

Abhidhamma Studies IV*

The Saccasaṅkhepa and Its Commentaries¹

L.S. Cousins[†]

PRELIMINARY REMARKS

L.S. Cousins' (LSC) article published here posthumously was considered not yet ready for publication by LSC himself. In an email to me dated 21 July 2014 with the preliminary version of this article attached, he characterised it as "very much a work in progress". This in his opinion was especially valid for the Appendices, and the third part of the paper. With respect to the latter he stated, "Part Three needs to be rewritten; it collects together various thoughts and is not a coherent whole. I have not yet made up my mind about some aspects." In the following months we further discussed several points, especially the translation of the introduction to the Saccasaṅkhepavivaraṇa. As a consequence LSC revised his translation several times, rendering the version contained in his original article obsolete. However, he did not find time to work on this article again because of other obligations (email, 25/9/2014). Sadly he was not granted the time to return to it.

Despite the unfinished state and the remaining imperfections, especially of the third part, this article is an important piece of scholarship

*[LSC's three previous Abhidhamma Studies are: "Abhidhamma Studies I: Jotipāla and the *Abhidhamma Anuṅkā*", *Thai International Journal of Buddhist Studies*, 2 (2011), 1–36; "Abhidhamma Studies II: Sanskrit Abhidharma Literature of the Mahāvihāravāsins", *Thai International Journal for Buddhist Studies*, 4 (2013), 1–61; "Abhidhamma Studies III: Origins of the Canonical Abhidha(r)mma Literature", *Journal of the Oxford Centre for Buddhist Studies*, 8 (2015), 96–145.]

¹ Thanks are due to Peter Skilling for access to mss of Sacc; to Uppsala University Library, Jacqueline Filliozat, Olivier de Bernon, and Petra Kieffer-Pülz for mss of the *ṭīkā*s.

not only concerning the history of Pāli literature, but also with respect to the development of the Abhidhamma and its representation in the Saccasaṅkhepa. Since we do not know what decisions LSC would have made concerning various points in his article, nor which of the more recent findings he would have accepted, we now publish this last version, designated as the fifth by him, and dated 14 July 2014; it incorporates the changes suggested by LSC himself in subsequent emails to me. Some of the questions we discussed were dealt with by me in articles that appeared only after LSC's demise. In order to bring these more recent findings to the reader's notice comments and references are added in square brackets.

The paper was finally revised by Rupert Gethin and me. We decided to eliminate the third Appendix to this paper which contained translations — characterised as “rough” by LSC himself — of difficult text portions from a variety of Abhidhamma commentaries and subcommentaries, since neither of us knew how LSC would have translated them finally in a revised version.

Petra Kieffer-Pülz

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

Saccasaṅkhepa (Sacc) has been variously attributed to (Culla-) Dhammapāla and to Ānanda. This dates back to at least the early thirteenth century. A careful examination of the contents of the work suggests, however, that it cannot be the work of Ānanda nor of Dhammapāla, if by the latter one means the author of the four Suttanta *ṭīkā*s and/or the Māhāṭīkā to the Visuddhimagga. The possibility that it is the work of Jotipāla is suggested, but complete certainty does not seem attainable as yet.

Two *ṭīkā*s are extant, although there is no printed edition of either as yet. One of them (Saccasaṅkhepavivarāṇa = Sacc-viv), despite often being labelled on the mss as the “old *ṭīkā*”, can be shown to be the later of the two. No date can be suggested for this, although it must be thirteenth century or more probably later.

The older of the two *ṭīkā*s, we are informed, was written at the request of Sāriputta and must therefore be the work of a pupil or

associate of his. It is referred to as the Sāratthasālinī (Sacc-t) in the mss and cannot be later than the thirteenth century in date. Some attempt is made here to explore the complex issues involved in dating the work of Sāriputta and his disciples.

PART ONE

I. PROPOSED AUTHORS OF THE SACCASAṅKHEPA

The authorship of the Saccasaṅkhepa has been disputed for a considerable time. Among twentieth-century scholars some have assigned it to a Culla-Dhammapāla, although mostly aware of other possibilities.² *CPD* (*Epilegomena* to Vol. I, p. 50) is a little more cautious and notes both attributions to Culla-Dhammapāla and to Dhammapāla without prefix. More recently, von Hinüber simply mentions Dhammapāla and Ānanda as possibilities.³

The confusion in fact derives from our sources. It has long been known that the three main traditional bibliographic sources differ on this. The nineteenth-century Sāsana-vaṃsa simply attributes Sacc to Dhammapāla-thera.⁴ The earlier Gandha-vaṃsa at first attributes it to “the teacher Dhammapāla, senior pupil of the teacher Ānanda”⁵ but then later refers to the author of Sacc as the teacher Culla-Dhammapāla: “The book named Saccasaṅkhepa was made by the teacher the Younger

² For example, Geiger 1956 [1916], p. 34; Malalasekera 1928, pp. 112; 202f.; Norman 1983, p. 152.

³ Von Hinüber 1996, § 351, cf. § 366.

⁴ [Sās 34.2f.] So also the later *Piṭakat samuiṅ* which refers to Dhammapāla as residing in “Badaratittha Monastery, Anurādha city west, Sri Lanka” (Mahāsiriyejaya-Sū 2012, p. 67, no. 290). However, this is unlikely to be correct.

⁵ [Gv B^e:] *Ānandācariyassa jeṭṭha-sisso Dhammapālo nāmācariyo Saccasaṅkhepaṃ nāma pakaraṇaṃ akāsi*. [LSC here follows the reading of Gv B^e as documented on the CSCD; Gv E^e 60,3of. reads *Culladhammapālo* and omits *pakaraṇaṃ*; thus, according to the roman edition, there is no discrepancy between the two statements of Gv. It is, however, known that there are a number of discrepancies in the various testimonies of the Gv, none of which is reliable (B^e E^e N^e).]

