

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

Journal of the Pali Text Society.

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

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.

T. W. RHYS DAVIDS.

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.—RH. D.]

I

ON THE ERA OF KAṆIṢKA

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 Kaṇiṣka 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 Kaṇiṣka 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 ΚΩΪΙΑΝΩΥ, which probably means ΚΟΪΠΑΝΟΥ, 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 *saṅvatsara* 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.

Kaniṣka.

Huviṣka.

Vāsudeva.⁵

To date Kaniṣka'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 KΑΔΔΑΦE□) 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 Kaniska-Huviska-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 Kaniska 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 Kaniska's people, as has been stated. How, asks Franke (p. 93), are we to explain that Kaniska 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 Kaniska 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 Kaniska 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 Kaṇiṣka'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 Kaṇiṣka 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 Kaṇiṣka bear witness themselves as to that with a clearness that cannot be surpassed. Franke observes (p. 93) that "Kaṇiṣka 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 Kaṇiṣka—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 *σθηροσσυ* of the Hermaios-Kadphises coins with *sthavira, therā*, is not for me convincing (cp. also Boyer, *Journ. as.*, 1900, I, 529 ff.). Is it plausible to separate the *σθηρος* of these badly written legends (or occasionally even *σθηρς*; 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*]ρηροσ 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]ρηρος*. 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 *σθηροσση*, *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* (= *δικαιοσση*) 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-chên, 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 Kuşana, 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 Kuşana 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 Kuşanas 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 Kuşana 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 *βασιλευς 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 *βασιλευς 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 βασιλευς βασιλεων σωτηρ μεγας.

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 βασιλεων? 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 A.

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 $\rho\text{AONANO}\rho\text{AO}$, 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 Kuṣāna 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 Kaniṣka and Huviṣka the form Σ, but always C. Is Smith, *Catal.*, 71, right in ascribing the legends ΗΑΙΟΣ to Kaniṣka? Cunningham's (*op. cit.*, pl. XVI, 1, 3) impressions give ΗΑΙΟC most clearly. Let the scripts of these Kings be now laid beside the ΒΑΣΙΑΕΩΣ ΣΤΗΡΟΣΕΤ 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 Kuṣānas, 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 Bhitā 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 Kushaṇas. 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 Kushaṇa 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 Kushaṇa 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-Sāsānid 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., Kaṇiṣka, 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 Kaṇiṣka 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 Kaṇiṣka'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 Kaṇiṣka 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 *Sāmaḥjātaka* (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 Thūpa 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) : *pavisitrā . . . 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 samāṇa goes to beg of a householder *bhattakāle 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 *āhāradésakāle*, 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 *upad̥dhā 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 upat̥thite* of the verse.

But whatever one may think of this supposition, it is, in my opinion, certain that this *bhattachāle upat̥thite* 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 *geham pavekkhi*. In the prose, 539, *pavisitvā* refers to the entry into the town. That the wanderer then comes to the *gehadvāram* 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 *kot̥thake*, etc., there will have been a hemistich to which *kot̥thake* structurally belongs—say, with an *at̥thāsi*, as the Commentary has it. The next verse consists of two opening *pādas* (*tatra ca so usukāro* and *ekam ca cakku 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 *ekam*) 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' upasaṅkamāṇesu, upasaṅkamitvū . . . etad avocam*, 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 *Dīvyāvadāna*. 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 *evam dhūretha 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 *atthavaṇṇanā*) 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 R̥ṣyaśr̥ṅga 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 pâli, 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 Kuṅāla-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 Ṛgveda; and, further, we have these Ākhyānas, in the canonical shape of the “Jātakas,” existing in precisely the same form as I find in the Ṛgveda:—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 samkhārā* 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 Suparṇādhya is worked into the Mahābhārata. On the Suparṇādhya 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 ;

gāthāś cāpy atra gāyanti ye purāṇavidō janāḥ—

strophes the relations of which with those of the Jātakas 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 :

gāthām 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 Mahābhāratā-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 apaṭhat* :—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 Jātakatthavannanā, with those pure metrical narratives, which are supposed to have been plundered by the author of the Atthavannanā? 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 (992). It is characteristic that the *ślokaḥ 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 Manikaṅṭha 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.

Pitaka) 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 Ṛgvedic 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 archaeological 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 Ṛgveda 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 Suparnādhyāya. 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 Śunaḥsepa story. About the Suparnādhyāya 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 *āsvina 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 ūsatuh*, 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. Ajigartā, Śunaḥṣepa, Viśvāmitra, and his sons are speaking. The subject is Viśvāmitra’s adoption of Śunaḥṣepa, 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. Śunaḥṣepa says there to Ajigarti : *Adarśus tvā śāsahastam . . . gavāṃ trīṇi śatāni tvam avṛṇīthāmad 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 Ajigarti 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 R̥gvedic material to form sacrificial liturgies differs, as is acknowledged, often and materially from its construction in the R̥ksaṃhitā. Here the tendency arose to conclude from this fact that the façade of our R̥gveda 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 R̥tvij, 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 aḍo gāthā bhavati* (in the text of the strophe clearly to be read *apa yo jahāra*; 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 tatthevantaradhāyiti*. 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 svairi svairiṇi 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 *p̥riplavam* (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 R̥gveda. 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 R̥gveda section is introduced. The constant recurrence of these R̥g.-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 R̥g.-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

YAMAKAPPAKARAṄATTHAKATHĀ

FROM THE

PAṄCAPPAKARAṄATTHAKATHĀ.

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 raṇaṅjaho
 Yamassa visayātito nānāyamakamaṇḍitaṃ
 Abhidhammappakaraṇaṃ chaṭṭhaṃ chaṭṭhānadesito ¹
 Yamakaṃ ayam āvatta-nilāmalatanūruho.
 Yaṃ desayī anuppatto tassa saṅvaṇṇanākkhamo ²
 Idāni yasmā tasmāssa hoti saṅvaṇṇanā ayan ti.

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

Tattha yesaṃ dasannaṃ Yamakānaṃ vasena idaṃ pakaraṇaṃ dasavidhena vibhattaṃ, tesaṃ ³ ceva imassa ca pakaraṇassa nām' attho tāva evaṃ veditabbo.

Ken'aṭṭhena Yamakan ti? Yugalaṭṭhena yugalaṃ hi yamakan ti vuccati; yamaka-pātihāriyaṃ, yamaka-sālā ti ādisu viya. Iti yugala-sankhātānaṃ ⁴ yamakānaṃ vasena desitattā imesu dasasu ekekaṃ yamakaṃ nāma. Imesaṃ pana yamakānaṃ samūhabhāvato sabbam eva taṃ ⁵ pakaraṇaṃ Yamakan ti veditabbaṃ. ⁶

[*Mūla-Yamakaṃ.*]

Tattha mūlavasena pucchāvissajjanaṃ katvā desitattā dasannaṃ tāva sabbapaṭhamāṃ Mūla-Yamakan ti vuttaṃ. Tassa uddesavāro niddesavāro ti dve vārā honti. Tesu uddiṭṭhānukkamena niddisitabbattā uddesavāro paṭhamo. 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.

āli. Tassa kusala - kusalamūlasankhātānaṃ¹ dvinnāṃ atthānaṃ vasena *attha-yamakan* ti vā tesaṃ² yeva atthānaṃ vasena anuloma - paṭilomato pavattapāḷidhamavasena *dhamma-yamakan* ti vā, anuloma-paṭilomato pavattapucchā-vasena *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 pāḷi-vavatthānam eva veditabbaṃ.

Kusalattikamātikāya hi kusalā dhammā ti idaṃ ādipadaṃ nissāya *mūlanayo*, *mūla-mūlanayo*, *mūlakanayo*, *mūla-mūlakanayo* ti ime cattāro nayā honti. Tesaṃ ekekasmīṃ naye *mūlayamakaṃ* *ekamūlayamakaṃ aññamañña-mūlayamakan* ti tīṇi tīṇi yamakāni. Evaṃ catusu navesu dvādasa yamakāni. Ekekasmīṃ yamake anuloma-paṭilomavasena dve dve *pucchā* ti catuvīsati pucchā. Ekekāya pucchāya sannīṭṭhāna-saṃsaya-vasena dve dve *atthā* ti atṭha-cattārisaṃ³ atthā.

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

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

Yathā ca kusalapadaṃ nissāya ime cattāro nayā; ekekasmīṃ naye tīṇṇaṃ tīṇṇaṃ yamakānaṃ vasena dvādasa yamakāni, ekekasmīṃ yamake dvinnāṃ dvinnāṃ pucchānaṃ vasena catuvīsati pucchā; ekekāya pucchāya dvinnāṃ dvinnāṃ atthānaṃ vasena atṭhacattārisaṃ³ 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 soḷasa nayā atṭhacattārisa⁵ yamakāni,

¹ S. Tassa kusalaṃ ca sankhātānaṃ.

² Br. tesaññeva.

³ Br. cattalīsaṃ.

⁴ Br. omits.

⁵ Br. cattalīsa.

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

Ettāvata mūlavāro nāma paṭhamaṇ¹ 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 nayādayo veditabbā ti sabbesu pi dasavāresu saṭṭhi-sata nayā asīti adhikāni cattāri yamaka-satāni saṭṭhi adhikāni navapucchā-satāni viśādhikāni ekūnavīsati atthasatāni ca uddiṭṭhānīti veditabbāni. Evaṇ tāva uddesavāre nayayamaka - pucchā - atthavārappabhedavasena Pāli - vavatthānam eva veditabbaṇ. Mūlaṇ hetu nidānaṇ cāti gāthā dasannam pi vārānaṇ udāna-gāthā nāma.

Tattha mūlādīni sabbāni pi kāraṇavevacanān'eva. Kāraṇaṇ³ hi patitṭhānaṭṭhena mūlaṇ; attano phalanipphādanatthaṇ⁴ hinoti pavattatīti hetu; handa naṇ gaṇhathāti dassentaṇ viya attano phalaṇ nidetīti nidānaṇ; etasmā phalaṇ sambhavatīti⁵ sambhavo; pabhavatīti pabhavo; samuṭṭhāti ettha phalaṇ, etena vā samuṭṭhātīti samuṭṭhānaṇ; attano phalaṇ āharatīti ahāro; appatikkhipitabb'atṭhena attano phalena ālambiyatīti ārammaṇaṇ; etaṇ paṭicca appatikkhipitvā phalaṇ eti pavattatīti paccayo; etasmā phalaṇ samudetīti samudayo ti evam eva etesaṇ padānaṇ vacanatto veditabbo.

Uddesavāraṇṇanā niṭṭhitā.

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

¹ S. omits.

² S. uddiṭṭhabbo.

³ Br. Kāraṇān.

⁴ S. °nippā°.

⁵ B. sambhotīti.

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

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

*Tiṇ' eva kusalamūlānīti na te*¹ *sabbe kusalamūlā.*² *Alobhādīni pana tīṇi eva kusalamūlānīti attho. Avasesā kusalā dhammā na kusalamūlā ti avasesā phassādayo kusalā dhammā kusalāmūlāni nāma na honti. Athavā avasesā phassādayo kusalā dhammā yeva nāma, na kusalamūlānīti pi attho. Ye vā pana kusalamūlā ti ye vā pana paṭhamapucchāyadutiya-padena kusalamūlā ti tayo alobhādayo gahitā, sabbe te dhammā kusalā ti, kinte sabbe tayo pi dhammā kusalā ti pucchati. Āmantā ti sabbesam pi kusalamūlānaṃ kusalabhāvaṃ sampatiṇchanto āha. Ayaṃ tāva mūlanayo 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 agahetvā*³ *samānaṭṭhena gahe-tabbā. Ayaṃ h' ettha*⁴ *attho: sabbe te kusalamūlena samānamūlā, yaṃ phassassa mūlaṃ, tad eva vedanādīnan ti. Atha nesāṃ tathābhāvaṃ sampatiṇchanto āmantā ti āha.*

*Kusalamūla - samuṭṭhānaṃ*⁵ *ti kusalacittasamuṭṭhānaṃ rūpaṃ*⁶ *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 kusalāmūlāni pi hontī, akusala-avyākata-mūlāni pi; idha kusalamūlānīti visesadassanaṭṭham idan vuttaṃ. Aññamañña-mūlāni cāti aññamaññaṃ hetupaccayena paccayā hontī*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. Aññamañña-paccayo is the seventh of the twenty-four relations among phenomena.

dhammā kusalamūlena ekamūlā ti avatvā *sabbe te dhammā kusalā* ti vuttaṅ. Kasmā? Atthavisesābhāvato. *Kusalamūlena ekamūlā* ti hi pucchāya katāya *mūlāni yāni ekato uppajjantīti* heṭṭhā vuttanayen' eva mūlavissajjanaṅ kātabbaṅ bhaveyya, evañ ca sati atthavisesābhāvo hoti; tasmā tathā akatvā evaṅ pucchā katā. Iminā upāyena mūlamūlanayādīsu pi aññamaññamūla-yamake pucchā viseso veditabbo.

Mūla-mūlanaye *sabbe te kusalamūlamūlā* ti¹ *sabbe te kusalamūlamūlasankhātā*² mūlā ti pucchati. *Ekamūlamūlā* ti samānatṭhena ekam eva mūla-mūlaṅ etesan ti ekamūla-mūlā. *Aññamañña-mūla-mūlā* ti aññamaññassa mūlaṅ aññamaññamūlaṅ. Aññamaññamūlañ hetupaccayaṭṭhena mūlaṅ etesan ti aññamañña-mūlamūlā.

Mūlakanaye *kusalamūlakā* ti hetupaccayaṭṭhena kusalaṅ mūlaṅ etesan ti kusalamūlakā.

Mūlamūlakanaye *kusala-mūlamūlakā* ti kusalānaṅ mūlaṅ kusalamūlaṅ. Hetupaccayaṭṭhen' eva kusalamūlaṅ mūlaṅ etesan ti kusalamūlamūlakā ti ayaṅ tāva kusalapadaṅ nissāya naya-yamaka-pucchāsu visesattho.

Akusala-padādīsu pi es' eva nayo. Ayaṅ pana viseseso : *ahetukaṅ akusalan* ti vicikicchāya ceva uddhaccena ca sampayuttaṅ mohaṅ sandhāya vuttan; *ahetukaṅ avyākatan* ti atṭhārassa cittuppādā arūpaṅ nibbānañ ca. *Avyākatamūlena ekamūlaṅ*³ ti idha pana ṭhapetvā sahetuka-avyākatasamuṭṭhānaṅ rūpaṅ sesaṅ labbhati. Sahetuka-avyākata-samuṭṭhānaṅ rūpaṅ avyākatamūlena ekamūlaṅ hoti. Taṅ abbhohārikaṅ⁴ katvā ekato labbhamānakavasen' eva c'etaṅ vissajjanaṅ kataṅ.

Nāmā dhammā ti nāmasankhātā dhammā. Te atthato cattāro arūpino khandhā nibbānañ ca. Nav'eva nāmamūlānīti kusalākusala-avyākatamūlavasena nava mūlāni. *Ahetukaṅ nāmaṅ nāmamūlena na ekamūlan* ti *ahetukaṅ sabbam* pi atṭhārassa cittuppādavicikicchā-uddhacca⁵ sampayutta-moha-nibbānasankhātaṅ nāmaṅ 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. *Sahetukay nāmamūlenāti* pade pi sahetukay nāmaṃ nāmamūlenāti attho. Sesay sabbattha uttānattham evāti.

Mūlavāra-vaṇṇanā niṭṭhitā.

Hetuvārādīsu¹ pi iminā va upāyena² attho vedītabbo. *Mūlay hetu nīlānaṃ cāti* gāthā yathā niddiṭṭhānaṃ dasanānam pi vārānaṃ puna udāravasen' eva³ vuttā ti.

Mūla-Yamaka-vaṇṇanā niṭṭhitā.

II

[*Khandha-Yamakay.*]

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

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

Tattha paṇṇattivāro uddesaniddesa-vasena dvihākārehi vavattito.⁴ Itaresu visuṃ uddesavāro natthi; ādīto paṭṭhāya pucchāvissajjanavasena ekadhā vavattitā.

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

*Rūpakkhando . . . pe . . . viññāṇakkhandho*⁶ ti tesu yeva pabhedato nāma vavattānaṃ. 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 tesam yeva padasodhanavāro sodhitānaṃ khandhānaṃ rūpaṃ rūpakkhando khandhā vedanākkhandho 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 vedanākkhandho ti ādini ekeka khandhamūlakāni cattāri cattāri katvā vīsati yamakāni. Paṭilomavāre pi, na rūpaṃ na rūpakkhando, na khandhā na vedanākkhandho 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 vedanākkhandho 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 kāraṇena' esa suddhakkhandhavāro ti vutto. Vacanasodhane viya hi ettha na vacanaṃ pamāṇaṃ. Yathā yathā pana suddhakkhandhā labbhanti, tathā tathā attho va pamāṇaṃ. Parato Āyatana-Yamakadisu 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 *rupaṃ khandho, khandhā rūpaṃ*¹ ti ādīni pañca yamakāni; paṭilomavāre pi *na rūpaṃ na khandho, na khandhā na rūpaṃ* ti ādīni pañc' eva.

Tato paraṃ tesam yeva suddhakhandhānaṃ *rūpaṃ khandho, khandhā vedanā*² ti ādinā nayena ekekakhandhamūlakāni cattāri cattāri cakkāni bandhitvā gato suddhakhandhamūlakānaṃ cakkānaṃ atthitāya *suddhakhandhamūlacakkavāro nāma*. Tattha *khandhā vedanā* ti ādisu khandhā vedanākkhandho ti ādinā nayena attho veditabbo.

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

Uddesavāravannaṇā niṭṭhitā.

Idāni *rūpaṃ rūpakkhando*³ ti ādinā nayena niddesavāro āraddho. Tattha *rūpaṃ rūpakkhando* ti yaṃ kiñci rūpaṃ ti vuccati, sabbaṃ taṃ rūpakkhando ti vacanasodhanatthaṃ pucchati. *Piyarūpaṃ satarūpaṃ na rūpakkhando* ti yaṃ piyarūpaṃ satarūpaṃ ti ettha rūpaṃ ti vuttaṃ; taṃ rūpaṃ eva, na rūpakkhando ti attho.

Rūpakkhando rūpaṃ ceva rūpakkhando cāti yo pana rūpakkhando so rūpaṃ ti pi rūpakkhando ti pi vattuaṃ vaṭṭatīti attho. Rūpakkhando rūpaṃ ti ettha pana yasmā rūpakkhando niyamen' eva rūpaṃ ti vattabbo, tasmā *āmanta* ti āha. Iminā upāyena sabbavissajjanesu attho veditabbo. Yo pana yattha viśeso bhavissati, tatth' eva taṃ vaṇṇayissāma.

