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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.—Rn. D.]
ON THE ERA OF KANIŠKA

That the question as to the date of the Kuśana Kings will one day be settled by an archaeological 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 Kanishka was the founder of the Śaka era (A.D. 78). I shared with Fergusson the responsibility for this view, the possibility of which has been but lately emphasized by Rapson. I am now no longer disposed to hold this as pre-eminently probable. Not that it is opposed to the fact that Kanishka was not a Śaka, but a Kuśana. 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 Miao, on account of which I considered the Kuśanas 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 ΚΟΠΑΝΟΤ, which probably means ΚΟΠΑΝΟΤ, 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. More significant than this is the fact of the very limited expansion of the Śaka era in North India. 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, whereas it was samvatsara 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.

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.). Lüders 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, 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?

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

- Kujula Kadphises.
- Vima Kadphises.
- Kaniska.
- Huviška.
- Vāsudeva.

To date Kaniska'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. 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 Vasiška; see recently Vogel, *JRAS*, 1910, 1811 ff.; Fleet, *ibid*. 1815 ff.

6 Mention should here be made of the frequently noted similarity between his copper coins (KOZOA KAAAΦΕΣ) 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-Huviška-Vāsudeva series, which is firmly fixed in this order by epigraphic and numismatic evidence.

Now, is this transposition plausible?

O. Franke\(^1\) 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 Kanishka’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 Kanishka 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 Kanishka bear witness themselves as to that with a clearness that cannot be surpassed. Franke observes (p. 93) that “Kanishka 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 Kanishka—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 στηροσον of the Hermaios-Kadphises coins with sthavira, therá, is not for me convincing (cp. also Boyer, Journ. as., 1900, I, 529 ff.). Is it plausible to separate the στηρος of these badly written legends (or occasionally even στήρι; cp. v. Sallet, Nachfolger Alexanders, 119) from the κωστηρος, occupying a corresponding place and elsewhere used by Hermaios? It should be considered that about this time—i.e., of Gondophares—both [σω]τηρος and σωστηρος are found (Smith, Catal. of Coins in the Ind. Museum, 56). The fact that the Indian translation gives mahatasa hardly precludes acceptance of [σω]τηρος. The agreement between the Greek and Indian text is not always absolute; and especially here, at the very close of the Greek dominion, an inaccurate translation would be scarcely surprising.
Kaniska 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?"  

Now it is by our efforts to evade the presumptive difficulty of the existence of Buddhism among the Yue-chi before Kaniska, 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 Yue-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 ἅρμαθησα, 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, certainly contains no Buddhist confession either, but belongs to the dhramikasa (=δχαν) 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 (Bhagvànlāl 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. 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 Kueishuang with Kuśana, 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 Kuśana 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 Kaṇiśka, Huviska, and Vasudeva, if we are to place them before the Kadphises?

We know that Kaṇiśka 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, Huviska 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 Kuśanas to which the Chinese testify? 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 Kuśana 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 Kaniska-Huviska-Vasudeva 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 Kaniska 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 Kaniska-Huviska-Vasudeva 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 Kharoṣṭhi script, which is used by Kadphises alone, not by the others.²

Which, now, comes earlier, which later? Observe how the series fits on to what precedes, and prolongs itself into that which follows. Kadphises bears the title βασιλεὺς βασιλεῶν σωτὴρ μεγας (and correspondingly the Indian equivalents).³ That clearly connects him with the preceding times. Kaniska comes next to him, because he also is called βασιλεὺς βασιλεῶν on some of his coins. On others, however, he has had inscribed PAONANO PAO. Huviska 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 Huviska? Cp. Fleet, JRAS. 1906, 183 n. 1.

³ He shares this title with the “unnamed king,” who must have stood to him in a nearer relation, which we cannot define with certainty.
but exclusively the middle Persian intitulation.\(^1\) If those coins are examined which come after Vāsudeva, and which connect his stamp with that of the Guptas and the so-called Skytho-Sāsānides ("Later Kushans,") Cunningham, *Num. Chron.*, 1893, pl. VIII f.; cp. Smith, *Catal.*, 87 ff.), I think it will be acknowledged to be impossible to find among them where to locate a βασιλεὺς βασιλεῶν σωτηρ 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 Kaniska—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


\(^{2}\) 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 Kuṣānas, if the place which I maintain for them is right; towards 200 years later, if Kaniska’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 Kanisoka and Huviska diminishes during the time immediately following. In the time of Vasudeva there are only three left (Fleet, JRAS. 1908, 178); later on only two (OHPO, evidently = Siva, and the goddess with the horn of plenty, APΔOΞPO, the Avestan Ashi Vanuhi), these being then traceable for a long time; they hold their ground until quite late, the one among the Skytho-Sasainides, the other among the Guptas (Rapson, Ind. Coins, 19). If we try to insert into this series, after the coins of Vasudeva, the Siva which occurs only among those of Kadphises, we shall understand that, by such an insertion, the continuity is broken. This Siva looks very different from the OHPO of Vasudeva, and later. Kadphises has nothing that we can place beside the APΔOΞPO.

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 Kaniska 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 Kusana, begins with Kadphises; but it exhibits, on closer examination, a

---


\(^2\) 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 Vasudeva (Num. Chron., 1892, pl. XIV, E, F) and of the "later Kushans," as well as on the Kusana-like coins of the Sasanid 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 Huviska, 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 1). Just so, it continually recurs under Kaniska, 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

Huviska 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, Vasudeva, 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 Vasudeva. Kadphises comes, clearly, close to Kaniska, *i.e.*, since Huviska immediately follows, he immediately precedes Kaniska. 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 Vasudeva, would appear at the time of Kaniska, *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 Kaniska. Gardner does not assign it to Kaniska.
phises II: "The order of succession of the Indian Kuśana 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 Kaniska, 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 Kuśana-monogram.¹

It will not surely occur to anyone to move him further back alone, without Vima 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 ṚAONANO ṚAO, 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 Kaniska. 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 Kuśana dominion drove out that of the Greek.\footnote{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.\footnote{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

\footnote{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 Kaṇiška and Huviška the form Σ, but always С. Is Smith, *Catal.*, 71, right in ascribing the legends ΗΛΙΟΣ to Kaṇiška? Cunningham’s (*op. cit.*, pl. XVI, 1, 3) impressions give ΗΛΙΟC most clearly. Let the scripts of these Kings be now laid beside the ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ ΣΤΗΡΟΣΣΤ ΕΡΜΑΙΟΤ of the Hermaios-Kujula coins.

\footnote{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 Kuśanas, is not precluded. Such a position may be assigned to that Heraos or Miaos mentioned above (p. 1, n. 8), of whom ΚΟΦΑΝΟΤ appears to be said, and on whose relation to Kujula Kadphises, and to the unnamed ὑπηρέται, 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 Kaniska, copper
coins of the same and of the two Kadphises, but none of
Huviska or Vasudeva. The inscription of the Stupa (see
recently Lüders, JRAS. 1909, 645 ff.) leaves hardly any
doubt that it was erected under Kaniska. 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 Kaniska
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.,
Huviska; Oor Kenorano is a misread legend of this king)
are found generally with those of Kadphises and Kaniska.
Hœrnle (Proc. As. Soc. Beng., 1895, 82) reports on a
discovery (in the territory of Paṭiala) of masses of coins
of the second Kadphises and of Kaniska (cp. also Thomas,
JRAS. 1877, 219 n. 3). With regard to the simultaneous
appearance of coins of Kadphises II, Kaniska, Huviska,
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 Vasudeva; they
support rather the placing of him next to (which must then
mean, before) Kaniska.

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 Huviska, and a number
of Kaniska and Vima Kadphises coins. If Kadphises came
at the end of the series, the absence of Vasudeva 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 Kaniska, 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 Vasudeva or the later Kuṣanas.
In point of fact, he is to be assigned to about the beginning of the Kuśana 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.\(^1\) Kuñika 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. Palæog., 25) declares his priority to Kuñika on palæographic grounds. We may repeat again that the Fleet-Franke theory on the Kuśanas 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 1800, 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 Kuñika 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 archaeologist 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 IIᵉ 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-Sāsānīd 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 argu-
ments 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., Kaniśka, and a single coin of Huviśka.
Smith (JRAS. 1903, 85) will probably be right when he
remarks thereupon: “The presumption, of course, is that
the monument was erected in the reign of Huviśka, the
latest Indian Sovereign whose coinage is included in the
deposit.” The positive dates of Huviśka 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 Kaniśka and Huviśka 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 conven-
tional 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 con-
ditions, even the sense of the prose did not stand really
firm, but tended in course of time to undergo one trans-
formation after another, as one generation of narrators
yielded place to the next. Nay, more; the prose could
even become quite forgotten, the poetic insertions mean-
while continuing to be handed down as part of the estab-
lished 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 quaequit 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 Cariya Piṭaka, it is written entirely in verse. Thus, in the *Mahārāṣṭra* (vol. II, p. 209 ff.), the *Sāmajātaka* (No. 540) runs first of all in pure prose,¹ and afterwards in purely metrical form. Considering the esteem in which the Pāli canon deserves to be held,² I think we shall have every reason to consider the type of mixed prose and poetry found in it, and which is almost the only prevailing one,³ as the oldest or as one of the oldest. It frequently occurs also in the Jātakas incorporated in the Vinaya, etc., and in many examples of Northern Buddhist literature, especially in the *Mahārāṣṭra* and in the *Jātakamālā*, etc.⁴ The inscription of Barhut (cp. *ZDMG*. LII, 648, n. 2), which names the *Yam bram(h)ano avayesi jatakan*, 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 Dhammapāda.
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 Pāli 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). This, again, would be incomprehensible without the prose as furnished by the commentator.

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

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

koṭṭhake usukārassa bhattachāle upaṭṭhite (J. 539, 163)

whereupon a conversation unfolds itself between the two men. Here Franke finds the words bhattachāle 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 geham pāvekkhi. Herewith, Franke holds, J. 539 corresponds, not in the verses, but in the prose just preceding the verse-passage quoted above (168) : pavisitvā . . . gehadvāram 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: yam brāhmaṇo ti—the opening words of the strophe, though this is, in the tale, preceded by another verse (sabbā nadi, 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 samaṇa goes to beg of a householder bhattachāle upaṭṭhite 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 āhāra-devakovāle, as the Mahāvastu (II, 49, 10, 12) says, with which we may compare the pious man in the Jātakamāla (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 pavitisvā . . . gehadvāram 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, 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 upadhi 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, and apparently there was no room, in the ancient form of the passage, for the now interjacent prose, which precisely, according to Franke, would have been the origin of the bhattachāle upatthite of the verse.

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

1 I mention incidentally that this proves less than it seems to do. In 507, 19, it was geham pakekkhi. In the prose, 539, pavisitvā refers to the entry into the town. That the wanderer then comes to the gehadvaram 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 kotthake, etc., there will have been a hemistich to which kotthake structurally belongs —say, with an atihāsi, as the Commentary has it. The next verse consists of two opening pādas (tatra ca so usukhāro and ekam ca cakkhu niggayhā); 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 atthavānanā. 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, 186 in Cabatons’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 Atthavānanā, 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. 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 generation of the Sutta and Vinaya collections—appeared to be the suitable

(e.g., yena . . . ten' upasamkami'isu, upasamkamiti'vā . . . etad avocu'yi, 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., Fausbøll). As a whole, it reminds us of parts of the North Buddhist texts, e.g. the Divyāvadāna. The progress of our knowledge of this literature, or of the respective Chinese translations, may one day permit us to determine more precisely whence it sprang. That a MS. of the Canon, like the Phayre, would here give the prose as well seems to me scarcely doubtful, though I am not in a position to affirm it positively. The introductory formula evam akkhāyatī (suggesting ākhyāna) evam anusūyatī 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 Kumālā-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 atthakathā, 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 atthakathā (more accurately, the atthavānvanā) 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 (e. int. al Cowel'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. 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 Rṣyaśṛṅga 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.). I here give the result concerning the relationship of verse to prose in his own words:

"Si les gāthā ont tous les caractères d’une très vieille plainte 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 IIe siècle avant J.-C., il est non moins évident que leur aṭṭhakathā n’a pas été seulement remise en pāli, mais qu’elle a encore été accommodée au goût du jour par un clerc du Vᵉ siècle de notre ère."

1 Keith (986 n. 1) calls the Jáñaka prose of Fausbøll’s edition “just as probably an original composition without any predecessor.” In the cases described (as well as in the Kuṇāla-Jáñaka, 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 Jáñaka 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 Jáñaka, 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 sāstras.”

Thus authors who compose prose and quote³ verse,

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

² I do not overlook this “may be” that leaves open the possibility of Ākhyāna verses; and only refrain, for brevity’s sake, in the following remarks, from always reminding the reader that of all this it is only said that it “may be.” But as soon as it is seriously accepted that the matter may also have happened otherwise, then the possibility at least of that with which I am concerned must be admitted, namely, that here we have Ākhyānas, just as I assume them to be in the Rgveda; and, further, we have these Ākhyānas, in the canonical shape of the “Jātakas,” existing in precisely the same form as I find in the Rgveda:—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 saṁkhūra, 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 Kathāsamgraha verses) back to such quotations, and thereby rob it, in a certain sense, of all reality.³

¹ Only the Kathāsamgraha strophes would be likely to be ascribed to the authors (or would not even they? cp. Hertel, WZKM. XXIV, 128). 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 Nīpāta (V, 253-7); unmixed with prose, has preserved the strophes which form the nucleus of a Jātaka (No. 368). 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 Śastraś? 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 saṁkhārā 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 Pūrnabhadra (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 Upaparṇādūya is worked into the Mahābhārata. On the Suparṇādūya 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. 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 courtezan, de-
serted by her lover, asks the wandering play actors, wherever
they go, “to sing this song particularly; thus she, direct-
ing 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 descrip-
tion 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 authors\(^1\) 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 borrowing\(^2\) 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 Athavāvanā, 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 gāthāh the
quality of Ākhyana strophes, for instance for those concern-
ing Rāma, which are mentioned in the Harivamśa, and which
might, as Lüders supposes,1 be translated from folk dialect;

\[
gāthās cāpy atra gāyanti ye purāṇavido janah—
\]

strophen 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 ff.). In the
wholly metrical M. Bh. there appears at first, in the
sermon of the sham holy bird, a clear reflex,3 having a
 correspon ding value, of the first gāthā in the Jātaka:
M. Bh.—dharmaṃ ca rata, etc. Jātaka.—dhammaṃ ca ratha,
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:

\[
gāthām apy atra gāyanti ye purāṇavido janah.
\]

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

---

1 Cp. also Charpentier, ZDMG. LXII, 745.
2 “Jātaka Mahābhārata-Parallelen,” WZKM. XX, 317 ff. In the
same connection the articles of Charpentier should be consulted.
3 This expression is, of course, not meant to prejudice the question
of the historical relations of the two versions.
which corresponds 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 śokatrayam āpathat:—then follow those śokas which are remarkably like the Jātaka śoka 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.

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 Śūtra 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 Jātakatthavannāna, with those pure metrical narratives, which are supposed to have been plundered by the author of the Atthavannāna? 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. 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 slokau cātra bhavātah 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, 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 Manikantha 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, 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, JRAI. 1893, 302; Pischel, “Die ind. Literatur” [in Kultur der Gegenwart, T.I., Abt. VII], 188) that the different versions of the Jātakas generally agree in the verses, but are as a rule very different in the prose form. This also testifies that the verses are at the
The prose and verse Jātaka of the *Jātakamālā* is the direct offspring of the prose and verse Pāli Jātaka. There is only this difference, that, in the Pāli Jātaka, the gaps, which existed in the old time when there was no fixed prose, are only inadequately filled in, and are therefore easily recognizable. In the *Jātakamālā*, on the other hand, the need of artistic form has penetrated into the prose also. That is a step further in the treatment of the old form, rather than the creation of a new form.

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

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

base of the whole (notice also the similarity in the Jātaka verses, and the difference in the Jātaka prose, in those Jain parallels, in the case which Charpentier discusses, *ZDMG.* LXII, 728). Comparisons between the Pāli texts and the *M. vastu* (which Windisch has so successfully made concerning important episodes in the traditional story of Buddha) must also be made for the Jātakas (as a continuation of Charpentier's work); and these comparisons must be the most extensive possible, and must include all accessible Northern material.
Piṭaka) of the first events after the Buddha's attainment of Buddhahood. That we are concerned with an old text belonging to the bedrock of Buddhist literature, anyone, who cannot see this fact for himself, may learn from Windisch's investigations.¹

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

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. 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. 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 Cop. 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 Rgvedic 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 Pūtaka 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 Rgveda 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, "Gurupūjākaumudi," 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., 388) 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 Brahmana passage (Ait. Br. VII, 18, 10, 11), where a priest ākhyānam... ācaṣṭē to the king. This brings me to the Śunahṣēpa 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 Brahmaṇa the story is related of the Flood or of Cyavana in order to explain the rite of the idā or of the ādvīna 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). 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 Sunahśepa 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 grha āśatuḥ, 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. 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. 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 brahmāṇah 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. Ajigarta, Śunahśepa, Viśvāmitra, and his sons are speaking. The subject is Viśvāmitra's adoption of Śunahśepa, 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?\textsuperscript{1} We shall not, of course, dispute the fact as such, that processes of patchwork in the history of the stories have played a fairly prominent rôle. As to that, it seems to me that the products of such patchwork ought not to be simply ruled out of the question when discussing the form in which stories are told; even such composites will generally keep within a prescribed form. But for our particular case, it seems to me that the separateness of the verses in the concluding act of the story from what has preceded them is by no means so complete as is assumed by Keith. Śunaḥśepa says there to Ajīgarti: \textit{Adarśas tvāśāsahastam...gavāṃ triṃśatānītvam anvṛitāmad Āṅgirah}. And again, in what follows, the verses bear reference to the event herein alluded to. It is true that Hariścandra and Rohita are not mentioned by name. But is not the mention of how Ajīgarti let himself be bribed by 300 cows to murder his son, at once a reference to the buyer, and to the events which have brought about the purchase? Thus, if these verses point back to what lies before and outside them, the earlier parts of the narrative provide us with the necessary information concerning and exactly corresponding to that reference. So that I really do not know why we are not to believe that the one and the other—without secondary adaptations or misleading disguises of other matter contained in them—belong as

\textsuperscript{1} May I adduce, for purposes of comparison, something in the same connection? The welding of the Ṛgvedic material to form sacrificial liturgies differs, as is acknowledged, often and materially from its construction in the Ṛksanhitā. Here the tendency arose to conclude from this fact that the façade of our Ṛgveda was, to a great extent, only façade; that much of what was seen revealed itself to criticism as composed of quite different forms lying behind it. How this distrust of what has been handed down to us—this tendency to look behind imagined curtains—should, in my opinion, be regarded, I have set forth in \textit{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 Śunahşepa story as a whole, the result will, I think, be essentially different from Keith's, "that if the story of Śunahşepa is a genuine Ākhyāna, no more extraordinary literary type ever existed." That the well-known interweaving of the Rgvedic 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 Rtvij, when we consider the ideas held in the Brāhmaṇa age as to the beginnings of Rgvedic 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 Rgvedic 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 tād yad ado gāthā bhavati (in the text of the strophe clearly to be read apa yo jahāra; also ruwaddhu! But cp. Jāt. 488, verse 2, bhavanti. The corruption might depend upon § 12). Cp. Hopkins' Great Epic, 381 n. 3; Geldner, ZDMG. LXV, 306 ff. See also Charpentier, ibid., LXIV, 65 ff.
dependent narratives. 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. Kāṭh. XXX, 1; so also, with the Buddhists, a gāthā of the Sundarikabhāravājasutta, 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. As conclusion: ity asurarakṣasāṇy apeyuh, as it is usually called with the Buddhists, when Māra and Buddha have interchanged verses: atha kho Māro pāpimā tatthevantaradḥāyīti. The Chāndogya Upaniṣad IV, 3, narrates in prose how a brahmačārin begs from two brahmīns. 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 sloka follows: Na me steno janapade na kadaryo na madyapo, nānāhitāgnir nāvidvān na scairī scairiṇī kutah. Thus here also, in a prominent place of the story, is a verse in the middle of the prose. The Kathopaniṣad 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 Rgveda will not expect to be able to prove, that joining the songs to Pavamāna into one mandala was the only conceivable alternative to the distribution of the songs to the other gods into all the mandalas.

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 Śaunahṣepam is instructive. Opposite to the officiating priest sits another on an equally sumptuous seat. The latter’s whole task consists in responding to every Rg which occurs in the discourse with an om, to every non-Rgvedic verse with a tathā. Are not these verses in consequence lifted above the prose context of the narrative as of greater significance, like the peah, 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 pārīplavam (Śat. Br. XIII, 4, 3; Āśv. Śraut. X, 7; Sāṅkś. Sr. XVI, 2); the om and tathā recall a certain similarity (how far-reaching may be questioned) with the structure of the Śaunahṣepam. We may recall the narrative addresses described by Sāṅkhāyana Sr. XVI, 11, at the head of which the Śaunahṣepam 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 Rgveda. 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.

