

THE METRES OF THE *LAKKHAṆA-SUTTANTA* (V)

1, *Introduction*¹

In an earlier article² devoted to an investigation of the verses in the *Upaṭṭhitappacupita* (= *Upasthitapracupita*) metre in the *Lakkhaṇa-suttanta* of the *Dīgha-nikāya*³, I stated that it would be worth while making an investigation of the passages in the other ornate metres used in that *suttanta*, to see whether there was also the possibility there of using the metre as a guide for the restoration of the

1. Abbreviations of the titles of texts are those adopted by the *Critical Pāli Dictionary* (CPD). Other abbreviations are:

CP = K.R. NORMAN, *Collected Papers* I-VI, PTS Oxford 1990-96;

EV I, II = K.R. NORMAN, *Elders' Verses* I, II, PTS London 1969, 1971;

GD II = K.R. NORMAN, *The Group of Discourses* II, PTS Oxford 1992;

Geiger = W. GEIGER, *Pāli Grammar*, PTS Oxford 1994;

BHSD = F. EDGERTON, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary*, New Haven 1953;

PSM = H.D.T. SHETH, *Pāiasaddamahāṇavo*;

Warder = A.K. WARDER, *Introduction to Pāli*;

m.c. = metri causa;

p(p). = page(s);

s.v. = under the heading;

v.l(l). = variant reading(s).

2. K.R. NORMAN, "The metres of the *Lakkhaṇa-suttanta*", in GATARE DHAMMAPALA et al. (edd.), *Buddhist Studies in honour of Hammalava Saddhātissa*, Nugegoda, 1984, pp. 176-88.

3. = D III 142-79.

According to H. Smith¹², the scheme is:

0 0 - | 0 - 0 | 0 0 - | 0 , 0 0 0 | 0 0 - | 0 - 0 - ||
 0 0 0 0 0 | 0 0 - | 0 0 - | 0 0 - | 0 - 0 | 0 0 - | 0 - 0 - ||

He defines the verses in the *Lakkhaṇa-sutta* as proto-*Udgatā*, and notes the presence of *Udgatā* verses at *Abhidh-av* 111,31–34.

Besides the PTS's edition (E^e)¹³, I have consulted the Burmese *Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana* edition (B^e)¹⁴, the Sinhalese *Buddhajayanti* edition (C^e)¹⁵ and a Siamese edition (S^e)¹⁶. In the light of the readings found in these editions of the text¹⁷ I have in most cases been able to suggest corrections for the errors which occur. I have discussed below the few passages where this was not possible.

In making this new edition of these verses I have used the following conventions:

- < > = add enclosed word(s) or letter(s) (which occur in no edition) to the text
 ˘ = shorten a long vowel (which occurs in all editions) m.c.
 ^ = lengthen a short vowel (which occurs in all editions) m.c.

2. Text

A. *Rucirā*.

1. *na 'pāṇinā na ca pana daṇḍa-leḍḍunā'¹*
 satthena vā maraṇa-vadhena vā puna²,
 ubbāadhanāya <va> paritaḷḷanāya vā
 na heṭṭhay³ janatam⁴ aheṭṭhako ahu.

12. H. SMITH, *Saddanūti*, p. 1157 (§ 8.4.1,15).

13. *The Dīgha Nikāya*, Vol. III, ed. J. ESTLIN CARPENTER, PTS London 1911.

14. Rangoon 1956.

15. Colombo 1976.

16. Bangkok 1926.

17. I have also consulted the PTS edition (Ee), the Burmese edition (Be) and the Nālandā edition (Ne) of the *Sumaṅgalavilāsini*, the cty upon the *Dīgha-nikāya*. To avoid confusion I have always referred to these editions as Sv Be, Sv Ee and Sv Ne. I quote Sv Ne only when it differs from Sv Be. I have also consulted Ee and Be of the *ṭikā* on the *Sumaṅgalavilāsini* (Sv-pt).

(1-1) B^eC^e *pāṇidaṇḍehi panātha leḍḍunā*; (2) B^eS^e *pana*; (3) S^e *viheṭṭhayī*; (4) E^e *jantum*.