Saññāyamake tāva *ditṭhisaññā* ti papañcasaññā ti ādisu āgatā ditṭhisaññā. Sankhārayamake *avasesā 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 nitṭhito.

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 nitṭhito.

Suddhakhandhavāre *rūpaṅ khandho*³ ti yaṅ kiñci rūpaṅ ti vuttaṅ sabbaṅ taṅ khandhā ti pucchati. Tattha yasmā piyarūpasātarūpasankhātāṅ vā rūpaṅ hotu bhūtopādā rūpaṅ vā, sabbaṅ pañcasu khandhesu sangahaṅ gacchat' eva, tasmā *āmantā* ti paṭijānāti.

Dutiye pade⁴ *khandhā rūpaṅ* ti pucchitabbe, yasmā rūpaṅ ti vacanena rūpakkhandho ca adhippeto, tasmā vacanaṅ anādiyivā atthavasena pucchanto *khandhā rūpakkhandho* ti āha. Iminā nayena sabbapadesu attho vedittabbo.

Parato Āyatana-Yamakādinaṅ niddesavāre pi es' eva nayo.

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

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

Paṭilome na *rūpaṅ na khandho*⁷ ti yaṅ dhammajātaṅ rūpaṅ na hoti, taṅ khandho pi na hotīti pucchati; vissajjane pan' assa *rūpaṅ thapetrā avasesā khandha na rūpakkhandho* ti rūpato aññe vedanādayo khandhā, rūpaṅ eva na honti, khandhā pana hontīti attho. *Rūpañ ca khandhe ca thapetrā avasesan* ti pañca-khandha-vinimuttaṅ nibbānañ

¹ Y. 17 (3 b).

² Y. 18 (4).

³ *Ibid.* 5.

⁴ Br. dutiyaṅ°.

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 ādināṇ heṭṭhā vuttanāyena' eva attho veditabbo ti. Suddhakhandhamūlacakkavāro niṭṭhito.

Paṇṇattivāravannanā niṭṭhitā.

Idāni yassa rūpakkhando ti ādinā nayena pavattivāro āraddho. Kasmā pan' ettha uddesavāro na vutto ti? Heṭṭhā dassitanāyattā paṇṇattivārasmiṇ hi uddesavāre nayo dassito. Tena pana nayena sakkā so idha avutto² pi vijānitun ti³ taṇ avatvā niddesavāro 'va āraddho. Imasmiṇ pana pavattivārasankhāte mahāvāre uppādavāro, nirodhavāro, uppādanirodhavāro ti tayo antaravārā honti. Tesu paṭhamo dhammāṇaṇ uppādalakkhaṇassa dīpitattā uppādavāro ti vuccati; dutiyo tesāṇ yeva nirodhalakkhaṇassa dīpitattā nirodhavāro ti; tatiyo ubhinnam pi lakkhaṇāṇaṇ dīpitattā uppādanirodhavāro ti vuccati. Uppādavāreṇa c' ettha dhammāṇaṇ uppajjanākāro va dīpito; nirodhavāreṇa uppāṇaṇ nāma niccaṇ natthīti tesāṇ yeva aniccatā dīpitā; uppādanirodhavāreṇa tadubhaṇaṇ.

Tattha uppādavāre tāva tiṇṇaṇ tiṇṇaṇ addhāṇaṇ vasena cha kālabhedā honti: paccuppanno, atīto, anāgato, paccuppannatīto, paccuppannenānāgato, atītenānāgato ti. (1) Tesu⁴ yassa rūpakkhando uppajjati paccuppannābhidhānavasena, pacuppanno veditabbo. So paccuppannāṇaṇ dhammāṇaṇ paccakkhāto⁵ gahetabbā ativiya suviññeyyo ti paṭhamāṇ vutto. (2) Yassa rūpakkhando uppajjitthāti⁶ atitābhidhānavasena atīto veditabbo. So paccakkhāto⁵ anubhūtapubbāṇaṇ atitadhammāṇaṇ anumānena anāgatehi suviññeyyatarattā dutiyaṇ vutto. (3) Yassa rūpakkhando uppajjissati⁷ anāgatābhidhānavasena anāgato veditabbo. So paccakkhāto⁵ ca anubhūtapubbavasena ca gahitadhammānumānena anāgate pi evarūpā dhammā uppajjissanti

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 rūpakkkhandho uppajjati tassa vedanākkhandho uppajjitthāti*¹ paccuppanne saddhiṃ atītābhidhānavasena paccuppannātīto veditabbo. So missakesu tisu suviññeyyatarattā catutthaṃ vutto. (5) *Yassa rūpakkkhandho uppajjati tassa vedanākkhandho uppajjissatīti*² paccuppannena saddhiṃ anāgatābhidhānavasena paccuppannānāgato veditabbo. So paccakkhāto³ gahetabbānaṃ atthitāya atthato⁴ suviññeyyataro ti pañca-maṃ vutto. (6) *Yassa rūpakkkhandho uppajjittha tassa vedanākkhandho 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 hontī. 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 paṭhamāṃ anulomanayena niddisīvā, pacchā paṭilomanayena niddiṭṭhā ; tesu uppajjati, uppajjittha, uppajjissatīti vacanato uppattidīpano anulomanayo, nuppajjati, nuppajjittha, nuppajjissatīti vacanato anuppattidīpano paṭilomanayo. Tattha paccuppannakāle⁶ tāva puggalavārassa anulomanaye *yassa rūpakkkhandho uppajjati tassa vedanākkhandho uppajjati ; yassa va pana vedanākkhandho uppajjati tassa rūpakkkhandho uppajjati ; yassa rūpakkkhandho uppajjati tassa saññākkhandho, sankhārakkhandho, viññānakkhandho uppajjati. Yassa vā pana viññānakkhandho uppajjati tassa rūpakkkhandho uppajjatīti*⁷ evaṃ rūpakkkhandho mūlakāni cattāri yamakāni. *Yassa vedanākkhandho uppajjati, tassa saññākkhandho uppajjatīti ādinā* nayena vedanākkhandhamūlakāni tīni, saññākkhandhamūlakāni dve, sankhārakkhandhamūlakā ekan ti agahitaggahaṇena⁸ dasa yamakāni hontī.

¹ Y. 23, 7, i.

² Y. 25, 9, i.

³ Br. paccakkhato.

⁴ S. atthato.

⁵ Y. 28, 11, i.

⁶ S. °kālana.

⁷ Y. 19 f.

⁸ So S. and Br. cf. 55, n. 3.

Tattha rūpakkhandhamūlakesu catūsu ādito ekam eva vissajjitaṅ. Sesāni tena sadisa-vissajjanānīti tantiyā lahu-bhāvatthaṅ sankhittāni.

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

Yathā puggalavāre dasa evaṅ okāsavāre dasa puggalokāsavāre dasāti paccuppannakāle tīsu vāresu anulomanaye tiṅsa yamakāni honti. Yathā ca anulomanaye, evaṅ paṭilomanaye pīti sabbāni pi paccuppannakāle saṭṭhi yamakāni honti. Tesāṅ vīsapucchā sataṅ cattārīsāni ca dve, attha satāni hontiti veditabbāni. Evaṅ sesesu pi pañcasu kālabbhedesu puggalādi bhedato anuloma-paṭilomanayavasena cha cha vārā. Ekekasmiṅ vāre dasa dasa katvā saṭṭhi saṭṭhi yamakānīti tīni yamakasatāni; tāni purimehi saddhiṅ saṭṭhādhikāni tīni yamakasatāni vīsādhikāni satta pucchā satāni cattālisāni ca cuddasa attha satāni honti. Idaṅ tāva uppādavāre pāli-vavatthānaṅ. Yathā ca uppādavāre, tathā nirodhavāre pi uppādanirodhavāre pīti sabbasmim pi pavatti-mahāvāre asīti yamakahassaṅ saṭṭhi satādhikāni dve pucchā sahasāni, vīsāṅ tīni satādhikāni ca cattāri atthasahasāni veditabbāni.

Pāli pana uppādavāre nirodhavāre ca tīsu asammissakālabbhedesu tasmiṅ tasmiṅ vāre ekekam eva yamakaṅ vissajjetvā sankhittā; tīsu missakakālabbhedesu. *Yassa vedanākkhandho uppajjati, tassa saññākkhandho uppajjitthāti*¹ ādinā nayena vedanākkhandhādi mūlakesu pi ekaṅ yamakaṅ vissajjitaṅ, uppāda-nirodhavāre pana chasu pi kālabbhedesu vissajjitam eva. Sesāni tena samānavissajjanattā sankhittānīti idaṅ sakale pi pavattimahāvāre pālivavatthānaṅ. Attha vinicchayatthaṅ pan' assa idaṅ lakkhaṅ veditabbaṅ. Imasmiṅ hi pavatti-mahāvāre catunnaṅ pañhānaṅ² 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. Ekekasmij 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 dvihi pi padehi gahitakhandhānaṃ uppādo vā nirodho vā labbhati, ayaṃ pacchāpañho nāma. (3) Yāya pana pucchāya vissajjane ekena pi padena gahitakhandhassa dvihi 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* imasmij vissajjane eken' eva padena gahitassa vedanākkhandhassa uppādo labbhati iti ayaṃ ceva añño ca evarūpo pañho purepañho ti veditabbo. *Yassa rūpakkhando uppajjittha, tassa vedanākkhandho uppajjitthāti*³ pucchāya pana *āmantā* ti imasmij vissajjane [eken' eva padena gahitassa vedanākkhandhassa]⁴ dvihi padehi gahitānaṃ rūpavedanākkhandhānaṃ, 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 paṭhama-pucchāya *asaññasattaṃ uppajjantānaṃ* ti ādike imasmij vissajjane *asaññasatte*⁶ *uppajjantānaṃ tesāṃ rūpakkhando uppajjati, no ca tesāṃ vedanākkhandho uppajjatīti* imasmij koṭṭhāse eken' eva padena gahitassa rūpakkhandhassa pi uppādo labbhati. *Pañcarokāraṃ uppajjantānaṃ tesāṃ rūpakkhando ca uppajjati vedanākkhandho ca uppajjatīti* imasmij koṭṭhāse dvihi pi padehi sangahitānaṃ rūpavedanākkhandhānam pi uppādo labbhati: iti ayaṃ ceva añño ca eva rūpo pañho paripuṇṇapañho ti veditabbo.

¹ Ekekasmij 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-khandhassa' 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 rūpakkhandho nuppajjittha, tassa vedanākkhandho nuppajjitthāti*² imāya pana pucchāya natthīti: imasmiṃ vissajjane paṭikkhepo labbhati.

*Yassa rūpakkhandho 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 tava 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 palipadam eva hutvā atthaṃ vissajjeti, idaṃ pāligatiyā vissajjanaṃ nāma. Taṃ⁵ pure pañhe labbhati. *Yattha rūpakkhandho nuppajjati, tattha vedanākkhandho nuppajjatīti*⁶ hi pañhe, *uppajjatīti*: idaṃ vissajjanaṃ palipadam eva hutvā atthaṃ vissajjayamānaṃ gataṃ, tasmā evarūpesu ṭhānesu pāligatiyā vissajjanaṃ veditabbāṃ.

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

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) Yaṅ vissajjanaṅ sarūpena dassetvā atthaṅ vissajjeti, idaṅ sarūpadassanena vissajjanaṅ nāma, taṅ paripuñña-pañhe labbhati. *Yassa rūpakkhandho uppajjati, tassa vedanākkhandho uppajjati*¹ hi pañhehi *asaññasattaṅ uppajjantānan* ti: idaṅ vissajjanaṅ imesaṅ rūpakkhandho uppajjati, no ca vedanākkhandho, [imesaṅ]² rūpakkhandho ca uppajjati vedanākkhandho cāti sarūpadassanen' eva atthaṅ vissajjayamānaṅ gataṅ, tasmā evarūpesu tñānesu sarūpadassanena vissajjanaṅ veditabbaṅ.

(4) Yaṅ pana vissajjanaṅ, tathārūpassa atthassa abhāvato, attha-paṭikkhepena pañhaṅ vissajjeti, idaṅ paṭikkhepa-vissajjanaṅ nāma. Yaṅ tathārūpassa atthassa ekakkhaṇe abhāvato,³ attha-paṭisedhanena pañhaṅ vissajjeti, idaṅ paṭisedhanena vissajjanaṅ nāma. Taṅ moghapañhe labbhati. *Yassa rūpakkhandho nuppajjīththa, tassa vedanākkhandho nuppajjīthhāti* hi pañhe, *natthiti* idaṅ vissajjanaṅ evarūpo nāma satto *natthiti* attha-paṭikkhepena pañhaṅ vissajjayamānaṅ gataṅ; tasmā evarūpesu tñānesu paṭikkhepena-vissajjanaṅ⁴ veditabbaṅ.

(5) *Yassa rūpakkhandho uppajjati tassa vedanākkhandho nirūjjhatiti*⁵ pañhe pana no ti idaṅ vissajjanaṅ ekasmiṅ paṭisandhikkhaṇe uppādena saddhiṅ nirodho nāma labbhatiti attha-paṭisedhanena pañhaṅ vissajjamānaṅ gataṅ, tasmā evarūpesu tñānesu paṭisedhanena - vissajjanaṅ⁶ veditabbaṅ.

Idāni ime cattāro pañhā imāni ca pañca vissajjanāni yesu satta visatiyā tñānesu pakkhipitabbāni, tāni evaṅ veditabbāni. *Asaññasattaṅ uppajjantānaṅ* ti⁷ ekaṅ tñānaṅ (1); *asaññe*⁸ *tatthāti*⁹ ekaṅ (2); *asaññasattānan* ti¹⁰ ekaṅ (3); *asaññā cavantānan* ti¹¹ ekaṅ (4); *arūpaṅ uppajjantānan* ti¹² ekaṅ (5); *arūpe tatthāti*¹³ ekaṅ (6); *arūpānan* ti¹⁴ ekaṅ (7); *arūpā cavantānan* ti¹⁵ ekaṅ (8); *arūpe pacchimabhavikānan* ti¹⁶ ekaṅ (9); *arūpe parinibbantānan* ti¹⁷ ekaṅ (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.

*arūpaṃ uppajjivā parinibbāyissantīti*¹ ekaṃ (11); *pañcavokāraṃ uppajjantānaṃ* ti² ekaṃ (12); *pañcavokāre tatthāti*³ ekaṃ (13); *pañcavokārānaṃ* ti⁴ ekaṃ (14); *pañcavokārā cavantānaṃ* ti⁵ ekaṃ (15); *pañcavokāre pacchimabhavikānaṃ* ti⁶ ekaṃ (16); *pañcavokāre parinibbantānaṃ* ti ekaṃ (17); *suddhāvāsaṃ uppajjantānaṃ* ti ekaṃ (18); *suddhāvāse tatthā* ti ekaṃ (19); *suddhāvāsānaṃ* ti ekaṃ (20); *suddhāvāse parinibbantānaṃ* ti ekaṃ (21); *sabbesaṃ uppajjantānaṃ* ti ekaṃ (22); *sabbesaṃ cavantānaṃ* ti ekaṃ (23); *sabbasādhārāna-vasena pacchimabhavikānaṃ* ti ekaṃ (24); *parinibbāyantānaṃ* ti ekaṃ (25); *catuvokāraṃ pañcavokāraṃ uppajjantānaṃ* ti ekaṃ (26); *cavantānaṃ* ti ekaṃ (27); *evaṃ imesaṃ catunnaṃ pañhānaṃ imāni pañca vissajjanāni imesaṃ satta-vīsatiyā ṭhānesu pakkhipivā, imasmiṃ pavattimāhāvāre attha-vinicchayo vedītabbo.*

Evaṃ viditvā hi⁷ *pañhaṃ* vissajjantena suvissajjito hoti, atthañ ca vinicchayantena suvinicchito hoti. *Tatrāyaṃ*⁸ *nayo. Yassa rūpakkhando uppajjati* yassa puggalassa *uppādakkhaṇa-samangitāya rūpakkhando uppajjati, tassa vedanākkhandho uppajjati* vedanākkhandho pi *tassa tasmiṃ yeva khaṇe uppajjati* pucchati.

Asaññasattaṃ uppajjantānaṃ ti *acittakapatisandhivasena asaññasattabhavaṃ*⁹ *uppajjantānaṃ. Tesāṃ rūpakkhando uppajjati* tesāṃ ekantena rūpakkhando uppajjati yeva. Pavatte pana tattha *uppajjantānaṃ rūpakkhando uppajjati* pi nirujjhati pi, *tasmā, asaññasattānaṃ* ti avatvā, *asaññasattaṃ uppajjantānaṃ* ti vuttaṃ. *No ca tesāṃ vedanākkhandho uppajjati* *acittakattā* pana tesāṃ *vedanākkhandho nuppajjat'* eva. *Idaṃ satta-vīsatiyā ṭhānesu pathame ṭhāne paripuṇṇapañhassa purimakotṭhāse sarūpadassanena vissajjanaṃ. Pañcavokāraṃ uppajjantānaṃ* ti rūpārūpa-missaka-pāṭisandhivasena *pañcavokārabhavaṃ uppajjantānaṃ. Tesāṃ rūpakkhando vedanākkhandho cāti tesāṃ ekantena rūpa-vedanākkhandha-sankhātā dve pi khandhā uppajjanti* yeva. Pavatte pana tattha *uppannānaṃ khandhā*

¹ Y. 22, 6, 1.

² Y. 19, 1, 1.

³ Y. 19, 1, ii.

⁴ Br. °vokāraṃ.

⁵ Y. 24, iii.

⁶ Y. 29, iii. etc.

⁷ S. viditvāna.

⁸ Br. tatthāyaṃ.

⁹ S. °bhāvaṃ.

uppajjanti pi nirujjhanti pi, tasmā, pañca-vokārānaṃ ti avatvā, *pañcavokāraṃ uppajjantānaṃ* ti vuttaṃ. Iday pañca-vokāraṃ uppajjantānaṃ ti t̄hāne paripuṇṇapañhassa pacchimakoṭṭhāse sarūpa-dassanena-vissajjanaṃ. Iminā upāyena sabbāni vissajjanāni veditabbāni.

Idaṃ paṇ' ettha uppāda-nirodhesu niyamalakkaṇaṃ. Sakale pi hi imasmiṃ Khandha-Yamake tattha tattha uppannānaṃ pavatte yāva maraṇā khandhānaṃ apariyanteṣu uppāda-nirodhesu vijjamānesu pi lahu-parivattānaṃ dhammānaṃ vinibbhogaṃ katvā uppāda-nirodhe dassetuṃ na sukaraṃ ti pavattiyaṃ uppāda-nirodhe anāmasitvā abhinavaṃ vipāka-vatṭaṃ nipphādayamānena nānākammaṇa nibbattānaṃ paṭisandhi-khandhānaṃ uppādaṃ dassetuṃ sukhaṃ ti paṭisandhi-uppādavasena' eva uppādavāro kathito. Uppannassa pana vipāka-vatṭassa-pariyosānena nirodhaṃ dassetuṃ sukhaṃ ti maraṇakāle nirodhavasena nirodhavāro kathito.

