftly pass’ means the nights while passing, prompt the individual to go near to the death, make [the individual] to go quickly”.

99 KTh1 10c has *abhidhāvayanti* (make to run towards) for *abhidhāvanti* (run towards). See also KTh1 22c, 37c, 39b, 41c, 49c. The same feature is similarly applied for present tense continuous forms: KTh1 17b: *abhinādayantā* (making cry) for *abhinadantā* and KTh1 39c: *gajjayantā* (making roar) for *gajjantā* (roar).

because of his preference for nasal endings¹⁰⁰ in the verses, the poet converts some masculine gender nouns into neuter such as *sucibhūmibhāgaṃ*¹⁰¹ instead of *sucibhūmibhāgo*;¹⁰² *pathaṃ*¹⁰³ instead of *patho*.¹⁰⁴ These neuter endings do not always suit the verb.¹⁰⁵ Although one may wish to justify the nominative of *paṅkajapuṇḍarīkā*¹⁰⁶ and the genitive of *narāmarānaṃ*¹⁰⁷ as having instrumental and accusative meanings respectively by reason of Pali exegeses,¹⁰⁸ some such usages occurring in the present series are hardly perceptible. The second *pāda* of stanza 48, *disā ca cando suvirājito va* (“the moon is as though illuminating the directions”), provides a clear example of poor grammar. In fact, the author could have instead formulated this *pāda* as either *disā ca candena virājītā va* or *disā ca cando ca virājītā va* to ensure the accuracy of both grammar and metre. The following stanza¹⁰⁹ also demonstrates the poet’s lack of grammatical proficiency.

*nisevitaṃ nekadijehi niccaṃ,
gāmena gāmaṃ satataṃ vasantā,
pure pure gāmavarā ca santi,
samayo mahāvīra Aṅgīrasānaṃ.*

There are fabulous villages in every city, ever frequented by various kinds of birds constantly living in them. O great hero, it is the time of *Aṅgīrasa*.

It is obvious that the subject of this stanza is *gāmavarā*. I am not sure if it is due to a mistake in transmission that the author characterizes it as *nisevitaṃ* instead of *nisevitā*, which is the accurate form. Furthermore, *nekadijehi* does not accord with *vasantā*. A case could be made, however, for the use of *vasantehi* for metrical reasons. Besides this, the stanza is tainted by tautological oddity: *nisevita* (lit. “frequented”) does not usually require further specification *niccaṃ* (lit. “always”). This first line looks rather awkward when it connects with *satataṃ vasantā* (lit.

100 Lang points out the quite opposite practice, i.e. “the loss of nasalization” of the composer of the *Upālipariprcchā* (see Lang 2001: 233).

101 KTh1 13a.

102 *bhūmibhāga* is apparently masculine. See M I 167: *ramaṇīyo vata bho bhūmibhāgo*, MW, s.v. *bhūmibhāga*.

103 KTh1 54a.

104 See MW, s.v. *patha*: “a way”.

105 See KTh1 41ab: *gagaṇaṃ*[. . .] *śamalaṅkatā*; 46abc: *vatthannaṇānaṃ sayanāsanaṅ ca, gandhaṅ ca mālaṅ ca vilepanaṅ ca tahiṃ samiddhā*.

106 KTh1 15: *sarā vicittā vividhā manoramā, susajjitā paṅkajapuṇḍarīkā, pasannasītodakacāruṇṇā*. “Lakes variegated and delightful in beauty embellished with red and white lotuses are filled with limpid, cool and adorable water”.

107 KTh1 16: *suphullanānāvidhapaṅkajehi, virājamānā sucigandhagandhā, pamodayanteva narāmarānaṃ*. “[Those lakes] effulgent with well-blossomed varied lotuses that are perfumed with pure fragrance, indeed cause the human beings and deities to feel elated”.

108 Commentators notice these types of features existing in the canon. See It 48: *brahmacariyesanā saha*; It-a II 18: “*brahmacariyesanā saha*” *ti brahmacariyesanāya saddhiṃ. vibhattilopena hi ayaṃ niddeso, karaṇatthe vā etaṃ paccattavacanaṃ*, A III 378: *upādānakkhayassa ca*; A-a III 393: “*upādānakkhayassa*” *cā ti upayogatthe sāmivacanaṃ*.

109 KTh1 45.

“always living”) in the second *pāda*. We know that both *niccaṃ* and *satataṃ* are synonymous.¹¹⁰ Some words are apparently redundant here. As a result, although this stanza carries an alliteration, it is overall of fairly poor quality.¹¹¹

In addition, some peculiar words and compounds can be found in this series: for instance, the use of the compound *sambuddharājam* (fully-enlightened king),¹¹² which is the word’s first attestation in Pali literature. This term occurs rarely even in Sanskrit sources.¹¹³ The term *gatīnaṃ*¹¹⁴ is presumably used in the sense of *gacchantānaṃ* (for those passing by) to keep the metre. Similarly, *sugītiyantā*¹¹⁵ occurs instead of *sugīyamānā* or *sugāyamānā*, but is apparently incorrect. Furthermore, *uttuṅgakaṇṇā*¹¹⁶ (lit. “high ears”), which refers to a deer, seems slightly unusual, and the proper term to characterize the running deer with erected ears is *ukkaṇṇā*.¹¹⁷ To the best of my knowledge, neither in the canon nor in the commentaries is there a reference to *uttuṅgakaṇṇā*.¹¹⁸

4.5. Figures of speech

Simile (*upamā*) is the most common rhetorical device in the KTh1. At four places in this series, the poet compares various kinds of forests with Nandana, the celestial park.¹¹⁹ Of these four, the following instance¹²⁰ is particularly remarkable since it equates one simile with another, which is extremely rare in the Pali canon.

*vicitrānīlabbham ivāyatam vanaṃ
surindaloke iva Nandanam vanaṃ,*

The long forest appearing as a colourful blue cloud resembles the park [named] Nandana in the world of the lord among gods [i.e. Sakka].

This literary device is similar to *Mālopamā* (multiple simile) in Sanskrit poetry.¹²¹ Some expressions such as *duma*[...] *pabhāsayanti*¹²² and *rukkhā*

110 See Sn-a I 123: “*niccaṃ*” *ti satataṃ*, M-a II 64: “*satatan*” *ti niccaṃ*. See also AK I 45 for *satatam* and *nityam*.

111 KTh1 34 and 58 are also highly contaminated with pleonastic oddity.

112 KTh1 30b.

113 Śs 361: *sambuddharājatanayā*.

114 KTh1 27: *sugandhanānādumajālakiṇṇam, vanaṃ vicittam suranandanam va, manobhirāmaṃ satataṃ gatīnaṃ*. “The forest full of distinctive groups of trees with fragrance is always adorable for passers-by just as the god’s [park] Nandana”. *gatīnaṃ* is genitive plural of *gati*. See DOP, s.v. *gati*: “going, moving, gait, progress, movement”.

115 KTh1 42: *gandhabbavijjādharakinnarā ca, sugītiyantā madhurassarena*. “Gandhabbas, *Vijjādharas* and *Kinnaras* singing in sonorous tone...”.

116 KTh1 10: *migā*[...] *uttuṅgakaṇṇā*[...] *ṣamantā mabhidhāvayanti* “deer with erected ears are running around in every direction”.

117 J VI 559–60: *te migā viya ukkaṇṇā samanta mabhidhāvino, ukkaṇṇā ti*[...] *kaṇṇe ukkhipivā*. See also MW, s.v. *utkarṇa*: “having the ears erect”.

