

Gāthās Interpolated by a Veyyākaraṇa¹⁾

—Jātaka pāḷi of the 5th Buddhist Council—

Kōji Hiraki

I wish to express my gratitude to Mr. Choei Shiratori (白鳥朝詠氏), President of FSC, who permitted me to make use of photographs of the Kuthodaw slabs in Mandalay taken under the supervision of himself.

Dr. Jion Abe stated in the 1987 article²⁾ that Mr. Shiratori, consulting Dr. Hajime Nakamura, would intend to publish them. As to the Canon and Burmese Buddhist history, the reader is referred to his article.

To outline in brief the Pāli Canon of the 5th Buddhist Council, it consists of approximately 730 slabs, and the Jātaka pāḷi numbers 21 slabs (Nos. 589–609).

It is noteworthy that there are several slight differences of Gāthās between the Jātaka pāḷi of the Fifth Buddhist Council (MJ) and Fausböll's edition by PTS (FJ).

It might at first sight seem reasonable to suggest that MJ's readings were influenced by the Veyyākaraṇa, which is, as Fausböll put it, a commentary which elucidates both the tale and certain words in the metrical pieces.

The list of Gāthās to be reviewed is as follows :

1) Kāka-jātaka :

MJ : *idaṃ* kaṇṭhe kiṇāyati | (Stone No. 592 Front, ll. 45–46)

FJ : kaṇṭhe kiṇakiṇāyati | (FJ No. 395, vol. III pp. 315, 138d)

2) Gaṅgamāla-jātaka :

MJ : Sandiṭṭhikam eva *amma* passa [tha] | (Stone No. 592 Back, l. 68)

FJ : Sandiṭṭhikam eva passatha | (FJ No. 421, vol. III p. 453, 43a)

3) Javanahamsa-jātaka :

MJ : āra *ṭhita* saṁvasanti | (Stone No. 594 Back, ll. 78–79)

FJ : āra santo saṁvasanti | (FJ No. 476, vol. IV p. 217, 36c)

4) Dūta-jātaka :

- MJ : *acikkheyya* tippāni parassa dhīro|(Stone No. 594 Back, ll. 93-94)
 FJ : *akkheyya* tippāni parassa dhīro|(FJ No. 478, vol. IV p. 226, 60c)
- 5) Paṇḍara-jātaka :
 MJ : Hiriyā titikkhāya damen' *upeto*|(Stone No. 598 Front, ll. 59-60)
 FJ : Hiriyā titikkhāya damena khantiyā|(FJ No. 518, vol. V p. 83, 246a)
- 6) Sudhābhōjana-jātaka :
 MJ : na cāpi *adatvā* udakaṃ p'ahaṃ piye|(Stone No. 601 Front, ll. 66-67)
 FJ : na cāpi *datvā* udakaṃ p'ahaṃ piye|(FJ vol. V pp. 391-392, 211d)
- 7) Kusa-jātaka :
 MJ : rañño Maddassantepare|(Stone No. 600 Front, l. 63)
 FJ : rañño Maddassa thīpure|(FJ No. 531, vol. V p. 296, 10d)
- 8) Sivi-jātaka :
 MJ : cakkhuṃ me upapajjathu|(Stone No. 596 Front, ll. 64-65)
 FJ : cakkhuṃ me upapajjathā|(FJ No. 499, vol. IV p. 410, 75f)
- 9) Somanassa-jātaka :
 MJ : arahāsi nam *yācituye* tuvaṃ pi|(Stone No. 596 Back, ll. 63-64)
 FJ : arahāsi naṃ *yācitave* tuvaṃ pi|(FJ No. 505, vol. IV p. 452, 215d)
- 10) Campeyya-jātaka :
 MJ : arahasi no *jānituye* katānīti|(Stone No. 596 Back, ll. 78-79)
 FJ : arahasi no jānitaye katānīti|(FJ No. 506, vol. IV p. 463, 238d)
- 11) Sona-Nanda-jātaka :
 MJ : yaṃ Nando *na pāvisē* gharaṃ|(Stone No. 600 Back, l. 45)
 FJ : yaṃ Nando *pāvisi* gharaṃ|(FJ No. 532, vol. V p. 329, 163b)

