

Pali Text Society

JOURNAL

OF THE

PALI TEXT SOCIETY

1910-1912

EDITED BY

T. W. RHYS DAVIDS, F.B.A., PH.D., LL.D., D.Sc.

OF THE MIDDLE TEMPLE, BARRISTER-AT-LAW

PROFESSOR OF COMPARATIVE RELIGION AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER

London

PUBLISHED FOR THE PALI TEXT SOCIETY,

BY

HENRY FROWDE

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE, AMEN CORNER, E.C.

1912

Pall Text Society

JOURNAL

OF THE

PALL TEXT SOCIETY

1910-1913

EDITED BY

T. W. RHYS DAVIES, M.A., F.R.S., LL.D., D.S.

OF THE MUSEUM OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE

AND OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER

LONDON

PUBLISHED FOR THE PALL TEXT SOCIETY

BY

HENRY BROWNE

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS, WATKINS STREET, CORNER

1913

CONTENTS

	PAGE
REPORT OF THE SOCIETY FOR THE YEARS 1910-1912	vii
I. TWO ESSAYS ON EARLY INDIAN CHRONOLOGY AND LITERATURE, BY PROFESSOR HERMANN OLDENBERG	xi
II. THE YAMAKA COMMENTARY FROM THE PAÑCAPPA-KARANATTHAKATHĀ, EDITED BY MRS. RHYS DAVIDS -	51
III. TWO NOTES ON THE BUDDHA-CARITA, BY DR. K. WATANABE - - - - -	108
IV. ABHIDHAMMA LITERATURE IN BURMA, BY SHWE ZAN AUNG, B.A. - - - - -	112
V. A LIST OF PALI BOOKS PRINTED IN CEYLON IN SINGHA-LESE CHARACTERS, BY W. A. DE SILVA - -	133
ISSUES OF THE PALI TEXT SOCIETY - -	155
LIST OF DONORS TO THE SOCIETY - -	163
STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTS FOR 1909-1911 - -	164

CONTENTS

PAGE	
vii	REPORT OF THE SOCIETY FOR THE YEARS 1910-1911
	I. TWO ESSAYS ON EARLY INDIAN CHRONOLOGY AND
xi	LITERATURE, BY PROFESSOR HERMANN OLDENBERG
	II. THE YAMANA COMMENTARY FROM THE PASCATYA-
51	KANAYATTHARATHA, EDITED BY DR. ERIC DAVIDS
	III. TWO NOTES ON THE BUDDHA-CARITA, BY DR. R.
108	WATANABE
	IV. ARTHURIAN LITERATURE IN BURMA, BY SHWE SAN
112	AUNG, B.A.
	V. A LIST OF PALL BOOKS PRINTED IN CEYLON IN SINGHA-
133	LESE CHARACTER, BY W. A. DE SILVA
155	ISSUES OF THE PALL TEXT SOCIETY
168	LIST OF DONORS TO THE SOCIETY
181	STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTS FOR 1909-1911

REPORT OF THE PALI TEXT SOCIETY FOR 1910-1912

WITH the publications of the issues of this year the Society will have entered upon the thirty-first year of its age. It has brought out, at the cost of several thousand pounds, a total of seventy-three volumes, issuing regularly two volumes or more each year. It has supplied these volumes to its subscribers at a price about half the prices charged by publishers, and it still has enough balance in hand to continue the work. This is not a bad record financially.

When the work started Pali was very little known; there were only one or two scholars in all Europe; the subject was simply ignored in the curricula of our schools of learning; and the historical evidence contained in the oldest Pali literature was almost entirely inaccessible. Now that literature is becoming widely known, the number of scholars engaged in the study of it has increased tenfold, and is still increasing, throughout the world; the subject is recognized at many Universities in the East and West; and the historical evidence preserved in those Pali books is increasingly receiving the attention it deserves to have. Who can doubt but that these results are mainly due to our Society, to the work of the scholars associated with it?

But our very success has brought with it a crisis in the affairs of the Society. Having published all the Pali works composed or written in India, and known to be still extant, except three or four now in preparation, the Society has started a Translation Series to make these documents available for those who cannot read Pali. The only Pali-

English Dictionary being now out of print, and costly, antiquated, and imperfect, the Society has, with great trouble and difficulty, collected enough funds to pay for a new edition—not enough for a perfect Dictionary—and this work is going on. Lastly, the Society has now under consideration the publication of all the Pali works written in Ceylon, Burma, and Siam.

These three undertakings—texts, translations, and Dictionary—will require the assistance of many co-workers. We have lost by death Fausböll and Feer, and Edmond Hardy, Minayeff and Morris and Strong, Trenckner and Warren and Wenzel. Others who were able to give of their scanty leisure hours have found it impossible to do so any longer, their other work now requiring all their time. For there are no Professors of Pali—that is, not in our Universities in the West. One or two have had sufficient means of their own to enable them to give their lives to the work. But the rest can give only of such leisure as remains after gaining their living in other ways. One consequence of this is that, several workers being occupied with the Dictionary, we want new editors of texts. Anyone willing to co-operate in this way in the work of making this remarkable literature known in the West, should communicate with the Honorary Secretary.

Another thing—it is impossible to carry on the publication of both texts and translations unless the Society continues to receive donations such as have helped us so largely in the past.

These two difficulties—the want of collaborators and the want of money—should not terrify us. When the work started, in 1882, we were told that no one cared for Pali, and we should neither be able to get the work done, nor the means of paying for it if we did. Well, we simply went on. After thirty years of continued effort the canonical books are printed. We now propose to translate and discuss them, and to publish the later Pali literature which explains them. And we think it most probable that we shall succeed now just about as well as we did before.

For these later works have a very high interest of their own. From the time when the Ceylon scholars began to write in Pali (in the fourth century) they continued steadily enough, though there were times of special activity, to produce a large number of works of exegesis, law, and medicine, poetry, history, and tales, religion and philosophy. Only one or two have as yet been printed. Many are irretrievably lost. Let us save those which we still have.

By HERMAN T. W. RHYS DAVIDS.

The following two articles, which appeared in the *Nachrichten der K. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, 1877, seemed to me so valuable in the history of Buddhist literature that I was anxious to make them known to those of our readers who are not familiar with German. By the courtesy of Professor Christy, and by the kind permission of the authorities of the Royal Academy at Göttingen, they have been translated into English, and are again this time published for the first time.

For these reasons, the Board of Trustees of the University of California, in its report for the year 1902, has endeavored to present a summary of the work of the University, and to show the progress of the various departments. The Board has also endeavored to show the financial condition of the University, and to present a plan for the future.

The Board of Trustees of the University of California, in its report for the year 1902, has endeavored to present a summary of the work of the University, and to show the progress of the various departments. The Board has also endeavored to show the financial condition of the University, and to present a plan for the future.

The Board of Trustees of the University of California, in its report for the year 1902, has endeavored to present a summary of the work of the University, and to show the progress of the various departments. The Board has also endeavored to show the financial condition of the University, and to present a plan for the future.

I

TWO ESSAYS ON EARLY INDIAN CHRONOLOGY AND LITERATURE

By HERMANN OLDENBERG

[THE following two articles, which appeared in the *Nachrichten der K. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, 1911, seemed to me so important for the history of Buddhist literature that I was anxious to make them known to those of our readers who are not familiar with German. By the courtesy of Professor Oldenberg, and by the kind permission of the authorities of the Royal Academy at Göttingen, they have been translated into English, and now appear also in our Journal.—R.H. D.]

TWO ERRATA ON EARLY INDIAN CHRONOLOGY AND LITERATURE

By HENRIK MANN OLSBERG

[The following two articles, which appeared in the *Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* at Göttingen, 1911, seemed to me so important for the history of Indian
classical literature that I was anxious to make them known to
those of our readers who are not familiar with German.
By the courtesy of Professor Olsberg, and by the kind
permission of the authorities of the Royal Academy at
Göttingen, they have been translated into English, and
now appear also in our journal.—Ed. D.]

I

ON THE ERA OF KANĪṢKA

THAT the question as to the date of the Kuṣana Kings will one day be settled by an archæological find is certain. It is none the less our duty to-day to make what we can out of such materials as we have. The question is of deep interest, not only for the epigraphist and the numismatist, but also for the historian of letters and the inquirer into Buddhism. It is my belief that we already have the true solution. But weighty opinions have pronounced in favour of other conclusions. Hence the need for fresh examination.

It was assumed some time ago by many that Kanīṣka was the founder of the Śaka era (A.D. 78). I shared with Fergusson¹ the responsibility for this view, the possibility of which has been but lately emphasized by Rapson.² I am now no longer disposed to hold this as pre-eminently probable. Not that it is opposed to the fact that Kanīṣka was not a Śaka, but a Kuṣana.³ The distinction between the various tribes coming in from Central Asia may well have

¹ *Zeitschrift für Numismatik*, VIII, 292 ff.

² *Catal. of the Coins of the Andhra Dynasty*, CVII.

³ The coins of Heraos or Miaos, on account of which I considered the Kuṣanas to be Śakas (*op. cit.* 295), are, it now appears, not to be read as von Sallet and P. Gardner deciphered them. Before the word ΚΩΙΙΑΝΩΤ, which probably means ΚΟΠΠΑΝΩΤ, stands not ΣΑΚΑ, as in Sallet's reproduction, but something more like ΣΑΝΑΒ. Cp. Cunningham, *Num. Chron.* 1890, 111 f.; Rapson, *Indian Coins*, 9 and pl. II, 1.

become obliterated in the imagination of the Indians, who probably only began some centuries later to connect the era with the name of the Śakas.¹ More significant than this is the fact of the very limited expansion of the Śaka era in North India.² Another point not exactly favourable to the association of the Śaka era with Kaṇiṣka, although it cannot claim to be a crucial one, is Kielhorn's indication that the word *varṣa* was later a favourite designation among the Śaka dates,³ whereas it was *saṃvatsara* that characterized the dates of the Kaṇiṣka series. The find of coins at Ahin Posh (to be presently dealt with) also makes me suspicious. It seems rather to suggest a moving of the era of Kaṇiṣka some decades forward.⁴

During recent years, in direct antithesis to such a moving forward, supporters have been won over to the view that the date of Kaṇiṣka is to be referred to the other widely distributed Indian era, the Vikrama era (57 B.C.). Lüders⁵ considers this hypothesis to be by far the most probable, "since Fleet and O. Franke, independently and by quite different ways, have come to the conclusion that both the Kadphises came not before but after Kaṇiṣka."

¹ Princes too, like the Western Kṣatrapas, who made use of the era without having founded it, might, as Rapson points out, have found mention in this connection. The idea that the era was called in its 169th year the Śaka era is an error, based on a forged inscription (Kielhorn, *Ep. Ind.* VII, 171; Fleet, *JRAS.* 1910, 818).

² Kielhorn, *Ind. Ant.* XXVI, 148.

³ *Ibid.* 153. Kielhorn also refers there to the standing use of *varṣa* among the western Kṣatrapas. It is approximately certain that the latter used the Śaka era.

⁴ On the other hand, I doubt whether, for this question, too much importance ought to be attributed to the Chinese record, according to which the King of the Yüe-chi (the nation to which Kaṇiṣka belongs) suffered in the year A.D. 90 a defeat at the hands of the Chinese, and paid the latter a yearly tribute (S. Lévi, *Notes sur les Indo-Scythes*, II; Boyer, *Journ. as.* 1900, I, 54, 9 f.). As a matter of fact, this does fall, by the adoption of the Śaka era, in the time of Kaṇiṣka. Is this adoption therefore impossible? The Chinese story may be coloured, and, finally, K. may also have suffered defeats.

⁵ *Bruchstücke buddhistischer Dramen*, 11.

From a note by Fleet,¹ we may expect from this eminent epigraphist a discussion on the Kadphises question. May I express the wish that he will examine the points dealt with below, which seem to me to throw doubts on such a solution?²

As is well known, the chronological order of the Kuṣana princes generally accepted has been :

Kujula Kadphises.³

V'ima⁴ Kadphises.

Kaṇiṣka.

Huviṣka.

Vāsudeva.⁵

To date Kaṇiṣka's accession 57 B.C. renders necessary the relegating Kujula Kadphises to an age, which is at variance with Chinese records (see below) and numismatic facts, according to which he is definitely placed in the first century after Christ.⁶ The objection is overcome by placing

¹ *JRAS*, 1910, 1316.

² V. Smith, in *ZDMG.* LX, 65 n. 1, LXI, 406 n. 1; *Catal. of the Coins in the Indian Museum*, 63, has already expressed doubts about this. I refer especially to the same investigator's *Early History of India*, where several points are touched upon (p. 241 ff.), which I also consider to be decisive. Unfortunately, I did not notice the last-named disquisition till I had finished my task. Perhaps the agreements between two investigations conducted independently of each other will lend weight to the conclusions drawn in them.

³ With Boyer (*Journ. as.* 1900, 1, 554 ff.) and others, I consider Kujula Kadphises to be identical with the Kozola Kadaphes of certain coins. Is he also identical with Kujula Kara Kadphises (cp. Rapson, *Ind. Coins*, 17)?

⁴ So I spell it instead of Hima, because of Rapson's evidence in the *Transactions of the Oriental Congress in Algiers*, I, 219.

⁵ For our purpose we need not examine the newly discovered Vāsiṣka; see recently Vogel, *JRAS.* 1910, 1311 ff.; Fleet, *ibid.* 1315 ff.

⁶ Mention should here be made of the frequently noted similarity between his copper coins (KOZOΛA KAΔAΦE□) and coins of the later Augustan era. Prof. Dressel says that the head certainly recalls Augustus: "There is, however," he adds, "nothing amounting to a portrait-likeness, which would anyway only be accidental . . . but if the evidence points that way, the Kozola coins could be referred to a somewhat later date, for the heads of Gaius (Caligula), of Claudius,

the two Kadphises after the Kanīṣka-Huviṣka-Vāsudeva series, which is firmly fixed in this order by epigraphic and numismatic evidence.

Now, is this transposition plausible?

O. Franke¹ gives his reasons in the following observations :

The Buddhists relate, as a highly significant event, that Kanīṣka was converted to their faith after he had been an unbeliever and had trodden underfoot the law of Buddha. Now the Chinese, on the other hand, mention, as one of the first associations of their nation with Buddhism, that, in the year 2 B.C., a Chinese official had learnt to know Buddhist sūtras by oral transmission, through the agency of an ambassador of the king of the Ta Yüe-chi—*i.e.*, of Kanīṣka's people, as has been stated. How, asks Franke (p. 93), are we to explain that Kanīṣka was the first among the kings of the Yüe-chi to be converted to Buddhism, although he is supposed to have reigned *after* the Kadphises in the second century A.D., and this conversion was celebrated with great jubilation, when, as early as the first century B.C., a king of the Yüe-chi was anxious for the spread of Buddhism? The problem is supposed to be solved by the inverted order suggested above. In that case Kanīṣka reigned before the event related of 2 B.C., from about the time of the Vikrama era (p. 99).

I cannot really see the difficulty which is here to be overcome by a procedure overturning so much. The passage translated by Franke does not speak at all of a

and even of Nero during the early part of his reign show points of contact with those of Kozola." For the second Kadphises (and equally for Kanīṣka and his followers) we have to take into account the approximation of his gold coinage to that of the Roman *aurei*, first minted in any considerable numbers under Augustus. See Percy Gardner, *The Coins of the Greek and Scythic Kings of Bactria and India* in the Brit. Museum, LIII; Rapson, *Indian Coins*, 17 f. V. Smith, *Early History of India*, 239 note.

¹ "On the Turkish Nations and Scythians of Central Asia" (*Abh. Berl. Akad.*, 1904), 90 ff.

king of the Yüe-chi who about 2 B.C. worked for the spread of Buddhism; it only speaks of an ambassador who knew Buddhist sūtras and communicated them to the Chinese.¹ That happened perhaps a century before Kanīṣka's time, if the date to be fixed for him, which I shall presently support, is the correct one. It very probably happened even before the expansion of the Yüe-chi dominion in India proper (see below). Now it is alleged to be very difficult to reconcile this episode with the records that Kanīṣka should first be hostile, and then a convert to Buddhism, and that this event should have been regarded by the Buddhists as of great significance. Yet it should be considered how confusedly the most varied forms of belief, originating in quite different lands, were in those times intermixed one with another. The coins of Kanīṣka bear witness themselves as to that with a clearness that cannot be surpassed. Franke observes (p. 93) that "Kanīṣka was the first to be converted to Buddhism." I find in the sources no support for this "first." The great weight which the Buddhists laid on his conversion is sufficiently explained, even if, in the fluctuations of religious movements, Buddhist currents of varying strength should have existed among the Yüe-chi already before Kanīṣka—long before him, outside India.²

¹ Elsewhere, it is true, a different conception of the Chinese story is given; see Franke, 92 n. 1. For our purpose it is of no great importance.

² That coins testify to matters of that kind for the time of Kadphises I certainly consider very doubtful. Rapson's (*JRAS.* 1897, 319 ff.) identification of the *στηροσσυ* of the Hermaios-Kadphises coins with *sthavira, thera*, is not for me convincing (cp. also Boyer, *Journ. as.*, 1900, I, 529 ff.). Is it plausible to separate the *στηρος* of these badly written legends (or occasionally even *στηρς*; cp. v. Sallet, *Nachfolger Alexanders*, 119) from the *σωτηρος*, occupying a corresponding place and elsewhere used by Hermaios? It should be considered that about this time—i.e., of Gondophares—both *[σω]τηρσο* and *σωτηροπος* are found (Smith, *Catal. of Coins in the Ind. Museum*, 56). The fact that the Indian translation gives *mahatasa* hardly precludes acceptance of *σ[ω]τηρος*. The agreement between the Greek and Indian text is not always absolute; and especially here, at the very close of the Greek dominion, an inaccurate translation would be scarcely surprising.

Kaṇiṣka was after all, as a second Asoka, of pre-eminent significance for the history of the faith. Would they not as a matter of course commemorate the conversion of such a man, or even—but that must remain matter of conjecture—invent a conversion on the analogy of that of Asoka?"¹

Now it is by our efforts to evade the presumptive difficulty of the existence of Buddhism among the Yüe-chi before Kaṇiṣka, that actual and most serious difficulties are created.

Let the reader recall the main facts which the annalists of the later Han dynasty give in a much-discussed passage (Franke, 66; Chavannes, T'oung Pao, 1907, 189 ff.). Long before the Yüe-chi invaded India, they are found under the rule of five princes. One of them, K'iu-tsiu-k'io, the prince of Kuei-shuang, subjugates the other four. He establishes himself as King of Kuei-shuang. He conquers parts of Parthia, Kipin, etc., and

Even should a "great" be implied in *στηροσσυ*, *sthavira* would not seem to me quite to correspond with the sense which *mahatasa* implies (it would rather perhaps suggest an expression from the language of Kadphises). And finally, even if *sthavira* was meant, it would be, in my judgment, rash to ascribe to the word, as such and especially in view of the *mahatasa*, a Buddhist-ecclesiastical sense. The *dhramathitasa*, sometimes *sacadhr*^o, certainly contains no Buddhist confession either, but belongs to the *dhramikasa* (= *δικαιου*) so often found on coins. Similarly it seems to me doubtful to find Buddhist tendencies in interpreting the symbol *nandipada*, which is found frequently on the Vima Kadphises coins (see, e.g., B. v. Sallet, *Nachfolger Alexanders*, 165; Cunningham, *Num. Chron.*, 1892, pl. XV, 1, 2, 3, 5, reverse). This symbol, it is true, plays a noteworthy rôle on Buddhist monuments (cf., among others, Cunningham, *The Bhilsa Topes*, 357, and pl. XXXII; also Foucher, *L'art gréco-bouddhique*, I, 428 ff.; Hardy, *König Asoka*, 53 [bas-relief of the eastern gate of Sanchi]). But as *nandipada* (Bhagvānlāl Indraji, *J. Bombay Br. RAS.* XV, 320) the symbol is just as much Saivite, and being found just on the coins mentioned close to Śiva and the Bull Nandi, may well be interpreted in this sense (cf. Rapson, *Catal. of the Coins of the Andhra Dynasty*, p. CLXXV).

¹ So also Smith, *Early History of India*, 246.

dies over eighty years of age.¹ He is succeeded by his son, Yen-kao-chēn, who subjugates India and rules it through a vice-regent. "The Yüe-chi became thereafter exceedingly rich and flourishing. In every land they were known as the Kings of Kuei-shuang, but the Chinese kept to the old name, and spoke of them as Ta Yüe-chi." I will not repeat here the reasons for identifying Kuei-shuang with Kuṣana, and K'iu-tsiu-k'io and his son with the two Kadphises. Franke, with Chavannes and many others, regards these identifications as certain; and, indeed, no serious doubt seems to be called for. If, then, the Kuṣana dominion, expanding from the north-west, reaches the gates of India under the first Kadphises, and then, under the second Kadphises, penetrates far into India, we must ask: What becomes of Kaṇiṣka, Huviṣka, and Vāsudeva, if we are to place them *before* the Kadphises?

We know that Kaṇiṣka extended his rule very far into India. The great monuments, such as Mathurā, and much besides, convince us that the accounts of a reign of remarkable brilliance are not merely the phantasies of Buddhist enthusiasm. Then come after him, still, as alleged, before the Kadphises, Huviṣka and Vāsudeva, with the stately series of epigraphic and numismatic documents telling of them. How can all that be pushed back to a time before the *beginnings* of the Indian dominion of the Kuṣanas to which the Chinese testify?² Does it not rather distinctly correspond to the passage from the Chinese Chronicle given above, which shows how, after the conquest of India by the son of K'iu-tsiu-k'io, the Kuṣana rule became "exceedingly rich and flourishing," to which the gold coins of these Kings might serve as an illustration?

¹ Chavannes, *op. cit.* 191 n. 1, gives reasons for placing the victories of K'iu-tsiu-k'io between A.D. 9 (the end of the earlier Han dynasty) and A.D. 92 (death of Pan-ku). Franke, *op. cit.*, gives as *terminus post quem* and *ante quem* A.D. 25 and 81.

² What Franke says, p. 96 ff., seems to be based on a consciousness of this difficulty, but not to overcome it.

My objection to the inversion suggested by Fleet and Franke is, in my opinion, very greatly strengthened by the series of coins of the kings in question. It seems to me that an examination of the coins will lead in exactly the same direction as that in which the examination just carried out has led. From the beginning the numismatists have placed the Kadphises group before the Kaṇiṣka-Huviṣka-Vāsudeva group. I believe they were perfectly right.

Let us for the moment leave Kadphises I (Kujula), and give our attention only to Kadphises II (V'ima) and the Kaṇiṣka group. There is no need to demonstrate that these kings belong together. It is quite sufficient to look at their coins.¹

But, within this series, there is a clear distinction between Kadphises on one side, and Kaṇiṣka-Huviṣka-Vāsudeva on the other. It is sufficient to indicate, among other evidence, the title *PAONANO pAO*, which is common to the last-named kings, and does not appear in connection with Kadphises; and, on the other hand, the Kharoṣṭhī script, which is used by Kadphises alone, not by the others.²

Which, now, comes earlier, which later? Observe how the series fits on to what precedes, and prolongs itself into that which follows. Kadphises bears the title *βασιλεὺς βασιλεων σωτηρ μεγας* (and correspondingly the Indian equivalents).³ That clearly connects him with the preceding times. Kaṇiṣka comes next to him, because he also is called *βασιλεὺς βασιλεων* on some of his coins. On others, however, he has had inscribed *PAONANO pAO*. Huviṣka and his successors have no longer the Greek,

¹ Besides the publications of v. Sallet and P. Gardner, Cunningham's *Num. Chron.*, 1892, and V. Smith's *Catal. of Coins in the Indian Museum, Calcutta*, may be mentioned.

² The only exception is a coin of Huviṣka? Cp. Fleet, *JRAS.* 1908, 183 n. 1.

³ He shares this title with the "unnamed king," who must have stood to him in a nearer relation, which we cannot define with certainty.

but exclusively the middle Persian intitulation.¹ If those coins are examined which come after Vāsudeva, and which connect his stamp with that of the Guptas and the so-called Skytho-Sāsānides ("Later Kushans," Cunningham, *Num. Chron.*, 1893, pl. VIII f.; cp. Smith, *Catal.*, 87 ff.), I think it will be acknowledged to be impossible to find among them where to locate a βασιλεὺς βασιλεῶν σωτηρ μέγας.

Similar observations may be made with regard to the character of the script in the coin legends. Kadphises has the Kharoṣṭhī script in common with the Greek and Indo-Parthian princes; it connects him with them. Then this script is no longer found on the coins of these regions.² The Greek script, on the other hand, with Kadphises—and also somewhat further with Kaṇiṣka—has preserved a tolerably correct appearance.³ With Vāsudeva it is slovenly. After the time of Vāsudeva it is lost in disfigured, more or less unrecognizable, repetitions of forms, the meaning of which, it may be, had become partly no longer understood. Next, let us follow the details in the figure of the depicted King—say, nose and mouth, cap or helmet, coat or armour, the appearance of the saint-like halo round his head. I make no attempt at more detailed descriptions, for to look at Gardner's, Cunningham's, and Smith's beautiful reproductions will show, more clearly than I can describe, how the chronological series here runs. The appearance of the variegated mass of divinities of divers origins on the reverse of the coins leads to the same result. Beside them, as is well known, appears the figure of Buddha. The great number

¹ Exception: the coin of Huviṣka (Smith, *Catal.*, p. 81, No. 39), with the remains of a legend ΑΙΩΝ, part of βασιλεῶν? Smith remarks: "I suspect that this coin is double struck." Cp. Cunningham, *Num. Chron.*, 1892, 107 f.

² For the only known (questionable) exception, see p. 8, n. 2. Among the western Kṣatrapas the Kharoṣṭhī ceases with Caṣṭana, some decades later than with the Kuṣanas, if the place which I maintain for them is right; towards 200 years later, if Kaṇiṣka's date is the Vikrama era!

³ Cp. Rapson's (*JRAS.* 1905, 812 f.) remarks on the form of the Α.

of the divinities of Kaṇiṣka and Huviṣka diminishes during the time immediately following. In the time of Vāsudeva there are only three left (Fleet, *JRAS.* 1908, 178); later on only two (OHPO, evidently = Śiva, and the goddess with the horn of plenty, APΔOXpO, the Avestan Ashi Vanuhi), these being then traceable for a long time; they hold their ground until quite late, the one among the Skytho-Sāsānides, the other among the Guptas (Rapson, *Ind. Coins*, 19). If we try to insert into this series, after the coins of Vāsudeva, the Śiva which occurs only among those of Kadphises, we shall understand that, by such an insertion, the continuity is broken. This Śiva looks very different from the OHPO of Vāsudeva, and later. Kadphises has nothing that we can place beside the APΔOXpO.

The monograms of the coins are also significant. On the one hand, Kadphises has the monogram *nandipada* already mentioned (above p. 6, *n.*). This appears also in the time of Kadphises I (see below), on certain coins belonging to Gondophares (see below), or closely connected with his.¹ It also appears on those of Zeionises, and, with a variant, also with the "Stratega" Aspavarma;² but to Kaṇiṣka and his followers it seems, at least in this form, to be approximately unknown.³ On the other hand, that monogram, which is characteristic of the Kuṣanas, begins with Kadphises; but it exhibits, on closer examination, a

¹ Cunningham, *Num. Chron.*, 1890, pl. XIV, 8. Cp. v. Sallet, *Nachfolger Alexanders d. Gr.*, 165; V. Smith, *ZDMG.* LX, 71 *n.* 2.

² *Num. Chron.*, 1890, pl. XV, 6. Further, see Rapson, *Catal. of the Coins of the Andhra Dyn.*, index III under Nandipada, and in the index of Smith's *Catalogue* (p. 342).

³ I find it, again, in Cunningham, on the coins of Vāsudeva (*Num. Chron.*, 1892, pl. XIV, E, F) and of the "later Kushans," as well as on the Kuṣana-like coins of the Sāsānid Ormazd II (beginning of the fourth century; *ibid.*, 1893, pl. XIV) in a more developed form, and distinct from the form which we find at the time of Kadphises. The symbol, it is true, is found once in its old form at the time of Huviṣka, according to Gardner, 155 (No. 159). Might this possibly be the later form?

remarkable development. At the time of Kadphises it has the form which we recognize, *e.g.*, from Cunningham's impressions, *Num. Chron.*, 1892, pl. XV, 2, 3, obverse, XVI, 1, 2, reverse; (in von Sallet, 186, key-shaped symbol 7¹). Just so, it continually recurs under Kaṇiṣka, if only, as a matter of course, the "later Kushans," who to a certain extent repeat that King's name, are kept distinct (Cunningham, *Num. Chron.*, 1893. Cp. Rapson, *Ind. Coins*, 19).²

Huviṣka follows. Cunningham gives several times the same monogram for him too. But, beside this, a somewhat more complicated form frequently appears; a horizontal stroke has appeared between the upper and the lower parts (see *e.g.*, Cunningham, *op. cit.*, 1892, pl. XIX, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, etc.).³ Next, Vāsudeva, keeping this (or a very similar?) form of monogram in some cases, changes it in the rest, in that he closes the opening at the bottom in various ways (*e.g.*, *op. cit.*, pl. XXIV., 1, 2, 3, reverse, 6, 7, etc.). In this changed form, then, the monogram passes over to the "later Kushans," and appears also among the Guptas (V. Smith, *Coinage of the Gupta Dynasty*, *JRAS.* 1889, pl. V).

Here, too, anyone with this series of forms before his eyes will note that the natural sequence is quite severed if Kadphises is placed later than Vāsudeva. Kadphises comes, clearly, close to Kaṇiṣka, *i.e.*, since Huviṣka immediately follows, *he* immediately precedes Kaṇiṣka. Rapson, *Ind. Coins*, 17, says, when he comes in his description to Kad-

¹ Among the impressions of Cunningham, which I refer to here, there is only one variant, pl. XV, 12.

² Exceptions, with the form of monogram belonging to Vāsudeva, would appear at the time of Kaṇiṣka, *Num. Chron.*, pl. XVII, 7, 8. But it seems to me certain that No. 8 ought to be ascribed to the "later Kushans," because of the general appearance of the King and the inscription (I think the coin which Cunningham, *Num. Chron.*, 1893, pl. VIII, 1, ascribes to the "later Kushans" is identical with this). In the same way, it seems, No. 7 should be judged.

³ According to Smith, *Catal.*, p. 74, No. 67 ff., some cases of this monogram would seem to have been found already at the time of Kaṇiṣka. Gardner does not assign it to Kaṇiṣka.

phises II: "The order of succession of the Indian Kuṣana monarchs from this point to the last quarter of the second century, A.D., is certain." Whether the date here stated is exact—he evidently means the end of Vāsudeva's reign—we must for the moment reserve. As to the rest, I believe that, as against the new hypothesis, Rapson will be found to be right.

Beside the kings thus far discussed, Kadphises I stands in a certain peculiar position. In their case, the mintage remains practically unchanged, the gold mintage—a novelty not found before—being especially important. But there is no impression of Kadphises I on gold coins. The very characteristic appearance of the kings represented, which is seen on all coins from the time of Kadphises II and Kaṇiṣka, is not to be found on the coins of Kadphises I; nor do we see on these coins the divinities we see on the others; nor has Kadphises the Kuṣana-monogram.¹

It will not surely occur to anyone to move him further back alone, without V'ima Kadphises, from the place hitherto assigned to him. Such an idea has never yet to my knowledge been suggested. The fact that the name Kadphises appears to unite him chronologically with Kadphises II might, it is true, lead us astray. But the characteristics of his coins, which we have just mentioned, will certainly not permit us to place him behind or among the pAONANO pAO , for instance, near Vāsudeva. His Kharoṣṭhī legend refers him rather to a place near his namesake Kadphises II, where there can only be the question of the place before Kadphises II, since the place after the latter is occupied by Kaṇiṣka. But, above all, his connection with the Greek king Hermaios secures him this place. The coins with Hermaios alone, those with Hermaios on the obverse, and with Kujula Kadphises on the reverse, then those with Kadphises alone, enable us to trace clearly—as has long been known—the stadia of the course of events, in

¹ The *Nandipadam*, however, on several of his coins associates him with Kadphises II (Smith, *Catal.*, 67).

which the Kuṣana dominion drove out that of the Greek.¹

If we take, in addition, the close affiliation of the types in Kadphises coins to classic types, whereby their appearance is seen to be clearly distinct from that of the remote offshoots and depraved styles, if again we take the Chinese statements discussed above (p. 4), we are not likely still seriously to doubt that Kujula Kadphises cannot be removed from the place formerly assigned him at the beginning of the series.²

To confirm this conclusion, we may recall the combinations of the coins of different kings in the finds made. We can, it is true, only arrive at a conclusive judgment when we have before us a description of all discoveries, a task which, it seems, the Royal Asiatic Society has in view. I should like, however, to draw attention here to some significant facts which happen to be at hand.

First of all there is the discovery in a Stūpa of Manikyala (Cunningham, *Achæol. Survey*, II, 162). Together with worn-out Roman coins of the end of the

¹ The following is also worthy of notice: Numismatists differ in their accounts of the forms of the Sigma found on the coins. Only renewed examinations of the originals can give any certainty. What is said here is entirely of a provisional nature. With this safeguard, then, I notice that Gardner as well as Cunningham (*Num. Chron.*, 1892, 63 ff., 98 ff.) nowhere show with Kanīṣka and Huviṣka the form Σ, but always C. Is Smith, *Catal.*, 71, right in ascribing the legends ΗΑΙΟΣ to Kanīṣka? Cunningham's (*op. cit.*, pl. XVI, 1, 3) impressions give ΗΑΙΟC most clearly. Let the scripts of these Kings be now laid beside the ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΣΤΗΡΟΣΣΤ ΕΡΜΑΙΟΥ of the Hermaios-Kujula coins.

² "Beginning" might so far be taken *cum grano salis* that the appearance of smaller rulers of the same family, outside India, and coming before or near to the founder of the great rule of the Kuṣanas, is not precluded. Such a position may be assigned to that Heraos or Miaos mentioned above (p. 1, n. 3), of whom ΚΟΡΡΑΝΟΥ appears to be said, and on whose relation to Kujula Kadphises, and to the unnamed σωτηρ μέγας, compare Cunningham, *Num. Chron.*, Chr. 1890, 112 f.; Rapson, *Ind. Coins*, 16. Smith, *Catal.*, 94, locates him in Western Afghanistan.

Republic there were found gold coins of Kaṇiṣka, copper coins of the same and of the two Kadphises, but none of Huviṣka or Vāsudeva. The inscription of the Stūpa (see recently Lüders, *JRAS.* 1909, 645 ff.) leaves hardly any doubt that it was erected under Kaṇiṣka. The inferences with regard to the position of the two Kadphises in the series of kings are clear.

Wilson (*Ar. Antiqua*, 358) testifies that coins of Kaṇiṣka have been met with almost everywhere mixed with those of his predecessors (that is, the two Kadphises). He also says (373, cp. 20) that those of "Kenorano" (*i.e.*, Huviṣka; Oer Kenorano is a misread legend of this king) are found generally with those of Kadphises and Kaṇiṣka. Hœrnle (*Proc. As. Soc. Beng.*, 1895, 82) reports on a discovery (in the territory of Paṭiālā) of masses of coins of the second Kadphises and of Kaṇiṣka (cp. also Thomas, *JRAS.* 1877, 219 n. 3). With regard to the simultaneous appearance of coins of Kadphises II, Kaṇiṣka, Huviṣka, cp. also Smith, *Early Hist.*, 253 n. 2. All these accounts speak in the most decided manner against placing Kadphises (especially the second Kadphises) later than Vāsudeva; they support rather the placing of him next to (which must then mean, before) Kaṇiṣka.

Finally, I will mention the find at Ahin Posh, of which I have to speak more in detail presently. There was found, together with Roman coins, one of Huviṣka, and a number of Kaṇiṣka and V'ima Kadphises coins. If Kadphises came at the end of the series, the absence of Vāsudeva coins would be curious. Though one such discovery may accidentally lead astray, we shall nevertheless be bound to give weight to the unanimous testimony of the whole of them, which exactly tallies with the result of our other arguments.

I will draw attention further to the difficulty which arises, if we accept the Vikrama era for Kaṇiṣka, with reference to Gondophares, who, as is known, appears in the Christian tradition. If the latter reigned, as all no doubt rightly believe, about the middle of the first century A.D., he would collide with Vāsudeva or the later Kuṣanas.

In point of fact, he is to be assigned to about the beginning of the Kuṣana time—to about the same time as Kujula Kadphises (I). The places where his coins were discovered, compared with those of Kujula, seem to bring both kings near together ; and Masson's discovery of some coins of Gondophares with many of Kujula, and some of the unknown king, in the Stūpas near Jelalabad, point to contemporaneity.¹ Kaṇiṣka and his followers have then extended their rule over wide regions which had belonged to Gondophares, leaving him no longer any space for his kingdom.²

It is all in keeping herewith when v. Sallet emphasizes the priority of Gondophares to Vāsudeva on numismatic grounds (*Nachf. Alexanders*, 52) ; and when Bühler (*Ind. Paläeog.*, 25) declares his priority to Kaṇiṣka on palæographic grounds. We may repeat again that the Fleet-Franke theory on the Kuṣanas does not agree with the clues by which we must try to let ourselves be led.

Of such clues I will, in conclusion, adduce the following :

Firstly, the localizing of the older Vikrama-dated records by Kielhorn (*Ind. Ant.*, XX, 403 f.) : the oldest being all from Eastern Rajputana—*i.e.*, the parts adjacent or belonging to Malwa ; then, up to about 1300, from a square, the corners of which lie at the mouth of the Narbada, at Gaya, Delhi, and the Runn of Cutch. For an era founded by Kaṇiṣka we should have expected more northerly discoveries.³

Then I should like to refer to the expressions of opinion which, quite lately, the excavation of the so-called house of Nāgadeva at Bhītā near Allahabad have elicited from the director of Indian archæological research, J. H.

¹ See on all this P. Gardner, *op. cit.*, L ; Cunningham, *Num. Chron.*, 1890, 123. Also what the same *Archæol. Survey*, II, 168, and Hoernle, *Proc. As. Soc. Beng.*, 1895, 88, say agrees with it.

² Cp. in this connection Vinc. Smith, *ZDMG*. See also what Cunningham says on the spread of Vāsudeva's coins, *Num. Chr.*, 1892, 50.

³ What Fleet says, *JRAS.* 1905, 232, does not seem to me to do away with the doubt.

Marshall. The materials upon which the observations of this eminent archæologist are based are not accessible to me. I can only quote his words:¹

“One fact . . . which seems to assert itself on this site, as well as elsewhere, is that a considerable period must have elapsed between the art epoch associated with the dynasty of the Śuṅgas and the epoch of the Kushanas. The art of the former was widespread and deeply rooted throughout Northern and Central India, and must have flourished well on towards the close of the first century B.C., if not longer. Yet, when we come to the well-defined Kushana strata among the buildings on this site, we find no objects whatever even in the most decadent Śuṅga style. How is their absence to be explained if we place the beginning of the Kushana era in the first century B.C.? . . . Certainly the date of A.D. 78 for Kanishka's accession seems to suit much better the date obtainable here.”²

Now against the date named by Marshall in the

¹ *JRAS.* 1911, 134 f. Compare also the words of the same investigator, *ibid.*, 1909, 1059 f. Further, the remark of M. Foucher might be considered (*L'Art gréco-bouddhique*, I, 623), according to which “le témoignage des bas-reliefs rapporte le *Buddha-carita* au II^e siècle de notre ère.” One might, however, hesitate to draw too readily any conclusions for the time of Kaṇiṣka, since the chronology of the monuments is partly very uncertain and partly itself depends upon the view taken of Kaṇiṣka.

² In conclusion, I will sum up here scattered remarks on the difficulties that arise by placing Kaṇiṣka in the Vikrama era :

1. Between the coins of Vāsudeva and the Skytho-Śāsānid coins formed on the model of the former there would be, as Smith, *Catal.*, 64, has already noticed, a surprisingly wide interval. Also between the former and the Gupta coins.

2. What applies to Kadphises II (above, p. 3, n. 6) applies, of course, also to Kaṇiṣka, that his gold coinage very probably presupposes the Roman aurei (Gardner, LIII). It becomes thereby very difficult to place the beginning of Kaṇiṣka's reign towards the middle of the first century B.C.

3. The form of the Sigma C prevailing with K. raises doubt. Cp. above, p. 13, n. 1; Rapson, *JRAS.* 1905, 811.

last sentence, and which I used to support, some arguments were touched upon at the beginning of this article. I here come back to one of them, to that which rests upon the frequently mentioned discovery at Ahin Posh. There in one stūpa have been found coins of Domitian, Trajan, and Sabina (the last A.D. 128-136), together with some of Kadphises II., Kanīṣka, and a single coin of Huviṣka. Smith (*JRAS.* 1903, 35) will probably be right when he remarks thereupon: "The presumption, of course, is that the monument was erected in the reign of Huviṣka, the latest Indian Sovereign whose coinage is included in the deposit." The positive dates of Huviṣka which we possess reach from the year 33 to 60.¹ If we refer them to the era of A.D. 78, the latest gives A.D. 138.

The coin of Sabina must thus have been pretty quick in reaching India. This is indeed possible, but it is surely more credible² that the era lies later. How much later? The question will scarcely be answered by the thought of the Seleucid era, with the hundreds omitted—a very improbable hypothesis. From the Sinological side it has been pointed out, that the Chinese account of Po-t'iao, the King of the Ta-Yüe-chi, who in A.D. 230 sent an ambassador to China, might possibly refer to Vāsudeva. M. Chavannes has kindly referred me to a remark of his own on the subject (*T'oung Pao*, 1904, 489 f.): Po-t'iao, he suggests, may be a permissible transcription of the name Vāsudeva. Since, however, in this series of kings, several Vāsudevas are met with, he holds it improbable that the successor of Kanīṣka and Huviṣka is meant. Hereon, the eminent Sinologist confesses to me, that he would express himself less positively to-day than in the words of the last of these sentences.

With the identification of Po-t'iao with the Vāsudeva of the inscriptions, we should now arrive at about A.D. 130-150. That is perhaps later than is probable. The beginnings of

¹ Lüders, *Ind. Ant.*, 1904, 39, 106.

² The difficulties would be greater if that coin had been described as worn out. Yet P. Gardner denies this (*op. cit.*, LI, n. 2).

the Kuṣana rule will thereby be pushed back further than is desirable—from events close to which, according to what has been discussed, they would appear to fall. We may recall (a) the Chinese dates for the victories of the K'io-tsiu-k'io (above p. 7, n. 1), which accord less with that allocation than with one of some decades earlier; then (b) the point as to Gondophares (p. 14 f.). Above all, difficulties arise in connection with the statement of Franke, that the Chinese testimony to the florescence of the Kuṣana dominion after the conquest of India by the son of K'iu-tsiu-k'io (above p. 6) is to be carried back to a source at the latest in A.D. 124.¹ In connection with that florescence, it is Kanīṣka's time that will above all be recalled to mind; it seems improbable that he should only succeed to the throne several years after the compilation of the Chinese information alluded to. Taking all in all, then, I would prefer—as compared with an assignment based on that statement about Po-t'iao—the estimate of Boyer (*Journ. As.*, 1900, I, 579), which fixes the Kanīṣka era towards the end of the first century A.D.—a slight readjustment, earlier or later, remaining of course conceivable.

¹ Franke, *op. cit.*, 71. I can, of course, only quote, not prove. After what Chavannes has made out, *T'oung Pao*, 1907, 150 (but see also p. 191, n. 1), a somewhat later date for the statement referred to might not be wholly inadmissible.

II

THE PROSE-AND-VERSE TYPE OF NARRATIVE AND THE JĀTAKAS.

I HAVE on several occasions—partly following Windisch—supported the view that in ancient India a type of narrative was popular, wherein, inside a general framework of prose, there appear, in emphasized passages, especially in the more important speeches and replies, verses. For the conventional tradition of such narratives, it sufficed to teach and to learn the verses. Hence the prose framework as a rule stood firm as to its sense, and not as to its literary form. Or rather, as was only to be expected under such conditions, even the sense of the prose did not stand really firm, but tended in course of time to undergo one transformation after another, as one generation of narrators yielded place to the next. Nay, more; the prose could even become quite forgotten, the poetic insertions meanwhile continuing to be handed down as part of the established tradition of texts preserved by a school. The chances are, therefore, that in spite of the comments of Indian exegesists invariably poured upon them, such verses remain unintelligible; will only perhaps become, or begin to become, intelligible in proportion as our combinations succeed in restoring the forgotten framework of prose. It is as verses in such narratives (“Ākhyāna”) that I have tried to explain a number of Rigvedic *sūkta*’s. Pischel, Geldner, and Sieg have worked along similar lines.

I have usually looked upon the Jātakas of the Pali canon as supplying the most essential support to these views.

Their structure seemed to have been clearly explained by the important investigations of Rhys Davids, Senart, and others. This support A. B. Keith—amongst other arguments opposing the theory in question—has been seeking to deprive me of in his interesting essay, “The Vedic Ākhyāna and the Indian Drama” (*JRAS.* 1911, 979 ff. esp. 985 f). He describes the Jātaka collection as a work to which the epigram applies:

“Hic liber est in quo quaerit sua dogmata quisque,
Invenit et pariter dogmata quisque sua.”

I consider this verdict somewhat pessimistic, so far at least as it concerns the literary form of the Jātaka text, which is the point here at issue. It seems to me that, at least up to the present, there has been in fact an entire consensus among most of us on this point. I should like to the best of my power to preserve that intact from Keith’s scepticism—nay, further, to win over that distinguished inquirer to our side.

“There is no cogent evidence,” writes Keith, “that any part (of the Jātaka collection) is a real Ākhyāna.”

Before testing this proposition, I will try to explain the situation to the uninitiated. In so doing, some points must be touched upon, in which Keith and I can hardly be said to differ in opinion.

I select a Jātaka: No. 212—verse begirt by prose. The verses—only these rank as canonical—run as follows:

“Different is the appearance above from that below. I ask thee, brahminee, what meaneth this below and this above?”

“I am a mime, your honour. Begging came I hither. But he whom you seek hath slunk away into the store-chamber.”

Nobody can imagine that the Buddhists would have found pleasure in reciting such unintelligible fragments to each other. Nor would such an introductory phrase as, “Now I will tell of the Brahmin, his wife, her lover, and

the mendicant," have sufficed to enlighten the listener. It was indispensable that the story should begin with the absence of the Brahmin and the visit of his wife's lover, to whom she gives food. A begging play-actor is standing by; suddenly the Brahmin returns; the lover hides in the store-room. The wife adds more stew for her husband to that left over by her lover. The stew below is cold, that on the top hot. The Brahmin, astonished at this, utters the first of the above-mentioned verses. He naturally suspects mischief. Perhaps he first suspects the mendicant. The latter anyway tells the husband what he has seen, and utters the second verse. And there then follows inevitably the conclusion: how the lover was fetched from the store-room, and, with the faithless wife, received the beating that was due.

The commentator of the Jātaka book tells the story in exactly the same way.¹ He writes in prose; he adds the verses where they are needed for the context, and explains their meaning. I would add that this is a typical case, recurring hundreds of times. The verses taken alone are, to a large extent, meaningless. Then comes in the prose, and by it all becomes clear; that the verses were intended to complete just that context indicated by the prose is self-evident. If confirmation were needed, it could be furnished by the very numerous cases in which the subject-matter of these stories agrees—essentially, if not in every detail—in other respects with the commentator's prose. Thus we find Jātakas introduced in the great Pāli-Piṭaka texts, where they, verses surrounded by prose, are recited in the ancient style of those texts. Other tales also occur in the Cariyā Piṭaka. Or, again, Jātakas occur in Northern Buddhist texts, such as the *Mahāvastu*, the collections of the Avadānas, and the carefully-polished *Jātakamālā*; or non-Buddhistic literature gives the requisite confirmation. Again, in sculpture:—bas-reliefs of Buddhist buildings,

¹ He only omits the incident, which I have introduced, of the husband at first suspecting the mendicant whom he sees before him. It is a natural assumption, but is nothing more.

many with inscriptions expressly referring to the Jātakas. In some of these cases not included in the body of the Pāli Jātakas the entire story is in prose, or, as in the Cariyā Piṭaka, it is written entirely in verse. Thus, in the *Mahāvastu* (vol. II, p. 209 ff.), the *Sāmajātaka* (No. 540) runs first of all in pure prose,¹ and afterwards in purely metrical form. Considering the esteem in which the Pāli canon deserves to be held,² I think we shall have every reason to consider the type of mixed prose and poetry found in it, and which is *almost* the only prevailing one,³ as the oldest or as one of the oldest. It frequently occurs also in the Jātakas incorporated in the Vinaya, etc., and in many examples of Northern Buddhist literature, especially in the *Mahāvastu* and in the *Jātakamālā*, etc.⁴ The inscription of Barhut (cp. *ZDMG.* LII, 643, n. 2), which names the *Yaṃ bram(h)ano avayesi jatakam*, also points to it, and is identical with the strophe which we find in

¹ Not counting the one verse (p. 212, 19 f.) quoted from the Dhammapada.