118 Yet, this can rarely be seen in later Pali digests such as the *Rasavāhinī* and *Saddhammasaṅgaha*. See RV 1, SS 83: *migo*[...] *uttuṅgakaṇṇo*.

119 See KTh1 14a, 27b, 55b.

120 KTh1 33ab.

121 Cf. Morgan and Sharma 2011: 209. See also ASED, s.v. *mālopamā*: “compound simile (in which an object is compared with several others instead of with one only) or concatenated simile...”.

122 KTh1 1ac.

*virocanti*¹²³ can also be recognized as hyperboles because the trees do not really shine or illuminate the forest.¹²⁴ The poet sometimes purposely uses words that diverge from their common meaning when describing some activities of animals. This tendency can be considered as one of the strategies adopted by him in order to strengthen the aesthetic beauty of the poem. While some verses attribute human nomenclatures to animals, some stanzas even attribute human activities to them. The following are three impressive examples that belong to this category.

1. *dijā[...]*modanti bhariyāhi samaṅgino¹²⁵
The birds ... rejoice united with [their] wives.
2. *mayūrasaṅghā[...]*naccanti nārīhi samaṅgibhūtā¹²⁶
The flocks of peacocks dance on the summit of mountains united with [their] females.
3. *alī vidhāvanti*¹²⁷
The bees are running.

Although *bharyāhi* and *nārīhi* literally refer to human wives and females,¹²⁸ these two terms occur in the above accounts to denote female birds and peahens respectively. Usually, the sweetheart of a male bird is referred to by the term *priyā* (Pali *piyā*)¹²⁹ in Sanskrit poems, and the term *morī* basically stands for peahen in Pali literature.¹³⁰ In accordance with the literal meaning of the third example mentioned above, the bees are running.¹³¹ However, bees do not run, they fly. The flight of a bee is expressed with the verb *paleti*¹³² in the canon. Hence, *vidhāvanti* looks absurd *prima facie*. It is justifiable to assume this to be one of the rhetorical devices employed by the author to strengthen the poetic value of his work.

4.6. Date and authorship

Buddhadatta, the author of the *Bv-a*, was highly regarded and considered a “great poet” by his successors.¹³³ Thus, the suspicion might arise that he composed the KTh1 himself and put it in Kāludāyi’s mouth to fit the motif of “sixty” stanzas stressed in a number of commentarial sources consulted by him. In the

123 KTh1 3c, 5c.

124 DLTL 406. The Sanskrit equivalent of this literary device is identified as *Atiśayokti* (see Morgan and Sharma 2011: 378), CODLT 119.

125 KTh1 17bc.

126 KTh1 21ab.

127 KTh1 18b.

128 See Vv-a 42: *narassa esā ti nārī, ayañ ca samaññā manussithīsu pavattā*.

129 RS 84: *puṃskokilāś cūtarasāsavena mattaḥ priyaṃ cumbati rāgahṛṣṭaḥ, kūjad dvirepho pyayam ambujasthaḥ priyaṃ priyāyāḥ prakaroti cātu* “the male cuckoo, intoxicated with the liquor of the juice of mango-blossoms kisses with passionate joy his mate; this humming bee in the lotus, too, is doing agreeable and liked things for his beloved” (Kale 1967: 23).

130 J II 37.

131 See Whitney 1885: 81: dhāv, “to run”. *Vidhāvati* typically occurs in the sense of “runs in various ways” (see KU 2:14: *yathodakam durge vrṣṭam parvateṣu vidhāvati*) and “runs hither and thither” (see S-a I 93: “*vidhāvati*” ti[...]*ito cito ca dhāvati*).

132 See DhP 14: *bhamaro[...]*paleti.

133 See: Vin-vn-pṭ II B° 2: *Buddhadattācariyābhidhāno Mahākavi*. See also Buddhadatta 1945: 36; Horner 1978: xl–xliii.

Bv-a, Buddhadatta composed a number of stanzas in metres and cadences using elegant phrases, to introduce some pivotal events related to the Buddha's biography.¹³⁴ These stanzas are replete with lucid syntactical connections and well-formed wording. Accordingly, deviations from conventional grammatical rules and metres are rarely found in Buddhadatta's stanzas, and no tautological oddities are encountered therein. On the other hand, as indicated above, the KTh1 contains a number of deviations from the grammar and metre, and tautology is one of its striking pitfalls. It is, therefore, highly improbable that these clumsy *pādas* came from the learned commentator's pen. There is no clear-cut evidence for the date of these stanzas. However, the *Vasantatilakā* line mentioned above¹³⁵ suggests that some stanzas of this series are quite late. The Pali canon rarely contains verses with 14 syllables per line¹³⁶ and no single *pāda* in the *Vasantatilakā* is attested therein. This cadence is not common even in Pali commentaries.¹³⁷ It should be remembered here that the *Bv-a* does not contain any other stanza composed in this cadence. In addition, *uttuṅgakaṇṇā*,¹³⁸ which appears in the present series, betrays in my opinion a Sinhalese influence, which suggests the relative modernity of some stanzas.

Part two

5. Kāludāyī's verses in the *Visuddhajanavilāsini*

The KTh2 runs from pages 533 to 537 in the *Ap-a*.¹³⁹ Although the influence and intervention of the Burmese textual scholarship is manifest in many stanzas of the present series, there is no clear evidence to help us decide whether or not the additional 37 stanzas were composed by a Burmese poet at a later period. Most of the stanzas from 12 to 48 in this series are fairly close to the tone of the *gāthās* in the *Jātaka*, *Apadāna* and *Buddhavaṃsa*. The composition of the series apparently dates back to the time of these three canonical works. The phraseology of the

134 See *Bv-a* 21–2, 79–81, 87, 211–2, 247. I do not understand why Barua rejects the poetic skill of Buddhadatta saying “nothing of poetry in his composition” (see Barua 1945: 82). Apart from the verses, the language used in the *Bv-a* is a clear testimony to his poetry; see also Dimitrov 2016: 242, 282, 283–6.

135 See “4.2. Metres”.

136 See, for some *Śakvarī* lines, A II 57: *bahubheravaṃ ratanagaṇānam ālayaṃ*; Th 35: *niyyanti dhīrā saraṇavaraggagāmino*.

137 Although *Vasantatilakā* is relatively rare in commentarial works, we can see it begins to be used in Pali literature from the fifth century onwards. For instance, Buddhaghosa uses *Vasantatilakā* in the *Visuddhimagga*. See Vism 77, 487, 501, 503. In the *Mahāvamsa* of Mahānāma, concluding stanzas of a number of chapters are composed in *Vasantatilakā* metre. See Mhv B^c 3: 42, 7: 74, 10: 106, 13: 21, 26: 26, 28: 44, 29: 70, 31: 125.

138 See n. 117.

139 However, the PTS edition of the *Ap-a* does not constitute a satisfactory work. C.E. Godakumbura, the editor of this work, indeed consulted only four witnesses in the process of editing. Apart from the SHB of the *Ap-a*, the other three materials stem from the Burmese tradition. Regrettably, he did not collate any palm-leaf manuscript written in Sinhalese or Thai (*Lan-nā*) characters (See *Ap-a*, xiii).

KTh2 suggests that it is earlier than the KTh1. Presumably, this is a creation of redactors (*dhammasaṅgāhakas*) who are fairly familiar with the idiom of the stanzas in the Pali canon. The following chart represents the similarities of wording between the aforementioned three canonical texts and the KTh2.