1) It matters whether the word 'idam' is used or not. Obviously, MJ becomes all the more explanatory because a demonstrative noun, *idam* (this) is used in the text of MJ. It may be inferred from this that not MJ but FJ was the original text and that MJ was revised or rewritten by some canonical writers. The veyyākaraṇa reads this ³⁾:

Tass' athto : ..., atha kiṃ carahi te vayassa *idam* kaṇṭhe kiṇikiṇāyatīti.

It is reasonable to suggest that the word *idam* in MJ was interpolated by the veyyākaraṇa. The phrase, "*idam~kiṇikiṇāyatīti*" in the veyyākaraṇa consists of ten syllables, which are two syllables in redundancy for a Śloka pāda. The assumption is that a writer substituted a six-syllable word (*kiṇikiṇāyati*) for a four-syllable word (*kiṇāyati*) so that it would be a eight-syllable pāda. The emendated pāda obeys the first and the second metrical rules by Pingala ⁴⁾.

2) MJ inserts the word 'amma' before 'passatha'. It seems to be identical with that of a Veyyākaraṇa⁵⁾.

Tattha..., vandāmā 'ti taṃ ināni mayaṃ sarājikā samaccā sabbe vandāma, passatha
amma khantisoraccānaṃ vipākaṃ ti.

It is most likely to be the source of MJ's reading. But why should be the word 'amma' selected? It can be explained from a metrical viewpoint. The verse 44 is in the Triṣṭubh metre, whose strophe consists of four 11-syllable pādas.

The pāda *a* exceptably consists of only nine syllables, whose metre is metrically corrupted because of a missing two-syllable word. My suggestion is that a canonical writer with some knowledge of Triṣṭubh metre must have added a two-syllable, but meaningless word 'amma' of the Veyyākaraṇa simply to remake the pāda a 11-syllable pāda rather than to make the meaning more understandable. The interpolation made pāda *a* a completely metrical Triṣṭubh pāda. The missing [tha] is supposed to be due to a carelessness of a scribe.

The scheme is : — — — — —, — — — — — [—]

In spite of the fact that two syllables are also lacking for the successive verse 44 (pāda *c*) in Triṣṭubh, he did not operate it to add a suitable two-syllable word just as he did in the verse 43. It is not understandable why he left it unchanged. He might have overlooked it.

3) Veyyākaraṇa : ..., santo pana paṇḍitā āra *ṭhitāpi* mettābhāvitena manasā āvajjantā saṃvasanti yeva (p. 218).

The word, "santo" is supposed to be replaced with 'ṭhitā' in a Veyyākaraṇa. The two obey equally the first rule of śloka by Pingala. And it may be supported by Dh-p-a III 398, 4 : mettādhāvanāya patiṭṭhitattā hīṃsato āra va ṭhito. CPD does not list B's reading "ārodhitā" mentioned in the footnote (FJ IV p. 217). It can be, however, regarded almost the same as MJ's. That is because it is a result of vocalization of "āra ṭhitā". The phenomenon has been seen throughout the Canon.

4) Veyyākaraṇa : tathāvidhassā 'ti paṇḍitapurisassa attanā saddhiṃ ekamaṇaṃ viditvā tathāvidhassa *acikkheyya*.

The word, "acikkheyya" appears frequently in the prose, not in the

verse.: (ex) ~mūḷhassa vā maggaṃ ācikkheyya, (SI 70, MI 24, Sn p. 15) CPD s.v. akkhāti; pot. 3 sg. ~eyya, Ja IV 226, 9* (=ācikkheyya). In a Gāthā parallel to this one, ācikkhi instead of ācikkheyya is used.: mūḷhassa maggaṃ ācikkhi (J No. 544, vi, p. 241, 137c).

FJ's text is perfect for a Triṣṭubh pāda, therefore there is no necessity to alter it. Because of the interpolation, the pāda exceeded the metrical rule for śloka by one syllable. This is an example of a poor interpolation.