Kiṃ paṇ' ettha pavattiyaṃ uppāda-nirodhānaṃ anāmatṭhabhāve pamānaṃ ti? Pāli yeva; Pāliyaṃ hi visesena uppādavārassa anāgatakālavāre pacchimabhavikānaṃ tesāṃ rūpakkhando ca nuppajjissati vedanākkhando ca nuppajjissatīti ayaṃ Pāli-atipamānaṃ eva. Pacchimabhavikānaṃ hi pavatte rūpārūpadhammānaṃ uppajjituṃ, yuttabhāve sati pi rūpakkhando ca nuppajjissati vedanākkhando ca nuppajjissatīti sannitṭhānaṃ katvā vuttabhāvena pavatte uppādo na gahito ti veditabbo. *Suddhāvāse parinibbantānaṃ tesāṃ tattha saññākkhando na nirujjhitta, no ca tesāṃ tattha vedanākkhando na nirujjhatīti ayaṃ* pana Pāli pavatte nirodhassa anāmatṭhabhāve ativiya pamānaṃ. *Suddhāvāse parinibbantānaṃ* hi cuticittassa bhangakkaṇe t̄hitānaṃ paṭisandhito paṭṭhāya pavatte uppajjitvā niruddhasaññākkhandhānaṃ gaṇanapatho natthi. Evaṃ sante pi tesāṃ tattha¹ *saññākkhando na nirujjhitthātī sannitṭhānaṃ katvā vuttabhāvena pavatte nirodho na gahito ti veditabbo.*

Evam ettha uppāda-nirodhesu niyamalakkaṇaṃ viditvā 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 jānituṃ 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.
Āmasivā pavattesu ṭhānesu³ kathayī jino
Tesaṃ Paḷivavatthānaṃ 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 vanṇayatā kātuṃ kiṃ nu sakkā ito⁴ paraṃ
Nayena iminā tasmā atthaṃ jānantu paṇḍitā ti.

Pavattivāra-vanṇanā niṭṭhitā.

Tadanantare pariññāvāre pi chaḷeva 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 rūpakkhandhaṃ ce parijānāti, vedanākkhandham pi parijānāti yeva, vedanākkhandhaṃ ce parijānāti, rūpakkhandham pi parijānāti yeva; rūpakkhandhaṃ ce na parijānāti, vedanākkhandham pi na parijānāti yeva, vedanākkhandhaṃ ce na parijānāti, rūpakkhandham pi na parijānāti yeva⁵; tasmā tesu pi yattha rūpakkhandhaṃ parijānāti tattha vedanākkhandhaṃ parijānātīti ādivasena pucchāṃ 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 labbhanti¹ veditabbaṃ.

Atha vā pariññākiccaṃ nāma puggalass' eva hoti, no okāsassa ; puggalo 'va pari jānituṃ 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 paccuppannakāle rūpakkhandhamūlakāni cattāri, vedanākkhandhamūlakāni tīni, saññākkhandhamūlakāni dve, sankhārakkhandhamūlakaṃ ekaṃ ti hetthāvuttanayen' eva anulomanaye agahitagahaṇena dasa yamakāni, paṭilomanaye dasātivīsati. Tathā sesesu pīti ekekasmīṃ kāle vīsati vīsati katvā chasu kālesu vīsāṃ yamakasataṃ cattārisāni 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 cittakhanavasena' eva labbhanti. Ten' eva tattha *yo rūpakkhandhaṃ pari jānāti so vedanākkhandhaṃ pari jānāti*³ ādisu pucchāsu āmantāti vissajjanaṃ kataṃ. Lokuttaramaggakhaṇasmīṃ hi nibbānārammaṇena cittena pañcasu khandhesu pariññākiccanibbattiyā yaṃ kiñci ekaṃ khandhaṃ pari jānanto itaram pi pari jānāti ti vuccati. Evam ettha *pari jānāti* ti pañhesu anulomanaye pariññākiccassamatthakappattaṃ aggamaggasamangiṃ sandhāya āmantā ti vuttanti veditabbaṃ.

Paṭilomanaye pana *na pari jānāti* ti pañhesu puthujjanādayo sandhāya āmantā ti vuttaṃ. *Pari jānithāti* imasmīṃ pana atītakālavāre maggānantara-aggaphale ṭhito pi pariññākiccassa niṭṭhitattā pari jānitha yeva nāma.

*Yo rūpakkhandhaṃ pari jānāti, so vedanākkhandhaṃ pari jānithāti*⁴ pañhena aggamaggasamangiṃ pucchati. Yasmā pan' esa khandhapañcakaṃ pari jānāti yeva nāma, na tāva niṭṭhita-pariññākicco, tasmā no ti paṭisedho kato. Dutiyapañhe pana *pari jānithāti* arahattaṃ pucchati. Yasmā pan', eso niṭṭhita-pariññākicco, natthi tassa pariññeyyaṃ nāma,

¹ Br, °abbā.

² Br. asitādhikāni.

³ Y. 49.

⁴ Y. 50.

tasmā no ti paṭisedho kato. Paṭilomanayavissajjane pan' ettha arahā rūpakkhandhaṃ na pari jānātīti arahato pariñ-
ñāya abhāvena vuttaṃ ; *aggamaggasamangī vedanākkhan-
dhaṃ na pari jānitthāti* arahattamaggaṭṭhassa anitṭhita-
pariññākiccatāya vuttaṃ. Na kevalañ ca vedanākkhan-
dham eva, ekadhammam pi so na pari jānitth' eva ; idaṃ
pana pucchāvasena vuttaṃ. No ca rūpakkhandhan ti
idam pi pucchāvasena vuttaṃ ; aññam pi pana so khand-
hato¹ pari jānāti, so vedanākkhandhaṃ pari jānissatīti ettha
yasmā maggaṭṭhapuggalo ekacittakkaṇiko, tasmā so
pari jānissatīti sankhaṃ na gacchati. Teṇa vuttaṃ no ti.
Te rūpakkhandhā ca na pari jāniṃsūti ettha attho ;
pucchāvasena na pari jānissatīti pan' ettha attho.² Iminā
upāyena sabbattha atthavinicchayo veditabbo ti.

Pariññāvāro nitṭhito.

Khandhayamakavaṇṇanā nitṭhitā.

[Āyatana-Yamakaṃ.]

Idāni Mūla-Yamake desite yeva kusalādidhamme āya-
tanavasenāpi sangaṇhitvā Khandha-Yamakānantaraṃ desi-
tassa Āyatana-Yamakassa vaṇṇanā hoti.

Tattha Khandha-Yamake vuttanayen' eva Pāḷivavat-
thānaṃ veditabbaṃ. Yath' eva hi tattha Paṇṇattivāro
Pavattivāro Pariññāvāro ti tayo mahāvārā honti, tathā
idhāpi. Vacanattho pi nesāṃ tattha³ vuttanayen' eva
desitabbo.⁴ Idhāpi ca Paṇṇattivāro uddesa-niddesavasena
dvidhā vavatthito ; itaro niddesavasen' eva.

Tattha *dvādasāyatanāntī*⁵ padaṃ ādiṃ katvā yāva
nāyatanā na mano,⁶ ti tāva Paṇṇattivārassa Uddesa-vāro
veditabbo.

Tattha *dvādasāyatanāntī*ti ayaṃ yamakavasena pucchi-

¹ Br. khandhaṃ.

² Br. : Te rūpakkhandhaṃ ca na pari jānitthāti pucchā sabhāgena
vuttaṃ ; na pari jāniṃsūti pan' ettha attho.

³ Br. *omits.*

⁴ Br. veditabbo.

⁵ Y. 52.

⁶ Y. 53.

tabbānaṃ āyatanānaṃ uddeso. *Cakkhāyatanāṃ . . . pe . . . dhammāyatanānaṃ* ti tesāṃ yeva pabhedato nāma vavatthānaṃ. Yamakavasena pucchāsukhatthaṃ¹ c'ettha paṭhamāṃ paṭipāṭiyā ajjhattarūpāyatanāni vuttāni, pacchābāhirarūpāyatanāni, pariyoṣāne manāyatana - dhammāyatanāni.

Yathā pana heṭṭhā khandhavasena, evam idha imesaṃ āyatanānaṃ vasena padasodhanavāro, padasodhanamūlacakkavāro, suddhāyatanavāro suddhāyatanamūlacakkavāro ti cattāro va nayavārā honti. Ekeko c' ettha anuloma-
paṭilomavasena duvidho yeva. Tesam attho tattha vuttanayen' eva veditabbo.

Yathā pana Khandha - Yamake padasodhanavārassa anulomavāre rūpaṃ rūpakkhandho, rūpakkhandho rūpan ti ādīni pañca yamakāni, tathā idha *cakkhu cakkhāyatanāṃ, cakkhāyatanāṃ cakkhūti* ādīni dvādasa. Paṭilomavāre pi *na cakkhu na cakkhāyatanāṃ, na cakkhāyatanāṃ na cakkhūti* ādīni dvādasa. Padasodhanamūlacakkavārassa pan' ettha anulomavāre ekekāyatanamūlakāni ekādasa ekādasa katvā dvattiṃsa sataṃ yamakāni, paṭilomavāre pi dvattiṃsa satam eva.

Suddhāyatanavārassāpi anulomavāre dvādasa, paṭilomavāre dvādasa.

Suddhāyatanamūlacakkavārassāpi anulomavāre ekekāyatanamūlakāni ekādas' ekādasa² katvā dvattiṃsa sataṃ 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 visesā. Tatrāyaṃ viseso *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 rūpan* ti rūpāyatanato yesaṃ bhūtopādāya

¹ Br. °tthañ.

² Br. ekādasa ekādasa.

³ Y. 53.

rūpañ ceva piyarūpa-sātarūpañ ca, *sīlakkhandho* ti¹ ādini vāyanatthena sīlādinaṃ yeva nāmāni. *Attharaso* ti ādini pi sādumadhuratthena atthādinañ ceva nāmāni; *avaseso dhammo* ti pariyattidhammādi anekappabhedo ti ayam ettha viseso.

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

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

Evaṃ yassa cakkhāyatanāṃ³ uppajjati, tassa sotāyatanāṃ uppajjati; yassa vā pana sotāyatanāṃ uppajjati, tassa cakkhāyatanāṃ uppajjati; yassa cakkhāyatanāṃ uppajjati, tassa ghānāyatanāṃ,⁴ jivhāyatanāṃ, kāyāyatanāṃ, rūpāyatanāṃ, saddāyatanāṃ, gandhāyatanāṃ, rasāyatanāṃ, phoṭṭhabbāyatanāṃ, manāyatanāṃ, dhammāyatanāṃ uppajjati; yassa vā pana dhammāyatanāṃ uppajjati tassa cakkhāyatanāṃ uppajjati evaṃ cakkhāyatanamūlakāni ekādasa, yassa sotāyatanāṃ uppajjati, tassa ghānāyatanāṃ uppajjati ādinā nayena sotāyatana-mūlakāni dasa; ghānāyatanamūlakāni nava; jivhāyatanamūlakāni attha; kāyāyatanamūlakāni satta; rūpāyatanamūlakāni cha; saddāyatanamūlakāni pañca; gandhāyatanamūlakāni cattāri; rasāyatanamūlakāni tīni; phoṭṭhabbāyatanamūlakāni dve; manāyatana-mūlakāṃ ekan ti agahitāgahanena⁵ cha satṭhi yamakāni honti.

Tattha cakkhāyatanamūlakesu ekādasasu yassa cakkhāyatanāṃ uppajjati, tassa sotāyatanāṃ, ghānāyatanāṃ, rūpāyatanāṃ, manāyatanāṃ, dhammāyatanāṃ uppajjati imāni pañc' eva vissajjitāni.

Tesu paṭhamāṃ vissajjetabbāṃ tāva vissajjitāṃ; dutiyaṃ

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

⁴ S. ghāṇā° throughout.

⁵ Br. agahitagg°.

kiñcāpi pathamena sadisavissajjitaṃ.¹ Cakkhu sotāyatanaṃ pavattitṭhāne 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-rasaphoṭṭhabbāyatanehi pi saddhiṃ tīṇi yamakāni purimehi dvīhi³ sadisavissajjanān' eva hontiti tantiyā lahubhāvattthaṃ sankhittāni. Sotāyatanaṃ mūlakesu yaṃ labbhati, taṃ purimehi sadisa-vissajjanam evāti ekam pi Pālinārūlhaṃ. Ghāṇāyatanaṃ mūlakesu rūpāyatanaṃ saddhiṃ ekaṃ, manāyatana-dhammāyatanehi saddhiṃ dve ti tīṇi yamakāni Pāliṃ ārūlhāni, sesāni ghāṇāyatana-yamake-na sadisavissajjanattā nārūlhāni. 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 aphoṭṭhabbānaṃ ti yojetabbā.⁴ Gandhādini c' ettha āyatanaṃ bhūtān' eva adhippetāni; tasmā sarūpakānaṃ⁵ sagandhāyatanaṃ ti āyatanaṃ vāsen' ettha attho veditabbo.

Saddāyatanaṃ mūlakāni atthābhāvato Pāliṃ nārūlhān' eva. Gandharasa-phoṭṭhabbā mūlakāni cattāri tīṇi dve ca hetthimehi sadisavissajjanattā Pāliṃ nārūlhāni.

Manāyatanaṃ mūlakaṃ vissajjitam evāti evam etāni pac-cuppannakāle puggalavārasa anulomavāre katipaya-yamaka-vissajjanen' eva chasatṭhi yamakāni vissajjitāni nāma hontiti veditabbāni. Yathā ca Puggalavāre, evaṃ Okāsavāre pi Puggalokāsavāre pi chasatṭhiti⁶ 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 Uppādvāre Pālivavatthānaṃ. Nirodhavārūppādanirodhavāresu pi es' eva nayo ti sabbasmim pi Pavattivāre atthavīsāni ekasattati yamakasātāni. Tato diguṇā pucchā, tato diguṇā atthā veditabbā.

Pāli pana manāyatanaṃ ca dhammāyatanaṃ 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 dasāyatanaṃ pātubhavanti. Opapātikānaṃ petānaṃ, opapātikānaṃ asurānaṃ, opapātikānaṃ tiracchānagatanānaṃ, opapātikānaṃ nerayikānaṃ, jaccabādhiraṇaṃ uppattikkhaṇe dasāyatanaṃ 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 ekādasāyatanaṃ pātubhavanti . . . Kāmāvacarānaṃ devānaṃ paṭhamakappikānaṃ manussānaṃ opapātikānaṃ petānaṃ . . . nerayikānaṃ paripunnāyatanaṃ . . . Rūpadhātuyā uppattikkhaṇe katamāni pañcāyatanaṃ pātubhavanti cakkhāyatanaṃ, rūpa-, sota-, manāyatanaṃ, dhammāyatanaṃ* ti.⁷ *Aghānakānaṃ*⁸ ti Brahmaṃpārisajjādayo sandhāya vuttaṃ, te hi sacakkhukā aghānakā hutvā uppajjanti.

¹ S. °navutāni tīni.

² S. navutāni sāta.

³ S. caturāsītāni ca.

⁴ S. sattati tevīsati.

⁵ Y. 58.

⁶ Vibh. 413.

⁷ Ib. 412.

⁸ Y. 58.

Kāmadhātuyaṅ pana aghānako opapātiko natthi. Yadi bhaveyya kassaci atthāyatanāni pātubhavanti vadeyya; gabbhaseyyako pana aghānako siyā; so sacakkhukānan ti¹ vacanato idha anadhippeto. Sacakkhukānaṅ saghānakānan ti jaccabadhiraṃ pi paripunnāyatanam pi opapātikaṅ sandhāya vuttaṅ. Saghānakānaṅ acakkhukānan ti jaccandham pi jaccabadhiraṃ pi opapātikaṅ sandhāya vuttam eva. Saghānakānaṅ sacakkhukānan ti paripunnāyatanam eva opapātikaṅ sandhāya vuttaṅ. Sarūpakānaṅ acakkhukānan ti ettha jaccandha-jaccabadhira-opapātikesu añañataro pi gabbhaseyyako pi labbhati yeva. Sacittakānaṅ acakkhukānan ti² ettha hetthāvuttehi jaccandhādīhi tīhi saddhiṅ arūpino pi labbhanti. Acakkhukānan ti ettha purimāpade vuttehi catūhi saddhiṅ asañañasattā pi labbhanti. Sarūpakānaṅ aghānakānan ti³ ettha gabbhaseyyakā ca asañañasattā ca sesarūpī-Brahmāno⁴ ca labbhanti. Sacittakānaṅ aghānakānan⁵ ti ettha gabbhaseyyakā ca rūpārūpī Brahmāno ca labbhanti. Acittakānaṅ arupakānan ti padesu pana ekavokārā-catuvokārasattā va labbhanti iminā nayena sabbesu Puggalavāresu puggalavibhāgo veditabbo.

Okāsa-vāre tattha cakkhāyatanan ti⁶ rūpī-Brahmalokaṅ pucchati; ten' eva āmantā ti vuttaṅ. Tasmīṅ hi kāle niyamato tāni āyatanāni paṭisandhiyaṅ uppajjanti. Idam ettha nayamukhaṅ; iminā nayamukhena sakale pi Pavattivāre attho veditabbo.

Pariññāvāro⁷ Khandha-Yamake vuttanayo yevāti.

Āyatana-Yamaka-vañṇanā samattā.

[Dhātu-Yamakaṅ.]

Idāni te yeva Mūla-Yamake desite kusalādi dhamme dhātuvasena saṅgaṇhitvā Āyatana-Yamakānantaraṅ desi-tassa Dhātu-Yamakassa⁸ vañṇanā hoti. Tattha Āyatana-Yamake vuttanāyena' eva Pālivavatthānaṅ veditabbaṅ.

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 Pannattivārādayo tayo mahāvārā avasesā antaravārā ca saddhiṃ kālappabhedādīhi Āyatana-Yamake āgatasadisā yeva. Idhāpi ca Yamaka-pucchāsukhatthaṃ² paṭipāṭiyā ajjhattika-bāhirā rūpadhātuyo ca³ vatvā viññāna-dhātuyo vuttā. Dhātūnaṃ pana bahuttā⁴ idha Āyatana-Yamakato bahutarāni yamakāni⁵ diguṇā pucchā⁶ diguṇā ca atthā honti. Tattha cakkhuddhātu Mūlakādisu yamakesu labbhamānaṃ 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-vannanā samattā.

[*Sacca-Yamaka.*]

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

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

Pannattivāre pan' ettha catunnaṃ saccānaṃ vasena padaśodhanavāro, padaśodhanamūlacakkavāro, suddhasaccavāro, suddhasaccamūlacakkavāro ti imesu catūsu vāresu Yamaka-vannanā veditabbā.