¹ That when anywhere in some longer prose text the recital of a story is told or described (Śaunahṣepam 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

YAMAKAPPAKARĀṆĀTTHAKATHĀ

FROM THE

PAṬCAPPAKARĀṆĀTTHAKATHĀ.

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 devānaṅ ānāy devo devo surālaye
Kathāvatthuppakaranāṅ desayitvā raṇaṅ javo
Yamassa visayātito nānāyamakamanītitaṅ
Abhidhammappakaranāṅ chaṭṭhaṅ chaṭṭhānadesito
Yamakaṅ ayam āvatta-nilāmalatanaṅuruho.
Yañ desayi anuppatto tassa saṅvannanākkhamo
Idāni yasā tasmāssa hoti saṅvannanā ayaṅ ti.


Tattha yesaṅ dasannaṅ Yamakānaṅ vasena idaṅ pakaraṇaṅ dasavidhena vibhattaṅ, tesāṅ ceva imassa ca pakaraṇassā nām’ attho tāva evaṅ veditabbo.


[Mūla-Yamakaṅ.]

Tattha mūlavasena pucchāvissajjanaṅ katvā desitattā dasannaṅ tāva sabbapathamaṅ Mūla-Yamakan ti vuttaṅ. Tassa uddesavāro niddesavāro ti dve vārā honti. Tesu uddiṭṭhānukkamena niddisitabbatta uddesavāro pathamo. Tassa ye keci kusala dhammā sabbe te kusalamūla; ye vā pana kusalamūla sabbe te dhammā kusalā ti idaṅ yamakaṅ

1 Br. "desako.
2 S. "akkamo.
3 Br. tesañ.
4 Br. yugala°.
5 Br. p'etaṅ.
6 S. "tabban ti.
ädi. Tassa kusala - kusalamūlasankhātānaṃ\(^1\) dvinnaṃ atthānaṃ vasena attha-yamakan ti vā tesaṃ\(^2\) yeva atthānaṃ vasena anuloma - paṭilomato pavattapālidhammavasena dhamma-yamakan ti vā, anuloma-paṭilomato pavattapucchā-vasena pucchā-yamakan ti vā tidhāyamakabhāvo veditabbo. Sesseu pi es'eva nayo.

Idāni imesaṃ yamakānaṃ vasena desite imasmiṃ Mūla-Yamake uddesavārassa tāva naya-yamaka-pucchā-atthava-vārappabhedavasena paḷi-vavatthānam eva veditabbān.


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

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

Yathā ca kusalapadaṃ nissāya ime cattāro nayā; ekekasmiṃ naye tiṇṇaṃ tiṇṇaṃ yamakānaṃ vasena dvādasa yamakāni, ekekasmiṃ yamake dvinnaṃ dvinnaṃ pucchānaṃ vasena catuvīsati pucchā; ekekāya pucchāya dvinnan dvinnaṃ atthānaṃ vasena aṭṭhacattārisaṃ\(^3\) atthā va\(^4\) honti. Akusalapadaṃ nissāya pi tath'eva; avyākatapadaṃ nissāya pi tath'eva; tiṇi pi padāni ekato katvā nidīṭṭhān; nāmapadaṃ nissāya pi tath'evāti, kusalattikamātikāya catuṣu padesu sabbe pi sōla savagatha atthacattārīsaṃ\(^5\) yamakāni,

\(^1\) S. Tassa kusalaṃ ca sankhātānaṃ.
\(^2\) Br. tesañneva.
\(^3\) Br. cattaliṣaṃ.
\(^4\) Br. omits.
\(^5\) Br. cattaliṣa.
channavuti pucchā, dve navuti sataj atthā ca uddesavasena vutta ti veditabbo.

Ettāvata mūlavāro nāma paṭhamañ1 udditṭho2 hoti. Tato parañ ye keci kusalā dhāmmā sabbe te kusalahetū ti ādayo tass'eva mūlavārassa vevacanavasena nava vārā udditṭhā. Iti mūlavāro, hetuvaro, nidānavāro, sambhavāro, pabhavāro, samaṭṭhānavāro, āharavāro, ārammanavāro, paccayavāro, samudayavāro ti sabbe pi dasa vārā honti.


Tattha mulādini sabbāni pi kāraṇavevacanān'eva. Kāraṇañ3 hi paṭṭhānaṭṭhena mulañ; attano phalanippadhanaṭṭhān4 hinoti pavattatiti hetu; handa nañ ganhathāti dassentañ viya attano phalañ nideṭṭhi nidadañ; etasmā phalañ sambhavatiti5 sambhavo; pabhavatiti pabhavo; samaṭṭhāti ettha phalañ, etena vá samaṭṭhātiti samaṭṭhānay; attano phalañ āharatiti ahāro; appatikkhipitabb'atthena attano phalena ālambiyatiti ārammanay; etañ paṭicca appatikkhipitvā phalañ eti pavattatiti paccayo; etasmā phalañ samudetiti samudayo ti evam eva etesañ padānañ vacanattho veditabbo.

Uddesavāravaṇāṇā niṭṭhitā.

Idāni ye keci kusalā dhāmmā6 ti adinā nayena niddesavāro āraddho. Tattha ye kecitī anavasesavacanañ. Kusalā dhāmmā ti kusalattikassa padabhājane vuttalakkhaṇā ana-

1 S. omits.  2 S. udditṭhabbo.  3 Br. Kāraṇañ.  4 S. "nippā".  5 B. sambhotiti.  6 Y. p. 3 (vol. i. for all references till end of Cy. on Anusaya-Yama'va).
vajjasukhavigākā kusalasabhāvā. Sabbe te kusalamulā ti kinte sabbe yeva kusalamulā ti pucchati.


Iminā upāyena sabbapucchāsu vissajjananayay veditabbo. Yaṅ pana yattha visesamattāy, tad eva vaṅpayissāma.


Kusalamulā - samuṭṭhānan ś ti kusalacittasamuṭṭhānaṃ rūpasā dassetāy. Ekamulān ti abobhādinā kusalamulēna samānamulāṇ. Yath' eva hi phassādinaṃ abobhādayo hettupaccayattā mulaṃ, tathā taṃ-samuṭṭhānaṃrūpasāpi; kusalalakkaṇābhāvena pana, taṃ na kusalāṇ.


Mūlāni yaṇi ekato uppaññantiti hi vuttaṃ. Tāni pana kusalamulāṇi pi honti, akusala-avyākatamulāṇi pi; idha kusalamulāṇiti visesadassananathham idan vuttaṃ. Aṇāmanāṇamulāni cāti aṇāmanāṇaṃ hettupaccayena paccayaḥ hontiti attho. Tass'eva paṭilomapucchāya sabbe te

---

1. S. omits.
2. Br. mūlāni.
5. Y. 4.
7. Cf. Paṭṭhāna. Aṇāmanāṇapaccayo is the seventh of the twenty-four relations among phenomena.


Mūlakanayena kusalamūlakā ti hetupaccayaṭṭhena kusalaṁ mūlaṁ etesan ti kusalamūlakā.

Mūlamūlakanayena kusala-mūlamūlakā ti kusalānaṁ mūlaṁ kusalamūlaṁ. Hetupaccayaṭṭhena' eva kusalamūlaṁ mūlaṁ etesan ti kusalamūlamūlakā ti ayaṁ tava kusalapadaṁ nissāya naya-yamaka-pucchāsu visesaṭṭho.

Akusala-padādisu pi es' eva nayo. Ayaṁ pana viseseso: āhetukāy akusalan ti vicikicchāya eva uddhaccena ca sampayuttaṁ mohaṁ sandhāya vuttan; āhetukāy avyākatana ti atṭhārasa cittuppādā arūpaṁ nibbānaṁ ca. Avyākatamūlena ekamūlag ³ ti idha pana ṭhapetvā sahetuka-avyākatasamūṭṭhānaṁ rūpaṁ sesaṁ labbhati. Sahetuka-avyākatasaṁūṭṭhānaṁ rūpaṁ avyākatamūlaṁ ekamūlaṁ hoti. Taṁ abbhohārikaṁ ⁴ katvā ekato labbhāmaṇakavasen' eva c'etāṁ vissajjanaṁ kataṁ.

Nāma dhammā ti nāmasankhātā dhammā. Te atthato cattāro arūpino khandhā nibbānaṁ ca. Nav'eva nāmamūlāniti kusalakusala-avyākatamūlāvasena nava mūlāni. Āhetukaṁ nāmaṁ nāmamūlāna na ekamūlan ti āhetukaṁ sabbam pi atṭhārasa cittuppādāvicikicchā-uḍḍhacca ⁵ sampayutta-moha-nibbānasankhātaṁ nāmaṁ nāmamūlāna na.

¹ Br. kusalamūlā ti. ² Br. kusalamūlasan.³ Y. 8 (2). ⁴ Br. abbo, ⁵ Br. vicikicchuddha.
Mūlavāra-vaññanā niṭṭhitā.

Hetuvārādisu\(^1\) pi iminā va upāyena\(^2\) attho veditabbo. Mūlañ hetu nidānañ cāti gathā yathā nidditthānañ dasan-nam pi vāranañ puna udārvasen' eva\(^3\) vutta ti.
Mūla-Yamaka-vaññanā niṭṭhitā.

II

[Khandha-Yamakaj.]

Idāni Mūla - Yamake desite yeva kusalādi dhamme khandhavasena sangañhitvā Mūla-Yamakānantarañ desitassa Khandha-Yamakassa vaññanā hoti.


Tattha paññattivāro uddesaniddesa-vasena dvihākārehī vavatthito.\(^4\) Itaresu visuñ uddesavāro natthi; ādito paṭṭhāya pucchāvissajjanavasena ekadhā vavatthitā.

Tattha paucakkhandhāti padañ adiñ katvā, yāva nā khandhā na sankheñā ti padañ tāva paññattivārassa uddesavāro veditabbo. Pucchāvāro ti pi tass' eva nāmañ. Tattha paucakkhandhāti ayañ yamakavasena pucchita-bānañ khandhānañ uddeso.\(^5\)

Rāpakkhandho ... pe ... riññānakkhandho\(^6\) ti tesaj yeva pabhedato nāmavavatthānañ. Idāni imesañ khan-

\(^1\) Y. 18.\(^2\) Br. vupāy.\(^3\) S. uddān.\(^4\) Br. pavattito.\(^5\) S. uddesavāro.\(^6\) Y. 14.
dhānaj vasena (1) padasodhanavāro khandhānaj vasena, (1) padasodhanavāro, (2) padasodhanamulacakkavāro, (3) suddhakkhandhavāro, (4) suddhakkhandhamulacakkavāro ti cattāro nayavārā honti. Tattha rūpay rūpakkhandho, rūpan¹ ti ādīnā nayena padam eva sodhetvā gato padasodhanavāro nāma. So anuloma-pāṭilomavasena duvidho hoti. Tassa anulomavāre rūpay rūpakkhandho ... rūpan ti ādīnī pañca yamakāni. Paṭilomavāre pi na rūpay na rūpakkhandho, na rūpakkhandho na rūpay ti ādīnī pañcē eva.


Eso pi ca suddhakkhandhavāro anuloma-pāṭilomavasena

¹ Y. 14. ² Y. 15. ³ Y. 18 (5). ⁴ Y. cf. 15, n. 2.
duvidho hoti. Tassa anulomavāre rūpay khandho, khandhā rūpan\(^1\) ti ādīnī paṅca yaṃakāṇī; paṭilomavāre pi na rūpay na khandho, na khandhā na rūpan ti ādīnī paṅcē eva.

Tato paraṇ tesāṇ yeva suddhakhandhānaṇaṇ rūpay khandho, khandhā vedanā\(^2\) ti ādīnā nayena ekeka khandhamulakāṇī cattāri cattāri cakkāṇi bandhitvā gato suddhakhandhamulakānaṇaṇ caikkānaṇat attithāya suddhakhandhamulacakka-vāro nāma. Tattha khandhā vedanā ti ādīsu khandhā vedanākkhandho ti ādīnā nayena attho veditabbo.

Itarathā niddesavārenā saddhiṣ̥ virodho hoti. So pi anuloma-paṭilomavasena duvidho hoti. Tassa anulomavāre rūpay khandho, khandhā, vedanā ti ādīni ekeka khandhamulakāṇi cattāri cattāri katvā visati yaṃakāṇī; paṭilomavāre pi na rūpay na khandho, na khandhā na vedanā ti ādīni visatim eva. Evaṇ taṇa ekena yamakasatena dvihī pucchāsatehi ekeka-pucchāya sanmiṭṭhāna-saṅsayavasena dve dve atthe katvā catūhi ca atthasatehi patimandito paṃṇattivārassa uddesavāro veditabbo ti.

Uddesavāravāṇanā niṭṭhitā.

Idāni rūpay rūpakkhandho\(^3\) ti ādīnā nayena niddesavāro āraddho. Tattha rūpay rūpakkhandho ti yaṃ kiṃci rūpan ti vucesati, sabban taṇ rūpakkhandho ti vacanasodhanathan puchhati. Piyarūpay sātaripūray na rūpakkhandho ti yaṃ piyarūpay sātarūpan ti ettha rūpan ti vuttaṇ; taṇ rūpam eva, na rūpakkhandho ti attho.

Rūpakkhandho rūpay ceva rūpakkhandho cāti yo pana rūpakkhandho so rūpan ti pi rūpakkhandho ti pi vastuṇ vaṭṭatiti attho. Rūpakkhandho rūpan ti ettha pana yasmā rupakkhandho niyamen’ eva rūpan ti vattabbo, tasmā āmanto tī āha. Iminā upāyena sabbavissajjanesu attho veditabbo. Yo pana yattha viseso bhavissati, tatth’ eva taṇ vanṇayissāma.

Saṃāyamake tava diṭṭhisāṇānā ti paṇaṃcasaaṇā ti ādīsu āgata diṭṭhisāṇānā. Sankhārayamake arasesā sankhārā ti anicca vata sankhāraṇā ti ādīsu āgata sankhārakkhandhato

\(^1\) Y. 15 (5). \(^2\) Ibid. (6). \(^3\) Y. 16 (1).
avasesā sankhatadhammā. Paṭilomavāre pi es' eva nayo ti.

Padasodhanavāro niṭṭhito.

Padasodhana-mūlacakkaṅvāre khandhā vedanākkhandho¹ ti ye keci khandhā sabbe te vedanākkhandho ti pucchatī. Sesapucchāsū pi es' eva nayo. Paṭilome na khandhā na vedanākkhandho² ti ettha ye paññatti-nibbānasankhātā dhammā khandhā na honti, te yasmā vedanākkhandho pi na honti, tasmā āmantā ti āha. Sesavissajanesu pi es' eva nayo ti.

Padasodhanamūlacakkaṅvāro niṭṭhito.

Suddhakhandhavāre rūpaṅ khandho³ ti yaṅ kiṅci rūpaṅ ti vuttaṅ sabban taṅ khandhā ti pucchatī. Tattha yasmā piyarūpasātarūpasankhātāvā rūpaṅ hotu bhūtupādā rūpaṅ vā, sabbaṅ paṅcasu khandhesu sangahaṅ gacchāt eva, tasmā āmantā ti paṭijānātī.

Dutiye pade⁴ khandhā rūpaṅ ti pucchitabbe, yasmā rūpaṅ ti vacanena rūpakkhandho ca adhippeto, tasmā vacanaṅ anādiyitvā atthvasena pucchanto khandhā rūpak-khandho ti āha. Iminā nayena sabbapadesu attho veditabbo.

Parato Āyatana-Yamakādinaṅ niddlesavāre pi es' eva nayo.

Saṅkhaṅkhandho ti etthāpi diṭṭhisāṅnā vā hotu saṅnā eva vā, sabbaya⁵ pi khandhabhāvato āmantā ti vuttaṅ.

Saṅkhāraquo sankhārakkhandho ti pade pi es' eva nayo. Khandhavinimmuttako hi sankhāro nāma natthi.

Paṭilome na rūpāṅ na khandho⁷ ti yaṅ dhhammajātaṅ rūpāṅ na hoti, taṅ khandhā pi na hoti pucchatī; vissajjane pan' assa rūpāṅ ṭhapetrā avasesā khandhā na rūpak-khandho ti rūpato aṅne vedanādayo khandhā, rūpam eva na honti, khandhā pana hontiti attho. Rūpaṅ ca khandhe ca ṭhapetrā avasesan ti paṅca-khandha-vinimuttaṅ nibbānaṅ

---
¹ Y. 17 (3 b). ² Y. 18 (4'). ³ Ibid. 5. ⁴ Br. dutiyay. 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.

Suddhakhandhamūlacakkaṇavāre rūpakkhandho¹ ti ādīnāḥ hetṭhā vuttanayen' eva attho veditabbo ti. Suddhakhandhamūlacakkaṇava niṭṭhito.

Paññattivāranāṇanā niṭṭhitā.

Idāni yassa rūpakkhandho ti ādīnā nayena pavattivāro āraddho. Kasmā paṃ ettha uddesavāro na vutto ti? Hetṭhā dassitanayattā paññattivārasmiḥ hi uddesavāre nayo dassito. Tena pana nayena sakkā so idha avutto² pi vijānitun ti³ taṭ avatvā niddesavāro 'va āraddho. Imasmiḥ pana pavattivārasanikkhāte mahāvāre uppādavāro, nirodhavāro, uppādanirodhavāro ti tayo antaravāra honti. Tesu paṭhamo dhammānaṃ uppādalakkhaṇassā dipitattā uppādavāro ti vuccati; dutiyō taṣāḥ yeva nirodhakkaṇassā dipittā nirodhavāro ti; tatiyo ubhinnam pi lakkhaṇānaṃ dipittā uppādanirodhavāro ti vuccati. Uppādavārena c' ettha dhammānaṃ uppajjanākāro va dipito; nirodhavārena uppанаṃ nāma niccaḥ natthiti taṣāḥ yeva aniccatā dipitā; uppādanirodhavārena tadubbhayaḥ.

Tattha uppādavāre tāva tinnaḥ tinnāḥ addhānaḥ vasena cha kālabhedā honti: paccuppanno, atīto, anāgato, pacuppannenatīto, pacuppannenanāgato, atitenanāgato ti. (1) Tesu⁴ yassa rūpakkhandho uppaṭijñāti paccuppannabhiddhānnavasena, pacuppanno veditabbo. So pacuppannānaṃ dhammānaṃ paccakkhāto⁵ gahetabbā ativiyā suviññeyyo ti paṭhamaṃ vutto. (2) Yassa rūpakkhandho uppaṭijñāthāti⁶ atitābhiddhānnavasena atīto veditabbo. So paccakkhāto⁵ anubhūtapubbānaḥ atitadhammānaḥ anumāṇena anāgatehi suviññeyyatārattā dutiyāḥ vutto. (3) Yassa rūpakkhandho uppaṭijñāsattāti⁷ anāgatābhiddhānnavasena anāgato veditabbo. So paccakkhāto⁵ ca anubhūtapubbavasena ca gahitadhammānumāṇena anāgate pi evarūpā dhammā uppaṭijñāsantīti

¹ Y. 19 (7). ² Br. avitto. ³ Br. jānitun.
⁴ Y. 19, 1, i. ⁵ Br. paccakkhato. ⁶ Y. 21, 8, i.
⁷ Y. 22, 5, i.
gahetabbato tatiya vutto. (4) Yassa rūpakkhandho uppajjati tassa vedanākkhando uppajjithāti¹ paccuppanne saddhiḥ atītabhidhānavasena paccuppannenātīto veditabbo. So missakesu tisu suviññeyyatattā catutthaḥ vutto. (5) Yassa rūpakkhandho uppajjathi tassa vedanākkhando uppajjissatitī² paccuppannena saddhiḥ anāgatābhidhānavasena paccuppannenaṇāgato veditabbo. So paccakkhato³ gahetabbānaḥ atthiṣaya atthato⁴ suviññeyyatāro ti pañcamaṣṭaḥ vutto. (6) Yassa rūpakkhandho uppajjiththa tassa vedanākkhandho uppajjissatitī⁵ atitena saddhiḥ anāgatābhidhānavasena atitenānāgato veditabbo. So purimehi duviññeyyo ti chaṭṭhaḥ vutto.

Evam etesu chasu kālabhededu yvayaṇ paṭhamo paccuppanno.