5) Veyyākaraṇa: ...adhivāsanakhantiyā indriyadamena ca upeto....

The verse is in Triṣṭubh strophe. The pāda *a* of FJ is corrupted because of two redundant syllables. It proves to have been caused by tautology, as compared with the presumably original verse parallel to this one:

Sn 462d, 463a=SN I. p. 168.: ājāniyo hoti hirinisedho

saccena danto damasā upeto

cf. Ja III, p. 443: guṇehi etehi upeta khattiya

A Canonical writer's selection of the annotation 'taming of the senses' (indriyadamena ca upeto) (CPD s.v. upeta) instead of 'patient endurance' (adhivāsanakhantiyā) (CPD s.v. adhvāsanakhanti) in a Veyyākaraṇa for the 'damena khantiyā' was intended to avoid tautology. And he, on the analogy of Sn463a (=Pj II. 407, indriyadamena samannāgato), replaced 'damena khantiyā' with 'daman'upeto,' so that he could reduce one syllable, by which metre could be improved better, although it had one syllable in redundancy.

6) Veyyākaraṇa: na cāpi datvā ti udakapasatam pi cāham labhitvā *adatva* na pivissānni....

This is an example of interpolations by a Veyyākaraṇa. The verse is in the Triṣṭubh. The pāda *d* is the exceptionally corrupted pāda, which implies that time has obscured the meaning of the pāda, so even a canonical writer could hardly catch it. Andersen's⁶⁾ listed a-datvā! 's.v. dadāti.' CPD does not list adatvā, but "a" of a-datvā is negative prefix. and "Often added to infinite forms of the verbs, part., inf., abs., grdv." (CPD s.v. ³a-6; Andersen s.v. a-⁴)

It is likely to be caused by a Canonical writer's misreading of the an-

notation. If it is read as na cāpi adatvā⁷⁾, it means affirmative, not negative, and the meaning turns reversed. And furthermore, he failed to improve the metre better. The pāda was changed for the worse.

<7>-11) omitted because of limited space.>

Remarks :

The problem of alteration of Gāthās has several aspects. Among the most vital problems is metre. As far as it is concerned, canonical writers can be classified roughly into two types. Judging by the sophisticated interpolation in the MJ No. 421, 43 verse, canonical writers in charge of this supposedly had some knowledge of Metre, while the other writers in charge of Gāthās in MJ No. 478, 60 and so on might not. Their concern for altering the text was to substitute a plain term for a difficult one used in the Veyyākaraṇa, so that it would be easier to read rather than to insist on the preservation of metre.

It should be noted that a tendency to rewrite not only verse but prose has been seen throughout other Mandalay Pali Scriptures.

-
- 1) K. Hiraki, "Gāthās that Versified a Veyyākaraṇa"(in Japanese).(unpublished)
 - 2) J. Abe. "An Aspect of Modern Burmese Buddhism" (in Japanese). The Eastern Institute, The East, 1987. As to Jātakas in Burma, see M.H. Bode, The Pali Literature of Burma and also W.B. Bollée, Kuṇāla-jātaka, PTS, 1970.
 - 3) Fausbøll noted in the footnote (p.315): Bd idaṃ kanhe kinnāyatīti; Bf idaṃ kanhe kiṇāyati.
 - 4) Hideaki Natani, Subasi Shahon no Kenkyu, 1988, pp. 69-72. Cf. A.K. Warder, Pali Metre, Pali Text Society, 1967.
 - 5) Fausbøll noted in the footnote as various readings (p. 453). Bdf add amma, but he would not insert it in his text.
 - 6) D. Andersen, A Pali Reader, with notes and glossary, 1917.
 - 7) An English translator of PTS edition followed a Veyyākaraṇa, referring to "for datvā reading 'datvā, i.e. adatvā' (FJ vol. V. p. 209).
- <Key Words> Jātaka paḷi of the 5th Buddhist Council, Gāthā, Veyyākaraṇa, Metre.

(Research Fellow, The Eastern Institute)