Pannattivāraniddese⁷ pana avasesaṃ dukkhasaccan ti dukkhavedanāya ceva taṇhāya ca vinimmuttā tebhūmakadhammā veditabbā. Avaseso samulayo ti Saccavibhange⁸ niddiṭṭhakāmāvacarakusalādibhedo dukkhasaccassa pacayo. 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 Dh. §§ 58, 20-4.

Pavattivāre¹ pan' ettha paccuppannakāle, Puggalavārassa anulomanaye yassa dukkhasaccaṃ uppajjati, tassa samudayasaccaṃ uppajjati. Yassa vā pana samudayasaccaṃ, tassa dukkhasaccaṃ uppajjati dukkhasaccamūlakehi tihi, samudayasaccamūlakehi dvihi, nirodhasaccamūlakena ekenāti labbhamānañ ca alabbhamānañ ca gahetvā Pāvivasena chahi yamakehi bhavitabbaṃ. Tesu yasmā nirodhassa neva uppādo na nirodho yujjati, tasmā dukkhasaccamūlakāni samudayasacca - maggasaccehi saddhiṃ dve, samudayasacca-mūlakaṃ magga, saccena saddhiṃ ekan ti tīni yamakāni āgatāni. Tassa patilomanaye pi Okāsavārādīsūpi es' eva nayo. Evam ettha sabbavāresu tiṇṇaṃ tiṇṇaṃ yamakānaṃ vasena yamakaganānā veditabbā.

Atthavinicchayaṃ pan' ettha idaṃ lakkhaṇaṃ imassa hi Sacca-Yamakassa Pavattivāre nirodhasaccaṃ tāva na labbhat' eva. Sesesu pana tīsu samudayasacca-maggasaccāni ekantena pavattiyaṃ yeva labbhanti.

Dukkhasaccaṃ cuti-paṭisandhisu pavattesu pi labbhati.² Paccuppannādayo pana tayo kālā cuti-paṭisandhinam pi pavattassa³ pi vasena labbhanti. Evam ettha yaṃ yaṃ labbhati, tassa tassa pi⁴ vasena atthavinicchayo veditabbo.

Tatr' idaṃ nayamukhaṃ : sabbesaṃ uppajjantānaṃ⁵ ti antamaso suddhāvāsānam pi; tehi⁶ dukkhasaccen' eva uppajjanti. Tanhāvippayuttacittassāti⁷ idaṃ dukkhasaccasamudayasaccesu ekakoṭṭhāsassa uppatti dassanattaṃ vuttaṃ; tasmā pañcavokāravasen' eva gahetabbaṃ. Catuvokāre pana tanhāvippayuttassa phalasaṃpattiṃ cittassa uppādakkhaṇe ekam⁸ pi saccaṃ nuppajjati. Idaṃ idha na gahetabbaṃ. Sesaṃ dukkhasaccaṃ⁹ cāti imasmiṃ¹⁰ hi khāṇe tanhaṃ ṭhapetvā sesaṃ dukkhasaccaṃ nāma hotīti¹¹ sandhāy' etaṃ vuttaṃ. Maggassa uppādakkhaṇe pi es' eva nayo.

Tattha pana rūpam eva dukkhasaccaṃ nāma. Sesā maggasampayuttakā dhammā saccavinimuttā; 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. tasmim.

¹¹ S. hoti taṃ sandhāy'.

kāraṇena āruppe maggassa uppādakkhaṇe tesañ maggasaccay uppajjati, no ca tesañ dukkhasaccay uppajjati vuttaṇ¹.

Sabbesaṇ uppajjantānaṇ paratte taṇhāvippayuttacittassa uppādakkhaṇe tesañ tatthāti² tesañ tasmaṇ uppattikkhaṇe ca taṇhāvippayuttacittuppattikkhaṇe cāti evaṃ ettha khaṇa-vasena okāso veditabbo.

Aññesu pi evarūpesu es' eva nayo.

Anabhisametāvīnaṇ³ ti catusaccapaṭisaṇvedasankhātaṇ⁴ abhisamayaṇ appattānaṇ⁵; abhisametāvīnaṇ ti abhisamita-saccānaṇ 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 dukkhasaccay pariññā⁸ ñāta-tīraṇa-pariññā-vasena⁹ vuttaṇ. Samudayasaccay pajahati tīraṇa - pahāna - pariññāvasena¹⁰: iti imāsaṇ pariññānaṇ vasena sabbapadesu attho veditabbo ti.

Sacca-Yamaka-vannaṇā samattā.

[Sankhāra-Yamaka.]

Idāni tesañ yeva Mūla-Yamake desitānaṇ kusalādidham-mānaṇ labbhamānavasena ekadesaṇ sangahitvā Sacca-Yama-kānantaraṇ desitassa Sankhāra-Yamakassa vannaṇā hoti.

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

Ayaṇ pan' ettha viseso. Pannattivāre tāva yathā heṭṭhā Khandhādayo dhamme uddisitvā rūpaṇ rūpakkhandho, cakkhu cakkhāyatanaṇ, cakkhu cakkhudhātu, dukkhaṇ dukkhasaccan ti padasodhanavāro āradhho, tathā anārabhitvā assāsapassāsā kāyasankhāro¹¹ ti paṭhamaṇ 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. appattasattānaṇ.

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 kāraṇabhūtaṣṣa karajakāyassa phalabhūto eva sankhāro ti kāyasankhāro.

Aparo nayo : sankhariyatiti sankhāro. Kena sankhariyati? Kāyena. Ayaṅ hi vāto viya bhastāya karajakāyena sankhariyatīti evam pi kāyassa sankhāro ti kāyasankhāro. Kāyena kato assāsapassāsā kāyikavāto ti² attho.

*Pubbe kho, āruso Visākha, vitakketvā vicāretvā pacchā rācaṅ*³ *bhīndati ; tasmā vitakkaricārā vacīsankhāro* ti vacanato pana sankhārotīti sankhāro. Kiṅ sankhāroti? Vacī; vaciyā⁴ sankhāro ti vacīsankhāro. Vacībhedasamuṭṭhāpakassa vitakkavicārādvayass' etaṅ nāmaṅ.⁵

Saññā ca vedanā ca cetasikā ete dhammā cittapaṭibaddhā ti vacanato yeva pana tatiyapade pi sankhariyatīti sankhāro. Kena sankhariyati? Cittena; karaṇatthe sāmivacaṅ katvā cittassa sankhāro ti cittasankhāro. Sabbesam pi cittasamuṭṭhānānam pi⁶ cetasikadhammāṅ etaṅ adhvacaṅ; vitakkavicārāṅ pana vacīsankhārabhāvena viṣuṅ gahitattā ṭhapetvā vitakkavicāreti vuttaṅ. Idāni *kāyo kāyasankhāro*, ti padasodhanavāro āradho.⁷ Tassa anulomanaye tīni, paṭilomanaye tīṇīti cha yamakāni. Padasodhanamūlacakkavāre ekekasankhāramulakāni dve dve katvā anulomanaye cha, paṭilomanaye chāti dvādasa yamakāni. Suddhasankhāravāre pana yathā-suddhakhanda-vārādīsu *rūpaṅ khandho, khandhā rūpaṅ cakkhu āyatanāṅ, āyatanā cakkhū* ti⁸ ādinā nayena yamakāni vuttāni. Evaṅ kāyo sankhāro, sankhāro kāyo ti avatvā, *kāyasankhāro vacīsankhāro, vacīsankhāro kāyasankhāro* ti⁹ ādinā nayena kāyasankhāramulakāni dve, vacīsankhāramulakaṅ ekan ti anulome tīni, paṭilome tīṇīti sabbāni pi suddhikavāre cha yamakāni vuttāni. Kiṅ kāraṇā? Suddhika-ekekapadavasena atthābhāvato. Yathā hi Khandha-Yamakādīsu rūpādi viṣiṭṭhāṅ khandhāṅ cakkhādi viṣiṭṭhāṅ ca āyatanādīṅ adhippetattā *rūpaṅ*

¹ M. i. 301 : "Cūḷavedalla-sutta."

² Br. *omits* kāyika.

³ S. vācam. M. *ibid.*

⁴ Br. vaciṅ, vaciyā. ⁵ S. nāma.

⁶ Br. *omits*. ⁷ Y. 230.

⁸ S. cakkhun ti.

⁹ Y. 231.

khandho khandhā rūpan; cakkhu āyatanaj, āyatanaj cakkhūti 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 atthābhāvato kāyo sankhārā sankhāro kāyo ti na vuttaj; *kāyo kāyasankhāro* ti ādi pana vattabbaṃ siyā. Tam pi kāyavacī-citta-padehi idha adhippetānaṃ sankhārānaṃ agahitattā na yujjati. Suddhasankhāravāro yeva. Padasodhane pana vinā pi atthena vacanaṃ yujjatīti tattha yo nayo gahito'va,¹ idha pana kāyasankhārassa vacīsankhārādīhi vacīsankhārassa cittasankhārādīhi cittasankhārassa ca kāyasankhārādīhi aññattā kāyasankhāro vacīsankhāro,² vacīsankhāro kāyasankhāro ti ekekasankhāramūlakāni dve dve katvā cha yamakāni yujjanti. Tesu agahita-gahaṇena³ tīn' eva labbhanti, tasmā tān' eva dassetuṃ anulomanaye tīṇi, paṭilomanaye tīṇīti cha yamakāni vuttāni. Suddhasankhāramūlacakkavāro pan' ettha na gahito ti evaṃ Paṇṇattivārassa Uddesavāro veditabbo.

Niddesa-vāre pan' assa anulome tāva yasmā na kāyādayo 'va¹ kāyasankhārādīnaṃ nāmaṃ, tasmā *no* ti paṭisedho kato. Paṭilome *na kāyo na kāyasankhāro* ti yo na kāyo kāyasankhāro⁴ ti pi na hontīti pucchati. *Kāyasankhāro na kāyo kāyasankhāro* ti kāyasankhāro kāyo na hoti, kāyasankhāro yeva pan' eso ti attho.

*Avasesan*⁵ ti na kevalaṃ sesasankhāradvayam eva, kāyasankhāravanimuttaṃ pana sesaṃ sabbam pi sankhatā-sankhatapaṇṇattibhedāṃ dhammajātaṃ neva kāyo na kāyasankhāro ti iminā upāyena sabbavissajjanesu attho veditabbo ti.

Paṇṇattivāravaṇṇanā samattā.

Pavattivāre pan' ettha paccuppannakāle puggalavārassa anulomanaye: *yassa kāyasankhāro uppajjati, tassa vacīsankhāro uppajjati*⁶ kāyasankhāramūlakāni dve, vacīsana-

¹ S. *omits.*

² S. *adds* ti.

³ Br. °*aggahaṇena.*

⁴ Y. 230.

⁵ Y. 230, *.

⁶ Y. 232.

khāramūlakaṅ ekaṅ ti tīṇ' eva yamakāni labbhanti; tāni gahitān' eva. Tassa paṭilomanaye pi okāsavarādisu pi es' eva nayo. Evam ettha sabbavāresu pi tiṇṇaṅ tiṇṇaṅ yamakānaṅ vasena yamakagananā veditabbā.

Atthavinicchaye paṇ' ettha idaṅ lakkhaṇaṅ: imasmiṅ hi Sankhāra-Yamake *assāsapassāsānaṅ uppādakkhaṇe*, *vitakkavicārānaṅ uppādakkhaṇe* ti ādi vacanato paccuppannādi kālabbhedo pavattivāsenāpi gahetabbo, na cuti-paṭisandhivasen' eva. *Dutiyaṅghāne tatiyaṅghāne tattha kāyasankhāro uppajjati*¹ ādi vacanato ca jhānam pi okāsavasena gahitaṅ ti veditabbāṅ. Evam ettha yaṅ yaṅ labbhati, tassa tassa vasena atthavinicchayo veditabbo. Tat' idaṅ nayamukhaṅ.

Vinā vitakkavicārehīti dutiya-tatiya-jhānavasena vuttaṅ. *Tesaṅ* ti tesaṅ dutiya-tatiya-jjhānasamāṅgaṅ. *Kāmāvacarānaṅ* ti kāmāvacare uppannasattānaṅ. Rūpāvacaradevānaṅ pana assāsapassāsā natthi. Arūpāvacarānaṅ rūpaṅ eva natthi. *Vinā assāsa passāsehīti* rūpārūpabhavesu nibbattasattānaṅ vitakkavicārūppattiṅ sandhāya vuttaṅ. *Paṭhamajjhāne kāmāvacare* ti kāmāvacarabhūmiyaṅ uppanne paṭhamajjhāne; angamattavasena c'ettha paṭhamajjhānaṅ gahetabbāṅ, na appanāvasen' eva, anappanāppatte pi hi savitakkasavicāracitte idaṅ sankhāradvayaṅ uppajjat' eva. *Cittassa bhāṅgakkhaṇe* ti² idaṅ kāyasankhārassa ekantacittasamuṭṭhānattā³ vuttaṅ. Uppajjamānam eva hi cittaṅ rūpaṅ vā arūpaṅ vā samuṭṭhāpeti, na bhijjamānaṅ.⁴ *Suddhāvāsānaṅ dutiye citte vattamāne*⁵ ti paṭisandhito dutiye bhavāngacitte. Kāmaṅ c'etaṅ paṭisandhicitte pi vattamāne tesaṅ tattha nuppajjitth' eva. Yāva pana abbokinnaṅ vipākacittaṅ vattati, tāva nuppajjitth' eva nāmā ti dassanattam etaṅ vuttaṅ. Yassa vā jhānassa vipākacittena te nibbattā, taṅ sataso pi sahaṅgaso pi uppajjamānaṅ paṭhamacittam eva. Vipākacittena pana visadisāṅ bhavanikantiyā āvajjanacittaṅ dutiyacittaṅ nāma. Taṅ sandhāy' etaṅ vuttan ti veditabbāṅ.

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 khīnāsavānaṃ. *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 kāraṇā? Cittasankhāro hi kāyasankhārena vinā pi uppajjati ca. Kāyasankhāro pana cittasamutṭhāno assāsapassāsavāto. Cittasamutṭhānarūpaṅ ca cittassa uppādakkhaṇe uppajjitvā yāva asaññāni soḷasa cittāni uppajjanti, tāva tiṭṭhati. Tesāṃ soḷasannaṃ sabbapacchimena saddhiṃ nirujjhatīti yena cittaena saddhiṃ uppajjati, tato paṭṭhāya sattarasamena saddhiṃ nirujjhati, na kassaci cittaassa uppādakkhaṇe vā ṭhitikkhaṇe vā nirujjhati, na pi ṭhitikkhaṇe vā bhangakkhaṇe vā uppajjati. Esā citta-samutṭhānarūpassa dhammatā ti niyamato cittasankhārena saddhiṃ ekakkhaṇe nirujjhanato *āmantā* ti vuttaṃ. Yaṃ pana Vibhangappakaraṇassa Sihalatṭhakathāya citta-samutṭhānarūpaṃ sattarasamassa cittaassa⁵ uppādakkhaṇe nirujjhatīti vuttaṃ, taṃ imāya Pāliya virujjhati. Atṭhaka-thāto ca Pāliye' va balavatarā ti Pāliyaṃ vuttam eva pamānaṃ.

*Yassa kāyasankhāro uppajjati, tassa vacīsankhāro niruj-jhatīti*⁶ ettha yasmā kāyasankhāro cittaassa uppādakkhaṇe uppajjati, na ca tasmīṃ khāṇe 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. °avicāraṃ.

³ Br. °carānaṅ.

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 tesañ yeva Mūla-Yamake desitānaṃ kusalādi dhammānaṃ labbhamānavasena ekadesañ sangahitvā Sankhāra-Yamakānantaraṃ desitassa Anusaya-Yamakassa atthavannaṇā hoti.

Tattha Pālivavatthānaṃ tāva vedītabbaṃ. Imasmiṃ hi Anusaya-Yamake Khandha-Yamakādisu viya desanaṃ akatvā aññena nayena Pāli-desanā katā.

Kathaṃ? Paṭhamaṃ tāva paricchedato, uddesato, uppattiṭṭhānato ti tihākārehi anusayo gahāpetuṃ paricchedavāro, paricchinnuddesavāro, uppattiṭṭhānavāro ti tayo vārā desitā. Tato sattannaṃ mahāvārānaṃ vasena anusaye yojetvā yamakadesanā katā.

Tattha *sattānusayā*¹ ti ayaṃ satt' eva, na tato uddhaṃ, na heṭṭhā ti gaṇanaparichedena paricchinditvā anusayānaṃ desitattā paricchedavāro nāma. *Kāmarāgānusayo . . . pe . . . avijjānusayo* ti ayaṃ paricchedena - vārena paricchinnānaṃ nāmamattaṃ uddisitvā ime nāma te ti desitattā paricchinnuddesavāro nāma. *Kattha kāmarāgānusayo anuseti . . . pe . . . ettha avijjānusayo anuseti* ti² ayaṃ imesu nāma thānesu ime anusayā anusetīti evaṃ tesañ yeva uppattiṭṭhānassa desitattā uppattiṭṭhānavāro nāma. Yesañ pana sattannaṃ mahāvārānaṃ vasena anusaye yojetvā yamaka-desanā katā, tesañ 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 yatthānusetīti* 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 anusetī ti¹ *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 eka-mūlakāni ekavīsati*.

Puna *yassa kāmarāgānusayo ca paṭighānusayo ca anusenti* ti³ *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, Pariṇṇā-vāro, Pahīnavāro, Uppajjanavāro ti imesam pi pañcannaṇ vārānaṇ, ekekasmīṇ-yamakagaṇanā yamakadiguṇā pucchā pucchā diguṇā ca atthā veditabbā*.

Ayaṇ *pan' ettha purimesu tīsu vāresu viseso: okāsavāre yattha tatthāti avatvā yato tato ti nissakkavacanena desanā katā*. Sesay *tādisam 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 ekekamhā*⁸ *yamakā ekekam eva pucchay 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. *ekekasmā*.

⁹ Y. 375.

na arūpadhātuy uppajjantassāti cha suddhikapucchā; na kāmadhātuy na arūpadhatuy, na rūpadhātuy na arūpadhātuy, na kāmadhātuy na rūpadhātuy uppajjantassāti tisso missakā pucchā cāti kāmadhātumūlakā¹ nava anulomapucchā honti.

Tathā rūpadhātumūlakā nava, arūpadhātumūlakā navāti satta vīsati anulomapucchā honti.