Dhammapāla according to his own understanding”,⁶ i.e. without his having been requested by anyone. However, the only other known mention of a Culla-Dhammapāla is in the Gandha-vaṃsa itself, where he is included with Dhammapāla in a list of eleven teachers from Jambudīpa.⁷ The still earlier Saddhamma-saṅgaha (c. A.D. 1400) by contrast gives the worthy elder Ānanda as the author.⁸

There is in fact an earlier attribution of Sacc to Dhammapāla, as mentioned by von Hinüber [1996: §351] — that by Ariyavaṃsa in his subcommentary (to the Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha), composed in A.D. 1466 (Maṇis I 377,23–25; 407,20). To this can be added an even earlier mention in A.D. 1154 by Aggavaṃsa in the Saddānīti.⁹ This might seem to settle the matter, if it were not for the fact that the twelfth- or thirteenth-century *ṭīkā* by a pupil or associate of Sāriputta attributes Sacc to Ānanda, using precisely the same verse we find in Saddhamma-s; so presumably the Sacc-ṭ is the source from which Saddhamma-s has taken its information. I shall refer to this *ṭīkā* as the Sāratthasālinī. To add to this, a second *ṭīkā*, whose date I will discuss below, has the attribution to Dhammapāla. This *ṭīkā* I will refer to as the Vivaraṇa, since it is described as an *atthavivara*<*ṇa*> in its introduction.

2. THE DATE AND AUTHORSHIP OF THE SACCASAṆKHEPA

It is clear then that the authorship of Sacc was ascribed to both Ānanda and Dhammapāla by the early thirteenth century and that the manuscripts of Sacc available to the author of the Sāratthasālinī did not contain the colophon attributing it to Dhammapāla, given in most (?) printed editions, but absent from the only manuscript used for the PTS edition. Also in the early thirteenth century, Sumaṅgala cites Sacc at least seven times in his Abhidh-s-mhṭ, mostly without attribution but

⁶ [Gv E^c 70,12f. = Gv B^e.:] *Saccasaṅkhepo nāma gantho attano matiyā Culla-Dhammapālācariyena kato.*

⁷ [Gv E^c 66,30 = Gv B^e.]

⁸ Saddhamma-s 62,31–32 [ch. 9, v. 16]:

*kato yo Saccasaṅkhepo nipuṇ’attha-vinicchayo
Ānanda-thera-pādena vicitta-naya-maṇḍito.*

⁹ [Sadd E^c I 8,9f.:] *Saccasaṅkhepa-ppakaraṇe hi Dhammapālācariyena ... uccāritam.*

twice explicitly mentioning Saccasaṅkhepa.¹⁰ In Abhidh-av-nt̥ he mentions it by name twice and also quotes it once without name.¹¹ Since Sumaṅgala mentions both Dhammapāla and Ānanda on a number of other occasions, this gives good reason to suspect that he either did not have information as to the authorship of Sacc or else knew of both attributions without being sure which, if either, was correct.

The confusion in the later tradition is clearly due to the fact that the name of Ānanda is embedded in the Sāratthasālinī, the better and more influential of the two *ṭīkā*s, while that of Dhammapāla is given in the widely known Saddanīti. Since the earliest known citations from Sacc are given by Sāriputta in his *sanne* to Abhidh-s,¹² we can probably assume that Sacc precedes the twelfth century and must therefore date to the period from the seventh to the eleventh century. Most probably it precedes the Māhāṭīkā to Vism in date. If so, it would be earlier than the eleventh century (see below). It does sometimes contain more Sanskritized language and concepts, otherwise found in the *ṭīkā* literature. In general we may say that it bears a relationship to the earlier *ṭīkā*s similar to the relationship which the Abhidhammāvātāra bears to the *aṭṭhakathās* of the school of Buddhaghosa.

Since there does not appear to be any explicit reference to Sacc in any pre-twelfth century source, we must turn to its content for confirmation as to its likely dating. Here the striking element is the manner in which Sacc often presents both the position of the *aṭṭhakathā* literature and that of the *ṭīkā* writer, i.e. Ānanda. The Sāratthasālinī refers to this as the *ṭīkā-naya* [*“ṭīkā method”*] and the *aṭṭhakathā-naya* [*“aṭṭhakathā method”*]. It needs to be examined in detail with reference to the specific issues to understand the place of the Saccasaṅkhepa in the history of the *abhidhamma* exegetical literature.

¹⁰ Abhidh-s-mh̥ [B^e] 95, 101, 108, 109, 143, 145, 146. They are introduced as follows: 95: *āhu Porāṇā*; 101: *Saccasaṅkhepe*; 108, 146: *vadanti*; 109: *vuttañ ca*; 143, 145: *āhu*.

¹¹ Abhidh-av-nt̥ II 38, 65, 96.

¹² Abhidh-s-sn 90, 102, 104, 146, 163, 175. Sacc is mentioned by name at 163,30 [*Satyasam̐kṣepayehi*].

IS BIRTH BORN?

At Sacc 31 we have the explicit statement that birth (*jāti*) can be born from any of the four conditions: *kamma*, mind, season, and nutriment. This accords with the Dhammasaṅgaṇi where the *upacaya* and *santati* of materiality can be either *upādīṇṇa* or mind-originated (Dhs §§ 746; 747). But in Sacc 32 it is pointed out that by the *aṭṭhakathā-naya* birth is not born from any cause. This is because birth is simply a name for the arising of *dhammas*; it has no separate existence. If it did, there would be an infinite regress.¹³ Here the distinction is not between the *aṭṭhakathā* and *īkā* methods, but between a canonical statement understood as *pariyāyena vutta* [“stated in a loose manner”] and a commentarial statement explained as *nippariyāya* [“stated in a strict manner”].

MIND-BORN SOUND WITHOUT COMMUNICATION

At Sacc 36 the number of types of mind-born *kalāpas* [“clusters”] is given as either seven or six. The figure six is reached by omitting the simple ninefold cluster of sound. In other words, mind-born sound would always be accompanied by communication. The view that there are seven is attributed to the Porāṇas by the Māhāṭīkā (Vism-mhṭ II 110) and to the Mahā-aṭṭhakathā by the Aṭṭhasālinī, the Mūlaṭīkā, and other sources. It is rejected by the Aṭṭhasālinī on the authority of the *āgama* commentaries of Buddhaghosa; and also by citing the Paṭṭhāna statement that “mind-originated sound base is a condition for ear discrimination by object condition”.¹⁴ However, a number of later writers point out that the Paṭṭhāna does not in fact specify “mind-originated” here.¹⁵ That also appears to be the case with the extant texts of the Paṭṭhāna.¹⁶ Since Ānanda appears to accept the reading of the Aṭṭhasālinī, it could indicate that the author of the Abhidhamma commentary had a different textual reading in the version of the Paṭṭhāna available to him.