Tattha (1) puggalato (2) okāsato (3) puggalokāsato ti tayo vārā honti. Tesu yassāti puggalavasena khandhānaḥ uppatti dipano puggalavāro, yatthāti okāsavasena khandhānaḥ uppatti dipano okāsavāro, yassa yatthāti puggalokāsavasena khandhānaḥ uppatti dipano puggalokāsavāro: ime pana tayo pi vārā paṭhamaṇā anulomanayena niddisitvā, pacchā paṭilomanayena nidiṭṭhā; tesu uppajjati, uppajjiththa, uppajjissatitī vacanato uppattitidipano anulomanayo, nuppajjati, nuppajjiththa, nuppajjissatitī vacanato anuppattitidipano paṭilomanayo. Tattha paccuppannakaāle⁶ tāva puggalavārassa anulomanaya yassa rūpakkhandho uppajjati tassa vedanākkhandho uppajjati; yassa va pana vedanākkhandho uppajjati tassa rūpakkhandho uppajjati; yassa rūpakkhandho uppajjati tassa saṅnakkhandho, sankhārakkhandho, viññānakkhandho uppajjati. Yassa va pana viññānakkhandho uppajjati tassa rūpakkhandho uppajjatitī⁷ evaṣ rūpakkhandho mulakāni cattāri yamakāni. Yassa vedanākkhandho uppajjati, tassa saṅnakkhandho uppajjatitī ādinā nayena vedanākkhandhamulakāni tīṇi, saṅnakkhandhamulakāni dve, sankhārakkhandhamulakā ekan ti agahitaggahāṇena⁸ dasa yamakāni honti.

¹ Y. 23, 7, i. ² Y. 25, 9, i. ³ Br. paccakkhato. ⁴ S. atṭhato. ⁵ Y. 28, 11, i. ⁶ S. no kālena. ⁷ Y. 19 f. ⁸ So S. and Br. cf. 55, n. 3.
Tattha rūpakkhandhamūlakesu catūsu ādito ekam eva vissajjitaṃ. Sesāni tena sadisa-vissajjanāṇīti tantiyā lahu-bhāvatthāyaṃ sankhīttāni.

Vedanākkhandhādi mūlakesu pi āmantā ti ekasadisam eva vissajjanaṃ, tasmā tāni pi tantiyā lahu-bhāvatthāyaṃ sankhīttāṃ' evāti evam etāni paccuppannakāle puggalavāre anulomanaye ekayamaka-vissajjanen' eva dasa yamakāni vissajjitaṃ nāma hontiti veditabbāni.


Pāli pana uppādavāre nirodhavāre ca tiṃu asammissakālabhadesu tasmiṃ tasmiṃ vāre ekekam eva yamakaṇ vissajjētvā sankhīttā; tiṃu missakakālabhadesu. Yasass vedenākkhandho uppaṭtī, tassa saṇṇākkhandho uppaṭṭhāti adinā nayena vedenākkhandhādi mūlakesu pi ekaṇ yamakaṇ vissajjitaṃ, uppādanairodhavāre pana chasu pi kālabhadesu vissajjitaṃ eva. Sesāni tena samānavissajjanattā sankhīttāṇī tīdaṃ sakale pi pavattimahāvāre pāli-vavatthānaṃ. Attha vinicchayatthānaṃ par' assa idaṃ lakkhaṇaṃ veditabbaṃ. Imasmiṃ hi pavatti-mahāvāre catunnaṃ paṇhānaṃ pañca vissajjanāṇi sattavisatiyā thānesu pakkhipitvā atthavinicchayo veditabbo.

1 Y. 23, 7, i. 2 S. inserts vasena.
Tattha (1) purepañho, (2) pacchāpañho, (3) paripunna-pañho, (4) moghapañho ti ime cattāro pañhā nāma. Ekekasmīni 1 yamake dve dve pucchā; ekekapucchāya pi dve dve padāni. (1) Tattha yāya pucchāya vissajjane ekeken’eva padena gahitakhandhassa uppādo vā niruddho vā labbhati, ayañ purepañho nāma. (2) Yāya pana pucchāya vissajjane dvīhi pi padehi gahitakhandhānañj uppañdo vā niruddho vā labbhati, ayañ pacchāpañho nāma. (3) Yāya pana pucchāya vissajjane ekena pi padena gahitakhandhassa dvīhi pi padehi gahitakhandhānañj uppañdo vā niruddho vā labbhati, ayañ paripunna pañho nāma. (4) Yāya pana pucchāya vissajjane paṭikkhepo vā paṭisedho vā labbhati, ayañ moghapañho nāma.

Yasmā pañ’ esa adassiyamāno na sakka jānituñ, tasmā dassayissāma.

(1) Tattha rūpakkhandho nappajjati tattha vedanākkhandho nappajjatiti 2 pucchāya, táva nappajjatiti imasmīni vissajjane eken’eva padena gahitassa vedanākkhandhassa uppādo labbhati iti ayañ ceva añño ca evarūpo pañho pure-pañho ti veditabbo. Yassa rūpakkhandho uppajjitha, tassa vedanākkhandho uppajjithati 3 pucchāya pana āmantā ti imasmīni vissajjane [eken’eva padena gahitassa vedanākkhandhassa] 4 dvīhi padehi gahitānañj rūpa-vedanākkhandhānañj, yassa kassaci sattassa atite uppañdo labbhati. Iti ayañ ceva añño ca evarūpo pañho pacchāpañho ti veditabbo. (3) Yassa rūpakkhandho uppajjati, tassa vedanākkhandho uppajjatiti 5 imāya pana pathama-pucchāya asaṅnasattaj uppajjantanan ti ādike imasmīni vissajjane asaṅnasatte 6 uppajjantanan añj tesaj rūpakkhandho uppajjati, no ca tesaj vedanākkhandho uppajjatiti imasmīni koṭṭhāse eken’eva padena gahitassa rūpakkhandhassa pi uppañdo labbhati. Paṅcarokkāraj uppajjantanan añj tesaj rūpakkhandho ca uppajjati vedanākkhandho ca uppajjatiti imasmīni koṭṭhāse dvīhi pi padehi sangahitānañj rūpa-vedanākkhandhānam pi uppañdo labbhati: iti ayañ ceva añño ca eva rūpo pañho paripunna pañho ti veditabbo.

---
1 Ekekasmīni hi.
2 Y. 20, 2. ii.
3 Y. 21 3, 1.
4 Br. omitis.
5 Y. 19, 1, 1.
6 Br. "sattaj upapaj".
(4) Purepacchāpañhe ti pi ēs' eva nayo.1 Etassa hi vissaj-jane purimakoṭṭhāse ekena padena sangahitassa rūpak-khandhass' eva uppādo dassito; dutiya-koṭṭhāse dvīhi padehi sangahitānaññ rūpa-vedānākkhandhānaññ, iminā yeva ca lakkhaññena yattha ekena padena sangahitassa khan-
dhassa uppādo vā nirodho vā labbhati, so purepañho ti vutto. Yattha hi dvīhi pi padehi sangahitānaññ khan-
dhānaññ uppādo vā nirodho vā labbhati, so pacchāpañho ti vutto.

Yassa rūpakkhandho nuppajjitthā, tassa vedānākkhandho nuppajjitthāti2 imāya pana pucchāya natthiti: imasmiñ vissajjane paṭikkhepo labbhati.

Yassa rūpakkhandho uppañjati, tassa vedānākkhandho nirupajjhatiti3 pucchāya no ti: imasmiñ vissajjane paṭisedho labbhati, tasmā ayañ ceva duvidho añño ca evarūpo pañho moghapañho ti veditabbo. Tucchapañho ti pi veccati.

Evañ tāva cattāro pañhā veditabbā.

Yañ4 (1) pāligatiyā vissajjanaññ (2) paṭivacana-vissaj-
janaññ (3) sarūpa-dassanena vissajjanaññ (4) paṭikkhepena-
vissajjanaññ (5) paṭisedhena-vissajjanaññ ti imāni pana pañca
vissajjānañi nāma.

(1) Tattha yañ vissajjanaññ palipadam eva hutvā atthañ
vissajjeti, idañ pāligatiyā vissajjanaññ nāma. Tañ5 pure
pañhe labbhati. Yattha rūpakkhandho nuppajjati, tattha vedānākkhandho nuppajjatiti6 hi pañhe, uppañjāti: idañ
vissajjanaññ palipadam eva hutvā atthañ vissajjayaṁanāñ
gatañ, tasmā evarūpesu ṭhānesu pāligatiyā vissajjanañ
veditabbāñ.

(2) Yañ pana vissajjanaññ paṭivacanabhāvena atthañ
vissajjeti, idañ paṭivacana-vissajjanaññ nāma; tañ pacchā-
pañhe labbhati. Yassa rūpakkhandho uppañjittā, tassa
vedānākkhandho uppañjittāti hi pañhe amantā7 ti idañ
vissajjanaññ paṭivacanavasen' eva atthañ vissajjayamānāñ
gatañ, tasmā evarūpesu ṭhānesu paṭivacana-vissajjanañ
veditabbāñ.

1 Br. etass' eva nāmañ.
2 Y. 21, 4, i.
4 Br. omitis.
5 S. Ete.
6 Y. 20, 2, ii.
7 Y. 21, 4, i.
(3) যাঁর বিসাজানাঁর সারিপেনা দাস্তী অথেষ্ট বিসাজেতি, ইদাঁ সারিপাদাসনান্দা বিসাজানাঁর নামা, তাঁ পারিপুষ্পা-পাঙ্খে লাভবিয়। যাসা রুপাক্ষান্দো উপাজজিতি, তাসা বেদাণ্যক্ষান্দো উপাজজিতি১ হি পাঙ্খেহি আসাঙ্গাসাত্তায় উপাজ-জিতা নাতি: ইদাঁ বিসাজানাঁর ইমেসাঁ রুপাক্ষান্দো উপাজ-জিতি, নো কা বেদাণ্যক্ষান্দো, [ইমেসাঁ]২ রুপাক্ষান্দো কা উপাজজিতি বেদাণ্যক্ষান্দো কাতি সারিপাদাসনান্দা যে অথেষ্ট বিসাজানাঁর লাভবিয়ানাঁর গাতাঁ, ত্সমা এবরিপুসা ত্সানুশ সারিপাদাসনান্দা বিসাজানাঁর লাভবিয়ানাঁ বিদ্যাত্বা।

(4) যাঁর পনা বিসাজানাঁর, তাথারুপাসা অথসা অথাই অথাই পাঙ্খেহু, অথেষ্ট পাথিক- পৃথিকায় বিসাজানাঁর নামা। যাঁর তাথারুপাসা অথসা বেদাণ্যান্দা কাক্ষান্দা অথাই অথাই পাঙ্খেহু, পাথিকহু বিসাজ- জিতি, ইদাঁ পাথিকহু বিসাজানাঁর নামা। তাঁ মথা- পাঙ্খে লাভবিয়। যাসা রুপাক্ষান্দো উপাজজিতা নো কা বেদাণ্যক্ষান্দো উপাজজিতা হি পাঙ্খে, নাতথিতি ইদাঁ বিসাজানাঁর এবরিপু নামা সাত্ত নাতথিতি অথেষ্ট-পাথিকক্ষান্দো পাঙ্খে বিসাজানাঁর লাভবিয়ানাঁর গাতাঁ, ত্সমা এবরিপুসা ত্সানুশ পাথিকহু বিসাজানাঁর পাথিকক্ষান্দো-বিসাজানাঁর৪ বিদ্যাত্বা।

(5) যাসা রুপাক্ষান্দো উপাজজিতি তাসা বেদাণ্যক্ষান্দো নিরুজজিতাতি৫ পাঙ্খে পনা নো কা ইদাঁ বিসাজানাঁর পাক্ষিক পাথিকহু বিসাজানাঁর লাভবিয় পাথিক নিরূপ না নামা লাভবিয়া অথেষ্ট-পাথিকহু বিসাজানাঁর লাভবিয়ানাঁর গাতাঁ, ত্সমা এবরিপুসা ত্সানুশ পাথিকহু বিসাজানাঁর-বিসাজানাঁর৬ বিদ্যাত্বা।

ইদানি ইমে কাত্তারু পাঙ্খে ইমানী কা পাঙ্খে বিসাজানাঁনি যেসা সাত্তা বিসাতঁয় ত্সানুশ পাক্ষিকপীতাবিয়ানি তানি এবাঁ বিদ্যাত্বা৯। আসাঙ্গাসাত্তায় উপাজজিতানাঁ তি৭ একা ত্সানুশ (১); আসাঙ্গা৮ নাতথী৯ একা তি (২); আসাঙ্গাসাত্তানান তি১০ একা (৩); আসাঙ্গা১১ বাঙ্গানানান তি১২ একা (৪); আরুপারু উপাজজিতানান তি১২ একা (৫); আরুপা নাতথী১৩ একা (৬); আরুপানান তি১৪ একা (৭); আরুপা বাঙ্গানানান তি১৫ একা (৮); আরুপা পাচ্চিমাবরিকান তি১৬ একা (৯); আরুপা পারিনিব্বানান তি১৭ একা (১০); যে কভা অন্যান্য উল্লেখ করা যায়।

---

1 Y. 19, 1, i. 2 Br. omit. 3 Br. arābhato. 4 S. pāṭikkhepa. 5 Y. 41, 1, i. 6 S. pāṭisēda. 7 Y. 19, 1, i. 8 Br. asānāsat. 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, 8, iii. 15 Y. 31, 1, i. 16 Y. 23, 6, iii. 17 Y. 22, 6, i.
arūpaṃ uppajjivā parinibbāyissantīti\textsuperscript{1} ekaṃ (11); pañca-
vokāray uppajjantānaṃ ti\textsuperscript{2} ekaṃ (12); pañcavokārey tatthāti\textsuperscript{3} ekaṃ (13); pañcavokāraya cavantānaṃ ti\textsuperscript{4} ekaṃ (14); pañcavokāraya cavantānaṃ ti\textsuperscript{5} ekaṃ (15); pañcavokāraya pacchimabhavikānaṃ ti\textsuperscript{6} ekaṃ (16); pañcavokāraya parinibbantānaṃ ti ekaṃ (17); suddhāvāsay uppa
jantānaṃ ti ekaṃ (18); suddhāvāsay tatthā ti ekaṃ (19); suddhāvāsanānaṃ ti ekaṃ (20); suddhāvāsanā parinibbantānaṃ ti ekaṃ (21); sabbasaṃ uppa
jantānaṃ ti ekaṃ (22); sabbasaṃ cavantānaṃ ti ekaṃ (23); sabbasa-
sadhārana-vasena pacchimabhavikānaṃ ti ekaṃ (24); parinibbāyantānaṃ ti ekaṃ (25); catuvokāraya pañcavokāray uppa-
jantānaṃ ti ekaṃ (26); cavantānaṃ ti ekaṃ (27); evaṃ imesaṃ catunnaṃ pañhānaṃ imaṇi pañca vissajjanāni imesu satta-visatiyā thānesu pakkhipitvā, imasmiṃ pavattima-
hāvāre aththa-vinicchayo veditabbo.

Evaṃ viditvā hi\textsuperscript{7} pañhaṃ vissajjantena suvissajjito hoti, aththa ca vinicchayantena suvinicchito hoti. Tatrāyaṃ\textsuperscript{8} nayo. Yassa rūpakkhandho uppa
jatiti yassa puggalassa uppādakkhaṇa-samangitāya rūpakkhando uppa
jatiti, tassa veda
nākkhandho uppa
jatiti veda
nākkhandho pī tassa tas-
miṃ yeva khaṇe uppa
jatiti pucchati.

Asaṅnasattāy uppa
jantānaṃ ti acittakapatiṃsandhivasena asaṅnasattabhava
naṃ\textsuperscript{9} uppa
jantānaṃ. Tesāy rūpakkhando uppa
jatiti tesāy ekantena rūpakkhando uppa
jatiti yeva. Pavatte pana tattha uppa
jantānaṃ rūpakkhando uppa
jatiti pī nirujjhati pī, tasmā, asaṅnasattānaṃ ti avatvā, asaṅnasattāy uppa
jantānaṃ ti vutta
ya. No ca tesāy veda
nākkhandho uppa
jatiti acittakatā pana tesāy veda
nākkhandho nuppa
jatiti eva. Idaṃ satta-visatiyā thānesu pāthame thāne paripūnṇapañhassa purimakoṭṭhāse sarūpadassanena vis-
sajjanaṃ. Pañcavokāray uppa
jantānaṃ ti rūparūpa-mi
saka-patiṃsandhivasena pañcavokārabhava
n uppa
jantānaṃ. Tesāy rūpakkhando veda
nākkhandho cāti tesāy ekantena rūpa-veda
nākkhandha-sankhātā dvī pī khandhā uppa
jantि yeva. Pavatte pana tattha uppa
nānaṃ khandhā

\textsuperscript{1} Y. 22, 6, 1.  
\textsuperscript{2} Y. 19, 1, 1.  
\textsuperscript{3} Y. 19, 1, i.ii.  
\textsuperscript{4} Br. *vokāray.  
\textsuperscript{5} Y. 24, iii.  
\textsuperscript{6} Br. tatthāya.  
\textsuperscript{7} S. viditvāna.  
\textsuperscript{8} Y. 29, iii. etc.  
\textsuperscript{9} S. *bhāva.  


Kīṇ pan’ ettha pavattiyān uppāda-nirodhānaḥ anāmatthabhāve pamānan ti? Pāli yeva; Paḷiyeva hi visesena uppāдавāraṁsa anāgatakālavāre pacchimabhāvikānaṁ tesaṁ rūpakkhandho ca nuppajjissati vedanākkhandho ca nuppajjissati ayaṁ Paḷi-atipamāṇam eva. Pacchimabhāvikānaṁ hi pavatte rūpārūpadhammānaḥ uppaḷijitūn, yuttabhāve sati pi rūpakkhandho ca nuppajjissati vedanākkhandho ca nuppajjissatiṁ sannīṭṭhānaṁ katvā vuttaḥāvena pavatte uppādo na gahito ti veditabbo. Siddhāvase parinibbantaṁ tesaṁ tattha saññākkhandho na nirujjhitha, no ca tesaṁ tattha vedanākkhandho na nirujjhati tī ayaṁ pana Pāli pavatte nirodhassā anāmatthabhāve ativiya pamānan. Siddhāvase parinibbantaṁ hi cuticittassa bhangaṃkhane thitanaṁ paṭisandhito paṭṭhaya pavatte uppaḷijitvā nirodh-dhassaññākkhandhānaṁ gaṇanaṁpatho natthi. Evaṁ sante pi tesaṁ tattha¹ saññākkhandho na nirujjhitthi tī sannīṭṭhānaṁ katvā vuttaḥāvena pavatte nirodho na gahito ti veditabbo.

Evam ettha uppāda-nirodhesu niyamalakkhaṇaḥ viditvā paṭisandhi uppādam eva cuti nirodham eva ca gahetvā,

¹ Br. tassa.
tesu tesu ṭhānesu āgatānaḥ vissajjanānaḥ atthavinicchayo veditabbo.

So pana saṅka ṣ aṣi-vissajjane vuttanayena sabbattha viditun¹ ti vissajjana-pañipatiyā na vitthārito. Iminā pana evaṃ dinnenaπī² nayena yo etesaḥ atthavinicchayaḥ jānituṇā na sakkoti, tena ācariye payirūpāsitvā sādhukaḥ suttā vijānītabbo.

Uppādassa nirodhassa ubhinnaḥ cāpi ekako
Nayassa anulomassa paṭiloma-nayassa ca
Vasena yāni khandhesu yamakāni ca paṇcasu
Puggalaṃ atha okāsāṃ puggalokāsam eva ca.
Āmasitvā pavattesse ṭhānesu³ kathayī jino
Tesaḥ Pāḷivavatthānaḥ dassitaḥ anupubbato.
Vinicchayatthaḥ atthassa paṅhā vissajjanāni ca
Vissajjanānaḥ ṭhānāni yāni tāni ca sabbaso
Dassetvā eka-paṅhāsminiḥ yojanā pi pakāsitā
Vitthārena gate ettha paṅhā-vasojjanakkame.
Atthaḥ vānṇayatā kātuṇā kiṇ nu saṅka ṣ iṇ parāṇa
Nayena iminā tasmā athaḥ jānantu paṇḍitā ti.

Pavattivāra-vānṇanaḥ niṣṭhitā.

Tadanantare pariṇāvāre pi chāl'eva kālabheda anulomama paṭilomato dve yeva nayā: puggala-vāro okāsavāro puggalokāsavāro ti imesu pana tisu puggalavāro va labbhati, na itare dve.