5.1. Relationship between Kālundāyi's verses and the Pali canonical texts

Table 1 sets out the similarities of wording between the three canonical texts, namely, the *Jātaka*, *Apadāna*, *Buddhavaṃsa*, and the second series of verses attributed to the Elder Kālundāyi.

The structure of the KTh2 has already been briefly discussed in section 3. Unlike the KTh1, this series has four different constant lines. Stanzas 12 to 19 offer a eulogy to the trees bearing sweet fruits – such as mango and wood apple – located on both sides of the road. Beginning in stanza 20, a description of blossoming trees runs until stanza 25. The last *pāda* of each stanza from 12 to 21 has a constant line *gantukālo mahāyasa* (“O glorious one, it is the time to go”); but from 22 to 34 it varies as *samayo te mahāyasa* (“O glorious one, the time [has come] for you”). The reason for the change of the constant line in this manner is not clear. We can observe that the majority of the trees in bloom that we come across from stanza 22 onwards are comparatively small.¹⁴⁰ However, it is not certain whether the poet has chosen a different constant line for these stanzas considering the smallness of the trees. This description turns into a eulogy to the quadrupeds living around the road from stanza 27, and it continues up to stanza 34, preserving the same constant line. Beginning in stanza 35, there is a charming portrayal of various kinds of birds seen around the road, which comes to an end in stanza 41. The constant line at the end of all the stanzas in this description is changed to *kālo te pitu dassane* (It is the time for seeing your father). Stanzas 42 to 48, which create a stunning picture of the lotus ponds around the road, have a different constant line *samayo te ñātidassane* (it is time for seeing your relatives). It is difficult to identify the reason for the shift of constant line in this series. However, this change undoubtedly adds an extra elegance to the poem.

5.2. Lacunae and corruptions

Generally speaking, the wording of the stanzas of the KTh2 is fairly clear. Nevertheless, compared to the KTh1, a number of stanzas are distorted. Regarding this, it is worth looking closely at its thirty-fourth stanza, in which one *pāda* is apparently missing. It runs as follows:

*sasā sigālā naṅgulā, kalandakāḷakā bahū,
kasturā sūrā gandhā te, kevalā gāyamānā va,
+++++++ +, samayo te mahāyasa.*

[There are] many hares, jackals, mongooses, squirrels, giant squirrels, musk-deer and rhinoceroses that are courageous. All of them [appear] as singing. O greatly reputed one, the time [has come] for you.

140 For instance, KTh2 21 speaks of quite big trees such as Punnāga and Giripunnāga while KTh2 22 describes various bushes of flowers such as *Aśoka* (*Jonesia asoca*) and *Koṣiḷāra* (*Bauhinia variegata*).

Table 1. The *Canon* and KTh2 compared

KTh2	Canon
<i>tiṇḍukāni piyālāni</i> 14a	<i>tindukāni piyālāni</i> J V 324, Ap I 17
<i>khuddakappaphalā niccaṃ</i> 16c	<i>phalāni khuddakappāni</i> J V 324, Ap I 17
<i>campakā salaḷā nāgā</i> 20a	<i>campakā salaḷā nīpā</i> Ap I 15
<i>punnāgā giripunnāgā pupphitā dharaṇīruhā, supupphitagā jotanti</i> 21abc	<i>punnāgā giripunnāgā</i> Ap I 16 <i>pupphitā dharaṇīruhā</i> Ap I 336 <i>sampupphitagā tiṭṭhanti</i> J VI 535
<i>dibbagandhā pavāyanti</i> 23d	<i>dibbā gandhā pavāyanti</i> Ap I 19, Vv 55 cf. <i>dibbā gandhā sampavanti</i> Ap I 15
<i>te sabbe āsayā chuddhā</i> 36c	<i>te pajja āsayā chuddhā</i> Bv 15
<i>supatitthā manoramā</i> 42b, 46b	<i>supatitthā manoramā</i> Ap I 15
<i>kumbhīrā makarākiṇṇā, valayā muṇjarohitā, macchakacchapavyāviddhā</i> 43abc	<i>kumbhīlā makarā cettha</i> Ap I 15 <i>jalajā muṇjarohitā</i> Ap 15 <i>macchakacchapavyāviddhā</i> J VI 530

Obviously, this stanza originally consisted of six *pādas*, but it has been reduced to five *pādas* in the editions that we use nowadays. This assumption is further confirmed since many of the preceding and following stanzas consist of six *pādas*. The way of recording this stanza in the PTS, BCS and Siamese editions seems somewhat problematic.¹⁴¹ As these editions suggest, the editors seem to have understood that it is the fifth *pāda* of this stanza that is missing. Furthermore, these editions relate that the fourth *pāda* is *kevalā gāyamānā va*. This *pāda*, however, is highly unlikely to occur as an even line in any *Anuṣṭubh* verse; it is far more likely to be an odd line. Therefore, according to my understanding, the lacunary *pāda* is in fact the fourth one, and *kevalā gāyamānā va* the fifth. It was misapprehended, by metrically deaf editors, as the fourth *pāda* of the present stanza and recorded accordingly. The meaning of the *pāda*, moreover, fits as the preceding line of the constant line. Many fifth *pādas* of the KTh2 that precede constant line typically speak of the way in which various quadrupeds and birds show their reverence to the Buddha. For instance, the fifth *pāda* of stanza 39 runs as follows: *sarehi pūjayantā va*, “as if offering with their cries”, while the same *pāda* of stanza 40 reads *gāyamānā sareneva*, “as if singing in a rhythmic tone”. Therefore, it is in fact the fourth *pāda* that is lacking. This *pāda* probably conveyed something relating to the manner of those wild animals flocking to see the Buddha by the sides of the road.

141 Ap-a 536, Ap-a B^c II 262, Ap-a S^c 436.

In addition, the KTh2 contains a multitude of other instances of contaminated readings. One can thus assume that the original version of this series would have been considerably different from the present form as it has come down to us. Expressed differently, the KTh2 has evidently undergone many minor corruptions, substitutions and emendations at the hands of diverse scribes and editors over the centuries. I have already mentioned that all ten verses of the *Theragāthā* are quoted at the very beginning of the KTh2. Interestingly, these stanzas differ remarkably from those of the *Theragāthā* available to us today.¹⁴² This is a striking testimony to the variations and distortions that have crept into the KTh2. Despite the corrupted readings that resulted from both aural and graphical confusions, it seems that the copyists have also produced a notable number of arbitrary readings as a result of applying their limited knowledge of Pali grammar to the poem. It would not be unreasonable to argue that many of the ambiguous terms and substitutions that we come across in these stanzas came from Burmese copyists and editors. It is sufficient to focus on a few contaminated readings within the KTh2.

The term *mocci*, occurring in the first *pāda* of the KTh2 15, seems corrupted. The neighbouring context of this stanza speaks of diverse kinds of fruits. The context of the first two *pādas* of this stanza¹⁴³ strongly suggests that *mocci* stands for a kind of plantain. Although no compelling evidence is yet at my disposal, I would suggest that *mocañ* (*ca*) was the original reading, eventually turned into *mocci ca* as a result of graphic confusion.¹⁴⁴ Similarly, the KTh2 reads the first *pāda* of stanza 30 as *tidhammabhinnā chaddantā*.¹⁴⁵ Here, the first term, *tidhammabhinnā*, is obviously a corrupted reading of *tidhā pabhinnā* as accurately emended in the BCS.¹⁴⁶ In this case, it is clear that *dhā-pa* has turned into *dhamma*. Two things have seemingly paved the way for this alteration. First, the scribe may have misread *pa* as *ma* owing to the

142 See *ten accimanto va* (KTh 21c) for *te accimanto va* (Th 527c), *Bhāgīrasānaṃ* (KTh2 1d) for *Bhagīrasānaṃ* (Th 527d), *api nāti-unhaṃ* (KTh2 3a) for *na panāti-unhaṃ* (Th 529a), *āsāya kasate khette* (KTh2 4a) for *āsāya kassate khettaṃ* (Th 530a), *punappunāṃ [dhaññāṃ] pūrenti koṭṭhakaṃ* (KTh2 6d) for *punappunāṃ dhaññāṃ upeti raṭṭhaṃ* Th (531d), *dhīro* (KTh2 8a) for *vīro* (Th 533a), *tayābhijāto* (KTh2 8d) for *tayā hi jāto* (Th 533d), *Tidivātīmodati* (KTh2 9d) for *Tidivāsmi modati* (Th 534d).