Tathā na kāmadhātu na rūpadhātu na arūpadhātumūlakā satta vīsati paṭiloma-pucchā. Puna na kāmadhātuyā na arūpadhātuyā, *na rūpadhātuyā na arūpadhātuyā, na* kāmadhātuyā na rūpadhātuyā ti sattavīsati dukamūlakā pucchā ti sabbā pi sampiṇḍitā ekāsīti pucchā honti. Tāsaṅ vasen' ettha vissajjanaṅ katan ti idaṅ Dhātuvāre Pālivavatthānaṅ. Evaṅ tāva sakale pi Anusaya-Yamake Pālivavatthānam etaṅ veditabbaṅ.

Ādito paṭṭhāya pan' ettha yaṅ yaṅ anuttānaṅ, tattha tattha ayaṅ vinicchayakathā.

Anusayā ti ken' atṭhena anusayā? Anusayanatṭhena. Ko esa anusayanatṭho nāmāti? Appahīnatṭho. Ete hi appahīnatṭhena tassa tassa santāne anusenti nāma, tasmā anusayā ti vuccanti. Anusentīti anurūpaṅ kāraṇaṅ labhitvā uppajjantīti atṭho. Athāpi siyā anusayanatṭho nāma appahīnākāro. Appahīnākāro ca uppajjantīti vattuṅ na yujjati, tasmā na anusayā uppajjantīti. Tatr' idaṅ paṭivacanaṅ, appahīnākāro anusayo. Anusayo ti pana appahīnatṭhena thāmagatakilesa vuccati. So cittasampayutto sārammano sappaccayatṭhena sahetuko ekantākusalo atīto pi hoti anāgato pi hoti paccuppanno pi; tasmā uppajjantīti vattuṅ yujjati. Tatr' idaṅ pamāṇaṅ: Abhidhamme tāva Kathāvatthusmiṅ anusayā avyākātā, anusayā ahetukā, anusayā cittavippayuttā ti sabbe vādā paṭisedhitā.² Paṭisambhidāmagge paccuppanne kilesa pajahatīti³ pucchāṅ katvā, anusayānaṅ paccuppannabhāvassa atthitāya thāmagatānusayaṅ pajahatīti vuttaṅ. Dhamma-sangahe⁴ mohassa padabhājane⁵ avijjānusayo avijjāpariyutthānaṅ avijjālaṅgī moho akusalamūlaṅ: ayaṅ tasmīṅ 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 ākusalacittena saddhiṃ avijjānusayassa uppanna-
bhāvo vutto.

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

Yam pi cittasampayutto sārammaṇo ti ādi vuttan, tam
pi suvuttam eva. Anusayo ti nām' esa parinipphanno
cittasampayutto akusaladhammo ti niṭṭham ettha gan-
tabbaṃ.

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

Idāni tesañ uppattitṭhānaṃ pakāsetuṃ kattha kāmarā-
gānusayo anusetīti¹ ādim āha. Tattha kāmadhātūyā 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 dvihā-
kārehi anuseti. Akusalasukhāya vedanāya c' eva upek-
hāvedanāya ca saha-jāto pi hutvā uppajjati. Tā vedanā
ārammaṇaṃ katvā pi uppajjati attho.

Avasesā pana kāmāvacara-kusalavipāka-kiriya-vedanā²
ārammaṇam eva katvā uppajjati. Kāmadhātūyā dvīsu
vedanāsu anusayamāno ce tāhi vedanāhi sampayuttesu
saññā-sankhāra-viññānesu 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. Oḷārikavasena hi bo-
dhaneyyo sukhaṃ bodhetun ti.

Tatra⁴ c' esa ārammaṇavasena anusayamāno na

¹ Y. 268.

² Br. °kriyā°.

³ Br. assādaṭṭhena.

⁴ Br. Nanu.

kevalaṃ imāsu dvīsu vedanāsu ceva vedanāsampayutta-dhammesu ca anuseti; iṭṭhesu pana rūpādīsu pi anuseti yeva. Vuttam pi c' etaṃ Vibhangappakaraṇe: *yaṃ loke piyarūpaṃ ettha sātārūpaṃ sattānaṃ kāmarāgānusayo anusetīti*. Imasmim pi pakaraṇe Anusayavārassa paṭilomanaye vuttaṃ.¹

*Yattha kāmarāgānusayo nānuseti, tattha diṭṭhānusayo nānusetīti? Dukkhāya 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 dhammaṃ dukkhavedanaṃ okāse rūpārūpāvacara-dhamme nava ca lokuttaradhamme ṭhapetvā avasesesu rūpa-sadda-gandha-rasa-phoṭṭhabbesu anusetīti vuttaṃ hoti. Taṃ idha kasmā na vuttan ti? Anolārikattā. Heṭṭhā vuttanayena hi vedanānaṃ yeva³ olārikattā imesaṃ ca anolārikattā etesu rūpādīsu anusetīti na vuttaṃ. Atthato pana labbhati, tasmā etesu pi kāmarāgānusayo anuseti yevāti veditabbo.

Na hi Satthā sabbāṃ sabbattha katheti. Bodhaneyya-sattānaṃ pana vasena katthaci yaṃ labbhati, taṃ sabbāṃ katheti, katthaci na katheti. Tathā hi anena⁴ *katthaci diṭṭhānusayo anusetīti pucchitvā sabbasakkāyapariyāpannesu dhammesu ettha diṭṭhānusayo anusetīti*⁵ yaṃ labbhati, tan sabbāṃ kathitaṃ.

Aparasmiṃ 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 anuseti. Dukkhāya vedanāya ettha vicikicchānusayo ca paṭighānusayo ca diṭṭhānusayo ca anusetīti yaṃ labbhati, taṃ sabbāṃ akathetvā rūpadhātu-arūpadhātūhi saddhiṃ tisso vedanāya kathitā. Vedanāsampayuttā pana arūpadhammā sabbāṃ ca rūpaṃ

¹ *Vibh.*, p. 340.

³ Br. vedanānaññeva.

⁵ Y. 268.

² Y. 283, 1, 4-5.

⁴ S. tena.

⁶ Y. 273, 1-4, 5.

na kathitaṃ. Kiñcāpi na kathitaṃ, diṭṭhānusayo pan' ettha anuseti yeva. Evam eva¹ kiñcāpi idha rūpādi iṭṭhārammaṇaṃ na kathitaṃ. Kāmarāgānusayo pan' ettha anuseti yevāti evaṃ tāva kāmarāgānusayassa anusayaṭṭhānaṃ veditaḃbaṃ.

Paṭighānusayassa pana *dukkhāya vedanāyāti*² vacanato dve domanassavedanā kāyaviññānasampayuttā dukkhavedanāti tisso vedanā anusayaṭṭhānaṃ. So pan' esa domanassavedanāsu sahaḃātavasena ārammaṇavasena cāti dvihākāre hi anuseti. Avasesadukkhavedanāya pana ārammaṇavasena' eva anuseti. Tāsu vedanāsu anusayamāno cetasā hi sampayuttesu saññākkhandhādīsu pi anuseti yeva. Yāya hi vedanāya esa sahaḃāto, taṃ-sampayuttehi saññādihi pi sahaḃāto va. Yāva vedanā ārammaṇaṃ karoti, tāhi sampayutte saññādayo pi karoti yeva. Evaṃ sante pi pana yasmā dukkhavedanā va asāta³dukkhavedayitattā nirassādatṭhena paṭighānusayassa uppattiyā sesasampayuttadhammesu adhikā, tasmā *dukkhāya vedanāya ettha . . . paṭighānusayo anusetīti vuttaṃ*. Olārikavasena hi bodhaneyye sukhaṃ bodhetun ti. Nanu sace³ ārammaṇavasena anusayamāno na kevalaṃ dukkhavedanāya ceva taṃ-sampayuttadhammesu ca anuseti, anitṭhesu pana rūpādīsu pi anuseti yeva. Vuttam pi c' etaṃ Vibhangappakaraṇe *yaṃ loke appiyarūpaṃ asātarūpaṃ, ettha sattānaṃ paṭighānusayo anusetīti*.⁴ Imasmim pi pakaraṇe anusayavārassa paṭilomanāye vuttaṃ *kāmadhātuyā dvīsu vedanāsu ettha paṭighānusayo nānuseti, *no ca tattha kāmarāgānusayo nānuseti; * rūpadhātuyā arūpadhātuyā aparīyāpanne 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.

ṭhapetvā avasesesu rūpādisu anusetīti vuttaṃ hoti ; taṃ idha kasmā na vuttan ti? Anolārikattā. Hetthā vuttanayena hi dukkhāvedanāya eva olārikattā imesaṃ pana anolārikattā etesu rūpādisu anusetīti na vuttaṃ ; atthato pana labbhati, tasmā etesu pi paṭighānusayo anuseti yevāti veditabbo.

Kiṃ pana itarā dve vedanā itthārammaṇaṃ vā paṭighassa ārammaṇaṃ na hontīti? No na hontī. Parihīnājjhānassa hi vippaṭisāravasena sampayuttadhammā tā vedanā ārabba domanassaṃ uppajjati. Itthārammaṇassa ca paṭiladdhassa viparināmaṃ vā appaṭiladdhassa appaṭilābhaṃ vā samanussarato pi domanassaṃ uppajjati. Domanassamattam eva pana taṃ hoti, na paṭighānusayo. Paṭighānusayo hi ¹ anitthārammaṇe paṭihaññavasena uppanno thāmagato kilesa, tasmā ettha domanassena saddhiṃ paṭigho uppanno pi attano paṭighakiccaṃ akarana-bhāvena evaṃ paṭighānusayo na hoti abbohārikattaṃ gacchati. Yathā hi pāṇātipātacetanāya saddhiṃ uppanno pi vyāpādo manokammaṃ nāma na hoti, abbohārikattaṃ gacchati, evaṃ paṭighānusayo na hoti, abbohārikattaṃ gacchati. Vuttam pi c' etaṃ ekaccaṃ itthārammaṇaṃ nekkhammasitam pi vā domanassaṃ sandhāya yaṃ eva-rūpaṃ domanassaṃ paṭighaṃ, tena pajahati, na tattha paṭighānusayo anusetīti evaṃ paṭighānusayassa anusayanatthānaṃ veditabbaṃ.

Mānānusayassa pana kāmādhātuyā dvīsu vedanādisūti ādi vacanato dve kāmāvacaravedanā rūpārūpadhātuyo cāti idaṃ tividaṃ anusayaṭṭhānaṃ. Tassa akusalāsu vedanāsu kāmāragānusayassa viya sahaṃjātānusayatā veditabbā. Sampayuttadhammesu pana sabbāsu pi kāmāvacarāsu sukha - adukkhamasukkhāvedanāsu rūpārūpadhātūsu ca ārammaṇavasena' eva anuseti. Anusayavārassa pana paṭilomanaye *dukkhāya vedanāya aparīyāpanne, ettha kāmāragānusayo ca nānuseti mānānusayo ca nānusetīti* ² vuttattā ṭhapetvā dukkhavedanañ ceva nava vidhañ ca lokuttaradhammañ ca sesarūpārūpadhammesu

¹ S. na paṭighānusayehi.

² Y. 283, 1, 3.

pi ayaṅ anuseti yevāti evaṅ mānānusayassa anusayanatthānaṅ¹ veditabbaṅ.

Diṭṭhānusaya-vicikicchānusayā pana kevalaṅ lokuttara-dhamme sveva nānuseti. Tebhūmakesu pana sabbesu pi anuseti yeva. Tena vuttaṅ sabbasakkāya pariyāpannesu dhammesu *ettha diṭṭhānusayo anuseti, ettha vicikicchānusayo anusetīti*.² Tattha sabbasakkāyapariyāpannesūti saṅsāravaṭṭa-nissitaṭṭhena sakkāyapariyāpannesu sabbadhammesūti attho.

Tattha pan' ete pañcasu cittuppādesu sahajātānusayavasena anuseti. Te vā pañca cittuppāde aññe vā tebhūmakadhamme ārabha pavattikāle ārammaṇānusayavasena anusetīti evaṅ diṭṭhānusayavicikicchānusayānaṅ anusayanatthānaṅ veditabbaṅ.

Bhavarāgānusaye pana kiñcāpidiṭṭhivippayuttesu catūsu cittesu uppajjanato sahajātānusayavasena kāmadhātuyā dviṣu vedanāsu anusetīti vattabbo bhaveyya. Kāmadhātuyaṅ pan' esa dvihi vedanāhi saddhiṅ uppajjamāno pi rūpārūpāvacaradhammam eva paṭilabhati. Kāmadhātuyā pariyāpannaṅ dhammam pi ārammaṇaṅ na karoti, tasmā ārammaṇānusayavasena niyamaṅ katvā *rūpadhātuyā arūpadhātuyā ettha bhavarāgānusayo anusetīti* vuttaṅ. Apī ca rāgo nām' esa kāmarāga-bhavarāgavasena duvidho. Tattha kāmarāgo kāmadhātuyā dviṣu vedanāsu anusetīti vutto. Sace pana bhavarāgo pi kāmarāgo³ viya³ evaṅ vuceyya, kāmarāgena saddhiṅ desanā sankinnā viya bhaveyyāti rāgakilesaṅ dvidhā⁴ bhinditvā, kāmarāgato bhavarāgassa visesadassanattham pi evaṅ desanā katāti evaṅ bhavarāgānusayassa anusayanatthānaṅ veditabbaṅ.

Avijjānusaya pana sabbesu pi tebhūmakadhammesu anuseti. Tena vuttaṅ sabbasakkāyapariyāpannesu dhammesu *ettha avijjānusayo anusetīti*. Tassa dvādasasu cittuppādesu sahajātānusayatā veditabbā. Ārammaṇakaraṇavasena pana na kiñci tebhūmakadhammaṅ ārabha nappavattatīti⁵ evaṅ avijjānusayassa anusayanatthānaṅ veditabbaṅ.

¹ S. anusayaṭṭh°.

² Y. 268.

³ S. omits.

⁴ S. inserts pi.

⁵ Br. na pav°.

Ayaṃ tāva paricchedavāra-paricchinnuddesavāra-uppat-
titthānavāra-bhedesu vinicchayakathā.

Sattannaṃ pana mahāvārānaṃ paṭhame anusayavāre :
yassa kāmarāgānusayo anuseti, tassa paṭighānusayo anuseti
ettha yade taṃ āmantāti paṭivacanaṃ dinnāṃ, taṃ duddinnaṃ
viya khāyati. Kasmā? Kāmarāgapaṭighānaṃ ekakkhaṇe
anuppattito. Yathā hi : *yassa manāyatanaṃ uppajjati, tassa*
dhammāyatanaṃ uppajjati? *Āmantā*¹ . . . *Assāsapassāsānaṃ*
uppādakkhaṇe tesāṃ kāyasankhāro ca uppajjati vacīsankhāro
ca uppajjati-ādisu² manāyatana-dhammāyatanaṃ kāya-
sankhāra-vacīsankhārā ca ekakkhaṇe uppajjanti, na tathā
kāmarāgapaṭighā. Kāmarāgo pi hi aṭṭhasu lobhasa-
hagata-cittuppādesu uppajjati ; paṭigho dvisu domanassa-
sahagatesūti natthi tesāṃ ekakkhaṇe uppatti, tasmā ettha
no ti paṭisedho kattabbo siyā. Taṃ akatvā pana *āmantā* ti
paṭivacanaṃ dinnattā hetthā Yamakesu viya, etthakhaṇe
paccuppannavasena vattamānavohāraṃ agahetvā,³ aññathā
gahettabbaṃ.⁴ Kathaṃ? Appahīnavasena. Appahīnatañ
hi sandhāya ayaṃ anuseti vattamānavohāro vutto, na
khaṇe paccuppannataṃ. Yasmā appahīnataṃ sandhāya
vutto, tasmā *yassa kāmarāgānusayo anuseti, tassa paṭi-*
ghānusayo anuseti pucchā *yassa kāmarāgānusayo appa-*
hīno, na anuppattidhammātaṃ āpādito, tassa paṭighānu-
sayo pi appahīno ti evam attho daṭṭhabbo.

Yasmā ca tesu sesako appahīno, tassa itaro pi appahīno
va hoti, tasmā *āmantā* ti vuttaṃ. Yadi evaṃ yaṃ upari⁵
uppajjanavāre *yassa kāmarāgānusayo uppajjati, tassa paṭi-*
ghānusayo uppajjati pucchitvā *āmantā* ti vuttaṃ, tattha
kathaṃ attho gahetabbo ti. Tatthāpi appahīnavasen' eva
uppattippaccaye sati uppattiyā anivāritavasena vā. Yathā
hi cittakammādīni ārabhitvā apariniṭṭhitakammantā citta-
kāradayo tesāṃ kammānaṃ akaraṇakkhaṇe pi mittasu-
hājādihi diṭṭha-diṭṭhatthāne imesu divasesu kiṃ karoṭhāti
vuttā cittakammaṃ karoma, katthakammaṃ karomāti
vadanti, te kiñcāpi tasmiṃ khaṇe na karonti, avicchinna-
kammantattā pana katakhaṇaṃ ca kattabbakhaṇaṃ ca

¹ Y. 60 (11-12).

² Y. 232, 1. i.

³ Br. agghetvā.

⁴ Br. °abbo.

⁵ S. omits.

upādāya karonti yeva nāma honti, evam eva yamhi santāne anusayā appahina, yam hi vā tesañ santāne uppajjanti,¹ paccaye sati, uppatti anivāritā. Tattha anuppajjanakhaṇe pi uppannapubbaṅ² 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 idaṅ anāgāmissa kāmarāgavyāpādānaṅ anavasesato pahīnattā vuttaṅ. *Tiṇṇaṅ puggalānaṅ*⁴ ti puthujjana-sotāpanna-sakadāgāmīnaṅ. *Dvinnāṅ puggalānaṅ* ti sotāpanna-sakadāgāmīnaṅ. Parato pi evarūpesu ṭhānesu es' eva nayo.

Okāsavārassa paṭhama-dutiya-pucchāsu⁵ yasmā kāmarāgānusayo *kāmadhātuyā dvisu vedanāsu* anuseti, paṭighānusayo dukkhavedanāya, tasmā *no* ti paṭisedho kato. Tato tatiya-pucchāya⁶ ubhinnaṃ pi kāmadhātuyā dvisu vedanāsu anusayanato *āmantaṅ* ti paṭivacanaṅ dinnāṅ. Rūpadhātu-ārūpadhātuyā pana mānānusayassa kāmarāgānusayena saddhiṅ asādhāraṇaṅ uppattiṭṭhānaṅ; tasmā *no ca tattha kāmarāgānusayo* ti vuttaṅ.

Iminā nayena sabbesaṅ uppattiṭṭhānavāraṅ oloketvā sādharmaṇāsādhāraṇaṅ uppattiṭṭhānaṅ veditabbaṅ.

Dukamūlaka-pucchāyaṅ,⁷ yasmā kāmarāga-paṭighānusayā nāpi ekasmiṅ ṭhāne uppajjanti, na-y-ekaṅ⁸ dhammaṅ ārammaṇaṅ karonti; tasmā *natthi*ti paṭikkhepo kato. Ayaṅ h' ettha adhippāyo. Yasmā ime dve anusayā anusayeyyaṅ, taṅ ṭhānam eva natthi, tasmā *kattha mānānusayo anuseti*ti ayaṅ pucchā apucchā yevāti. Aññesu pi evarūpesu es' eva nayo.