Kiṇ kāraṇā? Sadisa-vissajjanatāya. Yo hi koci puggalo yattha kathhaci ṭhāne rūpakkhandhaṇi ce pariṇāṇati, vedanākkhandham pi pariṇāṇati yeva, vedanākkhandhaṇi ce pariṇāṇati, rūpakkhandham pi pariṇāṇati yeva; rūpakkhandhaṇi ce na pariṇāṇati, vedanākkhandham pi na pariṇāṇati yeva, vedanākkhandhaṇi ce na pariṇāṇati, rūpakkhandham pi na pariṇāṇati yeva⁵; tasmā tesu pi yattha rūpakkhandhaṇ pariṇāṇati tattha vedanākkhandhaṇ pariṇāṇati ti ādiṇasesa pucchaḥ katvā āmanta tveva vissajjanaḥ

¹ S. veditun. ² Br. dinnena pi. ³ S. vāresu. ⁴ S. itaro. ⁵ Br. omits.
kātabbaj siyā ti sadisa-vissajjanatāya te idha na labbhan-titi veditabbaj.1


Paṭilomanaye pana na pariṣāṇatiti paṇhesu puthujjanadayo sandhāya āmantā ti vuttaṇ. Pariṣāṇiththāti imasmiṇī pana atitakālavāre maggaṇantarā-aggahale thito pi pariṇākkicceṣa niṭṭhitattā pariṣāṇiththa yeva nāma.

Yo rūpakkhandhay pariṣāṇatī, so vedanākkhandhay pariṣāṇiththāti4 paṇhena aggamaggasamangiṇī pucchati. Yasmā pan' esa khandhapaṇcakaj pariṣāṇatī yeva nāma, na tava niṭṭhitata-paṇīṇākkicco, tasmā no ti paṭisedho kato. Dutiya-paṇhe pana pariṣāṇiththātī arahattaṇ pucchati. Yasmā pan', eso niṭṭhitata-paṇīṇākkicco, natthi tassa pariṇāyeva nāma,
tasma no ti paṭisedho kato. Paṭilomanayavissajane pan’ ettha arahā rūpakkhandhaṇaḥ na pariṇāṇāti arahato pariṇāṇāya abhāvena vuttaṇaḥ; aggamaggasamangī vedanākkhandhaṇaḥ na pariṇāṇīthāti arahattamaggattassage aniṭṭhita-pariṇāṇākiccatayā vuttaṇaḥ. Na kevalāḥ ca vedanākkhandham eva, ekadhammam pi so na pariṇāṇith' eva; idaṃ pana pucchāvasena vuttaṇaḥ. No ca rūpakkhandhan ti idam pi pucchāvasena vuttaṇaḥ; anāṃ pi pana so khandhato pariṇāṇāti, so vedanākkhandhaṇaḥ pariṇāṇissatīti ettha yasmā maggattāhappuggalo ekacittakkhāniko, tasmā so pariṇāṇissatīti sankhaṃ na gacchati. Tena vuttaṇaḥ no ti. Te rūpakkhandhā ca na pariṇāṇīṣūti ettha attho; pucchāvasena na pariṇāṇissatīti pan’ ettha attho. 2 Iminā upāyena sabbatthā atthavinicchayo veditabbo ti.

Pariṇāṇāvāro niṭṭhito.

Khandhayamakavanṇanā niṭṭhito.

[Āyatana-Yamakaṇaḥ.]

Idāni Mūla-Yamake desite yeva kusalādidhamme āyatanaṇāsannāpi sangaṅhitvā Khandha-Yamakānantaraṇ desitassa Āyatana-Yamakassassa vaṇṇanā hoti.


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

Tattha dvādasāyatanānti ayaṇaṃ yamakasena pucchi-

1 Br. khandhaṇaḥ.
2 Br.: Te rūpakkhandhaṇaḥ ca na pariṇāṇīthāti pucchā saṃbhāgena vuttaṇaḥ; na pariṇāṇīṣūti pan’ ettha attho.
3 Br. omits. 4 Br. veditabbo. 5 Y. 52. 6 Y. 53.
tabbānaṃ āyatanānaṃ uddeso. Cakkhāyatanan... pe... dhammadāyatanan ti tesaṃ yeva pabhedaṃ nāma vavattānaṃ. Yamakavasena puchāsukhatthayā 1 c'ettha paṭhamaṃ paṭipātiyā ajjhattarūpāyananī vuttāni, paccābhāhirarūpāyananī, pariyośane manūyatana-dhammadāyananī.


Yathā pana Khandha-Yamake padasodhanavārassa anulomavāre rūpaṃ rūpakkhandho, rūpakkhandho rūpan ti ādini pañca yamakāni, tathā idha cakkhu cakkhāyatanan, cakkhāyatanan cakkhūti ādini dvādasa. Paṭilomavāre pi na cakkhu na cakkhāyatanan, na cakkhāyatanan na cakkhūti ādini dvādasa. Padasodhanamulacakkavārassa pan' ettha anulomavāre ekekāyatanamulakāni ekādasa ekādasa katvā dvattiṣa sataṃ yamakāni, paṭilomavāre pi dvattiṣa satam eva.

Suddhāyatanavārassāpi anulomavāre dvādasa, paṭilomavāre dvādasa.

Suddhāyatanamulacakkavārassāpi anulomavāre ekekāyatanamulakāni ekādasa ekādasa 2 katvā dvattiṣa sataṃ yamakāni, paṭilomavāre dvattiṣa satam evāti evam idha cha sattatādhikehi pañcahi yamakasatehi dvipaṁsasehi ekādasaḥi puchāsatehi catu adhikehi tevisāya atthisatehi ca patimandito Pannattivārassa Uddesavāro veditabbo.

Niddesavāre pan' assa hetṭhā Khandha-Yamakassa Pannattivāra-nidde vuttanayen' eva attho veditabbo aññatra visesa. Tatrāyaṃ viseso dibbaya-cakkhūti 3 dutiya-vijjānaṃ; paññācakkhūti tatiya-vijjānaṃ; dibbasotan ti dutiya-abhivijjānaṃ; taṭhāsotan ti taṭhā va; avaseso kāyo ti nāmakāyo, rūpakāyo, hatthikāyo assakāyo ti evam ādi. Avasesaṃ rūpan ti rūpāyatanato yesaṃ bhūtupādaya.

1 Br. c'ṭthaṃ. 2 Br. ekādasa ekādasa. 3 Y. 53.
rūpañ ca eva piyarūpa-sātarūpañ ca, silakkhandho ti ¹ adini vāyanāṭṭhena silādinañ yeva nāmāni. Attharaso ti adini pi sādumadhurāṭṭhena atthādinañ ca eva nāmāni; avaseso dhammo ti pariyattidhammādi anekappabhedo ti ayam ettha viseso.

Idhāpi ca Pavattivārassa uppādavārādisu tisu antara-vāresu ekekasmīñ chal eva kālabhedā. Tesañ ekekasmīñ kāle Puggalavārādayo tayo tayo vārā. Te sabbe pi anuloma-pañiloma-nayavasena duvidhā honti.

Tattha paccuppannakāle Puggalavārassa anulomanaye yathā Khandha-Yamake rūpakhandhamulakāñi cattāri, vedanākhandhamulakāñi tiñiti saññākhandhamulakāñi dve, sankhāarakhandhamulakāñ ekan ti agahitagganena ² dasa yamakāni honti.

Evañ yassa cakkhāyatananay ³ uppañjati, tassa sotāyatananay uppañjati; yassa vā pana sotāyatananay uppañjati, tassa cakkhāyatananay uppañjati; yassa cakkhāyatananay uppañjati, tassa ghānāyatananay, ⁴ jivhāyatananay, kāyāyatananay, rūpāyatananay, sādāyatananay, gandhāyatananay, rasāyatananay, phoṭṭhappāya-
tanay, manāyatananay, dhammāyatananay uppañjati; yassa vā pana dhammāyatananay uppañjati tassa cakkhāyatananay uppañjati evañ cakkhāyatanamulakāñi ekādasa, yassa sotāya-
tananay uppañjati, tassa ghānāyatananay uppañjatiti adinā nayena sotāyana-mulakāni dasa; ghānāyatanamulakāni nava; jivhāyatanamulakāni atṭha; kāyāyatanamulakāni sattā; rūpāyatanamulakāni cha; sādāyatanamulakāni pañca; gandhāyatanamulakāni cattāri; rasāyatanamulakāni tiñi; phoṭṭhappāyatanamulakāni dve; manāyatanamulakāñ ekan ti agahitagganena ⁵ cha satthi yamakāni honti.

Tattha cakkhāyatanamulakesu ekādasa su yassa cakkhā-
yatananay uppañjati, tassa sotāyatananay, ghānāyatananay, rūpā-
yatananay, manāyatananay, dhammāyatananay uppañjatiti imāni pañc' eva vissajjītāni.

Tesu paṭhamañ vissajjetabbañ tāva vissajjitañ; dutiyañ

¹ Sic. ² gandho. ² Br. agahitagganena. ³ Y. 58, 1 i. f. ⁴ S. ghānā throughout. ⁵ Br. agahitaggə.

Gandharasaphothṭhabbhehi pana saddhiṁ tinī rūpāyatanamanāyatanēhi saddhiṁ sadisavissajjanāni. Yathā eva h’ ettha sarūpakānaṁ acittakānan ti adivuttaṁ, tathā idhāpi sarūpakānaṁ andhakānaṁ arasakānaṁ aphanṭhhabbakānan ti yojetabbā. Gandhādini c’ ettha āyatanaabhūtān eva adhippetāni; tasmā sarūpakānaṁ sagandhāyatanā ti āyatanaivasen’ ettha attho veditabbo.

Saddāyatanamūlakāni attabhāvato Pālij nāruḷhān eva. Gandharasaphothṭhabbamūlakāni cattāri tinī dve ca hetṭhimehi sadisavissajjanattā Pālij nāruḷhāni.

Manāyatananamūlakāva vissajjitaṁ evāti evam etāni pac-cuppannakāle puggalavārassa anulomavāre katipaya-yamaka-vissajjanen’ eva chasaṭthi yamakāni vissajjītāni nāma hontiti veditabbāni. Yathā ca Puggalavāre, evāj Okāsavāre pi Puggalokāsavāre pi chasaṭthiti pac-cuppannakāle tisu vāresu anulomanaye āṭṭhanavuti

1 Br. ṣaṭṭiṁ. 2 Br. vissajjanattā. 3 S. tiṁ. 4 Br. yojanaṁ veditabbā. 5 S. kāni. 6 Br. omits iti.
sataŋ yamakāṇī honti. Yathā ca anulomanaye, evaŋ paṭilomanaye piti sabbāṇi pi paceuppannakāle channa-
vutādhikāṇī¹ tīṇi yamakasatāṇī honti. Tesu dvānavutādhikā-
ṇī² satta pucchāsatāṇi caturāsitādhikāṇī³ ca pannarasa
atthasatāṇi hontiti veditabbāni. Evāŋ sesesu pi paṅcasu
kālabhodesūti sabbāṇi pi cha sattādhikatevisati⁴ yamaka-
satāṇi. Tato digunā pucchā, tato digunā attthāti, idam
ettha Uppādavāre Pālivatathānaŋ. Nirodhavārūppādaniro-
havāresu pi es’ eva nayo ti sabbasmim pi Pavattivāre
atṭhavisāni ekasattati yamakasatāṇi. Tato digunā pucchā,
tato digunā attthā veditabbā.

Paḷī pana manāyatanaŋ ca dhammāyatanaŋ ca ekasa-
disay, nānaŋ natthi. Upari pana vārasankhepo hotiti ādini
vatvā tattha tatthā sankhittā. Tasmā yaŋ tattha tattha
sankhittay, taŋ sabbay asammuyhantehi sallakkhetabbay.

Atthavinicchaye pan’ ettha idaŋ nayamukhaŋ: sacak-
khukāṇaŋ asotakānaŋ ti⁵ apāye jātibadhira-opappatikay
sandhāya vuttaŋ. So hi sacakkhuko asotako hutfvā uppa-
jathi. Yathāha: kāmadhātuyā uppattikkhaṇe . . . kassaci
aparāni dasayatanāni pātubhavanti. Opappatikayā petānay,
opappatikayā asurānay, opappatikayā tiracchānagatānay,
opappatikayā nerayikānay, jaccabadhirānay uppattikkhaṇe
dasayatanāni pātubhavanti cakkhāyatanay, rūpa-, ghāna-,
gandha-, jivha-, rasa-, kāya, phottthabbāyatanay, manay-
tanay, dhammāyatanaŋ ti⁶; sacakkhukāṇaŋ sasotakānaŋ ti
sugati-duggatisu paripunyāyatane ca opappatike rūpi-
Brahma no ca sandhaya vuttaŋ, te hi sacakkhuṅa sasotakā
hutfvā uppajiangi. Yathāha: kāmadhātuyā uppattikkhaṇe
kassaci ekādasayatanāni pātubhavanti . . . Kāmāvaccaraŋaŋ
devānay pathamakappikānay manussānay opappatikayā
petānay . . . nerayikānay paripunyāyatanaŋ . . . Rūpa-
dhātuyā uppattikkhaṇe katanāni paṅcayatanāni pātubhavanti
cakkhāyatanay, rūpa-, sota-, manayatanay, dhammāyatanan
ati.⁷ Aghānakānaŋ⁸ ti Brahmapārisajjadaya sandhaya
vuttaŋ, te hi sacakkhuṅa aghānakā hutfvā uppajiangi.

¹ S. navutāni tīṇi. ² S. navutāni satta. ³ S. caturāsitāni ca.
⁴ S. sattati tevisati. ⁵ Y. 58. ⁶ Viṭūk. 413.
⁷ Tb. 412. ⁸ Y. 58.

Okāsa-vāre tattha cakkhāyatanānā ti 6 rūpi-Brahmalokakā puṭchati; ten’ eva āmantā ti vuttaṁ. Tasmīhi ke kāle niyamato tāni āyatanāṇi paṭisandhiyaṅ uppajjanti. Idam ettha nayamukhaṅ; imiṁ nayamukhena sakalē pi Pavaṭṭi-vāre atho veditabbo.

Pariṇāvāro 7 Khandha-Yamake vuttaṇayo yevāti.

Āyatana-Yamaka-vannaṁ saṁmatā.

[Dhāṭu-Yamakay.]


1 Y. 58, 1, i.  2 Y. 59, 1-11.  3 Y. 59, 3-6.  4 S. Brahmāno.
5 Y. 59, 3-11.  6 Y. 60, ii. 1-2.  7 Y. 163 f.  8 Y. 165.
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Pariṁśavāro pākatiko yevāti.

Dhātū-Yamaka-vannanā samattā.

[Sacca-Yamaka.]


Tatthehi hettha vuttanayen eva Pannattivārādayo tayo mahāvāra antaravārādayo ca avassesappabhēdā veditabba.

Pannattivāre pan' ettha catunnañ saccānañ vasena padasodhanavāro, padasodhanamūlacakkavāro, suddhasaccavāro, suddhasaccamūlacakkavāro ti imesu catūsu vāresu Yamaka-vannanā veditabba.


¹ S. omits.
² S. sukhañ. Cf. p. 72.
³ Br. va.
⁴ S. bahuttāya.
⁵ Br. inserts yamaka-.
⁶ Br. repeats pucchā.
⁷ Y. 174 ff.
⁸ Vibh., p. 106 ff.
⁹ Dhe. §§ 58, 20-4.

Atthavinicchayaḥ pan’ ettha idañ lakkhaṇaḥ imassa hi Sacca-Yamakassa Pavattivāre nirodhasaccay tāva na labbhat’ eva. Sesesu pana tisu samudayasacca-maggasaccāni ekantena pavattiyaḥ yeva labbbanti.

Dukkhasaccay cuti-paṭisandhisu pavattesu pi labbhati.² Paccuppannādayo pana tayo kāḷā cuti-paṭisandhinam pi pavattassa³ pi vasena labbbanti. Evam ettha yañ yañ labbbati, tassa tassa pi⁴ vasena atthavinicchayo veditabbo.


Tattha pana rūpam eva dukkhasaccay nāma. Sesā maggasampayuttakā dhammā saccavinimmuttā; ten’ eva

¹ Y. 178. ² Br. omits pavattesu. S. labbhanti. ³ Br. pavattiya. ⁴ Br. omits. ⁵ Y. 178. ⁶ Br. tesu pihi. ⁷ Ibid. ⁸ S. ekasmim. ⁹ Br. saccañ. ¹⁰ Br. tasmīṁ. ¹¹ S. hoti tañ sandhāy’.
kāranena āruppe maggassa uppādakkhāne tesāy maggasaccay uppajjati, no ca tesāy dukkhasaccay uppajjatiti vuttañ.¹

Sabbesañ uppažantānañ paratte tañhāvippayuttacittassa uppādakkhāne tesāy tathāti ² tesāy tasmiñ uppattikkhane ca tañhāvippayuttacittuppattikkhane cāti evam ettha khaṇavaṇa okāsō veditabbo.

Aññesu pi evarūpesu es’ eva nayo.

Anabhisametāriñan ³ ti catusaccapaṭisañvedasankhātañ ⁴ abhisamayañ appattānañ ⁵; abhisametāriñan ti abhisamitahassa cānañ na iminā nayamukhena sabbattha athavinichechayo veditabbo.


Sacca-Yamaka-vanṇanā samattā.

[Sankhāra-Yamaka.]

Idāni tesāy yeva Mūla-Yamake desitānañ kusalādidhammānañ labbhamaṇabavanasaña ekadesañ sangahitvā Sacca-Yamaka-kāṇantarañ desitassa Sankhāra-Yamakassa vanṇanā hoti.

Tatthāpi heṭṭhā vuttanayen’ eva Paññattivāraḍayo tayo mahāvāra antaravāraḍayo ca avasesappabhedā veditabbā.

Ayañ pan’ ettha viseso. Pannattivāre tāva yathā heṭṭhā Khandhādayo dhamme uddisītvā rūpañ rūpakkañhandho, cakkhu cakkhāyatananñ, cakkhu cakkhudhātu, dukkhāñ dukkhasaccan ti padasodhanavanāro āraddho, tathā anārabhītvā assaṣapassasā kāyasankhāro ¹¹ ti pathamañ tayo pi sankhāra vibhajitvā dassita.

¹ Y. 178, 1-4. ² Y. 179, i., 180, iii. etc. ³ Y. 181, 3 i. ff. ⁴ Br. paṭivedha.⁵ Br. appattasattanañ. ⁶ Y. 227. ⁷ Br. p’ettha. ⁸ Y. 227. ⁹ S. omits ṇāta-. ¹⁰ Br. ṇāṭatīrana. ¹¹ Y. 229.
Tattha kāyassa sankhāro kāyasankhāro assāsapassāsā-kāyikā ēte dhammadā kāyapati-baddhā ti ¹ hi vacanato kārana-bhūtassa karajakāyassa phalabhūto eva sankhāro ti kāyasankhāro.


Pubbe kho, ācuso Visākha, vitakketvā vicaētva pacchā rācaḥ ³ bhundati; tasmā vitakkavicārā vacisankhāro ti vacanato pana sankhārotiti sankhāro. Kiṅ sankhāroti? Vaci; vaciyo ⁴ sankhāro ti vacisankhāro. Vacibhesasamuṭṭhāpakassa vitakkavicārādīvayass' ētaḥ nāmaṇ.⁵

Saṅnā ca vedanā ca cetasikā ēte dhammadā cittapaṭibaddhā ti vacanato yeva pana tatiyapade pi sankhariyati ti sankhāro. Kena sankhariyati? Cittena; karaṇatthe sāmivacananā katvā cittassa sankhāro ti cittasankhāro. Sabbesam pi cittasamuṭṭhānānam pi ⁶ cetasikadhāmmānaṃ ētaḥ adhivacananā; vitakkavicāranā pana vacisankhārabhūvama visuṭṭ gahitattā ṭhapetvā vitakkavicāreti vuttaṃ. Idāni kāyo kāyasankhāro, ti padasodhanavāro āraddho.⁷


¹ M. i. 301: "Cūḷavedalla-sutta." ² Br. omits kāyikā.
³ S. vāc. ⁴ M. ibid. ⁵ M. ibid.
⁶ Br. omits. ⁷ Y. 230. ⁸ Br. vaciyo, vaciyo. ⁹ S. nāma.
⁹ Y. 231.

Niddesa-vāre pan' assa anulome tāva āsma na kāyā-dayo 'va1 kāyasankhārādīnaq nāmaq, tasmā no ti paṭi-sedho kato. Paṭilome na kāyo na kāyasankhāro ti yo na kāyo kāyasankhāro 4 ti pi na hontiti pucchati. Kāyasankhāro na kāyo kāyasankhāro ti kāyasankhāro kāyo na hoti, kāyasankhāro yeva pan' eso ti attho.

Avascesan5 ti na kevalaṇ sesasankhārādavyam eva, kāyasankhārāvinimuttaq pana sesaṇ sabbaṃ pi sankhata-sankhatapanettihedaṇ dhammajātaṇ neva kāyo na kāyasankhāro ti iminā upāyena sabbavissajjanesu attho veditabbo ti.

Pannattivāravanānaṃ samattā.