² I intend to return to this in another connection later on.

³ *Absolute* monopoly cannot be claimed for it, nor is that surprising. In some cases our Jātaka text shows metrical parts which give the whole narrative, so that the prose is superfluous (cp. Lüders *NGGW.* 1897, 126, n. 1; Senart, *Journ. as.*, 1901, I, 400). I will not enter here into details, which would necessitate a special inquiry. On the other hand, a Jātaka, where so many have but one verse, is quite conceivable with no verse at all. True, it could not then be included in our body of Jātakas, since this is essentially a collection of verses (see below; concerning No. 5, where there is in Fausböll's text no verse, cp. Chalmers' translation; on the exceptional case of the Kuṇāla-Jātaka, see p. 26, n. 1). Other Pali texts, however, may confirm the existence of such a Jātaka. Cp. Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, 196 (I judge the case in question to be more rare than the writer claims it to be). I do not, for that matter, hold it to be quite clear whether, in the case of a tale given in mere prose, as an integral part of a leading canonical text, verses may not have dropped out of such a narrative as superfluous, which had once formed a feature of the latter when told independently.

⁴ Only in these texts the prose appears as the work of the author, not of the commentator.

Jāt. 62 of the Pāli thesaurus (vol. I, p. 293).¹ This, again, would be incomprehensible without the prose as furnished by the commentator.

But if prose-additions, like those handed down in the Jātakatthavaṇṇanā (v. p. 21, n. 3), belong necessarily, with few exceptions, to the verses of our Pāli Jātakas, then we must also add that *this* form of the prose cannot be the original one.

Before I refer to the reasons for this conclusion, I wish to say that I am not convinced by the arguments with which R. O. Franke (*ZDMG.* LXIII, 13) seeks to demonstrate a divergent theory. Franke finds it quite improper to regard the creation of the Jātaka gāthās as a whole (with certain exceptions) and that of the Jātaka prose as two separate acts. He has recourse to a comparison between two passages in Jātakas 539 and 507. In 539 the Bodhisat has entered the town Thūṇa as a religious mendicant, and comes to the house of an arrow-maker :

koṭṭhake usukārassa bhattakāle upaṭṭhite (J. 539, 163)

whereupon a conversation unfolds itself between the two men. Here Franke finds the words *bhattakāle upaṭṭhite* out of place, without connection with the meaning of the verse. “To one who has gone a little into the mysteries of the canonical compilation, it will at once occur that another factor has been here at work.” The same pāda, namely, is also to be found in No. 507, 19, in which verse it is preceded by the words *so tassa gehaṃ pāvekkhi*. Herewith, Franke holds, J. 539 corresponds, not in the verses, but in the prose just preceding the verse-passage quoted above (163) : *pavisitvā . . . gehadvāraṃ patto*. From this he evidently draws the conclusion that this prose-passage, being similar to the meaning of the former verse, has now

¹ That is to say, the standard canonical strophe of the Jātaka; the other verses woven into the Commentary have not the same rank. That this is so comes out in the opening titular citation of the Commentary, in which the Jātaka is designated by the corresponding words : *yaṃ brāhmaṇo ti*—the opening words of the strophe, though this is, in the tale, preceded by another verse (*sabbā nadī*, etc.).

led to that continuation of the above-mentioned verse, although for the context it was meaningless.

Truly an ingenious conclusion, only to my mind too ingenious. In 507 and 539 the same situation occurs; an ascetic comes to a strange house. According to the customs of the Indian ascetics, he comes to beg for food (rendered explicitly *piṇḍāya caranto* in the prose of J. 539 after v. 162), and this would occur at mealtime. That a brahmin or samana goes to beg of a householder *bhattachāle upatthite* is also told in the *Sutta Nipāta* passage (130), from which the Jātakas have probably derived these words. How often does it not occur in the Jātakas, that certain words, judged by the main idea, are more or less superfluous, and are only adduced because the poet is fascinated and carried away by the situation, and portrays it as if it were an end in itself? Hence, I find nothing striking in the fact that the idea of the ascetic, coming to beg for food at a house, has produced the words applied to the same situation in the well-known Vasalasutta of the *Sutta Nipāta*, and thence probably having found their way into that other Jātaka on the occurrence of just that same situation;¹ this being the arrival at *āhāradeśakāle*, as the *Mahāvastu* (II, 49, 10, 12) says, with which we may compare the pious man in the *Jātakamālā* (p. 35, 19-21), looking out at the *āhārakāla* for any approaching guests.

To understand this kind of thing we have no need of any prose influence. But even if we persist, unnecessarily as I think, in seeing prose-influence at work, we could still side with my view as to the origin of these Ākhyānas. For in cases of this kind, speaking generally, it is near enough to that view to hold that a passage like our *pavisitvā . . . gehadvāraṃ patto* of the commentator's prose, may already have been imagined by the writer of the verse, he having composed it concerning a certain situation, which according to rule had to be described in prose. If

¹ Repetition of favourite standard passages in these poems is very frequent.

we really attach weight to the allusion to J. 507, 19,¹ as shown by Franke, all proof that the *existing* prose is contemporary with the verses is thus excluded. We only needed to regard this prose as the substitute, similar only on the whole, for the prose that was in the mind of the author of the verse. In just the case before us, it is true, the whole consideration seems to me to fall away; yet not in the sense, that what it would take away from the power of Franke's hypothesis to prove the contemporaneity of the prose in question and the verses, remains to the credit of the prose. For it was hardly the original intention of the author of the verses so to divorce the *upaḍḍhā gāthā* 162 from the following verse, by means of the prose, as we see it in the text that is now before us. On the contrary, verses 162 and 163 contained one continuous description of the entire incident,² and apparently there was no room, in the ancient form of the passage, for the now interjacent prose, which precisely, according to Franke, would have been the origin of the *bhattachāle upatthite* of the verse.

But whatever one may think of this supposition, it is, in my opinion, certain that this *bhattachāle upatthite* is not suited to be the foundation of hypotheses concerning the contemporaneity of the prose and the verse, hypotheses contradicted by all the clues which in other respects throw light on this question.

¹ I mention incidentally that this proves less than it seems to do. In 507, 19, it was *gehaṃ pavekkhi*. In the prose, 539, *pavisitvā* refers to the entry into the town. That the wanderer then comes to the *gehadvāraṃ* is a fresh fact.

² I note in passing that this description seems to have suffered while being handed down. Before or after the hemistich *koṭṭhake*, etc., there will have been a hemistich to which *koṭṭhake* structurally belongs—say, with an *atthāsi*, as the Commentary has it. The next verse consists of two opening *pādas* (*tatra ca so usukāro* and *ekaṃ ca cakkhu niggayha*); after the former a following *pāda* has been lost (containing, say, “he was working at an arrow”), which would have made good the number of *pādas* and made the *ca* (after *ekaṃ*) intelligible. Cp. on the passage Franke, *WZKM.* XX, 351.

I give once more a brief summary of these clues, which do not appear to have received everywhere the consideration they deserve.

Our Jātaka book, edited by Fausböll, calls itself *atthavaṇṇanā*. We can constantly see that the verses appear to it as something given, requiring a commentary.¹ As we know, in the great Phayre MS. which comprises the whole canon, the Jātaka consists only of verses.² (The Kuṇāla Jātaka, No. 536, forms, so far as I can see, a remarkable and unique exception.³) The prose shows, in the most perfect

¹ Cp. Senart, *Journ. as.*, 1901, I, 397 ff. "Besides," runs Lüder's pertinent remark, *NGGW.* 1897, 119 n. 2, "the arrangement according to the number of the gāthās, shows that originally these alone counted."

² Hertel (*ZDMG.* LXIV, 62; *WZKM.* XXIII, 280) is of opinion, judging by certain MSS. of the Pañcatantra and cognate works, which contain only the verses, that the Phayre MS. of the Jātaka contains a selection of the verses taken from the prose and verse compilation, which was to serve as the basis for a Jātaka translation into some vernacular. It would be strange enough, if it had been possible for such a casual private venture to have found its way, in place of the canonical Jātaka text, into the main body of the Phayre MS. The way in which the fact of the Phayre MS. fits into the circle of facts, marshalled above, shows too that it cannot be explained away thus. It may here be mentioned that this MS., as containing only verses, is not unique. Minayeff (*Recherches sur le Bouddhisme*, 152) speaks of one such at St. Petersburg and one at Paris. Rhys Davids has kindly pointed out to me that Nos. 135, 136 in Cabaton's List of the Pali MSS. in the Bibl. Nationale, if rightly described, must be of this kind. He adds that an edition of gāthās only, with Singhalese translation, was begun in 1905 at Colombo.—Besides, our Jātaka Commentary, in a number of passages (*v.* Fausböll, vol. VII, p. iii at the end), distinguishes, in the text of the verses, between the Pali reading and the Aṭṭhakathā reading. Is this, too, an allusion to a tradition containing only verses? It would be an advantage to know how the Phayre MS. stands with regard to that distinction.

³ The Kuṇāla-Jātaka appears, in the midst of the Jātaka Book, as an exotic piece, obviously broken off from elsewhere. Here we have *canonical prose*, with verses. Intermingled is the commentarial prose of the *Atthavaṇṇanā*, which can easily and surely be divided off from the canonical, even though Fausböll's text and Francis' translation scarcely give an idea of this. The canonical prose reveals characteristic turns belonging to the canonical diction of the Pali Piṭakas

harmony herewith, the commentator's style, and not the hieratic diction of the Suttanta or Vinaya prose, with which it forms so sharp a contrast.¹ But—as if the tradition could not do enough to bring this state of things to our notice—in a whole series of cases a story of this kind is put, in one of the great canonical texts, into the Master's mouth. *There* it is that we see the prose in the form that in ancient times—the time of the genesis of the Sutta and Vinaya collections—appeared to be the suitable

(*e.g.*, *yena . . . ten' upasaṃkamimṣu, upasaṃkamitvā . . . etad avocaṃ*, etc.) On the other hand, it has a flavour that is clearly divergent from the diction of the great Pali Sutta and Vinaya texts; cp. *e.g.* the long concatenations of compounds (vol. V, p. 416, 419 f., Fausböll). As a whole, it reminds us of parts of the North Buddhist texts, *e.g.* the *Divyāvadāna*. The progress of our knowledge of this literature, or of the respective Chinese translations, may one day permit us to determine more precisely whence it sprang. That a MS. of the Canon, like the Phayre, would here give the prose as well seems to me scarcely doubtful, though I am not in a position to affirm it positively. The introductory formula *evam akkhāyati* (suggesting *ākhyāna*) *evam anusūyati* looks like a constant, standing formula in such a canonical text. In the Pali Commentary these words form, so to speak, the catchword amounting to the title of a Jātaka. At the end, the identifying of the persons taking part with those surrounding the Buddha, and with himself, in verses, is here and elsewhere effected by the phrase *evaṃ dhāretha jātakan ti*. The phrase may be characteristic of certain sources (?), and, anyway, occurs more than once in the *Mahāvastu*. For our inquiry, the Kuṇāla-Jātaka yields yet another confirmation, among so many others, of how firmly rooted was the form in mixed prose and verse.

¹ The later diction of the *aṭṭhakathā*, writes Hertel, merely proves that the recension of the Jātaka which has come down to us is later than the main body of the canonical texts (*WZKM*. XXIV, 123). This does not go very far. It is scarcely doubtful that the *aṭṭhakathā* (more accurately, the *aṭṭhavaṇṇanā*) is the work of a commentator writing in Ceylon several centuries after Christ, presumably translating from the Singhalese, or working up Singhalese materials; a writer whose work makes no claim whatever to be entitled “canonical,” and who himself, as is often shown, claims nothing of the kind (*v. int. al* Cowell's Preface to vol. I of the Jātaka translation; Rhys Davids, *Buddhist India*, 200 f.). On the very different circumstances of the verses light is thrown by the Barhut inscription mentioned above (p. 22), *pace* by other clues.

one for such a tale—viz., the old hieratic prose.¹ Finally, as if to make the indubitable still more indubitable, while the prose-compiler had at his disposal, obviously at most, and on the whole at least, a fair tradition of the essential contents of the stories implied in the old verses, there is, nevertheless, often to be found in the prose—especially in minor, decorative details, etc., yet at times in those also of greater importance—traces of a more recent authorship than in the verses. Although he judges differently in his statements (p. 22 f.) referring to J. 539, 163, Franke has himself pointed out this fact in several ways, perhaps even going too far. Above all, I may recall the points established by Lüders some time ago, founded on the story of *Ṛṣyaśṛṅga* and the *Dasarathajātaka* (*NGGW*, 1897, 119, 126 ff.; 1901, 51; *ZDMG*, LVIII, 689 ff.), as well as the masterly treatment of the more ancient and more modern literary and monumental forms of the *Saddantajātaka* by Foucher (*Mélanges. Sylv. Lévi* 231 ff.²). I here give the result concerning the relationship of verse to prose in his own words:³

“Si les *gāthā* ont tous les caractères d’une très vieille complainte populaire, que la barbarie du procédé employé par le chasseur pour s’emparer de l’ivoire nous force à déclarer antérieure au médaillon de Barhut, c’est-à-dire au II^e siècle avant J.-C., il est non moins évident que leur *aṭṭhakathā* n’a pas été seulement remise en pāli, mais qu’elle a encore été accommodée au goût du jour par un clerc du V^e siècle de notre ère.”

¹ Keith (986 n. 1) calls the *Jātaka* prose of Fausbøll’s edition “just as probably an original composition without any predecessor.” In the cases described (as well as in the *Kuṇāla-Jātaka*, v. above, p. 26 n. 1) we have under our eyes the predecessor of this prose.

² The evidence for the prose as being posterior would be carried to an extreme, if the whole narrative of the fifteenth *Jātaka* were really built up on a false reading in the *gāthā* (Lüders, *NGGW*. 1897, 128 n. 1). But I believe this would affirm too much.

³ See p. 246 f. The value of this result seems to me unimpaired by the circumstance, that just this *Jātaka*, in its Pāli form, might be conceived, approximately at least, as consisting of verses only, needing no prose (cp. above p. 21, n. 1).

It seems to me that at least a part of the facts here co-ordinated is of such a nature, that the conclusions to be drawn distinctly refer to the structure of the Jātakas *as a whole*. It would be in itself very strange to judge each case separately—here to give priority to the gāthās, there to consider them contemporaneous with the prose—as Franke evidently does (cp. above p. 22 f.). This, however, I consider as excluded by the arguments just given.¹

But now I have arrived at the point where I come upon the attempt to lift off its hinges the proof, which in my estimation is contained in all the foregoing, the assertion, namely, that we are dealing here with Ākhyānas, more correctly with Ākhyāna verses and a prose settled subsequently. Keith says (*op. cit.* 986. n. 1): “The discrepancies of prose and verse are no reasonable evidence in favour of the prose being a replacement of an older prose which really was consistent with the verse.” He is of the same opinion as Hertel, who said (*WZKM.* XXIV, 122) that the frequent contradiction between prose and verses only proves that the author of the one is not identical with the author of the other, but that it proves nothing as to the origin and original disposal of the verses: “they may be Kathāsamgraha strophes,² or they may be borrowed from epic and dramatic poems or śāstras.”

Thus authors who compose prose and quote³ verse,

¹ I make, of course, an exception in the case of the Kuṇāla-Jātaka, which is obviously different from the rest of the collection.

² I do not overlook this “may be” that leaves open the possibility of Ākhyāna verses; and only refrain, for brevity’s sake, in the following remarks, from always reminding the reader that of all this it is only said that it “may be.” But as soon as it is seriously accepted that the matter may also have happened otherwise, then the possibility at least of that with which I am concerned must be admitted, namely, that here we have Ākhyānas, just as I assume them to be in the R̥gveda; and, further, we have these Ākhyānas, in the canonical shape of the “Jātakas,” existing in precisely the same form as I find in the R̥gveda:—the verses without the prose.

³ Keith in so many words admits that this was “just as probably” the case (p. 986 n. 1), as compared with the Ākhyāna theory. But the reader will not be deceived, if he credits him actually with a very decided inclination to the first-named view.

taken from who knows where?¹ In accordance with the idea that I have formed of the nature of the Ākhyāna, an occasional occurrence of this situation appears to me in no degree incompatible. Why should not the narrator, who wished to embellish his prose with poetic interludes, instead of composing the latter himself, borrow material which existed and may have been intended for something else? There was no question of any scruples regarding literary property. When the only strophe of the Mahāsudassana-jātaka (95) is the well-known verse *aniccā vata saṃkhārā*, etc., we are not likely to conclude that the author of the Jātaka composed it for that work.²

But it is, of course, one thing to regard such a working up of one or more quotations as a merely casual variation in mixed prose and verse, and quite another to trace the whole form (apart from the case of the Kathā-saṃgraha verses) back to such quotations, and thereby rob it, in a certain sense, of all reality.³

¹ Only the Kathāsaṃgraha strophes would be likely to be ascribed to the authors (or would not even they? cp. Hertel, *WZKM.* XXIV, 123). If a verse—whether standing alone, or where there are other verses—is added to a narrative, the whole of which it so pointedly summarizes, I consider it as lying well within the limits of my conception of the prose and verse tale.

² Senart (*Journ. as.*, 1901, I, 401) remarks that the Hiri-sutta of the *Sutta Nipāta* (V, 253-7), unmixed with prose, has preserved the strophes which form the nucleus of a Jātaka (No. 363). Here, too, I would fain believe that a story has been subsequently tacked on to didactic verses. But I may say here that I do not follow him when he, in the same connection, finds that, in the SN, the Dhaniya-, Cunda-, and Hemavata-suttas (I, 2, 5, 9), “offrent autant d'exemples décisifs de jātakas sans prose.” Are these Jātakas?

³ I am surprised that Keith (p. 986 n. 1) straightway regards Franke's views on Jāt. 539, 163, which we criticized above, as being in line with his own theory. What Franke says is clearly to this effect: that the prose has influenced contemporary verse; that it has helped to create this verse. Keith argues the converse. According to him, the verse must have been before the author of the prose; indeed, this author is supposed to quote it. Franke's construction, in fact, places in Keith's way a difficulty wherewith he would have to cope, not a support for him to lean upon.

Are we, in fact, to the extent imposed upon us by the latter conception, to regard the Jātaka verses as having been borrowed from epic or dramatic poetry or from Śāstras? That is the problem to be solved here.

A very large portion of these verses—I mean the greater part, reckoning without statistical precision—has not got the characteristic of philosophic universality that the *aniccā vata saṃkhārā* has, but by its contents proves to have been composed just for the context—or for one more or less similar—in which we find the corresponding verses.

Would these verses have been taken from dramatic poetry? Hertel thinks (*op. cit.*, 22) that just as Pūrṇabhadra (*Pañcat.* I, 211) has borrowed a strophe of the Śakuntalā,¹ the compilers of the Jātakas may have plundered dramatic literature. Plundering dramatic literature is anyway a step beyond merely borrowing a verse from a drama. That verse of Kālidāsa's has a fairly general theme, such as might easily be transferred to another situation. And we know that there was and still is a Śakuntalā. Do not the dramas, which would have described the definite situations indicated by the corresponding verses, differ in this respect from the Śakuntalā to their own disadvantage? Did they, at the time when the Jātakas were first written, exist at all except in Hertel's imagination, which is so rich in the discovery of dramas? It may be permitted, provisionally, to doubt it.

Other matter which may be urged against such plundering of dramatic literature applies equally to the assumption of epic prototypes.

Let it be considered that, in order to sustain such a hypothesis, we can scarcely get on with less than hundreds of poetic Jātakas which must have formed the basis for the Jātakas in mixed prose and verse handed down to us.

To begin with, I do not find a shadow of proof for such assumption. The materials we possess lead us—for the

¹ He adds: Just as the Suparṇādhyaṃya is worked into the Mahābhārata. On the Suparṇādhyaṃya as drama I will say a few words below.

largest part of the narratives of our Jātaka collection—to the fact of the prose and verse Jātaka.¹ If, to deprive that fact of any significance, we imagine, for incalculable masses of these stories, doubles of more or less “epic poems,” in pure poetic form, lying behind them, such an idea is mere free phantasy, and too free at that. If the author composed in prose, and interwove into his prose only such quotations in verse as were available here from a drama, there from an epic, or from a Śāstra, how does it happen that this embellishment was so regular, that it was never once omitted in the whole of our Jātaka collection—indeed, could not have been omitted, while for that which was lacking in this embellishment no place could be found in it? How is it that the opening words of the first quotation (*i.e.*, the first of any significance) became a title for the whole Jātaka? That the whole Jātaka collection was arranged according to the number of the verses which appeared in each piece? That those who handed it down expressly distinguished the verses, from the surrounding additions, as “text”? That they expressed themselves somewhat in the same way as in the following (cp. III, p. 61, 23 ff.)? The courtesan, deserted by her lover, asks the wandering play actors, wherever they go, “to sing this song particularly; thus she, directing the actors, tells them the first strophe.” But we are not told how the strophe runs till later, when the troubadours are fulfilling their trust. “They sang,” so the description runs, “the first strophe of the song,” and, now only, follow the words of it, and then, how he who is sought, hearing the verses on his side, “uttered the second strophe,” and so on. Or (vol. IV, p. 195, 6 ff.), “then there follow these (verses) [five ślokas follow]. Of these five, verse for verse, three belong to the Bodhisat, two to the King.” What author who—as Keith thinks of the

¹ I except, on the one hand, the Jātaka-like narratives without verses, which are sometimes met with in the Piṭaka texts—these, for that matter, do not in the least represent the pure poetic type here postulated—and, on the other hand, the few Jātakas touched on above, p. 22 n 3.

Jātaka authors—writes his prose as “an original composition, in which verses are quoted, whether taken from the epic,” etc., would write thus? So, rather, writes one who regards the verses not as something external, but as fixed data given to himself and his readers, and taken for granted as the necessary basis of his work. I have on a former occasion compared these verses fitted into the prose with verses in the middle of a prose story, such as a Grimm’s fairy tale, and which are put into the mouths of the characters. The comparison is inapt only in so far as what appears in the Jātakas as a fixed type, systematically carried out, is only seen sparingly in the fairy tale as suggested by mere chance and mood of the narrator.

For, indeed, a reader of the Pāli Jātaka collection cannot fail to recognize the fact that the verses constitute an essential element in the form wielded by the compilers of these stories. And they are verses (I do not know whether rare exceptions should not be discounted) which are not given to the listener as quotations, as in the *Pañcatantra*, where passages so often bear the stamp of having been taken from a thesaurus of popular philosophy. They are verses which are seen to have their home in the narrative itself; they have their place and their value because the characters in the story, or Buddha himself, have so spoken. If a form of narrative characterized by the intermixture of such verses was once in vogue, would the authors¹ not really have been able or allowed to use it, by themselves composing their stories according to that form in mixed prose and verse, but only by constantly borrowing² behind the scenes from foreign productions the one important element in the form? I cannot at all see the sense of such an idea.

Let us now consider how materials, warding off attacks

¹ I have in mind at the moment the old authors behind whose mask the author of the *Atthavaṇṇanā*, in a certain manner and with recognized limitations, has concealed himself.

² Or did they rather create it than borrow it (cp. p. 28 n. 2)? In this case we have precisely the narrative form in mixed prose and verse as I accept it.

upon, and confirming the type here supported, of a prose-and-verse form of narrative, fortify it round about in the most different directions. I do not attempt, in enumerating them, any completeness.

Of the Vedic evidence I shall have more to say later.

From epic literature Lüders (*NGGW.* 1897, 131) has long ago (as I think rightly) vindicated for such *gāthāḥ* the quality of Ākhyāna strophes, for instance for those concerning Rāma, which are mentioned in the Harivaṃśa, and which might, as Lüders supposes,¹ be translated from folk dialect ;

gāthās cāpy atra gāyanti ye purāṇavidō janāḥ—

strophes the relations of which with those of the Jātakaś Lüders has finely discussed.

Franke's investigations² also have brought much to the light of day that is very important to us in this connection. I may mention particularly how Jātaka 384, appears in the M. Bh. II., Adhy. 41 (Franke, *op. cit.*, 319 f.). In the wholly metrical M. Bh. there appears at first, in the sermon of the sham holy bird, a clear reflex,³ having a corresponding value, of the first *gāthā* in the Jātaka : M. Bh.—*dharmaṃ carata, etc.* Jātaka.—*dhammaṃ caratha, etc.* Then the M. Bh.—with a distant resemblance to the fourth *gāthā*—emphasizes a verse, addressed to the bird, denouncing its hypocrisy, above its context by the above mentioned and elsewhere recurring formula :

gāthāṃ apy atra gāyanti ye purāṇavidō janāḥ.

Thus the course of the epic, even in verses, characterizes a definite verse in quite a distinct sense as that of a *gāthā* handed down from the past, and attributes to it a quality

¹ Cp. also Charpentier, *ZDMG.* LXII, 745.

² "Jātaka Mahābhārata-Parallelen," *WZKM.* XX, 317 ff. In the same connection the articles of Charpentier should be consulted.

³ This expression is, of course, not meant to prejudice the question of the historical relations of the two versions.

which corresponds¹ exactly to the value of those *gāthās*, which, in the Pāli text, arise out of the prose.

Further, I should like to draw attention to the parallels between M. Bh. (III. Adhy. 194, Franke, p. 320 f.) and Jātaka 151. In both texts two travelling kings meet, and the question arises which must get out of the way of the other. The M. Bh. tells the story in prose. A wise man appears and *ślokatrayam apāṭhat* :—then follow those *ślokas* which are remarkably like the Jātaka *śloka* talk between the charioteers. Without ignoring some differences, we may say that the prose-poetic narrative of the Jātaka appears here in another prose-poetic version, the verses in the one corresponding almost literally to the verses in the other.²

But above all what we have chiefly to consider, as confirming the form obtaining in the great Jātaka collection, is the remaining field of Buddhist literature. Attention has been drawn above (p. 27) to those Jātakas which are found in the Sūtra and Vinaya texts of the Pāli canon. Do we there meet perchance, in an age which is many centuries earlier than the genesis of the Jātakatthavaṇṇanā, with those pure metrical narratives, which are supposed to have been plundered by the author of the Atthavaṇṇanā? We meet now with pure prose, now—in most cases, if I do not err—exactly as in the later Jātaka, with prose mixed with verse. For the purely metrical form in the Jātaka collection, occasionally appearing in between the traditional mixed form, there is no such guarantee of age.³ Texts like

¹ Could we not conclude with some ingenuity, from such a passage alone, that this form of mixed prose and verse narrative was the basic form of the passage in question in the epic?

² The story also of the frog-princess and the horses of Vāmadeva (M.Bh. III, Adhy. 192), which is at least in part mixed prose and verse, does not seem to me to admit of being so readily settled as it is by Keith (1992). It is characteristic that the *slokaṁ cātra bhavataḥ* occurs, where, at the speech of the frog-king, two verses appear first in the midst of what has so far been unbroken prose.

³ I note in passing that the verse narratives of the Jains, several of which Charpentier ("Studien über die indische Erzählungs-literatur," ZDMG. LXII, f.) has recently and very pertinently compared with Jātakas, can hardly be judged otherwise.

the Cariyā Piṭaka,¹ or, still more, the Apadāna, are, as experts in Buddhist literature will scarcely dispute, entirely secondary. The old *Sutta-Nipāta* has several narratives, on the childhood and youth of the Buddha-about-to-be, in pure metrical form (Asita; departure from home; meeting with Māra). Thus the *possibility* at least will be admitted that at that time Jātakas also were composed in this form. But even supposing this to have actually been the case, the fact would remain untouched, that the prose and verse form, which the Jātaka collection bears for the most part, was already in existence and popular at the time when the Nikāyas and the great Vinaya texts originated—that, for instance, the Maṇikanṭha Jātaka (253) appears in the Vinaya (vol. III, p. 145 ff.) with exactly the same three verses as in the Jātaka collection, and also with a prose frame work as in the latter; only with archaic prose in place of commentarial prose. To argue that this form of narrative, assured through the agreement of old and new evidences, arises from a much earlier purely epic poetical form, or even a dramatic form:—is not this a flight from the solid ground of fact to the regions of air?

We may strengthen our belief, that the prose and verse Jātaka form was firmly rooted in the literary consciousness of India, by the fact, that we see this form decisively asserting itself in the North Buddhist literature, too, and at a time when purely metrical Jātakas were actually to be found in it,² yet co-existing quite distinctly beside them.

¹ See hereon Charpentier, *WZKM.* XXIV, 351 ff.

² Thus, if I mistake not, in the *Mahāvastu* in a much larger proportion than the pure prose and the pure poetry. Whoever examines the purely metrical Jātakas there, will scarcely feel tempted to attach weight to them with regard to the question of the older development of this form of narrative. We may at this point incidentally remind ourselves that—among other texts—the *M. vastu* gives an opportunity, through comparison with the Pāli Jātakas, of illustrating the long-known fact (so von Oldenburg, *JRAS.* 1893, 302; Pischel, “Die ind. Literatur” [in *Kultur der Gegenwart*, T.I., Abt. VII], 188) that the different versions of the Jātakas generally agree in the verses, but are as a rule very different in the prose form. This also testifies that the verses are at the

The prose and verse Jātaka of the *Jātakamālā* is the direct offspring of the prose and verse Pāli Jātaka. There is only this difference, that, in the Pāli Jātaka, the gaps, which existed in the old time when there was no fixed prose, are only inadequately filled in, and are therefore easily recognizable. In the *Jātakamālā*, on the other hand, the need of artistic form has penetrated into the prose also. That is a step further in the treatment of the old form, rather than the creation of a new form.

Thus, in conclusion, even in those non-Buddhist prose and verse texts, where the gnomic element in the verses has attained predominance and almost sole rule, as in the *Pañcatantra*, I should prefer to assume not exactly a new form, but rather a shifting of importance, or, if you will, the formation of a new variety of the old Ākhyāna form. The ever-increasing pleasure in being orthodoxly proficient, one might say, in *punditdom*, led to this: that the possession of popular philosophy here was fain to show itself as proficiency in the literature of that philosophy. Thus the actual or feigned quotation, which was expressly given as such, was thrown into strong relief. This is certainly something different from the old Jātaka, but the difference is not fundamental.

I will conclude my disquisitions on the Jātakas with the remark that the prose and verse form, within the Pāli canon, possesses much further reaching significance than for those texts merely. Were there need, the theory of the prose and verse form could be still further confirmed by these wider fundamentals. Take, for instance, the narrative occurring at the beginning of the *Mahāvagga* (Vinaya

base of the whole (notice also the similarity in the Jātaka verses, and the difference in the Jātaka prose, in those Jain parallels, in the case which Charpentier discusses, *ZDMG*. LXII, 728). Comparisons between the Pāli texts and the *M. vastu* (which Windisch has so successfully made concerning important episodes in the traditional story of Buddha) must also be made for the Jātakas (as a continuation of Charpentier's work); and these comparisons must be the most extensive possible, and must include all accessible Northern material.

Piṭaka) of the first events after the Buddha's attainment of Buddhahood. That we are concerned with an old text belonging to the bedrock of Buddhist literature, anyone, who cannot see this fact for himself, may learn from Windisch's investigations.¹

In this section, the main part of which is in prose, we find, *e.g.*, the following: Buddha doubts lest it be futile to announce his doctrine to mankind. *Gāthās* arise in his mind: "With labour have I attained it; all too deep and difficult is it: they that are wrapt in darkness will not see it" (verses). Then Brahmā approaches him and expresses the desire that he would teach. The request of the god passes into a verse: "In Magadhaland formerly impure doctrine was announced; preach thou from the height of thy knowledge the pure Word." Buddha glances over the world and recognizes that there are beings on whom the labour of teaching will not be lost. Then he speaks a *gāthā* to Brahmā: "May the gates of immortality be opened to those who have ears" (chap. V). Now the Master arises and journeys to Benares. The ascetic Upaka meets him and speaks: "Radiant appearest thou! Who is thy teacher?" (prose). Buddha replies in *gāthās*: "I am the allknowing. No teacher have I. My like there is not. I go to Benares to roll the Wheel of the Doctrine in the benighted world" (chap. VI). And so, in like manner, the interweaving of prose and verse continues. Mārā "went thither where the Exalted One was; when he had arrived, he addressed the Exalted One with a *gāthā*," and verse for verse follow the speeches of Mārā: "Bound art thou with every band," etc., and Buddha's replies (chap. XI.). Later on, after Buddha has converted Uruvela-Kassapa and is journeying with him, doubts arise among the people as to which of the two is the teacher and which the scholar. Then Buddha speaks to Kassapa a *gāthā*: "How comes it, Kassapa, that thou hast left thy sacrificial fire?" And again follows, verse for verse,

¹ "Die Komposition des *Mahāvastu*," *ASGW. Phil. Hist.* Kl. Bd. XXVII, n. 14.

Kassapa's answer, new question, and new answer: "I have beheld the sanctuary of peace, and therefore take no further pleasure in sacrifice" (chap. XXII).

In very many places of the Piṭakas—I allude especially to the *Sutta-Nipāta*—we find this interweaving of prose and verse. Here we have essentially and obviously the same form as in the Jātakas.¹ But is there any necessity to point out how entirely arbitrary it would be to see in such verses borrowings, perhaps, from old Buddha epics, perhaps even from mimetic Buddha mysteries? The true interpretation, I take it, is plain. This age feels it natural to interrupt the even flow of simple recording at certain points; for instance, where weighty matters are spoken of, where mental tension is tightened or relaxed, where pregnant words are let fall, but also where triumphant sagacity succeeds in unravelling a difficult riddle, where through such sagacity's keen perception of the Particular the Universal is revealed—at such and similar points is the even step interrupted. It is not felt sufficient to express at such points merely the necessary. The inner emotion of the speaker and of those whom he allows to speak must find expression. Sharp accentuation is aimed at. There is a desire to describe how beautiful or sublime, how terrible, how significant, perhaps, too, how laughable is this or that, how in their course abiding systems manifest themselves.² It is then that the author rises from prose to verse form. By this we know that at this point a height is reached which it is fitting to adorn by art. In the midst of the unmeasured indefiniteness of the prose diction appear formations of another kind, welded, rounded off, and gathering into themselves the essence of the whole. Non-Indian parallels might be adduced, but I refrain. The Indian materials speak sufficiently for themselves. It is quite too narrow a conception that only a prose form,

¹ Cp. also Winternitz, *WZKM.* XXIII, 130; Rhys Davids, *Buddh. India*, 180 ff.

² My short paraphrase of the section from the Buddha legend can scarcely illustrate this; the text itself must be read.

or only a poetic form, can justify its existence, and that, when a mixture of both is found, it must follow that a prose-writer is quoting a poetic text. That mixed form has deeper roots.

My conception of the Jātaka as a prose-poetic Ākhyāna appearing to me on this wise established, I should like to speak very shortly, with reference to Keith's discussion, on the significance of these Ākhyānas for the question of the R̥gvedic Ākhyāna, and, further, as to how matters stand in regard to some works which I take to be Ākhyānas of the later Vedic age.

Keith notes, apparently in order to lower the importance of the Jātakas for the whole problem (p. 985), that the "composition of the tales" (of the Jātaka) cannot be dated. I will here put aside the archæological Jātaka records. But it may be remembered that, independently of the Jātaka collection, the existence of a number of prose and verse Jātakas is attested by the great Piṭaka texts. Concerning the age of these I have no need to speak here; that it is in every case considerable will not, or should not, be disputed.¹ I cannot adopt the standpoint that Keith apparently takes (p. 986), that these literary strata are altogether too recent to be brought into the problem of the Vedic Ākhyāna. Let it be considered how closely associated as a matter of literary history the old Buddhist didactic dialogue is with that of the Upaniṣads; how similar, for instance, the riddle verses of the Buddhists are to the Vedic ones, or how, in the prosody of the canonical Pāli texts, we hear the distinct echoes of Vedic laws, obliterated later.²

If then, the interval between the Buddhist Ākhyānas and those I accept as such in the R̥gveda were empty of testimony to this literary species, such a fact would scarcely

¹ I shall on another occasion return to this (cp. above, p. 21, n. 2).

² Cp. my remarks, "Gurupūjākaumudī," 9 ff. (NGGW. 1909, 228 ff.).

arouse suspicion. For as the surviving epic texts have almost throughout already taken the step from the old Ākhyāna form to the form which is poetical throughout, such testimony can only be looked for—at least, as to the main point—within the Vedic literature. This literature has, however, so much to do with theologisms, sacrificial rites, and such like, that an omission from it of such testimony might well be comprehensible, and in no case could we expect to find more than a rare occurrence of anything of the kind.¹

Such occurrences can, however, be actually demonstrated with the greatest certainty. I refer first of all to the Suparṇādhyāya. How completely Hertel's interpretation of this text as drama (*WZKM.* 23, 273 ff.) is up in the air has not escaped Keith (p. 1,004). The text itself is expressly characterized in two places (1, 5; 31, 7) as *ākhyānam*. If these are only appendices to the text they yet have the weight of old evidence. That that may have originally signified "drama," Hertel (*op. cit.*, 338) may be at liberty to believe. For me the story-like character of the text is sufficiently clearly pronounced in that catchword. And as this narrative, as it stands, obviously needs materially supplementing, it is necessary, for the question how to imagine them, to go to that Brāhmaṇa passage (*Ait. Br.* VII, 18, 10, 11), where a priest *ākhyānam . . . ācaṣṭe* to the king. This brings me to the Śunaḥśepa story. About the Suparṇādhyāya I will only first say that Keith (p. 1,004), who does not believe in Hertel's theory

¹ I pass by for the moment the known case in which narratives are woven into the discussion of rites—narratives which have for the most part, though not throughout, a pure prose form (see below, p. 45 f.). Explanations of a rite in narrative form and narrative as such are two somewhat different things. If in the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa the story is related of the Flood or of Cyavana in order to explain the rite of the *idū* or of the *āśvina graha*, that is not on the same lines as when, in the Aitāreya Br., an *ākhyāna* is given, which the Hotar tells the King, and the manner in which he tells it is described. The value of the one and of the other testimony for the question of the literary type of the narrative proper is, in my opinion, altogether different.

(drama), believes just as little in mine (Ākhyāna).¹ He does not say what raises his doubts about it, apart from his general distrust towards prose and verse narratives. Nor does he say how he on his part comes to terms with the gaps which need supplementing.

Now, in the Śunaḥśepa story we can distinguish with, as I have thought and still think, unambiguous clearness a union of prose and verse, the prose pervading the whole and upholding the coherence of the whole. More accurately the union is with three groups of verse. Keith attempts to deny to one after the other their significance in the sense of the prose and verse Ākhyāna (p. 989). I can by no means accept his reasons.

Firstly (Ait. Br. VII, 13), the King's question to Nārada and Nārada's answer as to the blessing a son brings to the father. "We have simply here a fragment of a gnomic poem, or rather poems taken over bodily."

The address *Nārada* in connection with the preceding prose sentence, *tasya ha Parvatanāradau gr̥ha ūṣatuḥ*, seems to me quite unambiguously to connect the verses with the situation, here explicitly stated and so usual in the epic, of a great sage visiting a king.² The fact that gnomic matter follows does not arouse the least doubt in the genuineness of the connection with the framework of narrative. The great epic, as well as the Jātakas, can illustrate how the tendency to intersperse the narrative with moralizings ran in the Indian blood.³ It is instructive to meet this connection here already, but not a matter for suspicion. Even if verses from another source are woven into the prose—

¹ Anyway, he verifies "the fact that part of the tale is certainly narrative."

² Does the vocative *brahmāṇaḥ* in § 7 point to a different situation from that presented in the prose framework? I scarcely believe it. The blessing of fatherhood is to be magnified here by contrast with the importance of *tapas*, as it is, in the context, under other aspects. This thought might easily lead to the use of that vocative.

³ In the Vedic examples of such a mixture of narrative and moralizing is the text quoted in Baudh. Dharm. II, 2, 3, 33 ff. perhaps also to be reckoned in?

which we cannot of course positively deny—why could we not judge as we did above concerning the Jātakas (p. 30)?

The second verse group (chap. XV) is supposed to represent “another little gnomic poem.” A vocative *Rohita* appears. As Indra is represented as speaking to the Prince Rohita, I think that that fits in excellently. The verse in question will have been composed for this connection; at all events will have been adapted to it. I really cannot understand what, in view of this harmless and unlaboured conception, can be urged in favour of Keith’s mistrustful theory. This gnomic poem is supposed to have been addressed to some Rohita; from that the Rohita of this story is supposed to derive his existence. But the Prince, of whose wanderings we here learn, will certainly have had a name in the story from the beginning. Why not Rohita, as it is related? And why may not the verse, which is represented as being addressed to him, have been actually addressed to him, and for that reason contain the vocative *Rohita*? Have we any ground for twisting this simple matter? May not the *flair*, which permits the philologist to discover mystification and deceit in the texts, be just a little too subtle?¹

In the third verse-group there is no longer gnomic purport. Ajīgartā, Śunaḥśepa, Viśvāmitra, and his sons are speaking. The subject is Viśvāmitra’s adoption of Śunaḥśepa, and the position the latter will take among Viśvāmitra’s sons. That is, we are told, an independent poem worked into the text, without connection with Hariścandra or Rohita. But consider how often and how naturally, in somewhat longer narratives, the action is grouped round new central points, especially where the feeling for rigid unity of action is less developed. New characters, new motives, are introduced. If the critic here,

¹ I note, further, that I am just as little convinced, when Keith remarks, on the separation of the verses always by means of the same prose sentences: “there cannot be the slightest doubt that the separation is artificial.” Every verse stands, just as the text gives it, as a variation on the common theme. This situation, recurring year after year, and this correspondingly recurring moralizing, seem to me beyond suspicion.

all too intent on disclosing in what he sees before him the traces of transforming and adulterating factors, were to conclude everywhere that foreign matter had been put together into a merely apparent whole, where should we come to?¹ We shall not, of course, dispute the fact as such, that processes of patchwork in the history of the stories have played a fairly prominent rôle. As to that, it seems to me that the products of such patchwork ought not to be simply ruled out of the question when discussing the form in which stories are told; even such composites will generally keep within a prescribed form. But for our particular case, it seems to me that the separateness of the verses in the concluding act of the story from what has preceded them is by no means so complete as is assumed by Keith. Śunaḥśepa says there to Ajīgarti : *Adarśus tvā śāsahastam . . . gavāṃ trīṇi śatāni tvam arṇṇīthāmad Aṅgiraḥ*. And again, in what follows, the verses bear reference to the event herein alluded to. It is true that Hariścandra and Rohita are not mentioned by name. But is not the mention of how Ajīgarti let himself be bribed by 300 cows to murder his son, at once a reference to the buyer, and to the events which have brought about the purchase? Thus, if these verses point back to what lies before and outside them, the earlier parts of the narrative provide us with the necessary information concerning and exactly corresponding to that reference. So that I really do not know why we are not to believe that the one and the other—without secondary adaptations or misleading disguises of other matter contained in them—belong as

¹ May I adduce, for purposes of comparison, something in the same connection? The welding of the Ṛgvedic material to form sacrificial liturgies differs, as is acknowledged, often and materially from its construction in the Ṛksamhitā. Here the tendency arose to conclude from this fact that the façade of our Ṛgveda was, to a great extent, only façade; that much of what was seen revealed itself to criticism as composed of quite different forms lying behind it. How this distrust of what has been handed down to us—this tendency to look behind imagined curtains—should, in my opinion, be regarded, I have set forth in *Göttinger Gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1907, 218 ff.

much together as they appear to do. Hereby, then, as was argued in the discussion on the Jātakas, there is hardly any inducement left to discover behind the verses interspersed with prose “an independent poem.”

If we look back on the Śunaḥśepa story as a whole, the result will, I think, be essentially different from Keith's, “that if the story of Śunaḥśepa is a genuine Ākhyāna, no more extraordinary literary type ever existed.” That the well-known interweaving of the R̥gvedic hymns¹ (which is not alluded to above) does not correspond to their true nature, is a thing apart, cannot surprise us here, where it is no ordinary tale-teller who narrates, but a R̥tviḥ, when we consider the ideas held in the Brāhmaṇa age as to the beginnings of R̥gvedic poetry.

But for the rest I see nothing but a sufficiently passable coherent narrative, in which important dialogues appear in verse form. The prose narrates soberly and monotonously, indicating merely the events, but the gnomic wisdom embodied in the speeches urges strongly towards verse-form; so does the passion of the dialogue between father and son, the pathos of the blessing which Viśvāmitra utters over his obedient sons. At the conclusion two verses, not in dialogue, which comprise the final result, portray a picture of the order and happiness which have grown out of all the suffering. What can there be so remarkable and suspicious in that?²

We saw (p. 36) that, as in the Buddhist literature, the interweaving of verses in the prose of the Jātakas proved to be only one instance of a more general feature. So we find correspondingly in the Vedic prose texts the same form of portrayal at least scattered here and there, also in smaller

¹ I revert below (p. 47, n. 1) to the part played by these R̥gvedic hymns.

² In the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa there is probably another isolated Ākhyāna verse (V, 30, 11) in the strophe of the Lotus thief, which is there introduced with the words *tad yad ado gūthā bhavati* (in the text of the strophe clearly to be read *apa yo jahūra*; also *ruṇaddhu*? But cp. Jāt. 488, verse 2, *bhavanti*. The corruption might depend upon § 12). Cp. Hopkins' *Great Epic*, 381 n. 3; Geldner, *ZDMG*. LXV, 306 f. See also Charpentier, *ibid.*, LXIV, 65 ff.

dependent narratives.¹ I select a few instances only. In the Brāhmaṇa narrative, which for the rest is in prose, where Indra comes to Manu in the form of a sacrificial priest, the brahmin answers the question as to who he is with a verse, *kim brāhmaṇasya pitaram*, etc. (*Maitr. S.*, p. IV, 8, 1, cp. *Kāth.* XXX, 1; so also, with the Buddhists, a *gāthā* of the *Sundarikabhāradvājasutta*, *Sutta - Nipāta* 462). In the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa XI, 5, 5, there is introduced into a peculiar narrative—the commentator characterizes it as *ākhyāyikā*—a fight between gods and Asuras, connected with a sacrifice completed at Janamejaya. In the middle of the prose are verses, in which the gods speak to Prajāpati, Prajāpati to the gods, and the Dānavas confess their defeat.² As conclusion: *ity asurarakṣasāny apeyuh*, as it is usually called with the Buddhists, when Māra and Buddha have interchanged verses: *atha kho Māro pāpimā tatthevantaradhāyīti*. The Chāndogya Upaniṣad IV, 3, narrates in prose how a brahmacārin begs from two brahmins. They give him nothing. Then he speaks—first a verse of mystical contents, containing the names of both in the vocative, and then the complaint, in prose, that nothing has been given to him. Whereupon one of the two considers, and for his part replies in like mystical verse. Finally prose: the beggar is given something to eat. *Ibid.* V, 11, prose statement: some men seek a teacher in order to gain theosophic instruction. They are directed to King Aśvapati. The latter speaks contentedly of the virtue prevalent in his kingdom. The *śloka* follows: *Na me steno janapade na kadaryo na madyapo, nānāhitāgnir nāvidvān na svairī svairiṇī kutaḥ*. Thus here also, in a prominent place of the story, is a verse in the middle of the prose. The Kāthopaniṣad may be mentioned here as a yet more significant piece, which begins with prose,

¹ I mentioned above (p. 41, n. 1) that such short narratives woven into the Brāhmaṇas are, as a rule, in pure prose.

² In par. 13, Eggeling wrongly avoids the translation, "We Dānavas do not understand," etc., by which the Dānavas are shown to be the speakers.

then gives the reflection of Naciketas in verse, then again prose, and then the discussion of Naciketas and Yama in verse. Keith, indeed (985 *n.* 1), thinks that this is in some measure similar to the Ākhyāna type. He remarks, however, that the source of the Upaniṣad TB, III, 11, 8, is only in prose; that the Upaniṣad proves nothing as to the earlier Vedic age. Anyway, the obviously pre-Buddhist text will be welcomed as a warrant for the prose-poetic form standing midway between the old Vedic and the Buddhist age.