¹³cf. Vism 452.

¹⁴Dhs-a 86–87, Sv III 887, Mp II 269; cf. Paṭis-a 693.

¹⁵Dhs-anuṭ 161, Spk-pt II 349, Abhidh-av-ṇṭ II 129.

¹⁶Paṭṭh I 135, II 478, III 97.

This then is not precisely a dispute between the *aṭṭhakathā-naya* and the *ṭīkā-naya* so much as a disagreement between the *aṭṭhakathās* and the earlier Sinhala commentaries. Ānanda in the *Mūlaṭīkā* in fact explains the issue, stating that the *Mahā-aṭṭhakathā* is referring to subtle sound, heard with the divine ear as in the Suttas, whereas the *Paṭṭhāna* refers to gross sound. He seems, however, to accept the rejection of this in Dhs-a, on the grounds that there is no such thing as a sound which cannot be discriminated by the ear.¹⁷ According to Sv-pt what is meant here is the sound experienced by someone reciting a *mantra*.¹⁸

We can note here that the author of Sacc simply gives both alternatives without indicating any preference.

THE MOMENT OF PRESENCE

At Sacc 54ff. we have the treatment of moments of mentality. As is well known, Ānanda, the author of the *Mūlaṭīkā*, rejected the moment of presence and allowed only the moments of arising and ceasing for mentality. This is the position which is stated in Sacc 54: only in the moment of arising of mentality can it give rise to materiality, if the moment of presence is not recognised. As Sacc-ṭ points out, the basis

¹⁷Dhs-mṭ 75,13–76,2 (to Dhs-a 86f.): *sahasaddā panā ti* (Dhs-a 86,15) *tassa vikārassa saddena saha sambhūtā vuttam. cittānuparivattitāya pana so na yāva saddabhāvī ti daṭṭhabbo. vitakkavipphārasaddo na sotaviññeyyo ti pavattena Mahā-aṭṭhakathāvādena cittasamuṭṭhānasaddo vinā pi viññatti-ghaṭṭanena uppajjati ti āpajjati. “yā tāya vācāya viññattī” ti* (Dhs §§ 637; 720; 848) *hi vacanato asotaviññeyyasaddena saha viññattiyā uppatti natthī ti viññāyatī ti. cittasamuṭṭhānaṃ saddāyatanan ti* (Dhs-a 86,30) *ettha ca na koci cittasamuṭṭhāno saddo asaṅgahito nāma atthī ti adhippāyena Mahā-aṭṭhakathāvādaṃ paṭisedheti. chabbidhena rūpasāṅgahādīsu hi sotaviññeyyan ti diṭṭhaṃ sutan ti ettha sutan ti ca na koci saddo na saṅgayhatī ti. Mahā-aṭṭhakathāyaṃ pana viññattisahajam eva jivhātālucalanādikaravittakkasamuṭṭhitam sukhumasaddaṃ “dibbasotena sutvā ādisatī” ti Sutte Paṭṭhāne ca oḷārikasaddaṃ sandhāya “sotaviññāṇassa ārammaṇapaccayena paccayo” ti vuttan ti iminā adhippāyena asotaviññeyyatā vuttā siyā. saddo ca asotaviññeyyo cā ti viruddham etan ti pana paṭikkhepo vedītabbo.*

¹⁸Sv-pt III 85,17–18: ... *yo loke mantajappo ti vuccati, yassa Mahā-aṭṭhakathāyaṃ asotaviññeyyatā vuttā.*

for this is the absence of presence in the Yamaka which analyzes in terms of the moments of arising and breaking up (Yam I 179 *passim*). The following stanza [Sacc 55] rejects the argument that the moment of presence can be inferred from the Aṅguttara reference to “change of what is present” as one of the three *saṅkhata-lakkhaṇa*.

The next stanza [Sacc 56], however, introduces an alternative with *atha vā*, possibly intended here as the preferred alternative. At all events, this now introduces the *aṭṭhakathā-mata* [“the opinion (expressed) in the commentary”], as the Sāratthasālinī points out, “after having shown the understanding of the *ṭīkākāra*”.

MATERIALITY AT REBIRTH IN AN *APĀYA*

Sacc 65 states that in the Descents [*apāya*] a blind or deaf being without gender has five <*kamma*-born> material decads at the moment of rebirth. It then adds that whether they have five or four has to be known by inference. The following verse [Sacc 66] begins by citing the statement that <in the Descents> an *opapātika* being lacking sight, hearing, and smell has only four material decads at the moment of rebirth, i.e. the decads of taste, touch, gender, and heart base. The Sāratthasālinī indicates that this statement is made in the *aṭṭhakathā*.¹⁹ This is superficially contrary to the Vibhaṅga commentary which gives a stanza (also cited in the Visuddhimagga and probably from an earlier source²⁰) that treats the *opapātika* and the *saṃsedaja* together and gives a minimum of three decads, i.e. omitting in addition the sense of taste.²¹ The Yamaka commentary, on the other hand, denies that there are any *opapātikas* in the *kāma-dhātu* who lack the sense of smell.²² Taking these two statements together, the understanding is then that some very small creatures have only the senses of touch and smell together with a basis for mind. However, the stanza (Sacc 66) concludes with the comment

¹⁹[Sacc-ṭ ad v. 66: *caturo bhavanti paṭisandhikkhaṇe jivhākāyabhāvavattu vasena caturo hontī ti aṭṭhakathāyaṃ vuttaṃ*].

²⁰[Vism 552,34f. (Vism Trsl., p. 661f.).]

²¹Vibh-a 161f.