2. *ten' eva so¹ sugatim upecca¹ modati
sukha-pphalaṃ² kariya³ sukhānī² vīdati,
sampajjasā⁴ rasa-haraṇī susaṅṅhitā
idh' āgato labhati rasa-ggas'-aggitaṃ⁵.*

(1-1) C^eS^e *sugatisu pecca*; (2-2) E^e takes as a compound; (3) S^e *kiriya*; (4) B^eC^e *samojasā* S^e *pānuñjasā*; (5) S^e *rasa-ggisaggitam*.

3. *ten' āhu naṃ abhinipuṇā¹ vicakkhaṇā:
'ayaṇ² naro sukha-bahulo bhavissati,
gihissa vā pabbajitassa vā puna²
taṃ lakkhaṇaṃ bhavati tad-attha-jotakaṃ.'*

(1) B^eC^e *atinipuṇā*; (2) E^e *ayan*; (3) S^e *pana*.

B. Uggatā.

4. *na ca vīsaṭaṃ na ca visāci¹
na ca pana² viceyya-pekkhitā²
uju³ tathā pasaṭaṃ uju⁴-mano
piya-cakkhunā bahu-janaṃ udikkhitā⁵.*

(1) C^e *visāci* E^e *visācitam* S^e *visāvi*; (2-2) B^eC^e two words; S^e *vidheyya-*; (3) B^eC^e *ujum*; (4) B^eC^eS^e *uju-* E^e *udu-*; (5) S^e *udakkhitā*.

5. *sugatisu¹ so phala-vipākam²
anubhavati tattha modatī,
idha ca pana³ bhavati go-pakhumo
abhinīla-netta-nayano sudassano.*

(1) E^eS^e *sugatisu*; (2) B^eC^eE^eS^e *-vipākam*; (3) S^e omits *pana*.

6. *abhiyogino ca nipuṇā <ca>
¹bahu² pana¹ nimitta-kovidā
sukhuma³-nayana-kusalā⁴ manujā
'piya-dassano' ti abhiniddisanti⁵ naṃ⁶.*

(1–1) S^e *bahupada-*; (2) B^eC^eE^e *bahū*; (3) S^e *gopakkhuma*; (4) C^e *-kusa-*
la-; (5) S^e *abhinandasanti*; (6) E^e *nam*.

7. *'piya-dassano gihī pi' santō²*
bhavati bahunaṃ³ piyāyito⁴,
yadi ⁵ca na⁵ bhavati gihī⁶, samaṇo⁷
<bhavati>⁸ piyo bahuna⁹ soka-nāsaṇo.⁹

(1) S^e omits *pi*; (2) B^eC^eS^e add *ca*; (3) B^eC^eS^e *bahujana-* E^e *bahunnaṃ*;
 (4) S^e *-piyāyako*; (5–5) S^e *pana*; (6) S^e *gihi*; (7) B^eC^eE^e add *hoti*; (8) S^e
hoti; (9) B^eC^eS^e *bahūnaṃ* Ee *bahunnaṃ*.

3. Commentary

1. Sv 936,35: *maraṇa-vadhenā ti etaṃ māretha etaṃ ghāthethā ti evaṃ ānattena maraṇa-vadhena*. Sv-pt III 155,3–8: *vadha-saddo "attānaṃ vadhitvā vadhitvā rodati" ti ādisu bādhan'-attho pi hoti ti tato visesan'-atthaṃ maraṇa-vadhenā ti vuttaṃ, maraṇa-saṅkhātena vadhenā ti attho. bādhan'-attho eva vā vadho-saddo, māraṇena vibādhanena (E^e so; B^e bādhanena) cā ti attho*.

Sv 937,1: *ubbādhanāyā ti bandhanāgāra-ppavesanena*. Sv-pt III 155,9–11: *ubbādhanāyā ti bandhanāgāre pakkhipitvā uddhaṃ uddhaṃ bādhanena. ten' āha bandhanāgāra-ppavesanenā ti*.

The version of *pāda* a in B^eC^e is *Jagatī*.

Pāda c is *Jagatī*, with the break . , . . . It can be changed into *Rucirā* by adding a short syllable after *ubbādhanāya*. Warder (p. 371) inserts *ca*. I prefer to insert *va* and to assume that it is m.c. for *vā*. For the *ca/va* alternation, arising from the similarity in appearance of the two characters in the early Brāhmī script, see GD II p. 146 (ad Sn 38).