143 KTh2 15: *kadalī pañca mocci ca, supattaphalagopitā*. Plantains and five [fold] *mocci* (bananas?), protected with lovely leaves.

144 The *Mahāvagga* uses *moca* for a kind of banana. See Vin I 246: *anujānāmi bhikkhave aṭṭha pānāni: amba pānaṃ jambupānaṃ cocapānaṃ mocapānaṃ madhupānaṃ muddikāpānaṃ sālūkapānaṃ phārusakapānaṃ*. “I allow you, monks, eight (kinds of) drinks: mango drink, roseapple drink, plantain drink, banana drink, honey drink, grape drink, edible lotus root drink, *phārusaka* drink” (Horner 2007: IV 339); see also DOP, s.v. *moca*: “a kind of (kernelled?) plantain”; PTSD, s.v. *moca*: “the plantain or banana tree, *Musa, Sapientum*”, Śkd III, s.v. *moca*: “*kadalīphalam*”. As the *Samantapāsādikā* reveals, *moca* refers to banana without seeds in the middle of the fruit. See: V-a V 1102: “*cocapānan*” *ti aṭṭhikehi kadalīphalehi katapānaṃ*. “*mocapānan*” *ti anaṭṭhikehi kadalīphalehi katapānaṃ*.

145 See n. 143.

146 See Ap-a II B° 261. It becomes clear when considered in terms of the fundamental question *Utrum alterum in abiturum erat?* “Which would have been more likely to give rise to the other?” (McCarter 1986: 21), that *tidhā pabhinnā* was the original reading.

close similarity of these two characters in Burmese script. Subsequently, he may have corrected *dhāma*, which makes no sense in this context, to *dhamma*. The copyist who is not closely acquainted with Pali tends to replace less familiar terms with more familiar ones, which is a common trend in manuscript transmission, well known to Textual Criticism.¹⁴⁷ Apparently, *tidhā pabhinna* occurs in the canon to describe rutting elephants.¹⁴⁸ It is said that a liquid exudes from three places of the rutting elephant's body, namely, the eyes, ears, and male organ.¹⁴⁹ Furthermore, *paccasevakā*,¹⁵⁰ which occurs in the fifth *pāda* of stanza 33, is only partly intelligible. Although *sevakā* (servants) is obvious, it is not clear what the author intended by *pacca*. However, when considering the whole stanza, I presume *pacca* is an aural confusion of *pajja*, the contraction of *pi+ajja*.¹⁵¹ With this conjecture, we are able to restore this *pāda* as follows: *te pajja sevakā addhā*.¹⁵² The reading *saddhimittādike* is also unintelligible. The literal meaning of this term, "with friends and so forth", makes no sense in this context.¹⁵³ The present distorted reading may have therefore been caused by the intervention of a copyist not proficient in Pali. Some dubious readings in this series remain to be further scrutinized. For instance, KTh2 29*a* reads *nanikulā*, while KTh2 34*a* reads *naṅgulā*. The BCS amends these readings to *nakulā*, "mongooses",¹⁵⁴ in both places. If this replacement is correct, *nanikulā* and *naṅgulā* constitute two contaminated readings that most probably resulted from a Burmese copyist's aural confusion of *nakulā*. It is rather difficult to distinguish *k* and *g* in Burmese pronunciation of Pali. I am inclined to believe that *naṅgulā* (KTh2 34*a*) stands for a kind of monkey. Even though no such

147 Martin (2010: 16).

148 Ap II 388: *tidhappabhinnamātaṅgā kuñjarā saṭṭhihāyanā*.

149 See Ap-a 288: "*tidhappabhinnā*" *ti akkhikaṇṇakosasaṅkhātehi tīhi ṭhānehi bhinnamadā*. See also Ap-a 311. I emend *tidhamabhinnā* as *tidhā pabhinnā* and render accordingly. KTh2 30: *tidhā pabhinnā chaddantā, surūpā sussarā subhā, sattappatiṭṭhitāṅgā te, ubho maggesu kūjino*. "Six-tusked elephants, flowing rut from three places [of their body], with pleasant cries, are lovely and auspicious. They, who are endowed with seven limbs touching the ground are crying in both [sides of the] ways".

150 KTh2 33.

151 *pi* and *ajja* contract as *pajja* both in prose and verse sections in the canon. See A IV 249: *aham pajja[...pāṇātipātā paṭivirato[...viharāmi]*, Bv 15: *te pajja āsayā chuddhā*, J V 368: *so pajja saṃsayam patto*. The commentary of the latter account (J-a V 369) analyses *pajja* as follows: "*so pajjā*" *ti so pi ajja*. Obviously, *pi* has the sense of a conjunction here. See also M-a I 40: *pikāro sampiṇḍanatto*, Vibh-a 405: *sampiṇḍanatto cettha pikāro*. *pi* can also be considered as the enclitic of *api*. See Ud-a 278: *apisaddo sampiṇḍanatto*.

152 KTh2 33: *dīpī acchā taracchā ca, tudarā varuṇā sadā, te dāni sakkhitā sabbe, mettāya tava tādino, te pajja sevakā addhā*. "Leopards, bears, hyenas and jackals are ever piercing. [However,] all of them are disciplined now with loving kindness of you who is like that. Indeed, they are also [your] servants today". For *tādī*, see Roth 1968: 47.

153 KTh2 39: *kokilā sakalā citrā, sadā mañjussarā varā, vimhāpitā te janatam, saddhimittādike surā, sarehi pūjayantā va*. "The cuckoos [whose feathers] are completely variegated, frequently endowed with perfect lovely tone. They are good at astonishing people together with friends and so forth(?). They appear as if offering [you] with [their] cries".

154 See Ap-a II B^c 261 and 262. KTh2 29*a*: *byagghā sindhavā nanikulā*, KTh2 34*a*: *sasā sigālā naṅgulā*.

kind of primate is identified with this name in the canon, the *Theragāthā* and *Jātaka* speak of *go-naṅgula*.¹⁵⁵ According to the commentary of the *Theragāthā*, *gonāṅgula* means either a kind of black monkey or just monkeys in general.¹⁵⁶ The author of KTh2 may have dropped the first syllable of this term (i.e. “go”) *metri causa*.