²²Yam-a 76,1: *kāmadhātuyam pana aghānako opapātiko natthi*.

that a knowledgeable person should understand this after investigating. As the Sāratthasālinī points out, this was said by the *ṭīkā-kāra*.²³

More probably, Sacc-ṭ is mistaken and Sacc is simply hinting at the view of the author of the Mūlaṭīkā.²⁴ Ānanda points out that neither the *opapātika* nor the *saṃsedaja* lacks the sense of smell in the canonical text.²⁵ The Anuṭīkā critiques various views.²⁶ Abhidh-av-ṇṭ presents this

²³[Sacc-ṭ ad v. 66: *upaparikkhitvā ti vimamsivā; gahetabban ti ṭīkākārena vuttam;*] e.g. Dhs-mṭ 129,24: *upaparikkhitvā gahetabbo*; Vibh-anuṭ (B^c) 124,4: *sabbaṃ taṃ vimamsivā gahetabbaṃ*.

²⁴Vibh-mṭ 109,12–13: *na hi pāliyaṃ kāmāvacarānaṃ saṃsedajopapātīkānaṃ aghānakānaṃ upapatti vuttā*. cf. Yam-mṭ 129.

²⁵Citing Vibh 412f., etc.

²⁶Vibh-anuṭ 123,6–124,4: *ettha ca yathā sattati ukkaṃsato ca rūpānī ti padaṃ saṃsedajopapātīsū ti ettha yonidvayavasena yojjyati, na evaṃ avakaṃsato tiṃsā ti idaṃ; idaṃ pana saṃsedajayonivasen' eva yojetabbaṃ, ekayoga-niddiṭṭhassāpi ekadeso sambandhaṃ labhatī ti. "saṃsedajass'eva ca jaccandhabadhira-aghānakanapūmsakassa jivhākāyavatthudasakānaṃ vasena tiṃsa rūpāni uppajantī ti vuttaṃ, na opapātīkassā" ti ayam ettha Aṭṭhakathāya adhippāyo. ye pana "opapātīkassa jaccandha ... pe ... uppajantī' ti Mahā-aṭṭhakathāyaṃ vuttan" ti vadanti, taṃ na gahetabbaṃ. so hi pamādapāṭho. evañ ca katvā Āyatanayamakavaṇṇanāya "kāmadhātuyāṃ pana aghānako opapātīko natthi. yadi bhavēyya, 'kassaci aṭṭhāyatanāni pātubhavanti' ti vadeyyā" ti vakkhati. apare panāhu "kassaci ekādasāyatanāni pātubhavanti' yāva 'kassaci navāyatanānī' ti pāli opapātīke sandhāya vuttā. tasmā pubbenāparaṃ Aṭṭhakathāyaṃ aviroduddho siddho hoti, tathā ca yathāvuttapāliyaṃ ayam atthavaṇṇanā aññadatthu saṃsandati sameti yevā" ti. yaṃ pan' eke vadanti "opapātīkaggahaṇena saṃsedajā pi saṅgayhanti. tathā hi Dhammahadāyavibhaṅge 'kāmadhātuyā upapattikkhaṇe [...] kassaci ekādasāyatanāni pātubhavanti' ti ādināṃ (Vibh 411,37–40) uddese "opapātīkānaṃ petānaṃ' ti ādinā opapātīkaggahaṇaṃ eva kataṃ, na saṃsedajaggahaṇaṃ" (Vibh-mṭ 135,20–21) ti, taṃ paripuṇṇāyatanānaṃ yeva saṃsedajānaṃ opapātīkesu saṅgahaṇavasena vuttan ti veditabbaṃ. tathā hi vakkhati saṃsedajayonikā paripuṇṇāyatanāparipuṇṇāyatanabhāvena opapātīkasaṅgahaṇaṃ katvā vuttā" ti "padhānāya vā yoniyā sabbaṃ paripuṇṇāyatanayoniṃ dassetuṃ 'opapātīkānaṃ' ti vuttan" ti ca. Aṭṭhakathāyaṃ pana yonidvayaṃ sarūpen' eva pakāsetuṃ, saṃsedajayonivasen' eva ca*

dispute as the views of Jotipāla, etc., as against those of Ānanda, etc., but this may be an oversimplification.²⁷

MATTER IN THE BRAHMA REALM

At Sacc 21 the eight kinds of inseparable (*avinibbhoga*) materiality [constituting the bare material octad] are listed: the four elements, colour, smell, taste, and nutriment. The fact that they are inseparable would seem to imply that they are all eight present in the Brahma realm. That raises certain issues, since Brahmas have only the senses of sight and hearing and do not consume even subtle material food. Sacc-ṭ points out that this is stated according to the *aṭṭhakathā-naya*, but the understanding of the *ṭikācariya* who declares that smell and so on do not exist in the *rūpaloka* will appear below. In fact, the list of eight inseparable *rūpas* as such appears first here, although it is later standard in the verse texts.

In the next verse of Sacc [v. 22] we find the explicit statement that tangible materiality, i.e. the object of the sense of touch, consists of the earth, fire, and wind elements in the *kāma<loka>*. This, as Sacc-ṭ points out, implies the view of the *ṭikācariya* for whom these three elements in the Brahma realm cannot be classified as tangible materiality. That in fact seems to be the position of the Vibhaṅga (Vibh 405) which includes only nine of the eighteen *dhātu* in the *rūpa* sphere. The *aṭṭhakathā* works do, however, classify those three elements in the Brahma realm as tangible materiality. Sacc-ṭ indicates that the *aṭṭhakathā* position is given later at Sacc 69.

Sacc 67–71 further addresses the question of matter in the Brahma realm.²⁸ The author of the *Mūlaṭṭikā* [on the *Abhidhamma*] denied the existence of smell, taste, and nutriment on the basis of Vibh 418f. and Kv 375.²⁹ He therefore held that on rebirth in the form realm only three septads of materiality (plus the life sextad) arise. This is exactly the

*avakaṃsato pavattiṃ dassetuṃ opapātikayoniyā itaraṃ asaṅgahetvā
“saṃsedaḥjopapāṭīsū” ti vuttan ti. sabbaṃ taṃ vīmaṃsitvā gahetabbaṃ.*

²⁷Cousins 2011, pp. 15f.

²⁸Cousins 2011, pp. 13f.