Puggalokāsavāre *catunnaṅ* ti puthujjana-sotāpanna-sakadāgāmi-anāgāmīnaṅ. Patilomanaye: *yassa kāmarāgānusayo nānuseti*⁹ ayaṅ pucchā anāgāmiṅ gahetvā pucchati. *Dvinnāṅ puggalānaṅ 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 ekaṅ.

⁹ Y. 286, 1, 2.

*nusayo*¹ *nānusetīti* anāgāmi-arahantānaṃ. *Kāmadhātuyā tisu vedanāsūti* vedanā-gahaṇena² vedanā sampayutta-kānam pi tesañ vatthārammaṇānam pīti sabbesam pi kāmāvacaradhammaṇaṃ 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, evañ sānusayakilesassa⁴ vaṭṭagāmi sattassa yāva ariyamaggena anusayā samugghātaṃ na gacchanti, tāva tesañ 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 tāsu dhātūsu puggalassa pure⁵ sānusayātā paññāyeyya, anusayassa uppattiṭṭhānaṃ na paññāyeyya; anusayassa ca uppattiṭṭhānadassanattaṃ ayaṃ vāro āradhho, tasmā tato manānusayena sānusayo⁶ ti vuttaṃ. Evaṃ⁷ hi sati tato dhātu dvayato uppanna mānānusayena sānusayo ti anusayassa uppattiṭṭhānaṃ dassitaṃ hoti. Imassa pana pañhassa atthe vutte ādi pañhassa atthe avutte ādi pañhassa attho pākaṭo na hotiti paṭhamaṃ na vutto; tasmā so evañ veditabbo *yato kāmarāgānusayenāti* yato uppanna kāmarāgānusayena sānusayo, kiṃ so tato 'va⁵ uppanna paṭighānusayena pi sānusayo ti. Yasmā pan' ete dve ekasmā ṭhānā na uppajjanti, tasmā no ti paṭisedho kato. *Arahā sabbatthāti* arahā sabbadhammesu uppajjanakena kenaci anusayena nirānusayo ti iminā atthavasena nippadesaṭṭhānesu bhummavacanam 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, āyatiṅ anuppatti dhammataṅ apādeti. *Āmantā* ti anāgāmimaggaṭṭhaṅ sandhāya paṭi-vacanaṅ. *Tadekatthaṅ pajahatīti* pahānekaṭṭhataṅ sandhāya vuttaṅ. *No* ti arahattamaggaṭṭhaṅ sandhāya paṭisedho kato.² *Yato kāmarāgānusayaṅ pajahatīti* yato uppajjanakaṅ kāmarāgānusayaṅ pajahatīti attho.

Aṭṭhamako ti³ arahattaphalaṭṭhato paṭṭhāya paccoroharāṇa-gaṇanāya ganiyamāno 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-maggasamangiṇī*⁴ ca aṭṭhamakaṅ ca *ṭhapetvā avasesā* ti saddhiṅ puthujjanena sekhāsekhā. Tesu hi puthujjano pahāna-pariññāya abhāvena nappajahanti. Sesā tesāṅ anusayānaṅ pahinattā *dvinnāṅ maggasamangiṇān* ti dve maggasamangino *ṭhapetvā* ti attho.

Iminā nayena sabbattha vinicchayo veditabbo.

Pajahanavārakathā niṭṭhitā.

Pariññāvāre *parijānātīti*⁵ tihi pariññāhi parijānāti. Sesam ettha hetthā vuttanayam eva. Ayam pi hi vāro Pajahanavāro viya maggaṭṭhānaṅ yeva vasena vissajjito ti.

Pariññāvārakathā niṭṭhitā.

Pahīnavāre⁶ phalaṭṭhavasen' eva desanā āraddhā. Anāgāmiṣṣa hi ubho p' ete anusayā pahīnā, tasmā *āmantā* ti vuttaṅ. Okāsavāre *yattha kāmarāgānusayo pahīno, tattha paṭighānusayo pahīno* ti⁷ pucchitvā *na vattabbaṅ*⁸ *pahīno* ti vā *appahīno* ti vā vuttaṅ. Taṅ kasmā ti uppattiṭṭhānassa asādhāraṇattā aññaṅ 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 uppatthānaṃ, aññaṃ paṭighānusayassa. Abhāvita-maggassa ca, yattha anusayo uppajjati, magge bhāvite tatth' eva so pahīno nāma hoti. Tattha yasmā neva kāmarāgānusayatthāne paṭighānusayo uppajjati, *na paṭighānusayatthāne kāmarāgānusayo,* tasmā so¹ tattha¹ *pahīno ti vā appahīno ti vā*ti na vattabbo.² So yasmiṃ attano uppatthāne kāmarāgānusayo pahīno, tasmīṃ appahīnatā tattha *pahīno ti* na vattabbo. Yaṃ kāmarāgānusayassa uppatthānaṃ, tasmīṃ atthitattā tattha *appahīno ti* na vattabbo.

Yattha kāmarāgānusayo pahīno, tattha mānānusayo pahīno ti ettha pana sādharanaṭṭhānaṃ sandhāya *āmanta* ti vuttaṃ. Kāmarāgānusayo hi kāmadhātuyā dvīsu vedanāsu anuseti. Mānānusayo tāsu ceva rūpārūpadhātūsu ca. So ṭhapetvā asādharanaṭṭhānaṃ sādharanaṭṭhāne tena saddhiṃ pahīno nāma hoti, tasmā *āmanta* ti vuttaṃ. Iminā nayena sabbas-mim pi okāsavāre pahīnatā ca na vattabbatā ca veditabbā. *Natthīti* āgatatthānesu pana heṭṭhā vuttasadiṣo va vinicchayo.

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

Okāsavāra-puggalokāsavāre pana heṭṭhā vuttanayen' eva veditabbo ti.

Pahīnavāra-kathā niṭṭhitā.

Uppajjanavāro anusayavārasadiṣo yeva.

Dhātuvārasassa pucchāvāre tāva *kati anusayā anusetīti*?⁴

* * S. omits.

¹ Br. *inverts order.*

² Y. 358.

³ Y. 365.

⁴ Y. 374.

Kati anusayā santānaṃ anugatā hutvā sayanti. Kati anusayā nānusetīti kati anusayā santānaṃ anugatā hutvā sayanti. Kati anusayābhangā ti kati anusayā anusenti nānusetīti evaṃ vibhajitabbā ti attho.

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

Niddesavāre² paṇ' assa *kassaci satta anusayā anusentīti* puthujjanavasena vuttaṃ; *kassaci pañcāti* sotāpanna-sakadāgāmiyasena vuttaṃ. Tesaṃ hi diṭṭhānusayo ca vicikicchānusayo ca pahīnā ti pañc' eva anusenti. Tattha yathā anusayavāre *anusenteti* padassa uppajjantīti attho gahito, evam idha na gahetabbo. Kasmā? Tasmīṃ khāṇe anuppajjanato. Kāmadhātuṃ uppajjantassa hi vipākacittaṃ ceva kammaśamutṭhānarūpaṃ ca uppajjati, akusalacittaṃ natthi. Anusayā ca akusalacittakkhāṇe uppajjanti, na vipākacittakkhāṇe ti tasmīṃ khāṇe anuppajjanato tathā attho na gahetabbo.

Katham³ pana gahetabbo ti? Yathā labbhati, tathā gahetabbo. Kathaṃ ca labbhati? Appahīnaṭṭhena. Yathā hi rāgadosamohānaṃ appahīnattā kusalāvyaḅkata-cittasamāgī ti⁴ puggalo sarāgo sadoso samoho ti vuccati, evaṃ maggabhāvanāya appahīnattā paṭisandhikkhāṇe pi tassa tassa⁴ puggalassa te te anusayā anusentīti vuccanti. Na kevalaṃ vuccanti, appahīnattā pana⁵ te⁵ anusenti 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 nānusetīti evaṃ vibhajitabbo anusayo nāma natthi.

*Rūpadhātuṃ uppajjantassa*⁷ *kassaci tayo ti anāgāmi-*vasena vuttaṃ. Tassa hi kāmarāgapaṭighadiṭṭhivicikicchānusayā cattāro pi anavasesato pahīnā. Itare tayo va appahīnā. Tena vuttaṃ *kassaci tayo anusayā anusentīti.*

Na kāmadhātuṃ 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 ariyasāvakaṣṣa rūpadhātuyā cutassa kāmādhātuyāṇ uppatthi nāma n' atthi, puthujjanass'eva hoti, tasmā satt' evāti niyametvā vuttaṇ.

Arūpadhātuyā cutassa kāmādhātuy uppajjantassa satt' evāti etthāpi es' eva nayo. Rūpadhātuyā uppatthi natthīti, kasmā natthi? Uppatti nipphādaḥkassa rūpāvacaṛaḥjānaṣṣa abbhāvā. Yo hi sabbaso rūpaṣāññānaṇ samatikkaṁānaṇ dhātuy uppanno ti nāṣṣa tattha rūpāvacaṛaḥjānaṇ atthi. Tad-abbhāvā rūpadhātuyāṇ uppatthi natthīti vedittabbā. Arūpadhātuyā cutassa na kāmādhātun ti ettha arūpadhātu yeva adhippetā. Iminā nayaṇa sabbavissaḥjanaṣṣu attho vedittabbo ti.

Dhātuvāṛakathā niṭṭhitā.

Anusaya-Yamakavannaṇā samattā.

[*Citta-Yamaka.*]

Idāni teṣaṇ¹ Mūla-Yamake desittānaṇ kusallādi-dhammānaṇ² labbhamaṇavasena ekadesama eva saṇgaṇhitvā Anusaya-Yamakānantaṛaṇ desittassa Citta-Yamakaṣṣa atthavaṇṇaṇā hoti. Tattha Pāḥivavattānaṇ tāva vedittabbaṇ.

Imasmaṇ Citta-Yamake mātikā-thapaṇaṇ,³ thapittamātikāya viṣṣajjanaṇ ti dve vārā honti. Tattha mātikāthapaṇe Puggalavāro, Dhammavāro, Puggaladhammavāro ti ādito va tayo suddhikamaḥvārā⁴ honti.

Tattha : *yassa cittaṇ uppajjati na nirujjhatti*⁵ evaṇ puggalavasena cittaṣṣa uppajjana - nirujjhaṇādibhedaṇ dīpento gato Puggalavāro nāma. *Yaṇ cittaṇ uppajjati na nirujjhatti*⁶ evaṇ dhammavasena' eva cittaṣṣa uppajjana - nirujjhaṇādibhedaṇ dīpento gato Dhammavāro nāma. *Yassa yaṇ cittaṇ uppajjati na nirujjhatti*⁷ evaṇ ubhaya-vasena cittaṣṣa uppajjanaṇnirujjhaṇādibhedaṇ dīpento gato Puggaladhammavāro nāma.

¹ Br. *adds* yeva.

² S. desittadhammānaṇ.

³ S. mātikāya th^o.

⁴ S. *omits* mahā.

⁵ Y. II, 1.

⁶ Y. II, 4.

⁷ Y. II, 6.

Tato *yassa sarāgaṇ cittan* ti soḷasannaṇ padānaṇ vasena¹ apare sarāgādi-padavisesitā soḷasa puggalavārā, soḷasa dhammavārā, soḷasa puggaladhammavārā ti atṭha cattārīsa² missakavārā honti. Te sarāgādi-padamattaṇ dassetvā sankhittā. Tato *yassa kusalacittan* ti ādinā nayena chasatṭhidvisata - sankhānaṇ abhidhammamātikā-padānaṇ vasena apare kusalādi-padavisesitā chasatṭhidvisata-puggalavārā, chasatṭhi - dvisata - puggaladhammavārā ti atṭha [cattārīsa]³ navuti sattaṣaṭṭhamissakavārā honti. Te pi kusalādi-padamattaṇ dassetvā sankhittā yeva. Yāni p'ettha sanidassanādīni padāni cittena saddhiṇ na vuccanti, tāni moghapucchāvasena gahitāni.⁴ Tesu pana tīsu vāresu sabbapaṭhame suddhika-puggalamahāvāre uppādanirodhakālasambhedavāro, uppāda-uppannavāro, nirodha-uppannavāro, uppādavāro, nirodhavāro, uppādanirodhavāro, [uppāda-nirodhabhāvo]⁵ uppajjamānanirodhavāro, uppajjamāna - uppannavāro, nirujjhamānanuppannavāro, uppannuppādavāro, atītānāgatavāro uppanna-uppajjamānavāro ti niruddha-nirujjhamānavāro atikkantakālavāro ti cuddasa antaravārā. Tesu uppādavāro, nirodhavāro, uppādanirodhavāro⁵ ti imesaṇ tīsu vāresu anuloma-pañilomavasena cha cha katvā atṭhārasa yamakāni. Uppannuppādavāre atītānāgatakālavasena anulomato dve, pañilomato dve ti cattāri yamakāni. Sesesu ādito niddiṭṭhesu tīsu, anantare niddiṭṭhesu tīsu, avasāne niddiṭṭhesu catūsūti dasasu vāresu anulomato ekaṇ, pañilomato ekan ti dve dve katvā vīsati yamakāni. Evaṇ sabbesu pi cuddasasu antaravāresu cattārīsa yamakāni, caturāsīti pucchā, atṭha satṭhi atṭhasataṇ hoti. Yathā ca ekasmiṇ suddhikapuggalamahāvāre, tathā suddhikadhammavāre pi suddhikapuggalādhammavāre pīti tīsu mahāvāresu chabbīsati yamakasataṇ. Tato diguṇā pucchā, tato diguṇā atthā ca veditabbā. Idaṇ pana vāratṭayaṇ sarāgādivasena soḷasa guṇaṇ kusalādivasena chasatṭhi dvisata guṇaṇ katvā imasmiṇ Citta-Yamake anekāni yamakasaḥassāni tato diguṇā pucchā, tato diguṇā atthā-ca

¹ Y. II, 9.

² Br. cattāliṣaṇ.

³ Br. omits.

⁴ Br. ṭhapitāni.

⁵ S. all three in loc. case.

hontiti. Paṭho pana sankhitto ti. Evaṃ tāva imasmiṃ Citta-Yamake Pālivavatthānam eva veditabbaṃ.

Mātikāṭhapanavannaṇā nitṭhitā.

Idāni ṭhapitānukkamena mātikaṃ vissajjetuṃ : *yassa cittaṃ uppajjati na nirujjhatī*¹ ādi āradhaya. Tattha² *uppajjati*³ *uppādakkhaṇasamangitāya uppajjanti na nirujjhatī* nirodhakkhaṇa-appattatāya⁴ na nirujjhati. *Tassa cittaṃ* ti tassa puggalassa tato paṭṭhāya cittaṃ *nirujjhissati na uppajjissatī* pucchati. Sesaya *cittaṃ* ti sesaya aparicchinṇavaṭṭadukkhāṇaya khīṇāsavaṇaya sabba-pacchimassa cuticittassa * *uppādakkhaṇo vattati*, etesaya tad - eva *cuticittaṃ* * *uppādapattatāya uppajjati nāma*, bhayaṃ appattatāya na nirujjhati. Idāni pana bhayaṃ patvā taṃ tesaya cittaṃ *nirujjhissati*, tato appaṭisandhikattā aññaṃ nuppajjissati.

Itaresaṃ ti pacchimakittasamangiṃ khīṇāsavaṇaya ṭhapetvā avasesāṇaya sekhāsekha-puthujjanāṇaya. *Nirujjhissati ceva uppajjissati cāti* yaṃ taṃ *uppādakkhaṇapattaṃ*⁵ taṃ *nirujjhissat'* eva. Aññaṃ pana tasmīṃ vā aññasmiṃ vā attabhāve uppajjissati ceva *nirujjhissati ca*. Dutiyapucchā-vissajjane tathārūpassa khīṇāsavassa cittaṃ sandhāya āmantā ti vuttaṃ.

*Nuppajjati*⁶ *nirujjhatī* bhagakkhaṇe arahato pacchimakittam pi sesāṇaya bhijjamāna⁷-cittam pi. Tato paṭṭhāya pana arahato tāva⁸ *cittaṃ na nirujjhissatī* sakkā vattuṃ, *uppajjissatī* pana na sakkā. Sesāṇaya *uppajjissatī* sakkā vattuṃ, *na nirujjhissatī* na sakkā, tasmā *no* ti paṭisedho kato.

Dutiyapañhe *yassa cittaṃ na nirujjhissati uppajjissatī*⁹ so puggalo yeva natthi, tasmā *natthī* patikkhepo kato.

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

¹ Y. II, 9.

² S. Tīni (*sic*).

³ S. *omits*.

⁴ Br. °khaṇayaṃ app°.

** S. *omits*.

⁵ Br. °ppattaṃ.

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

⁷ S. bhajjamānāṇayaṃ.

⁸ Br. *omits*.

⁹ *Ibid*.

¹⁰ Y. II, 10.

sandhāya āmantā ti. Uppādaṅ patvā, aniruddhabhāvaṅ sandhāya tesāṅ cittaṅ uppannaṅ ti vuttaṅ.

Nuppannaṅ ti¹ uppādaṅ appattaṅ. Sesāṅ cittaṅ uppajjitthāti etthāpi sabbesaṅ tāva cittaṅ khaṇapaccuppannam eva hutvā uppādakkhaṇaṅ atītattā uppajjittha nāma. Nirodhasamāpannānaṅ nirodhato pubbe uppanna-pubbantā asaññasattānaṅ asaññabhava² uppannapubbattā. *Uppajjittha ceva uppajjati cāti* uppādaṅ pattattā uppajjittha, anatītattā uppajjati nāmāti attho.

Uppādakkhaṇe anāgatañ cāti uppādakkhaṇe ca cittaṅ, anāgatañ ca cittaṅ ti attho.

Atikkantakālavāre³ *uppajjamānaṅ khaṇaṅ* ti uppādakkhaṇaṅ. Tattha kiñcāpi uppādakkhaṇo uppajjamāno nāma hoti, uppajjamānassa pana khaṇattā evaṅ vutto.