2. The variant *sugatisu pecca* for *sugatim upecca* in C^e perhaps arises from the *ma/sa* alternation, arising from the similarity in appearance of these two characters in the early Brāhmī script. For this see EV II p. 116 (ad Thī 262).

Sv 937,2: *pajasā ti ujukā* (Sv E^eN^e so; Sv B^e omits).

In *pāda* b *-pph-* is m.c.

The prose version states: *uddhaggassa rasa-haraṇiyo gīvāya jātā honti samabhivāhiniyo* (D III 166,8–9).

I follow Childers (see PED, s.v. *rasagga*) in believing that *rasagga-saggitaṃ* is to be analysed as *rasa-ggasa-aggi-tā*, with *ggas* < Sanskrit *gras* “to eat”, i.e. “the state of being topmost of those who eat flavours”. Despite the statement in PED that a development from *gras* is not otherwise found in Pāli, Sv-pt III 154,24–27 explains: *madhur’ādi-bhedaṃ rasaṃ sāra-vara-rasam eva vā* (E^e so; for *sāra-vara-rasam eva vā* B^e reads *gasati harati etehi, sayam eva vā taṃ*) *gasanti gilanti anto pavesentī ti rasa-ggasā, rasa-ggasānaṃ aggā rasa-ggas’aggā, te ettha santī ti rasa-ggas’aggī, tad eva lakkhaṇaṃ*. The Sanskrit equivalent is *rasarasāgratā* “(state of, possessing) excellent taste or flavour” (see BHSD, s.v. *rasāgra*), but the relationship between this and Pāli *rasaggasaggitaṃ* is problematical.

3. I omit *ti* at the end of *pāda* d and print *-jotakaṃ*.

Pāda c is *Jagatī*, and is also found in the *Vaṃsaṭṭhā* verses at D III 162,7*, in company with *pāda* d, which as a *Rucirā pāda* is out of place in a *Vaṃsaṭṭhā* verse.

4. Sv 937,3: *na ca viṣaṭan ti kakkāṭako* (Sv B^e so; Sv E^e *kakkaṭo*) *viya akkhīni nīharitvā na kodha-vasena pekkhitā ahoṣi*. Sv-pt III 155,12–13: *viṣaṭan ti kujjhana-vasena vinissaṭaṃ* (B^e *vinisiṭaṃ*) *katvā. ten’ āha kakkāṭo* (E^e so; B^e *kakkāṭako*) *viyā ti ādi*.

I follow Warder (p. 372) in reading *vīsaṭaṃ*.

Sv 937,5: *na ca visāci* (Sv B^e so; Sv E^e *visācikhitaṃ*) *ti vaṅk’-akkhi-koṭiyā pekkhitā pi nāhoṣi*. Sv-pt III 155,14–16: *visāci ti virūpaṃ sācikataṃ* (E^e so; B^e *sācikataṃ*), *vijimhan ti attho. ten’ āha vaṅk’-akkhi-koṭiyā ti, kuṭil’* (E^e so; B^e *kuṭila*)-*akkhi-koṭi-pātenā ti attho*. E^e *visācitaṃ* looks like an attempt to produce the past participle of a verb, while the Sv E^e reading *visācikhitaṃ* is perhaps influenced by *sācikataṃ*.

I follow Warder in reading *visāci*.

Sv 937,7: *na ca pana viceyya-pekkhitā ti viceyya-pekkhitā nāma yo kujjhivā yadā naṃ paro oloketi tadā nimmīleti* (Sv B^e so; Sv E^e *nimmīlati*) *na oloketi. puna gacchantaṃ kujjhivā oloketi, evarūpo nāhoṣi* (Sv B^e so; Sv E^e *nāma hoti*). *vineyya* (Sv B^e so; Sv E^e *viteyya*)-

pekkhitā ti pi pāṭho, ayaṃ ev' attho. Sv-ṭ III 155,17–21: *viceyya-pekkhitā ti ujukaṃ anoloketvā diṭṭhipātaṃ vicāretvā oloketā* (E° so; B° *oloketvā*). *ten' āha yo kujjhivā ti ādi. paro ti kujjhito. na oloketi sam-mukhā. gacchantam kujjhivā* (B° adds *na*) *oloketi parammukhā. viteyyā ti virūpaṃ tiriyaṃ, viññūnaṃ olokanakkamaṃ vītikkamivā ti attho.* Sv E° reads *viteyya-* as the *pāṭhāntara*, but the editor suggests (p. 937 note 1) that the correct reading is perhaps *vineyya-*. Sv-ṭ seems to have read *viteyya-* as the *pāṭhāntara* in Sv. I analyse *viceyya-pekkhitā* as a syntactical compound¹⁸. The reading *vidheyya* in S° is perhaps due to the *ca/dha* alternation, which arises from the similarity in appearance of these two characters in the early Brāhmī script. For this see GD II p. 141 (ad Sn 26–27).