²⁹Vibh-mṭ 108f. The position is rejected in the *Anuṭṭikā*: Vibh-anuṭ 121f.

position set out here. However, in the last two *pādas* of verse 71 we are given as the (preferred?) alternative (with *atha vā*) decads, enneads, and octads, i.e. the decads of eye, ear, and heart base, and the life ennead at rebirth, and (subsequently) the bare octad. As the Sāratthasālinī points out, this is the position of the *aṭṭhakathā*. In the next and final verse of its chapter on materiality, Sacc [v. 72] goes on to state that there are nineteen kinds of materiality in the form realm, exactly as given in the works of the school of Buddhaghosa.

RESULTS OF EXCITEMENT *CITTA*

At Sacc 144 it is stated that unskilful *citta* gives connexion in the four *apāya*. This can be taken as following the position that the last kind of unskilful *citta* (i.e. excitement *citta*) also gives rebirth, whereas the usual view is that the last kind of unskilful *citta* cannot condition rebirth, as stated in the Abhidhamma commentary.³⁰ This position is based upon the *aṭṭhakathākaṇḍa* of the Dhammasaṅgaṇī (Dhs § 1391) which specifies that this *citta* arising is exclusively abandoned by practice, i.e. there is no kind of excitement *citta* which is abandoned at stream-entry, after which rebirth in the four descents is not possible. According to Sumaṅgala the view apparently presented here is that of Buddhamitta and others.³¹ The Mūlaṭṭhā and Anuṭṭhā attribute this view to the Amataggapatha; so this may be the name of a work by Buddhamitta.³²

THE *GATINIMITTA*

At Sacc 173 it is stated that *kammanimitta* [“sign of *kamma*”] and *gatinimitta* [“sign of destiny”], which are two of the three kinds of mental object which occur at death and reconnexion, arise in a five-door process. This seems problematic for the latter which is a kind of vision

³⁰Dhs-a 261. [See also Dhs-a trsl. 396.]

³¹Abhidh-av-ṇṭ II 73f.; Abhidh-s-mhṭ 139 (translated Wijeratne and Gethin 2002, [p. 192]).

³²Vibh-anuṭ 104,25–26: *yaṃ “na bhāvanāya pahātabbam pi atthi uddhacca-sahagatan” ti ādi Amataggapathe vuttaṃ, taṃ akāraṇaṃ*. cf. Vibh-mṭ 95; Vibh-anuṭ 102,23–24: *Amataggapathe ti evaṃnāmake pakaraṇe*; Paṭṭh-anuṭ 323.

of something belonging to the realm in which rebirth will take place. The Abhidhamma commentary and Visuddhimagga in fact specify that this occurs at the mind door.³³ They seem to be generally followed in this by the *īkā* literature.³⁴ However, the Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha refers to apprehending the *kammanimitta* and the *gatinimitta* at the six doors. This is interpreted by Sāriputta, followed by Sumaṅgala, as meaning at the six doors for a *kammanimitta* and at the mind door for a *gatinimitta*.³⁵ They mention that some do not make that distinction and cite this verse of Sacc. However, they reject this view and refer to the Mūlaṭīkā with a quotation that appears in fact to be from the Māhāṭīkā. The Mūlaṭīkā and Anuṭīkā, [i.e. subcommentaries on the Abhidhamma,] do not appear to address this issue.

REPETITION OF ESTABLISHING

In its account of the consciousness process (Sacc 180) the Sacca-saṅkhepa rejects the statement that in the case of a small object, establishing (*voṭṭhapana*) occurs two or three times, utilizing the argument that the Paṭṭhāna does not list this possibility in its treatment of repetition condition. Such a comment is found in the commentaries of the school of Buddhaghosa.³⁶ The Visuddhimagga, however, seems to

³³Vibh-a 157f., 160; Vism 549, 551.

³⁴Vism-mhṭ II 300.

³⁵Abhidh-s-sn 163, Abhidh-s-mhṭ 146, Abhidh-av-nt II 96f. See Wijeratne and Gethin 2002, p. 209.

³⁶Ps II 226,9–10: *voṭṭhabbanam* (E^c *voṭṭhapanam*) *patvā ekaṃ dve* (E^c *ekadve*) *vāre āsevanam labhitvā cittam bhavaṅgam eva otarati*, i.e. it is repeated once or twice. Dhs-a 269,16–18: *voṭṭhabbanavasena* (E^c *voṭṭhapanē*) *pana ṭhatvā ekaṃ vā dve vā cittāni pavattanti. tato āsevanam labhitvā javanaṭṭhāne ṭhatvā*. Nidd-a I 69,5–7: *voṭṭhabbanam* (E^c *voṭṭhapanam*) *pana patvā anivattanabhāvena uppajjanti nāmā ti evam eke vaṇṇayanti*. Abhidh-s 18: *yāva javanuppādā pi appahontātītakam āpātham āgataṃ ārammaṇam parittam nāma, tattha javanam pi anuppajjitvā dvattikkhattum voṭṭhabbanam eva pavattati, tato param bhavaṅgapāto va hoti*. Pm-vn v. 101: *voṭṭhabbanam parittamhi dvattikkhattum pavattati*.

reject the possibility of multiple occurrences of establishing.³⁷ The Mūlaṭīkā provides detailed arguments from the Paṭṭhāna against this, but this position is cautiously questioned by the Anuṭīkā.³⁸ The counter-arguments are accepted by the author of the Majjhimaṭīkā, followed by Sumaṅgala.³⁹ In effect they point out that what is meant by repetition here is that it resembles repetition; in other words it is not literally a case of repetition condition. This circumvents the arguments of Ānanda based on the Paṭṭhāna. It might imply that Sacc is earlier in date than the time of composition of the Suttanta *ṭīkā*s attributed to Dhammapāla.⁴⁰

THE CONSCIOUSNESS PROCESS

Sacc 232–34 and Sacc 235 are contrasted in the Sāratthasālinī as presenting the *ṭīkā* method and the *aṭṭhakathā* method respectively. This does not appear to be exactly correct, since the view initially presented seems to be that of the first *theravāda*, i.e. that of Tipiṭaka-Cūḷanāga (Dhs-a 267). That is more or less accepted by Ānanda. However, the view given in Sacc 235 allows *tadārammaṇa* also after *kiriya* active minds. This is the view of the third *theravāda*, i.e. that of Tipiṭaka-