5.3. Metres

With the exception of the fourth stanza, which is *Anuṣṭubh*, all of the *gāthās* quoted from the *Theragāthā* belong to *Triṣṭubh* and *Jagatī* metres. The fourth *pāda* of the first stanza in the KTh2, *samayo Mahāvīra Bhāgīrasānaṃ* (O great hero, it is the time of *Bhāgīrasas*), belongs to *Jagatī* metre with an unknown cadence.¹⁵⁷ The third *pāda* of the ninth stanza¹⁵⁸ has 13 syllables and is thus in *Atijagatī* metre. It should be noted here that the corresponding *pāda* of this stanza attested in the *Mahāvastu* is apparently in *Indravamśā* cadence.¹⁵⁹ The tenth and eleventh stanzas are basically a mix of *Indravamśā*, *Indravajrā* and *Upeṇdravajrā* cadences, except the last *pāda* of the former stanza, composed in *Kamalā* cadence. Stanzas from 12 to 48 are in *Anuṣṭubh* metre. Many of these stanzas are more specifically *pathyāvakras*.¹⁶⁰

5.4. Grammar and special features of wording

Some peculiar wordings can also be noted in the KTh2. For example, *nibbhūtā yena kenaci*¹⁶¹ is an unusual *pāda* of which the literal meaning “are fearless by anybody” seems rather awkward! The poet could have used *na bhūtā yassa kasaci* – a more idiomatic utterance. The Pali canon typically uses the dative case to convey this idea.¹⁶² In addition to this kind of unusual statement, the series also contains deviations from conventional Pali grammar. The word *sevamāno*¹⁶³ is one such problematic term. It is not impossible that *sevamāno* here replaces *seviyamāno* (Skt. *sevyamānaḥ*),¹⁶⁴ to fit the metre. If so, this

155 Th 16, 62, J V 70.

156 Th-a I 237–8: *gonāṅgulakāḷamakkaṭā pakatimakkaṭā ti vadanti yeva*. See also DOP, s. v. *go-naṅgula*: “a kind of black monkey”, BHSd, s.v. *gonāṅgula*: “cow-tailed, a certain kind of (black-faced) monkey”.

157 This differs from the corresponding verse of the KTh1, which reads *samayo mahāvīra Aṅgīrasānaṃ*. The scansion of both these lines is, however, exactly the same.

158 KTh2 9c: *yā Bodhisattaṃ parihariya kucchinā*.

159 Mvu III 109: *yā bodhisatvaṃ parihārya kuṅṣiṇā*. However, in Pali, this line is hypermetric, due to the epenthesis of *parihariya* for *parihārya* (see n. 158). Some other hypermetric lines as follows: KTh2 12a, 14b, 17b, 23a, 31e, 35d, 36e, 37d, 37e, 47b. The constant lines: *samayo te nātīdassane* from KTh2 42f to 48f are enneasyllabic (*Vṛhaṭī*) while KTh2 14c and KTh2 40a are in heptasyllabic (*Uṣṇik*).

160 For *Pathyāvakra*, see VṛR 48–50. See also Warder 1967: 172.

161 KTh2 29d.

162 Cf. A II 120: *so na bhāyati samparāyikassa maraṇassa*, S II 279: *sabbe sīhassa bhāyanti*, Dh 37: *sabbe bhāyanti maccuno*.

163 KTh2 12: *ambā panasā kapiṭṭhā ca, pupphapallavalaṅkatā, dhuvapphalāni pavanti [sic], khuddāmadhukakūpamā, sevamāno ubho passe, gantukālo mahāyasa* “Mango, Jack and Wood apple [trees], adorned with flowers and sprouts, frequently produce fruits, which are similar to honey [combs]. O greatly reputed one, it is the time to go being served [by these trees] in both sides”.

164 Cf. Rv 11: *sevyamānau sukhasparśaiḥ śālaniryāsagandhibhiḥ*.

term refers to the Buddha. On the other hand, if one takes *sevamāno* as an adjective for the trees described in this context, the term must be singular with plural sense (i.e. *sevamānā*). Many such deviations from the grammar can be considered as the poet's metrical licence. Although *sabbadisā*¹⁶⁵ appears to be nominative, it gives locative meaning in this particular context. It is significant to note that Dhammapāla also asserts the locative sense of this term here.¹⁶⁶ In *disā sabbāni sobhayaṃ*,¹⁶⁷ *sabbāni* is neutralized, presumably for metrical reasons. In addition to this, *sobhayaṃ* obviously occurs in the plural sense, in lieu of *sobhayantā*. Perhaps the last syllable of the latter term is dropped *metri causa*.¹⁶⁸

5.5. Tautology

As with the KTh1, tautology is a salient feature even in the present poem. In Indic poetry, tautology is considered as a rhetorical device called *yamaka*, a kind of paronomasia.¹⁶⁹ Nevertheless, when it occurs without this special purpose, it lessens the poetic elegance of a stanza. This feature sounds especially odd in metres with fewer syllables, such as *Anuṣṭubh*. For instance, *niccaṃ* occurs twice in KTh2 16 to express the same meaning, “constantly”,¹⁷⁰ and *gandha* (fragrance) is used three times in stanza 24.¹⁷¹ Needless to say this tautology makes the meaning of some stanzas rather convoluted. It is worth looking at the following two *pādas* of stanza 21:

pupphitā dharaṇīruhā supupphitagā jotanti.

The blossomed trees whose tops are well-blossomed are shining.

These kinds of oddities lead one to presume that the composer of the KTh2 is sometimes careless about the wording of his poetry. It seems that some tautologies are deliberately used to strengthen the alliterative beauty of the poem, such

165 KTh2 2ab: *dumāni phullāni manoramāni, samantato sabbadisā pavanti*. “The delightful trees blossomed are diffusing [their scent] all around in all directions”.

166 Th-a II 224: “*sabbadisā*” *ti*[. . .]*sabbadisāsu*.

167 KTh2 23: *kaṇṇikārā phullitā niccaṃ, sovaṇṇaraṃsijotakā, dibbagandhā pavāyanti*. “Kaṇṇikāra trees, in bloom, the illustrators of golden rays are always diffusing heavenly scents”.

168 A great many verses in the *Khuddaka-nikāya* follow an independent style with regard to the singularity and plurality of verbs and nouns. See Thi 134: *naṅgalehi kasaṃ khettaṃ bījāni pavapaṃ chamā, puttadārāni posentā dhanāṃ vindanti māṇavā*. Here, both *kaṣaṃ* and *pavapaṃ* that qualify *māṇavā* occur in the sense of plural, namely, *kaṣantā* and *pavapantā* respectively. See Thi-a 113: “*kaṣan*” *ti kaṣantā*[. . .]*bahutthe hi idaṃ ekavacaṇaṃ*. . .*“pavapan*” *ti*[. . .]*vapantā*. As remarked by Norman (1995: 86), the author had thus “no eye for consistency”. One can argue that these are ignored *metri causa*. See also KTh2 25d: *ubho magge pasobhayaṃ*, KTh2 26d: *ubho magge palobhayaṃ*.

169 See Busch 2011: 96.

170 KTh2 16: *madhupphaladharā niccaṃ, morarukkā manoramā, khuddakappaphalā niccaṃ, gantukālo mahāyasa* “Lovely *Mora* trees that frequently bear tasty fruits are always having fruits like honey. O greatly reputed one, it is the time to go”.

171 KTh2 24: *supattā gandhasampannā, ketakī dhanuketakī, sugandhā sampavāyanti, disāsabbābhigandhino*. “*Ketakī* and *Dhanuketakī* [bushes] with lovely leaves, replete with fragrance, are defusing adorable fragrance that perfume all the directions”.

as *tittirā susarā sārā, susarā vanakukkuṭā*,¹⁷² although *susarā* could possibly have two meanings here.