Hence, when all is said, it is in no way possible to affirm such a severance of Buddhism from the Vedic period as would debar our bringing evidence from the one to serve for the other. Matter handed down in very different fields is linked together in the evidence it affords of the mixed prose and verse type. If particular instances seemed to resist the attempt to explain them away, one matter gave confirmation to the conception afforded of another. Accordingly my theory of that type will also appear plausible from the outset for the older Vedic time. However, I do not intend here to begin again to discuss Vedic material itself to see whether in it my theory does not find confirmation. I will pause at the threshold of the Ṛgveda. I would only like, in conclusion, to touch upon just one objection which Keith makes (p. 987 f.) against my ideas about the prose and verse Ākhyāna. He finds it hard to follow my assumption, indispensable in so many instances, of the loss of the prose portions, in view of the remarkable preservation of Vedic prose-texts like the Brāhmaṇas.¹

¹ I purposely mention here only the Brāhmaṇas, not the prose *mantras* of the Yajurveda. For the latter, permeated through and through with ritualistic sanctity, had naturally from the outset a chance of preservation, which lifts them above comparability with the prose of stories, and, in my opinion, with that of the Brāhmaṇas as well. Where Keith (p. 988) seems to regard as the ultimate basis of the Yajurvedic literature texts, in which those *mantras* were inseparably bound up with a prose explaining both them and the rites I cannot agree. I refer to my investigations in *Hymnen des Ṛgveda*, Prolegomena, 1888, 290 ff, especially 294 ff.

Keith himself feels that the objection loses its force as soon as facts are produced, in which that which was hard to comprehend yet comes to pass. I have endeavoured to indicate such facts in the foregoing. But I should like to remove that incomprehensible also, so far as it can be removed. I cannot of course be expected to prove that no other course was conceivable but the one which took place—that preservation of the prose was out of the question; just as the investigator of the R̥gveda will not expect to be able to prove, that joining the songs to Pavamāna into *one* maṇḍala was the only conceivable alternative to the distribution of the songs to the other gods into all the maṇḍalas.

Now in trying to explain the prevalent loss of the prose in view of the preservation of the verses, I do not of course depend upon the argument that verse is easier to remember. I might fairly be confronted by the Brāhmaṇa prose-texts and the great Buddhist prose sūtras. But is it, then, improbable that the prose of the Ākhyānas appeared essential only according to the sense, and not according to the letter? The description in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa of the recital of the Śaunaḥsepam is instructive. Opposite to the officiating priest sits another on an equally sumptuous seat. The latter's whole task consists in responding to every R̥c which occurs in the discourse with an *om*, to every non-R̥gvedic verse with a *tathā*. Are not these verses in consequence lifted above the prose context of the narrative as of greater significance, like the *ṛcaḥ*, only of course in a less degree? ¹

¹ It is at the same time noticeable, that the appearance of this priest with his responses of *tathā* characterizes the verses not as purely accidental flotsam, but as being essentially blended with this mode of narrative. Another Ākhyāna, which is expressly named as such, in which Hotar and Adhvaryu also take sumptuous seats, and the Adhvaryu responds with *om* and *tathā*, is the *pūriplavam* (Śat. Br. XIII, 4, 3; Āśv. Śraut. X, 7; Śāṅkh. Śr. XVI, 2); the *om* and *tathā* recall a certain similarity (how far-reaching may be questioned) with the structure of the Śaunaḥsepam. We may recall the narrative addresses described by Śāṅkhāyana Śr. XVI, 11, at the head of which the Śaunaḥsepam stands, which may thus be regarded as being more or less similar

Whether we agree with this estimate or not, it appears to be a fact. Hence it becomes, I think, intelligible—and to this conclusion the situation in the Jātakas points in the same way exactly—that the reciting of the narrative was only (and this is self-evident) tied to the letter, as to the verses, but in the prose part was bound only by the contents.¹

The countenance conferred hereby on verses in the tradition would be yet intensified, if Ākhyānas were found, already in early times, deserving a place in the orthodox tradition of Vedic lore. The natural place for them was in the Ṛgveda. But here, where everything that was to be learnt was arranged in verse form, the adoption of a mixed prose-and-verse text would have been as ill-suited to the context as the adoption of pure verses was well suited, not to speak of the advantage to be obtained by diminishing the already more than sufficient matter to be learned. When, then, the age of the Brāhmaṇa prose came, its theological contents might seem to the priestly circles, anyway, more urgently to need the exact preservation of a literal text, fixed once for all, than the stories of battles, intrigues, love adventures, and fables.

Let it be remembered how—at least in a number of schools—accentuation of itself raised the reciting of Brāhmaṇa prose into the sphere of a certain ritualistic sanctity.

in kind to this. As an integral part of each one of these addresses a Ṛgveda section is introduced. The constant recurrence of these Ṛg.-references suggests that such an element was considered to be essential for the type of that kind of narrative. The whole type may thus be considered as essentially the same, whether secular *gāthās* figured in purely secular narratives, or Ṛg.-verses in the ritualistic use by the Hotar, side by side with those *gāthās* or alone; only that the latter were at hand, and therefore taken over—a matter that cannot be concluded with respect to the former.

¹ That when anywhere in some longer prose text the recital of a story is told or described (Śaunaḥśepam in Ait. Br.; Jātakas in the Vinaya, etc.) reproduction of the prose was involved, is, of course, a matter which stands by itself.

That the lower estimation of the prose portions of the narratives does not harmonize with the demands of the highest literary delicacy of feeling is certainly true. And so this state of things also was surmounted, when in that respect progress had been made. But that it once existed we have—apart from the fact that positive clues point to it—obviously no reason *a priori* to find at all improbable.

II

YAMAKAPPAKARAṆATTHAKATHĀ

FROM THE

PAÑCAPPAKARAṆATTHAKATHĀ.

Edited by C. A. F. Rhys Davids.

FOREWORD.

THIS, the first European edition of the Commentary on the Yamaka, ascribed to Buddhaghosa, has been edited by way of a transcript made by my sister, M. C. Foley, from a Singhalese palmleaf MS. procured by Mr. E. P. Gooneratne several years ago for the Pali Text Society, and collated by myself with the excellent Burmese edition published by Mr. Saya U. Pye, through the Pyi Gyi Mandyne Press, Rangoon. The slight and superficial character of the mutually discrepant readings seemed to justify me in not waiting to consult other Singhalese MSS. in the effort to parallel, on the Singhalese side, Mr. Pye's comparative study among Burmese MSS. The Yamaka, the remaining volume of which will shortly appear, is, to the modern reader, for all its symmetry of structure, a baffling and forbidding composition. For this reason it seemed a seasonable matter to present at the same time such an elucidation of its contents as had commended itself to Theravāda scholars in early mediæval times, and has, by their direct successors, ever since been used as a guide.—ED.

Namo tassa Bhagavato arahato sammāsambuddhassa.

Sankhepen' eva devānaṃ deva-devo surālaye
Kathāvatthuppakaraṇaṃ desayitvā raṇaṇjaho
Yamassa visayātīto nānāyamakamaṇḍitaṃ
Abhidhammappakaraṇaṃ chaṭṭhaṃ chaṭṭhānadesito ¹
Yamakaṃ ayam āvatta-nīlāmalatanūruho.
Yaṃ desayī anuppatto tassa saṃvaṇṇanākkhamo ²
Idāni yasmā tasmāssa hoti saṃvaṇṇanā ayan ti.

Mūla-Yamakaṃ, Khandha-Yamakaṃ, Āyatana-Yamakaṃ,
Dhātu-Yamakaṃ, Sacca-Yamakaṃ, Sankhāra-Yamakaṃ,
Anusaya-Yamakaṃ, Citta-Yamakaṃ, Dhamma-Yamakaṃ,
Indriya-Yamakaṃ ti imesaṃ dasannaṃ Yamakānaṃ vasena
idaṃ pakaraṇaṃ dasavidhena vibhattaṃ ti hi vuttaṃ.

Tattha yesaṃ dasannaṃ Yamakānaṃ vasena idaṃ pakar-
aṇaṃ dasavidhena vibhattaṃ, tesaṃ ³ ceva imassa ca pakar-
aṇassa nāma' attho tāva evaṃ veditabbo.

Ken'aṭṭhena Yamakaṃ ti? Yugalaṭṭhena yugalaṃ hi
yamakaṃ ti vuccati; yamaka-pāṭihāriyaṃ, yamaka-sālā ti
ādīsu viya. Iti yugala-sankhātānaṃ ⁴ yamakānaṃ vasena
desitattā imesu dasasu ekekaṃ yamakaṃ nāma. Imesaṃ
pana yamakānaṃ samūhabhāvato sabbam eva taṃ ⁵ pakar-
aṇaṃ Yamakaṃ ti veditabbaṃ. ⁶

[*Mūla-Yamakaṃ.*]

Tattha mūlavasena pucchāvissajjanaṃ katvā desitattā
dasannaṃ tāva sabbapaṭṭhamaṃ Mūla-Yamakaṃ ti vuttaṃ.
Tassa uddesavāro niddesavāro ti dve vārā honti. Tesu
uddiṭṭhānukkamena niddisitabbattā uddesavāro paṭṭhamaṃ.
Tassa *ye keci kusalā dhammā sabbe te kusalamūlā; ye vā
pana kusalamūlā sabbe te dhammā kusalā* ti idaṃ yamakaṃ

¹ Br. °desako.
Br yugala°.

² S. °akkamo.
⁵ Br. p'etaṃ.

³ Br. tesaṃ.
⁶ S. °tabban ti.

ādi. Tassa kusala - kusalamūlasankhātānaṃ¹ dvinnāṃ atthānaṃ vasena *attha-yamakan* ti vā tesaṃ² yeva atthānaṃ vasena anuloma - paṭilomato pavattapāḷidhammavasena *dhamma-yamakan* ti vā, anuloma-paṭilomato pavattapucchāvasena *pucchā-yamakan* ti vā tidhāyamakabhāvo veditabbo. Sesesu pi es'eva nayo.

Idāni imesaṃ yamakānaṃ vasena desite imasmiṃ Mūla-Yamake uddesavārassa tāva naya-yamaka-pucchā-atthavārappabhedavasena pāli-vavatthānam eva veditabbaṃ.

Kusalattikamātikāya hi kusalā dhammā ti idaṃ ādipadaṃ nissāya *mūlanayo*, *mūla-mūlanayo*, *mūlakanayo*, *mūla-mūlakanayo* ti ime cattāro nayā honti. Tesaṃ ekekasmiṃ naye *mūlayamakaṃ ekamūlayamakaṃ aññamañña-mūlayamakan* ti tīṇi tīṇi yamakāni. Evaṃ catusu navesu dvādasa yamakāni. Ekekasmiṃ yamake anuloma-paṭilomavasena dve dve *pucchā* ti catuvīsati pucchā. Ekekāya pucchāya sannitṭhāna-saṃsaya-vasena dve dve *atthā* ti atṭha-cattārīsaṃ³ atthā.

Tattha *ye keci kusalā dhammā* ti kusalesu kusalā nu kho, na kusalā nu kho ti sandehābhāvato imasmiṃ pade *sannitṭhānattho* veditabbo.

Sabbe te kusalamūlā ti sabbe te kusalā dhammā kusalamūlā nu kho, na nu kho ti evaṃ vimativasena pucchitatthā imasmiṃ pade *saṃsayattho* veditabbo. So ca kho veneyyānaṃ saṃsayatṭhāne saṃsaya-dīpanatthaṃ vutto. Tathāgatassa pana saṃsayo nāma natthi. Ito paresu pi pucchāpadesu es'eva nayo.

Yathā ca kusalapadaṃ nissāya ime cattāro nayā; ekekasmiṃ naye tiṇṇaṃ tiṇṇaṃ yamakānaṃ vasena dvādasa yamakāni, ekekasmiṃ yamake dvinnāṃ dvinnāṃ pucchānaṃ vasena catuvīsati pucchā; ekekāya pucchāya dvinnāṃ dvinnāṃ atthānaṃ vasena atṭhacattārīsaṃ³ atthā va⁴ honti. Akusalapadaṃ nissāya pi tath'eva; avyākatapadaṃ nissāya pi tath'eva; tīṇi pi padāni ekato katvā niddiṭṭhaṃ; nāmapadaṃ nissāya pi tath'evāti, kusalattikamātikāya catūsu padesu sabbe pi solasa nayā atṭhacattārīsa⁵ yamakāni,

¹ S. Tassa kusalañ ca sankhātānaṃ.

² Br. tesaññeva.

³ Br. cattalīsaṃ.

⁴ Br. omits.

⁵ Br. cattalīsa.

channavuti pucchā, dve navuti satan atthā ca uddesa-vasena vuttā ti veditabbā.

Ettāvatā mūlavāro nāma paṭhaman¹ uddiṭṭho² hoti. Tato paraṇ ye keci kusalā dhammā sabbe te kusalahetū ti ādayo tass'eva mūlavārassa vevacanavasena nava vārā uddiṭṭhā. Iti mūlavāro, hetuvāro, nidānavāro, sambhava-vāro, pabhavavāro, samuṭṭhānavāro, āhāravāro, ārammaṇa-vāro, paccayavāro, samudayavāro ti sabbe pi dasa vārā honti.

Tattha mūlavāre āgatapariccheden'eva sesesu pi nayā-dayo veditabbā ti sabbesu pi dasavāresu saṭṭhi-sata nāyā asīti adhikāni cattāri yamaka-satāni saṭṭhi adhikāni navapucchā-satāni vīsādhikāni ekūnavīsati atthasatāni ca uddiṭṭhānīti veditabbāni. Evaṇ tāva uddesavāre naya-yamaka - pucchā - atthavārappabhedavasena Pāli - vavat-thānam eva veditabbāṇ. Mūlaṇ hetu nidānaṇ cāti gāthā dasannam pi vārānaṇ udāna-gāthā nāma.

Tattha mūlādīni sabbāni pi kāraṇavevacanān'eva. Kāraṇaṇ³ hi patitṭhānaṭṭhena mūlaṇ; attano phalanip-phādanatthaṇ⁴ hinoti pavattatīti hetu; handa naṇ gaṇ-hathāti dassentaṇ viya attano phalaṇ nidetīti nidānaṇ; etasmā phalaṇ sambhavatīti⁵ sambhavo; pabhavatīti pabhavo; samuṭṭhāti ettha phalaṇ, etena vā samuṭṭhātīti samuṭṭhānaṇ; attano phalaṇ āharatīti ahāro; appaṭikkhi-pitabb'atṭhena attano phalena ālambiyatīti ārammaṇaṇ; etaṇ paṭicca appaṭikkhipitvā phalaṇ eti pavattatīti paccayo; etasmā phalaṇ samudetīti samudayo ti evam eva etesaṇ padānaṇ vacanattho veditabbo.

Uddesavāravaṇṇanā niṭṭhitā.

Idāni ye keci kusalā dhammā⁶ ti adinā nayena niddesa-vāro āraddho. Tattha ye kecīti anavasesavacanaṇ. Kusalā dhammā ti kusalattikassa padabhājane vuttalakkaṇā ana-

¹ S. omits.

² S. uddiṭṭhabbo.

³ Br. Kāraṇaṇ.

⁴ S. °nippā°.

⁵ B. sambhotīti.

⁶ Y. p. 3 (vol. i. for all references till end of Cy. on Anusaya-Yama'ka).

vajjasukhavipākā kusalasabhāvā. *Sabbe te kusalamūlā* ti kinte sabbe yeva kusalamūlā ti pucchati.

Tīn' eva kusalamūlānīti na te¹ sabbe kusalamūlā.² Alobhādīni pana tīni eva kusalamūlānīti attho. *Avasesā kusalā dhammā na kusalamūlā* ti avasesā phassādayo kusalā dhammā kusalamūlāni nāma na honti. Athavā avasesā phassādayo kusalā dhammā yeva nāma, na kusalamūlānīti pi attho. *Ye vā pana kusalamūlā* ti ye vā pana paṭhamapucchāyadutiyapadena kusalamūlā ti tayo alobhādayo gahitā, *sabbe te dhammā kusalā* ti, kinte sabbe tayo pi dhammā kusalā ti pucchati. *Āmantā* ti sabbesam pi kusalamūlānaṃ kusalabhāvaṃ sampaticchanto āha. Ayaṃ tāva mūlanaye Mūlā-Yamakassa attho.

Iminā upāyena sabbapucchāsu vissajjananayo veditabbo. Yaṃ pana yattha visesamattaṃ, tad eva vaṇṇayissāma.

Ekamūla-yamake tāva *sabbe te kusalamūlena ekamūlā* ti gaṇanaṭṭhena ekamūlataṃ agahetvā³ samānaṭṭhena gahe-tabbā. Ayaṃ h' ettha⁴ attho: sabbe te kusalamūlena samānamūlā, yaṃ phassassa mūlaṃ, tad eva vedanādīnaṃ ti. Atha nesaṃ tathābhāvaṃ sampaticchanto *āmantā* ti āha.

*Kusalamūla - samuṭṭhānaṃ*⁵ ti kusalacittasamuṭṭhānaṃ rūpaṃ⁶ dassitaṃ. *Ekamūlan* ti alobhādīnā kusalamūlena samānamūlaṃ. Yath' eva hi phassādīnaṃ alobhādayo hetupaccayattā mūlaṃ, tathā taṃ-samuṭṭhānarūpassāpi; kusala-lakkhaṇābhāvena pana, taṃ na kusalaṃ.

Aññamañña-yamake ye keci kusalā ti apucchitvā, *ye keci kusalamūlena ekamūlā* ti pucchā kato. Kasmā? Iminā pi vyañjanena tass' ev' atthassa sambhavato, kusalamūlāni ti idaṃ purimassa visesanaṃ.

Mūlāni yāni ekato uppajjantīti hi vuttaṃ. Tāni pana kusalamūlāni pi honti, akusala-avyākatamūlāni pi; idha *kusalamūlānīti* visesadassanattham idan vuttaṃ. *Aññamaññamūlāni cāti aññamaññaṃ hetupaccayena paccayā hontīti*⁷ attho. Tass'eva paṭilomapucchāya sabbe te

¹ S. omits.

² Br. °mūlāni.

³ Br. aggahetvā.

⁴ Br. Ayaṃ c' ettha.

⁵ Y. 4.

⁶ Br. °ṭhānarūpaṃ.

⁷ Cf. *Paṭṭhāna*. *Aññamaññapaccayo is the seventh of the twenty-four relations among phenomena.*

dhammā kusalamūlena ekamūlā ti avatvā *sabbe te dhammā kusalā* ti vuttaṇ. Kasmā? Atthavisesābhāvato. *Kusalamūlena ekamūlā* ti hi pucchāya katāya mūlāni yāni ekato uppajjantīti hetthā vuttanayen' eva mūlavissajjanaṇ kātābaṇ bhaveyya, evañ ca sati atthavisesābhāvo hoti; tasmā tathā akatvā evaṇ pucchā katā. Iminā upāyena mūla-mūlanayādīsu pi aññamaññamūla-yamake pucchā viseso veditabbo.

Mūla-mūlanaye *sabbe te kusalamūlamūlā* ti¹ *sabbe te kusalamūlamūlasankhātā*² mūlā ti pucchati. *Ekamūlamūlā* ti samānaṭṭhena ekam eva mūla-mūlaṇ etesan ti ekamūla-mūlā. *Aññamañña-mūla-mūlā* ti aññamaññaassa mūlaṇ aññamaññamūlaṇ. Aññamaññamūlaṇ hetupaccayaṭṭhena mūlaṇ etesan ti aññamañña-mūlamūlā.

Mūlakanaye *kusalamūlakā* ti hetupaccayaṭṭhena kusalaṇ mūlaṇ etesan ti kusalamūlakā.

Mūlamūlakanaye *kusala-mūlamūlakā* ti kusalānaṇ mūlaṇ kusalamūlaṇ. Hetupaccayaṭṭhen' eva kusalamūlaṇ mūlaṇ etesan ti kusalamūlamūlakā ti ayaṇ tāva kusalapadaṇ nissāya naya-yamaka-pucchāsu visesattho.

Akusala-padādīsu pi es' eva nayo. Ayaṇ pana viseseso : *ahetukaṇ akusalan* ti vicikicchāya ceva uddhaccena ca sampayuttaṇ mohaṇ sandhāya vuttan; *ahetukaṇ avyākatan* ti atṭhārassa cittuppādā arūpaṇ nibbānañ ca. Avyākata-mūlena *ekamūlaṇ*³ ti idha pana ṭhapetvā sahetuka-avyākatasamuṭṭhānaṇ rūpaṇ sesaṇ labbhati. Sahetuka-avyākata-samuṭṭhānaṇ rūpaṇ avyākatamūlena ekamūlaṇ hoti. Taṇ abbhohārikaṇ⁴ katvā ekato labbhamānakavasen' eva c'etaṇ vissajjanaṇ kataṇ.

Nāmā dhammā ti nāmasankhātā dhammā. Te atthato cattāro arūpino khandhā nibbānañ ca. Nav'eva nāma-mūlānīti kusalākusala-avyākatamūlavasena nava mūlāni. Ahetukaṇ nāmaṇ *nāmamūlena na ekamūlan* ti ahetukaṇ sabbam pi atṭhārassa cittuppādavicikicchā-uddhacca⁵ sampayutta-moha-nibbānasankhātaṇ nāmaṇ nāmamūlena na

¹ Br. kusalamūlā ti.

² Br. kusalamūlasan°.

³ Y. 8 (2).

⁴ Br. abbo°.

⁵ Br. vicikicchuddh°.

ekamūlaṃ. Na hi taṃ tena saddhiṃ uppajjati. *Sahetukaṃ nāmamūlenāti* pade pi sahetukaṃ nāmaṃ nāmamūlenāti attho. Sesam sabbattha uttānattham evāti.

Mūlavāra-vaṇṇanā niṭṭhitā.

Hetuvārādīsu¹ pi iminā va upāyena² attho veditabbo. *Mūlaṃ hetu nidānaṃ cāti* gāthā yathā niddiṭṭhānaṃ dasan-
nam pi vārānaṃ puna udānavasen' eva³ vuttā ti.

Mūla-Yamaka-vaṇṇanā niṭṭhitā.

II

[*Khandha-Yamakaṃ.*]

Idāni Mūla - Yamake desite yeva kusalādi dhamme khandhavasena sangahitvā Mūla-Yamakānantaraṃ desi-
tassa Khandha-Yamakassa vaṇṇanā hoti.

Tattha Pālivavatthānaṃ tāva evaṃ veditabbaṃ. Imasmiṃ hi Khandha-Yamake tayo mahāvārā honti : paṇṇattivāro, pavattivāro, pariññāvāro ti. Tesu paṇṇattivāro khandhānaṃ nāmābhidhāna-sodhana-vasen' eva gatattā paṇṇattivāro ti vuccati. Pavattivāro tena sodhitanāmābhidhānaṃ khandhānaṃ uppāda-nirodha-vasena pavattiṃ sodhayamāno gato, tasmā pavattivāro ti vuccati. Pariññāvāro iminā-nukkamena pavattānaṃ khandhānaṃ sankhepen' eva tisso pariññā dīpayamāno gato ; tasmā pariññāvāro ti vuccati.

Tattha paṇṇattivāro uddesaniddesa-vasena dvihākārehi vavatthito.⁴ Itaresu visuṃ uddesavāro natthi ; ādito paṭ-
thāya pucchāvissajjanavasena ekadhā vavatthitā.

Tattha *pañcakkhandhāti* padaṃ ādiṃ katvā, yāva na *khandhā na sankhārā* ti padaṃ tāva paṇṇattivārassa uddesavāro veditabbo. *Pucchāvāro* ti pi tass' eva nāmaṃ. Tattha *pañcakkhandhā* ti ayaṃ yamakavasena pucchitab-
bānaṃ khandhānaṃ uddeso.⁵

*Rūpakkhando . . . pe . . . viññāṇakkhando*⁶ ti tesam yeva pabhedato nāmavavatthānaṃ. Idāni imesaṃ khand-

¹ Y. 13.

² Br. vupāy².

³ S. uddān^o.

⁴ Br. pavattito.

⁵ S. uddesavāro.

⁶ Y. 14.

dhānaṃ vasena (1) padasodhanavāro khandhānaṃ vasena, (1) padasodhanavāro, (2) padasodhanamūlacakkavāro, (3) suddhakkhandhavāro, (4) suddhakkhandhamūlacakkavāro ti cattāro nayavārā honti. Tattha rūpaṃ rūpakkhando, rūpan¹ ti ādinā nayena padam eva sodhetvā gato padasodhanavāro nāma. So anuloma-paṭilomavasena duvidho hoti. Tassa anulomavāre rūpaṃ rūpakkhando . . . rūpan ti ādini pañca yamakāni. Paṭilomavāre pi na rūpaṃ na rūpakkhando, na rūpakkhando na rūpaṃ ti ādini pañc' eva.

Tato paraṃ tesāṃ yeva padasodhanavāro sodhitānaṃ khandhānaṃ rūpaṃ rūpakkhando khandhā vedanākkhando ti ādinā nayena ekekakhandhamūlakāni cattāri cattāri cakkāni bandhitvā gato padasodhanamūlakānaṃ cakkānaṃ atthi tāya padasodhanamūlacakkavāro nāma. So pi anuloma-paṭilomavasena duvidho hoti. Tassa anulomavāre rūpaṃ rūpakkhando, khandhā vedanākkhando ti ādini ekeka khandhamūlakāni cattāri cattāri katvā vīsati yamakāni. Paṭilomavāre pi, na rūpaṃ na rūpakkhando, na khandhā na vedanākkhando ti ādini vīsati eva.

Tato paraṃ rūpaṃ khandho, khandhā rūpaṃ² ti ādinā nayena suddhakkhandhavasena' eva gato suddhakkhandhavāro nāma. Tattha khandhā rūpan ti ādisu khandhā rūpakkhando, khandhā vedanākkhando attho gahetabbo, Kasmā? Niddesavāre evaṃ bhājitattā. Tattha hi rūpaṃ khandho ti? Āmantā. Khandhā rūpakkhando ti? Rūpakkhando khandho ceva rūpakkhando ca; avasesā, khandhā, na rūpakkhando³ ti evaṃ khandhā rūpan ti ādinaṃ khandhā rūpakkhando ti ādinā nayena padaṃ uddharitvā attho vibhatto.⁴

Ten' eva ca kāraṇen' esa suddhakkhandhavāro ti vutto. Vacanasodhane viya hi ettha na vacanaṃ pamāṇaṃ. Yathā yathā pana suddhakkhandhā labbhanti, tathā tathā attho va pamāṇaṃ. Parato Āyatana-Yamakadīsu pi es' eva nayo.

Eso pi ca suddhakkhandhavāro anuloma-paṭilomavasena

¹ Y. 14.² Y. 15.³ Y. 18 (5).⁴ Y. cf. 15, n. 2.

duvidho hoti. Tassa anulomavāre *rupaṇ khandho, khandhā rūpan*¹ ti ādīni pañca yamakāni; paṭilomavāre pi *na rūpaṇ na khandho, na khandhā na rūpan* ti ādīni pañc' eva.

Tato paraṇ tesāṇ yeva suddhakhandhānaṇ *rūpaṇ khandho, khandhā vedanā*² ti ādinā nayena ekekakhandhamūlakāni cattāri cattāri cakkāni bandhitvā gato suddhakhandhamūlakānaṇ cakkānaṇ atthitāya *suddhakhandhamūlacakkavāro nāma*. Tattha *khandhā vedanā* ti ādisu *khandhā vedanākkhandho* ti ādinā nayena attho veditabbo.

Itarathā niddesavārena saddhiṇ virodho hoti. So pi anuloma-paṭilomavasena duvidho hoti. Tassa anulomavāre *rūpaṇ khandho, khandhā, vedanā* ti ādīni ekeka khandhamūlakāni cattāri cattāri katvā vīsati yamakāni; paṭilomavāre pi *na rūpaṇ na khandho, na khandhā na vedanā* ti ādīni vīsati eva. Evaṇ tāva ekena yamakasatena dvīhi pucchāsatehi ekeka-pucchāya sannitṭhāna-saṇsayavasena dve dve atthe katvā catūhi ca atthasatehi patimaṇḍito paṇṇattivārassa uddesavāro veditabbo ti.

Uddesavāravaṇṇanā niṭṭhitā.

Idāni *rūpaṇ rūpakkhando*³ ti ādinā nayena niddesavāro āraddho. Tattha *rūpaṇ rūpakkhando* ti yaṇ kiñci rūpan ti vuccati, sabban taṇ rūpakkhando ti vacanasodhanatthaṇ pucchati. *Piyarūpaṇ satarūpaṇ na rūpakkhando* ti yaṇ piyarūpaṇ satarūpan ti ettha rūpan ti vuttaṇ; taṇ rūpam eva, na rūpakkhando ti attho.

Rūpakkhando rūpaṇ ceva rūpakkhando cāti yo pana rūpakkhando so rūpan ti pi rūpakkhando ti pi vattuṇ vaṭṭatīti attho. *Rūpakkhando rūpan* ti ettha pana yasmā *rupakkhando* niyamen' eva rūpan ti vattabbo, tasmā *āmantā* ti āha. Iminā upāyena sabbavissajjanesu attho veditabbo. Yo pana yattha viseso bhavissati, tatth' eva taṇ vaṇṇayissāma.

Saññāyamake tāva *diṭṭhisaññā* ti papañcasaññā ti ādisu āgatā *diṭṭhisaññā*. Sankhārayamake *arasesā sankhārā* ti aniccā vata *sankhārā* ti ādisu āgatā *sankhārakkhandhato*

¹ Y. 15 (5).

² *Ibid.* (6).

³ Y. 16 (1).

avasesā sankhatadhammā. Paṭilomavāre pi es' eva nayo ti.

Padasodhanavāro niṭṭhito.

Padasodhana-mūlacakkavāre *khandhā vedanākkhandho*¹ ti ye keci khandhā sabbe te vedanākkhandho ti pucchati. Sesapucchāsu pi es' eva nayo. Paṭilome *na khandhā na vedanākkhandho*² ti ettha ye paññatti-nibbānasankhātā dhammā khandhā na honti, te yasmā vedanākkhandho pi na honti, tasmā *āmantā* ti āha. Sesavissajjanesu pi es' eva nayo ti.

Padasodhanamūlacakkavāro niṭṭhito.

Suddhakhandhavāre *rūpaṇ khandho*³ ti yaṇ kiñci rūpan ti vuttaṇ sabban taṇ khandhā ti pucchati. Tattha yasmā piyarūpasātarūpasankhātāṇ vā rūpaṇ hotu bhūtopādā rūpaṇ vā, sabbaṇ pañcasu khandhesu sangahaṇ gacchat' eva, tasmā *āmantā* ti paṭijānāti.

Dutiye pade⁴ *khandhā rūpan* ti pucchitabbe, yasmā rūpan ti vacanena rūpakkhandho ca adhippeto, tasmā vacanaṇ anādiyitvā atthavasena pucchanto *khandhā rūpakkhandho* ti āha. Iminā nayena sabbapadesu attho veditabbo.

Parato Āyatana-Yamakādīnaṇ niddesavāre pi es' eva nayo.

Saññākkhandho ti etthāpi diṭṭhisaññā vā hotu saññā eva vā, sabbāya⁵ pi khandhabhāvato *āmantā* ti vuttaṇ.

*Sankhārā*⁶ *sankhārakkhandho* ti pade pi es' eva nayo. Khandhavinimuttako hi sankhāro nāma natthi.

Paṭilome *na rūpaṇ na khandho*⁷ ti yaṇ dhammajātaṇ rūpaṇ na hoti, taṇ khandho pi na hotīti pucchati; vissajjane pan' assa *rūpaṇ thapetrā avasesā khandha na rūpakkhandho* ti rūpato aññe vedanādayo khandhā, rūpam eva na honti, khandhā pana hontīti attho. *Rūpañ ca khandhe ca thapetrā avasesan* ti pañca-khandha-vinimuttaṇ nibbānañ

¹ Y. 17 (3 b).

² Y. 18 (4).

³ *Ibid.* 5.

⁴ Br. dutiyap^o.

⁵ *Sic* S. Br.

⁶ Br. *omits*.

⁷ Y. 18 (6).

ceva paññatti ca. Ito paresu pi avasesan ti padesu es' eva nayo.

Suddhakhandhavāro niṭṭhito.

Suddhakhandhamūlacakkavāre rūpakkhando¹ ti ādīnaṃ heṭṭhā vuttanayen' eva attho veditabbo ti. Suddhakhandhamūlacakkavāro niṭṭhito.

Paṇṇattivāraṇṇanā niṭṭhitā.

Idāni yassa rūpakkhando ti ādinā nayena pavattivāro āraddho. Kasmā pan' ettha uddesavāro na vutto ti? Heṭṭhā dassitanayattā paṇṇattivārasmiṃ hi uddesavāre nayo dassito. Tena pana nayena sakkā so idha avutto² pi vijānitun ti³ taṃ avatvā niddesavāro 'va āraddho. Imasmiṃ pana pavattivārasankhāte mahāvāre uppādavāro, nirodhavāro, uppādanirodhavāro ti tayo antaravārā honti. Tesu paṭhamo dhammānaṃ uppādalakkhaṇassa dīpitattā uppādavāro ti vuccati; dutiyo tesāṃ yeva nirodhalakkhaṇassa dīpitattā nirodhavāro ti; tatiyo ubhinnaṃ pi lakkhaṇānaṃ dīpitattā uppādanirodhavāro ti vuccati. Uppādavārena c' ettha dhammānaṃ uppajjanākāro va dīpito; nirodhavārena uppannaṃ nāma niccaṃ natthīti tesāṃ yeva aniccatā dīpitā; uppādanirodhavārena tadubhayaṃ.

Tattha uppādavāre tāva tiṇṇaṃ tiṇṇaṃ addhānaṃ vasena cha kālabhedā honti: paccuppanno, atīto, anāgato, paccuppannenatīto, paccuppannenānāgato, atītenānāgato ti. (1) Tesu⁴ yassa rūpakkhando uppajjati⁵ paccuppannābhidhānavasena, paccuppanno veditabbo. So paccuppannānaṃ dhammānaṃ paccakkhāto⁶ gahetabbā ativiya suviññeyyo ti paṭhamāṃ vutto. (2) Yassa rūpakkhando uppajjitthāti⁷ atītābhidhānavasena atīto veditabbo. So paccakkhāto⁸ anubhūtapubbānaṃ atītadhammānaṃ anumānena anāgatehi suviññeyyatarattā dutiyaṃ vutto. (3) Yassa rūpakkhando uppajjissati⁹ anāgatābhidhānavasena anāgato veditabbo. So paccakkhāto¹⁰ ca anubhūtapubbavasena ca gahitadhammānumānena anāgate pi evarūpā dhammā uppajjissantīti

¹ Y. 19 (7).

² Br. avitto.

³ Br. jānitun.

⁴ Y. 19, 1, i.

⁵ Br. paccakkhato.

⁶ Y. 21, 3, i.

⁷ Y. 22, 5, i.

gahetabbato tatiyaṃ vutto. (4) *Yassa rūpakkhando uppajjati tassa vedanākkhando uppajjitthāti*¹ paccuppanne saddhiṃ atītābhidhānavasena paccuppannenātīto veditabbo. So missakesu tīsu suviññeyyatarattā catutthaṃ vutto. (5) *Yassa rūpakkhando uppajjati tassa vedanākkhando uppajjissatīti*² paccuppannena saddhiṃ anāgatābhidhānavasena paccuppannenānāgato veditabbo. So paccakkhato³ gahetabbānaṃ atthitāya atthato⁴ suviññeyyataro ti pañcaṃ vutto. (6) *Yassa rūpakkhando uppajjittha tassa vedanākkhando uppajjissatīti*⁵ atītena saddhiṃ anāgatābhidhānavasena atītenānāgato veditabbo. So purimehi duviññeyyo ti chaṭṭhaṃ vutto.

Evam etesu chasu kālabhedeṣu yvāyaṃ paṭhamo paccuppanno.

Tattha (1) puggalato (2) okāsato (3) puggalokāsato ti tayo vārā honti. Tesu *yassāti* puggalavasena khandhānaṃ uppatti dīpano puggalavāro, *yatthāti* okāsavasena khandhānaṃ uppatti dīpano okāsavāro, *yassa yatthāti* puggalokāsavasena khandhānaṃ uppatti dīpano puggalokāsavāro : ime pana tayo pi vārā paṭhamaṃ anulomanayena niddisitvā, pacchā paṭilomanayena niddiṭṭhā ; tesu uppajjati, uppajjittha, uppajjissatīti vacanato uppattidīpano anulomanayo, nuppajjati, nuppajjittha, nuppajjissatīti vacanato anuppattidīpano paṭilomanayo. Tattha paccuppannakāle⁶ tāva puggalavārassa anulomanaye *yassa rūpakkhando uppajjati tassa vedanākkhando uppajjati ; yassa va pana vedanākkhando uppajjati tassa rūpakkhando uppajjati ; yassa rūpakkhando uppajjati tassa saññākkhando, sankhārakkhando, viññāṇakkhando uppajjati. Yassa vā pana viññāṇakkhando uppajjati tassa rūpakkhando uppajjatīti*⁷ evaṃ rūpakkhando mūlakāni cattāri yamakāni. *Yassa vedanākkhando uppajjati, tassa saññākkhando uppajjatīti ādīnā* nayena vedanākkhandhamūlakāni tīni, saññākkhandhamūlakāni dve, sankhārakkhandhamūlakā ekaṃ ti agahitaḡḡaḡaḡena⁸ dasa yamakāni honti.

¹ Y. 23, 7, i.

² Y. 25, 9, i.

³ Br. paccakkhato.

⁴ S. atṭhato.

⁵ Y. 28, 11, i.

⁶ S. °kālena.

⁷ Y. 19 f.

⁸ So S. and Br. cf. 55, n. 3.

Tattha rūpakkhandhamūlakesu catūsu ādito ekam eva vissajjitaṇ. Sesāni tena sadisa-vissajjanānīti tantiyā lahu-bhāvatthaṇ sankhittāni.

Vedanākkhandhādi mūlakesu pi *āmantā* ti ekasadisam eva vissajjanaṇ, tasmā tāni pi tantiyā lahu-bhāvatthaṇ sankhittān' evāti evam etāni paccuppannakāle puggalavāre anulomanaye ekayamaka-vissajjanen'¹ eva dasa yamakāni vissajjitāni nāma hontīti veditabbāni.

Yathā puggalavāre dasa evaṇ okāsavāre dasa puggalokāsavāre dasāti paccuppannakāle tīsu vāresu anulomanaye tiṇsa yamakāni honti. Yathā ca anulomanaye, evaṇ paṭilomanaye pīti sabbāni pi paccuppannakāle saṭṭhi yamakāni honti. Tesāṇ vīsapucchā sataṇ cattārīsāni ca dve, attha satāni hontīti veditabbāni. Evaṇ sesesu pi pañcasu kālabhedesu puggalādi bhedato anuloma-paṭilomanayavasena cha cha vārā. Ekekasmiṇ vāre dasa dasa katvā saṭṭhi saṭṭhi yamakānīti tīni yamakasatāni; tāni purimehi saddhiṇ saṭṭhādhikāni tīni yamakasatāni vīsādhikāni satta pucchā satāni cattālīsāni ca cuddasa attha satāni honti. Idaṇ tāva uppādavāre pāli-vavatthānaṇ. Yathā ca uppādavāre, tathā nirodhavāre pi uppādanirodhavāre pīti sabbasmim pi pavatti-mahāvāre asīti yamakasahassaṇ saṭṭhi satādhikāni dve pucchā sahassāni, vīsaṇ tīni satādhikāni ca cattāri atthasahassāni veditabbāni.

Pāli pana uppādavāre nirodhavāre ca tīsu asammissakālabhedesu tasmiṇ tasmiṇ vāre ekekam eva yamaṇaṇ vissajjetvā sankhittā; tīsu missakakālabhedesu. *Yassa vedanākkhandho uppajjati, tassa saññākkhandho uppajjitthāti*¹ ādinā nayena vedanākkhandhādi mūlakesu pi ekaṇ yamaṇaṇ vissajjitaṇ, uppāda-nirodhavāre pana chasu pi kālabhedesu vissajjitam eva. Sesāni tena samānavissajjanattā sankhittānīti idaṇ sakale pi pavattimahāvāre pālivavatthānaṇ. Attha vinicchayatthaṇ pan' assa idaṇ lakkhaṇaṇ veditabbaṇ. Imasmiṇ hi pavatti-mahāvāre catunnaṇ pañhānaṇ² pañca vissajjanāni sattavīsatiyā ṭhānesu pakkhipitvā atthavinicchayo veditabbo.

¹ Y. 23, 7, i.

² S. *inserts* vasena.

Tattha (1) purepañho, (2) pacchāpañho, (3) paripuṇṇapañho, (4) moghapañho ti ime cattāro pañhā nāma. Ekekasmiṃ hi¹ yamake dve dve pucchā; ekekapucchāya pi dve dve padāni. (1) Tattha yāya pucchāya vissajjane ekeken'eva padena gahitakhandhassa uppādo vā nirodho vā labbhati, ayaṃ purepañho nāma. (2) Yāya pana pucchāya vissajjane dvīhi pi padehi gahitakhandhānaṃ uppādo vā nirodho vā labbhati, ayaṃ pacchāpañho nāma. (3) Yāya pana pucchāya vissajjane ekena pi padena gahitakhandhassa dvīhi pi padehi gahitakhandhānaṃ uppādo vā nirodho vā labbhati, ayaṃ paripuṇṇapañho nāma. (4) Yāya pana pucchāya vissajjane paṭikkhepo vā paṭisedho vā labbhati, ayaṃ moghapañho nāma.

Yasmā pan' esa adassiyamāno na sakkā jānituṃ, tasmā dassayissāma.

(1) *Yattha rūpakkhando nuppajjati tattha vedanākkhandho nuppajjatīti*² pucchāya, tāva *uppajjatīti* imasmiṃ vissajjane eken'eva padena gahitassa vedanākkhandhassa uppādo labbhati iti ayaṃ ceva añño ca evarūpo pañho pure-pañho ti veditabbo. *Yassa rūpakkhando uppajjittha, tassa vedanākkhandho uppajjitthāti*³ pucchāya pana *āmantā* ti imasmiṃ vissajjane [eken'eva padena gahitassa vedanākkhandhassa]⁴ dvīhi padehi gahitānaṃ rūpa-vedanākkhandhānaṃ, yassa kassaci sattassa atīte uppādo labbhati. Iti ayaṃ ceva añño ca evarūpo pañho pacchāpañho ti veditabbo. (3) *Yassa rūpakkhando uppajjati, tassa vedanākkhandho uppajjatīti*⁵ imāya pana paṭhamapucchāya *asaññasattaṃ uppajjantānaṃ* ti ādike imasmiṃ vissajjane *asaññasatte*⁶ *uppajjantānaṃ tesaṃ rūpakkhando uppajjati, no ca tesaṃ vedanākkhandho uppajjatīti* imasmiṃ koṭṭhāse eken'eva padena gahitassa rūpakkhandhassa pi uppādo labbhati. *Pañcarokāraṃ uppajjantānaṃ tesaṃ rūpakkhando ca uppajjati vedanākkhandho ca uppajjatīti* imasmiṃ koṭṭhāse dvīhi pi padehi sangahitānaṃ rūpa-vedanākkhandhānam pi uppādo labbhati: iti ayaṃ ceva añño ca eva rūpo pañho paripuṇṇapañho ti veditabbo.

¹ Ekekasmiṃ hi.

² Y. 20, 2. ii.

³ Y. 21 3, 1.

⁴ Br. omits.

⁵ Y. 19, 1, 1.

⁶ Br. °sattaṃ upapaj°.

(4) Purepacchāpañhe ti pi es' eva nayo.¹ Etassa hi vissajjane purimakotṭhāse ekena padena sangahitassa rūpak-khandhass' eva uppādo dassito ; dutiya-kotṭhāse dvīhi padehi sangahitānaṃ rūpa-vedanākkhandhānaṃ, iminā yeva ca lakkhaṇena yattha ekena padena sangahitassa khandhassa uppādo vā nirodho vā labbhati, so purepañho ti vutto. Yattha hi dvīhi pi padehi sangahitānaṃ khandhānaṃ uppādo vā nirodho vā labbhati, so pacchāpañho ti vutto.

*Yassa rūpak-khandho nuppajjittha, tassa vedanākkhandho nuppajjitthāti*² imāya pana pucchāya natthīti : imasmiṃ vissajjane paṭikkhepo labbhati.

*Yassa rūpak-khandho uppajjati, tassa vedanākkhandho nirujjhatīti*³ pucchāya no ti : imasmiṃ vissajjane paṭisedho labbhati, tasmā ayañ ceva duvidho añño ca evarūpo pañho moghapañho ti veditabbo. Tucchapañho ti pi vuccati.

Evaṃ tāva cattāro pañhā veditabbā.

Yaṃ⁴ (1) pāligatiyā vissajjanaṃ (2) paṭivacana-vissajjanaṃ (3) sarūpa-dassanena vissajjanaṃ (4) paṭikkhepena-vissajjanaṃ (5) paṭisedhena-vissajjanaṃ ti imāni pana pañca vissajjanāni nāma.

(1) Tattha yaṃ vissajjanaṃ pālipadam eva hutvā atthaṃ vissajjeti, idaṃ pāligatiyā vissajjanaṃ nāma. Taṃ⁵ pure pañhe labbhati. *Yattha rūpak-khandho nuppajjati, tattha vedanākkhandho nuppajjatīti*⁶ hi pañhe, *uppajjatīti* : idaṃ vissajjanaṃ pālipadam eva hutvā atthaṃ vissajjayamānaṃ gataṃ, tasmā evarūpesu ṭhānesu pāligatiyā vissajjanaṃ veditabbaṃ.

(2) Yaṃ pana vissajjanaṃ paṭivacanabhāvena atthaṃ vissajjeti, idaṃ paṭivacana-vissajjanaṃ nāma ; taṃ pacchāpañhe labbhati. *Yassa rūpak-khandho uppajjittha, tassa vedanākkhandho uppajjitthāti* hi pañhe *āmantā*⁷ ti idaṃ vissajjanaṃ paṭivacanavasena' eva atthaṃ vissajjayamānaṃ gataṃ, tasmā evarūpesu ṭhānesu paṭivacana-vissajjanaṃ veditabbaṃ.

¹ Br. etass' eva nāmaṃ.

² Y. 21, 4, i.

³ Y. 41, 1, i.

⁴ Br. omits.

⁵ S. Ete.

⁶ Y. 20, 2, ii.

⁷ Y. 21, 4, i.

(3) Yaṇṇaṃ viśajjanaṃ sarūpena dassetvā atthaṇṇaṃ viśajjeti, idaṇṇaṃ sarūpadassanena viśajjanaṃ nāma, taṇṇaṃ paripuñña-paṇṇhe labbhati. *Yassa rūpakkhando uppajjati, tassa vedanākkhando uppajjati*¹ hi paṇṇhehi *asaññasattaṇṇaṃ uppajjantānaṃ* ti: idaṇṇaṃ viśajjanaṃ imesaṇṇaṃ rūpakkhando uppajjati, no ca vedanākkhando, [imesaṇṇaṃ]² rūpakkhando ca uppajjati vedanākkhando cāti sarūpadassanena' eva atthaṇṇaṃ viśajjayamānaṇṇaṃ gataṇṇaṃ, tasmā evarūpesu tṇṇānesu sarūpadassanena viśajjanaṃ veditabbaṇṇaṃ.

(4) Yaṇṇaṃ pana viśajjanaṇṇaṃ, tathārūpassa atthassa abhāvato, attha-paṭikkhepena paṇṇaṇṇaṃ viśajjeti, idaṇṇaṃ paṭikkhepa-viśajjanaṇṇaṃ nāma. Yaṇṇaṃ tathārūpassa atthassa ekakkhāṇe abhāvato,³ attha-paṭisedhanena paṇṇaṇṇaṃ viśajjeti, idaṇṇaṃ paṭisedhanena viśajjanaṇṇaṃ nāma. Taṇṇaṃ mogha-paṇṇhe labbhati. *Yassa rūpakkhando nuppajjitttha, tassa vedanākkhando nuppajjittthāti* hi paṇṇhe, *natthāti* idaṇṇaṃ viśajjanaṇṇaṃ evarūpo nāma satto *natthāti* attha-paṭikkhepena paṇṇaṇṇaṃ viśajjayamānaṇṇaṃ gataṇṇaṃ; tasmā evarūpesu tṇṇānesu paṭikkhepena-viśajjanaṇṇaṃ⁴ veditabbaṇṇaṃ.