³⁷Vism 459.14–15: *evaṃ ekass’ eva kiriyaviññāṇassa voṭṭhapanavasena pavatti veditabbā.*

³⁸Dhs-mṭ 129f.; Dhs-anuṭ 138.9–22: *api c’ ettha “yaṃ javanabhāvappattaṃ, taṃ chinnamūlakarukkhapupphaṃ viyā” ti (Dhs-a 293.15–17) vakkhamānattā anupacchinnabhavamūlānaṃ pavattamānassa voṭṭhabbanassa kiriyabhāvo na siyā, vutto ca “yasmim̐ samaye manoviññādhātu uppannā hoti kiriyā neva kusalā nākusalā na ca kammavipākā upekkhāsahagatā” ti, tasmā “javana-ṭṭhāne ṭṭhāne ti javanassa uppajjanaṭṭhāne dvikkhattuṃ pavattitvā, na javanabhāvenā” ti, “āsevanaṃ labhitvā ti ca āsevanaṃ viya āsevanan” ti vuccamāne na koci virodho, vipphārikassa pana sato dvikkhattuṃ pavatti yev’ ettha āsevanasadisatā. vipphārikatāya hi viññattisamuṭṭhāpakattañ c’ assa vuccati. vipphārikam pi javanaṃ viya anekakkhattuṃ appavattiyā dubbalattā na nipariyāyato āsevanapaccayabhāvena pavatteyyā ti na imassa pāṭhe āsevanatthaṃ vuttaṃ, Aṭṭhakathāyaṃ pana pariyāyato vuttaṃ yathā “phala-cittesu maggaṅgaṃ maggapariyāpannan” ti. ayam ettha attano mati. ayam pi porāṇakehi asaṃvaṇṇitattā sādhukaṃ upaparikkhitabbo.*

³⁹Ps-pt II 169ff.; Abhidh-av-nt II 41ff.

⁴⁰See also: Bodhi 1993, pp. 159–62; Kim 1999, pp. 208ff.

Mahādhammarakkhita (Dhs-a 286f.). Since Ānanda explicitly rejects the possibility of *tadārammaṇa* after *kiriya* active minds,⁴¹ this can then be described as the *aṭṭhakathā* method in the sense that it is not the *īṭkā* method! The same issue arises at Sacc 226 and 227, which contrast the method of the Paṭṭhāna and that of the Aṭṭhakathā, and at Sacc 272, which explicitly denies the possibility of *tadārammaṇa* after *kiriya* active minds on the grounds that this possibility is not given in the Paṭṭhāna. Sacc-ṭ again refers to this as the *īṭkā* method. Sacc 273, however, gives an alternative view (with *vā*), pointing out that this should be carefully examined.

COMPASSION AND JOY IN JOY

In Sacc 295 we have the statement that compassion (*karuṇā*) and joy (*muditā*) in the joy of others are in twenty *cittas*, i.e. not in *cittas* accompanied by neutral feeling.⁴² Then in the same stanza we have the alternative position (with *vā*) that they are found in twenty-eight.⁴³ This position is related to the fact that in the canonical *abhidhamma* compassion and joy in the joy of others are shown only for the first three *jhānas* and not for the fourth which has neutral feeling.

In the cases I have taken so far we find that the view of the *īṭkā*, i.e. of Ānanda, is taken first and then subsequently the view of the commentaries of the school of Buddhaghosa is given. This could be interpreted as expressing a preference for the latter or as an eclectic position that recognises the authority of both. The situation is rather different with the final topic I want to address.

⁴¹Dhs-mṭ 134.20–24: *na ca katthaci kiriyānantaram tadārammaṇassa vutta-
ṭṭhānaṃ dissati. vijjamāne ca tasmim avacane kāraṇaṃ natthi, tasmā
upaparikkhitabbo eso theravādo. vipphārikañ hi javanaṃ nāvaṃ viya
nadīsoto bhavaṅgaṃ anubandhatī ti yuttaṃ, na pana chaḷaṅgupekkhavato
santavuttiṃ kiriyajavanaṃ paṇṇapuṭaṃ viya nadīsoto ti. cp. Dhs-anuṭ 141.*

⁴²Dhs-a 157.16–17: *karuṇāmuditāparikammaḱāle pi hi imesaṃ uppatti Mahā-
aṭṭhakathāyaṃ anuññātā eva. Dhs-mṭ 99.18–19: Mahā-aṭṭhakathāyaṃ anu-
ññātā nāṭisamāhitāya bhāvanāyā ti yevāpanakehi pi nibbisesataṃ dasseti.
Vism-mṭ I 386.4–5: tathā hi aṭṭhavīsatiyā cittuppādesu karuṇāmuditānaṃ
pavattiṃ ācariyā icchanti.*

⁴³cf. Abhidh-s-mṭ 89; Wijeratne and Gethin 2002, pp. 74–75.

THE NATURE OF CONCEPTS

The concluding chapter of Sacc concerns *nibbāna* and *paññatti* (concepts). Verses 373–78 discuss the definition of *vijjamānapaññatti*, i.e. the case of labels describing phenomena which really exist in *abhidhamma* terms. The definition given is that a *vijjamānapaññatti* is just sound accompanied by a particular “alteration [in the material elements] that constitutes communication” (*viññattivikāra*), i.e. modulated sound. This position is certainly held by Ānanda, but it is not quite clear that it originates with him. The *Netti* commentary gives it as the view of others (*apare*), but it is not known whether this commentary (traditionally attributed to Dhammapāla) precedes Ānanda in date or not.⁴⁴ Similarly, with the late sixth-century Paṭisambhidāmagga commentary.⁴⁵

3. CONTENTS, DATE AND AUTHORSHIP

What is clear from the above survey is that the position of the author of Sacc is eclectic. In one or two cases he specifically follows the position of the *Mūlaṭīkā* or others. Most often, however, where there is a difference from the works of the school of Buddhaghosa, he presents both views, and it is not entirely certain what position he prefers, if any. In these circumstances I think we can rule out the authorship of Ānanda who is usually rather definite in his opinions.⁴⁶