Pavattivāre pan' ettha paccuppannakāle puggalavārassa anulomanaye: yassa kāyasankhāro uppaṭjati, tassa vacīsankhāro uppaṭjatiti6 kāyasankhāramulakāni dve, vacīsan-

1 S. omits. 2 S. adds ti. 3 Br. aggrahanaṇa. 4 Y. 230. 5 Y. 230, *. 6 Y. 292.
khāramulakaṇṭ ekan ti tiṇ' eva yamakāṇi labbhanti; tāṇi gahitān' eva. Tassa paṭilomanaye pi okāsavāraṇaśe pi es' eva nayo. Evam ettha sabbavāresu pi tiṇṇaṇ tiṇṇaṇ yamakāṇaṇa vasena yamakaganānaṇa veditabbā. 

Atthavinicchaye pan' ettha idaṃ lakkhaṇaṇaṃ: imasmiṇaṃ hi Sankhāra-Yamake asāsapassānaṇaṃ uppādakkhane, vitakkavicārāṇaṇaṃ uppādakkhane ti ādi vacanato paccuppanṇādi kālabheda pavattivasenāpi gahetabbo, na cuti-paṭisandhivasen' eva. Dutiyaṭaṭhāne tatiyaṭaṭhāne tattha kāyasankhāro uppajjatiti

1 ādi vacanato ca jhānam pi okāsavasena gahitaṇi ti veditabbāṇ. Evam ettha yaṃ yaṃ labbhati, tassa tassa vasena atthavinicchayo veditabbo. Tatr' idaṃ nayamukhaṇaṃ.


2 idaṃ kāyasankhāraṇa ekantacittasamuṭṭhānattā

3 vuttaṇa. Uppajjamānaṇa eva hi cittāna rūpaṇa va arūpaṇa va samuṭṭhaṇaṇa. Cittasā bhavasamakṣaṇaṇa duṭṭhe citti vattamāna


1 Ibid. ii. 2 Y. 233, 2 i. ff. 3 S. ekatta. 4 S. bhajamāna. 5 Y. 285 ff.


Yassa kāyasankhāro uppaṭjati, tassa vacīsankhāro nirujjhatiti ettha yasmā kāyasankhāro cittassa uppādakkhane uppaṭjati, na ca tasmiṇa khane vitakkavicārā nirujjhanti, tasmiṇa no ti paṭisvedho kato ti. Iminā navyakheṇa sabbattha vicinicchayo veditabbo. Pariṇāvāro pākatiko yevāti.

Sankhāra-Yamaka-vāṇanā samattā.

1 Y. 287 f. 2 Br. 6avicāraṃ. 3 Br. 6carānaṇaṃ.
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 tesāṇ yeva Mūla-Yamake desitānaṇ kusalādi dhammadānaṇ labbhamānaṇasena ekadesaṇ sangahitvā Sankhāra-Yamakānantharaṇ desitassa Anusaya-Yamakassa atthavannāna hoti.


So anuloma-paṭiloma-nayavasena duvidho hoti. Tattha anulomanaye yassa anuseti, yattha anuseti, yassa yatthānusetiti 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, bhavārāgānusayo, avijjānusayo anuseti. Yassa vā pana avijjānusayo anuseti, tassa kāmarā-

1 Y. 268.  
2 Ibid.
ganusayo anuseti ti\(^1\) kamaragaganusaya-mulakani cha yamakani. Puna agahita-gahanavasena\(^2\) patighanusaya-
mulakani pa\(\text{n}\)ca, mahanusaya-mulakani cattari, ditthahunu-
saya-mulakani ti\(\text{n}\)i, vicikiechhanusaya-mulakani dve, bhavaragaganusaya-mulaka\(\text{n}\)i ekan ti evan\(\text{s}\) sabbani pi ekam-
mulakani ekavisati.

Puna yassa kamaragaganusayo ca patighhanusayo ca anusenti ti\(^3\) evan\(\text{s}\) agatani dukamulakani pa\(\text{n}\)ca, tikamulakani cattari, catukkamulakani ti\(\text{n}\)i, pa\(\text{n}\)cakamulakani dve, chakka-
mulaka\(\text{n}\)i ekan ti aparani pi\(^4\) pa\(\text{n}\)narasa honti. Tan\(\text{i}\) purimehi ekavisati\(\text{y}\) saddhi\(\text{y}\) chattiya\(\text{y}\) puggalavare chattiyasa yamakani; thathi okasa-vare; thathi puggaloka-
savare ti sabbani pi anulomanaye atttha sata\(\text{n}\) yama-
kani; thathi pa\(\text{t}\)ilomanaye ti anusayavare sulasadhi-
ani dve yamakasatani. Tato diguna\(^5\) puccha, tato atth\(\text{a}\) ca\(^6\) veditabb\(\text{a}\).

Yath\(\text{a}\) c\(\text{'}\) ettha evan\(\text{s}\) Sanusayavaro, Pajahanavaro, Parin\(\text{n}\)a-varo, Pahinavaro, Uppajjanavaro ti imesam pi pa\(\text{n}\)canna\(\text{n}\) varana\(\text{n}\)i, ekekasm\(\text{y}\)yamakaganan\(\text{a}\) yamaka-
diguna pucch\(\text{a}\) pucch\(\text{a}\) diguna ca atth\(\text{a}\) veditabb\(\text{a}\).

Aya\(\text{n}\) pan\(\text{'}\) ettha purimesu tisu varesu viseso: okasa-
vare yaththa tatthati avatv\(\text{a}\) yato tato ti nissakkavacanan\(\text{a}\) desana kat\(\text{a}\) . Sesaj tadisam eva. Yo pa\(\text{n}\)aya\(\text{n}\) sabba-
pacchimo Dhautuvaro nama, so pucchava\(\text{ro}\) , vissajjanavaro ti dvidha thito.

Tassa pucchavare kammadhatuy\(\text{a}\) cutassa kammadhatug upajjantassati\(^7\) vattva kammadhatug va pana upajjantassaka kammadhatuy\(\text{a}\) cutassati na vutta\(\text{n}\)i. Kij kara\(\text{n}\)a? Atthavisessabhavato. Dve pi hi ek\(\text{a}\) pucch\(\text{a}\) ekaththa yeva; tasm\(\text{a}\) ekekamha\(^8\) yamak\(\text{a}\) ekekam eva puccha\(\text{n}\) pucchitv\(\text{a}\) sabbapucchavasa\(\text{n}\)e pucchannukkamen' eva kammadhatuy\(\text{a}\) cutassa kammadhatug upajjantassa kassaci satta anusay\(\text{a}\) anusentiti\(^9\) adin\(\text{a}\) nayena vissajjana\(\text{k}\) kata\(\text{n}\).

Tattha kammadhatuy\(\text{a}\) cutassa kammadhatug upajjantassa, rupadhathug, arupadhathug, na kammadhatug, na rupadhathug,

\(^1\) Ibid. \(^2\) Br. agahitaggahana\(^3\). \(^3\) Y. 270, 1-2, 3. 
\(^4\) S. omits. \(^5\) S. dviguna, diguna. \(^6\) S. ca attha. 
\(^7\) Y. 374. \(^8\) Br. ekekasm\(\text{a}\). \(^9\) Y. 375.
na arūpadhātuḥ uppajjantassāti cha suddhikapucchā; na kāmadhātuḥ na arūpadhatuḥ, na rūpadhātuḥ na arūpadhātuḥ, na kāmadhātuḥ na rūpadhātuḥ uppajjantassāti tisso missakā pucchā cāti kāmadhātumulakā¹ nava anulomapucchā honti.

Tathā rūpadhātumulakā nava, arūpadhātumulakā navāti satta visati anulomapucchā honti.


Ādito paṭṭhāya pan’ ettha yañ yañ anuttānañ, tattha tattha ayañ vinicchayakathā.


¹ S. mūlikā always. ² K. V. xi. 1 (ii. 244). ³ See Pts. ii. 217. ⁴ S. Br. sīc. ⁵ Dh. S., § 390.
hotiti ākusalacittena saddhiṣ avijjānusayassa uppannahāvo vutto.

Imasmiṁ yeva Anusaya-Yamake sattanaṁ mahāvāraṇaṁ aṅñatarasmiṁ Uppajjanavāre yassa kāmarāgānusayo uppaṭṭhati tassa paṭighānusayo uppaṭṭhati ādi vuttaṁ; tasmā anusetiti anurūpaṁ kāraṇaṁ labhitvā uppaṭṭhati yaṁ vuttaṁ, taṁ imāṁ tantipamāṇena suvuttan ti veditabbant.

Yam pi cittasampayutto sārammano ti ādi vuttaṁ, tam pi suvuttam eva. Anusayo ti nāṁ esa parinipphanno cittasampayutto akusaladhammo ti niṭṭham ettha gantabbaṁ.

Kāmarāgānusayo ti ādīsu kāmarāgo ca so appahinatthena anusayo cati kāmarāgānusayo. Sesapadesu pi es' eva nayo.

Idañi teṣaṁ uppaṭṭīṭhānaṁ pakāsetuṁ kattha kāmarāgānusayo anusetiti 1 ādīm āha. Tattha kāmadhātuyā dvīṣu vedanāsūti kāmāvacarabhūmiyaṁ sukhāya ca upekhāya cati dvīṣu vedanāsu. Eṭṭha kāmarāgānusayo anusetiti imāsu dvīṣu vedanāsu uppaṭṭhati. So pan' esa akusalavedanāsu sahajātāvasena ca arammanāvasena cati dvīṣa-kārehi anuseti. Akusalasukhāya vedanāya c' eva upekhāvedanāya ca sahajāto pi hutvā uppaṭṭhati. Ta vedānā arammanañ ca katva pi uppaṭṭhati attho.


Tatra 4 c' esa arammanāvasena anusayamāno na

1 Y. 268. 2 Br. kriyā. 3 Br. assadanaṭṭhena. 4 Br. Nanu.
kevalaj imasu dvisu vedanasu ceva vedanisasampayutta-dhammesu ca anuseti; itthhesu pana rupadisu pi anuseti yeva. Vuttam pi etaj Vibhangappakarañe: yaq loke piyarupay ettha satarupay sattanañ kamaraganusayo anusetiti. Imasmim pi pakarañe Anusayavarassa pañilomanañye vuttañ. ¹


Na hi Satthä sabbaj sabbattha katheti. Bodhaneyyasattanañ pana vasena katthaci yañ labbhati, tañ sabbaj katheti, katthaci na katheti. Tathä hi anena ⁴ katthaci dittharanusayo anusetiti puchitva sabbasakkadiyapariyapannesu dhammesu ettha dittharanusayo anusetiti ⁵ yañ labbhati, tan sabbaj kathitaj.

Aparasmij þhane vissajjantena rupadhathuyai arupadhathuyai ettha viciikkicchäñusayo ca mänänusayo ca ditthäñusayo ca anusetiti. ⁶ Kammadhathuyai dvisu vedanasu ettha viciikkicchänusayo ca kamaragänusayo ca mänänusayo ca ditthänusayo ca anuseti. Dukkhaya vedanaya ettha viciikkicchänusayo ca pañighänusayo ca ditthänusayo ca anusetiti yañ labbhati, tañ sabbaj akathetvä rupadhathu-arupadhätuhi saddhiñ tisso vedanaya kathita. Vedanäsampayuttã pana arupadhhammã sabbaj ca rupaj


ধাপত্তা অবসেসু রুপাদিসু অনুসেতিতি বুত্তাতি হতি; তাঁত ইদ্ধা কাস্মু না বুটাত তি? অনোয়ারিকতী। হেঁথা বুটানন্যেন হি দুক্কহাবেদানায়া মিত্র অলিকতাম মিয়াজ পান অনোয়ারিকতানু অতি রুপাদিসু অনুসেতিতি না বুত্তাত; অত্তাতু পানা লাব্বাণ্ড, তামা অতি পি পাঁশ্চানষাত্তায়ো অনুসেত্তি যেব্বিতি বেদিতাভ।

কিছু পানা আতর্ভা ইত্নাতামনা অতি পাঁশ্চাননা অরাম্ভান্নু না হোতি। নো না হোতি। পারিনাজ্যানস্সা হি ভিপলানারাবাসায়া বেদিতান্নান্নার পাংসান্নার সাম্পায়ূটতাহামা তা বুদো আর্বাভা দোমানায়া গুপ্তান্যায়। ইত্নাতামনা পান পাঁশ্চান্নাল্লাহ অভিনান্নামাজ যায় পাঁশ্চান্নাল্লাহ পাংসান্নার অপায়ালাভা অতি সামানুসারাত্ত পি দোমানায়া গুপ্তান্যায়।

দোমানামাতামতা অতি পালা তাঁতি হতি, পি পাঁশ্চানষাত্তায়ো। পাঁশ্চানষায়ো হি অনুত্তারামাণে পাঁশ্চানান্নায়ো দোমানায়ো পি তামায়ো অবহারিকতাত গুচ্ছাতী। যথাত্তা হি পান্নাতিনুতাতে দোমানাত অপায়ালাভা পি অতি পাঁশ্চানষাত্তায়ো অকারান্নাঞ্জিতা পি তামায়ো অবহারিকতাল্লাহ গুচ্ছাতী, পান পাঁশ্চানষায়ো হতি, পি তামায়ো অবহারিকতাল্লাহ গুচ্ছাতী। মুতাম পি পি ভীত একালাত ইত্নাতামনা নেক্কহামাতথা পি দোমানায়া সান্দহামায়া যায় হেঁথা পায় দোমানায়া পাঁশ্চানাল্লাহ, তো পাণ্ডাইত, পি তর্থা পাঁশ্চানষায়ো অনুসেত্তা পান পাঁশ্চানষায়ো আনুসায়ান্নাপাণ্ডাইতাল্লাহ গুদিতাভাত।

মানান্নায়ো পানা কামাদাহাতুয়া দিসু বুদো অনুপ্যাদিতুচ্ছু লী ভ্রান্তা অতি পানান্নার রুপায়ূপাদাহাতুয়ো কাতি ইদাণ তিন্দুণা আনুসয়ান্নাত্তাল্লাহ। তাসা অকুলালো দোবসু কামারান্নায়ো সাস্যা সাহাজাতামাতায়ো বিদ্যাতাভ। সাম্পায়ূটতাহামাসু পানা সাব্বালো পি কামায়ুাঞ্জারাশু সুক্কহা_ অদুক্কহামাসুক্কহাবেদানায়ো রুপায়ূপাদাহাতুসু অতি পামানান্নায়ো এবং অনুসেত্ত। আনুসায়ান্নাসাত পানা পাঁশ্চাননাল্লাহ দুক্কহায়া বেদানায়া অপরিযায়োপানে, এত্থা কামারান্নায়ো হি নানুষ্যেতি মানান্নায়ো না এনুসেত্তী২ পিতুত্তাতা ধাপত্তা দুক্কহাবেদানান্ন এবং নাভা না নাবান্না লোকুতরাদামান্ন এবং সেসারুপায়ূপাদাহামাসু

1 S. না পাঁশ্চানষায়ো।
2 Y. 283, 1, 3.
pi ayaŋ anuseti yevati evaŋ mānānusayassa anusayanaṭṭhānaŋ 1 veditabbaŋ.


Tattha pan’ ete paṇcasu cittuppādesu sahajātānusayasavasena anuseti. Te vā paṇca cittuppāde aṅne vā tebhūmakadhamme ārabba pavattikałe ārammanānusayavasena anusetiti evaŋ diṭṭhānusayavicikicchānusayānaŋ anusayanatṭhānaŋ veditabbaŋ.


Avijjānusayo paṇa sabbesu pi tebhūmakadhammesu anuseti. Tena vuttaŋ sabbasakkāyapariya-pannesu dhāmmesu ettha avijjānusayo anusetitī. Tassa dvādassu cittuppādesu sahajātānusayata veditabbā. Ārammanakaranavasena pana na kiṅci tebhūmakadhammaŋ ārabba nappavattatitī 5 evaŋ avijjānusayassa anusayanaṭṭhānaŋ veditabbaŋ.

1 S. anusayaṭṭhò. 2 Y. 268. 3 S. omits.
4 S. inserts pi. 5 Br. na pavo.
Ayaḥ tāva paricchedavāra-paricchinnuddesavāra-uppattiḥthānavāra-bhedesu vinicchayakathā.

Sattannaḥ pana mahāvārānaḥ paṭhame anusayavāre:
yassa kāmarāgānusayo anusetī, tassa patighānusayo anusetī

Yasmā ca tesu sesako appahīno, tassa itaro pi appahīno va hoti, tasmā amantā ti vuttaŋ. Yadi evaŋ yaŋ upari⁵ uppajjanavāre yassa kāmarāgānusayo uppajjati, tassa patighānusayo uppajjatī pucchitvā amantā ti vuttaŋ, tatthā kathañ attho gahetabbo ti. Tatthāpi appahinavasen’ eva uppattippaccaye sati uppattiyā anivāritavasena vā. Yathā hi cittakammādīni ārabhītvā aparinīṭhitakammantā citta-kārādavo tesāy kammanān akaraṇakkhaṇe pi mittasu-hajjādihi diṭṭha-diṭṭhatthāne imesu divasesu kīj karothāti vutta cittakammāna karoma, kaṭṭhakammāṇa karomāti vadanti, te kiṃcāpi tasmiṇ khaṇe na karonti, avicchinna-kammantattā pana katakhaṇaṇi ca kattabbaṅkhaṇaṇi ca

¹ Y. 60 (11-12).
² Y. 232, 1. i.
³ Br. agahetvā.
⁴ Br. çabbo.
⁵ S. omits.
upādāya karonti yeva nāma honti, evam eva yamhi santāne anusaya appahina, yam hi vā tesaṅ santāne uppaṃjanti, paccaye sati, uppatti anivāritā. Tattha anuppajjanakhaṃe pi uppannapubbaṅ ceva kālantare uppaṃjanaṅ ca upādāya; yassa kāmarāgānusayo uppaṃjati, tassa patighānusayo uppaṃjati yeva nāmāti, evam atho veditabbo. Ito paresu pi evarūpesu vissajjanesu es' eva nayo.


Okāsavārassa pathama-dutiya-pucchāso yasmā kāmarāgānusayo kāmadhātuyā dvīsu vedanāsu anuseti, patighānusayo dukkhalo adhibhūtaya, tasmā no ti paṭisetho kato. Tato tatiya-pucchāya ubhinnam pi kāmadhātuyā dvīsu vedanāsu anusayanato āmantā ti paṭivacanaṃ dinnāṃ. Rūpadhātu-arūpadhātuyā pana māṇānusayassa kāmarāgānusayena saddhiṅ asādhāraṇaṃ uppattiṭṭhānaṃ; tasmā no ca tattha kāmarāgānusayo ti vuttaṃ.

Iminā nayena sabbesaṅ uppattiṭṭhānavāraṃ oloketvā sādhāraṇasādhāraṇaṃ uppattiṭṭhānaṃ veditabbaṃ.

Dukamulaka-pucchāyaj, yasmā kāmarāga-patighānusayo nāpi ekasmiṅ thāne uppaṃjanti, na-y-ekaṅ dharmmaṅ ārammanaṅ karonti; tasmā natthiti paṭikkhepo kato. Ayāṅ h' ettha adhippayo. Yasmā ime dve anusaya anusayeyyuṃ, taṅ thānam eva natthi, tasmā kattha māṇānusayo anuseti ayaṅ pucchā apucchā yevāti. Aññesu pi evarūpesu es' eva nayo.

Puggalokāsavāre catunnan ti puthujjana-sotāpanna-sakadāgāmi-anāgāmināṃ. Patilomanaye: yassa kāmarāgānusayo nānuseti ayaṅ pucchā anāgāmiṅ gahetvā pucchati. Dvinnāy puggalānaṃ sabbattho kāmarāgā-

1 Br. uppatti. 2 Br. pubbaṅ. 3 Y. 268. 4 Ibid. 269 5 Y. 271, 1, 2; 1, 3. 6 Ibid. 1, 4-5. 7 S. ṇchāya. Y. 272, 1-2, 3 ff. 8 Br. na ekaṅ. 9 Y. 286, 1, 2.
nusayo\textsuperscript{1} nānusetiti anāgāmi-arahantānañ. Kāmadhātuyā tisu vedanāsīti vedanā-gahāñena\textsuperscript{2} vedanā sampayutta-kānam pi tesañ vatthārammanānam pīti sabbesam pi kāmāvacaradhammānañ gahāñag veditabbag.

Ayañ anusayavāre vinicchayakathā.

Sānusaya-vāre\textsuperscript{3} pana yo kāmarāgānusayena sānusayo ti yathā ekantarikajarādi rogena ābādhiko yāva tamhā rogā na muccati, tāva tassa rogassa anuppattikkhāne pi sarogo yeva nāma hoti, evañ sānusayakilesassa\textsuperscript{4} vaṭṭagāmi sattassa yāva ariyamaggena anusaya samugghātañ na gacchanti, tāva tesañ anusayānañ anuppattikkhāne pi sānusayo yeva nāma hoti; evarūpañ sayanañ sandhāya āmantāti vuttañ. Sesam sānusayatañ ettha anusayavārasadisam eva.