(5) *Yassa rūpakkhando uppajjati tassa vedanākkhando nirujjhatīti*⁵ paṇṇhe pana no ti idaṇṇaṃ viśajjanaṇṇaṃ ekasmiṇṇaṃ paṭisandhikkhāṇe uppādena saddhiṇṇaṃ nirodho nāma labbhatīti attha-paṭisedhanena paṇṇaṇṇaṃ viśajjamānaṇṇaṃ gataṇṇaṃ, tasmā evarūpesu tṇṇānesu paṭisedhanena - viśajjanaṇṇaṃ⁶ veditabbaṇṇaṃ.

Idāni ime cattāro paṇṇhā imāni ca paṇṇca viśajjanāni yesu satta viśatiyā tṇṇānesu pakkipitabbāni, tāni evaṇṇaṃ veditabbāni. *Asaññasattaṇṇaṃ uppajjantānaṇṇaṃ* ti⁷ ekaṇṇaṃ tṇṇānaṇṇaṃ (1); *asañṇe*⁸ *tatthāti*⁹ ekaṇṇaṃ (2); *asaññasattānaṇṇaṃ* ti¹⁰ ekaṇṇaṃ (3); *asañṇā cavantānaṇṇaṃ* ti¹¹ ekaṇṇaṃ (4); *arūpaṇṇaṃ uppajjantānaṇṇaṃ* ti¹² ekaṇṇaṃ (5); *arūpe tatthāti*¹³ ekaṇṇaṃ (6); *arūpānaṇṇaṃ* ti¹⁴ ekaṇṇaṃ (7); *arūpā cavantānaṇṇaṃ* ti¹⁵ ekaṇṇaṃ (8); *arūpe pacchimabhavikānaṇṇaṃ* ti¹⁶ ekaṇṇaṃ (9); *arūpe parinibbantānaṇṇaṃ* ti¹⁷ ekaṇṇaṃ (10); *ye vā*

¹ Y. 19, 1, i.² Br. omits.³ Br. arābhato.⁴ S. paṭikkhepa-°.⁵ Y. 41, 1, i.⁶ S. paṭisedha-°.⁷ Y. 19, 1, i.⁸ Br. asaññasatte.⁹ Y. 19, 1, ii.¹⁰ Y. 21, 2, iii.¹¹ Y. 31, 1, iii.¹² Y. 19, 1, i.¹³ Y. 19, 1, ii.¹⁴ Y. 21 3, iii.¹⁵ Y. 31, 1, i.¹⁶ Y. 23, 6, iii.¹⁷ Y. 22, 6, i.

*arūpaṇ uppajjivā parinibbāyissantīti*¹ *ekaṇ* (11); *pañcavokāraṇ uppajjantānaṇ ti*² *ekaṇ* (12); *pañcavokāre tatthāti*³ *ekaṇ* (13); *pañcavokārānaṇ ti*⁴ *ekaṇ* (14); *pañcavokārācavantānaṇ ti*⁵ *ekaṇ* (15); *pañcavokāre pacchimabhavikānaṇ ti*⁶ *ekaṇ* (16); *pañcavokāre parinibbantānaṇ ti* *ekaṇ* (17); *suddhāvāsaṇ uppajjantānaṇ ti* *ekaṇ* (18); *suddhāvāse tatthāti* *ekaṇ* (19); *suddhāvāsānaṇ ti* *ekaṇ* (20); *suddhāvāse parinibbantānaṇ ti* *ekaṇ* (21); *sabbesaṇ uppajjantānaṇ ti* *ekaṇ* (22); *sabbesaṇ cavantānaṇ ti* *ekaṇ* (23); *sabbasādhāraṇa-vasena pacchimabhavikānaṇ ti* *ekaṇ* (24); *parinibbāyantānaṇ ti* *ekaṇ* (25); *caturvokāraṇ pañcavokāraṇ uppajjantānaṇ ti* *ekaṇ* (26); *cavantānaṇ ti* *ekaṇ* (27); *evaṇ imesaṇ catunnaṇ pañhānaṇ imāni pañca vissajjanāni imesu satta-vīsatiyā thānesu pakkhipitvā, imasmiṇ pavattimāhāvāre attha-vinicchayo veditabbo.*

Evaṇ veditvā hi⁷ pañhaṇ vissajjantena suvissajjito hoti, atthañ ca vinicchayantena suvinicchito hoti. Tatrāyaṇ⁸ nayo. *Yassa rūpakkhando uppajjatīti yassa puggalassa uppādakkhana-samangitāya rūpakkhando uppajjati, tassa vedanākkhando uppajjatīti vedanākkhando pi tassa tasmiṇ yeva khaṇe uppajjatīti pucchatī.*

*Asaññasattaṇ uppajjantānaṇ ti acittakapaṭisandhivasena asaṇñasattabhavaṇ*⁹ *uppajjantānaṇ. Tesāṇ rūpakkhando uppajjatīti tesāṇ ekantena rūpakkhando uppajjati yeva. Pavatte pana tattha uppajjantānaṇ rūpakkhando uppajjati pi nirujjhati pi, tasmā, asaṇñasattānaṇ ti avatvā, asaṇñasattaṇ uppajjantānaṇ ti vuttaṇ. No ca tesāṇ vedanākkhando uppajjatīti acittakattā pana tesāṇ vedanākkhando nuppajjat'eva. Idaṇ satta-vīsatiyā thānesu paṭhame thāne paripunnapañhassa purimakotṭhāse sarūpadassanena vissajjanaṇ. Pañcavokāraṇ uppajjantānaṇ ti rūpārūpa-missaka-paṭisandhivasena pañcavokārabhavaṇ uppajjantānaṇ. Tesāṇ rūpakkhando vedanākkhando cāti tesāṇ ekantena rūpa-vedanākkhandha-sankhātā dve pi khandhā uppajjanti yeva. Pavatte pana tattha uppannānaṇ khandhā*

¹ Y. 22, 6, 1.

² Y. 19, 1, 1.

³ Y. 19, 1, ii.

⁴ Br. °vokāraṇ.

⁵ Y. 24, iii.

⁶ Y. 29, iii. etc.

⁷ S. veditvāna.

⁸ Br. tatthāyaṇ.

⁹ S. °bhāvaṇ.

uppajjanti pi nirujjhanti pi, tasmā, pañca-vokārānan ti avatvā, *pañcavokāraṇ uppajjantānan* ti vuttaṇ. Idaṇ pañca-vokāraṇ uppajjantānan ti tḥāne paripuṇṇapañhassa pacchimakoṭṭhāse sarūpa-dassanena-vissajjanaṇ. Iminā upāyena sabbāni vissajjanāni veditabbāni.

Idaṇ pan' ettha uppāda-nirodhesu niyamalakkhaṇaṇ. Sakale pi hi imasmiṇ Khandha-Yamake tattha tattha uppannānaṇ pavatte yāva maraṇā khandhānaṇ अपरियान्तेसु uppāda-nirodhesu vijjamānesu pi lahu-parivattānaṇ dhammānaṇ vinibbhogaṇ katvā uppāda-nirodhe dassetuṇ na sukaran ti pavattiyaṇ uppāda-nirodhe anāmasitvā abhinavaṇ vipāka-vaṭṭaṇ nipphādayamānena nānākammena nibbattānaṇ paṭisandhi-khandhānaṇ uppādaṇ dassetuṇ sukhan ti paṭisandhi-uppādavasen' eva uppādavāro kathito. Uppannassa pana vipāka-vaṭṭassa-pariyosānena nirodhaṇ dassetuṇ sukhan ti maraṇakāle nirodhavasena nirodhavāro kathito.

Kiṇ pan' ettha pavattiyaṇ uppāda-nirodhānaṇ anāmatṭhabhāve pamāṇan ti? Pāli yeva; Pāliyaṇ hi visesena uppādavārassa anāgatakālavāre pacchimabhavikānaṇ tesāṇ rūpakkkhandho ca nuppajjissati vedanākkhandho ca nuppajjissatīti ayaṇ Pāli-atipamāṇam eva. Pacchimabhavikānañ hi pavatte rūpārūpadhammānaṇ uppajjitūṇ, yuttabhāve sati pi *rūpakkkhandho ca nuppajjissati vedanākkhandho ca nuppajjissatīti* sannitṭhānaṇ katvā vuttabhāvena pavatte uppādo na gahito ti veditabbo. *Suddhāvāse parinibbantānaṇ tesāṇ tattha saññākkhandho na nirujjhittha, no ca tesāṇ tattha vedanākkhandho na nirujjhatīti* ayaṇ pana Pāli pavatte nirodhassa anāmatṭhabhāve ativiya pamāṇaṇ. *Suddhāvāse parinibbantānaṇ* hi cuticittassa bhaṅgakkhaṇe tḥitānaṇ paṭisandhito paṭṭhāya pavatte uppajjitvā niruddhasaññākkhandhānaṇ gaṇanapatho natthi. Evaṇ sante pi *tesāṇ tattha*¹ *saññākkhandho na nirujjhitthātī* sannitṭhānaṇ katvā vuttabhāvena pavatte nirodho na gahito ti veditabbo.

Evam ettha uppāda-nirodhesu niyamalakkhaṇaṇ veditvā paṭisandhi uppādam eva cuti nirodham eva ca gahetvā,

¹ Br. tassa.

tesu tesu ṭhānesu āgatānaṃ vissajjanānaṃ atthavinicchayo veditabbo.

So pana sakkā ādi-vissajjane vuttanayena sabbattha viditun¹ ti vissajjana-paṭipāṭiyā na vitthārito. Iminā pana evaṃ dinnenāpi² nayena yo etesaṃ atthavinicchayaṃ jānitun na sakkoti, tena ācariye payirūpāsivā sādhukaṃ sutvā vijānitabbo.

Uppādassa nirodhassa ubhinnaṃ cāpi ekako
Nayassa anulomassa paṭiloma-nayassa ca
Vasena yāni khandhesu yamakāni ca pañcasu
Puggalaṃ atha okāsaṃ puggalokāsam eva ca.
Āmasitvā pavattesu ṭhānesu³ kathayī jino
Tesaṃ Pāḷivavatthānaṃ dassitaṃ anupubbato.
Vinicchayatthaṃ atthassa pañhā vissajjanāni ca
Vissajjanānaṃ ṭhānāni yāni tāni ca sabbaso
Dassetvā eka-pañhasmiṃ yojanā pi pakāsītā
Vitthārena gate ettha pañhā-vissajjanakkame.
Atthaṃ vaṇṇayatā kātuṃ kiṃ nu sakkā ito⁴ paraṃ
Nayena iminā tasmā atthaṃ jānantu paṇḍitā ti.

Pavattivāra-vaṇṇanā niṭṭhitā.

Tadanantare pariññāvāre pi chaḷ'eva kālabhedā anuloma-paṭilomato dve yeva nayā: puggala-vāro okāsavāro puggalokāsavāro ti imesu pana tisu puggalavāro va labbhati, na itare dve.

Kiṃ kāraṇā? Sadisa-vissajjanatāya. Yo hi koci puggalo yattha katthaci ṭhāne rūpakkhandaṃ ce parijānāti, vedanākkhandham pi parijānāti yeva, vedanākkhandhaṃ ce parijānāti, rūpakkhandaṃ pi parijānāti yeva; rūpakkhandaṃ ce na parijānāti, vedanākkhandham pi na parijānāti yeva, vedanākkhandhaṃ ce na parijānāti, rūpakkhandaṃ pi na parijānāti yeva⁵; tasmā tesu pi yattha rūpakkhandaṃ parijānāti tattha vedanākkhandhaṃ parijānātīti ādivasena pucchaṃ katvā āmantā tveva vissajjanaṃ

¹ S. veditun.

² Br. dinnena pi.

³ S. vāresu.

⁴ S. itaro.

⁵ Br. omits.

kātabbaṃ siyā ti sadisa-vissajjanatāya te idha na labbhan-tīti veditabbaṃ.¹

Atha vā pariññākieccaṃ nāma puggalass' eva hoti, no okāsassa ; puggalo 'va parijānituṃ samattho ; no okāso ti puggalavāro v' ettha gahito, na okāsa-vāro. Tassa pana agahitattā tad-anantaro puggalokāsavāro labbhamāno pi na gahito. Yo pan' esa puggalavāro gahito, tattha pac-cuppannakāle rūpakkkhandhamūlakāni cattāri, vedanākkhandhamūlakāni tīni, saññākkhandhamūlakāni dve, sankhārakkhandhamūlakaṃ ekaṃ ti heṭṭhāvuttanayen' eva anulomanaye agahitagahaṇena dasa yamakāni, paṭilomanaye dasātivīsati. Tathā sesesu pīti ekekasmiṃ kāle vīsati vīsati katvā chasu kālesu vīsaṃ yamakasataṃ cattārīsāni dve pucchā satāni asīti² cattāri atthasatāni ca hontīti idam ettha Pāli-vavatthānaṃ. Atthavinicchaye pan' ettha atītānāgatapaccuppannasankhātā tayo addhā pavattivāre viya cuti-paṭisandhivasena na labbhanti, pavatte cittakkhanavasena' eva labbhanti. Ten' eva tattha *yo rūpakkkhandhaṃ parijānāti so vedanākkhandhaṃ parijānātīti*³ ādīsu pucchāsu āmantāti vissajjanaṃ kataṃ. Lokuttaramaggakhaṇasmiṃ hi nibbānārammaṇena cittaṇa pañcasu khandhesu pariññākieccanibbattiyaṃ yaṃ kiñci ekaṃ khandhaṃ parijānanto itaram pi parijānātīti vuccati. Evam ettha *parijānātīti* pañhesu anulomanaye pariññākieccasamatthakappattaṃ aggamaggasamangiṃ sandhāya āmantā ti vuttan ti veditabbaṃ.

Paṭilomanaye pana *na parijānātīti* pañhesu puthujjanādayo sandhāya āmantā ti vuttaṃ. *Parijānitthāti* imasmiṃ pana atitakālavāre maggānantara-aggaphale ṭhito pi pariññākieccassa niṭṭhitattā parijānittha yeva nāma.

*Yo rūpakkkhandhaṃ parijānāti, so vedanākkhandhaṃ parijānitthāti*⁴ pañhena aggamaggasamangiṃ pucchati. Yasmā pan' esa khandhapañcakaṃ parijānāti yeva nāma, na tāva niṭṭhita-pariññākiecco, tasmā *no* ti paṭisedho kato. Duttiya-pañhe pana *parijānitthāti* arahattaṃ pucchati. Yasmā pan', eso niṭṭhita-pariññākiecco, natthi tassa pariññeyyaṃ nāma,

¹ Br, °abbā.

² Br. asītādhikāni.

³ Y. 49.

⁴ Y. 50.

tasmā *no* ti paṭisedho kato. Paṭilomanayavissajjane pan' ettha arahā rūpakkkhandhaṇ na pariṇānātīti arahato pariṇāyā abhāvena vuttaṇ ; *aggamaggasamangī vedanākkhandhaṇ na pariṇānitthāti* arahattamaggaṭṭhassa anitṭhita-pariṇānikicatāya vuttaṇ. Na kevalañ ca vedanākkhandham eva, ekadhammam pi so na pariṇānitth' eva ; idaṇ pana pucchāvasena vuttaṇ. No ca rūpakkkhandhan ti idam pi pucchāvasena vuttaṇ ; aññam pi pana so khandhato¹ pariṇānāti, so vedanākkhandhaṇ pariṇānissatīti ettha yasmā maggaṭṭhapuggalo ekacittakkhaniko, tasmā so pariṇānissatīti sankhaṇ na gacchati. Tena vuttaṇ *no* ti. Te rūpakkkhandhā ca na pariṇāniṣṣūti ettha attho ; pucchāvasena na pariṇānissatīti pan' ettha attho.² Iminā upāyena sabbattha atthavinicchayo veditabbo ti.

Pariṇānavāro nitṭhito.

Khandhayamakavaṇṇanā nitṭhitā.

[*Āyatana-Yamakaṇ*.]

Idāni Mūla-Yamake desite yeva kusalādidhamme āyatanavasenāpi sangaṇhitvā Khandha-Yamakānantaraṇ desitassa Āyatana-Yamakassa vaṇṇanā hoti.

Tattha Khandha-Yamake vuttanayen' eva Pālivavatthānaṇ veditabbaṇ. Yath' eva hi tattha Paṇṇattivāro Pavattivāro Pariṇānavāro ti tayo mahāvārā honti, tathā idhāpi. Vacanattho pi nesāṇ tattha³ vuttanayen' eva desitabbo.⁴ Idhāpi ca Paṇṇattivāro uddesa-niddesavasena dvidhā vavatthito ; itaro niddesavasen' eva.

Tattha *dvādasāyatanānīti*⁵ padaṇ ādiṇ katvā yāva *nāyatanā na mano*,⁶ ti tāva Paṇṇattivārassa Uddesa-vāro veditabbo.

Tattha *dvādasāyatanānīti* ayaṇ yamakavasena pucchi-

¹ Br. khandhaṇ.

² Br. : Te rūpakkkhandhañ ca na pariṇānitthāti pucchā sabhāgena vuttaṇ ; na pariṇāniṣṣūti pan' ettha attho.

³ Br. *omits*.

⁴ Br. veditabbo.

⁵ Y. 52.

⁶ Y. 53.

tabbānaṃ āyatanānaṃ uddeso. *Cakkhāyatanaṃ . . . pe . . . dhammāyatanaṃ* ti tesāṃ yeva pabhedato nāma vavatthānaṃ. Yamakavasena pucchāsukhatthaṃ¹ c'ettha paṭhamāṃ paṭipāṭiyā ajjhattarūpāyatanāni vuttāni, pacchābāhīrarūpāyatanāni, pariyosāne manāyatana - dhammāyatanāni.

Yathā pana heṭṭhā khandhavasena, evam idha imesaṃ āyatanānaṃ vasena padasodhanavāro, padasodhanamūlacakkavāro, suddhāyatanaavāro suddhāyatanaamūlacakkavāro ti cattāro va nayavārā honti. Ekeko c' ettha anulomapaṭilomavasena duvidho yeva. Tesam attho tattha vuttanayen' eva veditabbo.

Yathā pana Khandha - Yamake padasodhanavārassa anulomavāre rūpaṃ rūpakkhando, rūpakkhando rūpaṃ ti ādīni pañca yamakāni, tathā idha cakkhu cakkhāyatanaṃ, cakkhāyatanaṃ cakkhūti ādīni dvādasā. Paṭilomavāre pi na cakkhu na cakkhāyatanaṃ, na cakkhāyatanaṃ na cakkhūti ādīni dvādasā. Padasodhanamūlacakkavārassa pan' ettha anulomavāre ekekāyatanaamūlakāni ekādasā ekādasā katvā dvattiṃsa satāṃ yamakāni, paṭilomavāre pi dvattiṃsa satam eva.

Suddhāyatanaavārassāpi anulomavāre dvādasā, paṭilomavāre dvādasā.

Suddhāyatanaamūlacakkavārassāpi anulomavāre ekekāyatanaamūlakāni ekādas' ekādasā² katvā dvattiṃsa satāṃ yamakāni, paṭilomavāre dvattiṃsa satam evāti evam idha cha sattatādhikehi pañcahi yamakasatehi dvipaññāsehi ekādasahi pucchāsatehi catu adhikehi tevīsāya atthasatehi ca paṭimaṇḍito Paṇṇattivārassa Uddesavāro veditabbo.

Niddesavāre pan' assa heṭṭhā Khandha - Yamakassa Paṇṇattivāra-niddese vuttanayen' eva attho veditabbo aññatra viśesā. Tatrāyaṃ viśeso *dibbaṃ-cakkhūti*³ *dutiya-vijjāñānaṃ*; *paññācakkhūti* *tatiya-vijjāñānaṃ*; *dibbasotaṃ* ti *dutiya-abhiññāñānaṃ*; *taṇhāsotaṃ* ti *taṇhā* va; *avaseso kāyo* ti *nāmakāyo*, *rūpakāyo*, *hatthikāyo* *assakāyo* ti evam ādi. *Avasesaṃ rūpaṃ* ti rūpāyatanaato yesaṃ bhūtopādāya

¹ Br. °tṭhañ.² Br. ekādasā ekādasā.³ Y. 53.

rūpañ ceva piyarūpa-sātarūpañ ca, *sīlakkhandho* ti¹ ādīni vāyanaṭṭhena sīlādīnaṃ yeva nāmāni. *Attharaso* ti ādīni pi sādumadhuraṭṭhena atthādīnañ ceva nāmāni; *avaseso dhammo* ti pariyattidhammādi anekappabhedo ti ayam ettha viseso.

Idhāpi ca Pavattivārassa uppādavārādīsu tīsu antara-vāresu ekekasmiṃ chal eva kālabhedā. Tesāṃ ekekasmiṃ kāle Puggalavārādayo tayo tayo vārā. Te sabbe pi anuloma-paṭiloma-nayavasena duvidhā honti.

Tattha paccuppannakāle Puggalavārassa anulomanaye yathā Khandha-Yamake rūpakkhandhamūlakāni cattāri, vedanākkhandhamūlakāni tīṇi saññākkhandhamūlakāni dve, sankhārakkhandhamūlakāṃ ekaṃ ti agahitagahanena² dasa yamakāni honti.

Evaṃ yassa cakkhāyatanaṃ³ uppajjati, tassa sotāyatanaṃ uppajjati; yassa vā pana sotāyatanaṃ uppajjati, tassa cakkhāyatanaṃ uppajjati; yassa cakkhāyatanaṃ uppajjati, tassa ghānāyatanaṃ,⁴ jivhāyatanaṃ, kāyāyatanaṃ, rūpāyatanaṃ, saddāyatanaṃ, gandhāyatanaṃ, rasāyatanaṃ, phoṭṭhabbāyatanaṃ, manāyatanaṃ, dhammāyatanaṃ uppajjati; yassa vā pana dhammāyatanaṃ uppajjati tassa cakkhāyatanaṃ uppajjatīti evaṃ cakkhāyatanaṃ mūlakāni ekādasā, yassa sotāyatanaṃ uppajjati, tassa ghānāyatanaṃ uppajjatīti ādinā nayena sotāyatana-mūlakāni dasa; ghānāyatanaṃ mūlakāni nava; jivhāyatanaṃ mūlakāni atṭha; kāyāyatanaṃ mūlakāni satta; rūpāyatanaṃ mūlakāni cha; saddāyatanaṃ mūlakāni pañca; gandhāyatanaṃ mūlakāni cattāri; rasāyatanaṃ mūlakāni tīni; phoṭṭhabbāyatanaṃ mūlakāni dve; manāyatanaṃ mūlakāṃ ekaṃ ti agahitāgahanena⁵ cha saṭṭhi yamakāni honti.

Tattha cakkhāyatanaṃ mūlakesu ekādasasu yassa cakkhāyatanaṃ uppajjati, tassa sotāyatanaṃ, ghānāyatanaṃ, rūpāyatanaṃ, manāyatanaṃ, dhammāyatanaṃ uppajjatīti imāni pañc' eva vissajjitāni.

Tesu paṭhamāṃ vissajjetabbāṃ tāva vissajjitaṃ; dutiyaṃ

¹ Sic. ? °gandho. ² Br. agahitagghanena. ³ Y. 58, 1 i. f.

⁴ S. ghāṇā° throughout.

⁵ Br. agahitagg°.

kiñcāpi paṭhamena sadisavissajjitaṃ.¹ Cakkhu sotāyatanaṃ pavattiṭṭhāne pana ghāṇāyatanaṃ na ekantena pavattito kathaṃ nu kho etaṃ vissajjetabban ti vimatinivāraṇatthaṃ vissajjitaṃ. Rūpāyatana - manāyatana-dhammāyatanehi saddhiṃ tīṇi yamakāni asadisavibhājanattā² vissajjitāni. Sesesu jivhāyatana-kāyāyatanehi tāva saddhiṃ dve yamakāni purimehi dvīhi³ saddhiṃ sadisavissajjanāni. Saddāyatanaṃ paṭisandhikkhaṇe anuppat-tito tena saddhiṃ yamakassa vissajjanam eva natthi. Gandha-rasaphoṭṭhabbāyatānehi pi saddhiṃ tīṇi yamakāni purimehi dvīhi³ sadisavissajjanān' eva hontīti tantiyā lahubbhāvattāṃ sankhittāni. Sotāyatanaṃ mūlakesu yaṃ labbhati, taṃ purimehi sadisavissajjanam evāti ekam pi Pālinārūḥaṃ. Ghāṇāyatanaṃ mūlakesu rūpāyatanaṃ saddhiṃ ekaṃ, manāyatana-dhammāyatanehi saddhiṃ dve ti tīṇi yamakāni Pāliṃ ārūḥāni, sesāni ghāṇāyatana-yamake-na sadisavissajjanattā nārūḥāni. Tathā jivhāyatana-kāyāyatana-mūlakāni. Rūpāyatanaṃ mūlakesu manāyatana-dhammāyatanehi saddhiṃ dve yeva vissajjanāni.

Gandharasa-phoṭṭhabbehi pana saddhiṃ tīṇi rūpāyatana-manāyatanehi saddhiṃ sadisavissajjanāni. Yath' eva h' ettha sarūpakānaṃ acittakānaṃ ti ādivuttaṃ, tathā idhāpi sarūpakānaṃ andhakānaṃ arasakānaṃ aphoṭṭhabbakānaṃ ti yojetabbā.⁴ Gandhādīni c' ettha āyatanabhūtān' eva adhippetāni ; tasmā sarūpakānaṃ⁵ sagandhāyatanaṃ ti āyatanavaseṇ' ettha attho veditabbo.

Saddāyatanaṃ mūlakāni atthābhāvato Pāliṃ nārūḥān' eva. Gandharasa-phoṭṭhabbamūlakāni cattāri tīṇi dve ca hetṭhimehi sadisavissajjanattā Pāliṃ nārūḥāni.

Manāyatanaṃ mūlakaṃ vissajjitam evāti evam etāni pac-cuppannakāle puggalavārassa anulomavāre katipaya-yamaka-vissajjanen' eva chasatṭhi yamakāni vissajjitāni nāma hontīti veditabbāni. Yathā ca Puggalavāre, evaṃ Okāsavāre pi Puggalokāsavāre pi chasatṭhīti⁶ pac-cuppannakāle tīsu vāresu anulomanaye atṭhanavuti

¹ Br. °sajjanaṃ.

² Br. vissajjanattā.

³ S. tīhi.

⁴ Br. yojanā veditabbā.

⁵ S. kāni.

⁶ Br. omits iti.

sataṃ yamakāni honti. Yathā ca anulomanaye, evaṃ paṭilomanaye pīti sabbāni pi paccuppannakāle channavutādhikāni¹ tīni yamakasatāni honti. Tesu dvā-navutādhikāni² satta pucchāsātāni caturāsītādhikāni³ ca pannarasa atthasātāni hontīti veditabbāni. Evaṃ sesesu pi pañcasu kālabhedeṣūti sabbāni pi cha sattādhikatevīsati⁴ yamakasātāni. Tato diguṇā pucchā, tato diguṇā atthāti, idam ettha Uppādavāre Pālivavatthānaṃ. Nirodhavārūppādanirodhavāresu pi es' eva nayo ti sabbasmim pi Pavattivāre atthavīsāni ekasattati yamakasātāni. Tato diguṇā pucchā, tato diguṇā atthā veditabbā.

Pāli pana manāyatanañ ca dhammāyatanañ ca ekasadisāṃ, nānaṃ natthi. Upari pana vārasankhepo hotīti ādīni vatvā tattha tattha sankhittā. Tasmā yaṃ tattha tattha sankhittaṃ, taṃ sabbāṃ asammuyhantehi sallakkhetabbāṃ.

Atthavinicchaye pan' ettha idaṃ nayamukhaṃ: *sacakkhukānaṃ asotakānaṃ* ti⁵ apāye jātibadhira-opapātikaṃ sandhāya vuttaṃ. So hi sacakkhuko asotako hutvā uppajjati. Yathāha: *kāmadhātuyā uppattikkhaṇe . . . kassaci aparāni dasāyatanāni pātubhavanti. Opapātikānaṃ petānaṃ, opapātikānaṃ asurānaṃ, opapātikānaṃ tiracchānagatānaṃ, opapātikānaṃ nerayikānaṃ, jaccabadhirānaṃ uppattikkhaṇe dasāyatanāni pātubhavanti cakkhāyatanaṃ, rūpa-, ghāna-, gandha-, jivhā-, rasa-, kāya, phoṭṭhabbāyatanaṃ, manāyatanaṃ, dhammāyatanaṃ* ti⁶; *sacakkhukānaṃ sasotakānaṃ* ti sugati-duggatīsu paripunnāyatane ca opapātike rūpī-Brahmā no ca sandhāya vuttaṃ, te hi sacakkhukā sasotakā hutvā uppajjanti. Yathāha: *kāmadhātuyā uppattikkhaṇe kassaci ekādasāyatanāni pātubhavanti . . . Kāmāvacarānaṃ devānaṃ paṭhamakappikānaṃ manussānaṃ opapātikānaṃ petānaṃ . . . nerayikānaṃ paripunnāyatanaṃ . . . Rūpadhātuyā uppattikkhaṇe katamāni pañcāyatanāni pātubhavanti cakkhāyatanaṃ, rūpa-, sota-, manāyatanaṃ, dhammāyatanaṃ* ti.⁷ *Aghānakānaṃ*⁸ ti Brahmapārisajjādayo sandhāya vuttaṃ, te hi sacakkhukā aghānakā hutvā uppajjanti.

¹ S. °navutāni tīni.

² S. navutāni satta.

³ S. caturāsītāni ca.

⁴ S. sattati tevīsati.

⁵ Y. 58.

⁶ Vibh. 413.

⁷ Ib. 412.

⁸ Y. 58.

Kāmadhātuyaṇ pana aghānako opapātiko natthi. Yadi bhaveyya kassaci aṭṭhāyatanāni pātubhavantīti vadeyya; gabbhaseyyako pana aghānako siyā; so *sacakkhukānaṇ* ti¹ vacanato idha anadhippeto. *Sacakkhukānaṇ saghānakānaṇ* ti jaccabadhiram pi paripunnāyatanam pi opapātikaṇ sandhāya vuttaṇ. *Saghānakānaṇ acakkhukānaṇ* ti jaccandham pi jaccabadhiram pi opapātikaṇ sandhāya vuttam eva. *Saghānakānaṇ sacakkhukānaṇ* ti paripunnāyatanam eva opapātikaṇ sandhāya vuttaṇ. *Sarūpakānaṇ acakkhukānaṇ* ti ettha jaccandha-jaccabadhira-opapātikesu aññataro pi gabbhaseyyako pi labbhati yeva. *Sacittakānaṇ acakkhukānaṇ* ti² ettha heṭṭhāvuttehi jaccandhādīhi tīhi saddhiṇ arūpino pi labbhanti. *Acakkhukānaṇ* ti ettha purimapade vuttehi catūhi saddhiṇ asaññasattā pi labbhanti. *Sarūpakānaṇ aghānakānaṇ* ti³ ettha gabbhaseyyakā ca asaññasattā ca sesarūpī-Brahmāno⁴ ca labbhanti. *Sacittakānaṇ aghānakānaṇ*⁵ ti ettha gabbhaseyyakā ca rūpārūpī Brahmāno ca labbhanti. *Acittakānaṇ arupakānaṇ* ti padesu pana ekavokārā-catuvokārasattā va labbhantīti iminā nayena sabbesu Puggalavāresu puggalavibhāgo veditabbo.

Okāsa-vāre tattha *cakkhāyatanan* ti⁶ rūpī-Brahmalokaṇ pucchati; ten' eva *āmantā* ti vuttaṇ. Tasmiṇ hi kāle niyamato tāni āyatanāni paṭisandhiyaṇ uppajjanti. Idam ettha nayamukhaṇ; iminā nayamukhena sakale pi Pavattivāre attho veditabbo.

Pariññāvāro⁷ Khandha-Yamake vuttanayo yevāti.

Āyatana-Yamaka-vaṇṇanā samattā.

[*Dhātu-Yamakaṇ*.]

Idāni te yeva Mūla-Yamake desite kusalādi dhamme dhātuvasena sangāhitvā Āyatana-Yamakānantaraṇ desitassa Dhātu-Yamakassa⁸ vaṇṇanā hoti. Tattha Āyatana-Yamake vuttanayen' eva Pālivavatthānaṇ veditabbaṇ.

¹ Y. 58, 1, i.

² Y. 59, 1-11.

³ Y. 59, 3-6.

⁴ S. Brahmāṇo.

⁵ Y. 59, 3-11.

⁶ Y. 60, ii. 1-2.

⁷ Y. 163 f.

⁸ Y. 165.

Idhāpi hi¹ Paṇṇattivārādayo tayo mahāvārā avasesā antaravārā ca saddhiṃ kālappabhedādīhi Āyatana-Yamake āgatasadisā yeva. Idhāpi ca Yamaka-pucchāsukhatthaṃ² paṭipāṭiyā ajjhattika-bāhirā rūpadhātuyo ca³ vatvā viññāṇa-dhātuyo vuttā. Dhātūnaṃ pana bahuttā⁴ idha Āyatana-Yamakato bahutarāṇi yamakāni⁵ diguṇā pucchā⁶ diguṇā ca atthā honti. Tattha cakkhudhātu Mūlakādīsu yama-kesu labbhamānanaṃ yamakānaṃ atthavinicchayo Āyatana-Yamake vuttanayen' eva veditabbo. Taṃ sadisā yeva h' ettha atthagati; ten' eva ca kāraṇena Pāli pi sankhittā. Pariññāvāro pākatiko yevāti.

Dhātū-Yamaka-vannaṇā samattā.

[*Sacca-Yamaka.*]

Idāni te yeva Mūla-Yamake desite kusalādi dhamme saccavasena sangahitvā Dhātu-Yamakānantaraṃ desitassa Sacca-Yamakassa vannaṇā hoti.

Tatthāpi heṭṭhā vuttanayen' eva Paṇṇattivārādayo tayo mahāvārā antaravārādayo ca avasesappabhedā veditabbā.

Paṇṇattivāre pan' ettha catunnaṃ saccānaṃ vasena padasodhanavāro, padasodhanamūlacakkavāro, suddhasaccavāro, suddhasaccamūlacakkavāro ti imesu catūsu vāresu Yamaka-vannaṇā veditabbā.

Paṇṇattivāraniddese⁷ pana *avasesaṃ dukkhasaccan* ti dukkhavedanāya ceva taṇhāya ca vinimmuttā tebhūmaka-dhammā veditabbā. *Avaseso samudayo* ti Saccavibhange⁸ niddiṭṭhakāmāvacarakusalādibhedo dukkhasaccassa pac-cayo. *Avaseso nirodho* ti tadangavikkhambhanasamuccheda-paṭippassaddhi-nirodho ceva khaṇabhanganirodho ca. *Avaseso maggo* ti tasmiṃ kho pana samaye pañcangiko maggo⁹ hoti, atṭhangiko micchāmaggo pi janghamaggo sakatamaggo ti evam ādiko.

¹ S. *omits*.

² S. *sukhaṃ*. Cf. p. 72.

³ Br. *va*.

⁴ S. *bahutāya*.

⁵ Br. *inserts* yamaka-.

⁶ Br. *repeats* pucchā.

⁷ Y. 174 ff.

⁸ *Vibh.*, p. 106 ff.

⁹ Dhs. §§ 58, 20-4.

Pavattivāre¹ pan' ettha paccuppannakāle, Puggala-vārassa anulomanaye yassa dukkhasaccaṇ uppajjati, tassa samudayasaccaṇ uppajjati. Yassa vā pana samudayasaccaṇ, tassa dukkhasaccaṇ uppajjati dukkhasaccamūlakehi tīhi, samudayasaccamūlakehi dvīhi, nirodhasaccamūlakena ekenāti labbhamānañ ca alabbhamānañ ca gahetvā Pāli-vasena chahi yamakehi bhavitabbaṇ. Tesu yasmā nirodhassa neva uppādo na nirodho yujjati, tasmā dukkhasaccamūlakāni samudayasacca - maggasaccehi saddhiṇ dve, samudayasacca-mūlakaṇ magga, saccena saddhiṇ ekan ti tīni yamakāni āgatāni. Tassa patilomanaye pi Okāsa-vārādīsūpi es' eva nayo. Evam ettha sabbavāresu tiṇṇaṇ tiṇṇaṇ yamakānaṇ vasena yamakagaṇanā veditabbā.

Atthavinicchayaṇ pan' ettha idaṇ lakkhaṇaṇ imassa hi Sacca-Yamakassa Pavattivāre nirodhasaccaṇ tāva na labbhat' eva. Sesesu pana tīsu samudayasacca-maggasaccāni ekantena pavattiyaṇ yeva labbhanti.

Dukkhasaccaṇ cuti-paṭisandhīsu pavattesu pi labbhati.² Paccuppannādayo pana tayo kālā cuti-paṭisandhīnam pi pavattassa³ pi vasena labbhanti. Evam ettha yaṇ yaṇ labbhati, tassa tassa pi⁴ vasena atthavinicchayo veditabbo.

Tatr' idaṇ nayamukhaṇ : sabbesaṇ uppajjantānaṇ⁵ ti antamaso suddhāvāsānam pi; tehi⁶ dukkhasaccen' eva uppajjanti. Tanhāvippayuttacittassāti⁷ idaṇ dukkhasaccasamudayasaccesu ekakoṭṭhāsassa uppatti dassanatthaṇ vuttaṇ; tasmā pañcavokāravasen' eva gahetabbaṇ. Catuvokāre pana tanhāvippayuttassa phalasamāpatti cittassa uppādakkhaṇe ekam⁸ pi saccaṇ nuppajjati. Idaṇ idha na gahetabbaṇ. Sesaṇ dukkhasaccaṇ⁹ cāti imasmiṇ¹⁰ hi khaṇe tanhaṇ ṭhapetvā sesaṇ dukkhasaccaṇ nāma hotīti¹¹ sandhāy' etaṇ vuttaṇ. Maggassa uppādakkhaṇe pi es' eva nayo.

Tattha pana rūpam eva dukkhasaccaṇ nāma. Sesā maggasampayuttakā dhammā saccavinimmuttā; ten' eva

¹ Y. 178.

² Br. omits pavattesu. S. labbhanti.

³ Br. pavattiyā.

⁴ Br. omits.

⁵ Y. 178.

⁶ Br. tesu pihi.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ S. ekasmim.

⁹ Br. saccañ.

¹⁰ Br. tasmiṇ.

¹¹ S. hoti taṇ sandhāy'.

kāraṇena āruppe maggassa uppādakkaṇe tesāṃ maggasaccaṃ uppajjati, no ca tesāṃ dukkhasaccaṃ uppajjatīti vuttaṃ.¹

Sabbesaṃ uppajjantānaṃ paratte taṇhāvippayuttacittassa uppādakkaṇe tesāṃ tatthāti² tesāṃ tasmiṃ uppattikkaṇe ca taṇhāvippayuttacittuppattikkaṇe cāti evam ettha khaṇa-vasena okāso veditabbo.

Aññesu pi evarūpesu es' eva nayo.

Anabhisametāvīnaṃ³ ti catusaccapaṭisaṃvedasankhātāṃ⁴ abhisamayaṃ appattānaṃ⁵; abhisametāvīnaṃ ti abhisamita-saccānaṃ ti iminā nayamukhena sabbattha atthavinicchayo veditabbo.

Pariññā-vāre⁶ pana ñātapariññā, tīraṇapariññā, pahāna-pariññā ti tisso pi⁷ pariññāyo labbhanti. Yasmā ca lokut-taradhammesu pariññā nāma natthi; tasmā idha dve saccāni gahitāni. Tattha dukkhasaccaṃ parijānātīti⁸ ñāta-tīraṇa-pariññā-vasena⁹ vuttaṃ. Samudayasaccaṃ pajahatīti tīraṇa - pahāna - pariññāvasena¹⁰: iti imāsaṃ pariññānaṃ vasena sabbapadesu attho veditabbo ti.

Sacca-Yamaka-vaṇṇanā samattā.

[Sankhāra-Yamaka.]

Idāni tesāṃ yeva Mūla-Yamake desitānaṃ kusalādidham-mānaṃ labbhamānavasena ekadesaṃ sangahitvā Sacca-Yama-kānantaraṃ desitassa Sankhāra-Yamakassa vaṇṇanā hoti.

Tatthāpi heṭṭhā vuttanayen' eva Paṇṇattivārādayo tayo mahāvārā antaravārādayo ca avasesappabhedā veditabbā.

Ayaṃ pan' ettha viseso. Paṇṇattivāre tāva yathā heṭṭhā Khandhādayo dhamme uddisitvā rūpaṃ rūpakkhando, cakkhu cakkhāyatanaṃ, cakkhu cakkhudhātu, dukkhaṃ dukkhasaccaṃ ti padasodhanavāro āradhho, tathā anārabhitvā assāsapassāsā kāyasankhāro¹¹ ti paṭhamaṃ tayo pi sankhārā vibhajitvā dassitā.

¹ Y. 178, 1-4.

² Y. 179, iii., 180, iii. etc.

³ Y. 181, 3 i. ff.

⁴ Br. paṭivedha°.

⁵ Br. appattasattānaṃ.

⁶ Y. 227.

⁷ Br. p' ettha.

⁸ Y. 227.

⁹ S. omits ñāta-.

¹⁰ Br. ñātatīraṇa°.

¹¹ Y. 229.

Tattha kāyassa sankhāro kāyasankhāro *assāsapassāsā-kāyikā ete dhammā kāyapaṭibaddhā* ti¹ hi vacanato kāranabhūta-ssa karajakāyassa phalabhūto eva sankhāro ti kāyasankhāro.

Aparo nayo : sankharīyatīti sankhāro. Kena sankharīyatīti? Kāyena. Ayaṃ hi vāto viya bhastāya karajakāyena sankharīyatīti evam pi kāyassa sankhāro ti kāyasankhāro. Kāyena kato assāsapassāsā kāyikavāto ti² attho.

*Pubbe kho, āvuso Visākha, vitakketvā vicāretvā pacchā vācaṃ*³ *bhīndati ; tasmā vitakkavicārā vacīsankhāro* ti vacanato pana sankhārotīti sankhāro. Kiṃ sankhāroti? Vacī ; vacīyā⁴ sankhāro ti vacīsankhāro. Vacībhedasamuṭṭhāpakassa vitakkavicārādvayass' etaṃ nāmaṃ.⁵

Saññā ca vedanā ca cetasikā ete dhammā cittapaṭibaddhā ti vacanato yeva pana tatiyapade pi sankharīyatīti sankhāro. Kena sankharīyatīti? Cittena ; karaṇatthe sāmivacanaṃ katvā cittassa sankhāro ti cittasankhāro. Sabbesam pi cittasamuṭṭhānānam pi⁶ cetasikadhammānaṃ etaṃ adhivacanaṃ ; vitakkavicārānaṃ pana vacīsankhārabhāvena visuṃ gahitattā ṭhapetvā vitakkavicāreti vuttaṃ. Idāni *kāyo kāyasankhāro*, ti padasodhanavāro āraddho.⁷ Tassa anulomanaye tīṇi, paṭilomanaye tīṇīti cha yamakāni. Padasodhanamūlacakkavāre ekekasankhāramulakāni dve dve katvā anulomanaye cha, paṭilomanaye chāti dvādasa yamakāni. Suddhasankhāravāre pana yathā-suddhakhandha-vārādīsu *rūpaṃ khandho, khandhā rūpaṃ cakkhu āyatanaṃ, āyatanā cakkhū* ti⁸ ādinā nayena yamakāni vuttāni. Evaṃ kāyo sankhāro, sankhāro kāyo ti avatvā, *kāyasankhāro vacīsankhāro, vacīsankhāro kāyasankhāro* ti⁹ ādinā nayena kāyasankhāramulakāni dve, vacīsankhāramulakaṃ ekaṃ ti anulome tīṇi, paṭilome tīṇīti sabbāni pi suddhikavāre cha yamakāni vuttāni. Kiṃ kāraṇā? Suddhika-ekekapadavasena atthābhāvato. Yathā hi Khandha-Yamakādisu rūpādi viṣiṭṭhānaṃ khandhānaṃ cakkhādi viṣiṭṭhānaṃ ca āyatanādīnaṃ adhippetattā *rūpaṃ*

¹ M. i. 301 : "Cūḷavedalla-sutta."

² Br. omits kāyika.

³ S. vācam. M. *ibid.*

⁴ Br. vaciṃ, vaciyā. ⁵ S. nāma.

⁶ Br. omits.

⁷ Y. 230.

⁸ S. cakkhun ti.

⁹ Y. 231.

*khandho khandhā rūpan; cakkhu āyatanan, āyatanan cak-
khūti suddhika-ekekapadavasena attho atthi, evam idha
kāyo sankhāro, sanākhārā kāyo ti natthi. Kāyasankhāro ti
pana dvīhi pi padehi eko'va attho labbhati. Assāso
vā passāso vā ti suddhika - ekekapadavasena atthā-
bhāvato kāyo sankhārā sankhāro kāyo ti na vuttan; kāyo
kāyasankhāro ti ādi pana vattabban siyā. Tam pi kāya-
vacī-citta-padehi idha adhippetānan sankhārānan agahi-
tattā na yujjati. Suddhasankhāravāro yeva. Padaso-
dhane pana vinā pi atthena vacanan yujjatīti tattha yo
nayo gahito'va,¹ idha pana kāyasankhārassa vacīsankhārā-
dīhi vacīsankhārassa cittasankhārādīhi cittasankhārassa ca
kāyasankhārādīhi aññattā kāyasankhāro vacīsankhāro,²
vacīsankhāro kāyasankhāro ti ekekasankhāramūlakāni dve
dve katvā cha yamakāni yujjanti. Tesu agahita-gaha-
ṇena³ tīn' eva labbhanti, tasmā tān' eva dassetuṇ anu-
lomanaye tīni, paṭilomanaye tīnīti cha yamakāni vuttāni.
Suddhasankhāramūlacakkavāro pan' ettha na gahito ti
evaṇ Paṇṇattivārassa Uddesavāro veditabbo.*

*Niddesa-vāre pan' assa anulome tāva yasmā na kāyā-
dayo 'va¹ kāyasankhārādīnan nāman, tasmā no ti paṭi-
sedho kato. Paṭilome na kāyo na kāyasankhāro ti yo na
kāyo kāyasankhāro⁴ ti pi na hontīti pucchatī. Kāyasankhāro
na kāyo kāyasankhāro ti kāyasankhāro kāyo na hoti,
kāyasankhāro yeva pan' eso ti attho.*

*Avasesan⁵ ti na kevalan sesasankhāradvayam eva,
kāyasankhāravinimuttan pana sesan sabbam pi sankhatā-
sankhatapaṇṇattibhedan dhammajātan neva kāyo na
kāyasankhāro ti iminā upāyena sabbavissajjanesu attho
veditabbo ti.*

Paṇṇattivāravanṇanā samattā.

*Pavattivāre pan' ettha paccuppannakāle puggalavārassa
anulomanaye: yassa kāyasankhāro uppajjati, tassa vacī-
sankhāro uppajjatīti⁶ kāyasankhāramūlakāni dve, vacīsan-*

¹ S. omits.

² S. adds ti.

³ Br. °aggahaṇena.

⁴ Y. 230.

⁵ Y. 230, *.

⁶ Y. 232.

khāramūlakaṇ ekaṇ ti tīṇ' eva yamakāni labbhanti; tāni gahitān' eva. Tassa paṭilomanaye pi okāsavārādīsu pi es' eva nayo. Evam ettha sabbavāresu pi tinnaṇ tinnaṇ yamakānaṇ vasena yamakagaṇanā veditabbā.

Atthavinicchaye paṇ' ettha idaṇ lakkhaṇaṇ: imasmiṇ hi Sankhāra-Yamake *assāsapassāsānaṇ uppādakkhane*, *vitakkavicārānaṇ uppādakkhane* ti ādi vacanato paccuppannādi kālabhedo pavattivasenāpi gahetabbo, na cuti-paṭisandhivasen' eva. *Dutiyaajjhāne tatiyaajjhāne tattha kāyasankhāro uppajjati*¹ ādi vacanato ca jhānam pi okāsavasena gahitaṇ ti veditabbaṇ. Evam ettha yaṇ yaṇ labbhati, tassa tassa vasena atthavinicchayo veditabbo. Tatr' idaṇ nayamukhaṇ.