It also seems unlikely that Sacc could have been written after the availability of the *ṭīkā*s attributed to Dhammapāla, i.e. the four Suttanta *ṭīkā*s and the *Māhāṭīkā*. The author of Sacc leaves open positions which are to some extent closed after these subcommentaries become authoritative. If these are the work of Dhammapāla II in the eleventh century, then that Dhammapāla was not the author. The earlier Dhammapāla, who is among others the author of the Khuddakanikāya *aṭṭakathās*, shows little interest in *abhidhamma* and therefore seems unlikely. A real

⁴⁴Nett-a I 21,21–22: *kā pana sā ti? nāmapaññattinibandhanā tajiṅṅapaññatti. viññattivikārasahito saddo evā ti apare.*

⁴⁵Paṭis-a I 307,17–18: *aññe pana “nāmaṃ nāma atthajotako saddo” ti vadanti.*

⁴⁶In Cousins 1972, [p. 161], I thought Ānanda the most likely author, but the more detailed survey given here supersedes that.

possibility would be Jotipāla, the probable author of the *Anuṭṭikā*.⁴⁷ The very fact that he wrote the *Anuṭṭikā* which juxtaposes exegesis and critique of the *Mūlaṭṭikā* shows that this approach would not be alien to him. We know that he wrote a verse text in Sanskrit; so one in Pali would be quite possible.⁴⁸ Given that the later tradition (after the time of *Sumaṅgala*) confuses Jotipāla and Dhammapāla, it would then be quite easy to understand why Dhammapāla's authorship became established in some sources.

We can note that the Sanskrit verse cited at *Vism-sn* III 1086 (to *Vism* 453) is closely parallel to *Sacc* 124–26.⁴⁹ Since the Sanskrit verse in question could well be the work of Jotipāla, this gives some force to the hypothesis. Against it is the fact that in some cases *Sacc* does seem to adopt the position of the *Mūlaṭṭikā*. However, this would be accounted for if *Sacc* were an earlier work of Jotipāla prior to the full development of his critique of the *Mūlaṭṭikā* as presented in the *Anuṭṭikā*. This might also account for the slightly more Sanskritic style of *Sacc*, if Jotipāla had only recently come from an area where Sanskrit or a Sanskritised Middle Indian was more used. If this hypothesis is accepted, the date of the composition of *Sacc* would be ca. A.D. 600. Otherwise we could only say that it is by an unknown author writing at some date between the seventh and tenth centuries.

OFFERING HOMAGE AT THE COMMENCEMENT OF A WORK

It is quite common to offer homage to the three jewels at the start of a work, but this pattern is not quite universal. Firstly, it is not found in *Vism* nor in any surviving work prior to this.⁵⁰ It is nearly universal in

⁴⁷See Cousins 2011.

⁴⁸*Sumaṅgala* attributes a Pali stanza to Jotipāla, but there is no way of knowing whether he has rendered this from Sanskrit. *Abhidh-av-ṅ* II 181: *Ācariya-Jotipālattherena pana nipphannānipphannavasena dasa rūpāni avinibbhogavuttikāni eko kalāpo ti vatvā puna taṃsamatthan'atthaṃ idaṃ vuttaṃ:*

*avinibbhogavuttīni catujāṇekalakkhaṇā
nipphannāṇaṭṭha vā tesu, hitvāna kāyalakkhaṇe ti.*

⁴⁹Cousins [2013, pp. 47f.]

⁵⁰The *Peṭakopadesa* may have had a more unusual authorial beginning. See Crosby 2012, [pp. 128–30].

the *aṭṭhakathā* literature. Only apparently an exception are a number of cases where a work is a continuation of another.⁵¹ Another case which is only apparently an exception is Pj I which starts by commenting precisely on the three refuges at the beginning of Khp. This leaves Paṭi-a, which commences by offering homage to the Buddha alone, as the only real exception. A small number of later works follow the same practice.⁵² However, when we come to the *ṭīkā* literature, almost all works prior to the twelfth century revert to the earlier pattern and do not include any homage at all.⁵³

It is striking then that we see a new practice commence with Sāriputta in the twelfth century. He follows the offering of homage to the three jewels with a fourth homage to his *guru*. The same practice is followed by his pupil Sumaṅgala.⁵⁴ Yet this precise approach does not seem to be followed by subsequent authors. Many revert to the three homages. Instead, some add as a fourth homage one to former teachers (*pubbācariya*).⁵⁵ This was already done in the presumably earlier Kaṅkhāvitarāṇī. It is significant, then, that Vin-vn-ṭ adds both the *guru* and the former teachers. This is comparable to the alternative of five refuges found in some later texts of the esoteric Theravādin tradition.⁵⁶ I should also mention that some grammatical texts add as a fourth homage Kaccāyana or Moggallāna, as the founder of their particular tradition.⁵⁷

⁵¹Pj II, Vibh-a, Ppk-a, Thī-a.

⁵²e.g. Rūp, Mhv, Vism-gp, Dhātum, Pāc-y, Abh-ṭ.

⁵³This includes all those attributed to Ānanda and Dhammapāla [except for Vism-mhṭ] as well as Mūlas, Kacc, Abhidh-av-pt, Nett-pt, Kkh-pt.

⁵⁴Similarly, the Dhātupāṭhaviḷāsīnī, [and also Sāriputta's pupil Saṅgharakkhita, see Kieffer-Pülz 2017, pp. 30, 34, 36, 38.]

⁵⁵Khuddas-pt, Sacc-viv, Pay; Mūlas-ṭ has *porāṇācariya*. [See also Kieffer-Pülz 2017, p. 29.]

⁵⁶In these texts the *kammaṭṭhāna* replaces the *pubbācariyas*. See for example: Bizot 1992, pp. 217, 220f.; Crosby 2000, p. 187: “found throughout the *yogāvacara* tradition”.

⁵⁷[For instance Mogg-p-ṭ, Sc; see Kieffer-Pülz 2017, pp. 27f., 42.]