Okāsavāre pana rūpadhātuyā arūpadhātuyā ettha mānānusayena sānusayo ti vutte tāsu dhātusu puggalassa pure\textsuperscript{5} sānusayāta paññāyeyya, anusayassa uppattiṭṭhānañ na paññāyeyya; anusayassa ca uppattiṭṭhānadassanaththañ ayañ vāro āraddho, tasmā tato mānānusayena sānusayo\textsuperscript{6} ti vuttañ. Evañ\textsuperscript{7} hi sati tato dhātu dvayato uppannena mānānusayena sānusayo ti anusayassa uppattiṭṭhānañ dassitañ hoti. Imassa pana pañhassa atthe vutte ādi pañhassa atthe avutte ādi pañhassa attho pākato na hotiti paṭhamañ na vutto; tasmā so evañ veditabbo yato kāmarāgānusayenāti yato uppannena kāmarāgānusayena sānusayo, kiñ so tato 'va\textsuperscript{5} uppannena paṭighānusayena pi sānusayo ti. Yasmā pan’ ete dve ekāsmā thāna na uppajjanti, tasmā no ti paṭisedho kato. Arahā sabbatthāti arahā sabbadhammesu uppājjanakena kenaci anusayena nirānusayo ti iminā atthavasena nippadesatṭhānesu bhummavacanam eva katan ti, iminā upāyena sabbattha atthavinicchayo veditabbo ti.

Sānusaya-vārakathā niṭṭhitā.

\textsuperscript{1} S. adda ca. Y. ibid. \textsuperscript{2} Br. vedanāgg. \textsuperscript{3} Y. 294. \\
\textsuperscript{4} Br. sasankilesassa. \textsuperscript{5} Br. omits. \textsuperscript{6} Y. 296, 1, 3. \\
\textsuperscript{7} Br. Evant.
Pajahanavāre pajahatiti\(^1\) tena tena maggena pahāna-pariṇānasena pajahati, āyatīṅ anuppatti dhammataṅ āpaṅd. Amantā ti anāgāmimaggatṭhān sandhāya paṭi-vacanaṅ. Tadekatṭhān pajahatiti pahānekatṭhataṅ sandhāya vuttaṅ. No ti arahattamaggatṭhān sandhāya paṭisedho kato.\(^2\) Yato kāmarāgānusayaṅ pajahatiti yato uppajjanakaṅ kāmarāgānusayan pajahatiti attho.

Aṭṭhamako ti\(^3\) arahattaphalaṭṭhato paṭṭhāya paccoro-haranaṅ-gaṅanāya ganiyamāno sotāpatti maggaṭṭho aṭṭhamako nāma. Dakkhiṇeyya-gaṅanāya hi arahā agga-dakkhineyyattā paṭṭhamo, arahattamaggatṭho dutiyō, anāgāmi, tatiyo ... pe ... sotāpatti maggaṭṭho aṭṭhamo. So idha aṭṭhamako ti vutto. Nāmasaṅña yeva vā esa tassāti.


Iminā nayena sabbattha vinicchayo veditabbo.

Pajahanavārakathā niṭṭhita.


Pahīnavāre\(^6\) phalaṭṭhavasen’ eva desanā āraddhā. Anāgāmissa hi ubho p’ete anusayaṁ pahīnā, tasmā āmantā ti vuttaṅ. Okāsavāre yattha kāmarāgānusayaṁ pahīno, tattha patīghāṇusayaṁ pahīno ti\(^7\) puchitvā na vattabbayā pahīno ti vā appahīno ti vā vuttaṅ. Taṅ kasmaṁ ti uppattiṭṭhānaṁ asādhāraṇattā aññāṅ hi kāmarāgānu-

---

\(^1\) Y. 318 ff.  \(^2\) Br. omits.  \(^3\) Y. 322, 1, 4-5 ff.  \(^4\) Y. 325, 1, 4-5 ff.  \(^5\) Y. 338.  \(^6\) Y. 356.  \(^7\) Y. 358.  \(^8\) Br. "bb."
sayassa uppatitṭhānaṃ, aṅgaṃ paṭighānusayassa. Abhāvita-maggassa ca, yattha anusayo uppaṭjati, magge bhāvite tattḥ’ eva so pahino nāma hoti. Tattha yasmā neva kāmarāgānusayattḥhāne paṭighānusayo uppaṭjati, *na paṭighānusayattḥhāne kāmarāgānusayo,* tasmā so tattha¹ pahino ti vā appahino ti vāti na vattabbo.² So yasmiṃ attano uppatitṭhāne kāmarāgānusayo pahīno, tasmīṃ appahīnattā tattha pahīno ti na vattabbo. Yaṃ kāmarāgānusayassa uppatitṭhānaṃ, tasmīṃ aṭṭhitattā tattha appahīno ti na vattabbo.


Okāsavāra-puggalokāsavāre pana heṭṭhā vuttanayen’ eva veditabbo ti.

Pahinavārakathā niṭṭhitā.

Uppajjanavāro anusayavārasadiso yeva.
Dhatuvārassa pucchavāre tāva kati anusayaḥ anusentiti?⁴

* * S. omissions. ¹ Br. inverts order. ² Y. 358.
3 Y. 365. ⁴ Y. 374.

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


Anusayābhanga natthiti 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 nānusetiti evaṃ vibhajitabbā anusayo nāma natthī.

Rūpadhātuṣṭaṇā uppajjantassā⁷ kassaci tayo ti anāgāmivasena vuttaṃ. Tassa hi kāmarāgapaṭighadhiṭṭhivicikīchānusaya ca cattāro pi anavasesato pahīṇā. Itare tayo va appahīṇa. Tena vuttaṃ kassaci tayo anusayā anusentiti.

Na kāmadhātūn ti kāmadhātuyā paṭisiddhātā sesā dve dhātuyo uppajjantassāti attho.

¹ S. vavatthāpanę. ² Y. 875. ³ Br. kathān. ⁴ Br. omits. ⁵ S. omits. ⁶ Br. substitutes yeva. ⁷ uppajjantessu.
Satt evati yasmā ariyasāvakassa rūpadhātuyā cutassa kāmadhātuyā upatti nāma n’ atthi, puthujjanass’eva hoti, tasmā satt evati niyametvā vuttañ.


Dhātuvārakathā niṭṭhitā.

Anusaya-Yamakavannanā samattā.

[Citta-Yamaka.]


Imasmiñ Citta-Yamake mātikā-thapananāñ, 3 ṭhapitamātikāya vissajjanañ ti deze vārā honti. Tattha mātikātha-pane Puggalavāro, Dhammavāro, Puggaladhammavāro ti ādito va tayo suddiekamahāvārā 4 honti.

Tattha: yassa cittan uppajjati na nirujjhātini 5 evañ puggalavasena cittassa uppajjana - nirujjhanādibhedanāñ dipento gato Puggalavāro nāma. Yañ cittan uppajjati na nirujjhātini 6 evañ dhammavasen’ eva cittassa uppajjana-nirujjhanādibhedanāñ dipento gato Dhammavāro nāma. Yassa yañ cittan uppajjati na nirujjhātini 7 evañ ubhaya-vasena cittassa uppajjananirujjhanādibhedanāñ dipento gato Puggaladhammavāro nāma.

1 Br. adds yeva.  2 S. desitadhammānañ.  3 S. mātikāya th.  4 S. omits mahā.  5 Y. II, 1.  6 Y. II, 4.  7 Y. II, 6.
Tato \textit{yassa sarāgaṇa\textit{c}ittan} ti solasanna\textit{p} padāna\textit{p} vasena\textsuperscript{1} apare sarāgaṇi-paddavisēsitā solasa puggalavārā, solasa dhammavārā, solasa puggaladhammavārā ti aṭṭha cattārīsa\textsuperscript{2} missakavārā honti. Te sarāgaṇi-paddamattan dassetvā sankhittā. Tato \textit{yassa kusalacittan} ti ādinā nayena chasatthhidvisata-sankhāna\textit{p} abhidhhammaditikā-padāna\textit{p} vasena apare kusala\textit{d}i-paddavisētā chasatthi-dvisata-puggalavārā, chasatthi-dvisata-puggaladhammavārā ti aṭṭha [cattārīsa]\textsuperscript{3} navuti sattasatāmissakavārā honti. Te pi kusalādi-paddamatta\textit{p} dassetvā sankhittā yeva. Yāni p'ettha sandassanādini padāni cattena sadhī\textit{n}a vuccanti, tāni moghapuchchāvasena gahitāni.\textsuperscript{4}

Teso pana tisu vāresu sabbapathame suddhika-puggaladhāvārā uppādanirodhakālasambhedavāro, uppāda-uppannavāro, nirodha- uppannavāro, uppādavāro, nirodhavāro, uppādanirodhavāro, [uppāda-nirodhabhāvo]\textsuperscript{3} uppajjamāna-nirodhavāro, uppajjamāna-uppannavāro, niruṣjhamāna-nupannavāro, uppannuppadavāro, atītānāgatavāro uppana-uppajjamānaupavāro ti niruddha-niruṣjhamānaupavāro atikkantakālaavāro ti cuddasa antaravāra. Tesu uppādavāro, nirodhavāro, uppādanirodhavāro\textsuperscript{5} ti imesān tisu vāresu anuloma-patilomavasena cha cha katvā aṭṭhārasa yamakāni. Uppannuppadavāre atītānāgatakālaavasena anulomo dve, patilomato dve ti cattāri yamakāni. Sesesu ādito nidditthu tisu, anantare nidditthu tisu, avasāne nidditthu catūṣiti dasasu vāresu anulomo eka\textit{p}, patilomato ekan ti dve dve katvā visati yamakāni. Evān sabbesu pi cuddasa\textit{u} Antaravāresu cattāri\textit{a} yamakāni, caturāsiti pucchā, aṭṭha satthi aṭṭhasata\textit{a} hoti. Yathā ca ekasmiṇī suddhikapuggalamahāvāre, tathā suddhikapuggalamahāvāre pīti tisu mahāvāresu chabbisati yamakasata\textit{a}. Tato digunā pucchā, tato digunā atthā ca veditabbā. Ida\textit{n}a pana vārattayan sarāgaṇivasena solasa guna\textit{n}a kusalādivasena chasatthi dvisata guna\textit{n}a katvā imasmiṇī Citta-Yamake anekāni yamakasahassāni tato digunā pucchā, tato digunā atthā-ca

\textsuperscript{1} Y. II, 9. \textsuperscript{2} Br. cattālisa\textit{n}. \textsuperscript{3} Br. \textit{omits}. \textsuperscript{4} Br. ṭhapitāni. \textsuperscript{5} S. \textit{all three in loc. case}. 


Nuppajjati nirujjhātī bhangaṅkhaṇe arahato pacchimacittam pi sesaṇaṃ bhijjamanāṃ-cittam pi. Tato paṭṭhāya pana arahato tāva cittaṃ na nirujjhissatītī sakka vattuṃ, uppajjissatītī pana na sakka. Sesānaṃ uppajjissatītī sakka vattuṇa, na nirujjhissatītī na sakka, tasmā no tī paṭisedho kato.

Dutiya-pañhe yassa cittaṃ na nirujjhissatī uppajjissatītī so puggalo yeva natthi, tasmā natthi paṭikkhepo kato.

Uppannaṃ ti uppādesamangino p’etaṃ nāmaṇa. Uppādaṃ patvā aniruddhassāpi. Tatthā uppādesamangitaṃ
sandhāya āmantā ti. Uppādāy patvā, aniruddhabhāvan sandhāya tesāy cittāy uppannaṃ ti vuttaṃ.

Uppannaṃ ti¹ uppādaṃ appattaṃ. Sesāy cittāy uppa-
jitthāti eththāpi sabbesaṃ tāva cittāṃ khanappaccuppannam eva hutvā uppādakkhanaṃ atitattā uppajjittha nāma. Nirodhasamāpannānaṃ nirodho pubbe uppanna-pubbantā asaṃnasattanaṃ asaṃnahhave² uppanna-pubbattā. Uppa-
jitthā ceva uppajjati cāti uppādaṃ pattattā uppajjitthā, anatitatta uppajjati nāmati attho.

Uppādakkhane anāgatañ cāti uppādakkhane ca cittāṃ, anāgatañ ca cittan ti attho.

Atikkantakālavāre³ uppajjamānaṃ khaṇaṃ ti uppāda-
khanaṃ. Tattha kiñcāpi uppādakkhano uppajjamāno nāma hoti, uppajjamānassa pana khanattā evaṃ vutto.

Khaṇaṃ vitikkantagatikantakālan ti na ciraṃ vitikkan-
taṃ, tam eva pana uppādakkhanaṃ vitikkantaṃ hutvā atikkantakālan ti sankhaṃ gacchati. Nirujjhamaṇaṃ khaṇaṃ ti niruddhakkhanaṃ. Tattha kiñcāpi nirodhaka khaṇo nirujjhamāno nāma na hoti, nirujjhamānassa pana khanattā evaṃ vutto. Khaṇaṃ vitikkantaṃ atikkantak-
kālan ti kīṃ tassa cittāṃ evaṃ nirodhakkhanam pti vitikkant-
taṃ hutvā atikkantakālaṃ nāma hotitti pucchati. Tattha yasmaṃ bhangakkhane cittāṃ uppādakkhanaṃ khaṇaṃ vitikkantaṃ hutvā atikkantakālaṃ hoti. Niruddhakkhanaṃ khaṇaṃ vitikkantaṃ hutvā atikkantakālaṃ nāma hoti. Atītam pana cittāṃ ubho pī khaṇe khaṇaṃ vitikkantaṃ hutvā atikkantakālaṃ nāma, tasmā bhangakkhane cittāṃ uppādakkhanaṃ vitikkantaṃ bhangakkhanaṃ avitikkantaṃ. Atītaṃ cittāṃ uppādakkhanañ ca vitikkantaṃ bhangak-
khaṇañ ca vitikkantaṃ ti vissajjanam āha.

Dutiyapañhe⁴ vissajjane yasmaṃ atītaṃ cittāṃ ubho pī khaṇe vitikkantaṃ hutvā atikkantakālaṃ nāma hoti, tasmā atīta cittan ti vuttaṃ.

Pāṭilomapañha⁵-vissajjane yasmaū uppādakkhane ca cittāṃ anāgatañ ca cittāṃ ubho pī khaṇe khaṇaṃ vitik-
kantaṃ hutvā atikkantakālaṃ nāma na hoti, tesāy khaṇa-

---

¹ Br. Anupp⁶. ² Br. saññībhāve. ³ Y. II, 14. ⁴ Br. paññhassa. Y. II, 14. ⁵ Ibid.
 naïj avitikkantattā, tasmā uppādakkhaṇe cittay anāgataṇ
cittan ti vuttaṇ. Dutiyavissajjanaṇ pākatam eva.

Dhammavāre pi iminā va upāyena sabbavissajjanesu
attho veditabbo.

Puggaladhammavāro dhammavāragatiko yeva. Sabbe
pi missakavārā yassa sarāgacittan ti ādinā nayena mukha-
mattaya dassetvā sankhittā. Vitthāro pana nesaṇ heṭṭhā
vuttanayen' eva veditabbo.

Tese pana yassa sarāgaya cittay uppajjati na nirujjhathi,
tassa cittay nirujjhisatīna uppajjisatīti evaṇ vitthare-
tabbatāya pucchā va sadisā hoti. Yasmā pana sarāgaya
cittan pacchima cittan na hoti, tasmā: yassa sarāgaya cittay
uppajjati na nirujjhathi, tassa cittay nirujjhisati na uppa-
jissatīti no ti evaṇ vissajjitatātā vissajjanaṇ asadisaṇ
hoti. Taṭ taṭ tassa tassā pucchāya anurūpavasena
veditabban ti.

Citta-Yamaka-vaṇṇāna samattā.

[Dhamma-Yamaka.]

Idāni tesaṇ yeva Mūla-Yamake desitanaṇ kusalādi
dhammānaṇ mātiṇaṇ ṭhapetvā Citta-Yamakānantaraṇ
desitassa Dhamma-Yamakassa vaṇṇana hoti. Tattha
Khandha - Yamake vuttanayen' eva Pālivavatthinān
veditabbaṇ. Yath' eva ¹ hi tattha pannoṭṭivāra tayo tayo
mahāvārā avasesā antaravārā ca honti, tatha idhāpi. Yo
kusalāṇ ² dhammāṇ bhāveti, so akusalāṇ dhammāṇ paja-
hatīti agahittā pan' ettha pariṇāvāro bhāvanāvāro
nāmāti veditabbo. Tattha yasmā avyākato dhammo neva
bhāvetabbo, na pahātabbo, tasmā taṇ padam eva na
uddhataṇ. Pannoṭṭivāre pan' ettha tinnaṇ kusalādi-
dhammānaṇ vasena padasodhanavāro, padasodhanā-
mūlacakkavāro, suddhadhammadvāro, 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. 108).
mūlacakkāvāro ti imesu catūsu varesu yamakāgānanā vedabbā.

Paṇṇattivāranidde pana kusalā kusalā dhammā\(^1\) ti kusalānaṇaṇ ekantena kusaladhammattā āmantā ti vuttaṃ. Sesavissajanesu pi es' eva nayo. Avasesā dhammā na akusalā dhammā ti avasesā dhammā akusalā na honti, dhammā pana hontiti attho. Iminā nayena sabbavissajjanāṇi veditabbāni.

Pavattivāre pan' ettha paccuppannakāle puggalavārassa anulomanaye yassa kusalā dhammā uppaįjanti, tassa akusalā dhammā uppaįjanti; yassa vā pana akusalā dhammā uppaįjanti, tassa kusalā dhammā uppaįjanti\(^2\) kusaladhamma-mūlakāni dve yamakāni, akusaladhammamūlakaṇā ekan ti tini yamakāni honti. Tassa paṭilomanaye pi okassavārādisu pi es' eva nayo. Evam ettha sabbavāre tiṇṇaṇ tiṇṇaṇ yamakānaṇ vasena yamakāgānanā veditabbā.


Dutiye akusale ti\(^4\) bhavaṇ assādetvā uppannesu nikanti-javanese dutiye javanacicte. Dutiye citte vattaṃāne ti paṭisandhito dutiye bhavangacicte vattaṃāne, saha vā paṭisandhiyā bhavangaṃ vipākavasena ekam eva katvā bhavanikantiya avajjanacicte. Taṇ hi kriyacittattā avyākatajāti yaṇ pi pākato dutiyaṇ nāma hoti. Yassa cittassa

\(^1\) Y. II, 23.  
\(^2\) Ibid., 25.  
\(^3\) Ibid., 27.  
\(^4\) Ibid., 28.

Dhamma-Yamakavanñanā samattā.

[Indriya-Yamaka.]


1 Y. II, 29.  
2 Ibid. 37.


1 Y. II, 71.  
2 Ibid., 72.  
3 Ibid.  
4 Ibid., nn. 1, 2 f.  
5 Ibid., 78.

Anāgatavāre eten' eva bhārenāti1 etena purisabhāven' eva antarā2 itthibhāvaṅ anāpajjitvā purisa paṭisandhiha- āṇen' evāti attho. Katici bhare dassetvā parinibbāyissantīti katici paṭisandhiyo gahetvā itthibhāvaṇ appatvā va parinibbāyissantīti attho. Dutiya pucchāya pi es' eva nayo.

Paccuppannena aitavāre suddhāvāsaṅaṅ uppatti cittassa bhangakkhaṇe manindriyaṁ ca na uppajjithāti3 Citta-Yamake viya uppādakkhaṇātikkamavasena attaṁ aggheretvā,4 tasmin bhave anuppanna-pubbavasena gahetabbo ti. Iminā nayamukhena sabbasmim pi pavattivāre atthavinicchayo veditaabbo.

Pariṇāvāre pana cakkhumulakādisu ekam eva cakkhu-sota-yamakaṇ dassitaṁ. Yasmā pana sesāni pi lokiyā-avyākatāni ceva lokiya-avyākata-missakāni ca pariṇāey- yan' eva, tasmaṁ tāni anupadiṭṭhāni pi iminā va dassitāni honti. Yasmā pana akusalaṅ ekantato pahātabbam eva, ekantaṅ kusalaṅ bhāvetabbam eva, lokuttarāvyākataṅ sacchikātatābaṁ, tasmaṁ domanassindriyāṅ pajahatīti anaṅṅatassāmitindriyāṅ bhāretīti aṅṅatāvinindriyāṅ sacchikarotīti vuttaṁ. Aṅṅindriyāṅ pana bhāvetabbam pi atthi sacchakātātābaṁ pi. Taṅ bhāvanāvasen' eva gahi-
taṁ.