Vinā vitakkavicārehīti dutiya-tatiya-jhānavasena vuttaṇ. *Tesaṇ* ti tesaṇ dutiya-tatiya-jjhānasamangīnaṇ. *Kāmāvacarānaṇ* ti kāmāvacare uppannasattānaṇ. Rūpāvacara-devānaṇ pana assāsapassāsā natthi. Arūpāvacaraṇaṇ rūpam eva natthi. *Vinā assāsa passāsehīti* rūpārūpa-bhavesu nibbattasattānaṇ vitakkavicārūppattiṇ sandhāya vuttaṇ. *Paṭhamajjhāne kāmāvacare* ti kāmāvacarabhūmiyaṇ uppanne paṭhamajjhāne; angamattavasena c'ettha paṭhamajjhānaṇ gahetabbaṇ, na appanāvasen' eva, anappanāppatte pi hi savitakkasavicāraccitte idaṇ sankhāradvayaṇ uppajjat' eva. *Cittassa bhangakkhane* ti² idaṇ kāyasankhārassa ekantacittasamuṭṭhānattā³ vuttaṇ. Uppajjamānam eva hi cittaṇ rūpaṇ vā arūpaṇ vā samuṭṭhāpeti, na bhijjamānaṇ.⁴ *Suddhāvāsānaṇ dutiye citte vattamāne*⁵ ti paṭisandhito dutiye bhavangaccitte. Kāmañ c'etaṇ paṭisandhicitte pi vattamāne tesaṇ tattha nuppajjitth' eva. Yāva pana abbokiṇṇaṇ vipākacittaṇ vattati, tāva nuppajjitth' eva nāmā ti dassanattham etaṇ vuttaṇ. Yassa vā jhānassa vipākacittena te nibbattā, taṇ sataso pi saḥassaso pi uppajjamānaṇ paṭhamacittam eva. Vipākacittena pana visadiṇaṇ bhavanikantiyā āvajjanacittaṇ dutiyacittaṇ nāma. Taṇ sandhāy' etaṇ vuttan ti veditabbaṇ.

¹ *Ibid.* ii.² Y. 233, 2 i. ff.³ S. ekatta°.⁴ S. bhajamāna.⁵ Y. 235 ff.

Pacchimacittasamangīnan ti¹ sabbapacchimena appaṭi-sandhikacittena samangībhūtānaṃ khīṇāsavānaṃ. *Avitakka-avicāra-pacchimacittan* ti² rūpāvacarānaṃ dutiyaj-jhānikādi cuticittavasena arūpāvacarānaṃ³ catutthaj-jhānikacuticittavasena' etaṃ vuttaṃ. *Tesan* ti tesāṃ pacchimacittasamangī ādīnaṃ.

*Yassa kāyasankhāro nirujjhati, tassa cittasankhāro nirujjhatīti*⁴ ettha niyamato kāyasankhārassa cittasankhārena saddhiṃ ekakkhaṇe nirujjhanato *āmantā* ti paṭi-vacanaṃ dinnāṃ, na cittasankhārassa kāyasankhārena saddhiṃ. Kiṃ kārāṇā? Cittasankhāro hi kāyasankhārena vinā pi uppajjati ca. Kāyasankhāro pana cittasamutṭhāno assāsapassāsavāto. Cittasamutṭhānarūpaṇ ca cittassa uppādakkhane uppajjitvā yāva asaṇṇāni soḷasa cittāni uppajjanti, tāva tiṭṭhati. Tesāṃ soḷasannaṃ sabbapacchi-mena saddhiṃ nirujjhatīti yena cittaena saddhiṃ uppajjati, tato paṭṭhāya sattarasamena saddhiṃ nirujjhati, na kassaci cittassa uppādakkhane vā ṭhitikkhane vā nirujjhati, na pi ṭhitikkhane vā bhangakkhane vā uppajjati. Esā citta-samutṭhānarūpassa dhammatā ti niyamato cittasankhārena saddhiṃ ekakkhaṇe nirujjhanato *āmantā* ti vuttaṃ. Yaṃ pana Vibhangappakaraṇassa Sīhalaṭṭhakathāya citta-samutṭhānarūpaṃ sattarasamassa cittassa⁵ uppādakkhane nirujjhatīti vuttaṃ, taṃ imāya Pāliya virujjhati. Atṭhakathāto ca Pāliye' va balavatarā ti Pāliyaṃ vuttam eva pamāṇaṃ.

*Yassa kāyasankhāro uppajjati, tassa vacīsanekhāro niruj-jhatīti*⁶ ettha yasmā kāyasankhāro cittassa uppādakkhane uppajjati, na ca tasmiṃ khaṇe vitakkavicārā nirujjhanti, tasmā *no* ti paṭisedho kato ti. Iminā nayamukhena sabbattha vicinicchayo veditabbo. Pariññāvāro pākatiko yevāti.

Sankhāra-Yamaka-vannaṇā samattā.

¹ Y. 237 f.

² Br. °avicāraṇ.

³ Br. °carāṇaṇ.

⁴ Y. 247, 1, i., 20 paragraph.

⁵ *Compendium of Philosophy*, 1910, p. 26 ff.; 125, § 3.

⁶ Y. 259, 1. i.

[*Anusaya-Yamaka.*]

Idāni tesaṇ yeva Mūla-Yamake desitānaṇ kusalādi dhammānaṇ labbhamānavasena ekadesaṇ sangahitvā Sankhāra-Yamakānantaraṇ desitassa Anusaya-Yamakassa atthavaṇṇanā hoti.

Tattha Pālivavatthānaṇ tāva veditabbaṇ. Imasmiṇ hi Anusaya-Yamake Khandha-Yamakādīsu viya desanaṇ akatvā aññena nayena Pāli-desanā katā.

Kathaṇ? Paṭhamāṇ tāva paricchedato, uddesato, uppattiṭṭhānato ti tihākārehi anusayo gahāpetuṇ paricchedavāro, paricchinnuddesavāro, uppattiṭṭhānavāro ti tayo vārā desitā. Tato sattannaṇ mahāvārānaṇ vasena anusaye yojetvā yamakadesanā katā.

Tattha *sattānusayā*¹ ti ayaṇ satt' eva, na tato uddhaṇ, na heṭṭhā ti gaṇanaparicchedena paricchinditvā anusayānaṇ desitattā paricchedavāro nāma. *Kāmarāgānusayo . . . pe . . . avijjānusayo* ti ayaṇ paricchedena-vārena paricchinnānaṇ nāmamattaṇ uddisitvā ime nāma te ti desitattā paricchinnuddesavāro nāma. *Kattha kāmarāgānusayo anuseti . . . pe . . . ettha avijjānusayo anuseti* ti² ayaṇ imesu nāma ṭhāṇesu ime anusayā anusentīti evaṇ tesaṇ yeva uppattiṭṭhānassa desitattā uppattiṭṭhānavāro nāma. Yesaṇ pana sattannaṇ mahāvārānaṇ vasena anusaye yojetvā yamaka-desanā katā, tesaṇ imāni nāmāni (1) anusayavāro, (2) sānusayavāro, (3) pajahanavāro, (4) pariññāvāro. (5) pahīnavāro, (6) uppajjanavāro, (7) dhātuvāro ti : tesu paṭhamo anusayavāro.

So anuloma-paṭiloma-nayavasena duvidho hoti. Tattha anulomanaye *yassa anuseti, yattha anuseti, yassa yatthānuseti*ti puggalokāsa - tad - ubhayavasena tayo antaravārā honti. Tesu paṭhame puggalavāre. *Yassa kāmarāgānusayo anuseti, tassa paṭighānusayo anuseti. Yassa vā pana paṭighānusayo anuseti, tassa kāmarāgānusayo anuseti. Yassa kāmarāgānusayo anuseti tassa mānānusayo, diṭṭhānusayo, vicikicchānusayo, bhavarāgānusayo, avijjānusayo anuseti. Yassa vā pana avijjānusayo anuseti, tassa kāmarā-*

¹ Y. 268.

² *Ibid.*

gānusayo anuseti ti ¹ *kāmarāgānusaya-mūlakāni* cha yamakāni. Puna *agahita-gahaṇavasena* ² *paṭighānusaya-mūlakāni* pañca, *mānānusaya-mūlakāni* cattāri, *diṭṭhānusaya-mūlakāni* tīṇi, *vicikicchānusaya-mūlakāni* dve, *bhavarāgānusaya-mūlakaṇ* ekan ti evaṇ sabbāni pi ekamūlakāni ekavīsati.

Puna *yassa kāmarāgānusayo ca paṭighānusayo ca* anusenti ti ³ evaṇ āgatāni dukamūlakāni pañca, tikamūlakāni cattāri, catukkamūlakāni tīṇi, pañcakamūlakāni dve, chakkamūlakaṇ ekan ti aparāni pi ⁴ paṇṇarasa honti. Tāni purimehi ekavīsatiyā saddhiṇ chattiṇsāti puggalavāre chattiṇsa yamakāni; tathā okāsa-vāre; tathā puggalokāsavāre ti sabbāni pi anulomanaye aṭṭha sataṇ yamakāni; tathā paṭilomanaye ti anusayavāre solasādhikāni dve yamakasatāni. Tato diguṇā ⁵ pucchā, tato atthā ca ⁶ veditabbā.

Yathā c' ettha evaṇ Sānusayavāro, Pajahanavāro, Pariññā-vāro, Pahīnavāro, Uppajjanavāro ti imesam pi pañcannaṇ vārānaṇ, ekekasmiṇ-yamakaganaṇā yamakadiguṇā pucchā pucchā diguṇā ca atthā veditabbā.

Ayaṇ pan' ettha purimesu tisu vāresu viseso: okāsavāre yattha tatthāti avatvā yato tato ti nissakkavacanena desanā katā. Sesāṇ tādīsam eva. Yo panāyaṇ sabba-pacchimo Dhātuvāro nāma, so pucchāvāro, vissajjanavāro ti dvidhā ṭhito.

Tassa pucchāvāre *kāmadhātuyā cutassa kāmadhātuy* *uppajjantassāti* ⁷ vatvā *kāmadhātuy* vā pana *uppajjantassa kāmadhātuyā cutassāti* na vuttaṇ. Kiṇ kāraṇā? Attha-visesābhāvato. Dve pi hi ekā pucchā ekatthā yeva; tasmā ekekaṃhā ⁸ yamakā ekekaṃ eva pucchāṇ pucchitvā sabbapucchāvasāne pucchānukkamen' eva *kāmadhātuyā cutassa kāmadhātuy* *uppajjantassa kassaci satta anusayā anusenti* ⁹ ādinā nayena vissajjanaṇ kataṇ.

Tattha *kāmadhātuyā cutassa kāmadhātuy* *uppajjantassa, rūpadhātuy, arūpadhātuy, na kāmadhātuy, na rūpadhātuy,*

¹ *Ibid.*

² Br. agahitaggahaṇa°.

³ Y. 270, 1-2, 3.

⁴ S. omits.

⁵ S. dviguṇā, diguṇā.

⁶ S. ca atthā.

⁷ Y. 374.

⁸ Br. ekekaṃhā.

⁹ Y. 375.

na arūpadhātuy uppajjantassāti cha suddhikapucchā; na kāmādhātuy na arūpadhātuy, na rūpadhātuy na arūpadhātuy, na kāmādhātuy na rūpadhātuy uppajjantassāti tisso missakā pucchā cāti kāmādhātumūlakā¹ nava anulomapucchā honti.

Tathā rūpadhātumūlakā nava, arūpadhātumūlakā navāti satta vīsati anulomapucchā honti.

Tathā na kāmādhātu na rūpadhātu na arūpadhātumūlakā satta vīsati paṭiloma-pucchā. Puna na kāmādhātuyā na arūpadhātuyā, *na rūpadhātuyā na arūpadhātuyā, na* kāmādhātuyā na rūpadhātuyā ti sattavīsati dukamūlakā pucchā ti sabbā pi sampiṇḍitā ekāsīti pucchā honti. Tāsaṃ vasen' ettha vissajjanaṃ katan ti idaṃ Dhātuvāre Pālivavatthānaṃ. Evaṃ tāva sakale pi Anusaya-Yamake Pālivavatthānam etaṃ veditabbaṃ.

Ādito paṭṭhāya pan' ettha yaṃ yaṃ anuttānaṃ, tattha tattha ayaṃ vinicchaya-kathā.

Anusayā ti ken' atṭhena anusayā? Anusayanatṭhena. Ko esa anusayanatṭho nāmāti? Appahīnatṭho. Ete hi appahīnatṭhena tassa tassa santāne anusenti nāma, tasmā anusayā ti vuccanti. Anusentīti anurūpaṃ kāraṇaṃ labhītvā uppajjantīti attho. Athāpi siyā anusayanatṭho nāma appahīnākāro. Appahīnākāro ca uppajjatīti vattuṃ na yujjati, tasmā na anusayā uppajjantīti. Tatr' idaṃ paṭivacanaṃ, appahīnākāro anusayo. Anusayo ti pana appahīnatṭhena thāmagatakilesa vuccati. So cittasam-payutto sārammaṇo sappaccayaṭṭhena sahetuko ekantākusalo atīto pi hoti anāgato pi hoti paccuppanno pi; tasmā uppajjatīti vattuṃ yujjati. Tatr' idaṃ pamāṇaṃ: Abhidhamme tāva Kathāvatthusmiṃ anusayā avyākata, anusayā ahetukā, anusayā cittavippayuttā ti sabbe vādā paṭisedhitā.² Paṭisambhidāmagge paccuppanne kilese pajahatīti³ pucchāṃ katvā, anusayānaṃ paccuppannabhāvassā atthitāya thāmagatānusayaṃ pajahatīti vuttaṃ. Dhamma-sangahe⁴ mohassa padabhājane⁵ avijjānusayo avijjāpariyutṭhānaṃ avijjālaṅgī moho akusalamūlaṃ: ayaṃ tasmiṃ samaye moho

¹ S. mūlikā always.

* * S. omits.

² K. V. xi. 1 (ii. 244).

³ See Pts. ii. 217.

⁴ S. Br. sic.

⁵ Dh. S., § 390.

*hotīti ākusala-*cittena saddhiṃ avijjānusayassa uppanna-
bhāvo vutto.

Imasmiṃ yeva Anusaya-Yamake sattannaṃ mahāvārānaṃ
aññatarasmiṃ Uppajjanavāre *yassa kāmarāgānusayo uppaj-*
jati tassa paṭighānusayo uppajjatīti ādi vuttaṃ; tasmā
anusentīti anurūpaṃ kāraṇaṃ labhitvā uppajjantīti yaṃ
vuttaṃ, taṃ iminā tantipamāṇena suvuttaṃ ti veditabbaṃ.

Yam pi cittasampayutto sārammaṇo ti ādi vuttaṃ, tam
pi suvuttaṃ eva. Anusayo ti nāma' esa parinipphanno
cittasampayutto akusaladhammo ti niṭṭham ettha gan-
tabbaṃ.

Kāmarāgānusayo ti ādisu kāmarāgo ca so appahīna-
tṭhena anusayo cāti kāmarāgānusayo. Sesapadesu pi es'
eva nayo.

Idāni tesāṃ uppattiṭṭhānaṃ pakāsetuṃ *kattha kāmarā-*
*gānusayo anusetīti*¹ ādim āha. Tattha *kāmadhātuyā dvīsu*
vedanāsūti kāmāvacarabhūmiyaṃ sukhāya ca upekhāya
cāti dvīsu vedanāsu. *Ettha kāmarāgānusayo anusetīti*
imāsu dvīsu vedanāsu uppajjati. So pan' esa akusala-
vedanāsu saha-jātavasena ca ārammaṇavasena cāti dvīhā-
kārehi anuseti. Akusalasukhāya vedanāya c' eva upek-
hāvedanāya ca saha-jāto pi hutvā uppajjati. Tā vedanā
ārammaṇaṃ katvā pi uppajjatīti attho.

Avasesā pana kāmāvacara-kusalavipāka-kiriya-vedanā²
ārammaṇam eva katvā uppajjati. Kāmadhātuyā dvīsu
vedanāsu anusayamāno ce tāhi vedanāhi sampayuttesu
saññā-sankhāra-viññāṇesu pi anuseti yeva. Na hi sakkā
vedanāsu anusayamānena taṃ-sampayuttehi saññādihi
saddhiṃ asaha-jātena vā bhavituṃ, taṃ-sampayutte vā
saññādayo ārammaṇaṃ akatvā uppajjituṃ. Evaṃ sante pi
pana, yasmā imā dve vedanā va sātasantasukhattā assā-
danaṭṭhena³ kāmarāgānusayassa uppattiyā sesa-sam-
payuttadhammesu paṭṭhānā; tasmā *dvīsu vedanāsu ettha*
kāmarāgānusayo anusetīti vuttaṃ. Olārikavasena hi bo-
dhaneyyo sukhaṃ bodhetuṃ ti.

Tatra⁴ c' esa ārammaṇavasena anusayamāno na

¹ Y. 268.

² Br. °kriyā°.

³ Br. assādaṭṭhena.

⁴ Br. Nanu.

kevalaṇ imāsu dvīsu vedanāsu ceva vedanāsampayutta-dhammesu ca anuseti; iṭṭhesu pana rūpādīsu pi anuseti yeva. Vuttam pi c' etaṇ Vibhangappakarane : *yaṇ loke piyarūpaṇ ettha satarūpaṇ sattānaṇ kāmarāgānusayo anusetīti*. Imasmim pi pakarane Anusayavārassa paṭilomanaye vuttaṇ.¹

*Yattha kāmarāgānusayo nānuseti, tattha diṭṭhānusayo nānusetīti ? Dukkāya vedanāya rūpadhātuyā arūpadhātuyā ettha kāmarāgānusayo nānuseti, no ca tattha diṭṭhānusayo nānuseti . . . apariyāpanne ettha kāmarāgānusayo ca nānuseti, diṭṭhānusayo ca nānusetīti*² ettha hi dukkha-vedanāya ceva rūpadhātu ādīsu ca nānusetīti vuttattā sampayutta dhammaṇ dukkhavedanaṇ okāse rūpārūpāvacara-dhamme nava ca lokuttaradhamme ṭhapetvā avasesesu rūpa-sadda-gandha-rasa-phoṭṭhabbesu anusetīti vuttaṇ hoti. Taṇ idha kasmā na vuttan ti ? Anolārikattā. Heṭṭhā vuttanayena hi vedanānaṇ yeva³ olārikattā imesaṇ ca anolārikattā etesu rūpādīsu anusetīti na vuttaṇ. Atthato pana labbhati, tasmā etesu pi kāmarāgānusayo anuseti yevāti veditabbo.

Na hi Satthā sabbaṇ sabbattha katheti. Bodhaneyya-sattānaṇ pana vasena katthaci yaṇ labbhati, taṇ sabbaṇ katheti, katthaci na katheti. Tathā hi anena⁴ *katthaci diṭṭhānusayo anusetīti pucchitvā sabbasakkāyapariyāpannesu dhammesu ettha diṭṭhānusayo anusetīti*⁵ yaṇ labbhati, tan sabbaṇ kathitaṇ.

Aparasmiṇ ṭhāne vissajjantena rūpadhātuyā arūpadhātuyā ettha vicikicchānusayo ca mānānusayo ca diṭṭhānusayo ca anusetīti.⁶ Kāmadhātuyā dvīsu vedanāsu ettha vicikicchānusayo ca kāmarāgānusayo ca mānānusayo ca diṭṭhānusayo ca anusenti. Dukkāya vedanāya ettha vicikicchānusayo ca paṭighānusayo ca diṭṭhānusayo ca anusenti yaṇ labbhati, taṇ sabbaṇ akathetvā rūpadhātu-arūpadhātūhi saddhiṇ tisso vedanāya kathitā. Vedanāsampayuttā pana arūpadhammā sabbaṇ ca rūpaṇ

¹ *Vibh.*, p. 340.

² Y. 283, 1, 4-5.

³ Br. vedanānaññeva.

⁴ S. tena.

⁵ Y. 268.

⁶ Y. 273, 1-4, 5.

na kathitaṇ. Kiñcāpi na kathitaṇ, diṭṭhānusayo pan' ettha anuseti yeva. Evam eva¹ kiñcāpi idha rūpādi iṭṭhārammaṇaṇ na kathitaṇ. Kāmarāgānusayo pan' ettha anuseti yevāti evaṇ tāva kāmarāgānusayassa anusayaṭṭhānaṇ veditabbaṇ.

Paṭighānusayassa pana *dukkhāya vedanāyāti*² vacanato dve domanassavedanā kāyaviññāṇasampayuttā dukkha-vedanāti tisso vedanā anusayaṭṭhānaṇ. So pan' esa domanassavedanāsu saha-jātavasena ārammaṇavasena cāti dvihākāre hi anuseti. Avasesadukkhavedanāya pana ārammaṇavasen' eva anuseti. Tāsu vedanāsu anusaya-māno cetasā hi sampayuttesu saññākkhandhādīsu pi anuseti yeva. Yāya hi vedanāya esa saha-jāto, taṇ-sampayuttehi saññādīhi pi saha-jāto va. Yāva vedanā ārammaṇaṇ karoti, tāhi sampayutte saññādayo pi karoti yeva. Evaṇ sante pi pana yasmā dukkhavedanā va asāta dukkhavedayitattā nirassādaṭṭhena paṭighānusayassa uppattiya sesasampayuttadhammesu adhikā, tasmā *dukkhāya vedanāya ettha . . . paṭighānusayo anusetīti vuttaṇ*. Olārikavasena hi bodhaneyye sukhaṇ bodhetun ti. Nanu sace³ ārammaṇavasena anusayamāno na kevalaṇ dukkhavedanāya ceva taṇ-sampayuttadhammesu ca anuseti, anitṭhesu pana rūpādīsu pi anuseti yeva. Vuttam pi c' etaṇ Vibhangappakaraṇe *yaṇ loke appiyarūpaṇ asātarūpaṇ, ettha sattānaṇ paṭighānusayo anusetīti*.⁴ Imasmim pi pakaraṇe anusayavārassa paṭilomanaye vuttaṇ *kāmadhātuyā dvīsu vedanāsu ettha paṭighānusayo nānuseti, *no ca tattha kāmarāgānusayo nānuseti ;* rūpadhātuyā arūpadhātuyā apariyāpanne ettha paṭighānusayo ca nānuseti kāmarāgānusayo ca nānusetīti*.⁵ Ettha hi dvīsu kāmāvacaravedanāsu⁶ ceva rūpadhātu ādīsu ca nānusetīti vuttattā sampayuttadhammā dve vedanā sabbakāye⁷ rūpārūpāvacaradhammesu⁸ nava ca⁹ lokuttaradhammesu⁸

¹ S. ettha.

² Y. 271, 2, 4-5.

³ Br. cesa.

⁴ Vibh. 340.

* * S. omits.

⁵ Y. 283. In the question ibid. for Y. read Yattha.

⁶ Br. Ettha hi dukkhavedanāya.

⁷ Br. sa-okāse.

⁸ Br. °dhamme.

⁹ S. omits.

Kiñ pana itarā dve vedanā iṭṭhārammaṇaṇ vā paṭi-
 ghassa ārammaṇaṇ na hontīti? No na honti. Pari-
 hīnajjhānassa hi vippaṭisāravasena sampayuttadhammā
 tā vedanā ārabha domanassaṇ uppajjati. Iṭṭhāram-
 maṇassa ca paṭiladdhassa vipariṇāmaṇ vā appaṭiladdhassa
 appaṭilābhaṇ vā samanussarato pi domanassaṇ uppajjati.
 Domanassamattam eva pana taṇ hoti, na paṭighānusayo.
 Paṭighānusayo hi ¹ aniṭṭhārammaṇe paṭihaññavasena
 uppanno thāmagato kilesa, tasmā ettha domanassena
 saddhiṇ paṭigho uppanno pi attano paṭighakiccaṇ akarāṇa-
 bhāvena evaṇ paṭighānusayo na hoti abbohārikattaṇ
 gacchati. Yathā hi pāṇātipātacetanāya saddhiṇ uppanno
 pi vyāpādo manokammaṇ nāma na hoti, abbohārikattaṇ
 gacchati, evaṇ paṭighānusayo na hoti, abbohārikattaṇ
 gacchati. Vuttam pi c' etaṇ ekaccaṇ iṭṭhārammaṇaṇ
 nekkhammasitam pi vā domanassaṇ sandhāya yaṇ eva-
 rūpaṇ domanassaṇ paṭighaṇ, tena pajahati, na tattha
 paṭighānusayo anusetīti evaṇ paṭighānusayassa anusaya-
 naṭṭhānaṇ veditabbaṇ.

¹ S. na paṭighānusayehi.

Digitized by Noolaham Foundation.
noolaham.org | aavanaham.org

pi ayaṇ anuseti yevāti evaṇ mānānusayassa anusayanatthānaṇ¹ veditabbaṇ.

Diṭṭhānusaya-vicikicchānusayā pana kevalaṇ lokuttara-dhamme sveva nānusenti. Tebhūmakesu pana sabbesu pi anusenti yeva. Tena vuttaṇ sabbasakkāya pariyāpannesu dhammesu *ettha diṭṭhānusayo anuseti, ettha vicikicchānusayo anusetīti*.² Tattha sabbasakkāyapariyāpannesūti saṅsāravatṭa-nissitatṭhena sakkāyapariyāpannesu sabbadhammesūti attho.

Tattha pan' ete pañcasu cittuppādesu saha-jātānusaya-vasena anusenti. Te vā pañca cittuppāde aññe vā tebhūmakadhamme ārabba pavattikāle ārammaṇānusayavasena anusetīti evaṇ diṭṭhānusayavicikicchānusayānaṇ anusayanatthānaṇ veditabbaṇ.

Bhavarāgānusaye pana kiñcāpidiṭṭhivippayuttesu catūsu cittesu uppajjanato saha-jātānusayavasena kāmādhātuyā dvīsu vedanāsu anusetīti vattabbo bhavēyya. Kāmādhātuyaṇ pan' esa dvīhi vedanāhi saddhiṇ uppajjamāno pi rūpārūpāvacaradhammam eva paṭilabhati. Kāmādhātuyā pariyāpannaṇ dhammam pi ārammaṇaṇ na karoti, tasmā ārammaṇānusayavasena niyamaṇ katvā *rūpadhātuyā arūpadhātuyā ettha bhavarāgānusayo anusetīti* vuttaṇ. Api ca rāgo nām' esa kāmarāga-bhavarāgavasena duvidho. Tattha kāmarāgo kāmādhātuyā dvīsu vedanāsu anusetīti vutto. Sace pana bhavarāgo pi kāmarāgo³ viya³ evaṇ vucceyya, kāmarāgena saddhiṇ desanā sankinnā viya bhavēyyāti rāgakilesaṇ dvidhā⁴ bhinditvā, kāmarāgato bhavarāgassa visesadassanattham pi evaṇ desanā katāti evaṇ bhavarāgānusayassa anusayanatthānaṇ veditabbaṇ.

Avijjānusayo pana sabbesu pi tebhūmakadhammesu anuseti. Tena vuttaṇ sabbasakkāyapariyāpannesu dhammesu *ettha āvijjānusayo anusetīti*. Tassa dvādasasu cittuppādesu saha-jātānusayatā veditabbā. Ārammaṇakaraṇavasena pana na kiñci tebhūmakadhammaṇ ārabba nappavattatīti⁵ evaṇ avijjānusayassa anusayanatthānaṇ veditabbaṇ.

¹ S. anusayatṭh°.

² Y. 268.

³ S. omits.

⁴ S. inserts pi.

⁵ Br. na pav°.

Ayaṇ tāva paricchedavāra-paricchinnuddesavāra-uppat-
tiṭṭhānavāra-bhedesu vinicchayakathā.

Sattannaṇ pana mahāvārānaṇ paṭhame anusayavāre :
yassa kāmarāgānusayo anuseti, tassa paṭighānusayo anuseti
ettha yade taṇ āmantāti paṭivacanaṇ dinnāṇ, taṇ duddinnaṇ
viya khāyati. Kasmā? Kāmarāgapaṭighānaṇ ekakkhaṇe
anuppattito. Yathā hi : *yassa manāyatanaṇ uppajjati, tassa*
dhammāyatanaṇ uppajjati? *Āmantā*¹ . . . *Assāsapassāsānaṇ*
uppādakkhaṇe tesāṇ kāyasankhāro ca uppajjati vacīsankhāro
ca uppajjati-ādisu² manāyatana-dhammāyatanāni kāya-
sankhāra-vacīsankhārā ca ekakkhaṇe uppajjanti, na tathā
kāmarāgapaṭighā. Kāmarāgo pi hi aṭṭhasu lobhasa-
hagata-cittuppādesu uppajjati ; paṭigho dvīsu domanassa-
sahagatesūti natthi tesāṇ ekakkhaṇe uppatti, tasmā ettha
no ti paṭisedho kattabbo siyā. Taṇ akatvā pana āmantā ti
paṭivacanassa dinnattā hetṭhā Yamakesu viya, etthakhaṇe
paccuppannavasena vattamānavohāraṇ agahetvā,³ aññathā
gahetabbaṇ.⁴ Kathaṇ? Appahīnavasena. Apahīnatañ
hi sandhāya ayaṇ *anuseti*ti vattamānavohāro vutto, na
khaṇe paccuppannataṇ. Yasmā appahīnataṇ sandhāya
vutto, tasmā *yassa kāmarāgānusayo anuseti, tassa paṭi-*
*ghānusayo anuseti*ti pucchā yassa kāmarāgānusaya appa-
hīno, na anuppattidhammātaṇ āpādito, tassa paṭighānu-
sayo pi appahīno ti evam attho daṭṭhabbo.

Yasmā ca tesu sesako appahīno, tassa itaro pi appahīno
va hoti, tasmā āmantā ti vuttaṇ. Yadi evaṇ yaṇ upari⁵
uppajjanavāre *yassa kāmarāgānusayo uppajjati, tassa paṭi-*
*ghānusayo uppajjati*ti pucchitvā āmantā ti vuttaṇ, tattha
kathaṇ attho gahetabbo ti. Tatthāpi appahīnavasen' eva
uppattippaccaye sati uppattiyā anivāritavasena vā. Yathā
hi cittakammādīni ārabhitvā apariniṭṭhitakammantā citta-
kāradayo tesāṇ kammānaṇ akaraṇakkhaṇe pi mittasu-
hajjādīhi diṭṭha-diṭṭhaṭṭhāne imesu divasesu kiṇ karoṭhāti
vuttā cittakammaṇ karoma, kaṭṭhakammaṇ karomāti
vadanti, te kiñcāpi tasmiṇ khaṇe na karonti, avicchinna-
kammantattā pana katakhaṇaṇ ca kattabbakhaṇaṇ ca

¹ Y. 60 (11-12).² Y. 232, 1. i.³ Br. agahetvā.⁴ Br. °abbo.⁵ S. omits.

upādāya karonti yeva nāma honti, evam eva yamhi santāne anusayā appahīna, yam hi vā tesañ santāne uppajjanti,¹ paccaye sati, uppatti anivāritā. Tattha anuppajjanakhaṇe pi uppannapubbaṇ² ceva kālantare uppajjanakañ ca upādāya; *yassa kāmarāgānusayo uppajjati, tassa paṭighānusayo uppajjati* yeva nāmāti, evam attho veditabbo. Ito paresu pi evarūpesu vissajjanesu es' eva nayo.

*No ca tassāti*³ idaṇ anāgāmissa kāmarāgavyāpādānaṇ anavasesato pahīnattā vuttaṇ. *Tiṇṇaṇ puggalānan*⁴ ti puthujjana-sotāpanna-sakadāgāmīnaṇ. *Dvinnāṇ puggalānan* ti sotāpanna-sakadāgāmīnaṇ. Parato pi evarūpesu thānesu es' eva nayo.

Okāsavārassa paṭhama-dutiya-pucchāsu⁵ yasmā kāmarāgānusayo *kāmadhātuyā dvīsu vedanāsu* anuseti, paṭighānusayo dukkhavedanāya, tasmā *no* ti paṭisedho kato. Tato tatiya-pucchāya⁶ ubhinnaṃ pi kāmadhātuyā dvīsu vedanāsu anusayanato *āmanta* ti paṭivacanaṇ dinnāṇ. Rūpadhātu-ārūpadhātuyā pana mānānusayassa kāmarāgānusayena saddhiṇ asādhāraṇaṇ uppattiṭṭhānaṇ; tasmā *no ca tattha kāmarāgānusayo* ti vuttaṇ.

Iminā nayena sabbesaṇ uppattiṭṭhānavāraṇ oloketvā sādharma-sādhāraṇaṇ uppattiṭṭhānaṇ veditabbaṇ.

Dukamūlaka-pucchāyaṇ,⁷ yasmā kāmarāga-paṭighānusayā nāpi ekasmiṇ thāne uppajjanti, na-y-ekaṇ⁸ dhammaṇ ārammaṇaṇ karonti; tasmā *natthīti* paṭikkhepo kato. Ayaṇ h' ettha adhippāyo. Yasmā ime dve anusayā anusayeyyaṇ, taṇ thānam eva natthi, tasmā *kattha mānānusayo anusetīti* ayaṇ pucchā apucchā yevāti. Aññesu pi evarūpesu es' eva nayo.

Puggalokāsavāre *catunnaṇ* ti puthujjana-sotāpanna-sakadāgāmi-anāgāmīnaṇ. Patilomanaye: *yassa kāmarāgānusayo nānusetīti*⁹ ayaṇ pucchā anāgāmiṇ gahetvā pucchati. *Dvinnāṇ puggalānaṇ sabbattha kāmarāgā-*

¹ Br. uppatti.

² Br. pubbañ.

³ Y. 268.

⁴ *Ibid.* 269

⁵ Y. 271, 1, 2; 1, 3.

⁶ *Ibid.* 1, 4-5.

⁷ S. °chāya. Y. 272, 1-2, 3 ff.

⁸ Br. na ekaṇ.

⁹ Y. 286, 1, 2.

*nusayo*¹ *nānusetīti* anāgāmi-arahantānaṃ. *Kāmadhātuyā tīsu vedanāsūti* vedanā-gahaṇena² vedanā sampayuttakānam pi tesāṃ vatthārammaṇānam pīti sabbesam pi kāmāvacaradhammānaṃ gahaṇaṃ veditabbaṃ.

Ayaṃ anusayavāre vinicchayakathā.

Sānusaya-vāre³ pana *yo kāmarāgānusayena sānusayo* ti yathā ekantarikajarādi rogena ābādhiko yāva tamhā rogā na muccati, tāva tassa rogassa anuppattikkhaṇe pi sarogo yeva nāma hoti, evaṃ sānusayakilesassa⁴ vaṭṭagāmi sattassa yāva ariyamaggena anusayā samugghātāṃ na gacchanti, tāva tesāṃ anusayānaṃ anuppattikkhaṇe pi sānusayo yeva nāma hoti; evarūpaṃ sayanaṃ sandhāya āmantāti vuttaṃ. Sesam sānusayataṃ ettha anusaya-vārasadisam eva.

Okāsavāre pana rūpadhātuyā arūpadhātuyā ettha *mānānusayena sānusayo* ti vutte tāsū dhātūsu puggalassa pure⁵ sānusayātā paññāyeyya, anusayassa uppattiṭṭhānaṃ na paññāyeyya; anusayassa ca uppattiṭṭhānadassanattāṃ ayaṃ vāro āraddho, tasmā *tato mānānusayena sānusayo*⁶ ti vuttaṃ. Evaṃ⁷ hi sati tato dhātu dvayato uppannena mānānusayena sānusayo ti anusayassa uppattiṭṭhānaṃ dassitaṃ hoti. Imassa pana pañhassa atthe vutte ādi pañhassa atthe avutte ādi pañhassa attho pākaṭo na hotīti paṭhamaṃ na vutto; tasmā so evaṃ veditabbo *yato kāmarāgānusayenāti* yato uppannena kāmarāgānusayena sānusayo, kiṃ so tato 'va⁵ uppannena paṭighānusayena pi sānusayo ti. Yasmā pan' ete dve ekasmā ṭhānā na uppajjanti, tasmā *no* ti paṭisedho kato. *Arahā sabbatthāti* arahā sabbadhammesu uppājjanakena kenaci anusayena nirānusayo ti iminā atthavasena nippadesaṭṭhānesu bhumma vacanam eva katan ti, iminā upāyena sabbattha atthavinicchayo veditabbo ti.

Sānusaya-vārakathā niṭṭhitā.

¹ S. *adds* ca. Y. *ibid.*

² Br. vedanāgg°.

³ Y. 294.

⁴ Br. sasankilesassa.

⁵ Br. *omits.*

⁶ Y. 296, 1, 3.

⁷ Br. Evañ.

Pajahanavāre pajahatīti¹ tena tena maggena pahāna-pariññāvasena pajahati, āyatiṃ anuppatti dhammataṃ apādeti. *Āmantā* ti anāgāmimaggaṭṭhaṃ sandhāya paṭi-vacanaṃ. *Tadekaṭṭhaṃ* pajahatīti pahānekaṭṭhataṃ sandhāya vuttaṃ. *No* ti arahattamaggaṭṭhaṃ sandhāya paṭisedho kato.² *Yato kāmarāgānusayaṃ* pajahatīti yato uppajjanakaṃ kāmarāgānusayaṃ pajahatīti attho.

Aṭṭhamako ti³ arahattaphalaṭṭhato paṭṭhāya paccoroharāṇa-gaṇanāya gaṇiyamāno sotāpatti maggaṭṭho aṭṭhamako nāma. Dakkhiṇeyya-gaṇanāya hi arahā agga-dakkhiṇeyyattā paṭhamo, arahattamaggaṭṭho dutiyo, anāgāmī, tatiyo . . . *pe* . . . sotāpatti maggaṭṭho aṭṭhamo. So idha aṭṭhamako ti vutto. Nāmasaññā yeva vā esā tassāti.

*Anāgāmi-maggasamangiṇ*⁴ *ca aṭṭhamakaṇ ca ṭhapetvā avasesā* ti saddhiṃ puthujjanena sekhāsekhā. Tesu hi puthujjano pahāna-pariññāya abhāvena nappajahanti. Sesā tesāṃ anusayānaṃ pahīnattā *dvinnāṃ* maggasamangiṇaṃ ti dve maggasamangino *ṭhapetvā* ti attho.

Iminā nayena sabbattha vinicchayo veditabbo.

Pajahanavārakathā niṭṭhitā.

Pariññāvāre *parijānātīti*⁵ tīhi pariññāhi parijānāti. Sesam ettha heṭṭhā vuttanayam eva. Ayam pi hi vāro Pajahanavāro viya maggaṭṭhānaṃ yeva vasena vissajjito ti.

Pariññāvārakathā niṭṭhitā.

Pahīnavāre⁶ phalaṭṭhavasena' eva desanā āraddhā. Anāgāmissa hi ubho p' ete anusayā pahīnā, tasmā *āmantā* ti vuttaṃ. Okāsavāre *yattha kāmarāgānusayo pahīno, tattha paṭighānusayo pahīno* ti⁷ *pucchitvā na vattabbaṃ*⁸ *pahīno ti vā appahīno ti vā* vuttaṃ. Taṃ kasmā ti uppattiṭṭhānassa asādhāraṇattā aññaṃ hi kāmarāgānu-

¹ Y. 318 ff.

² Br. omits.

³ Y. 322, 1, 4-5 ff. Cf. fn. *ibid*.

⁴ Y. 325, 1, 4-5 ff.

⁵ Y. 338.

⁶ Y. 356.

⁷ Y. 358.

⁸ Br. °bbo.

sayassa uppattiṭṭhānaṃ, aññaṃ paṭighānusayassa. Abhāvita-maggassa ca, yattha anusayo uppajjati, magge bhāvite tatth' eva so pahīno nāma hoti. Tattha yasmā neva kāmarāgānusayaṭṭhāne paṭighānusayo uppajjati, *na paṭighānusayaṭṭhāne kāmarāgānusayo,* tasmā so ¹ tattha ¹ *pahīno ti vā appahīno ti vāti* na vattabbo.² So yasmiṃ attano uppattiṭṭhāne kāmarāgānusayo pahīno, tasmiṃ appahīnattā tattha *pahīno ti* na vattabbo. Yaṃ kāmarāgānusayassa uppattiṭṭhānaṃ, tasmiṃ aṭṭhitattā tattha *appahīno ti* na vattabbo.

Yattha kāmarāgānusayo pahīno, tattha mānānusayo pahīno ti ettha pana sādharmaṇaṭṭhānaṃ sandhāya āmantā ti vuttaṃ. Kāmarāgānusayo hi kāmādhātuyā dvīsu vedanāsu anuseti. Mānānusayo tāsu ceva rūpārūpadhātūsu ca. So ṭhapetvā asādharmaṇaṭṭhānaṃ sādharmaṇaṭṭhāne tena saddhiṃ pahīno nāma hoti, tasmā āmantā ti vuttaṃ. Iminā nayena sabbas-mim pi okāsavāre pahīnatā ca na vattabbatā ca veditabbā. Natthīti āgataṭṭhānesu pana heṭṭhā vuttasadiṣo va vinicchayo.

Puggalokāsavāro okāsavāragahiko yeva. Paṭilomanaye, *yassa kāmarāgānusayo appahīno* ³ ti puthujjana-sotāpanna-sakadāgāmiवासena pucchati. Kiñcāpi hi ime dve anusayā puthujjanato paṭṭhāya yāva anāgāmimaggaṭṭhā channaṃ puggalānaṃ appahīnā. Idha pana parato tiṇṇaṃ puggalānaṃ dvinnāṃ puggalānaṃ ti ādi vacanato maggaṭṭhā adhippetā, tasmā puthujjana - sotāpanna - sakadāgāmino sandhāya āmantā ti vuttaṃ. *Dvinnāṃ puggalānaṃ* ti sotāpannasakadāgāmiṇaṃ. Iminā nayena puggalavāre vinicchayo veditabbo.

Okāsavāra-puggalokāsavāre pana heṭṭhā vuttanāyen' eva veditabbo ti.

Pahīnavāra-kathā niṭṭhitā.

Uppajjanavāro anusayavārasadiṣo yeva.

Dhātuvārassa pucchāvāre tāva *kati anusayā anusenti* ti?⁴

* * S. omits.

¹ Br. *inverts order*.

² Y. 358.

³ Y. 365.

⁴ Y. 374.

Kati anusayā santānaṃ anugatā hutvā sayanti. Kati anusayā nānuseti kati anusayā santānaṃ anugatā hutvā sayanti. *Kati anusayābhangā* ti kati anusayā anuseti nānuseti evaṃ vibhajitabbā ti attho.

Sesam ettha yaṃ vattabbaṃ siyā, taṃ heṭṭhā Pāli-vavatthāne¹ vuttam eva.

Niddesavāre² pan' assa *kassaci satta anusayā anuseti* puthujjanavasena vuttaṃ ; *kassaci pañcāti* sotāpanna-sakadāgāmiyasena vuttaṃ. Tesaṃ hi diṭṭhānusayo ca vicikicchānusayo ca pahīnā ti pañc' eva anuseti. Tattha yathā anusayavāre *anuseti* padassa uppajjantīti attho gahito, evam idha na gahetabbo. Kasmā ? Tasmiṃ khaṇe anuppajjanato. Kāmadhātun uppajjantassa hi vipākacittaṃ ceva kammamuṭṭhānarūpaṃ ca uppajjati, akusalacittaṃ natthi. Anusayā ca akusalacittakkhaṇe uppajjanti, na vipākacittakkhaṇe ti tasmiṃ khaṇe anuppajjanato tathā attho na gahetabbo.

Katham³ pana gahetabbo ti ? Yathā labbhati, tathā gahetabbo. Kathaṃ ca labbhati ? Appahīnaṭṭhena. Yathā hi rāgadosamohānaṃ appahīnattā kusalāvyākata-cittasamangī ti⁴ puggalo sarāgo sadoso samoho ti vuccati, evaṃ maggabhāvanāya appahīnattā paṭisandhikkhaṇe pi tassa tassa⁴ puggalassa te te anusayā anuseti vuccanti. Na kevalaṃ vuccanti, appahīnattā pana⁵ te⁵ anuseti yeva nāmāti veditabbā.

Anusayābhangā natthīti yassa hi yo anusayo⁴ anuseti, so anuseti nāma;⁶ yo nānuseti, so nānuseti yeva ; ayaṃ anuseti ca, nānuseti ca;⁵ ayaṃ siyā anuseti,⁵ siyā nānuseti evaṃ vibhajitabbo anusayo nāma natthi.

*Rūpadhātun uppajjantassa*⁷ *kassaci tayo* ti anāgāmiyasena vuttaṃ. Tassa hi kāmarāgapaṭighadiṭṭhivicikicchānusayā cattāro pi anavasesato pahīnā. Itare tayo va appahīnā. Tena vuttaṃ *kassaci tayo anusayā anuseti*.

Na kāmadhātun ti kāmadhātuyā paṭisiddhattā sesā dve dhātuyo uppajjantassāti attho.

¹ S. °vavatthāpane.

² Y. 375.

³ Br. kathaṃ.

⁴ Br. omits.

⁵ S. omits.

⁶ Br. substitutes yeva.

⁷ uppajjantesu.

Satt' evāti yasmā ariyasāvakassa rūpadhātuyā cutassa kāmādhātuyaṃ uppatti nāma n' atthi, puthujjanass'eva hoti, tasmā satt' evāti niyametvā vuttaṃ.

Arupadhātuyā cutassa kāmādhātuyā uppajjantassa satt' evāti etthāpi es' eva nayo. Rūpadhātuyā uppatti natthīti, kasmā natthi? Uppatti nipphādakassa rūpāvacarajjhānassa abhāvā. Yo hi sabbaso rūpasāññānaṃ samatikamānaṃ dhātuyā uppanno ti nāssa tattha rūpāvacarajjhānaṃ atthi. Tad-abhāvā rūpadhātuyaṃ uppatti natthīti veditabbā. Arūpadhātuyā cutassa na kāmādhātun ti ettha arūpadhātu yeva adhippetā. Iminā nayena sabbavissajjanesu attho veditabbo ti.

Dhātuvāra-kathā niṭṭhitā.

Anusaya-Yamakavannanā samattā.

[Citta-Yamaka.]

Idāni tesāṃ ¹ Mūla-Yamake desitānaṃ kusalādi-dhammānaṃ ² labbhamānavasena ekadesam eva sangaṇhitvā Anusaya-Yamakānantaraṃ desitassa Citta-Yamakassa atthavaṇṇanā hoti. Tattha Pāḷivavatthānaṃ tāva veditabbaṃ.

Imasmiṃ Citta-Yamake mātikā-ṭhapaṇaṃ, ³ ṭhapitamātikāya vissajjanaṃ ti dve vārā honti. Tattha mātikāṭhapaṇe Puggalavāro, Dhammavāro, Puggaladhammavāro ti ādito va tayo suddhikamahāvārā ⁴ honti.

Tattha : *yassa cittaṃ uppajjati na nirujjhatīti* ⁵ evaṃ puggalavasena cittassa uppajjana - nirujjhanādibhedāṃ dīpento gato Puggalavāro nāma. *Yaṃ cittaṃ uppajjati na nirujjhatīti* ⁶ evaṃ dhammavasena' eva cittassa uppajjana - nirujjhanādibhedāṃ dīpento gato Dhammavāro nāma. *Yassa yaṃ cittaṃ uppajjati na nirujjhatīti* ⁷ evaṃ ubhaya-vasena cittassa uppajjananirujjhanādibhedāṃ dīpento gato Puggaladhammavāro nāma.

¹ Br. *adds* yeva.

² S. desitadhammānaṃ.

³ S. mātikāya ṭh^c.

⁴ S. *omits* mahā.

⁵ Y. II, 1.

⁶ Y. II, 4.

⁷ Y. II, 6.