Sv 937,11: *ujuṃ* (Sv B° so; Sv E° *uju*) *tathā pasataṃ uju* (Sv B° so; Sv E° *udu*)-*mano ti uju* (Sv B° so; Sv E° *ujju*)-*mano hutvā uju* (Sv B° so; Sv E° *ujjuṃ*) *pekkhitā hoti* (Sv B° so; Sv E° *ahosi*). *yathā ca ujuṃ tathā pasataṃ vipulaṃ vitthataṃ* (Sv B° so; Sv E° *vitthāritaṃ*) *pekkhitā hoti* (Sv B° so; Sv E° *ahosi*). Sv-ṭ III 155,2–156,4: *jinhaṃ anoloketvā ujuṃ* (E° so; B° *ujukaṃ*) *olokanaṃ nāma kuṭila-bhāva-karānaṃ pāpa-dhammānaṃ abhāvena uju-gata-cittass'* (E° so; for *abhāvena uju-gata-cittass'* B° reads *abhāvena ujukata-cittatass'*) *eva hotī ti āha ujumano hutvā ujuṃ pekkhitā ti. yathā ca ujuṃ pekkhitā ahosī* (E° so; B° *hotī*) *ti ānetvā sambandho. pasataṃ* (B° so; E° *pasatan*) *ti ummīlana-vasena samma-d-eva patthataṃ* (E° so; B° *patthataṃ*) *vitataṃ* (E° so; B° omits). *vipulaṃ vitthāritan ti tass' eva vevacanaṃ.*

Warder (p. 372) reads the first two words of *pāda* c as *ujju tatha*, with the note "In *u(j)ju* the quality of the first syllable is variable". His reading permits the repetition of *ujju* in the *pāda*, which may be stylistically preferable, but at the expense of having to shorten the second vowel of *tathā*. I prefer to read *uju tathā*.

I read *ujju-* in the compound in *pāda* c, with Warder. The need to read a double consonant m.c. in this position in the *pāda* shows that *udu-* cannot be the original reading. This would seem to rule out Johnston's sug-

18. For syntactical compounds see K.R. NORMAN, "Syntactical compounds in Middle Indo-Aryan", in C. CAILLAT (ed.), *Middle Indo-Aryan and Jaina Studies*, Leiden 1991, pp. 3-9.

gestion¹⁹ that we should combine *paṣaṭam* with *udu-mano* and divide the compound as *paṣaṭa-mudu-mano* “with clear and gentle mind”. Sv and Sv-ṭ read *-j-* or *-jj-* in the explanation with no reference to *-d-*, which presumably means that *-d-* was unknown to the commentators and is therefore a very late introduction into the text.

As the text stands *ujū* and *pāsaṭām* must be accusatives used adverbially with the agent noun *udikkhitā* to parallel the accusatives *vīsaṭam* and *visāci* used adverbially in *pāda* a with the agent noun *pekkhitā*. It would, however, theoretically be possible to take *paṣaṭam* as compounded with *ujju-mano*, and divide the compound as *paṣaṭa-m-ujju-mano*. For the sandhi consonant *-m-* see GD II p. 174 (ad Sn 132).

PED states incorrectly that *paṣaṭa* is the past participle of *paṣajati*, and translates accordingly. I derive *paṣaṭa* < Sanskrit *praśṛta*, and I assume that the meaning is the opposite of *viṣaṭa*.

5. It is necessary to read *vipākam* before *anubhavati* in *pāda* a, against all the editions, to give the required final short vowel in the *pāda*.

The prose version (D III 167,14) has *abhinīla-netto*, and *nayana* in *abhinīla-netta-nayano* is pleonastic.