Khaṇaṅ vītikkantaṅ atikkantakālaṅ ti na ciraṅ vītikkantaṅ, tam eva pana uppādakkhaṇaṅ vītikkantaṅ hutvā *atikkantakālaṅ* ti sankhaṅ gacchati. Nirujjhamānaṅ khaṇaṅ ti niruddhakkhaṇaṅ. Tattha kiñcāpi nirodha khaṇo nirujjhamāno nāma na hoti, nirujjhamānassa pana khaṇattā evaṅ vutto. Khaṇaṅ vītikkantaṅ atikkantakālaṅ ti kiṅ tassa cittaṅ evaṅ nirodhakkhaṇam pi vītikkantaṅ hutvā atikkantakālaṅ nāma hotīti pucchati. Tattha yasmā bhangakkhaṇe cittaṅ uppādakkhaṇaṅ khaṇaṅ vītikkantaṅ hutvā atikkantakālaṅ hoti. Nirodhakkhaṇaṅ khaṇaṅ vītikkantaṅ hutvā atikkantakālaṅ nāma hoti. Atītam pana cittaṅ ubho pi khaṇe khaṇaṅ vītikkantaṅ hutvā atikkantakālaṅ nāma, tasmā bhangakkhaṇe cittaṅ uppādakkhaṇaṅ vītikkantaṅ bhangakkhaṇaṅ avītikkantaṅ. Atītaṅ cittaṅ uppādakkhaṇañ ca vītikkantaṅ bhangakkhaṇañ ca vītikkantaṅ ti vissajjanam āha.

Dutiyaapañhe⁴ vissajjane yasmā atītaṅ cittaṅ ubho pi khaṇe vītikkantaṅ hutvā atikkantakālaṅ nāma hoti, tasmā *atītacittaṅ* ti vuttaṅ.

Paṭilomapañha⁵ - vissajjane yasmā uppādakkhaṇe ca cittaṅ anāgatañ ca cittaṅ ubho pi khaṇe khaṇaṅ vītikkantaṅ hutvā atikkantakālaṅ nāma na hoti, tesāṅ khaṇā-

¹ Br. Anupp°.

² Br. saññabhava.

³ Y. II, 14.

⁴ Br. °pañhassa. Y. II, 14.

⁵ *Ibid.*

naṃ avitikkantattā, tasmā *uppādakkhaṇe cittaṃ anāgataṃ cittaṃ* ti vuttaṃ. Dutiyavissajjanaṃ pākāṭam 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 hetthā vuttanāyena' eva veditabbo.

Tesu pana *yassa sarāgaṃ cittaṃ uppajjati na nirujjhati, tassa cittaṃ nirujjhissati na uppajjissatīti* evaṃ vitthārettabbatāya 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 vuttanāyena' eva Pālivavatthānaṃ veditabbaṃ. Yath' eva¹ hi tattha paṇṇattivārā tayo tayo mahāvārā avasesā antaravārā ca hontī, tathā idhāpi. Yo kusalāṃ² dhammaṃ bhāveti, so akusalāṃ dhammaṃ pajahatīti agahitattā paṇ' ettha pariññāvāro bhāvanāvāro nāmāti veditabbo. Tattha yasmā avyākato dhammo neva bhāvetabbo, na pahātabbo, tasmā taṃ padam eva na uddhatāṃ. Paṇṇattivāre paṇ' ettha tinnāṃ kusalādi-dhammānaṃ vasena padasodhanavāro, padasodhanamūlacakkavāro, suddhadhammavāro, suddhadhamma-

¹ Br. Yathā only.

² Here the S. MS. omits the next 3½ 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 kusalānaṅ ekantena kusaladhammattā *āmantā* ti vuttaṅ. 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, akusaladhammamūlakaṅ ekan ti tīni yamakāni honti. Tassa paṭilomanaye pi okāsavārādisu pi es' eva nayo. Evam ettha sabbavāre tīnaṅ tīnaṅ yamakānaṅ vasena yamakagaṇanā veditabbā.

Atthavinicchaye pan' ettha idaṅ lakkhaṇaṅ: imassa hi Dhammayamakassa pavattimahāvāre *uppajjanti nirujjhantīti* imesu uppādanīrodhesu kusalākusaladhammā tāva ekantena pavattiyaṅ yeva labbhanti, na cutipāṭisan-dhīsu. Avyākatadhammā pana pavatte ca cutipāṭisan-dhīsu cāti tīsu pi kālesu labbhanti. Evam ettha yaṅ yattha yattha labbhati, tassa vasena tattha tattha vinicchayo veditabbo. Tatr' idaṅ nayamukhaṅ, kusalākusalānaṅ tāva ekakkhaṇe anuppajjanato *no* ti paṭisedho kato *Avyākatā cāti cittasamuṭṭhānarūpavasena vuttaṅ. Yattha kusalā dhammā nuppajjantīti*³ asaṅṅabhavaṅ sandhāya vuttaṅ. Ten' ev' ettha *āmantā* ti vissajjanaṅ kataṅ. *Uppajjantīti* idam pi asaṅṅabhavaṅ yeva sandhāya vuttaṅ. Avyākatānaṅ pana anuppattitṭhānassa abhāvā *natthīti* paṭikkhepo kato.

Dutiye akusale ti⁴ bhavaṅ assādetvā uppannesu nikanti-javanesu dutiye javanacitte. *Dutiye citte vattamāne* ti paṭisandhito dutiye bhavangacitte vattamāne, saha vā paṭisandhiyā bhavangaṅ vipākavasena ekam eva katvā bhavanikantiyā āvajjanacitte. Taṅ hi kriyacittattā avyākatajāti yaṅ pi pākato dutiyaṅ nāma hoti. *Yassa cittassa*

¹ Y. II, 23.

² *Ibid.*, 25.

³ *Ibid.*, 27.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 28.

sindriya-upekkhindriyāni paṭisandhiyaṃ uppattilabhāvato gahitāni. Tathā saddhindriyādāni pañca. Lokutarāni tīni paṭisandhiyaṃ abhāven' eva na gahitāni. Iti yāni gahitāni, tesāṃ vasen' ettha cakkhundriyamūlake naye yamakagaṇanā veditabbā. Yathā c'ettha, evaṃ sabbattha. Yāni pana na gahitāni, tesāṃ vasena yamakāni na gaṇetabbāni. Gaṇantena vā moghapucchāvasena gaṇetabbānīti evaṃ tāva sabbavāresu Pālivavatthānam eva veditabbāṃ.

Atthavinicchaye pan' ettha idaṃ nayamukhaṃ: *sacakkhukānaṃ na itthīnaṃ* ti¹ brahmaparisajjādānaṃ ceva rūpīnaṃ purisa-napuṃsakānaṃ ca vasena vuttaṃ. Tesāṃ hi itthindriyaṃ nuppajjati. *Sacakkhukānaṃ na purisānaṃ* ti² rūpībrahmānaṃ ceva itthi-napuṃsakānaṃ ca vasena vuttaṃ. Tesāṃ hi purisindriyaṃ nuppajjati. *Acakkhukānaṃ uppajjantānaṃ tesāṃ jīvitindriyaṃ uppajjati*³ ekavokāra-catuvokāra-kāmadhātusatte sandhāya vuttaṃ. *Sacakkhukānaṃ rinā somanassenā*³ ti upekkhāsahagatānaṃ catunnaṃ mahāvīpākapaṭisandhīnaṃ vasena vuttaṃ. *Sacakkhukānaṃ rinā upekkhāyāti*,³ somanassasahagatapaṭisandhikānaṃ vasena vuttaṃ. *Upekkhāya acakkhukānaṃ* ti⁴ ahetuka-paṭisandhivasena vuttaṃ. *Ahetukānaṃ* ti ahetukapaṭisandhicittena saddhiṃ saddhindriyādānaṃ abhāvato vuttaṃ. Tattha hi ekanten' eva saddhāsatipaññāyo natthi. Samādhiviriyaṃ pana indriyappattāni na honti. *Sahetukānaṃ acakkhukānaṃ* ti gabbhaseyyakavasena ceva arūpivasena ca vuttaṃ. Añño hi sahetuko acakkhuko nāma natthi. *Sacakkhukānaṃ ahetukānaṃ* ti apāye opapātikavasena vuttaṃ. *Sacakkhukānaṃ nāṇavippayuttānaṃ* ti kāmadhātuyāṃ duhetukapaṭisandhikānaṃ vasena vuttaṃ. *Sacakkhukānaṃ nāṇasampayuttānaṃ* ti rūpībrahmāno ceva kāmāvacaradevamanusse ca sandhāya vuttaṃ. *Nāṇasampayuttānaṃ acakkhukānaṃ* ti arūpīno ca tihetuka-gabbhaseyyake ca sandhāya vuttaṃ. Jīvitindriyamūlake *rinā somanassena uppajjantānaṃ* ti⁵ dve pi jīvitindriyāni sandhāya vuttaṃ.

¹ Y. II, 71.

² *Ibid.*, 72.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.*, nn. 1, 2 f.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 78.

Paratte somanassavippayutta - cittassa uppādakkhāṇe ti arūpajivitindriyaṇ sandhāya vuttaṇ. Iminā nayena sabbatthāpi paṭisandhipavattivasena jīvitindriyayojanā veditabbā. Somanassindriyādīmūlakesu pi paṭisandhipavattivasen' ev' attho gahetabbo. Paṭilomanaye pana nirodhavāre ca etesaṇ ceva aññesaṇ ca dhammaṇaṇ yathālābhavasena cuti-paṭisandhi-pavattesu tisu pi anupādānirodhā veditabbā.

Anāgatavāre *eten' eva bhārenāti*¹ etena purisabhāven' eva antarā² itthibhāvaṇ anāpajjivā purisa paṭisandhigahaṇen' evāti attho. *Katicī bhāve dassetvā parinibbāyissantīti* katicī paṭisandhiyo gahetvā itthibhāvaṇ appatvā va parinibbāyissantīti attho. Dutiyapucchāya pi es' eva nayo.

Paccuppannaena atītavāre *suddhāvāsāṇaṇ uppatti cittassa bhaṅgakkhāṇe manindriyaṇ ca na uppajjithāti*³ Citta-Yamake viya uppādakkhāṇātikamavasena atthaṇ aggaḥetvā,⁴ tasmiṇ bhāve anuppanna-pubbavasena gahetabbo ti. Iminā nayamukhena sabbasmim pi pavattivāre atthavinicchayo veditabbo.

Pariññāvāre pana cakkhumūlakādīsu ekam eva cakkhusota-yamakaṇ dassitaṇ. Yasmā pana sesāni pi lokiya-avyākātāni ceva lokiya-avyākāta-missakāni ca pariññeyyān' eva, tasmā tāni anupaditṭhāni pi iminā va dassitāni honti. Yasmā pana akusalaṇ ekantato pahātābbam eva, ekantaṇ kusalaṇ bhāvetābbam eva, lokuttarāvvyākātaṇ sacchikātabbaṇ, tasmā *domanassindriyaṇ pajahatīti anaññātassāmitindriyaṇ bhāvetīti aññātāvindriyaṇ sacchikarotīti* vuttaṇ. Aññindriyaṇ pana bhāvetābbam pi atthi sacchikātabbam pi. Taṇ bhāvanāvasen' eva gahitaṇ.

Tattha *dre puggalā* ti sakadāgāmi-maggasamangī ca arahattamaggasamangī ca. Tesu eko samucchinditṭṭaṇ *asamatthattā domanassindriyaṇ nappajahati*⁵ nāma, eko pahīna-dosattā. *Cakkhundriyaṇ na parijānātīti* anupādāṇ

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

āpādetuṃ asamatthatāya na pariḷānāti. Iminā nayena sabbavissajjanesu attho vedītabbo ti.

Indriya-Yamaka-vaṇṇanā samatta.

Ettāvata ca :

Yass' ovāde tathāva niṭṭhitakiccassa kiccasampanno
yuvati jano pi atīto suvihitanīyamo yamassānaṃ¹
Devaparīsāya majjhe devapure sabbadevadevena²
Yamakaṃ nāma pakāsitaṃ yamāmalalomena yantena.³
Pāḷivavatthānavidhiṃ pucchāvissajjane ca atthanayaṃ
dassetuṃ āraḍdhā Yamaka-aṭṭhakathā⁴ mayā tassa.
Sādhū bahu⁵ anantarāyo lokamhi yathā anantarāyena.
Ayaṃ ajja pañcamattehi tantiyā bhānavārehi.
Niṭṭhā pattaṃ⁶ evaṃ niṭṭhānaṃ pāpuṇantu sabbe hi pi
hitasukhanībattikarā 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 pattā, 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 seq.	Pao-yun's Translation, Chap. XXIX.
		Ver. 1 - 33a	Ver. 1984 -2016a	Ver. 1 - 30
Sec. 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 Aśvaghōṣa. 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-pao-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 *Ari* 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 *Āḍi*) 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 Tāvātīṃsa 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 Dhammasaṅgani; (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 *Piṭkat 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 *Sāsanālakāra* (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 Ngadatyī 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 *Mātikāganṭhi*, 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 *Mātikathadīpanī*, ascribed to Chapada on p. 19, Bode's *Pali Lit.*, is not in the *Piṭakat Thonbôn Sadan*.

bhivaṃsa 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) Paṭīcasamuppāda; (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) Dhammahadaya. On the first thirteen, the reader is referred to the *Compd. Phil.*

² See pp. 200, 201, *The Three Tikās*, 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 Tikās*.

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. 584, 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 "jiva" (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 Kathāvattu was taught regularly before, but not after, Ariyavaṁsa 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 Kathāvattu*.

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" (*saṁsaya*).

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 Paṇnattivāra, 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 Comte, 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" (*anan-tanaya*) 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 Petakopadesa² ("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 Sammahavinodanī⁶ ("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 Vanaratanatissa, *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 Cariyāpitaka 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 Thibathu of Pinya.

The Peṭakālaṅkāra⁴ ("The Progress⁵ of the Piṭaka"), by Nānābhivamsa,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-patigyi, *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 Mahāthupavamsa 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, Thibathu, 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 *Maṇḍipā* ("The Lamp of Gems"), a sub-commentary on the *Aṭṭhasālinī*, written by Ariyāvamsa¹ 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 Hamsavati (Pegu) in 1550, is a sub-commentary on the *Mūlatīkā*. The *Paṭṭhānasārādīpanī* ("Lights on the Essence of the *Paṭṭhāna*"),³ based on previous comments, is the work of Saddhammalaṅkāra of Hamsavati (1580). Tilokaguru⁴ of Pakangyi, who flourished in Sagaing, wrote two sub-commentaries—*Ṭīkāvaṇṇanā* and *Anuṭīkāvaṇṇanā*—on the *Dhātukathā* during the reign of Anaukpetlun Mindaya, who became king in 1605. In 1615 he wrote a *Vaṇṇanā-ṭīkā* on the *Yamaka*. The *Paṭṭhānavāṇṇanāṭīkā* 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 Tipītakālaṅkāra,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 *Pañcappakarāṇa-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 Suttanipāta, 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 Nāmacāradīpaka ("The Actions of Mind"), by Chapada,¹ is not an *ethical* treatise, as classified by Dr. Forchhammer.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 Abhidhammāvātāra 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 Buddhādāsa of Ceylon. He flourished during the reign of *Sīrimahāparakkamabāhu* (1164), a contemporary of *Narapatissithu* 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 Ariyavaṃsa 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 Sāsanaṅkāra³ 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 Dhammasaṅgaṇi, 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, *Sīlacāra*, 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 *Nāmacārādīpaka* was also supplied by its own author, *Chapada*. *Mahākassapa* of Pagan wrote a *ṭikā* on the *Paramatthabindu*.

The *Manisāramañjūsā* (“The Casket of Genuine Gems”), a sub-commentary on the *Tikagyaw*, was written by *Ariyavaṃsa* at the special request of his master, *Ye-ngôn*² *Sadaw* of *Sagaing*, to satisfy the latter with the former’s profound scholarship. But *Tipitakadhara*, the teacher of *Sīladevī*, daughter of *Bayin Naung*, at *Haṃsavatī*, 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 *Manisāramañjūsā*.

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 Jambudipadhaja, a disciple of the Thè-in Thathanabaing (1837).

The Yamaka was translated by the five translators of the Dhātukathā, but a sixth translation by Jambudipadhaja 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 *Silavaṃsa* 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*, *Gunañkāra* of *Pindale*, in 1763.

The *Aṭṭhasālinī* appears to have been translated as early as 1442; it was subsequently translated by *Ariyālañkāra* 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 *Pañcappakaranatṭhakathā* was made by *Gūgyi Sadaw*, *Paññasiha*, a disciple of the first *Bagaya Sadaw* (1782). He also translated the *Mūlaṭikā*. 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 *Nemyodhammakyawthu* (1859).

The "door" theory seems to have received special attention in *Burma*, for the *Dvārakathā* of the *Mūlaṭika* was translated by *Nangyaung*² *Sadaw*, *Aggadhammālañkāra*, 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 Anuṭikā 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, Tipitakālaṅkāra.
9. Munindasāra of Myedu.
10. Ōk-kyauṅ Sadaw, U Po during the reign of Bagyidaw (1819).
11. Vicittālaṅkāra of Salin.
12. Panlhwa Sadaw, Silācāra.
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 Nāna 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-kyaung 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, Nānālaṅkāra of Tharrawaddy's reign, translated both the Paramatthavinicchaya and the Nāmarūpapariccheda.

Ne-yin Sadaw Ariyālaṅkāra translated the Saṅkhepa-vaṇṇanā during Taninganwe 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 ṭikā 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 Nangy-aung Sadaw during Ngadatkyi Dayaka's reign.

Three treatises on "The Processes of Thought," entitled

Vithiletyos,¹ exist. The first was written by Taungdwin Sadaw, Nāṇālaṅkāra, 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 Vithicittapakāsini, by Ôk-kyaung Sadaw, U Pôk, during the last reign, and the Vithicittavikāsini, by Nemydhammakyawthu, during Mindoon's reign, are on the same subject. The Vithimañjari ("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 Gaṅṭhi,² on cruces in philosophy, had also sprung up. There is a Gaṅṭhi on the Aṭṭhasālinī by the first Kyaw Aung Sanda Sadaw, written during Hanthawaddypa's reign. The Samohavinodani also has a Gaṅṭhi by Shwedaung Sadaw. Nāṇābhivaṃsa prepared three Gaṅṭhis on the Mātikā, the Dhātukathā, and on the first five sections of the Yamaka. The Compendium of Philosophy has two Gaṅṭhis, the first by the first Kyaw Aung Sanda Sadaw, and the second by Dakkhinārāma Sadaw during Mindoon's reign. Another Gaṅṭhi 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 Paramattharatanā-

¹ See p. 283, *Compd. Phil.*

² The Gaṅṭhisāra, ascribed to Chapada on p. 18, Bode's *Pali Lit.*; the Dasagaṅṭhivāṇṇanā, Vepullabuddhi of Pagan (p. 28, *ibid.*); the Visuddhimagga-gaṅṭhipadattha, to Sāradassī (p. 56), and the Gaṅṭhipadattha, to Nāṇavara of Pagan (pp. 66, 67), are not traceable in the *Piṭakat Thonbôn Sadan*. But a Gaṅṭhi on the Paṭṭhāna and another on the Ṭikagyaw, 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 Lakrivikiraṇa 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.