Tato *yassa sarāgaṇaṃ cittaṇaṃ* ti soḷasannaṃ padānaṃ vasena¹ apare sarāgādi-padavisesitā soḷasa puggalavārā, soḷasa dhammavārā, soḷasa puggaladhammavārā ti aṭṭha cattārīsa² missakavārā honti. Te sarāgādi-padamattaṇaṃ dassetvā sankhittā. Tato *yassa kusalacittaṇaṃ* ti ādinā nayena chasaṭṭhidvisata - sankhānaṃ abhidhammamātikā-padānaṃ vasena apare kusalādi-padavisesitā chasaṭṭhidvisata-puggalavārā, chasaṭṭhi - dvisata - puggaladhammavārā ti aṭṭha [cattārīsa]³ navuti sattaṣaṭṭhamissakavārā honti. Te pi kusalādi-padamattaṇaṃ dassetvā sankhittā yeva. Yāni p'ettha sanidassanādīni padāni cittaṇaṃ sad-dhiṇaṃ na vuccanti, tāni moghapucchāvasena gahitāni.⁴ Tesu pana tīsu vāresu sabbapaṭṭhame suddhika-puggalamahāvāre uppādanirodhakālasambhedavāro, uppāda-uppannavāro, nirodha-uppannavāro, uppādavāro, nirodhavāro, uppādanirodhavāro, [uppāda-nirodhabhāvo]⁵ uppajjamānanirodhavāro, uppajjamāna - uppannavāro, nirujjhamānanuppannavāro, uppannuppādavāro, atītānāgataavāro uppanna-uppajjamānavāro ti niruddha-nirujjhamānavāro atikkantakālavāro ti cuddasa antaravārā. Tesu uppādavāro, nirodhavāro, uppādanirodhavāro⁵ ti imesaṃ tīsu vāresu anuloma-paṭilomavasena cha cha katvā aṭṭhārasya yamakāni. Uppannuppādavāre atītānāgatakālavasena anulomato dve, paṭilomato dve ti cattārī yamakāni. Sesesu ādito niddiṭṭhesu tīsu, anantare niddiṭṭhesu tīsu, avasāne niddiṭṭhesu catūsūti dasasu vāresu anulomato ekaṃ, paṭilomato ekaṃ ti dve dve katvā vīsati yamakāni. Evaṃ sabbesu pi cuddasasu antaravāresu cattārīsa yamakāni, caturāsīti pucchā, aṭṭha saṭṭhi aṭṭhasataṇaṃ hoti. Yathā ca ekasmiṃ suddhikapuggalamahāvāre, tathā suddhikadhammavāre pi suddhikapuggalādhammavāre pīti tīsu mahāvāresu chabbīsati yamakasataṇaṃ. Tato diguṇā pucchā, tato diguṇā atthā ca veditabbā. Idaṃ pana vārattayaṇaṃ sarāgādivasena soḷasa guṇaṃ kusalādivasena chasaṭṭhi dvisata guṇaṃ katvā imasmiṃ Citta-Yamake anekāni yamakasahassāni tato diguṇā pucchā, tato diguṇa atthā-ca

¹ Y. II, 9.² Br. cattālisaṇaṃ.³ Br. omits.⁴ Br. ṭhapitāni.⁵ S. all three in loc. case.

hontīti. Pāṭho pana sankhitto ti. Evaṃ tāva imasmiṃ Citta-Yamake Pālivavatthānam eva veditabbaṃ.

Mātikāṭhapanavannaṇā nīṭṭhitā.

Idāni ṭhapitānukkamena mātikaṃ vissajjetuṃ : *yassa cittaṃ uppajjati na nirujjhatīti*¹ ādi āraddhaṃ. Tattha² *uppajjati*³ uppādakkaṇasamangitāya *uppajjanti na nirujjhatīti* nirodhakkhaṇa-appattatāya⁴ na nirujjhati. *Tassa cittaṃ* ti tassa puggalassa tato paṭṭhāya cittaṃ *nirujjhissati na uppajjissatīti* pucchati. *Sesaṃ cittaṃ* ti sesaṃ aparicchinṇavaṭṭadukkhāṇaṃ khīṇāsavaṇaṃ sabba-pacchimassa cuticittassa * uppādakkaṇo vattati, etesaṃ tad - eva cuticittaṃ * uppādapattatāya uppajjati nāma, bhaṅgaṃ appattatāya na nirujjhati. Idāni pana bhaṅgaṃ patvā taṃ tesāṃ cittaṃ nirujjhissati, tato appaṭisandhikattā aññaṃ nuppajjissati.

Itaresaṃ ti pacchimakittasamangiṃ khīṇāsavaṇaṃ ṭhapetvā avasesānaṃ sekhāsekha-puthujjanānaṃ. *Nirujjhissati ceva uppajjissati cāti* yaṃ taṃ uppādakkaṇapattaṃ⁵ taṃ nirujjhissat' eva. Aññaṃ pana tasmiṃ vā aññasmiṃ vā attabhāve uppajjissati ceva nirujjhissati ca. Dutiyapucchā-vissajjane tathārūpassa khīṇāsavassa cittaṃ sandhāya āmantā ti vuttaṃ.

*Nuppajjati*⁶ *nirujjhatīti* bhaṅgakkhaṇe arahato pacchimakittam pi sesānaṃ bhijjamāna⁷-cittam pi. Tato paṭṭhāya pana arahato tāva⁸ *cittaṃ na nirujjhissatīti* sakkā vattuṃ, *uppajjissatīti* pana na sakkā. Sesānaṃ *uppajjissatīti* sakkā vattuṃ, *na nirujjhissatīti* na sakkā, tasmā no ti paṭisedho kato.

Dutiyapañhe *yassa cittaṃ na nirujjhissati uppajjissatīti*⁹ so puggalo yeva natthi, tasmā *natthīti* paṭikkhepo kato.

*Uppannaṃ*¹⁰ ti uppādasamangino p' etaṃ nāmaṃ. Uppādaṃ patvā aniruddhassāpi. Tattha uppādasamangitaṃ

¹ Y. II, 9.

² S. Tīni (sic).

³ S. omits.

⁴ Br. °khaṇaṃ app°.

* * S. omits.

⁵ Br. °ppattaṃ.

⁶ S. : Nuppajjissati nirujjhissatīti. Y. II, 9.

⁷ S. bhajjamānānaṃ.

⁸ Br. omits.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Y. II, 10.

sandhāya āmantā ti. Uppādaṇ patvā, aniruddhabhāvaṇ sandhāya tesāṇ cittaṇ uppānnaṇ ti vuttaṇ.

Nuppannaṇ ti¹ uppādaṇ appattaṇ. Sesāṇ cittaṇ uppajjitthāti etthāpi sabbesaṇ tāva cittaṇ khaṇapaccuppannaṇ eva hutvā uppādakkaṇaṇ atītattā uppajjittha nāma. Nirodhasamāpannānaṇ nirodhato pubbe uppāna-pubbantā asaṇṇasattānaṇ asaṇṇabhava² uppānapubbattā. Uppajjittha ceva uppajjati cāti uppādaṇ pattattā uppajjittha, anatītattā uppajjati nāmāti attho.

Uppādakkaṇe anāgataṇ cāti uppādakkaṇe ca cittaṇ, anāgataṇ ca cittaṇ ti attho.

Atikkantakālavāre³ uppajjamānaṇ khaṇaṇ ti uppādakkaṇaṇ. Tattha kiñcāpi uppādakkaṇo uppajjamāno nāma hoti, uppajjamānassa pana khaṇattā evaṇ vutto.

Khaṇaṇ vītikkantaṇ atikkantakālaṇ ti na ciraṇ vītikkantaṇ, tam eva pana uppādakkaṇaṇ vītikkantaṇ hutvā atikkantakālaṇ ti sankhaṇ gacchati. Nirujjhamānaṇ khaṇaṇ ti niruddhakkaṇaṇ. Tattha kiñcāpi nirodha khaṇo nirujjhamāno nāma na hoti, nirujjhamānassa pana khaṇattā evaṇ vutto. Khaṇaṇ vītikkantaṇ atikkantakālaṇ ti kiṇ tassa cittaṇ evaṇ nirodhakkaṇaṇ pi vītikkantaṇ hutvā atikkantakālaṇ nāma hotīti pucchati. Tattha yasmā bhangakkaṇe cittaṇ uppādakkaṇaṇ khaṇaṇ vītikkantaṇ hutvā atikkantakālaṇ hoti. Nirodhakkaṇaṇ khaṇaṇ vītikkantaṇ hutvā atikkantakālaṇ nāma hoti. Atītaṇ pana cittaṇ ubho pi khaṇe khaṇaṇ vītikkantaṇ hutvā atikkantakālaṇ nāma, tasmā bhangakkaṇe cittaṇ uppādakkaṇaṇ vītikkantaṇ bhangakkaṇaṇ avītikkantaṇ. Atītaṇ cittaṇ uppādakkaṇaṇ ca vītikkantaṇ bhangakkaṇaṇ ca vītikkantaṇ ti vissajjanaṇ āha.

Dutiyapaṇhe⁴ vissajjane yasmā atītaṇ cittaṇ ubho pi khaṇe vītikkantaṇ hutvā atikkantakālaṇ nāma hoti, tasmā atītacittaṇ ti vuttaṇ.

Paṭilomapaṇha⁵ - vissajjane yasmā uppādakkaṇe ca cittaṇ anāgataṇ ca cittaṇ ubho pi khaṇe khaṇaṇ vītikkantaṇ hutvā atikkantakālaṇ nāma na hoti, tesāṇ khaṇa-

¹ Br. Anupp°.

² Br. saṇṇībhava.

³ Y. II, 14.

⁴ Br. °paṇhassa. Y. II, 14.

⁵ Ibid.

naṃ avitikkantattā, tasmā *uppādakkhane cittaṃ anāgataṃ cittaṃ* ti vuttaṃ. Dutiyavissajjanaṃ pākaṭam eva.

Dhammavāre pi iminā va upāyena sabbavissajjanesu attho veditabbo.

Puggaladhammavāro dhammavāragatiko yeva. Sabbe pi missakavārā *yassa sarāgacittaṃ* ti ādinā nayena mukhamattaṃ dassetvā sankhittā. Vitthāro pana nesāṃ heṭṭhā vuttanayen' eva veditabbo.

Tesu pana *yassa sarāgaṃ cittaṃ uppajjati na nirujjhati, tassa cittaṃ nirujjhissati na uppajjissatīti* evaṃ vitthāretabbatāya pucchā va sadisā hoti. Yasmā pana sarāgaṃ cittaṃ pacchimacittaṃ na hoti, tasmā : *yassa sarāgaṃ cittaṃ uppajjati na nirujjhati, tassa cittaṃ nirujjhissati na uppajjissatīti* no ti evaṃ vissajjitabbattā vissajjanaṃ asadisāṃ hoti. Taṃ taṃ tassā tassā pucchāya anurūpavasena veditabban ti.

Citta-Yamaka-vaṇṇanā samattā.

[*Dhamma-Yamaka.*]

Idāni tesāṃ yeva Mūla-Yamake desitānaṃ kusalādi dhammānaṃ mātikaṃ ṭhapetvā Citta-Yamakānantaraṃ desitassa Dhamma-Yamakassa vaṇṇanā hoti. Tattha Khandha - Yamake vuttanayen' eva Pālivavatthānaṃ veditabbaṃ. Yath' eva¹ hi tattha paṇṇattivārā tayo tayo mahāvārā avasesā antaravārā ca honti, tathā idhāpi. Yo kusalaṃ² dhammaṃ bhāveti, so akusalaṃ dhammaṃ pajahatīti agahitattā pan' ettha pariññāvāro bhāvanāvāro nāmāti veditabbo. Tattha yasmā avyākato dhammo neva bhāvetabbo, na pahātabbo, tasmā taṃ padam eva na uddhataṃ. Paṇṇattivāre pan' ettha tiṇṇaṃ kusalādi-dhammānaṃ vasena padasodhanavāro, padasodhanamūlacakkavāro, suddhadhammavāro, suddhadhamma-

¹ Br. Yathā only.

² Here the S. MS. omits the next 3¼ pages, continuing, in apparent oblivion of the hiatus, with the words vāre eten' eva . . . (see p. 106).

mūlacakkavāro ti imesu catūsu varesu yamakagaṇanā vedtabbā.

Paṇṇattivāraniddese pana *kusalā kusalā dhammā*¹ ti kusalānaṃ ekantena kusaladhammattā *āmantā* ti vuttaṃ. Sesavissajjanesu pi es' eva nayo. *Avasesā dhammā na akusalā dhammā* ti avasesā dhammā akusalā na honti, dhammā pana hontīti attho. Iminā nayena sabbavissajjanāni veditabbāni.

Pavattivāre pan' ettha paccuppannakāle puggalavārassa anulomanaye *yassa kusalā dhammā uppajjanti, tassa akusalā dhammā uppajjanti; yassa vā pana akusalā dhammā uppajjanti, tassa kusalā dhammā uppajjantīti*² kusaladhammamūlakāni dve yamakāni, akusaladhammamūlakaṃ ekaṃ ti tīni yamakāni honti. Tassa paṭilomanaye pi okāsavārādīsu pi es' eva nayo. Evam ettha sabbavāre tiṇṇaṃ tiṇṇaṃ yamakānaṃ vasena yamakagaṇanā veditabbā.

Atthavinicchaye pan' ettha idaṃ lakkhaṇaṃ : imassa hi Dhammayamakassa pavattimahāvāre *uppajjanti nirujjhantīti* imesu uppādanīrodhesu *kusalākusaladhammā* tāva ekantena pavattiyaṃ yeva labbhanti, na cutipaṭisandhīsu. *Avyākatadhammā* pana pavatte ca cutipaṭisandhīsu cāti tīsu pi kālesu labbhanti. Evam ettha yaṃ yattha yattha labbhati, tassa vasena tattha tattha vinicchayo veditabbo. Tatr' idaṃ nayamukhaṃ, *kusalākusalānaṃ* tāva ekakkhaṇe anuppajjanato *no* ti paṭisedho kato *Avyākatā cāti cittasamuṭṭhānarūpavasena* vuttaṃ. *Yattha kusalā dhammā nuppajjantīti*³ *asaññabhavaṃ* sandhāya vuttaṃ. Ten' ev' ettha *āmantā* ti vissajjanaṃ kataṃ. *Uppajjantīti* idam pi *asaññabhavaṃ* yeva sandhāya vuttaṃ. *Avyākatānaṃ* pana anuppattitṭhānassa *abhāvā natthīti* paṭikkhepo kato.

Dutiye akusale ti⁴ bhavaṃ assādetvā uppannesu nikanti-javanesu dutiye javanacitte. *Dutiye citte vattamāne* ti paṭisandhito dutiye bhavangacitte vattamāne, saha vā paṭisandhiyā bhavangaṃ vipākavasena ekaṃ eva katvā bhavanikantiyā āvajjanacitte. Tañ hi kriyacittattā *avyākatajāti* yaṃ pi pākato dutiyaṃ nāma hoti. *Yassa cittassa*

¹ Y. II, 23.

² *Ibid.*, 25.

³ *Ibid.*, 27.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 28.

*anantarā aggamaggaṇ ti gotrabhucittaṇ sandhāya vuttaṇ. Kusalā dhammā uppajjissanti te aggamaggadhamme yeva sandhāya vuttaṇ. Yassa cittassa anantarā aggamaggaṇ paṭilabhissanti, tassa cittassa uppādakkaṇe ti*¹ *idaṇ cittaajātivaseṇa vuttaṇ. Tajjatikassa hi ekāvajjanena uppannassa tato orimacittassa uppādakkaṇe pi etaṇ lakkhaṇaṇ labbhat' eva. Nirodhavāre pi kusalā-kusalānaṇ ekato anirujjhanato no ti*² *vuttaṇ. Iminā naya-mukhena sabbattha vinicchayo veditabbo ti.*

Dhamma-Yamakavaṇṇanā samattā.

[*Indriya-Yamaka.*]

Idāni tesā yeva Mūla-Yamake desitānaṇ kusalādi-dhammānaṇ labhamānavaseṇa ekadesaṇ sangahitvā Dhamma-Yamakānantaraṇ desitassa Indriya-Yamakassa vaṇṇanā hoti.

Tattha Khandha-Yamakādīsu vuttanāyena' eva Pāli-vatthānaṇ veditabbaṇ. Idhāpi hi paṇṇattivārādayo tayo mahāvārā avasesā antaravārā ca saddhiṇ kālappabhedādīhi Khandha-Yamakādīsu āgatasadisā va. Indriyānaṇ pana bahutāya dhātuyamakato pi bahutarāni yamakāni honti. Yathā pana hetthā puggalavārādīsu cakkhāyatana-cakkhudhātu-mūlake naye cakkhāyatana-cakkhudhātūhi saddhiṇ jivhāyatana-kāyāyatanaṇ na yojitāni. Jivhāyatana-kāyāyatana-mūlakāni ca yamakāna' eva na gahitāni, tathā idhāpi cakkhundriya-mūlake naye jivhindriya-kāyindriyāni na yojitāni; jivhindriya-kāyindriyamūlakāni ca yamakāna' eva na gahitāni. Tesā agahaṇe kāraṇaṇ tattha vuttanāyena' eva veditabbaṇ. Manindriyaṇ pana yathā cakkhundriyādi-mūlakehi, tathā' eva itthindriyādi-mūlakehi pi saddhiṇ yasmā yojanaṇ gacchatī, tasmā nikkhattapaṭipattiyā yojetvā sabbehi pi cakkhundriyamūlakādīhi saddhiṇ pariyosāne yojitaṇ ti veditabbaṇ. Cakkhundriyena saddhiṇ itthindriya-purīṇindriya-jīvitindriyāni yojitāni. Sukhindriya - dukkhindriya - domanasindriyāni paṭisandhiyaṇ natthīti na gahitāni. Somanas-

¹ Y. II, 29.

² *Ibid.* 37.

sindriya-upekkhindriyāni paṭisandhiyaṇ uppattilabhā-
vato gahitāni. Tathā saddhindriyādīni pañca. Lokut-
tarāni tīni paṭisandhiyaṇ abhāven' eva na gahitāni.
Iti yāni gahitāni, tesāṇ vasen' ettha cakkhundriya-
mūlake naye yamakagaṇanā veditabbā. Yathā c'ettha,
evaṇ sabbattha. Yāni pana na gahitāni, tesāṇ vasena
yamakāni na gaṇetabbāni. Gaṇantena vā moghapucchā-
vasena gaṇetabbānīti evaṇ tāva sabbavāresu Pālivavat-
thānam eva veditabbāṇ.

Atthavinicchaye pan' ettha idaṇ nayamukhaṇ: *sacak-
khukānaṇ na itthīnan* ti¹ brahmaparisajjādīnañ ceva
rūpīnaṇ purisa-napuṇsakānañ ca vasena vuttaṇ. Tesañ
hi itthindriyaṇ nuppajjati. *Sacakkhukānaṇ na purisānan*
ti² rūpībrahmānañ ceva itthi-napuṇsakānañ ca vasena
vuttaṇ. Tesañ hi purisindriyaṇ nuppajjati. *Acak-
khukānaṇ uppajjantānaṇ tesāṇ jīvitindriyaṇ uppajjatīti*³
ekavokāra-catuvokāra-kāmadhātusatte sandhāya vuttaṇ.
*Sacakkhukānan vinā somanassenā*³ ti upekkhāsahagatānaṇ
catunnaṇ mahāvīpākapaṭisandhīnaṇ vasena vuttaṇ.
Sacakkhukānaṇ vinā upekkhāyāti,³ somanassasahagata-
paṭisandhikānaṇ vasena vuttaṇ. *Upekkhāya acak-
khukānan* ti⁴ ahetuka - paṭisandhivasena vuttaṇ.
Ahetukānan ti ahetukapaṭisandhicittena saddhiṇ sad-
dhindriyādīnaṇ abhāvato vuttaṇ. Tattha hi ekanten'
eva saddhāsatipaññāyo natthi. Samādhiviriyāni pana
indriyappattāni na honti. *Sahetukānaṇ acakkhukānan* ti
gabbhaseyyakavasena ceva arūpivasena ca vuttaṇ. Añño
hi sahetuko acakkhuko nāma natthi. *Sacakkhukānaṇ*
ahetukānan ti apāye opapātikavasena vuttaṇ. *Sacak-
khukānaṇ ñāṇavippayuttānan* ti kāmadhātuyaṇ duhetuka-
paṭisandhikānaṇ vasena vuttaṇ. *Sacakkhukānaṇ ñāṇa-
sampayuttānan* ti rūpībrahmāno ceva kāmāvacara-
devamanusse ca sandhāya vuttaṇ. *Ñāṇasampayuttānaṇ*
acakkhukānan ti arūpino ca tihetuka-gabbhaseyyake ca
sandhāya vuttaṇ. Jīvitindriyamūlake *vinā somanassena*
uppajjantānan ti⁵ dve pi jīvitindriyāni sandhāya vuttaṇ.

¹ Y. II, 71.² Ibid., 72.³ Ibid.⁴ Ibid., nn. 1, 2 f.⁵ Ibid., 78.

Paratte somanassavippayutta - cittassa uppādakkhane ti arūpajīvitindriyaṃ sandhāya vuttaṃ. Iminā nayena sabbatthāpi paṭisandhipavattivāsena jīvitindriyayojanā veditabbā. Somanassindriyādimūlakesu pi paṭisandhipavattivāsen' ev' attho gahetabbo. Paṭilomanaye pana nirodhavāre ca etesaṃ ceva aññesaṃ ca dhammānaṃ yathālābhavasena cuti-paṭisandhi-pavattesu tīsu pi anup-pādanirodhā veditabbā.

Anāgatavāre eten' eva bhāvenāti¹ etena purisabhāven' eva antarā² itthibhāvaṃ anāpajjitvā purisa paṭisandhigahānen' evāti attho. Katicī bhare dassetvā parinibbāyissantīti katicī paṭisandhiyo gahetvā itthibhāvaṃ appatvā va parinibbāyissantīti attho. Dutiyapucchāya pi es' eva nayo.

Paccuppanna atītavāre suddhāvāsānaṃ uppatti cittassa bhangakkhane manindriyaṃ ca na uppajjitthāti³ Citta-Yamake viya uppādakkhanaṭikkamavasena atthaṃ aggahetvā,⁴ tasmiṃ bhare anuppanna-pubbavasena gahetabbo ti. Iminā nayamukhena sabbasmim pi pavattivāre atthavinicchayo veditabbo.

Pariññāvāre pana cakkhumūlakādīsu ekam eva cakkhusota-yamakaṃ dassitaṃ. Yasmā pana sesāni pi lokiya-avyākatāni ceva lokiya-avyākata-missakāni ca pariññeyyān' eva, tasmā tāni anupadiṭṭhāni pi iminā va dassitāni honti. Yasmā pana akusalaṃ ekantato pahātabbam eva, ekantaṃ kusalaṃ bhāvetabbam eva, lokuttarāvyākataṃ sacchikātabbaṃ, tasmā domanassindriyaṃ pajahatīti anaññātassāmītindriyaṃ bhāvetīti aññātāvindriyaṃ sacchikarotīti vuttaṃ. Aññindriyaṃ pana bhāvetabbam pi atthi sacchikātabbam pi. Taṃ bhāvanāvasen' eva gahitaṃ.

Tattha dve puggalā ti sakadāgāmi-maggasamangī ca arahattamaggasamangī ca. Tesu eko samucchindituṃ asamatthattā domanassindriyaṃ nappajahati⁵ nāma, eko pahīna-dosattā. Cakkhundriyaṃ na parijānātīti anuppādaṃ

¹ Y. II, 117.² S. anantarā.³ Y. II, 145.⁴ S. agahetvā.⁵ Br. na paj°.

āpādetuṃ asamatthatāya na parijānāti. Iminā nayena sabbavissajjanesu attho veditabbo ti.

Indriya-Yamaka-vaṇṇanā samatta.

Ettāvatā ca :

Yass' ovāde thatvā niṭṭhitakiccassa kiccasampanno

yuvati jano pi atīto suvihitaniyamo yamassānaṃ¹

Devaparisāya majjhe devapure sabbadevadevena²

Yamakaṃ nāma pakāsitaṃ yamāmalalomena yantena.³

Pālivavatthānavidhiṃ pucchāvissajjane ca atthanayaṃ

dassetuṃ āraḍdhā Yamaka-atṭhakathā⁴ mayā tassa.

Sādhu bahu⁵ anantarāyo lokamhi yathā anantarāyena.

Ayam ajja pañcamatthehi tantiyā bhāṇavārehi.

Nitthā pattaṃ⁶ evaṃ niṭṭhānaṃ pāpuṇantu sabbe hi pi

hitasukhanibbattikarā manorathā⁷ sabbasattānaṃ ti.

Yamakappakaranatthakathā niṭṭhitā.

¹ Br. °ssānaṃ.

² S. sabbe dev°.

³ So Br. S. reads pakāsitasakalalomena santena. I do not follow the meaning in either.

⁴ S. āraḍdhāya, omitting Yamaka.

⁵ Br. Sā subahu antarāye.

⁶ Br. Niṭṭhaṃ pattaṃ, and omits hi.

⁷ S. hitaṃ sukhaniṭṭhikarā manorathasab°.

III

TWO NOTES ON THE BUDDHA-CARITA.

BY K. WATANABE.¹

1. A PROSE TRANSLATION OF PART OF THE BUDDHA-CARITA EXISTING IN CHINESE.

A WORK entitled *Fo-chui-pān-ni-phān-liao-shwo-kiao-kie-king* (Sūtra of teaching spoken briefly by the Buddha just before his attaining Parinirvāṇa), is one of the most popular sūtras in China and Japan. The sūtra was translated by the famous Kumārajīva, and is mentioned in Nanjio's so-called "Catalogue of the Tripiṭaka" (No. 122). It is commonly called *Fo-i-kiao-king* (Sūtra of the Buddha's last teaching), according to its shortened title.

The importance of this small sūtra in Buddhist history is sufficiently indicated by the fact, that the great Chinese emperor Thai-tsung, of the Thang-dynasty, issued a special edict to propagate this sūtra, in order to regulate the conduct of Buddhist monks through its teaching. Even in modern Japan, the sūtra is solemnly recited by almost all Buddhist sects. An English translation was published by Rev. K. Nukariya, but this version has had only a limited circulation. A revised translation of the Sutra

¹ This article reached me just too late for insertion in the last journal, 1909. The author, who has now left Strassburg, and whose address in Japan we do not know, has not seen a proof of this article.—RH. D.

into some European tongue is wanted, owing to the high ethical value of the treatise.

Now this important Sūtra is, in fact, a prose translation of the Mahāparinirvāṇa-sarga in the Buddha-Carita. The following table will clearly prove this fact :

Fo-i-kiao-king.		Dharmarakṣa's Translation of the Buddha-Carita, Chap. XXVI.	Beal's Translation, S.B.E. XIX, p. 290 <i>seq.</i>	Pāo-yun's Translation, Chap. XXIX.
Sec.		Ver. 1 - 33a	Ver. 1984 -2016a	Ver. 1 - 30
1.	Introduction	33b- 34	2016b-2017	31
2.	Commandment	35 - 44	2018 -2027	32 - 42
3.	Subduing mind	45 - 52	2028 -2035	43 - 49
4.	Measured nourishment	53 - 56a	2036 -2039a	50 - 52
5.	Proper sleep	56b- 62	2039b-2045	53 - 58
6.	Anger	63 - 67	2046 -2050	59 - 63
7.	Pride	68 - 71	2051 -2054	64 - 65
8.	Honesty	72 - 73a	2055 -2056a	66
9.	Small desire	73b- 76a	2056b-2059a	67
10.	Contentedness	76b- 81a	2059b-2064a	68 - 69
11.	Secluded life	81b- 84a	2064b-2067a	70 - 71
12.	Diligence	84b- 86	2067b-2069	72 - 74
13.	Samādhi	87 - 91a	2070 -2074a	75 - 78
14.	Wisdom	91b- 96a	2074b-2079a	79 - 81
15.	Single mind	96b- 98	2079b-2081	82
16.	Carelessness	99 -104	2082 -2087	83 - 88
17.	Anuruddha and Buddha	105 -111	2088 -2094	89 - 95
18.	Conclusion	112 -119a	2095 -2102a	96 -102b
		119b-131	2102b-2114	102b-126

A commentary on this sūtra is mentioned in Nanjio's "Catalogue" (No. 1,209). The text in this commentary is entirely taken from the translation by Kumārajīva. The work is ascribed to Vasubandhu and the translation to Paramārtha. But the accuracy of this tradition is very doubtful, as is shown by the following statement in the *Cung-king-mulu* (Nanjio, No. 1,603), fasc. 5 :

"I-kiao-king-lung, one volume : it is said that this śāstra was translated by Paramārtha. But the work is not mentioned in the Catalogue of Translations by Paramārtha. Therefore it is now registered under 'doubtful translations.'"

The authorship of the work is also very uncertain. In a Chinese commentary on the śāstra by Tsin-yuen (Nanjio, No. 1,597 ; vide *ibid.*, p. 465), the work is ascribed to Āśvaghoṣa. This apparently shows that the authorship was invented in China, and it suggests to us that the work might have been compiled by an Indian or Chinese monk,

based on the translation by Kumārajīva — perhaps by Paramārtha himself, for he wrote many commentaries on several sūtras and śāstras according to the description of the *Li-tai-sān-pāo-ki* (Nanjio, No. 1504), fasc. 17.

2. THE BUDDHA-CARITA AND THE MĀRKAṆḌEYA-PURĀṆA.

In the Mārkaṇḍeya-purāṇa there is a famous story regarding King Hariścandra. In the conclusion of this story a battle between Vasiṣṭha and Viśvāmitra is described. The two Brahmins fight a furious single combat, each assuming the form of a bird.

I will borrow here the passage from an English translation by Mr. M. N. Dutt :¹

“ And in accordance with each other’s curse, both Vasiṣṭha and the highly energetic Viśvāmitra, the son of Kuśika, although endowed with great effulgence, came from inferior births. Although born of different species, they, both of incomparable energy and endowed with mighty strength and prowess, being greatly enraged, fought with each other. O Brahmin, the *Ari*,² was two thousand yojanas high, and the heron (*Vaka*) was three thousand and ninety-six yojanas high. Endowed with great strength, they, striking each other with their wings, created exceeding fear in creatures.”

Aśvaghōṣa alludes to this story in a chapter of his Buddha-Carita, in which several examples, from Brahmanic literature are given. The following passage is taken from a Chinese translation of the Buddha-Carita by Dharmarakṣa (Nanjio, No. 1,351). Its corresponding English rendering is selected from Beal’s *Fo-sho-hing-tsang-king* (S.B.E.,

¹ *Wealth of India* Series, Calcutta, 1897, p. 50. See also Pargiter’s translation, 1904, p. 60; and the Sanskrit text published by K. M. Banerjea, 1862, p. 90.

² Perhaps *Āri* is a better reading: the Sanskrit text, as well as Pargiter’s translation, read *Ādi*; and in other MSS. it is written *Āti* or *Āti*.

vol. xix., p. 330), in which I have corrected two important names, indicating the Purāṇic story.

“The two demons, *Āri* (or *Ādi*) and *Vaka*, were ever drawn into contention; in the first place, because of their folly and ignorance causing wide ruin among men; how much less for our all-wise master should we begrudge our lives.” The perpetual contention and enmity between *Vasiṣṭha* and *Viśvāmitra* is a well-known story in the *Mahābhārata*.

In another translation of the *Buddha-Carita* by Pāo-yun (Nanjio, No. 1323, chap. 30, verses 67, 68), the passage is somewhat different. This translation is, in general, very obscure and clumsy compared with the translation by Dharmarakṣa. The passage is, in English, as follows:

“In ancient times there were ignorant persons; through their folly they struggled like water-animals (?); from their intensity of ignorance they destroyed each other. Buddha appeared in the world to remove all ignorance; why shall we foolishly covet our present lives for Buddha?”

The phrase “struggled like water animals,” or “struggling water-animals,” is a very difficult one. But I venture to suppose that it is merely a mistaken translation for *ariva-koca*, or something like that. *Ari*, or *Āri*, may be here wrongly translated as “struggled” or “struggling,” as *ari* means hostile, and is so rendered in Dutt’s translation. *Vaka* is, perhaps, the source of “water-animal,” as the ideograph commonly used for it in Chinese means “insect,” though it is sometimes applied to animal or creature.

IV

ABHIDHAMMA LITERATURE IN BURMA.¹

BY SHWE ZAN AUNG, B.A.

THE Rev. Bhikkhu Ānanda Metteyya, the Director of the International Buddhist Society of the Buddhasāsana Samāgama, urged me long ago to write a paper on the Abhidhamma literature of Burma. After the appearance of "The Pali Literature of Burma," by Mrs. Bode, Ph.D., I thought that the Bhikkhu's request had become wholly superfluous. At first sight it would appear that the learned authoress gave greater prominence to grammarians than to our philosophers; but after a careful reading, I came to the conclusion that she left very little to be desired. Although the Abhidhamma has been most cultivated in Burma, original indigenous works on the subject in Pali constitute a mere handful. The reason for this paucity is not far to seek: Buddhist philosophers are, as a rule, most conservative, and would on no account add to the canon. Their critical and comparative study of the texts is not with a view to strike out "new departures of thought," nor even to make philosophy "move in a circle," as in the West, but to preserving the pristine beauty of the doctrine. Their object is better to understand and expound it to the people in their own vernacular. Hence we have more Burmese works than pure Pali. And if we leave the former out of account, the latter, which may be counted

¹ Laid before the Congress of Orientalists at Athens, 1912.

on one's fingers, will scarcely, in a superficial review, afford sufficient materials for a paper.

A short time ago, Mrs. Rhys Davids suggested that I should give an account of the books now studied by eminent Theras of Burma. I have, therefore, changed the preposition "of" into "in," in the title of this paper. But as a busy official, I can find no time for a treatment in detail of the works herein enumerated.

A word more before I begin my subject. It is most fitting to hold a Congress of Orientalists at Athens, an ancient seat of civilization, once the "eye of Europe." But whence its philosophy?

Thales, the father of Greek speculation, was born at Miletus, a Greek colony in Asia Minor, about 640 B.C.—*i.e.*, seventeen years before the *traditional* date of the Buddha's birth. But Indian philosophy began long before that event. Apart from the fact that the real founders of Indian mediæval logic were Buddhists,¹ we have reason to believe that ancient logic was regularly taught at ancient Takkasilā (the Greek Taxila) long before the father of logic was born at Stagira in 384 B.C. Again, there is much in common between the Buddhist and the Heraclitean theory of *flux*. The celebrated phrase of the Ephesian philosopher, "All is and is not; for, though in truth it does come into being, yet it forthwith ceases to be,"² is entirely Buddhistic. The Heraclitean Fire,³ ever enkindled and ever extinguished, is no less Buddhistic than his illustration of the theory of flux by a river.⁴ The greatest Indian Sage, who brought down philosophy from the heaven of Tāvātimsa as from the Olympus, elaborated the Philosophy of Association two centuries before Aristotle

¹ See Prof. S. Ch. Vidyabhusana's *History of the Mediæval School of Indian Logic*.

² See p. 83, Lewes's *History of Philosophy*.

³ "Like the flame of a lamp" (*jālā viya*). See p. 166, *Compd. Phil.*, by S. Z. Aung and C. Rhys Davids.

⁴ "Like the current of a river" (*nadīsoto viya*). See p. 9, n. 1, and p. 166, *ibid.*

laid the germs of it.¹ The Asiatic invasion of Alexander the Great served for the first time to connect the East and the West more intimately than before.

Dhammarakkhita (the Greek Demetrius) was a Bactrian,² and Mahārakkhita was sent by Tissa as a missionary to Yonaloka.³ Then, again, Buddhists are proud of King Milinda (the Greek Menander).

The mention of Tissa's missionaries brings me directly to the subject of my paper.⁴ The method adopted in the present paper is not historical,⁵ as it is considered desirable to keep together similar works of each class of Buddhist literature. Nevertheless, the starting-point of this paper must be the traditional Asokan mission of Sona and Uttara to Thaton about 308 B.C.⁶ Buddhist philosophy, which they are supposed to have introduced into Burma, had then been already collected⁷ into its present form, though it was not reduced to writing till the Fourth Council.

A. THE CANONICAL BOOKS.

There are seven books on the Abhidhamma—namely : (1) The Dhammasaṅgaṇi ; (2) The Vibhaṅga ; (3) The Dhātukathā ; (4) The Puggala-paññatti ; (5) The Kathāvatthu ; (6) The Yamaka ; and (7) The Paṭṭhāna.

¹ See p. 7, *ibid.* ² See p. 227, Rhys Davids's *Manual of Buddhism*.

³ This name was evidently derived from Ionia.

⁴ The materials for this paper are chiefly drawn from the *Pitkat Thonbôn Sadan*, a bibliographical work of great authority, compiled in 1886 by Mingyi Mahāthiri Zeyathu, the Maing-gaing Myoza, who was the royal librarian and of deep erudition. King Mindoon used to remark that this author "lived in his library." This work is published by the Pyigyī Mandain Press, Rangoon.

⁵ Much as I wish to draw upon the *Sāsanālaṅkāra* (an historical sketch of Buddhism in Burma, written by Mingyi Thiri Mahā Nanda Thingyan, the Saw Myoza, in 1831, at the special request of King Bagyidaw, and published by the Hanthawaddy Press), for the biographical sketches of Chapada, Taungbila Sadaw, Kyazwa, Ariyavamsa, etc., I do not wish to repeat what has already been well said about them by Mrs. Bode in her *Pali Literature of Burma*.

⁶ This is according to the Buddhist tradition. Western authorities have fixed 250 B.C. ⁷ See p. 188, Rhys Davids's *Buddhist India*.

Though the fourth book has been considered¹ as probably the earliest, it will not be amiss briefly to notice them in the order in which we find them given to us by a line of philosophers from the Buddha down to the present day.

The first book² is a compendium of things. By “things” (*dhammā*) are meant mind and body; therefore, it deals concisely with different states and classes of consciousness and qualities of body or properties of matter. These two ultimate facts (*paramatthadhamma*’s) form the basis of Buddhist philosophy. This work is so important to students that a knowledge of a digest of it, called *Mātikā*, is considered by scholars as indispensable to the study of the remaining six books. The importance of the digest may be inferred from the fact that there are no less than six Burmese *Akauks* (analytic works) on it. The first analysis of it was made by Tipiṭakālaṅkāra, *alias* Taungbila Pôkgōgyaw, Munidhaghosa (born 1575)³ during the reign of Thalun Mindaya, who came to the throne in 1629. The second analysis, by Myauk-nangyaung Sadaw, Aggadhammālaṅkāra, appeared during the reign of Ngadatkyi Dayaka of Sagaing, who ascended the throne in 1648. The third was written by Taungbilu Sadaw during the reign of Wunbe-Insan Min, who became king in 1672. A fourth was added by Tantabin Sadaw Nandamedhā, during the reign of Ngasingu Min, who succeeded to the throne in 1776. The first Bagaya Sadaw wrote the fifth during the reign of Bodawpaya (1781); and the last was contributed by a relative of the two Nyaungan Sadaws, U Po and U Pôk, during the reign of Bagyidaw (1819).

Besides these *Akauks*,⁴ a work, entitled *Mātikāgaṇṭhi*, was prepared on “knotty” points in the *Mātikā* by Nāṇā-

¹ See Rhys Davids’s *Buddhist India*.

² This is the only book that has yet been translated into English—viz., by Mrs. Rhys Davids. See her *Buddhist Psychology*.

³ See p. 53, Bode’s *Pali Lit.*

⁴ The *Mātikatthadīpanī*, ascribed to Chapada on p. 19, Bode’s *Pali Lit.*, is not in the *Pitakat Thonbôn Sadan*.

bhivamsa of Maungdaung, who became the Thathanabaing of Bodawpaya.

The Vibhaṅga classifies things already dealt with in the first book (Dhs). It is divided into eighteen¹ sections, into the details of which I cannot here enter. The comments² of Sumaṅgalamahāsāmi, the author of the Tikagyaw, on the order of the first four sections will, however, be interesting to students. According to him, things are first classified under the five Khandhas for the benefit of those students who have not a very clear idea of mind; next under the twelve Āyatana's for those who are not clear about body; and then under the eighteen Dhātu's ("elements") for those who are hazy about both mind and body. The Khandha-classification is suitable for those who are quick of intellect, and therefore need but an outline to grasp the doctrine; the Āyatana-classification, for the average class of students, who are in need of the medium discourse; and the Dhātu-classification, for those who are slow and require a detailed exposition. Now, each of these heads of classification constitutes the "whole of what we know."³ This universe of existence is next viewed under aspects of the four Noble Truths (Ariya-saccāni),⁴ because it is not profitable simply to know mind and body without also knowing their "cause."

The relation of this book to the first is explained by Sadhammajotipāla, *alias* Chapada, the author of the Saṅkhepavannanā, as that of the "branches-and-leaves" to the "root-and-stem" of the Buddhist philosophical tree.⁵

¹ (1) Khandha; (2) Āyatana; (3) Dhātu; (4) Sacca; (5) Indriya; (6) Paṭiccasamuppāda; (7) Satippaṭṭhāna; (8) Sammappadhāna; (9) Iddhipāda; (10) Bojjhaṅga; (11) Maggaṅga; (12) Jhāna; (13) Appamaññā; (14) Sikkhāpada; (15) Paṭisambhidā; (16) Ñāṇa; (17) Khuddaka-vatthu; and (18) Dhammahadāya. On the first thirteen, the reader is referred to the *Compd Phil.*

² See pp. 200, 201, *The Three Tīkās*, edited by Saya Pye.

³ See pp. 182-184, *Compd. Phil.*

⁴ *I.e.*, the *What*, the *How arisen*, the *Ceasing* to be, the *Means* for causing ceasing to be.

⁵ See p. 248, *The Three Tīkās*.

In the third book (Dhātukathā) the Buddha amplified the Dhātu-section of the second (Vibhaṅga) in relation to the first two books. Why he developed these three, and only these three, sections may be inferred from Sumaṅgala's comments already referred to.

The analysis of mind and body into either the five Khandhas, or the twelve Āyatana's, or the eighteen "Elements," is intended to show that there is no conscious subject behind consciousness, that there is no noumenon behind phenomenon; in other words, that there is no metaphysical entity called "soul."

Now, the term "puggala" has a double meaning. In the orthodox sense it means "personality,"¹ and as such it is but a concept (*paññatti*). But in the heterodox view it means "a soul." The very title of the fourth book (Puggala-Paññatti) shows that it treats of different concepts of personalities. It merely states the Buddhist position with reference to the question of soul; but it does not support it with any arguments. These are left over for the fifth book on controversial doctrines.

The object of the fifth book, the Kathāvatthu ("The Book of Controversies"), is to "convert" heterodox believers to the orthodox view,² and the book begins with the Puggalakathā, a controversy on the question of the soul between

¹ On "Personal Identity," see p. 11, *Compd. Phil.* Hume accounts for the idea of identity by the easiness of the transition of the mind from one idea to another in the series. "The smooth and uninterrupted progress of thought readily deceives the mind and makes us ascribe our identity to the changeable succession of connected qualities." *Treatise of Human Nature*, Part IV., sec. iii. "Nor is there any single power of the soul which remains unalterably the same, perhaps for one moment. . . . There is properly no simplicity in it at one time, nor identity in difference . . . memory does not so much produce, as discover personal identity, by showing us the relation of cause and effect among our different perceptions." *Ibid.*, p. 534, Green and Grote's edition.

On the sense in which Buddhists admit personal identity, see the beautiful article, entitled "Thinking of Something Else," by Mrs. Rhys Davids, in the *Buddhist Review*, vol. iv., No. 1.

² See the *Mūlaṭīkā* and the *Anuṭīkā*.

an adherent of Buddhism (*sakavādī*) and an imaginary opponent (*paravādī*). The opponent in the first controversy is, therefore, the *Attavādī*, with whom the “puggala” is the “attā” (self), “satta” (sentient being), or “jīva” (living thing) of current metaphysics.

It is generally believed that the whole book was added by Tissa at the Third Council; but the traditional view is that the Buddha Himself left an outline¹ (*Mātikā*) to be elaborated by a later genius on the lines laid down by Him. Anyway, it is the first of the three principal landmarks² in the history of Buddhist philosophy. The *Kathāvatthu* was taught regularly before, but not after, *Ariyavaṃsa* of the fifteenth century.³

The object of the sixth book, the *Yamaka* (“The Book of Pairs”),⁴ is to “convince” the convert⁵ on doubtful points already dealt with in the earlier books. The *Yamaka* is not to be committed to memory either by the stupid, or by the intelligent. The intelligent once versed in its *method*, can recite the text without any difficulty; but the stupid would make no head or tail out of it, even if it were committed to memory.⁶

The *Paṭṭhāna* is the last, but not the least, of the series. It sets forth all the possible laws of relation obtaining among things; that is, it treats not only of the “related modes of consciousness,” to use Mansel’s descriptive phrase,

¹ Buddhaghosa writes: “The Buddha began with *eight* ‘causes of views’ (*aṭṭhamukhā vādayutti*’s) by way of *two* ‘fivefolds’ in *four* questions on the subject of the soul, and left an outline in a text of one short recital (*bhaṇavāra*), in the series of all controversies.” See pp. 1, 2, the *Cy. on the Kathāvatthu*.

² The two other landmarks being the *Milindapañhā* and the *Visudḍhimagga*.

³ I owe this information to the late Payagyi Sadaw of Henzada.

⁴ One of the “pairs” is “conviction” (*sanniṭṭhāna*) and “doubt” (*samsaya*).

⁵ See the *Mūlaṭīkā* and the *Anutīkā*.

⁶ This from Aletawya Sadaw, U Kosalla of Rangoon. But it seems to me that the remark equally applies to the *Paṭṭhāna*, of which only a small portion, the *Paṇṇattivāra*, otherwise called the *Pucchāvāra*, is committed to memory in Burma.

but also of those of all the modes of existence in the universe.¹ Western Associationists seem to have been concerned about the empirical phenomena of accidental suggestion of *ideas*, in association with the past experience of one or other individual thinker. And it is not surprising that some prominence has been given to these phenomena by ancient, as well as by modern philosophers, among whom are Hartley and Condillac, when we know that the Buddha Himself attached a degree of importance to them. The very fact that these principles are embodied in the Paṭṭhāna, entitled the Mahāpakaraṇa ("The Great Book"), as distinguished from its predecessors, the lesser six, is a clear proof that the Buddha, too, was in favour of the Association Philosophy. A thorough-going Associationist philosopher would say: "Give me mind and a few principles of association, and I will construct the entire universe."² The relative importance of "The Great Book" among the seven books of the Abhidhamma may be judged from the Buddhist tradition that all the "six rays of human aura" were simultaneously omitted from the Buddha's body when He expounded the principles of relation. The method of "The Great Book," from its universality of application, has received two epithets—"infinite" (*anantanaya*) and "universal" (*samantanaya*). This book has been likened by Buddhists to a bottomless ocean fathomed only by the Buddha's omniscience. To this simile we may add another modern illustration—that the Paṭṭhāna and the Buddha's intellect ran in parallels, meeting only in the depth of infinity, even as parallel rays do in distant stars.

On the twenty-four modes³ of relation dealt with in this crowning portion of the Abhidhamma, I cannot touch here.

¹ See p. 2, *Compd. Phil.*

² Cf. . . . "nothing is requisite to make a man what he is, but a sentient principle with this single property—*i.e.*, the association of ideas." Priestley, Hartley's Theory, Introductory Essays, quoted on p. 245, Mansel's *Metaphysics*.

³ See pp. 191, 192, *Compd. Phil.*

Before closing this part of the paper, I may add that night lectures in Burmese (*nyawās*) are given in the Viharas of Burma on the Dhammasaṅgaṇi, Dhātukathā, Yamaka, and Paṭṭhāna.

Among anthological works bearing on the subject of Abhidhamma may be mentioned the Netti ("On Methods"), by Kaccāna, son of the Brahmin Tiritivaccha, who first became an adviser to King Sucandapajjota, and afterwards the Arahant pre-eminent in the method of exposition;¹ the Peṭakopadesa² ("The Rules of the Tipiṭaka"), compiled by the Arahants on the basis of the Netti; and the well-known Milindapañha,³ written by the Venerable Nāgasena in the first century A.D.

These last three have no commentaries; but all the canonical books have been studied with the aid of commentaries called Aṭṭhakathās, and sub-commentaries (Ṭikās, Anuṭikās, etc.).

B. COMMENTARIES AND SUB-COMMENTARIES.

The commentaries in use in Burma are those of Buddhaghosa, written during the reign of Mahānāma in Ceylon (A.D. 412).⁴ The Aṭṭhasālinī ("The Essence of Meanings")⁵ is the commentary on the Dhammasaṅgaṇi, and the Sammohavinodanī⁶ ("The Dispelling of Ignorance") is that on the Vibhaṅga. That a great deal of Buddhist philosophy may be learnt from these two commentaries may be inferred from the fact that the great Divine wrote only a single commentary, entitled the Pañcappakaraṇa-Aṭṭhakathā, on the next five books of the Abhidhamma.

A Ṭikā on these three was written by Vanaratana-tissa, alias Ānanda of the "Great Monastery" in Anurādhapura. It is known as Mūlaṭikā; its author occasionally dissented

¹ Cf. n. 2, p. 5, Bode's *Pali Lit.*

² *Ibid.*

³ See the *Milinda Questions* in the Sacred Books of the East series

⁴ Said to have been a contemporary of King Thinlingyaung Pagan A.D. (441).