Tattha dre puggalā ti sakadāgāmi-maggasamangī ca arahattamaggasamangī ca. Tesu eko samucchinditās asamatthattā domanassindriyāṅ nappajahati5 nāma, eko pahina-dosattā. Cakkhundriyāṅ na pariṇāntīti anuppādaṁ

1 Y. II, 117. 2 S. anantarā. 3 Y. II, 145. 4 S. agahetvā. 5 Br. na paj̄ō.
āpādezuṇ asamatthatāya na pariñāṇī. Iminā nayena sabbavissajanesu attho veditabbo ti.

Indriya-Yamaka-vāṇīṇanā samatta.

Ettāvatā ca:
Yass’ ovāde ṭhatvā niṭṭhitakiccassā kiccasampanno yuvati jano pi atito suvihitaniyamo yamassānaṇ 1
Devaparisāya majjhe devapure sabbadevadewena 2
Yamakaṇā nāma pakāsitaṇ yamāmalalomena yantena.3
Pālivavatthānavidhiṇ puchchāvissajjane ca atthanayaṇ dassetuṇ āraddhā Yamaka-āṭṭhakathā 4 mayā tassa.
Sādhu bahu 5 anantarāyo lokamhi yathā anantarāyena.
Ayam ajja pāñcamattehi tantiyā bhāṇavārehi.
Nīṭṭhā pattaṇ 6 evaṇ niṭṭhānaṇ pāpuṇantu sabbe hi pi hitasukhanibbattikarā manorathā 7 sabbasattānan ti.

Yamakappakaranatthakathā niṭṭhita.

1 Br. ossānaṇ. 2 S. sabbe dev°.
3 So Br. S. reads pakāsitasakalalomena santea. I do not follow the meaning in either.
4 S. āraddhāya, omitting Yamaka. 5 Br. Sā subahu antarāye.
6 Br. Nīṭṭhā pattaṇ, and omits hi.
7 S. hitaṇ sukhanippattikarā 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-păn-ni-phăn-liao-shwo-kiao-kie-kîng (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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sec. 1. Introduction</td>
<td>1 - 33a</td>
<td>104 - 2016a</td>
<td>1 - 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Commandment</td>
<td>34 - 34</td>
<td>2017 - 2017</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Measured nourishment</td>
<td>45 - 52</td>
<td>2028 - 2035</td>
<td>43 - 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Proper sleep</td>
<td>53 - 56a</td>
<td>2036 - 2036a</td>
<td>50 - 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Anger</td>
<td>56b - 62</td>
<td>2039b - 2045</td>
<td>58 - 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Pride</td>
<td>63 - 67</td>
<td>2046 - 2050</td>
<td>59 - 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Honesty</td>
<td>68 - 71</td>
<td>2051 - 2054</td>
<td>64 - 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Small desire</td>
<td>72 - 73a</td>
<td>2055 - 2056a</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Contentedness</td>
<td>73b - 76a</td>
<td>2056b - 2059a</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Secluded life</td>
<td>76b - 81a</td>
<td>2059b- 2064a</td>
<td>68 - 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Diligence</td>
<td>82b - 84a</td>
<td>2064b - 2067a</td>
<td>70 - 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Samādhi</td>
<td>84b - 86</td>
<td>2067b - 2069</td>
<td>72 - 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Wisdom</td>
<td>87 - 91a</td>
<td>2070 - 2074a</td>
<td>75 - 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Single mind</td>
<td>91b - 96a</td>
<td>2074b - 2079a</td>
<td>79 - 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Carelessness</td>
<td>96b - 98</td>
<td>2079b - 2081</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Anuruddha and Buddha</td>
<td>99 - 104</td>
<td>2082 - 2087</td>
<td>83 - 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Conclusion</td>
<td>105 - 111</td>
<td>2088 - 2094</td>
<td>89 - 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>112 - 119a</td>
<td>2095 - 2102a</td>
<td>96 - 1029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>119b - 131</td>
<td>2102b - 2114</td>
<td>1029 - 126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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-kia-kiong-lung, one volume: it is said that this sāstra 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 sāstra by Tsin-yuen (Nanjio, No. 1,597; vide ibid., p. 465), the work is ascribed to Aśvaghoṣa. 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 Kumārajiva—perhaps by Paramārtha himself, for he wrote many commentaries on several śūtras 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 Vasistha 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 Vasistha 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 Árī,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."

Āśvaghoṣa 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 Dharmarākṣa (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 Árī is a better reading: the Sanskrit text, as well as Pargiter's translation, read Ādi; and in other MSS. it is written Áti or Āṭi.
vol. xix., p. 330), in which I have corrected two important names, indicating the Purānic story.

"The two demons, Āri (or Āḍī) 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 Dharmarākṣa. 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 arivakoca, or something like that. Āri, 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.
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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 Tāvatīma 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. 88, Lewes’s History of Philosophy.
⁴ “Like the current of a river” (nādisoto viya). See p. 9, n. 1, and p. 166, ibid.
laid the germs of it. 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, and Mahārakkhita was sent by Tissa as a missionary to Yonaloka. 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. The method adopted in the present paper is not historical, 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. Buddhist philosophy, which they are supposed to have introduced into Burma, had then been already collected 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.

3 This name was evidently derived from Ionia.
4 The materials for this paper are chiefly drawn from the Pitkat Thonbōn 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 Pyigyi Mandain Press, Rangoon.
5 Much as I wish to draw upon the Sūsanālāṅkāra (an historical sketch of Buddhism in Burma, written by Mingyi Thiri Mahā Nanda Thingyan, the Saw Myoza, in 1881, at the special request of King Bagyidaw, and published by the Hanthawaddy Press), for the biographical sketches of Chapada, Taungbila Sadaw, Kyazwa, Ariya-vamsa, 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 considered 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 book 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 Pōkgögyaw, Munidhaghosa (born 1575) during the reign of Thalun Mindaya, who came to the throne in 1629. The second analysis, by Myauk-nangyaung Sadaw, Aggadhammālaṅkāra, appeared during the reign of Ngadatkyi Dayaka of Sagaing, who ascended the throne in 1648. The third was written by Taungbilu Sadaw during the reign of Wunbe-Insan Min, who became king in 1672. A fourth was added by Tantabin Sadaw Nandamedhā, during the reign of Ngasingu Min, who succeeded to the throne in 1776. The first Bagaya Sadaw wrote the fifth during the reign of Bodawpaya (1781); and the last was contributed by a relative of the two Nyaungan Sadas, U Po and U Pōk, during the reign of Bagyidaw (1819).

Besides these Akauks, a work, entitled Mātikāgaṇṭhi, was prepared on “knotty” points in the Mātikā by Nāṇā-
bhivamsa of Maungdaung, who became the Thathanabaing of Bodawpaya.

The Vibhaṅga classifies things already dealt with in the first book (Dhs). It is divided into eighteen¹ sections, into the details of which I cannot here enter. The comments² of Sumaṅgalamahāśāmi, 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 Saṅkhēpavāṇṇanā, 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) Paticcasamuppāda; (7) Satipatthāna; (8) Sammappadhāna; (9) Iddhipāda; (10) Bojjhanga; (11) Maggaṅga; (12) Jhāna; (13) Appamaññā; (14) Sikkhāpada; (15) Paṭisambhidā; (16) Ēna; (17) Khuddaka-vattphu; and (18) Dhammahadaya. On the first thirteen, the reader is referred to the Compd Phil.


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 Tikūs.
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 Sumanāgala'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," 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, and the book begins with the Puggalakathā, a controversy on the question of the soul between

---

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

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

2 See the Mūlaṭīkā and the Anuṭīkā.
an adherent of Buddhism (sakavādi) and an imaginary opponent (paravādi). The opponent in the first controversy is, therefore, the Attavādi, 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 outline\(^1\) (Mātikā) to be elaborated by a later genius on the lines laid down by Him. Anyway, it is the first of the three principal landmarks\(^2\) in the history of Buddhist philosophy. The Kathāvatthu was taught regularly before, but not after, Ariyāvārīsa of the fifteenth century.\(^3\)

The object of the sixth book, the Yamaka ("The Book of Pairs"),\(^4\) is to "convince" the convert\(^5\) 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' (āṭṭhamukhā vādayutti's) by way of two 'fivesfolds' in four questions on the subject of the soul, and left an outline in a text of one short recital (bhaṇavāra), in the series of all controversies." See pp. 1, 2, the Cy. on the Kathāvatthu.

\(^2\) The two other landmarks being the Milindapaṅhā and the Visudhīmagga.

\(^3\) I owe this information to the late Payagyi Sadaw of Henzada.

\(^4\) One of the "pairs" is "conviction" (sanniṭṭhāna) and "doubt" (sainṣaya).

\(^5\) See the Mūlaṭīkā and the Anuttikā.

\(^6\) 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 Pannatīvāra, otherwise called the Pucchāvāra, is committed to memory in Burma.
but also of those of all the modes of existence in the universe.¹ Western Associationists seem to have been concerned about the empirical phenomena of accidental suggestion of ideas, in association with the past experience of one or other individual thinker. And it is not surprising that some prominence has been given to these phenomena by ancient, as well as by modern philosophers, among whom are Hartley and Condillac, when we know that the Buddha Himself attached a degree of importance to them. The very fact that these principles are embodied in the Paṭṭhāna, entitled the Mahāpakarana ("The Great Book"), as distinguished from its predecessors, the lesser six, is a clear proof that the Buddha, too, was in favour of the Association Philosophy. A thorough-going Associationist philosopher would say: "Give me mind and a few principles of association, and I will construct the entire universe."²

The relative importance of "The Great Book" among the seven books of the Abhidhamma may be judged from the Buddhist tradition that all the "six rays of human aura" were simultaneously omitted from the Buddha's body when He expounded the principles of relation. The method of "The Great Book," from its universality of application, has received two epithets—"infinite" (anantanaya) and "universal" (samantanaya). This book has been likened by Buddhists to a bottomless ocean fathomed only by the Buddha's omniscience. To this simile we may add another modern illustration—that the Paṭṭhāna and the Buddha's intellect ran in parallels, meeting only in the depth of infinity, even as parallel rays do in distant stars.

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

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*.
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 Dhammasaṅgāni, Dhātukathā, Yamaka, and Paṭṭhāna.

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

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

B. Commentaries and Sub-commentaries.

The commentaries in use in Burma are those of Buddhaghosa, written during the reign of Mahānāma in Ceylon (a.d. 412).⁴ The Aṭṭhasālinī ("The Essence of Meanings")⁵ is the commentary on the Dhammasaṅgāni, and the Sammohavinodani⁶ ("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 Ananda 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. An Anuṭikā, written by Dhammapāla of Kañcipurā (Conjevaram) while residing in the Badaratittha monastery in Anurādhapura, is a sub-commentary on the Mulaṭikā.

Buddhaghosa’s monumental work, the Visuddhimagga (“The Path of Purity”), is an anthological Atṭhakathā, and forms an indispensable textbook in Burma. Dhammapāla wrote a sub-commentary on this; it is known as Mahāṭikā, or Paramatthamañjūsā (“The Casket of Philosophy”), and is largely quoted by Ledi Sadaw. The fact that his commentary on the Cariyāpiṭaka is called Paramatthadīpani (“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.

Sirmaṅgala wrote two Yojanas (Pali paraphrases) on the Atṭhasālinī and the Samohavinodani during the reign of Lezishin Thihathu of Pinya.

The Peṭakālaṅkāra (“The Progress of the Piṭaka”), by Ŋañabhivamsa, is a modern Ṭikā on the Netti. Another sub-commentary, entitled Nettivibhāvanī (“The Netti Made Clear”), was written by Saddhammapālasiri at the request of the Minister Senāpati, during the reign of Narapatigyi, alias Thupārāma Zedi Dayaka, who became king in 1442.

The Visuddhimagga also has a short Ṭikā, the Visuddhimaggaṅkhepa (“The Epitome of the Visuddhimagga”), written by the author of the Mahāṭhupavāṃsa while residing in the Mahindaśena monastery in Anurādhapura. Chapada, who visited Ceylon with his master Uttarājīva, ¹

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 Thonbón Sadan.
³ Tazishin, Thihathu, became king in 1298.
⁴ Cf. p. 78, Bode’s Pali Lit.
⁵ Meaning here “pleasing rhythmic flow.”
⁶ See p. 115, above.
contributed another, entitled Visuddhimagga-gaṇṭhipada ("The Difficult Terms in the Visuddhimagga").

The Maṇidipa ("The Lamp of Gems"), a sub-commentary on the Aṭṭhasālinī, written by Ariyāvamsa¹ of Pinya during the reign of Narapatiyī of Sagaing, was not completed. The Madhusarattadhapani ("The Sweet Essence of Meanings"), written by Mahanāma² during the reign of Bayin Naung, who became king of Haṃsavatī (Pegu) in 1550, is a sub-commentary on the Mūlāṭikā. The Paṭṭhānasāradīpani ("Lights on the Essence of the Patthāna"),³ based on previous comments, is the work of Saddhmammālaṅkāra of Haṃsavatī (1580). Tilokaguru⁴ of Pakangyi, who flourished in Sagaing, wrote two sub-commentaries—Tīkāvaṇṇanā and Anuṭikāvaṇṇanā—on the Dhātukathā during the reign of Anaukpetlun Mindaya, who became king in 1605. In 1615 he wrote a Vaṇṇanā-tīkā on the Yamaka. The Paṭṭhānavaṇṇanāṭikā was also written by him. The Dhātukathāyojanā was written by Pubbārāma Sadaw, Sāradassi⁵ of Pakangyi during the reign of Hanthawaddy-yauck Min, who succeeded to the throne in 1738. The Visativaṇṇanā ("The Exposition of the Twenty"), by Tipiṭakālaṅkāra,⁶ is on the first twenty stanzas of the Aṭṭhasālinī Mahākassapa of the "Great Monastery," is the author of the Abhidhammatthāgāṇṭhipada ("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 Paṭṭhānagaṇṇanaya, ascribed to Chapada, on p. 19, ibid., is not traceable in the Pitakat Thonbōn Sadan.
⁴ See p. 54, ibid.
⁵ Mrs. Bode, on p. 67, thought that this might be a grammatical work. The Gulhatthadhapani ("Light on Hidden Meanings"), ascribed to this author on p. 56 by Mrs. Bode, probably deals with the Aṭṭhasālinī and the Samohavinodani; for it is said that Sagu Sadaw, U Pandica, the teacher of Ledi Sadaw, added to it his expositions on hidden meanings in the Paṇḍappakaraṇa-aṭṭhakathā. The only work with this title that appears in the Pitakat Thonbōn Sadan is the one by Upatissa of Ava on the Jinālaṅkāra, by Buddhakakkhita, 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 Tikā, by Ngakhôn Sadaw, Ādissavāmsa, 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 Lethan¹ in Burma. Buddhadatta, said to be a native of the Colo province towards the east of Anurādhapura,² wrote the Abhidharmāvatāra ("Introductory Philosophy") and the Rūparūpavibbāga ("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 Manisāramañjūśā.³ Similarly, the Saccasaṅkhēpa ("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 Somadevi, 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 Nāmarūpa-pariccheda

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. 28, 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 Mohavicchedani ("The Dispelling of Ignorance") is the work of Mahākassapa of the Cola province. The Nāmaçāradīpaka ("The Actions of Mind"), by Chapada, is not an ethical treatise, as classified by Dr. Forchammer. The Sucittālaṅkāra ("The Progress of Thought") is the work of a native of Pakangyi. The royal author of the Paramatthābindu ("The Drop of Philosophy"), who became king of Pagan in A.D. 1234, was a deep student of philosophy. It is said that he went through the Tipiṭaka nine times. His knowledge of the doctrine was so accurate that he earned the name of Kyazwa.

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

The Abhidhammāvatāra has two tīkās. The older one was written by Vācissaramahāsāmi of the "Great Monastery" of Anurādha; the later, by Sumanīgalamaḥāsāmi, the author of the well-known Tīkagyaw, is entitled Abhidhammatthavikāsini ("The Blossoms of Philosophy"). A tīkā on the Rūparūpavibhāga was written by an anonymous writer of the Mahāvihāra. Vācissaramahāsāmi also wrote the older tīkā on the Saccasaṅkhāpa. Its new tīkā, by an anonymous writer, is called Sāratthasālinī ("The Very Essence of Meanings"). There are five tīkās on the Compendium of Philosophy. The eldest of them was written by Navavimala; the second tīkā, 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 Compā. Phil.  
5 This author is said to be a disciple of Sariputtarā, who is the author of the Sāratthadipani, a sub-commentary on the Vinayasāṅkha. The latter, otherwise known as Sāritānuja or Mahāsāmipāda, was the son of King Buddhādāsa of Ceylon. He flourished during the reign of Sirimahāparakkamabhū (1164), a contemporary of Nārapatisithu of Pagan (1174). But it is not likely that two tīkās would be written simultaneously by the pupils of a common teacher. Cf. p. 19, Bode's Pali Lit.
hammatthavibhāvanī ("Philosophy made Clear"), by Sumanāgalamahāsāmi, a pupil of Sāriputta[ra], was formerly known in Burma as Tikahla ("The Beautiful Tikā"), because the comments in it are so very apt. But when Ariyāvamsa became proficient in the Buddhist scriptures after a study of it, the "Tikahla" changed itself to "Tikagyaw" (the famous Tikā). The Saṅkhepavanṇanā, by Chapada, is the third Tikā on the Compendium. This author is believed to have visited Ceylon in Anno Buddhī, 1714 (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 Mahāvijayabahu, 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 tikās 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 Sāsanālaṅkāra 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 Dhammasaṅgani, 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 ĭkā was added by Gaing-ōk Sadaw, Silācāra, of Salin, but when it was written is not stated. The Paramatthadīpanī, the fifth and the last ĭkā 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 Tikagyī (the great Tīkā), but his pupils call it Tikamaw (the proud Tīkā). On the authority of the Mahātīkā, 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 Paramatthavinīcchaya has two ĭkās, the earlier by Mahābodhi, and the later by an anonymous writer, both of the "Great Monastery." Similarly, the Nāmarūppariparmcheda has two, the earlier by Vācissaramahāsāmi, and the later by an anonymous writer, both of Anurādhapura. Mahābodhi also appears as the author of a ĭkā on the Khema.1 Mahākassapa of Ceylon wrote a ĭkā on his own work, the Mohavīchedā. A ĭkā on the Nāmacāraṇadīpaṇa was also supplied by its own author, Chapada. Mahākassapa of Pagan wrote a ĭkā on the Paramatthabindu.

The Maṇiśāraṇaṁjūsā ("The Casket of Genuine Gems"), a sub-commentary on the Tikagyaw, was written by Ariyāvāma at the special request of his master, Ye-ngôn2 Sadaw of Sagaing, to satisfy the latter with the former's profound scholarship. But Tipiṭakadhara, the teacher of Siladevi, daughter of Bayin Naung, at Haṁsavatī, wrote a sub-țikā on the Tikagyaw, and called it Appheggusārāpani, 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 Maṇiśāraṇaṁjūsā.

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 analyses\(^1\) 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, Anadadhaja (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 Pōk (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 Thē-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 Silavamsa 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 Săraddassī during the reign of Taniganwe Min (1714). A third translation was supplied by Ngataraw Sadaw in Sagaing. A new translation by Jāgara of Dakkhinārāma, near the Arakan Pagoda, appeared in 1859.

When the Petakopadesa was translated is not known, but the Milinda was translated by Dandaing Sadaw, Gunaṅkāra of Pindale, in 1763.

The Aṭṭhasālinī appears to have been translated as early as 1442; it was subsequently translated by Ariyālaṅkāra of Pakangyi during the reign of Taniganwe 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, Paññasīha, 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 Mūlaṭikā was translated by Nangyaung² Sadaw, Aggadhhammadłaṅkāra, 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 Khimagan Sadaw, appeared during King Tharawaddy’s reign (1897). 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 Mañisāramañjūsā, 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.
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 Sadas.
7. Wetkhok Sadaw, Mañisāra.
8. The first Bagaya Sadaw, Tipiṭakālaṅkāra.
9. Munindasāra of Myedu.
10. Ök-kyauh 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).
15. Thetkegyin Sadaw of Alon.
17. Mahābodhi Sadaw of Amarapura.
18. An anonymous therā of Pakangyi.
19. A native of Pindale.
21. Paññasīha, 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 Ņāna during Alaungpaya’s reign (1758), and again by the Salin Thathanabaing during Bagyidaw’s reign. It is not known when and by whom the Saccasaṅkhēpa was first translated, but a second translation of it was made by Ōk-kyuang Sadaw during the same reign. Neither do we know when the translation of the Suciṭṭālaṅkāra was made, but the Paramatthabindu was translated by the first Bagaya Sadaw during Bodaw’s reign (1782). The first Sindè Sadaw, Ńāpañāṅkāra of Tharrawaddy’s reign, translated both the Paramatthavinnicchaya and the Nāmarūpapariccheda.