5.6. Figures of speech

Unlike the KTh1, the KTh2 makes use of a limited number of similes.¹⁷³ Of these, *khuddakappaphalā*,¹⁷⁴ “honey-like fruits”, is particularly noteworthy. None of the typical illustrative terms such as *va, iva, viya*, and so forth are used in this simile, but instead *kappa* is used. One may be inclined to separate *khuddakappa* into *khuddaka* and *appa*. However, it is semantically illogical. *Kappa* (Skt. *kalpa*) rarely occurs in the canon to introduce similes.¹⁷⁵ Hyperbole, which occurs in several places, adds an extra elegance to the KTh2. According to the twenty-third stanza, *kaṇikāra* trees in bloom diffuse heavenly scents: *dibbā gandhā pavāyanti*. The term *dibbā*, which literally means “divine” or “heavenly”,¹⁷⁶ occurs here to qualify the adorable scent of *kaṇikāra*¹⁷⁷ flowers. This usage is attestable in the canon.¹⁷⁸ In the stanza 13, moreover, fruited trees are shining, while in stanza 20, flowered trees are radiating. Similarly, in stanza 42, the ponds filled with sweet water are sparkling. These can be identified as examples of the use of hyperbole in this series. One can recognize a metaphor when reading the last two *pādas* of stanza 8 in conjunction with stanza 11:¹⁷⁹

maññām ahaṃ sakkati devadevo, tayābhijāto muni saccanāmo,

...

*Buddhassa puttomhi asayhasāhino, Aṅgīrasassappaṭimassa tādino,
pituppitā mayha tvaṃ si Sakka, dhammena me Gotama ayyako si.*

I, the sage who is truly named, well begotten by you, suppose the god of the gods [also] is capable of [doing it]. I am the son of the Enlightened

172 KTh2 41: *tittirā susarā sārā, susarā vanakukkuṭā, mañjussarā rāmaṇeyyā, kālo te pitu dassane*. “The perfect partridges and jungle fowls with lovely screams are endowed with melodious cries that are delightful. It is the time for seeing your father”.

173 See KTh212d, 14c, 16c, 17b, 17d, 35d.

174 KTh2 16c.

175 See M I 150: *Satthukappena*, M-a II 159: “*Satthukappena*” *ti Satthusadisena*. See also Sn 6: *khaggavisāṇakappo*, Sn-a I 65: “*khaggavisāṇakappo*” *ti khaggavisāṇasadiṣo*, Vin I 255: *ahatakappena*, V-a V 1111: “*ahatakappena*” *ti ahataṣadisena*, J-a V 324: “*khuddakappāni*” *ti* [...] *khuddamadhupaṭibhāgāni madhurāni*. Cf. SNa I 42c: *śailakalpanamahāvapaṃ*, Rv 5:36b *kumārakalpaṃ suṣuve kumāraṃ*.

176 See DOP, s.v. *dibba*, MW, s.v. *divya*.

177 For instance, see KTh2 23: *kaṇṇikārā phullitā niccaṃ, sovaṇṇaramsijotakā, dibbagandhā pavāyanti, disā sabbāni sobhayaṃ, sādaraṃ vinatān’eva, samayo te mahāyasa*. “*Kaṇṇikāra* trees, in bloom, the illustrators of golden rays are always diffusing heavenly scents enchanting all the directions as if they bent with reverence. O greatly reputed one, the time [has come] for you”. *Kaṇṇikāra* with double *ṇṇ* is seemingly an editorial substitution following its Sanskrit equivalent *kaṇṇikāra*. However, *kaṇṇikāra* with single *ṇ* has many attestations in the Pali literature. DOP, s.v. *kaṇṇikāra*: “the tree *Sterospermum acerifolium*, its flower”: MW, s.v. *kaṇṇikāra*: “*Pterospermum acerifolium*, *Cathartocarpus fistula*, the flower of *Pterospermum acerifolium*”. See also RŚ 149: *navakaṇṇikāraṃ*, “earring-trees”.

178 M I 212: *dibbā maññe gandhā sampavanti*. “Heavenly scents seem to be floating in the air” Nāṇamoli and Bodhi (1995: 307).

179 KTh2 8cd, and 11.

One who bears the unbearable, of the incomparable Aṅgīrasa who is like that. O Sakka, you are my father's father, and reasonably, you are O Gotama, my grandfather.

Kāludāyi uses *ahaṃ*[...] *tayābhijāto muni saccanāmo* to introduce himself. In the *Theragāthā*, it is common for Elders to introduce themselves as a *muni*, “sage”,¹⁸⁰ especially in the verses appearing as soliloquies. Using *tayābhijāto* (lit. well begotten by you), he metaphorically expresses that he is a son of the Buddha, on the grounds that he has attained liberation under the former. This echoes the *Aggañña-sutta*, where the Buddha explains the reason why he counts his disciples as his children.¹⁸¹ The metaphorical relationship introduced in the first two *pādas* culminates in the verse quoted above where Kāludāyi further emphasizes the Buddha as his father, and therefore King Suddhodana is his grandfather. Stanza 29 says that tigers, Sindh horses and mongooses appear as good but frightful.¹⁸² Since this statement carries two contradictory ideas, it can be called an oxymoron.¹⁸³ In addition to the figures of speech related to meaning, the KTh2 is also replete with literary devices associated with rhythm,¹⁸⁴ such as twining and alliteration.¹⁸⁵ At times, the poet is capable of producing attractive alliteration effortlessly by simply arranging the elements of the stanza.¹⁸⁶ Some stanzas in this series contain more than one literary device as follows:¹⁸⁷

*asokā koviḷārā ca, somanassakarā varā,
sugandhā kaṇṇikā gandhā, rattavaṇṇehi bhūsitā,
sādarā vinatuggaggā, samayo te mahāyasa.*

Excellent Asoka trees and coral trees that are pleasing [with] fragrant [flowers] tied in bunches, adorned with red colours, appear as if respectfully bent [with their] uppermost tops. O greatly reputed one, it is your time.

Obviously, *somanassakarā varā*, *sugandhā kaṇṇikā gandhā* and *uggaggā* are alliterations. The stanza as a whole provides a clear example of anthropomorphism since it attributes human characteristics to *Aśoka* trees and coral trees, describing them with their bent tops, as paying homage to the Buddha. In a slightly different manner, KTh2 23, 24, 30, 31, 34, 39 and 40 present the

180 See Anuruddha in Th 83, Tālapuṭa in Th 97, and Vaṅgīsa in Th 110.

181 D III 84: *Bhagavatamhi putto oraso mukhato jāto*. In the *Kaṇṇakattthalasutta*, the Elder Ānanda considers himself a son of the Buddha. See M II 130: *ahaṃ Bhagavato putto*. Moreover, in the *Apadāna* we read Pajāpati Gotamī, the stepmother of the Buddha, also claims that she is a Buddha's daughter. See Ap II 532: *ahaṃ Sugata te mātā tvaṃ ca dhīra pitā mama, saddhammasukhado nātha tayā jātamhi Gotama*.

182 KTh2 29 *byagghā sindhavā naṅkulā, sādthurūpā bhayānakā*.

183 DLTLT 627–8. See also *Virodha*, Hasan-Rokem and Shulman 1996: 172.

184 See KTh2 6–7.

185 Morgan and Sharma 2011: 236.

186 See KTh2 21a: *punnāgā giripunnāgā*, 24b: *ketakī dhanuketakī*, 27a: *sīhā kesarasīhā ca*.

187 KTh2 22.

same idea but as an assumption. Therefore, this literary device is attested as *utprekṣā*,¹⁸⁸ but some scholars have compared it to personification.¹⁸⁹ Some peculiar expressions used in this series nevertheless remain to be categorized as literary devices or otherwise. For instance, 30*ad* says that “tuskers are twittering”!¹⁹⁰ It is interesting to note that the author uses *kūjino* in place of *gajjino* in order to convey elephants’ trumpets. The elephant’s trumpet is usually illustrated with *gajjeti* or *kuñcati*, and *kūjino* typically refers to birds twittering.¹⁹¹ It is not quite certain whether or not the author purposely uses these as literary devices. Perhaps, *kuñcino* was the original reading that has been turned into the present form as a result of aural confusion and scribal intervention.