⁵ See *B. Psy.*, by Mrs. Rhys Davids.

⁶ See n. 1, p. 22, *Compd. Phil.*

from Buddhaghosa.¹ An Anuṭikā, written by Dhammapāla of Kañcipura (Conjevaram) while residing in the Badaratittha monastery in Anurādhapura, is a sub-commentary on the Mūlaṭikā.

Buddhaghosa's monumental work, the Visuddhimagga ("The Path of Purity"), is an anthological Aṭṭhakathā, and forms an indispensable textbook in Burma. Dhammapāla wrote a sub-commentary on this; it is known as Mahāṭikā, or Paramatthamañjūsā² ("The Casket of Philosophy"), and is largely quoted by Ledi Sadaw. The fact that his commentary on the Cariyāpiṭaka is called Paramatthadīpanī ("The Lamp of Philosophy") shows that it also bears on the subject of Abhidhamma. He is also the author of a commentary on the Netti, as well as of a sub-commentary on this. The latter is now known as the old Netti Ṭikā.

Sirimaṅgala wrote two Yojanas (Pali paraphrases) on the Aṭṭhasālinī and the Samohavinodanī during the reign of Lezishin³ Thihathu of Pinya.

The Peṭakālaṅkāra⁴ ("The Progress⁵ of the Piṭaka"), by Ñāṇābhivaṃsa,⁶ is a modern Ṭikā on the Netti. Another sub-commentary, entitled Nettivibhāvanī ("The Netti Made Clear"), was written by Saddhammapālasīri at the request of the Minister Senāpati, during the reign of Nara-patigyī, alias Thupārāma Zedi Dayaka, who became king in 1442.

The Visuddhimagga also has a short Ṭikā, the Visuddhimaggasaṅkhepa ("The Epitome of the Visuddhimagga"), written by the author of the Mahāthupavaṃsa while residing in the Mahindasena monastery in Anurādhapura. Chapada, who visited Ceylon with his master Uttarājīva,⁷

¹ E.g., see p. 26, *Compd. Phil.*

² A work with similar title ascribed to Vepullabuddhi of Pagan, on p. 28, Bode's *Pali Lit.*, is not found in the *Pitakat Thonbôn Sadan*.

³ Tazishin, Thihathu, became king in 1298.

⁴ Cf. p. 78, Bode's *Pali Lit.* ⁵ Meaning here "pleasing rhythmic flow."

⁶ See p. 115, above.

⁷ See p. 116 above, and p. 17, Bode's *Pali Lit.* Vajira Uttama on p. ix. *Compd. Phil.*, is a misreading.

contributed another, entitled *Visuddhimagga-gaṇṭhipada* ("The Difficult Terms in the *Visuddhimagga*").

The *Maṇidīpa* ("The Lamp of Gems"), a sub-commentary on the *Aṭṭhasālinī*, written by Ariyāvaṃsa¹ of Pinya during the reign of Narapatigyi of Sagaing, was not completed. The *Madhusāratthadīpanī* ("The Sweet Essence of Meanings"), written by Mahanāma² during the reign of Bayin Naung, who became king of Hamsavatī (Pegu) in 1550, is a sub-commentary on the *Mūlaṭikā*. The *Paṭṭhānasārādīpanī* ("Lights on the Essence of the *Paṭṭhāna*"),³ based on previous comments, is the work of Saddhammālaṅkāra of Hamsavatī (1580). Tilokaguru⁴ of Pakangyi, who flourished in Sagaing, wrote two sub-commentaries—*Ṭikāvaṇṇanā* and *Anuṭikāvaṇṇanā*—on the *Dhātukathā* during the reign of Anaukpetlun Mindaya, who became king in 1605. In 1615 he wrote a *Vaṇṇanā-ṭikā* on the *Yamaka*. The *Paṭṭhānavāṇṇanāṭikā* was also written by him. The *Dhātukathāyojanā* was written by Pubbārāma Sadaw, Sāradassi⁵ of Pakangyi during the reign of Hanthawaddy-yauk Min, who succeeded to the throne in 1733. The *Vīsativāṇṇanā* ("The Exposition of the Twenty"), by Tipiṭakālaṅkāra,⁶ is on the first twenty stanzas of the *Aṭṭhasālinī*. Mahākassapa of the "Great Monastery," is the author of the *Abhidhammatthagaṇṭhipada* ("The Difficult Terms in the *Abhidhamma*").

An account of the commentaries and sub-commentaries

¹ See p. 41, Bode's *Pali Lit.*

² See p. 47, *ibid.*

³ The *Paṭṭhānagaṇānaya*, ascribed to Chapada, on p. 19, *ibid.*, is not traceable in the *Pitakat Thonbôn Sadan*.

⁴ See p. 54, *ibid.*

⁵ Mrs. Bode, on p. 67, thought that this might be a grammatical work. The *Gulhatthadīpanī* ("Light on Hidden Meanings"), ascribed to this author on p. 56 by Mrs. Bode, probably deals with the *Aṭṭhasālinī* and the *Samohavinodanī*; for it is said that Sagu Sadaw, U Pandicca, the teacher of Ledi Sadaw, added to it his expositions on hidden meanings in the *Pañcappakaraṇa-aṭṭhakathā*. The only work with this title that appears in the *Pitakat Thonbôn Sadan* is the one by Upatissa of Ava on the *Jinālaṅkāra*, by Buddharakkhita, wrongly ascribed to Buddhadatta. Therefore, the *Abhidhamma Gulhattha* itself remains hidden somewhere.

⁶ See p. 115 above.

on Abhidhamma topics will be incomplete without also mentioning the following:

The commentary on the Khuddakapāṭha, by an anonymous writer, and that by Buddhaghosa on the Suttanipāṭa, are both called Paramatthajotikā ("Lights on Philosophy"). Dhammapāla's commentaries on the Udāna, Vimāna-Vatthu, Peta-Vatthu, Theragāthā, and Therīgāthā, all bear the proud title of Paramatthadīpanī ("The Light-giving Lamps of Philosophy"). A Tīkā, by Ngakhôn Sadaw, Ādiccavaṃsa, on the Khuddakapāṭha, has also been given the title of Paramatthasūdanī ("The Distillation of Extract of Philosophy").

C. LITTLE-FINGER MANUALS.

We now come to the class of commentaries called *Lethan*¹ in Burma. Buddhadatta, said to be a native of the Coḷa province towards the east of Anurādhapura,² wrote the Abhidhammāvatāra ("Introductory Philosophy") and the Rūpārūpavibhāga ("A Division between Mind and Body") while residing in a monastery in the port of Kavirapaṭṭana. The former was studied here certainly prior to the fifteenth century, and is quoted by Ariyāvaṃsa in his Maṇisāramañjūsā.³ Similarly, the Saccasaṅkhepa ("The Outlines of Truth"), by Dhammapāla, used to be a textbook in Pagan before it was superseded by the Compendium of Philosophy.⁴ Anuruddha is said, in the concluding verse of his well-known Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha,⁵ to have written it at the request of his lay supporter Nampa, while residing by turn in the two monasteries built by Somadevī, queen of Vaṭṭagāmini, and the Minister Mūla. Anuruddha is also the author of two other works—the Paramatthavinicchaya ("The Solutions of Philosophical Problems") and the Nāmarūpapariccheda

¹ See p. viii., *Compd. Phil.*

² See n. 5, p. 122, above. This contemporary of Buddhaghosa is generally believed to be a native of Jambudīpa.

³ See p. 23, *Compd. Phil.*, n. 2.

⁴ See p. viii., *Compd. Phil.* I owe this to U Candima of Bahan.

⁵ See *Compendium of Philosophy*, by the writer and Mrs. Rhys Davids.

(“The Distinction between Mind and Body”). Khema of Anurādhapura gave his name to the title of a manual which he wrote. The Mohavicchedanī (“The Dispelling of Ignorance”) is the work of Mahākassapa of the Coḷa province. The Nāmacārādīpaka (“The Actions of Mind”), by Chapada,¹ is not an *ethical* treatise, as classified by Dr. Forchammer.² The Sucittālaṅkāra (“The Progress of Thought”) is the work of a native of Pakangyi. The royal author of the Paramatthabindu³ (“The Drop of Philosophy”), who became king of Pagan in A.D. 1234, was a deep student of philosophy. It is said that he went through the Tipiṭaka nine times. His knowledge of the doctrine was so accurate that he earned the name of Kyazwa.

Ancillary literature has grown round the nucleus of each of these manuals.

The Abhidhammāvatāra has two *ṭikās*. The older one was written by Vācissaramahāsāmi of the “Great Monastery” of Anurādha; the later, by Sumaṅgalamahāsāmi, the author of the well-known *Ṭikagyaw*, is entitled Abhidhammatthavikāsinī (“The Blossoms of Philosophy”). A *ṭikā* on the Rūpārūpavibhāga was written by an anonymous writer of the Mahāvihāra. Vācissaramahāsāmi also wrote the older *ṭikā* on the Saccasaṅkhepa. Its new *ṭikā*, by an anonymous writer, is called Sāratthasālinī (“The Very Essence of Meanings”). There are five⁴ *ṭikās* on the Compendium of Philosophy. The eldest of them was written by Navavimala;⁵ the second *ṭikā*, entitled Abhid-

¹ See p. 116 above.

² See p. 18, Bode's *Pali Lit.*

³ This is not a grammatical work. See p. 25, *ibid.*

⁴ One was omitted in the preface to the *Compd. Phil.*

⁵ This author is said to be a disciple of Sariputtarā, who is the author of the Sāratthadīpanī, a sub-commentary on the Vinayapitaka. The latter, otherwise known as Sāritānuja or Mahāsānipāda, was the son of King Buddhadāsa of Ceylon. He flourished during the reign of Sīrimahāparakkamabāhu (1164), a contemporary of Narapatisithu of Pagan (1174). But it is not likely that two *ṭikās* would be written simultaneously by the pupils of a common teacher. Cf. p. 19, Bode's *Pali Lit.*

hammatthavibhāvanī (“Philosophy made Clear”), by Sumaṅgalamahāsāmī, a pupil of Sāriputta[ra], was formerly known in Burma as Tikahla (“The Beautiful Ṭikā”), because the comments in it are so very apt. But when Ariyāvamsa became proficient in the Buddhist scriptures after a study of it, the “Tikahla” changed itself to “Tikagyaw” (the famous Ṭikā). The Saṅkhepavaṇṇanā,¹ by Chapada, is the third Ṭikā on the Compendium. This author is believed to have visited Ceylon in *Anno Buddhi*, 1714² (sakkaraj A.D. 532 or 1170). In his introductory verse, he describes himself as one who had been to Ceylon three times. He says he wrote it at the request of Mahāvijayabāhu, who was “conspicuous in the Island, even as the moon in the sky of the ‘sarada’ or autumnal season, by the royal arms which had been and would be attained.” He refers to the existence of the earlier ṭikās on the Compendium, and compares the Tikagyaw to the “moon which cannot shine within bamboos, etc.,” and his own work to the “firefly which can.” This pretty simile will give the reader an idea of the scope of the work in question. In the conclusion of the work, the year A.B. 1990 is mentioned. The author of the Sāsanālaṅkāra³ draws attention to the discrepancy between this date and that given in the Kalyani inscriptions. Chapada is an apologist for the method and arrangement adopted in the Compendium. While the Saccasaṅkhepa begins with an exposition on the body, Anuruddha sets out with an inquiry into the mind. Why? Because he had the Dhamma-saṅgaṇi, instead of the Vibhaṅga, in his mind when he wrote the Compendium. If so, why did he not follow the arrangement adopted in his prototype? Why begin with evil thoughts instead of with good thoughts? Chapada gives a reason which is, however, not very convincing. He would have been nearer the truth had he adopted the Huxleyan phrase and said: “Because the evil ‘knocks at

¹ I notice that Mrs. Bode has made a correct guess on p. 18 that this is a work on the Compendium.

² See pp. 49, 50 of the *Kalyani Inscriptions* (Rangoon Edition).

³ See n. 5, p. 114, above.

our door more loudly than the good.'” The apologist goes into very minute details, into which I can hardly be expected to enter.

A fourth *ṭikā* was added by Gaing-ôk Sadaw, *Sīlācāra*, of Salin, but when it was written is not stated. The *Paramatthadīpanī*, the fifth and the last *ṭikā* on the Compendium, by Ledi Sadaw of to-day, is by far the most important contribution to the Buddhist literature of Burma. He himself calls it *Tikagyi* (the great *Ṭikā*), but his pupils call it *Tikamaw* (the proud *Ṭikā*). On the authority of the *Mahāṭikā*, by Dhammapāla, he took exceptions to the accepted views of the *Tikagyaw*. Hence his work has not yet gained the popularity it deserves, especially among older generations steeped in commentarial traditions of the *Tikagyaw*, which he criticizes.

The *Paramatthavinicchaya* has two *ṭikās*, the earlier by Mahābodhi, and the later by an anonymous writer, both of the “Great Monastery.” Similarly, the *Nāmarūpapariccheda* has two, the earlier by Vācissaramahāsāmi, and the later by an anonymous writer, both of Anurādhapura. Mahābodhi also appears as the author of a *ṭikā* on the *Khema*.¹ Mahākassapa of Ceylon wrote a *ṭikā* on his own work, the *Mohavicchedanī*. A *ṭikā* on the *Nāmacāradīpaka* was also supplied by its own author, Chapada. Mahākassapa of Pagan wrote a *ṭikā* on the *Paramatthabindu*.

The *Maṇisāramañjūsā* (“The Casket of Genuine Gems”), a sub-commentary on the *Tikagyaw*, was written by Ariyāvamsa at the special request of his master, Ye-ngôn² Sadaw of Sagaing, to satisfy the latter with the former’s profound scholarship. But Tipiṭakadhara, the teacher of Sīladevī, daughter of Bayin Naung, at Hamsavatī, wrote a sub-*ṭikā* on the *Tikagyaw*, and called it *Appheggusārādīpanī*, otherwise known as *Cūlatikā*. The former title suggests that it contains nothing but “the pith without the bark” of philosophy and mocks,³ by implication, the *Maṇisāramañjūsā*.

¹ See p. 124, above. ² Yedin Sadaw of Mrs. Bode, p. 41, *Pali Lit.*

³ I owe this to Aleytawya Sadaw U Kosalla. Mrs. Bode has noticed the later work before the former. See p. 36, *ibid.*

D. BURMESE TRANSLATIONS (NISSAYAS).

It is not known when and by whom the first two books of the Abhidhamma were translated. Judging from the several analyses¹ made on the Mātikā of the former, it appears that these *Akauks* were used as substitutes for the translations. They could not have been translated earlier than 1698, when Sane Min came to the throne and ordered the translation of the canonical texts, commentaries, and sub-commentaries, etc. The Dhātukathā, however, appears to have received earlier attention from translators.² No less than five translations of it exist. The first translation was made by Tipitakālaṅkāra (1629); the second, by Nangyaung Sadaw, Aggadhammālaṅkāra (1648); the third, by Taungbilu Sadaw, Anatadhaja (1672); the fourth, by Tantabin Sadaw, Nandamedhābhisīri, Saddhammadhaja (1776); and the fifth, by an anonymous relative of the two Nyaung-gan Sadaws, U Po and U Pôk (1819).

All these five translations have also been called *Akauks*, confirming the view that in the case of the Dhammasaṅgani, the Mātikā-akauks served as substitutes for the translations.

The Puggala-paññatti has two translations, the first by an anonymous, and the second by Sinde Sadaw (1859). When the Kathāvatthu was first translated is not known, but a second translation was made by Jambudīpadhaja, a disciple of the Thè-in Thathanabaing (1837).

The Yamaka was translated by the five translators of the Dhātukathā, but a sixth translation by Jambudīpadhaja appeared in 1837. The Paṭṭhāna can also boast of six translations by the same translators as the Yamaka.

All these translations, also called *Akauks*, show successive efforts on the part of the learned to present the doctrine to the people in the vernacular garb.

¹ See p. 115, above.

² This is quite in accordance with the view expressed that the Dhātu analysis of mind and body is most suitable for the mass. See p. 116 above.

The *Netti* was first translated by *Sīlavam̐sa* during the reign of *Shwenangyawshin*, King *Narapati* (1501). The author, who was a native of *Taungdwingyi*, was the greatest epic poet. Another translation of it was made by *Sāradassī* during the reign of *Taninganwe Min* (1714). A third translation was supplied by *Ngataraw Sadaw* in *Sagaing*. A new translation by *Jāgara* of *Dakkhiṇārāma*, near the *Arakan Pagoda*, appeared in 1859.

When the *Peṭakopadesa* was translated is not known, but the *Milinda* was translated by *Dandaing Sadaw*, *Guṇa-aṅkāra* of *Pindale*, in 1763.

The *Aṭṭhasālinī* appears to have been translated as early as 1442; it was subsequently translated by *Ariyālaṅkāra* of *Pakangyi* during the reign of *Taninganwe Min* and again by *Pye Sadaw* during *Mindoon's* reign.¹ *Sōnda Sadaw*, *Nandamālā*, translated the *Visuddhimagga* during the reign of *Ngasingu Min* (1776). A translation of the *Pañcappakaraṇaṭṭhakathā* was made by *Gūgyi Sadaw*, *Pañṇasīha*, a disciple of the first *Bagaya Sadaw* (1782). He also translated the *Mūlaṭīkā*. The commentary on the *Netti* was translated by *Saddhammanandi* of *Pakangyi* (1782). A joint translation of the sub-commentary on the *Visuddhimagga* was made by the *Maing-gaing* and *Nemyo-dhammakyawthu* (1859).

The "door" theory seems to have received special attention in *Burma*, for the *Dvārakathā* of the *Mūlaṭīkā* was translated by *Nangyaung*² *Sadaw*, *Aggadhammālaṅkāra*, as far back as 1648. It was translated a second time by *Bagaya Sadaw* during the reign of *Bodawpaya* (1782). A third translation of it, by *Khinmagan Sadaw*, appeared during King *Tharawaddy's* reign (1837). The last-mentioned *Sadaw* was noted for his complete knowledge of the canonical texts. It is said that he used to exclaim: "Burn all your manuscripts, and I will reproduce them out of my memory."

Dhammapāla's Anuṭīkā was translated by *Ariyāvaṃsa*,

¹ See the inscriptions of *Pagan*, *Pinya*, and *Ava*.

² Described as *Myauk-nangyaung* on p. 115 above.

the author of the *Maṇisāramañjūsā*, during the reign of Mahāthihathūra, otherwise known in history as Pyizon Min (1648). This translation is generally known as *Mahānissaya* (the great translation). From this it looks as if Burmese translators tackled the sub-commentaries first. We may form a fair idea as to the extent of the study of the Compendium of Philosophy from the twenty-two translations of it. It was translated by :

1. An anonymous writer at the request of Prince Sithu, grandson of Bayin Naung (1550).
2. Taungbilu Sadaw, Anantadhaja of Sagaing.
3. Nangyaung Sadaw, Aggadhammālaṅkāra.
4. Palaing Sadaw, Ariyālaṅkāra of the Dakkhiṇāvamsa monastery in Sagaing, which gave the name of Dakkhiṇāwan Nissaya to the translation.
5. An anonymous disciple of both Nangyaung and Taungbilu Sadaws.
6. Sonda Sadaw of Kangyi.
7. Wetkhok Sadaw, Maṇisāra.
8. The first Bagaya Sadaw, Tipiṭakālaṅkāra.
9. Munindasāra of Myedu.
10. Ōk-kyauṅ Sadaw, U Po during the reign of Bagyidaw (1819).
11. Vicittālaṅkāra of Salin.
12. Panlhwa Sadaw, Sīlācāra.
13. Sudhammālaṅkāra during the reign of Tharrawaddy (1837).
14. Vāyāma of Legaing.
15. Thetkegyin Sadaw of Alon.
16. Medi Sadaw, Kavidhaja.
17. Mahābodhi Sadaw of Amarapura.
18. An anonymous thera of Pakangyi.
19. A native of Pindale.
20. Ye-u Sadaw of Sagaing.
21. Paññāsīha, a disciple of Thitsein Sadaw, at the request of Princess Patein, during the reign of Tharrawaddy ; and
22. The Maing-gaing Myoza, during Mindoon's reign.

The Abhidhammāvatāra was first translated by Ñāṇa during Alaungpaya's reign (1753), and again by the Salin Thathanabaing during Bagyidaw's reign. It is not known when and by whom the Saccasaṅkhepa was first translated, but a second translation of it was made by Ôk-kyauṅ Sadaw during the same reign. Neither do we know when the translation of the Sucittālaṅkāra was made, but the Paramatthabindu was translated by the first Bagaya Sadaw during Bodaw's reign (1782). The first Sindè Sadaw, Ñāṇālaṅkāra of Tharrawaddy's reign, translated both the Paramatthavinicchaya and the Nāmarūpapariccheda.

Ne-yin Sadaw Ariyālaṅkāra translated the Saṅkhepa-vaṇṇanā during Taininganwe Min's reign. The Tikagyaw was first translated by the first Sindè Sadaw, who closely followed the Maṇisāramañjūsā of Ariyāvamsa. Two other translations of this by the Maing-gaing Myoza and by a thera of Monywa exist. The Abhidhammatthadīpanī was translated by Panlhwa Sadaw. A translation of the Maṇisāramañjūsā, by Khingyi Pu of Sinbyugyun during Tharrawaddy's reign, was not completed. The Appheggusāradīpanī was translated by the second Ngakhôn Sadaw, Dīpalaṅkāra, during Pagan Min's reign (1846). When and by whom the new sub-commentaries on the Abhidhammāvatāra and the Saccasaṅkhepa were translated is not known, but the ṭīkā on the Paramatthabindu was translated by the first Bagaya Sadaw.

These numerous translations of the more important works are sufficient to show what books are generally recommended by the learned to the people in general, but scholars did not rest contented with giving them mere translations; they also wrote Burmese works based on traditional comments.

E. BURMESE WORKS.

The Thingyo-kyanyogyi, the oldest Burmese work on the Compendium of Philosophy, was prepared by Nangyaung Sadaw during Ngadatkyi Dayaka's reign.

Three treatises on "The Processes of Thought," entitled

Vīthiletyos,¹ exist. The first was written by Taungdwin Sadaw, Ñāṇālaṅkāra, during Naungdawgyi's reign (1760); the second, by Shwedaung Sadaw, during Bodaw's reign; and the third, by The-in Sadaw, during Pagan Min's reign. The Vīthicittapakāsini, by Ôk-kyauṅ Sadaw, U Pôk, during the last reign, and the Vīthicittavikāsini, by Nemy-dhammakyawthu, during Mindoon's reign, are on the same subject. The Vīthimañjarī ("The Germination of Thoughts"), by Upaṇḍita, a disciple of Ledi Sadaw, has since been added to the list.

The first Burmese analytical work on the Compendium, called Thingyo-Akauk, was written by the first Bagaya Sadaw. Since then, similar works, too numerous to be named, have been multiplied.

A class of composition, called Gaṇṭhi,² on cruces in philosophy, had also sprung up. There is a Gaṇṭhi on the Aṭṭhasālinī by the first Kyaw Aung Sanda Sadaw, written during Hanthawaddypa's reign. The Samohavinodanī also has a Gaṇṭhi by Shwedaung Sadaw. Ñāṇābhivamsa prepared three Gaṇṭhis on the Mātikā, the Dhātukathā, and on the first five sections of the Yamaka. The Compendium of Philosophy has two Gaṇṭhis, the first by the first Kyaw Aung Sanda Sadaw, and the second by Dakkhiṇārāma Sadaw during Mindoon's reign. Another Gaṇṭhi on the same, by Payagyi Sadaw,³ was added.

A Madhu³ by Mogaung Sadaw, on the same, is so similar to the last that both appear to have been based on a common prototype.

A catechism in Burmese on the Appheggusāradīpanī was prepared by Sōnda Sadaw. The Paramattharatana-

¹ See p. 283, *Compd. Phil.*

² The Gaṇṭhisāra, ascribed to Chapada on p. 18, Bode's *Pali Lit.*; the Dasagaṇṭhivāṇṇanā, Vepullabuddhi of Pagan (p. 28, *ibid.*); the Visuddhimagga-gaṇṭhipadattha, to Sāradassī (p. 56), and the Gaṇṭhipadattha, to Ñāṇavara of Pagan (pp. 66, 67), are not traceable in the *Piṭakat Thonbôn Sadan*. But a Gaṇṭhi on the Paṭṭhāna and another on the Tikagyaw, are given in the list of MSS. in the Bernard Free Library, Rangoon.

³ See p. x., *Compd. Phil.*

vali ("A Row of Philosophical Gems") was prepared by Dhammathingyan (1831) at the request of the Saw Atunwun.¹ The Paramatthasarūpadīpanī, by Ingan Sadaw, Visuddhārāma, and the Abhidhammatthasarūpadīpanī, by Myobyngyi Sadaw, the author of another well-known *Akauk* on the Compendium, have their prototypes in the Visuddhimagga and the Compendium of Philosophy respectively.

Ledi's numerous *dīpanī*'s all bear on Abhidhamma topics in plain language. He is the most popular writer of the day.

After a hurried survey of the Abhidhamma literature in Burma, I cannot help concluding this paper with a remark that, like Germans, the Burmese is a nation of philosophers. Here every one philosophizes on any event. Whenever any two men meet on important occasions, philosophy is discussed. The Burmans have succeeded in keeping the "fires" of philosophy alive for twenty-two centuries ever since it was entrusted to their loyal charge by the far-sighted policy of Asoka, the greatest of Buddhist Kings, and his spiritual adviser, Tissa. Thus, with a grateful sense, we look back to India, with which Greece was also connected.²

¹ See p. x., *Compd. Phil.*

² It is regrettable that the publication of the Journal could not be further delayed to permit the author to read the proofs. He must, therefore, not be held responsible for any misprints in Burmese names and titles.—RH. D.

V

A LIST OF PALI BOOKS PRINTED IN CEYLON IN SINGHALESE CHARACTERS

BY W. A. DE SILVA.

PRINTING in Singhalese character was introduced to Ceylon by the Dutch about the year 1737 for the purpose of translating and publishing Christian works in the language of the people. The Colombo Auxiliary Bible Society followed in the same lines about the year 1813. The Wesleyan missionaries established a press in 1815, the Church Mission Society in 1822, the Baptist Mission in 1841, and the Roman Catholics in 1849. The above-named presses were entirely in the hands of Europeans, and printed only Christian tracts and educational works for Christian schools. Two Pali books appear to have been printed at the Wesleyan Mission Press. A Pali translation of the New Testament in 1835 and a Compendious Pali Grammar, with a Copious Vocabulary, 302 pp., 8vo., by Rev. B. Clough, was issued in 1824.¹ The first press under the control of Singhalese and Buddhists—the Lankopakāra Press—was established at Galle in 1862 with the aid of the King of Siam. About the same time the Sarwagña Sāsanābhiwurdhi Dāyaka Press was established at Kotahena, Colombo, under the control of Migettuwatte Unnānsē. The Lakrivikirana Press was established in 1863, and other presses—notably, the

¹ *Vide* Dr. Murdoch's Catalogue of Printed Books in Singhalese, Christian Vernacular Education Society, 1868.

Lankābhiññā Press, which for a long time was under the control of the late lamented Pandit Baṭuvantudāve, came into existence. The first Pali work of importance was published in 1865 by the well-known scholar, Rev. Waskaduwe Subhūti Nāyaka Unnānsē, who is still living. It was the Abhidhānappadīpikā, with English and Singhalese interpretations, 215 pp., 8vo., and printed at the Government Press.

The Pirit Pota (a collection of Sūtras), the most popular book in use among the Buddhists, appears to have been printed in 1868 at the Lankābhiññā Press; and, as the number of presses increased, a few other Pali books appeared in print from time to time. Within the last twenty years a large number of Pali works has been issued.

Under Ordinance No. 1 of 1885 (Ceylon) it was made compulsory for printers and publishers to supply three copies of every publication printed in Ceylon to the Government Record Room, and a quarterly list of such publications is published in the *Government Gazette*. One copy of these is forwarded to the Secretary of State for the Colonies for the British Museum, and another copy is expected to be deposited in the Colombo Museum Library. It was, however, found, when proceeding with the compilation of this list, that a number of books which I looked to find deposited in the Colombo Museum Library were not to be found there. They had to be searched for in private libraries, and I am greatly indebted to B. Siriniwāsa Unnānsē of Kalutara, among others, for placing at my disposal the particulars of the books found in the library of the late Weligama Śrī Sumangala Nāyaka Unnānsē.

The present list is, as far as possible, a complete one, but some of the books given there are out of print and very difficult to procure.

There has not yet been any attempt made in Ceylon to print the Pali works in a systematic manner, as has been done in Siam and Burma. The texts are often printed in

parts of about eighty pages, and are issued at irregular intervals; and many of the texts thus begun have never been completed and others are still dragging their weary length along. Apart from the texts, the Singhalese Press has issued two classes of works with a certain degree of abundance—viz., Grammars, and isolated Sūtras with descriptive and detailed translations. A large number of books of the last category existed in Ceylon in MS. form. They were mainly disquisitions based on particular Sūtras and not mere translations into Singhalese.

DARLEY GARDENS, COLOMBO,
November, 1910.

1. Abhidhammattha Sangaha: a Compendium of Abhidhamma. Edited by H. Devamitta Unnānsē; Lankābhiññā Viśruta Press, Colombo, 1888; pp. 48, demy 8vo.
2. Abhidhammattha Sangaha. 2nd ed. of 1. C. Boteju, Colombo, 1909; pp. 48, small 8vo.
3. Abhidhammattha Sangaha Pakaraṇa. By Anuruddha Mahā-Thera. Edited by Paññānanda Unnānsē of Welitara; Jināḷankāra Press, Colombo, 1898; pp. 92, roy. 8vo.
4. Abhidhammattha Vibhāvinī Tīkā. By Sumaṅgala Mahā-Thera. Edited by Welitara Paññānanda Unnānsē; Jināḷankāra Press, Colombo, 1898; pp. 175, roy. 8vo.
5. Abhidhamma Mātrukāwa and Paṭṭhāna Mātrukāwa; with paraphrase in Singhalese. Edited by Mādampē Dhammādhāra Unnānsē; Śāstrāloka Press, 1889; pp. 86, demy 12mo.
6. Abhidhamma Atthasālinī Atthayōjanā. Edited by K. Paññasekhara Unnānsē; D. P. Kandamby, at Kāṭaluwa, 1890; pp. 275, roy. 8vo.
7. Abhidhammattha Sangaha Praśnottara Sannaya. The Singhalese paraphrase by Anuruddha Sthavira. Edited by Nandārāma Tissa Unnānsē; Lakmini-pahana Press, Colombo, 1890; pp. 136, demy 8vo.

8. Abhidhammattha Sangaha Saṅkhepa Vaṇṇanā. By Saddhamma Jōtipāla Mahā-Thera. Edited by Welitara Paññānanda Unnānsē ; Jināḷankāra Press, Colombo, 1889 ; pp. 55, roy. 8vo.
9. Abhidhammattha Sangaha Sannaya. Singhalese paraphrase by Sāriputra Sangharāja Mahā-Sthavira. Edited by Paññāmoli Tissa Unnānsē ; Satya Samuccaya Press, Kelaniya, 1897 ; pp. 204, demy 8vo.
10. Abhidhamma Sammoha Vinodanī Atthayojanā. Edited by Paññāsekhara Unnānsē ; D. P. Kandamby, Lan-kopakāra Press, Galle, 1892 ; pp. 264, roy. 8vo.
11. Abhidhānappadīpikā : Glossary. By Moggalāyana Mahā-Sthavira. Edited by W. Subhūti Nāyaka Unnānsē ; Government Printer, Colombo, 1883 ; pp. 340, roy. 8vo.
12. Abhidhānappadīpikā. Edited by W. Subhūti Nāyaka Unnānsē ; the Government Printer, Colombo, 1893 ; pp. 568, demy 8vo.
13. Abhidhānappadīpikā ; with Singhalese translation of the words. By Pantiya Sīla Vaṃsa Unnānsē and Bellana Saranankara Unnānsē ; the Satya Samuccaya Press, Pēliyagoda, 1891 ; pp. 75, roy. 8vo.
14. Abhidhānappadīpikāwa : Singhalese translation. Edited by Toṭagamuve Paññāmoli Tissa Unnānsē ; the Satya Samuccaya Press, Pēliyagoda, 1894 ; pp. 168 ; demy 8vo.
15. Abhisambodhi Āḷaṅkāra. Published by P. S. Perera, at the Vidyāsāgara Press, Colombo, 1897 ; pp. 34 ; demy 8vo.
16. Abhinava Sāsana Vaṃsa ; an account of the organization of the Amarapura sect. By W. Piyatissa Unnānsē ; Jināḷankāra Press, Colombo, 1899 ; pp. 18, demy 8vo.
17. Acchariya-Abbhuta Sūtra ; with Singhalese paraphrase. Published by W. Rūpasingha, at the Jināḷankāra Press, Colombo, 1897 ; pp. 44, demy 8vo.
18. Aggikkhandhopama Sutta ; with Singhalese paraphrase.

- Edited by Sīlavamsa Unnānsē and B. Samaranān-kara Unnānsē ; D. Witachy Appuhamy, Pæliyagoda, 1891 ; pp. 88, roy. 8vo.
19. Ākkhyāta Padaya: Grammar. Edited by D. Sumaṅgala Unnānsē; Lakābhiñṇā Viśruta Press, Colombo, 1889; pp. 56, crown 8vo.
 20. Ālavaka Sūtraya : Pali text with Singhalese paraphrase ; Sudarśana Press, Colombo, 1897 ; pp. 60, demy 8vo.
 21. Aṅgulimāla Sūtraya : Pali text with Singhalese translation. Edited by Giridara Ratanajoti Unnānsē ; Dinakraprākāsa Press, Colombo, 1891 ; pp. 40, demy 8vo.
 22. Aṅguttara-Nikāya. Edited by H. Devamitta Nāyaka Unnānsē ; published by D. J. Kuruppu Jayawardana at the Lakrivikirana Press, Colombo, 1893–1900 ; Parts 1–7, pp. 560, demy 8vo.
 23. Aṅguttara-Nikāya (Part I.). Printed by D. C. Abeywardana, Colombo, 1901 ; pp. 80, demy 8vo.
 24. Aṅguttara-Nikāya Gāthā Sannaya : Singhalese paraphrase of the verses in the Aṅguttara. By W. S. Wācissara Unnānsē ; K. D. Mendis, Welitara, 1907 ; pp. 48, demy 8vo.
 25. Aṅguttara-Nikāya Gāthā Sannaya : Singhalese paraphrase. Edited by W. Dhammānanda Bhikkhu ; published by D. W. Gunawardana at Ambalangoda, 1908 ; pp. 148, demy 8vo.
 26. Aputtaka Sūtraya ; with Singhalese paraphrase. Granthāloka Press, Colombo, 1900 ; pp. 12, demy 8vo.
 27. Ārakā Sūtra ; with Singhalese paraphrase. Published by A. Cooray at the Sudarśana Press, Colombo, 1894 ; pp. 11, demy 8vo.
 28. Āsirviśopama Sūtraya ; with Singhalese paraphrase. Edited by D. B. D. S. Samaranāyaka ; Weerkody Bros., Colombo, 1891 ; pp. 36, demy 8vo.
 29. Ātānāṭiya Sūtra ; with Singhalese paraphrase. The Sudarśana Press, Colombo, 1885 ; pp. 30, demy 8vo.

30. Attanagalu Vihāra Vamsa: History. By Śrī Mayitriya Mahā Swāmi. Edited by Tangalla Jinaratana Unnānsē; Sudarśana Press, Colombo, 1898; pp. 113, demy 8vo.
31. Attanagalu Vihāra Vamsa. Edited by C. A. Sīlakhanda Unnānsē; published by N. J. Cooray and Sons, Colombo, 1909; pp. 112, demy 8vo.
32. Atthasālinī Atthayojanā, of Nānakitti Swāmi. Edited by Paññāsekhara Unnānsē; the Lankopakāra Press, Galle, 1900; pp. 275, demy 8vo.
33. Atthipuñja Sūtraya. The Kandy Buddhist Press, Kandy, 1897; pp. 9, demy 8vo.
34. Ayogarajātaka Vyākkyāyana; with Singhalese paraphrase. Edited by Dhammānanda Sabha Unnānsē Sayivasiri Press, Pæliyagoda, 1904; pp. 44, demy 8vo.
35. Besajja Mañjūsā: Medical; with Singhalese translation. Edited by M. Dharmaratana; Lakminipahana Press, Colombo, 1889; Part 1; pp. 40, demy 8vo.
36. Bhikkhu - Pāṭimokkha and Bhikkhunī - Pāṭimokkha. Edited by Sugunasāra Unnānsē; N. J. Cooray, Colombo, 1901; pp. 182, fcap. 8vo.
37. Bhikkhunī-Pāṭimokkha. See Bhikkhu-Pāṭimokkha.
38. Bhikshu-Prātimoksha-Ganti-Dīpaniya. Edited by K. Gunaratana Unnānsē; S. Appuhamy, at Kelaniya Press, 1889; pp. 78, fcap. 8mo.
39. Bhikshu-Sīlaya: Pali and Singhalese, on rules of conduct for monks. Edited by Swarnajotiyasabha Unnānsē, Udugampola; the Granthaparakāsa Press, Colombo, 1893; pp. 68, demy 8vo.
40. Bodhipakshika Dharma Vibhāgaya: Pali and Singhalese. Edited by D. L. Rūpasīṅha; the Granthāloka Press, Colombo, 1899; pp. 24, demy 8vo.
41. Brahmāyu Sūtraya; with Singhalese paraphrase. Śastrādhāra Press, Colombo, 1895; pp. 73; demy 8vo.
42. Brahmajāla Sutta: Pali with Singhalese paraphrase. Edited by B. Rewata Unnānsē and W. Sugatatissa Unnānsē; Sudharmārāma Press, Wanavahala, 1899; pp. 128; demy 8vo.

30. Attanagalu Vihāra Vamsa: History. By Śrī Mayitriya Mahā Swāmi. Edited by Tangalla Jinaratana Unnānsē; Sudarśana Press, Colombo, 1898; pp. 113, demy 8vo.
31. Attanagalu Vihāra Vamsa. Edited by C. A. Silakhandha Unnānsē; published by N. J. Cooray and Sons, Colombo, 1909; pp. 112, demy 8vo.
32. Atthasālinī Atthayojanā, of Nānakitti Swāmi. Edited by Paññāsekhara Unnānsē; the Lankopakāra Press, Galle, 1900; pp. 275, demy 8vo.
33. Atthipuñja Sūtraya. The Kandy Buddhist Press, Kandy, 1897; pp. 9, demy 8vo.
34. Ayogarajātaka Vyākkyāyana; with Singhalese paraphrase. Edited by Dhammānanda Sabha Unnānsē Sayivasiri Press, Pæliyagoda, 1904; pp. 44, demy 8vo.
35. Besajja Mañjūsā: Medical; with Singhalese translation. Edited by M. Dharmaratana; Lakminipahana Press, Colombo, 1889; Part 1; pp. 40, demy 8vo.
36. Bhikkhu - Pāṭimokkha and Bhikkhunī - Pāṭimokkha. Edited by Sugunasāra Unnānsē; N. J. Cooray, Colombo, 1901; pp. 182, fcap. 8vo.
37. Bhikkhunī-Pāṭimokkha. See Bhikkhu-Pāṭimokkha.
38. Bhikshu-Prātimoksha-Ganti-Dīpaniya. Edited by K. Gunaratana Unnānsē; S. Appuhamy, at Kelaniya Press, 1889; pp. 78, fcap. 8mo.
39. Bhikshu-Sīlaya: Pali and Singhalese, on rules of conduct for monks. Edited by Swarnajotiyasabha Unnānsē, Udugampola; the Granthaparakāsa Press, Colombo, 1893; pp. 68, demy 8vo.
40. Bodhipakshika Dharma Vibhāgaya: Pali and Singhalese. Edited by D. L. Rūpasīṅha; the Granthāloka Press, Colombo, 1899; pp. 24, demy 8vo.
41. Brahmāyu Sūtraya; with Singhalese paraphrase. Śastrādhāra Press, Colombo, 1895; pp. 73; demy 8vo.
42. Brahmajāla Sutta: Pali with Singhalese paraphrase. Edited by B. Rewata Unnānsē and W. Sugatatissa Unnānsē; Sudharmārāma Press, Wanavahala, 1899; pp. 128; demy 8vo.

43. Buddha-Pangaraya : Pali verses with Singhalese translation ; Vidyāwardena Press, Colombo, 1908 ; pp. 24, demy 8vo.
44. Buddhi-ppasādinī ; a Commentary on Pada-Sādinī : Grammar ; Vidyāsāgara Press, Colombo, 1908 ; pp. 134, roy. 8vo.
45. Bauddha Pratipatti Dīpaniya : Pali and Singhalese ; Compendium of Buddhist conduct. Edited by K. Paññāsekara Unnānsē ; D. P. Kandamby, Kataluwa, 1893 ; pp. 48, demy 16mo.
46. Bauddha Pratipatti Sangrahawa : Pali and Singhalese ; compilation of rules of Buddhist conduct. Compiled by Ñānamōli Unnānsē ; Lankābhiññā Viśruta Press, 1889 ; pp. 50, demy 12mo.
47. Bālappabodhana Ṭikā : Grammar. Edited by Dhammaratana Unnānsē ; Lankābhiññā Viśruta Press, Colombo, 1887 ; pp. 50, demy 8vo.
48. Bālāvatāra : Grammar. By Dharmakirti Sangha-Rāja. Edited by Don Andris de Silva Batuvantudave Pandit ; Lankābhiññā Viśruta Press, Colombo, 1869 ; pp. 77, demy 8vo.
49. Bālāvatāra : Pali Grammar. Edited by Sri Dharmārāma Nāyaka Unnānsē ; the Satya Samuccaya Press, Pæliyagoda, 1902 ; pp. 86, demy 8vo.
50. Bālāvatāra with Ṭika : Pali Grammar. Edited by H. Sumaṅgala Mahā-Nāyaka Unnānsē ; H. Don Carolis, at the Lakrivikirana Press, Colombo, 1893 ; pp. 338, demy 8vo.
51. Bālāvatāra Balana Sannaya : Pali and Singhalese ; Grammar. Edited by E. Sankicca Unnānsē ; Sucaritodaya Press, Panadura, 1899 ; pp. 188, demy 8vo.
52. Bālāvatāra Liyana Sannaya and Okandapola Sannaya : Grammar. By Dhammajoti Terunnānsē. Edited by Don Andris de Silva Batuvantudave Pandit ; Lankābhiññā Viśruta Press, Colombo, 1888 ; pp. 141, demy 8vo.
53. Bālāvatāra Pucchā Visajjanā : Grammar. Published

- by K. Jotiratana Unnānsē ; Jināḷankāra Press, Colombo, 1905 ; pp. 160, demy 8vo.
54. Bālāvatara Sangraha : Grammar. By Stinamalave Dhammajoti Terunnānsē. Edited by D. Jinaratana Unnānsē ; Lankābhiñṇā Viśruta Press, Colombo, 1889 ; pp. 126, demy 8vo.
55. Bālāvatara-Sutra Nirdeśa : Grammar. Edited by Don Andris de Silva Batuvantudave Pandit ; Lankābhiñṇā Viśruta Press, 1885 ; pp. 103, demy 12mo.
56. Bālapaṇḍita Sūtraya ; with Singhalese paraphrase. Edited by Dharmaratana Unnānsē ; Satya Samuccaya Press, Pæliyagoda, 1893 ; pp. 48, demy 8vo.
57. Catubhānavāra - Atthakathā. Edited by Weligama Dhammapāla Unnānsē ; Jināḷankāra Press, Colombo, 1898 ; pp. 104, demy 8vo.
58. Catubhānavāra-Atthakathā. Edited by W. Dhammapāla Unnānsē ; Sucaritodaya Press, Panadura, 1903 ; pp. 104, demy 8vo.
59. Cetokhila-Sūtraya ; with Singhalese paraphrase ; Lankabhina Viśruta Press, Colombo, 1897 ; pp. 25, demy 8vo.
60. Cūḷa-Niruttiya : Grammar. By Sri Saddharmāḷankāra-Thera. Edited by Dharmasādaka Unnānsē ; Granthaloka Press, Colombo, 1896 ; pp. 36, demy 8vo.
61. Cūḷapuñṇama Sūtraya ; with Singhalese paraphrase. Granthaprākāśa Press, Colombo, 1893 ; pp. 16, demy 8vo.
62. Cūḷa-Sīhanāda-Sūtraya ; with Singhalese paraphrase. Granthaprākāśa Press, Colombo, 1897 ; pp. 36, demy 8vo.
63. Cullahastippadōpama-Sūtraya ; with Singhalese paraphrase. Sumitra Press, Colombo, 1894 ; pp. 61, demy 8vo.
64. Cūḷakammavibhaṅga - Sutta ; with Singhalese paraphrase. Lakrivikirana Press, Colombo, 1890 ; pp. 28, demy 8vo.
65. Culla-Vagga, Vinaya. Published by D. D. Amara-

- singha; K. D. J. Gunatunga, at Alutgāma, 1909; pp. 452, demy 8vo.
66. Culla-Vedalla-Sūtraya; with Singhalese paraphrase. Edited by L. Dhammarakkhita Unnānsē; Grantha-prākāsa Press, Colombo, 1897; pp. 32, demy 8vo.
67. Cunda-Sūtraya; with Singhalese paraphrase. Grantha-prākāsa Press, Colombo, 1896; pp. 6, demy 8vo.
68. Dakṣiṇavibhaṅga - Sūtraya; with Singhalese paraphrase. Edited by M. Nāṇissara Unnānsē; Lankabhina Viśruta Press, Colombo, 1890; pp. 24, demy 8vo.
69. Dakṣiṇavibhaṅga-Sūtraya. Sayivasiri Press, Pæliya-goda, 1898; pp. 29, demy 8vo.
70. Daṃsakpevatum - Sūtraya; with Singhalese translation. Śāstrādhāra Press, Colombo, 1887; pp. 24, demy 8vo.
71. Daṃsakpevatum Sūtraya; with Singhalese paraphrase. Don. Simon de Silva, Colombo, 1909; pp. 66, demy 8vo.
72. Dāṭhāvamsa. By Dharmakirti Swamy; with Singhalese translation: History. Edited by Asabha Unnānsē; Śāstrādhāra Press, Kēlaniya, 1883; pp. 111, demy 8vo.
73. Dhajagga-Sutta; with Singhalese paraphrase. Vidyā-sāgara Press, Colombo, 1896; pp. 34, demy 8vo.
74. Dhammahadaya - Vibhaṅga - Sūtra Sannaya; with Singhalese translation. Edited by P. Somānanda; D. J. Gunatunga, Colombo, 1906; pp. 76, demy 8vo.
75. Dhammapada; with Singhalese paraphrase. Edited by H. Devamitta Nāyaka Unnānsē; Lankābhiñṇā Viśruta Press, Colombo, 1879; pp. 138, demy 8vo.; 2nd ed., 1889.
76. Dhammapada. Edited by H. Devamitta Nāyaka Unnānsē; Lankābhiñṇā Viśruta Press, Colombo, 1886; pp. 29, demy 8vo.
77. Dhammapada - Aṭṭhakathā. Edited by M. Nāṇissara Unnānsē; Grantha-prākāsa Press, Colombo, 1891-1906; pp. 659, demy 8vo.