Ne-yin Sadaw Ariyālaṅkāra translated the Saṅkhēpavaññanā during Taninganwe Min’s reign. The Tikagyaw was first translated by the first Sindè Sadaw, who closely followed the Manisāramañjūsā of Ariyāvaṃsa. Two other translations of this by the Maing-gaing Myoza and by a theravada of Monywa exist. The Abhidhammatthadīpanī was translated by Panlhwa Sadaw. A translation of the Manisāramañjūsā, by Khingyi Pu of Sinbyugyun during Tharrawaddy’s reign, was not completed. The Appheggusāradīpanī was translated by the second Ngakhôn Sadaw, Dipalaṅkāra, during Pagan Min’s reign (1846). When and by whom the new sub-commentaries on the Abhidhammāvatāra and the Saccasaṅkhēpa were translated is not known, but the tikā on the Paramatthabindu was translated by the first Bagaya Sadaw.

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

E. BURMESE WORKS.

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

Three treatises on “The Processes of Thought,” entitled
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 Ōk-kyaua Sadaw, U Pök, during the last reign, and the Vithicittavikāsini, by Nemydhammakyawthu, during Mindoon's reign, are on the same subject. The Vithimañjarī ("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 Gaṅthi,² on crudes in philosophy, had also sprung up. There is a Gaṅthi on the Aṭṭhasālinī by the first Kyaw Aung Sanda Sadaw, written during Hanthawaddypa's reign. The Samohavinodanī also has a Gaṅthi by Shwedaung Sadaw. Nāṇābhivamsa prepared three Gaṅthis on the Mātikā, the Dhātukathā, and on the first five sections of the Yamaka. The Compendium of Philosophy has two Gaṅthis, the first by the first Kyaw Aung Sanda Sadaw, and the second by Dakkhinārāma Sadaw during Mindoon's reign. Another Gaṅthi on the same, by Payagy 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 Appheggusāradipanī was prepared by Sōnda Sadaw. The Paramattharatanā-

¹ See p. 288, Compd. Phil.
² The Gaṅthisāra, ascribed to Chapada on p. 18, Bode's Pali Lit.; the Dasaganṭḥivannanā, Vepullabuddhi of Pagan (p. 28, ibid.); the Visuddhimagga-gaṅthipadaththa, to Sāradassi (p. 56), and the Gaṅṭhi-padaththa, to Nānavara of Pagan (pp. 66, 67), are not traceable in the Pīṭakat Thonbōn Sadan. But a Gaṅthi on the Paṭṭhāna and another on the Tikagyaw, are given in the list of MSS. in the Bernard Free Library, Rangoon.
³ See p. x, Compd. Phil.
vali ("A Row of Philosophical Gems") was prepared by Dhammathingyan (1831) at the request of the Saw Atunwun. The Paramatthasarūpadipani, by Ingan Sadaw, Visuddhārāma, and the Abhidhammatthasarūpadipanī, by Myobyingyi 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 dipani’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.—Rt. D.
A LIST OF PALI BOOKS PRINTED IN CEYLON
IN SINGHALESE CHARACTERS

BY W. A. DE SILVA.

Printing in Sinhalese 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 1885 and a Compendious Pali Grammar, with a Copious Vocabulary, 302 pp., 8vo., by Rev. B. Clough, was issued in 1824. The first press under the control of Sinhalese and Buddhists—the Lankopakāra Press—was established at Galle in 1862 with the aid of the King of Siam. About the same time the Sarwagāna Sāsanābhiwurdhi Dāyaka Press was established at Kotahena, Colombo, under the control of Migettuwatte Unnānsā. The Lakrivikiraṇa Press was established in 1863, and other presses—notably, the

1 Vide Dr. Murdoch's Catalogue of Printed Books in Sinhalese, Christian Vernacular Education Society, 1868.
Lankābhiṇṇā Press, which for a long time was under the control of the late lamented Pandit Baṭuvantuḍāve, came into existence. The first Pali work of importance was published in 1865 by the well-known scholar, Rev. Waskadaḍuwe Subhūti Nāyaka Unnānsē, who is still living. It was the Abhidhānappadipika, 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 Lankābhiṇṇā Press; and, as the number of presses increased, a few other Pali books appeared in print from time to time. Within the last twenty years a large number of Pali works has been issued.

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

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

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

Darley Gardens, Colombo,
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18. Aggikkhandhopama Sutta; with Singhalese paraphrase.
Edited by Silavamsa Unnānsē and B. Samaranaṅ-kara Unnānsē; D. Witachy Appuhamy, Pāliyagoda, 1891; pp. 88, roy. 8vo.


20. Ālavaka Sūtraya: Pali text with Singhalese paraphrase; Sudarśana Press, Colombo, 1897; pp. 60, demy 8vo.


27. Ārakā Sūtra; with Singhalese paraphrase. Published by A. Cooray at the Sudarśana Press, Colombo, 1894; pp. 11, demy 8vo.

28. Āsirviṣopama Sūtraya; with Singhalese paraphrase. Edited by D. B. D. S. Samaranaṅyaka; Weerkody Bros., Colombo, 1891; pp. 36, demy 8vo.


32. Atthasalini Atthayojanā, of Nānakittī Swāmi. Edited by Paññāsekharā Unnānsē; the Lankopakāra Press, Galle, 1900; pp. 275, demy 8vo.

33. Atthipuṇja Sūtraya. The Kandy Buddhist Press, Kandy, 1897; pp. 9, demy 8vo.


37. Bhikkhuni-Pāṭimokkha. See Bhikkhu-Pāṭimokkha.


40. Bodhipakshika Dharma Vibhāgaya: Pali and Singha-


40. Bodhipakshika Dharma Vibhāgaya: Pali and Singha-

41. Brahmayu Sūtraya; with Singhalese paraphrase. Śastrādhāra Press, Colombo, 1895; pp. 73; demy 8vo.

43. **Buddha-Pangaraya**: Pali verses with Singhalese translation; Vidyāwardena Press, Colombo, 1908; pp. 24, demy 8vo.


45. **Baudhāya Pratipatti Dipaniya**: Pali and Singhalese; Compendium of Buddhist conduct. Edited by K. Paññāsekara Unnāṃśe; D. P. Kandamby, Kata- luwa, 1893; pp. 48, demy 16mo.

46. **Baudhāya Pratipatti Sangrahawa**: Pali and Singhalese; compilation of rules of Buddhist conduct. Compiled by Nānāmōli Unnāṃśe; Lankābhiṁṇā Viśruta Press, 1889; pp. 50, demy 12mo.


51. **Bālāvatāra Balana Sannaya**: Pali and Singhalese; Grammar. Edited by E. Sankicca Unnaṃśe; Sucaritodaya Press, Panadura, 1899; pp. 188, demy 8vo.


53. **Bālāvatāra Puccha Visajjanā**: Grammar. Published


56. Bālapandita Sutrasya; with Singhalese paraphrase. Edited by Dharmaratana Unnānsē; Satya Samuccaya Press, Pāeliyagoda, 1893; pp. 48, demy 8vo.


65. Culla-Vagga, Vinaya. Published by D. D. Amara-
68. Daksināvibhaṅga - Sūtraya; with Singhalese paraphrase. Edited by M. Nānissara Unnānsē; Lankabhina Viśruta Press, Colombo, 1890; pp. 24, demy 8vo.
74. Dhammahadaya - Vibhaṅga - Sūtra Sannaya; with Singhalese translation. Edited by P. Somānanda; D. J. Gunatunga, Colombo, 1906; pp. 76, demy 8vo.
80. Dhammapadārtha - Gāthā Sannaya. Edited by U. Dhammānanda Unnānsē; Saddharmaprākāsa Press, Alutgāma, 1907, pp. 80, demy 8vo.
84. Dinacarita-Sangaha. Edited by M. Vipulasāra Unnānsē; N. M. Perera, Colombo, 1890; pp. 18, demy 12mo.
88. Ghaṭikāra - Sūtraya; with Singhalese paraphrase; Victoria Press, Colombo, 1897; pp. 28, demy 8vo.
89. Heranasika and Dinacariya: Pali and Singhalese.
94. Jinālankāra (Sannaya); with Singhalese paraphrase. Edited by W. Dipankara Unnānsē; Vidyāloka Press, Galle, 1900; pp. 93, demy 8vo.
100. Kaccāyana-Sutta; with Singhalese translation. Published by N. J. Cooray at Wellampitiya, 1904; pp. 128.


121. Mahāparinirvāna-Sūtraya; with Singhalese paraphrase. Edited by Paṅṅānanda Unnānsē; James Fonseca and Sons, Colombo, 1887; pp. 280; demy 8vo.
123. Mahā-Pirit Pota: Piruwana Pot Vahāṃsa. Published by J. D. Fernando, Śāstrādhāra Press, Colombo, 1891; pp. 82, 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 Vahāṃsa. Printed
by J. D. Fernando, Colombo, 1899; pp. 148, demy 8vo.


138. Mahāsatipaṭṭhāna-Sūtra; with Singhalese paraphrase. Published by F. Cooray at the Sudarṣana Press, Matara, 1908; pp. 20, demy 8vo.
139. Mahātirtayatana - Sūtraya; with Singhalese paraphrase. Printed by M. H. Perera, Pāliyagoda, 1901; pp. 36, demy 8vo.


143. Mayitribhāvanāva and Abhidharma Kāmataṇhā; with Singhalese paraphrase. Edited by D. Saranākara Unnānsē; Lankāloka Press, Galle, 1898; pp. 12, fcap. 8vo.


149. Milindapraśnāya. Published by M. J. Rodrigo at the Vidyāsāgara Press, Colombo, 1896; pp. 80, demy 8vo; Part.


151. Moggallāna-Paṇcakapradipa: Grammar. Edited by


173. Sandhi-Dīpanī: Grammar. Edited by Nānḍārāma
Tissa Unnāṃsē; Śāstrādhāra Press, Colombo, 1886; pp. 85, demy 8vo.
177. Sapta-Suryodgamana-Sūtraya; with Singhalese paraphrase; Saivasri Press, Peliyagoda, 1898; pp. 56, demy 8vo.
180. Sāraṇa-Sīla-Saṅgraha. Edited by M. Gunaratana Unnāṃsē; Weerakkody Bros., Colombo; pp. 44, demy 12mo.
186. Sāraṭṭhappakāsini: Commentary on Saṃyutta-
Sucaritodaya Press, Pānadura, 1903; pp. 200, demy 8vo.

188. Sārattha-Saṅgaha: Grammar. Tikā of Bālāvatāra. 
By Uttama Maṅgala Buddhaghosa Mahā-Sthavira. 
Edited by G. Gunaratana Unnānsē; Satyasamuccaya Press, Kelaniya, 1901; pp. 65, demy 8vo.

189. Sāsanawamsadipa, Sannaya (Singhalese paraphrase). 
Edited by Nānatilaka Nāyaka Unnānsē; Vidyāratnakāra Press, Welitara, 1903; pp. 320, demy 8vo.; Parts 1-4.

190. Sāsanavamsa-Dipaya; account of the introduction of Buddhism into Ceylon. By Vimalasāra Unnānsē; Sāstrāloka Press, Colombo, 1881; pp. 163, demy 8vo.


192. Selasūtra, Sannaya (Singhalese paraphrase). Edited 
by K. Paññānanda Unnānsē; printed at Dipaduttama Vihāra, Colombo, 1896; pp. 44, demy 8vo.

193. Sigālovāda-Sūtraya; with Singhalese paraphrase. 
Edited by Tangalle Jinaratana Unnānsē; Sudarṣaṇa Press, Colombo, 1889; pp. 64, demy 8vo.


197. Subodha-Laṅkaraya: Grammar of Saṅgharakkhita 
Mahā - Sthavira; with Singhalese paraphrase.


204. Sutta-Nipāta. Edited by Paññatissa Unnānsē and Aggadhamma Unnānsē; Welitara, 1891; pp. 186, demy 8vo.


208. Sūtra-Saṅgraha, Sannaya (Singhalese paraphrase).
By Medhāvītissa Unnānsē; Saddharmaprahāsa Press, Alutgāma, 1905; pp. 80, demy 8vo.

209. Tamotama-Parāyana-Sūtraya; with Singhalese paraphrase; Sayivasri Press, Pāliyagoda; pp. 16, 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.


221. Vasala-Sūtraya; with Singhalese paraphrase. Don Simon de Silva, 1908; pp 14, demy 8vo.
228. Vinayattha-Mañjūsā, Ṭīkā by Kankhā-Vitarāṇī. Edited by Paññālankāra and Piyatissa, Unnānsē; D. C. Abeywardana, Colombo, 1901; pp. 80, 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.—Rt. D.]
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I.—ARRANGEMENT BY YEARS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1882</th>
<th>1889</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Buddhavanaśa and Cariyā</td>
<td>Dīgha, Vol. I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Piṭaka.</td>
<td>3. Peta-Vatthu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Āyāranga.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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-Sangāṇi.           |                           |
| 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    | Mahā-Bodhi-Vaṃsa.         |                           |
| 3    | Itivuttaka.               |                           |

1890.

| 1    | Journal, 1891–1893.       |                           |
| 2    | Mahā-Bodhi-Vaṃsa.         |                           |

1891.

| 1    | Dhātu-Kathā.              |                           |
| 2    | Therīgāthā Cy.            |                           |

1892.

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

1893.

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

1894.

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

1895.

| 1    | Journal, 1893–1896.       |                           |
| 2    | Yogāvacara’s Manual.      |                           |
| 3    | Majjhima, Vol. II., Part 1|                           |
### II.—INDEX TO TEXTS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>Net Subscription Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£  s.  d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Anāgata-Vaṁśa (in *Journal* for 1884) | ... |
2. Abhidhammattha-Sangaha (in *Journal* for 1884) | ... | ... | ... |
3. Anguttara Nikāya, 6 vols. | ... | ... | ... | 3 3 0 |
II.—INDEX TO TEXTS—continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME.</th>
<th>Net Subscript.</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Attha-Sālinī (1897)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Āyāranga (1882)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Buddha-Vaṇsa (together with No. 7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cariyā-Piṭaka (1882)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Cha-kesa-dhātu-vāṇsa (in Journal for 1885)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Dāthā-Vaṇsa (in Journal for 1884)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Dhammapada Commentary, vol. 1, part 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1906)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhammapada Commentary, vol. 1, part 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1909)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhammapada Commentary, vol. 1, parts 1 and 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhammapada Commentary, vol. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhammapada Commentary, vol. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Dhamma-Sangaṇi (1885)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Dhātu Kathā (1892)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Dīgha-Nikāya, 3 vols.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Duka-Paṭṭhāna (1906)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Gandha-Vaṇsa (in Journal for 1886)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Iti-vuttaka (1890)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Jina-Carita (in Journal for 1905)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Kathā Vatthu, 2 vols.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Kathā Vatthu Commentary (in Journal for 1889)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Khudda-Sikkhā (in Journal for 1883)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Mahāvaṇsa (1908)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Mahā-Bodhi-Vaṇsa (1891)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Majjhima-Nikāya, 3 vols.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Mūla-Sikkhā (in Journal for 1883)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Netti-Pakaraṇa (1902)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Pañca-gati-dīpana (in Journal for 1884)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Paṭisambhidāmagga, two vols.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Peta-Vatthu (1889)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Peta-Vatthu Commentary (1894)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Puggala-Paññatti (1883)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II.—INDEX TO TEXTS—continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME.</th>
<th>Net Subscription Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£</td>
<td>s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Saṅyutta-Nikāya, 6 vols.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Saddhammasangaha (in Journal for 1890)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Saddhammopāyana (in Journal for 1877)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Sandesa-Kathā (in Journal for 1885)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Sāsana-Vaṃsa (1897)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Simā-vivāda-vinicchaya-kathā (in Journal for 1887)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Sumangala-Vilāsini, vol. 1 (1886)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutta-Nipāta (1902)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Sutta-Nipāta Glossary (1893)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Tela-kaṭāha-gāthā (in Journal for 1884)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-42. Thera-theri-gāthā (1888)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Therī-gāthā Commentary (1892)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Udāna (1885)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Vibhanga (1904)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Vimāna-Vatthu (1886)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Vimāna-Vatthu Commentary (1901)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Yamaka, I. and II.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Yamaka Commentary (1912)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Yogāvacara’s Manual (1896)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III.—INDEX TO AUTHORS.

Alwis, James; Lectures on Pali and Buddhism (1888).
Andersen, D.; Index to Trenckner’s Notes (1908). Revise of Pali words beginning with “S” (1909).
Anesaki, M.; The Sutta Nipāta in Chinese (1907).
Bell, H. C. P.; List of MSS. in the Oriental Library, Kandy, 1882.
Bendall, Cecil; On the Mahāvagga (1889).
Benson, A. C.; Buddha, a sonnet (1883).
Bode, Mabel H.; ed. of Sāsana-Vaṃsa. Index to the
III.—INDEX TO AUTHORS—continued.

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 (1909).
Feer, Léon; ed. of Saṅyutta, 5 vols; and of Pañca-gati Dīpana.
List of MSS. in the Bibliothèque Nationale (1882).
Frankfurter, Otto; List of MSS. in the Bodleian Library, Oxford (1882).
Geiger, W.; ed. of Mahāvāṇṣa; transl. of Mahāvāṇṣa (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-Pakarana.
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-vāṇṣa (1885), Anāgata-vāṇṣa (1886), Gandha-
III.—INDEX TO AUTHORS—continued.

Vaśsa (1886), Simā Vivāda (1887), and Kathā Vatthu Commentary (1889).
Moore, Justin H.; Collation of the Iti-vuttaka (1907).
Notes and Queries (1884, 1885, 1886, 1887, 1889, and 1891).
Müller, F. Max; On Kenjur Kasawara (1883).

Glossary of Pali Proper Names (1888).
Norman, H. C.; Commentary on the Dhammapada.
Oldenberg, Hermann; ed. of Therī-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 Translations” (1903).

Rhys Davids, Mrs.; ed. of Vibhanga, Duka-Paṭṭhāna, Yamaka, Compendium of Philosophy (1910), Yamaka Commentary (1912).

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 Vaṃsa.
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.
Wenzel, H.; Nāgārjuna’s “Friendly Epistle” (1886). Index to verses in the Divyāvadāna (1896).

For 1912-13 the issues will be:

3 Yamaka II. Mesd. Foley, Hunt, and Rhys Davids (concl.)

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-Vilāsini, II., III., the Sutta-Nipāta Commentary, the Papañca-Sūdanī, the Sāratthappakāsinī, the Niddesa, the Apadana, 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.


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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>His Majesty the King of Siam</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R.H. Prince Krom Mun Devavāṇsa Varoprakar</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R.H. Prince Prisdang</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Secretary of State for India</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund Hardy, the late (three donations)</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. V. S. Davids, Esq.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. T. Cave, Esq.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Hannah, Esq. (two donations)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Horn</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor Dr. Edw. Müller</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Forlong, the late</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed. T. Sturdy, Esq.</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Plimmer (five donations)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. C. Warren, the late</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. B. Andrews, Esq.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.M.’s Government</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss C. M. Ridding</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. F. Johnston, Esq. (two donations)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.H. the Raja of Bhinga</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. H. Baynes, Esq.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edw. Greenly, Esq.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. Môn, K.S.M.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

£1,658 4 9
### Statement of Account for 1909

#### Receipts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance at Bank, January 1, 1909</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance in hand, January 1, 1909</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Subscriptions for current and past years</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Donations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Interest at Bank</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To Printers</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Publisher’s Charges</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Insurance of Stock</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Burmese MS. (Theragāthā Commentary)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Yamaka (Rangoon)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Stationery and Postage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Dictionary Fund</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance at Bank</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance in hand</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**£923 2 7**

**£923 2 7**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECEIPTS</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance at Bank, January 1, 1910</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance in hand, January 1, 1910</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Subscriptions and Sales</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment for Transcription</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest at Bank</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURE</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To Printers</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>271</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher's Charges</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance of Stock</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert Engraving Company</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributors (to Journal and Angutt. Index vol.)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcriber</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roller Cabinet</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationery, Postage, etc.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance at Bank</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance in hand</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

£929 14 0

£929 14 0
### Statement of Account for 1911

#### Receipts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance at Bank, January 1, 1911</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance in hand, January 1, 1911</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Subscriptions and Sales</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Donations</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Interest at Bank</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To Printers</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Publisher's Charges</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Insurance of Stock</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Contributors</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Typist</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Binding</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Purchase of Books</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Stationery, Postage, etc.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance at Bank, December 31, 1911</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance in hand, December 31, 1911</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**£980 12 1**