Lankābhiñṇā 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. Waskaḍuwe 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 Lankābhiñṇā 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 Weḷigama 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; Lankābhīṅṅā 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 Weḷitara; Jinālakāra Press, Colombo, 1898; pp. 92, roy. 8vo.
4. Abhidhammattha Vibhāvinī Tikā. By Sumaṅgala Mahā-Thera. Edited by Weḷitara Paññānanda Unnānsē; Jinālakāra 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 Vaṅṅanā*. By Saddhamma Jōtipāla Mahā-Thera. Edited by Weḷitara Paññānanda Unnānsē; Jinālakāra 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 Paññāsekkhara 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 Sila Vamsa Unnānsē and Bellana Saranankara Unnānsē; the Satya Samuccaya Press, Pēliyagoda, 1891; pp. 75, roy. 8vo.
14. *Abhidhānappadīpikāwa*: Singhalese translation. Edited by Totagamuve Paññāmoli Tissa Unnānsē; the Satya Samuccaya Press, Pēliyagoda, 1894; pp. 168; demy 8vo.
15. *Abhisambodhi Ālaṅkāra*. Published by P. S. Perera, at the Vidyāsāgara Press, Colombo, 1897; pp. 34; demy 8vo.
16. *Abhinava Sāsana Vamsa*; an account of the organization of the Amarapura sect. By W. Piyatissa Unnānsē; Jinālakāra Press, Colombo, 1899; pp. 18, demy 8vo.
17. *Acchariya-Abbhuta Sūtra*; with Singhalese paraphrase. Published by W. Rūpaśingha, at the Jinālakāra Press, Colombo, 1897; pp. 44, demy 8vo.
18. *Aggikkhandhopama Sutta*; with Singhalese paraphrase.

Edited by Silavaṃsa 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. Āṅgulimāla Sūtraya : Pali text with Singhalese translation. Edited by Giridara Ratanajoti Unnānsē ; Dinakraprākāsa Press, Colombo, 1891 ; pp. 40, demy 8vo.
22. Āṅguttara-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. Āṅguttara-Nikāya (Part I.). Printed by D. C. Abeywardana, Colombo, 1901 ; pp. 80, demy 8vo.
24. Āṅguttara-Nikāya Gāthā Sannaya : Singhalese paraphrase of the verses in the Āṅguttara. By W. S. Wācissara Unnānsē ; K. D. Mendis, Weḷitara, 1907 ; pp. 48, demy 8vo.
25. Āṅguttara-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. Āṭānāṭiya Sūtra ; with Singhalese paraphrase. The Sudarśana Press, Colombo, 1885 ; pp. 30, demy 8vo.

30. Attanagalu Vihāra Vaṃsa: History. By Śrī Mayi-
trīya Mahā Swāmi. Edited by Tangalla Jinaratana
Unnānsē; Sudarśana Press, Colombo, 1898; pp. 113,
demy 8vo.
31. Attanagalu Vihāra Vaṃsa. Edited by C. A. Silak-
khandha Unnānsē; published by N. J. Cooray and
Sons, Colombo, 1909; pp. 112, demy 8vo.
32. Atthasālinī Atthayojanā, of Nānakitti Swāmi. Edited
by Paññāsekkhara Unnānsē; the Lankopākāra Press,
Galle, 1900; pp. 275, demy 8vo.
33. Atthipūñja Sūtraya. The Kandy Buddhist Press,
Kandy, 1897; pp. 9, demy 8vo.
34. Ayogaraḷātaka Vyākkyāyana; with Singhalese para-
phrase. Edited by Dhammānanda Sabha Unnānsē
Sayivasiri Press, Pæliyagoda, 1904; pp. 44, demy 8vo.
35. Besajja Mañjūsā: Medical; with Singhalese transla-
tion. 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-Pratimoksha-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 Swarnaḷotiyasabha
Unnānsē, Udugampola; the Granthaparakāsa Press,
Colombo, 1893; pp. 68, demy 8vo.
40. Bodhipakshika Dharma Vibhāgaya: Pali and Singha-
lese. Edited by D. L. Rūpasīṅgha; the Granthā-
loka Press, Colombo, 1899; pp. 24, demy 8vo.
41. Brahmāyu Sūtraya; with Singhalese paraphrase. Śas-
trādhāra 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 Dipaniya : 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 Ñanamōli 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 Dharmakīrti 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, Peliyagoda, 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. Bālāvātara Sangraha : Grammar. By Stinamalave Dhammajoti Terunnānsē. Edited by D. Jinaratana Unnānsē ; Lankābhiñṇā Viśruta Press, Colombo, 1889 ; pp. 126, demy 8vo.
55. Bālāvātara-Sūtra Nirdesa : 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 Weḷigama 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 Dharmasadaka Unnānsē ; Granthaloka Press, Colombo, 1896 ; pp. 36, demy 8vo.
61. Cūḷapuñṇama Sūtraya ; with Singhalese paraphrase. Granthaprākāsa Press, Colombo, 1893 ; pp. 16, demy 8vo.
62. Cūḷa-Sihanāda-Sūtraya ; with Singhalese paraphrase. Granthaprākāsa 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. Nānissara 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. Dāthāvamsa. 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. Vidyāsāgara 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. Nānissara Unnānsē; Grantha-prākāsa Press, Colombo, 1891-1906; pp. 659, demy 8vo.

78. *Dhammapada - Atthakathā*. 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 Jinālakāra Press, Colombo, 1899; pp. 81, demy 8vo.
80. *Dhammapadārtha - Gāthā Sannaya*. Edited by U. Dhammānanda Unnānsē; Saddharmaprākāsa Press, Alutgāma, 1907, pp. 80, demy 8vo.
81. *Dhatwattha Sangaha: Grammar*. By Visuddhācāra-Thera; Jinālakāra 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; Sihala - 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 Ñānatilaka Nāyaka Unnānsē; Śāstraloka Press, Colombo, 1886; pp. 59, demy 8vo.
86. *Gadalādeni 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. Ñānatiloka Nāyaka Unnānsē; Vidyāratnākāra Press, Weḷitara, 1898; pp. 76, demy 8vo.
88. *Ghāṭikāra - Sūtraya*; with Singhalese paraphrase; Victoria Press, Colombo, 1897; pp. 28, demy 8vo.
89. *Heṛanasika and Dinacariya: Pali and Singhalese*.

Jinālakāra Press, Colombo, 1897; pp. 12, demy 8vo.

90. Jānussati Sūtraya; with Singhalese paraphrase. Sumitra Press, Colombo, 1895; pp. 22, demy 8vo.
91. Jātakatthakathā. Edited by Silānanda Unnānsē; Jinālakāra 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. Dhammananda Unnānsē; Śāstrādhāra Press, Colombo, 1886; pp. 101, demy 8vo.
94. Jinālakāra (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 Ñānatiloka 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 ; Lankābhiñṇā 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 - Vitarāṇī ; Commentary. Edited by M. Ñānissara Unnānsē ; Jinālakāra Press, Colombo, 1905 ; pp. 240, roy. 8vo.
108. Kārikāva : Grammar. Of Dharmasenāpati Sthavira of Burma. Edited by W. Ñānatiloka Nāyaka Unnānsē ; Vidyāratnākāra Press, Weḷitara, 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. Jinālakāra Press, Colombo, 1897 ; pp. 20, demy 8vo.
111. Kasibhāradvāja-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. Jinālakāra 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 I.
118. Mahābodhivaṃsa. Edited by M. S. P. Sarānanda Unnānsē ; P. D. Joronis Appuhamy, Colombo, 1891 ; pp. 100, demy 8vo. ; Part I.
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 ; Lankābhiñṇā Viśruta Press, Colombo, 1898 ; pp. 82, demy 8vo.
121. Mahāparinirvāna-Sūtraya ; with Singhalese paraphrase. 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 Ṭikā : 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. Mahāsatipatṭhāna - Sūtraya ; with Singhalese paraphrase. Edited by H. Jayatilaka. Published by F. Cooray, Colombo, 1888; pp. 140, demy 8vo.
135. Mahāsatipatṭhāna - Sūtraya ; with Singhalese paraphrase. Edited by Borukgamuwa Revata Unnānsē; the Buddhist Press, Colombo, 1898; pp. 88, demy 8vo.
136. Mahāsatipatṭhāna - Sūtraya ; with Singhalese paraphrase. Sudarṣana Press, Colombo, 1900; pp. 130, demy 8vo.
137. Mahāsatipatṭhāna-Sūtra Sannaya (Singhalese paraphrase). Published by G. M. Kapurala at the Granthaprākāsa Press, Colombo, 1909; pp. 80; Part 1.
138. Mahāsatipatṭhāna - 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. Mahāwaṃsa : 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. Mahāwaṃsa ; with Singhalese translation. Sihala Samaya Press, Colombo, 1909.
142. Mahāwaṃsa Ṭikā : 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. Saranaṅkara Unnānsē ; Lankāloka Press, Galle, 1898 ; pp. 12, fcap. 8vo.
144. Mayitribhāvanāva Tisarāṇa Astanga Silaya : 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. Milindapraṣṇaya. 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. Rasavāhini. Edited by Saranātissa Unnānsē. Lankābhiññā Viśruta Press, Colombo, 1891-1893 ; pp. 290, demy 8vo.
155. Rasavāhini. Edited by M. Somaratana Unnānsē ; Jinālanakāra Press, Colombo, 1906 ; pp. 228, demy 8vo.
156. Rūpabhedappakāsaniya : Grammar. By Jambudhaja Mahā-Sthavira. Edited by W. Nānatiloka Nāyaka Unnānsē ; Vidyāratanakāra Press, Welitara, 1907 ; pp. 44, demy 12mo.
157. Rūpamāla-Vaṇṇanā : Grammar of Saraṇāṅkara Saṅgharāj. Edited by G. Ratanajoti Unnānsē ; Sīvyasrī Press, Colombo, 1905 ; pp. 76, 8vo.
158. Sabda Binduwa ; with Singhalese paraphrase ; the Grammar of Dharmarāja-Guru Mahā-Sthavira. Edited by M. Vipulasāra Unnānsē ; Lankābhiññā 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, Welitara, 1899 ; pp. 72 ; demy 8vo.
161. Sabdasaraththa-Jālinī ; the Grammar of Nagita Mahā-Sthavira. Edited by D. Silakkhandha Unnānsē ; Lankābhiññā Viśruta Press, Colombo, 1900 ; pp. 128, demy 8vo.
162. Saddhamma - Vacakopa-desa ; 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 Baturantudave ; Śāstrādhāra Press, Colombo, 1874 ; pp. 126, demy 8vo.
164. Saddhammopāyana-Nibbaccana-Rūpasiddhiya : Grammar. Edited by Ñānawimaltissa Unnānsē. Jinā-lankāra Press, Colombo, 1901 ; pp. 99, demy 8vo.
165. Saddhasarattha-jālinī : Grammar. By Nagita Sthavira. Edited by P. Silānanda 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-Sādini ; 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 ; Lakrivikiraṇa 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. Amarasinha 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. Sāratthappakāsinī : Commentary on Saṃyutta-

- Nikāya. Edited by P. Vimalabuddhi Sthavira; Vidyāratnākāra Press, Weḷitara, 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. Ṭikā of Bālāvātāra. 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 Ñānatilaka Nāyaka Unnānsē; Vidyāratnākāra Press, Weḷitara, 1903; pp. 320, demy 8vo.; Parts 1-4.
190. Sāsanawaṃsa-Dīpaya; 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 Dīpaduttama 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 Valaṅjanaya, Vinaya of Panchamūla Mahā - Sthavira. Edited by W. Paññānanda Unnānsē; Jinālakāra Press, Colombo, 1908; pp. 103, demy 12mo.
195. Simālakāra 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-Ṭikā : Grammar. By H. Śrī Sumaṅgala Nāyaka Unnānsē; Lakrivikiraṇa Press, Colombo, 1892, pp. 327, demy 8vo.
199. Sudhiramukha Maṇḍanaya : Grammar. By Attara-gāma Bandara; Lankābhiñṇā 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 Ayiswariyālaṅkarāṇa Mahā-Saṅgharāja of Siam. Edited by C. A. Silakkhandha Unnānsē; Vidyāprākāsa Press, Ambalaṅgoda, 1894; pp. 51, demy 8vo.
201. Sumana-Sūtra; with Singhalese paraphrase. Lankābhiñṇā Viśruta Press, Colombo, 1896; pp. 11, demy 8vo.
202. Sumaṅgalappasādinī, Khuddasikkhā, Ṭikā of Saṅgharakṣita Mahā-Sthavira. Edited by Sumanajoti Unnānsē; Jinālakāra Press, Colombo, 1888; pp. 187, demy 8vo.
203. Sumaṅgala Vilāsini, Dīgha-Nikāyaṭṭhakathā. Edited by B. Saraṇāṅkara Unnānsē; Granthaprākāsa Press, Colombo, 1898; pp. 80; demy 8vo.; Part 1.
204. Sutta-Nipāta. Edited by Paññatissa Unnānsē and Aggadhamma Unnānsē; Weḷitara, 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; Jinālakāra Press, Colombo, 1898; pp. 80, demy 8vo.
207. Suttasaṅgha - Aṭṭhakathā. Edited by W. Sugatapāla Unnānsē; Jinālakāra Press, Colombo, 1900; pp. 225, roy. 8vo.
208. Sūtra-Saṅgraha, Sannaya (Singhalese paraphrase).

- By Medhāvītissa Unnānsē; Saddharmapṛākāsa 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 ; Jinālakāra Press, Colombo, 1891 ; pp. 44, demy 8vo.
216. Vācākopadesaya ; Grammar of Mahā-Vijitāvī Mahā-Sthavira. Edited by W. Ñāṇatilaka Nāyaka Unnānsē ; Vidyāratnākāra Press, Weḷitara, 1902 ; pp. 68, demy 12mo.
217. Vācca-Vācākāya ; Grammar of Dhammadassī. Edited by W. Ñāṇatilaka Nāyaka Unnānsē ; Vidyāratnākāra Press, Weḷitara, 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. Ñāṇatilaka 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; Lankābhiñṇā 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-Maṅjūsā, Tikā* by Kankhā-Vitarāṇī. Edited by Pañṇālaṅkāra 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. *Viyārapada Sūtraya*; with Singhalese paraphrase; Sudarṣana Press, Pæliyagoda, 1893; pp. 20, demy 8vo.
231. *Vurtamālava*: Verses on King Prakramabāhu of Dedigamuwa; Lankābhiñṇā Viśruta Press, Colombo, 1901; pp. 31, demy 12mo.
232. *Vuttodaya*: Grammar, with Singhalese paraphrase. edited by Vimalajoti Unnānsē; Lankābhiñṇā 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.—RH. D.]

PALI TEXT SOCIETY

HARBORO' GRANGE,

ASHTON-ON-MERSEY,

CHESHIRE.

Issues of the Pali Text Society.

I.—ARRANGEMENT BY YEARS.

1882.

1. Journal.
2. Buddhavaṅsa 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. Sumangala, 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-Vaṅsa.

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-Vaṅsa.		2. Journal, 1904-1905.
1898.		1906.
1. Saṅyutta, 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. Mahāvāṅsa.
1901.		1909.
1. Vimāna-Vatthu ^y 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. Saṅyutta, 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-Vaṅsa (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-Vaṅsa (together with No. 7)	0	10	6
7.	Cariyā-Piṭaka (1882)			
8.	Cha-kesa-dhātu-vaṅsa (in <i>Journal</i> for 1885)			
9.	Dāṭhā-Vaṅsa (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.	Digha-Nikāya, 3 vols.	1	11	6
14.	Duka-Paṭṭhāna (1906)	0	10	6
15.	Gandha-Vaṅsa (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.	Mahāvaṅsa (1908)	0	10	6
22.	Mahā-Bodhi-Vaṅsa (1891)	0	10	6
23.	Majjhima-Nikāya, 3 vols.	1	11	6
24.	Mūla-Sikkhā (in <i>Journal</i> for 1883)			
25.	Netti-Pakaraṇa (1902)	0	10	6
26.	Pajja-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-Vilāsini, 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-vaṅsa (1896). Index to Pali words discussed in Translations (1901). Early Pali Grammarians in Burma (1908). Mahāvaṅsa (Eng. transl., 1912).
- Carpenter, J. E. ; ed. of *Dīgha* and *Sumangala-Vilāsini*.
- 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 *Saṅyutta*, 5 vols ; and of *Pañca-gati 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 *Mahāvaṅsa* ; transl. of *Mahāvaṅsa* (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 *Mahāvaṅsa* (1903).
- Hoerning, Dr. ; *List of Pali MSS. in the British Museum* (1888 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-vaṅsa* (1885), *Anāgata-vaṅsa* (1886), *Gandha-*

III.—INDEX TO AUTHORS—*continued*.

- Vaṅsa (1886), Simā 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-vaṅsa, 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-sālīnī, Khudda-sikkhā, Mūla-sikkhā, Dhamma-sangaṇi, 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-sangaha, Dāthā-Vaṅsa, 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 Saṅyutta (1904). Similes in the Nikāyas (1907 and 1908).
Psalms of the Sisters (1909).
- Saddhānanda, N. ; ed. of Saddhamma-Sangaha (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 Vaṅsa.
 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. Patthāna 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 Devavajsa 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
	£1,658	4	9

STATEMENT OF ACCOUNT FOR 1909.

RECEIPTS.		EXPENDITURE.	
	£	s.	d.
Balance at Bank, January 1, 1909 ...	679	19	3
Balance in hand, January 1, 1909 ...	1	19	0
By Subscriptions for current and past years ...	217	2	1
Donations ...	6	6	0
Interest at Bank ...	17	16	3
To Printers ...	123	11	6
Publisher's Charges ...	77	18	9
Insurance of Stock ...	201	10	3
Burmese MS. (Theragāthā Commentary) ...	11	15	8
Yamaka (Rangoon) ...	5	5	0
Stationery and Postage ...	5	0	0
Dictionary Fund ...	1	16	0
Balance at Bank ...	4	12	0
Balance in hand ...	28	18	6
	659	4	2
	5	1	0
	£923	2	7

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
" 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

STATEMENT OF ACCOUNT FOR 1911.

RECEIPTS.			EXPENDITURE.		
	£	s.	d.		
Balance at Bank, January 1, 1911	564	6	6		
Balance in hand, January 1, 1911	3	14	11		
By Subscriptions and Sales	361	18	11		
" Donations	17	13	9		
" Interest at Bank	32	18	0		
				289	17 11
				9	5 9
				5	5 0
				58	9 0
				6	15 1
				0	15 0
				17	14 1
				7	4 4
				584	4 8
				1	1 2
				£980	12 1
				£150	0 0
				189	17 11
To Printers					
" Publisher's Charges					
" Insurance of Stock					
" Contributors					
" Typist					
" Binding					
" Purchase of Books					
" Stationery, Postage, etc.					
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.