78. Dhammapada - Aṭṭhakathā. Edited by Gunaratana Unnānsē; Śāstraloka Press, Colombo, 1887; pp. 80, demy 8vo. (part).
79. Dhammapadārtha-Gāthā Sannaya (Singhalese translation). Edited by S. Sumaṅgala Unnānsē; printed at Jinālankāra Press, Colombo, 1899; pp. 81, demy 8vo.
80. Dhammapadārtha - Gāthā Sannaya. Edited by U. Dhammānanda Unnānsē; Saddharmapṛākāsa Press, Alutgāma, 1907, pp. 80, demy 8vo.
81. Dhatwattha Sangaha: Grammar. By Visuddhācāra-Thera; Jinālankāra Press, Colombo, 1898; pp. 88, crown 8vo.
82. Dhatwattha Dīpanī: Pali, Singhalese, and English; Grammar. Edited by H. Jinaratana Unnānsē; J. F. Weerakkody, Colombo, 1895; pp. 173, demy 8vo.
83. Dīgha-Nikāya; with Singhalese translation. By W. A. Samarasekara. Edited by W. Arthur de Silva; Sīhala - Samaya Press, Colombo, 1904-1905; pp. 1138, demy 8vo.; Vols. 1 and 2.
84. Dinacarita-Sangaha. Edited by M. Vipulasāra Unnānsē; N. M. Perera, Colombo, 1890; pp. 18, demy 12mo.
85. Ekakkhara-Kosha: Glossary of words. Edited by Ñāṇatilaka Nāyaka Unnānsē; Śāstrāloka Press, Colombo, 1886; pp. 59, demy 8vo.
86. Gadālādeni Sannaya: Grammar, with Singhalese. Edited by H. Sumaṅgala Mahā-Nāyaka Unnānsē; Śāstrādhāra Press, Colombo, 1877; pp. 184, demy 8vo.; 2nd ed., 1907.
87. Gandhābhāranaya: Grammar. Edited by W. Ñāṇatilaka Nāyaka Unnānsē; Vidyāratnākāra Press, Welitara, 1898; pp. 76, demy 8vo.
88. Ghāṭikāra - Sūtraya; with Singhalese paraphrase; Victoria Press, Colombo, 1897; pp. 28, demy 8vo.
89. Heranasika and Dinacariya: Pali and Singhalese.

- Jināḷankāra Press, Colombo, 1897 ; pp. 12, demy 8vo.
90. Jānussati Sūtraya ; with Singhalese paraphrase. Sumitra Press, Colombo, 1895 ; pp. 22, demy 8vo.
91. Jātakatṭhakathā. Edited by Silānanda Unnānsē ; Jināḷankāra Press, Colombo, and Granthaprākāsa Press, Colombo, 1892-1910 ; pp. 560, demy 8vo. (7 parts).
92. Jātaka-Gāthā Sannaya (Singhalese paraphrase). By Rajamurari. Edited by B. Dhammaratana ; Sucaritodaya Press, Pānadure, 1905 ; pp. 80, demy 8vo. (Part I.).
93. Jina-Carita ; with Singhalese paraphrase. By Medhankara Unnānsē. Edited by W. Dhammānanda Unnānsē ; Śāstrādhāra Press, Colombo, 1886 ; pp. 101, demy 8vo.
94. Jināḷankāra (Sannaya) ; with Singhalese paraphrase. Edited by W. Dīpankara Unnānsē ; Vidyāloka Press, Galle, 1900 ; pp. 93, demy 8vo.
95. Kaccāyana : Grammar. By Kaccāyana Sthavira. Edited by M. Gunaratana Unnānsē ; Śāstrāloka Press, Colombo, 1887 ; pp. 137, demy 8vo.
96. Kaccāyana-Bheda : Grammar of Mahā-Yasa Thera ; Sarvaṅgasāsanabhi Vurdhi Dāyaka Press, Colombo, 1886 ; pp. 16, roy. 8vo.
97. Kaccāyana-Bhedaya Sannaya : Grammar ; with Singhalese paraphrase. By Jinawaṃsa Śrī Paññāsāra Mahā-Sthavira. Edited by K. Paññārāma Unnānsē ; Saddharmaprākāsa Press, Alutgāma, 1906 ; pp. 160, demy 8vo.
98. Kaccāyana- Nāmika - Akkhyāta - Rūpamāla : Grammar. Edited by Śrī Dharmārāma Nāyaka Unnānsē ; Satya Samuccaya Press, Pæliyagoda, Colombo, 1895 ; pp. 62, demy 8vo.
99. Kaccāyana-Sāraya by Mahā-Yasa Sthavira of Burma ; with Singhalese translation. Edited by Ñāṇatiloka Nāyaka Unnānsē ; Vidyāratnakāra Press, Welitara, 1892 ; pp. 48, crown 8vo.

100. Kaccāyana-Sutta ; with Singhalese translation. Published by N. J. Cooray at Wellampitiya, 1904 ; pp. 128.
101. Kaccāyana - Sūtra - Pāṭha : Grammar ; Lankābhiññā Viśruta Press, Colombo, 1895 ; pp. 16, demy 8vo.
102. Kaccāyana - Sūtra - Padaya : Grammar. Edited by M. Gunaratana Unnānsē ; N. J. Cooray, at Wellampitiya, Colombo, 1898 ; pp. 80, demy 8vo.
103. Kaccāyana Sūtra Niddesa : Grammar. N. J. Cooray, Colombo, 1905 ; pp. 42, 8vo.
104. Kaccāyana - Vaṇṇanā of Mahā-Vijitāvī Sthavira : Grammar. Edited by Paññālankāra Sumana-sāra, and Piyatissa Unnānsē ; Granthāloka Press, Colombo, 1905 ; pp. 498, demy 8vo.
105. Kālāma-Sūtra ; with Singhalese paraphrase. Edited by P. Sumaṅgala Unnānsē ; Theosophical Society Press, Kandy, 1893 ; pp. 32, demy 8vo.
106. Kamma - Vācā. Edited by G. Jinaratana Unnānsē ; printed by D. C. Abewardana at Braybrooke Street, Colombo, 1898 ; pp. 28, crown 8vo.
107. Kankhā - Vitaranī ; Commentary. Edited by M. Ñāṇissara Unnānsē ; Jinālankāra Press, Colombo, 1905 ; pp. 240, roy. 8vo.
108. Kārikāva : Grammar. Of Dharmasenāpati Sthavira of Burma. Edited by W. Ñāṇatiloka Nāyaka Unnānsē ; Vidyāratnākāra Press, Welitara, 1897 ; pp. 152, demy 8vo.
109. Kārakā - Puśpa - Muñjariya : Grammar ; with Singhalese paraphrase. By Attaragāma Banda ; N. M. P. Wijeratna Appuhāmi, Colombo, 1907 ; pp. 260, demy 8vo.
110. Karma-Nidāna-Sūtraya ; with Singhalese paraphrase. Jinālankāra Press, Colombo, 1897 ; pp. 20, demy 8vo.
111. Kasībhāradvāja-Sutta ; with Singhalese paraphrase. Edited by W. Paññā-Tissa Unnānsē ; Dharmawardhana Press, Colombo, 1896 ; pp. 26, demy 8vo.
112. Kāyavirati-Gāthā ; with Singhalese paraphrase. Śastrāloka Press, Colombo, 1882 ; pp. 72 ; demy 8vo.

113. Kudasika. By Dharmasiri Mahā-Sthavira ; with
Singhalese translation. Jināṇkārā Press, Colombo,
1898 ; pp. 188, demy 8vo.
114. Kudasika. Granthaprākāsa Press, Colombo, 1894 ;
pp. 172, demy 8vo.
115. Macchikovāda-Sūtraya ; with Singhalese paraphrase.
Granthaprākāsa Press, Colombo, 1909 ; pp. 36,
demy 8vo.
116. Macchikovāda-Sūtraya ; with Singhalese paraphrase.
Laksilumina Press, Colombo, 1909 ; pp. 36.
117. Mahābodhivaṃsa. Edited by Pedinnoruva Sobhita
Unnānsē ; Weerakkody Bros., Colombo, 1890 ;
pp. 104, demy 8vo. ; Part 1.
118. Mahābodhivaṃsa. Edited by M. S. P. Sarānanda
Unnānsē ; P. D. Joronis Appuhamy, Colombo, 1891 ;
pp. 100, demy 8vo. ; Part 1.
119. Mahādharma - Samādāna - Sūtraya ; with Singhalese
paraphrase. Granthaprākāsa Press, Colombo, 1897 ;
pp. 24, demy 8vo.
120. Mahā-Maṅgala-Sutta ; with Singhalese translation.
Edited by H. Devānanda Unnānsē ; Lankābhiññā
Viśruta Press, Colombo, 1898 ; pp. 82, demy 8vo.
121. Mahāparinirvāṇa-Sūtraya ; with Singhalese para-
phrase. Edited by Paññānanda Unnānsē ; James
Fonseca and Sons, Colombo, 1887 ; pp. 280 ;
demy 8vo.
122. Mahā-Pirit Pota : Collection of Sūtras. Printed by
F. Cooray at the Sudarṣana Press, Colombo, 1887 ;
pp. 33, demy 12mo.
123. Mahā-Pirit Pota : Piruwana Pot Vahaṃsa. Published
by J. D. Fernando, Śāstrādhāra Press, Colombo,
1891 ; pp. 82, demy 8vo.
124. Mahā-Pirit Pota. Printed by B. Silva, Kelaniya,
1891 ; pp. 62, demy 8vo.
125. Mahā-Pirit Pota. Published by J. D. Fernando at
the Śāstrādhāra Press, Colombo, 1892 ; pp. 60,
demy 8vo.
126. Mahā-Pirit Pota : Piruwana Pot Vahaṃsa. Printed

- by J. D. Fernando, Colombo, 1899; pp. 148, demy 8vo.
127. Mahā-Pirit Pota. Printed by N. J. Cooray, Colombo, 1899; pp. 28, demy 8vo.
128. Mahā-Pirit Pota : Piruwana Pot Vahamsa. Granthā-loka Press, Colombo, 1899; pp. 76, demy 8vo.
129. Mahā-Pirit Pota : Piruwana Pot Vahamsa. Grantha-prākāsa Press, Colombo, 1904; pp. 136, 8vo.
130. Mahārūpasiddhi. By Buddhappiya Mahā-Thera : Grammar. Published by M. Gunaratana Unnānsē, Vidyāsāgara Press, Colombo, 1897; pp. 280, demy 8vo.
131. Mahārūpasiddhi : Sannaya (Singhalese paraphrase); Grammar. Edited by D. Dhammaratana Unnānsē, Pæliyagoda, 1901; pp. 60, demy 8vo. (part).
132. Mahārūpasiddhi Tīkā : Grammar. Edited by Tangalle Palita and Dharmaratana, Unnānsē; Jinā-lankāra Press, Colombo, 1903; pp. 130, demy 8vo.
133. Mahāsamaya - Sutta ; with Singhalese paraphrase. Granthaprākāsa Press, Colombo, 1896; pp. 70, demy 8vo.
134. Mahāsatipaṭṭhāna - Sūtraya ; with Singhalese paraphrase. Edited by H. Jayatilaka. Published by F. Cooray, Colombo, 1888; pp. 140, demy 8vo.
135. Mahāsatipaṭṭhāna - Sūtraya ; with Singhalese paraphrase. Edited by Borukgamuwa Revata Unnānsē; the Buddhist Press, Colombo, 1898; pp. 88, demy 8vo.
136. Mahāsatipaṭṭhāna - Sūtraya ; with Singhalese paraphrase. Sudarṣana Press, Colombo, 1900; pp. 130, demy 8vo.
137. Mahāsatipaṭṭhāna-Sūtra Sannaya (Singhalese paraphrase). Published by G. M. Kapurala at the Granthaprākāsa Press, Colombo, 1909; pp. 80; Part 1.
138. Mahāsatipaṭṭhāna - Sūtra ; with Singhalese paraphrase. Published by F. Cooray at the Sudarṣana Press, Matara, 1908; pp. 20, demy 8vo.

139. Mahātirtāyatana - Sūtraya ; with Singhalese paraphrase. Printed by M. H. Perera, Pæliyagoda, 1901 ; pp. 36, demy 8vo.
140. Mahāwamsa : History. Edited by Batuvantudave Pandit and H. Śrī Sumaṅgala Nāyaka Unnānsē ; the Government Printer, Colombo, 1909 ; pp. 728 ; demy 8vo ; 2nd ed. ; 1st ed., 1877.
141. Mahāwamsa ; with Singhalese translation. Sihala Samaya Press, Colombo, 1909.
142. Mahāwamsa Tīkā : Commentary. Edited by Pandit Batuvantudave and M. Nāṇissara Unnānsē ; Government Printing Office, Colombo, 1895 ; pp. 508, roy. 8vo.
143. Mayitribhāvanava and Abhidharma Kāmatanḥā ; with Singhalese paraphrase. Edited by D. Saraṇaṅkara Unnānsē ; Lankāloka Press, Galle, 1898 ; pp. 12, fcap. 8vo.
144. Mayitribhāvanāva Tisarāṇa Astanga Sīlaya : Pali and Singhalese ; S. A. Z. Siriwardana, Galle, 1885 ; pp. 15, fcap. 16mo.
145. Majjhima - Nikāya. Lakrivikirana Press, Colombo, 1895-1907 ; pp. 480, demy 8vo. ; Parts 1-6.
146. Mallikovāda - Sūtraya ; with Singhalese paraphrase. Widyāsāgara Press, Wennawatta, 1894 ; pp. 40, demy 8vo.
147. Manoratha-Pūranī Atuvava. Edited by K. Śrī Dharmārāma Nāyaka Unnānsē ; Satyasamuccaya Press, Pæliyagoda, 1893-1907 ; pp. 855, demy 8vo.
148. Mayituna-Saṃyoga-Sūtraya ; with Singhalese paraphrase. Granthaprākāsa Press, Colombo, 1897 ; pp. 16, demy 8vo.
149. Milindaprasṇaya. Published by M. J. Rodrigo at the Vidyāsāgara Press, Colombo, 1896 ; pp. 80, demy 8vo ; Part.
150. Moggallāyana - Vyākaraṇa : Grammar. Edited by H. Devamitta Nāyaka Unnānsē ; published by N. M. Perera, Colombo, 1890 ; pp. 90, demy 8vo.
151. Moggallāna - Pañcakapradīpa : Grammar. Edited by

- Srī Dharmārāma Nāyaka Unnānsē; Government Printing Office, Colombo, 1896; pp. 244, demy 8vo.
152. Mukhamatta-Dīpanī, with Kaccāyana Vutti: Grammar. Edited by W. Dhammaratana Unnānsē; Government Printer, Colombo, 1898; pp. 642, roy. 8vo.
153. Mulusika: Singhalese and Pali. Printed by S. A. Z. Siriwardana, Galle, 1887; pp. 37, demy 8vo.
154. Rasavāhinī. Edited by Saraṇatissa Unnānsē. Lankābhiñṇā Viśruta Press, Colombo, 1891-1893; pp. 290, demy 8vo.
155. Rasavāhinī. Edited by M. Somaratana Unnānsē; Jinālankāra Press, Colombo, 1906; pp. 228, demy 8vo.
156. Rūpabhedappakāsaniya: Grammar. By Jambudhaja Mahā-Sthavira. Edited by W. Nānatiloka Nāyaka Unnānsē; Vidyāratanakāra Press, Wēlitara, 1907; pp. 44, demy 12mo.
157. Rūpamāla-Vaṇṇanā: Grammar of Saraṇaṅkara Saṅgharāj. Edited by G. Ratanajoti Unnānsē; Sīvyā-Srī Press, Colombo, 1905; pp. 76, 8vo.
158. Sabda Binduwa; with Singhalese paraphrase; the Grammar of Dharmarāja-Guru Mahā-Sthavira. Edited by M. Vipulasāra Unnānsē; Lankābhiñṇā Viśruta Press, Colombo, 1888; pp. 38, demy 12mo.
159. Sabda-Binduwa. Edited by W. Nānatiloka Nāyaka Unnānsē; Śāstrāloka Press, Colombo, 1888; pp. 12, demy 8vo.
160. Sabdapravurtiprakāsaya; the Grammar of Saddhamma-Guru Mahā-Sthavira. Vidyāratanakāra Press, Wēlitara, 1899; pp. 72; demy 8vo.
161. Sabdasaratta-Jālinī; the Grammar of Nagita Mahā-Sthavira. Edited by D. Sīlakkhandha Unnānsē; Lankābhiñṇā Viśruta Press, Colombo, 1900; pp. 128, demy 8vo.
162. Saddhamma - Vacakopa-desā; a first book of Pali lessons with Singhalese. By Sarānanda Unnānsē; Saddharmaprākāsa Press, Alutgāma, 1909; pp. 148, demy 8vo.

163. Saddhammopāyanaya ; of Abhayagiri Kavicakravati Ānanda Mahā-Sthavira. Edited by Pandit Batuvantudave ; Śāstrādhāra Press, Colombo, 1874 ; pp. 126, demy 8vo.
164. Saddhammopāyana-Nibbaccana-Rūpasiddhiya : Grammar. Edited by Ñāṇawimaltissa Unnānsē. Jinā-lankāra Press, Colombo, 1901 ; pp. 99, demy 8vo.
165. Saddhasarattha-jālinī : Grammar. By Nagita Sthavira. Edited by P. Sīlānanda Unnānsē ; Vidyāsāgara Press, Colombo, 1902 ; pp. 163, demy 8vo.
166. Saddatthabheda-Cintā : Grammar. By Saddhamma Siri Mahā-Sthavira of Burma. Edited by Sujāta Sāmaṇera and Ñāṇānanda Sāmaṇera ; Vidyāsāgara Press, Colombo, 1901 ; pp. 28, demy 8vo.
167. Sādhujanappa-Sādinī ; controversial matter regarding interpretation of Vinaya. By Ambalaṅgoda Devānanda Unnānsē ; Mahābodhi Press, Colombo, 1909 ; pp. 84, demy 8vo.
168. Sāmaṇera - Praṣṇaya : Pali with Singhalese paraphrase. Edited by B. Saraṇankara Unnānsē ; Granthaprākāsa Press, Colombo, 1899 ; pp. 172, roy. 8vo.
169. Samantakuṭa - Varnanā : Description of Samanala. By Vedeha Mahā-Sthavira. Edited by Dhammānanda Unnānsē and M. Ñāṇissara Unnānsē ; Government Printing Office, Colombo, 1890 ; pp. 232, demy 8vo.
170. Samanta-Pāsādikā : Commentary. Printed by N. J. Cooray and Sons, 1908 ; pp. 880, demy 8vo.
171. Sambandha-Cintā : the Grammar of Śrī Saṅgharakkhita Mahā-Sthavira. Edited by K. Sarānanda Unnānsē ; Lakrivikirana Press, Colombo, 1891 ; pp. 98, demy 8vo.
172. Sandesa-Kathā. Edited by H. Śrī Sumaṅgala Mahā-Nāyaka Unnānsē ; N. J. Cooray, at Brandiyawatta, 1896 ; pp. 16, demy 8vo.
173. Sandhi-Dīpanī : Grammar. Edited by Ñandārāma

- Tissa Unnānsē ; Śāstrādhāra Press, Colombo, 1886 ; pp. 85, demy 8vo.
174. Sāṅkhyā - Ruppāti - Sūtraya ; with Singhalese paraphrase ; Granthaprākāsa Press, Colombo, 1896 ; pp. 29, demy 8vo.
175. Saṃyutta-Nikāya. Edited by B. Amarasiṅha Unnānsē ; Widyāratnākāra Press, Welitara, 1898-1905 ; pp. 400, roy. 8vo. ; Parts 1-5.
176. Sappurisādāna-Sūtraya ; with Singhalese paraphrase. Sarvaṅgasāsanābhivurdhi Dāyaka Press, Colombo, 1897 ; pp. 20, demy 8vo.
177. Sapta-Suryodgamana-Sūtraya ; with Singhalese paraphrase ; Saivasri Press, Pæliyagoda, 1898 ; pp. 56, demy 8vo.
178. Saptārya - Dhana - Sūtraya ; with Singhalese paraphrase ; Granthaprākāsa Press, Colombo, 1896 ; pp. 24, demy 8vo.
179. Sārabasūtraya ; with Singhalese paraphrase. Jinā-lankāra Press, Colombo, 1897 ; pp. 24, demy 8vo.
180. Saraṇa - Sila - Saṅgraha. Edited by M. Gunaratana Unnānsē ; Weerakkody Bros., Colombo ; pp. 44, demy 12mo.
181. Sarasaṅgaha, of Siddhartha Mahā-Sthavira. Edited by Y. Sarānanda Unnānsē ; Vidyāsāgara Press, Colombo, 1898 ; pp. 256, demy 8vo.
182. Sarasaṅgaha ; with Singhalese paraphrase. Edited by Y. Somānanda Unnānsē ; Lakrivikirāṇa Press, Colombo, 1891 ; pp. 98, demy 8vo. (part).
183. Sarasaṅgraha ; with Singhalese translation. Edited by K. Dhammasiri Tissa Unnānsē ; Widyāratnākāra Press, Welitara, 1898 ; pp. 64, demy 8vo. (part).
184. Sārattha-Dīpanī, Satarabhānavāra Sannaya ; with the Singhalese of Saraṇaṅkāra Saṅgharāja. Edited by Beligalle Sobhita Unnānsē ; Satyasamuccaya Press, Kelaniya, 1891 ; pp. 191, demy 8vo.
185. Sārattha-Mañjūsā. Printed by N. J. Cooray and Sons, Colombo, 1907 ; pp. 160, roy. 8vo.
186. Sāratthappakāsini : Commentary on Saṃyutta-

- Nikāya. Edited by P. Vimalabuddhi Sthavira ; Vidyāratnākāra Press, Welitara, 1898-1905 ; pp. 304, roy. 8vo. ; Parts 1-4.
187. Sārattha - Samuccaya, of W. Dhammapāla - Thera. Sucaritodaya Press, Pānadure, 1903 ; pp. 200, demy 8vo.
188. Sārattha-Saṅgha : Grammar. Tīkā of Bālāvatāra. By Uttama Maṅgala Buddhaghosa Mahā-Sthavira. Edited by G. Gunaratana Unnānsē ; Satyasamuccaya Press, Kelaniya, 1901 ; pp. 65, demy 8vo.
189. Sāsanawaṃsadīpa, Sannaya (Singhalese paraphrase). Edited by Nāṇatilaka Nāyaka Unnānsē ; Vidyāratnākāra Press, Welitara, 1903 ; pp. 320, demy 8vo. ; Parts 1-4.
190. Sāsanawaṃsa-Dīpayā ; account of the introduction of Buddhism into Ceylon. By Vimalasāra Unnānsē ; Śāstrāloka Press, Colombo, 1881 ; pp. 163, demy 8vo.
191. Satarabhānavāra, Sannaya. See Sārattha-Dīpanī.
192. Selasūtra, Sannaya (Singhalese paraphrase). Edited by K. Paññānanda Unnānsē ; printed at Dīpa-duttama Vihāra, Colombo, 1896 ; pp. 44, demy 8vo.
193. Sigālovāda-Sūtraya ; with Singhalese paraphrase. Edited by Tangalle Jinaratana Unnānsē ; Sudarśana Press, Colombo, 1889 ; pp. 64, demy 8vo.
194. Sikkhāpada Valañjanaya, Vinaya of Panchamūla Mahā - Sthavira. Edited by W. Paññānanda Unnānsē ; Jinālakāra Press, Colombo, 1908 ; pp. 103, demy 12mo.
195. Simālaṅkāra Saṅgha, of Wagiswara Sthavira ; Jinālakāra Press, Colombo, 1904 ; pp. 43, demy 8vo.
196. Sīmanaya-Dappanaya ; rules regarding the building of Ordination Halls. By Dharmālakāra Nāyaka Unnānsē ; Lokartha Sādhaka Press, Colombo, 1885 ; pp. 248, demy 8vo.
197. Subodha-Laṅkaraya : Grammar of Saṅgharakkhita Mahā - Sthavira ; with Singhalese paraphrase.

- Edited by Pandit Dharmasena; N. J. Cooray and Sons, Colombo, 1909; pp. 260, demy 8vo.
198. Subodhi-Tīkā : Grammar. By H. Śrī Sumaṅgala Nāyaka Unnānsē; Lakrivikirana Press, Colombo, 1892, pp. 327, demy 8vo.
199. Sudhiramukha Maṇḍanaya : Grammar. By Attara-gāma Bandara; Lankābhiññā Viśruta Press, Colombo, 1885, pp. 39, demy 8vo.
200. Sugata-Vidatthi-Vidhanaya; account of the size of the figure of Buddha and measurements in general. By Pravāra Ayiswariyālaṅkaraṇa Mahā-Saṅgharāja of Siam. Edited by C. A. Sīlakkhandha Unnānsē; Vidyāprākāsa Press, Ambalaṅgoda, 1894; pp. 51, demy 8vo.
201. Sumana-Sūtra; with Singhalese paraphrase. Lankābhiññā Viśruta Press, Colombo, 1896; pp. 11, demy 8vo.
202. Sumaṅgalappasādinī, Khuddasikkhā, Tīkā of Saṅgharakṣita Mahā-Sthavira. Edited by Sumanajoti Unnānsē; Jinālankāra Press, Colombo, 1888; pp. 187, demy 8vo.
203. Sumaṅgala Vilāsinī, Dīgha-Nikāyaṭṭhakathā. Edited by B. Saraṇaṅkara Unnānsē; Granthaprākāsa Press, Colombo, 1898; pp. 80; demy 8vo.; Part 1.
204. Sutta-Nipāta. Edited by Paññatissa Unnānsē and Aggadhamma Unnānsē; Welitara, 1891; pp. 136, demy 8vo.
205. Sūtra-Nipāta, Sannaya (Singhalese paraphrase). Edited by P. Paññānanda Unnānsē; Śāstrāloka Press, Colombo, 1891; pp. 104, demy 8vo.
206. Sutta - Nipāta - Aṭṭhakathā. Edited by W. Dhammānanda, Bhikshu; Jinālankāra Press, Colombo, 1898; pp. 80, demy 8vo.
207. Suttasaṅgaha - Aṭṭhakathā. Edited by W. Sugatapāla Unnānsē; Jinālankāra Press, Colombo, 1900; pp. 225, roy. 8vo.
208. Sūtra-Saṅgraha, Sannaya (Singhalese paraphrase).

- By Medhāvītissa Unnānsē; Saddharmaprākāsa Press, Alutgāma, 1905 ; pp. 80, demy 8vo.
209. Tamotama-Parāyana-Sūtraya ; with Singhalese paraphrase ; Sayivasri Press, Pæliyagoda ; pp. 16, demy 8vo.
210. Telakaṭāha - Gāthā ; with Singhalese paraphrase ; N. J. Cooray Appuhamy, Colombo, 1908 ; pp. 40, demy 8vo.
211. Telakaṭāha-Gāthā ; Pali verses. Edited by C. Piya-tissa Unnānsē ; Granthāloka Press, Colombo, 1901 ; pp. 88, demy 8vo.
212. Tirokudda - Sūtraya ; with Singhalese paraphrase. Edited by A. Dhammatilaka, Colombo, 1889 ; pp. 12, demy 8vo.
213. Thūpāvamsa ; History. Edited by B. Dhammaratana Unnānsē ; Satyasamuccaya Press, Pæliyagoda, Colombo, 1896 ; pp. 86, demy 8vo (part).
214. Udāyi Sutta ; Singhalese paraphrase. By Attadassi Unnānsē ; G. D. A. Perera, Colombo, 1899 ; pp. 68, fcap. 8vo.
215. Uposatha - Sūtraya ; with Singhalese paraphrase ; Jinālankāra Press, Colombo, 1891 ; pp. 44, demy 8vo.
216. Vācākopadesaya ; Grammar of Mahā-Vijitāvī Mahā-Sthavira. Edited by W. Ñāṇatilaka Nāyaka Unnānsē ; Vidyāratnākāra Press, Welitara, 1902 ; pp. 68, demy 12mo.
217. Vācca-Vācākāya ; Grammar of Dhammadassī. Edited by W. Ñāṇatilaka Nāyaka Unnānsē ; Vidyāratnākāra Press, Welitara, 1899 ; pp. 48, demy 8vo.
218. Vammika-Sūtra ; with Singhalese translation. Edited by Baddegāma Dhammaratana Unnānsē ; Satyasamuccaya Press, Pæliyagoda, 1893 ; pp. 16, demy 8vo.
219. Vandana-Gāthā : verses of Adoration ; Laksilumina Press, Colombo, 1907 ; pp. 26, demy 12mo.
220. Vandana-Gāthā Saṅgraha : Pali and Singhalese. J. P. Ekanayaka, Matara, 1898 ; pp. 8, demy 16mo.

221. Vasala-Sūtraya ; with Singhalese paraphrase. Don Simon de Silva, 1908 ; pp 14, demy 8vo.
222. Vattakkhandhaka Vinaya : Rules : B. D. Zoysa, Colombo, 1905 ; pp. 88, demy 8vo.
223. Vibhathyatthaya : Grammar. By a Princess of Burma. Edited by W. Ñānatilaka Nāyaka Unnānsē ; Vidyāratnākāra Press, Welitara, 1905 ; pp. 36, demy 12mo.
224. Vijaya-Sūtraya ; with Singhalese paraphrase. Granthaprākāsa Press, Colombo, 1890 ; pp. 33, demy 8vo.
225. Vimukti - Saṅgraha. Edited by H. Devamitta Unnānsē ; Lankābhiññā Viśruta Press, Colombo, 1891 ; pp. 144, demy 16mo.
226. Vimukti Saṅgraha. Edited by Talahena Amaramoli Unnānsē ; P. H. Appuhamy, Colombo, 1889, pp. 160, demy 8vo.
227. Vinayālaṅkāra. By a Mahā-Sthavira of Burma. Edited by Ñāṇavimalatissa Unnānsē ; Jinālaṅkāra Press, Colombo ; pp. 184, demy 8vo.
228. Vinayattha-Mañjūsā, Tīkā by Kankhā-Vitaranī. Edited by Paññālaṅkāra and Piyatissa, Unnānsē ; D. C. Abeywardana, Colombo, 1901 ; pp. 80, demy 8vo.
229. Visuddhi-Magga ; with Singhalese paraphrase. Edited by M. Dharmaratana ; Lakminipahāna Press, Colombo, 1890-1909 ; demy 8vo. ; Parts 1-4.
230. Viyāgrapada Sūtraya ; with Singhalese paraphrase ; Sudarṣana Press, Pæliyagoda, 1893 ; pp. 20, demy 8vo.
231. Vurtamālava : Verses on King Prakramabāhu of Dedigamuwa ; Lankābhiññā Viśruta Press, Colombo, 1901 ; pp. 31, demy 12mo.
232. Vuttodaya : Grammar, with Singhalese paraphrase. edited by Vimalajoti Unnānsē ; Lankābhiññā Viśruta Press, Colombo, 1888 ; pp. 30, demy 8vo.

[Mr. De Silva has not had the opportunity of seeing his contribution through the press, and must not be held responsible for typographical errors.—R.H. D.]

PALI TEXT SOCIETY

HARBORO' GRANGE,

ASHTON-ON-MERSEY,

CHESHIRE.

Issues of the Pali Text Society.

I.—ARRANGEMENT BY YEARS.

1882.

1. Journal.
2. Buddhavaṇsa and Cariyā Piṭaka.
3. Āyāranga.

1883.

1. Journal.
2. Thera-therī-gāthā.
3. Puggala-Paññatti.

1884.

1. Journal.
2. Saṅyutta, Vol. I.

1885.

1. Journal.
2. Anguttara, Part I.
3. Dhamma-Saṅgaṇi.
4. Udāna.

1886.

1. Journal.
2. Sumaṅgala, Vol. I.
3. Vimāna-Vatthu.

1887.

1. Journal.
2. Majjhima, Vol. I.

1888.

1. Journal.
2. Saṅyutta, Vol. II.
3. Anguttara, Part II.

1889.

1. Journal.
2. Dīgha, Vol. I.
3. Peta-Vatthu.

1890.

1. Journal.
2. Saṅyutta, Vol. III.
3. Itivuttaka.

1891.

1. Journal, 1891–1893.
2. Mahā-Bodhi-Vaṇsa.

1892.

1. Dhātu-Kathā.
2. Therīgāthā Cy.

1893.

1. Saṅyutta, Vol. IV.
2. Sutta-Nipāta Glossary.

1894.

1. Peta-Vatthu Cy.
2. Kathā-Vatthu, Vol. I.

1895.

1. Anguttara, Part III.
2. Kathā-Vatthu, Vol. II.

1896.

1. Journal, 1893–1896.
2. Yogāvacara's Manual.
3. Majjhima, Vol. II., Part I.

1897.	1905.
1. Attha-Sālinī.	1. Paṭisambhidā, Vol. I.
2. Sāsana-Vaṇsa.	2. Journal, 1904-1905.
1898.	1906.
1. Saṃyutta, Vol. V.	Duka-Paṭṭhāna, I.
2. Majjhima, Vol. II., Part 2.	Dhammapada Com ^y , I., Part 1.
1899.	1907.
1. Anguttara, Part IV.	1. Journal, 1906-7.
2. Majjhima, Vol. III., Part 1.	2. Paṭisambhidā, Vol. II.
1900.	1908.
1. Anguttara, Vol. V.	1. Journal, 1908.
2. Majjhima, Vol. III., Part 2.	2. Mahāvaṇsa.
1901.	1909.
1. Vimāna-Vatthu ⁷ Cy.	1. Dhammapada Commen-
2. Journal, 1897-1901.	tary, Vol. I., Part 2.
1902.	2. Journal, 1909.
1. Netti-Pakarāṇa.	1910.
2. Majjhima, Vol. III., Part 3.	1. Anguttara Nikāya, Vol. VI.
1903.	(Indexes).
1. Dīgha, Vol. II.	2. Dīgha-Nikāya, Vol. III.
2. Journal, 1902-1903.	1911.
1904.	1. Dhammapada Commen-
1. Saṃyutta, Vol. VI. (In-	tary, Vol. II.
dexes).	2. Yamaka I.
2. Vibhanga.	

Total, 30 years ; 50 texts ; 69 volumes ; 19,468 pages.

II.—INDEX TO TEXTS.

NAME.	Net Sub- scription Price.
£ s. d.	
1. Anāgata-Vaṇsa (in <i>Journal</i> for 1886) ...	
2. Abidhammattha - Sangaha (in <i>Journal</i> for 1884)	
3. Anguttara Nikāya, 6 vols.	3 3 0

II.—INDEX TO TEXTS—*continued.*

NAME.	Net Sub- scription Price.		
	£	s.	d.
4. Attha-Sālinī (1897)	0	10	6
5. Āyāranga (1882)	0	10	6
6. Buddha-Vaṇsa (together with No. 7)	0	10	6
7. Cariyā-Piṭaka (1882)			
8. Cha-kesa-dhātu-vaṇsa (in <i>Journal</i> for 1885)			
9. Dāṭhā-Vaṇsa (in <i>Journal</i> for 1884)			
10. Dhammapada Commentary, vol. 1, part 1 (1906)	0	8	0
Dhammapada Commentary, vol. 1, part 2 (1909)	0	10	6
Dhammapada Commentary, vol. 1, parts 1 and 2	0	16	0
Dhammapada Commentary, vol. 2	0	10	6
Dhammapada Commentary, vol. 3	0	10	6
11. Dhamma-Saṅgaṇi (1885)	0	10	6
12. Dhātu Kathā (1892)	0	10	6
13. Dīgha-Nikāya, 3 vols.... ..	1	11	6
14. Duka-Paṭṭhāna (1906)	0	10	6
15. Gandha-Vaṇsa (in <i>Journal</i> for 1886)			
16. Iti-vuttaka (1890)	0	7	0
17. Jina-Carita (in <i>Journal</i> for 1905)			
18. Kathā Vatthu, 2 vols.... ..	1	1	0
19. Kathā Vatthu Commentary (in <i>Journal</i> for 1889)	0	10	6
20. Khudda-Sikkhā (in <i>Journal</i> for 1883)			
21. Mahāvaṇsa (1908)	0	10	6
22. Mahā-Bodhi-Vaṇsa (1891)	0	10	6
23. Majjhima-Nikāya, 3 vols.	1	11	6
24. Mūla-Sikkhā (in <i>Journal</i> for 1883)			
25. Netti-Pakarāṇa (1902)	0	10	6
26. Pājja-Madhu (in <i>Journal</i> for 1887)			
27. Pañca-gati-dīpana (in <i>Journal</i> for 1884)			
28. Paṭisambhidāmagga, two vols.	1	1	0
29. Peta-Vatthu (1889)	0	10	6
30. Peta-Vatthu Commentary (1894)	0	10	6
31. Puggala-Paññatti (1883)	0	7	0

II.—INDEX TO TEXTS—*continued.*

NAME.	Net Sub- scription Price.		
	£	s.	d.
32. Saṅyutta-Nikāya, 6 vols.	3	3	0
33. Saddhammasaṅgaha (in <i>Journal</i> for 1890)			
34. Saddhammopāyana (in <i>Journal</i> for 1877)			
35. Sandesa-Kathā (in <i>Journal</i> for 1885) ...			
36. Sāsana-Vaṅsa (1897)	0	10	6
37. Sīmā-vivāda-vinicchaya-kathā (in <i>Journal</i> for 1887)			
38. Sumangala-Vilāsinī, vol. 1 (1886) ...	0	10	6
Sutta-Nipātā (1902)			
39. Sutta-Nipāta Glossary (1893)	0	10	6
40. Tela-kaṭāha-gāthā (in <i>Journal</i> for 1884)...			
41-42. Thera-therī-gāthā (1883)	0	10	6
43. Therī-gāthā Commentary (1892) ...	0	10	6
44. Udāna (1885)	0	10	6
45. Vibhanga (1904)	0	10	6
46. Vimāna-Vatthu (1886)	0	7	0
47. Vimāna-Vatthu Commentary (1901) ...	0	10	6
48. Yamaka, I. and II.	1	1	6
49. Yamaka Commentary (1912)	0	10	6
50. Yogāvacara's Manual (1896)	0	7	0

III.—INDEX TO AUTHORS.

- Alwis, JAMES ; Lectures on Pali and Buddhism (1883).
 Andersen, D. ; Index to Trenckner's Notes (1908). Revise
 of Pali words beginning with " S " (1909).
 Anesaki, M. ; The Sutta Nipāta in Chinese (1907).
 Aung, S. Z. ; A Compendium of Philosophy (Abhidham-
 matthasaṅgaha, 1910). Abhidhamma Literature in
 Burma (1912).
 Bell, H. C. P. ; List of MSS. in the Oriental Library, Kandy,
 1882.
 Bendall, Cecil ; On the Mahāvagga (1883).
 Benson, A. C. ; Buddha, a sonnet (1883).
 Bode, Mabel H. ; ed. of Sāsana-Vaṅsa. Index to the

III.—INDEX TO AUTHORS—*continued.*

- Gandha-vaṇsa (1896). Index to Pali words discussed in Translations (1901). Early Pali Grammarians in Burma (1908). Mahāvaṇsa (Eng. transl., 1912).
- Carpenter, J. E. ; ed. of Dīgha and Sumangala-Vilāsinī.
- Chalmers, R. ; ed. of Majjhima, vols. 2 and 3.
- Clauson, G. L. M. ; A New Kammavācā (1907).
- Dé, Harinath ; Notes and Translations (1907).
- Edmunds, A. J. ; A Buddhist Bibliography (1903).
- Fausböll, V. ; Glossary to the Sutta-Nipāta (1893). Catalogue of Mandalay MSS. in the India Office Library (1896).
- Feer, Léon ; ed. of Saṃyutta, 5 vols ; and of Pañca-gatī Dīpana.
- List of MSS. in the Bibliothèque Nationale (1882).
- Franke, R. Otto ; Three Papers on Pali Grammarians and Lexicographers (1903). On the alleged Buddhist Councils (1908). Gāthās of the Dīgha Nikāya (1909).
- Frankfurter, Otto ; List of MSS. in the Bodleian Library, Oxford (1882).
- Geiger, W. ; ed. of Mahāvaṇsa ; transl. of Mahāvaṇsa (1912).
- Gooneratne, E. R. ; ed. of Tela-Kaṭāha-Gāthā (1884), Vimāna-Vatthu (1886), Pajja-Madhu (1887), and Dhatu-Kathā (1892).
- Hardy, Edmund ; ed. of Anguttara, vols. 3-5, Peta-Vatthu, Peta-Vatthu Commentary, Vimāna-Vatthu Commentary, and Netti-Pakarāṇa.
- On some stanzas in eulogy of the Buddha (1901). On the enlarged text of the Mahāvaṇsa (1903).
- Hoerning, Dr. ; List of Pali MSS. in the British Museum (1883 and 1888).
- Hunt, Mabel ; Index to the Paṭisambhidā (1908) ; to the Anguttara (1910).
- Jacobi, H. ; ed. of Āyāranga.
- Konow, Sten ; Pali words beginning with “H” (1907) ; with “S” (1909).
- Minayeff, J. P. ; ed. of Sandesa-Kathā (1885), Cha-kesa-dhātu-vaṇsa (1885), Anāgata-vaṇsa (1886), Gandha-

III.—INDEX TO AUTHORS—*continued*.

- Vaṇsa (1886), Sīmā Vivāda (1887), and Kathā Vatthu Commentary (1889).
- Moore, Justin H.; Collation of the Iti-vuttaka (1907).
- Morris, Richard; ed. of Anguttara, vols. 1 and 2, Buddha-vaṇsa, Cariyā-pitaka, Puggala-paññatti, and Saddham-mopāyana (1887).
- Notes and Queries (1884, 1885, 1886, 1887, 1889, and 1891).
- Müller, F. Max; On Kenjur Kasawara (1883).
- Müller-Hess, Edward; ed. of Attha-sālinī, Khudda-sikkhā, Mūla-sikkhā, Dhamma-saṅgaṇi, and Theri-gāthā Com-mentary.
- Glossary of Pali Proper Names (1888).
- Norman, H. C.; Commentary on the Dhammapada.
- Oldenberg, Hermann; ed. of Thera-gāthā.
- List of MSS. in the India Office Library (1882). The Era of Kaniṣka; the Ākhyāna Type and the Jātakas (1912).
- Runkle, C. B.; Index to Warren's "Buddhism in Transla-tions" (1903).
- Rouse, W. H. D.; Index to the Jātakas (1890). Text and translation of the Jina-Carita (1905).
- Rhys Davids, T. W.; ed. of Dīgha, Sumangala, Abhidham-mattha-saṅgaha, Dāṭhā-Vaṇsa, and Yogāvacara's Manual.
- List of MSS. in the Copenhagen Royal Library (1883). On spelicans (1887). Persecution of Buddhists in India (1896). The Bhabra Edict of Asoka (1896). Abbreviations of titles of Pali books (1896 and 1909) Political Divisions in India (1901).
- Rhys Davids, Mrs.; ed. of Vibhanga, Duka-Paṭṭhāna, Yamaka, Compendium of Philosophy (1910), Yamaka Commentary (1912).
- The Earliest Rock Climb (1901). Index to Saṃyutta (1904). Similes in the Nikāyas (1907 and 1908). Psalms of the Sisters (1909).
- Saddhānanda, N.; ed. of Saddhamma-Saṅgaha (1890).
- Schrader, F. Otto; Nirvana (1905).

III.—INDEX TO AUTHORS—*continued*.

- Silva, W. A., de ; Pali Books printed in Ceylon (1912).
 Steinthal, P. ; ed. of Udāna.
 Strong, S. A. ; ed. of Mahā-bodhi Vaṇsa.
 Suzuki, Daisetz T. ; The Zen Sect of Buddhism (1907).
 Takakusu, J. ; Abhidharma Literature of the Sarvāstivādins (1905).
 Taylor, Arnold C. ; ed. of Kathā Vatthu and Paṭisambhidā.
 Trenckner, V. ; ed. of Majjhima, vol. 1.
 Warren, H. C. ; Pali MSS. in the Brown University Library (1885). Digest of Visuddhi Magga (1891).
 Watanabe, K. ; A Chinese collection of Iti-vuttakas (1907).
 The Story of Kalmāsapāda (1909). Notes on the Buddha-Carita (1912).
 Wenzel, H. ; Nāgārjuna's "Friendly Epistle" (1886). Index to verses in the Divyāvadāna (1896).
 Windisch, E. ; ed. of Iti-vuttaka. Collation of Udāna (1890).
 Zoysa, Louis de ; List of MSS. in the Colombo Museum (1882).

For 1912-13 the issues will be :

1. Dhammapada Commentary, Vol. III. H. C. Norman.
2. Journal, 1910-12.
- 3 Yamaka II. Mesd. Foley, Hunt, and Rhys Davids (*concl.*)
4. Sutta - Nipāta. Professor Dines Andersen and Helmer Smith.
5. Khuddakapāṭha, Text and Commentary. Miss Hunt.
6. Paṭṭhāna Commentary. R. Marr Murray and J. H. Wisdom.

For 1914 to 1920 the issues will be selected from the following :—The Dhammapada Commentary, the Peṭakopadesa, the Samanta-Pāsādikā, a second edition of the Dhammapada, the Sumangala-Vilāsinī, II., III., the Sutta-Nipāta Commentary, the Papañca-Sūdanī, the Sāratthappakāsinī, the Niddesa, the Apadāna, the Tikapaṭṭhāna, the Theragāthā Commentary, and the Rasavāhinī.

SUBSCRIPTION one guinea a year.

BACK ISSUES, one guinea a year. Separate volumes can be supplied to subscribers on payment of a subscription of half a guinea a volume. No book can be supplied until the subscription for it has been paid. A set of the Journals (18 vols.) may be purchased for 8 guineas.

TRANSLATIONS SERIES (Henry Frowde, Amen Corner, London, E.C.):

1. Psalms of the Early Buddhists, with Dhammapāla's Chronicle. A.—Psalms of the Sisters (Therīgāthā). By Mrs. Rhys Davids (ready), 1909. Price 5s. net.
2. A Compendium of Philosophy (Abhidhammatthasangaha). By Shwe Zan Aung and Mrs. Rhys Davids (1910). Price 5s. net.
3. The Mahāvamsa or Great Chronicle of Ceylon. By W. Geiger, assisted by Mrs. Bode (1912). 10s. net.

In preparation :

Psalms of the Brethren (Theragāthā), Dhammapada, Sutta-Nipāta, and other works.

List of Donors to the Pali Text Society down to December 31, 1911.

	£	s.	d.
His Majesty the King of Siam	200	0	0
H.R.H. Prince Krom Mun Devavansa Varo- prakar	20	0	0
H.R.H. Prince Prisdang	10	0	0
The Secretary of State for India	31	10	0
Edmund Hardy, the late (three donations) ...	129	0	0
H. V. S. Davids, Esq.	3	0	0
L. T. Cave, Esq.	5	0	0
R. Hannah, Esq. (two donations)	16	16	0
Miss Horn	10	0	0
Professor Dr. Edw. Müller	10	0	0
General Forlong, the late	1	1	0
Ed. T. Sturdy, Esq.	800	0	0
Mrs. Plimmer (five donations)	30	15	0
H. C. Warren, the late	50	0	0
J. B. Andrews, Esq.	5	0	0
H.M.'s Government	200	0	0
Miss C. M. Ridding	10	0	0
R. F. Johnston, Esq. (two donations)	3	3	0
H.H. the Raja of Bhinga	100	0	0
F. H. Baynes, Esq.	5	5	0
Edw. Greenly, Esq.	1	1	0
U. Môn, K.S.M.	16	13	9
	<u>£1,658</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>9</u>

STATEMENT OF ACCOUNT FOR 1909.

[illegible]

STATEMENT OF ACCOUNT FOR 1910.

RECEIPTS.		EXPENDITURE.	
	£ s. d.		£ s. d.
Balance at Bank, January 1, 1910	... 659 4 2	To Printers	... 90 6 6
Balance in hand, January 1, 1910	... 5 1 0		160 3 2
By Subscriptions and Sales	... 213 19 11		21 6 3
" Payment for Transcription	... 13 0 0		271 15 11
" Donation	... 5 5 0	" Publisher's Charges	... 10 4 7
" Interest at Bank	... 33 3 11	" Insurance of Stock	... 5 5 0
		" Expert Engraving Company	4 15 11
		" Contributors (to <i>Journal</i> and	
		Angutt. Index vol.)	... 40 1 6
		" Transcriber	... 13 0 0
		" Binding	... 8 8 6
		" Roller Cabinet	3 7 6
		" Stationery, Postage, etc.	... 4 13 8
		Balance at Bank	564 6 6
		Balance in hand	3 14 11
	£929 14 0		£929 14 0

STATEMENT OF ACCOUNT FOR 1911.

RECEIPTS.			EXPENDITURE.		
	£	s. d.		£	s. d.
Balance at Bank, January 1, 1911	...	564 6 6	To Printers	...	£150 0 0
Balance in hand, January 1, 1911	...	3 14 11		139 17 11	
By Subscriptions and Sales	...	361 18 11		289 17 11	
" Donations	...	17 13 9	" Publisher's Charges	...	9 5 9
" Interest at Bank	...	32 18 0	" Insurance of Stock	...	5 5 0
			" Contributors	...	58 9 0
			" Typist	...	6 15 1
			" Binding	...	0 15 0
			" Purchase of Books	...	17 14 1
			" Stationery, Postage, etc.	...	7 4 4
			Balance at Bank, December 31, 1911	584 4 8	
			Balance in hand, December 31, 1911	1 1 2	
				£980 12 1	

PRINTED BY
BILLING AND SONS, LIMITED,
GUILDFORD.