6. Since the emphasis in verse 5 is on the colour of the eyes, the occurrence of *sukhuma* in *pāda* c is somewhat unexpected. The existence in Sanskrit of the compounds *sūkṣma-darśin* “sharp-sighted, of acute discernment” and *sūkṣma-dṛṣṭi* “a keen glance, keen sighted” shows, however, that the compounding of *sukhuma* and *nayana* is not entirely inappropriate.

The reading *gopakhuma-* in S^o and the v.ll. *pamukha-* and *pakuma-* given in E^o suggest that some traditions thought that since verse 5 deals with (*go-*)*pakhuma* and *-nayana* there was a need for experts in *pakhuma* and *nayana*. It is, therefore, possible that the original reading was *pakhuma-nayana-kusalā* “skilled in lashes and eyes”, in which case we may assume that *sukhuma-* replaced *pakhuma-* becau-

19. E.H. JOHNSTON, “Notes on some Pali words”, JRAS 1931, pp. 565-92 [pp. 570-71]. CPD (s.v. *udu*) wrongly refers to p. 370.

se of the similarity in appearance of the characters *sa* and *pa* in early Brāhmī script. For this see GD II p. 214 (ad Sn 353).

Sv 937,14: *piya-dassano ti piyāyamānehi passitabbo*. Sv-pt̄ III 156,5–6: *piyaṃ piyāyitabbaṃ dassanaṃ olokaṇaṃ etassā ti piya-dassano*.

Sv 937,25: *abhiyogino ti lakkhaṇa-satthe yuttā*. Sv-pt̄ III 156,19–20: *lakkhaṇa-satthe yuttā ti lakkhaṇa-satthe āyuttā sukusalā*.

I add <ca> in *pāda* a and *bahu* in *pāda* b, with Warder (p. 372).

E° *nam* in *pāda* d must be a misprint.

7. I follow Warder (p. 372) in reading *gihi* and *santō* in *pāda* a, *bahunaṃ* in *pāda* b and *bahuna* (which is what I assume he means by *bahūnāṃ*) in *pāda* d. I also follow him in taking *hoti* from *pāda* c to *pāda* d in the form *bhavaṭī*. S° reads *hoti* in this position.

I omit *ti* at the end of *pāda* d.

4. Translation

1. He did not harm people by hand or stick or clod, or sword or beating to death, or bondage or threatening. He was a non-harmer.

2. For that very reason going to a good rebirth he rejoiced; having done that which has a happy result he found happiness. (His) straight flavour-bearers were well formed. Come here he obtained the highest place of those who consume flavours.

3. Therefore the skilful clever ones said of him: “This man will have much happiness. Whether for a householder or a wanderer this mark is indicative of that meaning”.

4. He was not one who looked askance, or crookedly, or discriminatingly. He was one of sincere mind who looked straightly and clearly with loving eye at the multitude.

5. He enjoyed the fruit and result in good rebirths; he rejoiced there. But here he was reborn as one with cow-lashes, with blue eyes, of good appearance.

6. Soothsayers and clever men and many knowledgeable in signs, men skilled in keen eyes indicated that he was “one of lovely appearance”.

7. Of lovely appearance, even being a householder he will be beloved of many. But if he does not become a householder, he will be an ascetic, a beloved destroyer of the grief of many.

5. Conclusions

1. All editions omit *va* (or *ca*) in 1c, and *ca* in 6a, indicating that the correct schemes of both the *Rucirā* and *Uggatā* metres had been forgotten in all traditions.

2. All editions fail to give the reading *bhavati* in place of *hoti* in 7d, which is further evidence that the correct scheme of the *Uggatā* metre had been lost in all traditions. The editors of B^cC^eE^e print *hoti* in the wrong *pāda*, indicating that they too lacked knowledge of the metre.

3. It is not clear why E^e reads *udu-mano* in 4c, when it reads *uju* as a separate word in the same *pāda*. One might have suspected that the editor of E^e was taking it as the *lectio difficilior*, except that he lists no variant readings for this. This is strange, as it is very unlikely that all his manuscripts and printed editions had this reading at this point. He does list variants for *udu-mano* at D III 167,9. Nor does the editor of Sv E^e list any variant readings for *udu-mano* in the lemma at Sv 937,11 although, again, it is very unlikely that all his sources had *udu-*.

4. PED does not list *sampajjasa*, *samojasa* or *pajasa*, *visāci* or *sācikata*, or *pekkhitar* (except under *viceyya* [s.v. *vicinteti*]).