Concluding remarks

This article initially looked at the references of two schools to the Elder Kāludāyi in canonical sources available in Indic languages and then turned to look at the Pali commentarial discussions of this figure. Thereafter, the KTh1 and KTh2 were analysed, paying special attention to phraseology, special features, peculiarities in wording, tautologies, metres, figures of speech, lacunae, corruptions and clues as to the authorship of the two series. The foregoing discussion demonstrated that the verses of Kāludāyi in the *Theragāthā* contain several anomalies. On the other hand, the motif of Kāludāyi’s 60 verses is widespread in the commentaries. The KTh1 and KTh2 are two peripheral series of verses ascribed to Kāludāyi and preserved in the *Bv-a* and *Ap-a* respectively. The style of the latter version is closer to some of the texts in the *Khuddaka-nikāya*, and it is apparently older than KTh1. Both series are endowed with charming eulogies to the environment, and they are adorned with an array of literary figures. However, a considerable amount of contaminated and unintelligible readings that have crept into the poems have undermined their poetic value. This article suggests emendations for some corrupted readings in the KTh2. According to the *Ap-a*, KTh2 was included in the *Theragāthā*. This statement cannot simply be ignored. It is probable that these old stanzas could not be accommodated within the Pali canon but then continued to be preserved in the commentaries as peripheral texts. Nevertheless, KTh1 and KTh2 contain 100 stanzas in total, which contrasts starkly with the motif of 60 stanzas stressed in a number of commentaries. Moreover, I suggest that the two series have reached their present form as a result of autonomous developments, and that they stem from different authors. Some stanzas in the KTh1 appear to be much later interpolations. However, as of yet, there is insufficient evidence to establish whether or not the whole series is of very recent composition. The authorship of the KTh1 and KTh2 remains to be identified in future studies. More research is needed to identify all the rhetorical devices used in both series. Researchers who have additional expertise in

188 Shulman 2011: 81.

189 Morgan and Sharma 2011: 219.

190 KTh2 30*ad*: *chaddantā*[...] *kūjino*. See n. 151.

191 See MW, s.v. *kūjin*: “warbling, making a rumbling sound in the bowels”.

zoology, specifically ornithology or botany, will be able to do more justice to the contents of the KTh2.

Bibliography

Abbreviations

A	Āṅguttara-nikāya
A-a	Āṅguttara-nikāya-aṭṭhakathā
Ap	Apadāna
Ap-a	Apadāna-aṭṭhakathā
BCS, B ^e	Burmese <i>Chaṭṭhasaṅgīti Tipiṭaka</i> Edition
Bv	Buddhavaṃsa
Bv-a	Buddhavaṃsa-aṭṭhakathā
C ^e	Sinhalese Buddhajayanti Edition
D	Dīgha-nikāya
D-a	Dīgha-nikāya-aṭṭhakathā
Dhp	Dhammapada
Dhs-a	Dhammasaṅgaṇī-aṭṭhakathā
It	Itivuttaka
It-a	Itivuttaka-aṭṭhakathā
J	Jātaka
J-a	Jātaka-aṭṭhakathā
KTh1	1 st series of Kāludāyi's verses
KTh2	2 nd series of Kāludāyi's verses
M	Majjhima-nikāya
M-a	Majjhima-nikāya-aṭṭhakathā
M-aṭ	Majjhima-nikāya-aṭṭhakathāṭīkā
Mhv	Mahāvaṃsa
S	Saṃyutta-nikāya
S-a	Saṃyutta-nikāya-aṭṭhakathā
Sd-ṭ	Sāratthadīpanīṭīkā
SHB	Simon Hewavitarne Bequest <i>Aṭṭhakathā</i> (Sinhalese Script) Edition
S ^e	Siamese <i>Tipiṭaka</i> Edition
Sn	Suttanipāta
Sn-a	Suttanipāta-aṭṭhakathā
Th	Theragāthā
Th-a	Theragāthā-aṭṭhakathā
Thi	Therīgāthā
Thi-a	Therīgāthā-aṭṭhakathā
Ud-a	Udāna-aṭṭhakathā
V-a	Vinaya-aṭṭhakathā
Vibh-a	Vibhaṅga-aṭṭhakathā
Vin	Vinaya-piṭaka
Vin-vn-pt	Vinayavinicchayaṭīkā
Vism	Visuddhimagga
Vv-a	Vimānavatthu-aṭṭhakathā

Except where otherwise stated, all the above abbreviations refer to editions of texts published by the Pali Text Society (PTS).

AK	Ramanathan, A.A. <i>Amarakośa: with the Unpublished South Indian Commentaries</i> . Vol. I. 1989. India: Adyar Library and Research Centre.
ASED	MacDonnell, Arthur Anthony. 1893. <i>A Sanskrit English Dictionary</i> . London: Longmans Green & Company.
BHSD	Edgerton, Franklin. 1953. <i>Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary</i> . Two vols. New Haven: Yale University Press.
Bu-up	Gray, James. 1892. <i>Buddhaghosuppatti</i> . London: Luzac & Co.
CODLT	Baldick, Chris. 2001. <i>The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms</i> . New York: Oxford University Press.
DL D	Dupriez, Bernard. 1991. <i>A Dictionary of Literary Devices Gradus A-Z</i> . Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press.
DLTLT	Cuddon, J.A. 1998. <i>Dictionary of Literary Terms & Literary Theory</i> . London: Penguin Books.
DOP	Cone, Margaret. 2001–2010. <i>Dictionary of Pāli</i> . Two vols. Oxford: Pali Text Society.
DPL	Childers, Robert Cæsar. 1875. <i>A Dictionary of the Pāli Language</i> . London: Trübner & Co.
GV	Minayeff. 1886. “Gandhavaṃsa”, <i>Journal of the Pāli Text Society</i> . London: Pali Text Society, 54–80.
Hk	Jośhī, Jayaśaṅkara. 1957. <i>Halāyudhakośaḥ</i> . Lakhnau: Uttara Pradeśa Hindī Saṃsthāna.
Jinak	Buddhadatta, A.P. 1962. London: Luzac & Company Ltd.
KU	Rawson, J.N. 1934. <i>The Kaṭha Upaniṣad. Carey Centenary Volume</i> . London: Oxford University Press.
Mvu	Senart, Par É. 1977. <i>Le Mahāvastu. Texte Sanscrit Publié Pour La Première Fois Et Accompagné D’Introductions Et D’un Commentaire</i> , Vol. III. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.
MW	Monier-Williams, Monier. 1899. <i>A Sanskrit–English Dictionary</i> . Oxford: Oxford University Press.
PJv	Ñāṇavimala, Kirielle. 1951. Ed. <i>Pūjāvaliya</i> . Colombo: M.D. Gunasena and Co.
PJv ²	Abhayaratna, D.H.S. 1904. Ed. <i>Pūjāvaliya</i> . Colombo: Granthaparakāśa Press.
PSED	Apte, Vaman Shivaram. 1890. <i>The Practical Sanskrit–English Dictionary</i> . Poona: Shiralkar.
PTSD	Rhys Davids, T.W. and William Stede. 1921–1925. <i>Pāli–English Dictionary</i> . London: Pali Text Society.
RS	Punekar, Shakar Mokashi. 1966. <i>Kalidasa’s Ritusamharam</i> . Bombay: Sigma Publications.
RV	Saraṇatissa. 1896. <i>Rasavāhinī</i> . Colombo: Vidyāsāgara Press.
Rv	Karmarkar, R.D. 2003. <i>Raghuvamśa of Kālidāsa</i> . Delhi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratishthan.

- SBV Gnoli, Raniero. 1977. *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Saṅghabhedavastu*. Two Vols. Rome: Istituto Italiano Per IL Medio Estremo Oriente.
- Śkd Kanta Deva, Raja Radha. 1967. *Śabdakalpadrumaḥ*. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Series.
- Śs Bendall, Cecil. 1902. *Çikshāsamuccaya: A Compendium of Buddhist Teaching*. St Petersburg: Commissionnaires de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences.
- SNa Johnston, E.H. 1928. *The Saundarananda of Aśvaghoṣa*. London: Oxford University Press.
- SS *Saddhammasaṅgaha* 1890, *Journal of the Pali Text Society*. London: Pali Text Society, 21–90.
- Vp Tarkavācaspati, Śrī Tārānātha. 1962. *Vācaspatyam*. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Series.
- Vin-vn Buddhadatta, A.P. 1915–1928. *Buddhadatta's Manuals. Part I & II*. London: Pali Text Society.
- VṛR Sarmā, Śrī Kedārnātha. 1962. *The Vṛttaratnākara of Bhaṭṭa Kedāra*. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office.

References

- Barua, B.M. 1945. “Buddhadatta and Buddhaghosa: their contemporaneity and age”, *University of Ceylon Review* 3/2, 77–88.
- Bodhi, Bhikkhu. 2000. *The Connected Discourses of the Buddha*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.
- Bodhi, Bhikkhu. 2012. *The Numerical Discourses of the Buddha*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.
- Bodhi, Bhikkhu. 2017. *The Suttanipāta: An Ancient Collection of the Buddha's Discourses and Its Canonical Commentaries*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.
- Browning, R. 1960. “Recentiores Non Deteriores”, *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 7. University of London: School of Advanced Studies, 11–21.
- Buddhadatta, A.P. 1945. “The great author of summaries: contemporary of Buddhaghosa”, *University of Ceylon Review* 3/1, 34–40.
- Busch, Allison. 2011. *Poetry of Kings: The Classical Hindi Literature of Mughal India*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Clark, Chris. 2015. “A study of the Apadāna, including an edition and annotated translation of the second, third and fourth chapters”. PhD thesis, University of Sydney.
- Cousins, L.S. 1972. “Dhammapāla and the Ṭikā literature”, *Religion*, Vol. II, 159–65.
- Dimitrov, Dragomir. 2016. *The Legacy of the Jewel Mind: On the Sanskrit, Pali, and Sinhalese Works by Ratnamati. A Philological Chronicle (Phullalocanavamsa)*. Naples: Università degli studi Napoli “L'Orientale”, 229–326.
- Gamage, Aruna K. 2013. *Dharmavādaparīkṣā*. Colombo: S. Godage & Brothers.
- Gamage, Aruna. Forthcoming. “Two series of Kālundāyī's verses in the Pāli commentaries: a literal translation”, *Buddhist Studies Review*.
- Hasan-Rokem, Galit and David Shulman. 1996. *Untying the Knot: On Riddles and Other Enigmatic Modes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hayashi, Takatsugu. 2013. “Apocryphal Suttas not listed in the Buddhist Councils: Kuḷumbasutta, Catuparivaṭṭasutta and other source materials”, *Journal of Pāli and Buddhist Studies*. Vol. 27: Society for the Study of Pāli and Buddhist Culture, 21–46.

- von Hinüber, Oskar. 1996. *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Horner, I.B. 2007. *The Book of the Discipline Vol. IV*. Lancaster: Pali Text Society.
- Horner, I.B. 1978. *The Clarifier of the Sweet Meaning*. London: Pali Text Society.
- Kale, M.R. 1967. *The Ritusamhara of Kālidāsa*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Lang, Karen C. 2001. "Poetic license in the Buddhist Sanskrit verses of the *Upālipariṣcchā*", *Indo-Iranian Journal*, 44, 231–40.
- Langer, Kenneth. 1981. "Compartmentalization and clustering of words for woman and the role of *sā* in the portrayal of women in Sanskrit court poetry", *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 101, 177–93.
- Malalasekara, G.P. 1928. *The Pāli literature of Ceylon*. Colombo: M.D. Gunasena & Co., Ltd.
- McCarter, P. Kyle. 1986. *Textual Criticism: Recovering the Text of the Hebrew Bible*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Martin, Gary D. 2010. *Multiple Originals: New Approaches to Hebrew Bible Textual Criticism*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Morgan, Les and Ram Karan Sharma. 2011. *Croaking Frogs: A Guide to Sanskrit Metrics and Figures of Speech*. India: Mahodara Press.
- Ñānamoli, Bhikkhu and Bhikkhu Bodhi. 1995. *The Middle Length Discourses of the Buddha*. Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society.
- Norman, K.R. 1983. *A History of Indian Literature*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Norman, K.R. 1995. *The Elders' Verses* 2 Vols. Oxford: Pali Text Society.
- Nyānaponica, Bhikkhu. 2005. *Darlegung Der Bedeutung (Atthasālinī)*. Oxford: Pali Text Society.
- Pieris, Aloysius. 2004. *Studies in the Philosophy and Literature of Pāli Ābhidhammika Buddhism*. Colombo: The Ecumenical Institute for Study and Dialogue.
- Porter, J. Scott. 1848. *Principles of Textual Criticism: with their application of the Old and New Testaments*. London: Simms and McIntyre.
- Roth, Gustav. 1968. "'A saint like that' and 'A saviour' in Prakrit, Pāli, Sanskrit and Tibetan literature", *Śrī Mahāvīr Jaina Golden Jubilee Volume*. I. Bombay: Mahāvīr Jain Vidyālaya, 46–62.
- Salomon, Richard. 2016. "Concatenation in Kālidāsa and other Sanskrit poets", *Indo-Iranian Journal*, 59, 48–80.
- Schubring, Walther. 1955. "Jinasena, Mallinātha, Kālidāsa", *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 105/2, 131–7.
- Silk, Jonathan A. 2015. "Canonicity", *Brill's Encyclopedia of Buddhism*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 5–37.
- Shulman, David. 2011. "On singularity: what Sanskrit poetics believe to be real", in H.L. Seneviratne (ed.), *The Anthropologist and the Native: Essays for Gananath Obeyesekere*. New York: Anthem Press, 75–100.
- Skilling, Peter. 2010. "Scriptural authenticity and the Śrāvaka schools: an essay towards an Indian perspective", *The Eastern Buddhist*, 41/2, 1–47.
- Warder, A.K. 1967. *Pali Metre*. London: Messrs Luzac And Company Ltd.
- Walters, Jonathan S. 2017. *The Legends of the Buddhist Saints*. US: Jonathan S. Walters and Whitman College.
- Whitney, William Dwight. 1885. *The Roots, Verb-Forms and Primary Derivatives of the Sanskrit Language*. Leipzig: Breitkopf and Härtel.
- Winternitz, M. 1927. *A History of Indian Literature*. Vol. I. University of Calcutta.