Sacc-ṭ does not, however, follow precisely this practice. It simply has the three refuges, followed immediately by the mention of Sāriputta as having requested the work. Even so, that still suggests some continuation of the influence of Sāriputta.⁵⁸

4. THE COMMENTARIES TO THE SACCASAṄKHEPA

The situation is also somewhat confused as regards the commentaries to the Saccasaṅkhepa. The Sāsanavaṃsa simply attributes an *abhinava-ṭīkā* to an *araññavāsi-thera* — this could be either a name or a monastic epithet: “the elder Araññavāsin” or “a forest-dwelling elder” or “an elder belonging to the Araññavāsin section of the Saṅgha”. Possibly this is a reference to the Sāratthasālinī.⁵⁹ According to its introduction its writing was requested by Sāriputta who is referred to as *araññavāsin*. If so, the author of the Sāsanavaṃsa clearly thought that the Sāratthasālinī was the later work.⁶⁰

⁵⁸[The differences in the introduction of Sacc-ṭ and Vin-vn-ṭ have been examined in Kieffer-Pülz 2018, pp. 192–97, 203.]

⁵⁹[For an overview over the various commentaries to Sacc listed in the Pali literary works, see Kieffer-Pülz 2018, p. 202.]

⁶⁰[For a discussion of these passages, see Kieffer-Pülz 2018, pp. 203ff.]

PART TWO

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE VIVARAṆA

The introduction [of Sacc-viv] is as follows:⁶¹

<p><i>Saraṇaṃ sabba-lokassa Buddhaṃ Dhammaṃ Gaṇ'-uttamaṃ Vanditvā paramaṃ hitaṃ sukha-daṃ ratana-ttayaṃ (1)</i></p> <p><i>pāda c is anuṭṭhubha</i> 1c. so B^{m3}; B^{m1}: paramahita-</p>	<p>After offering reverence to the three jewels that afford the highest benefit and happiness — Buddha, Dhamma, and the Supreme Community — the refuge for the whole world</p>
<p><i>Katvā porāṇācariya-pādesu aṅjalī- puṭaṃ Pasanna-sīla-saddhādi-guṇa-bhūṣita- cetasā (2)</i></p> <p>Saccasaṅkhepa <i>pāda a is bha-vipulā</i> 2b. B^{m3}: aṅcaliputhaṃ [or °putaṃ?]</p>	<p>after having folded my hands in <i>aṅjali</i> at the feet of former teachers, [I will make an explanation of the meaning of the]⁶²</p> <p>that fulfils the essence of the the goal (<i>attha?</i>) [and] was</p>
<p><i>Bhadanta-Dhammapālena param'- attha-rasa-ññunā Racito Saccasaṅkhepo yo attha- rasa-pūrako (3)</i></p>	<p>composed by Bhadanta Dhammapāla, a knower of the essence of the highest meaning (<i>attha</i>), his peaceful mind adorned with the qualities <i>sīla</i>, faith and so on,</p>
<p><i>Sarīra-suriya-ramsi-pabhā-jālā- vamaṇḍito Paññ'-obhāsa-karo moha-andha- kāra-tamo-nudo (4)</i></p>	<p>[that Saccasaṅkhepa which] is decorated with a multitude (<i>jāla</i>) of attractive features (<i>pabhā</i>) like the blazing radiance (<i>jāla</i>) of the sun and the relics/body [of the</p>

⁶¹[LSC stated that he doesn't understand the overall structure of this. Furthermore, for several of the passages we discussed various possibilities. Since LSC did not make a final revision of this text, it remains unclear what he would have decided on. We, therefore mention other possible translations in the footnotes.]

⁶²[This sentence is only mentioned in v. 8; vv. 2–8 form one sentence.]

<p><i>pāda</i> a is <i>sa-vipulā</i> 4d. B^m3:°<i>kāre</i></p>	<p>Buddha],⁶³ and brings the light of wisdom, dispelling the darkness and blindness of delusion,</p>
<p><i>Piṭake ca sabhāvattha-adhippāy’-attha-akkhito</i>⁶⁴ <i>Ganthato yeva saṅkhepo attha-rāsi-sudubbaco</i> (5) 5d. B^m3:°<i>sudubbate</i></p>	<p>[that Saccasaṅkhepa which] is a summary of the scripture[s?]⁶⁵ that have told the essential meaning and the intended meaning [to be found?] in the Piṭaka [??]⁶⁶ itself has a mass of meaning very hard to explain.⁶⁷</p>
<p><i>Paññādubbalo vattum asamattho va sabbathā</i> <i>Gabbh’ andha-kāra-bahalaṃ pavitṭho</i></p>	<p>One weak in wisdom is as if unable to explain everywhere and accordingly, is as if entered into</p>

⁶³[In an earlier attempt LSC had rendered this as: “which is decorated with a blazing radiance like the rays of the sun and the body [of the Buddha]”; he then pondered whether only *pabhājāla* is compared to *suriya-ramsi*, and suggested: “is decorated with a net of light [emanating from] the body [of the Buddha] comparable to rays of the sun.” As parallels he referred to Vjb 405,20–21: *bahuno devasaṅghassa sannipātato, bhagavato sarīrappabhājālavisañjanati cā ti ekacce* (this is in the explanation of the setting in motion of the wheel; here *sarīrappabhājālavisañjana* certainly is no Dvandva); see also Bv-a 165,17: *tassa dehābhinikkhantam* (E^s *dehābhinibbattam*) *pabhājālam anuttaram*; see also Ap-a 421,6–7 where *suvanṇapabhā* and *buddhassa sarīrapabhā* together are *mahā obhāso*. The translation printed above was LSC’s final variant, dating from 6/8/2014. He wrote, “This is taking it as a *yamaka*, but I am not sure if *pabhā* can mean something like ‘attractive features’.”]

⁶⁴Read *akkhi so? akkhi* = *akkhā* 3rd aorist. Or understand it as an ablative belonging to the following *gandhato*, characterizing the book (but the form remains problematic).

⁶⁵[LSC, email 6/8/2014: “Perhaps intended as a collective word here?”]

⁶⁶[LSC, email 6/8/2014: “or ‘that has told ..., is a summary of a scripture’.”]

⁶⁷[LSC, email 6/8/2014: “The *Piṭake* must be the Abhidhamma-piṭaka, but *ganthato* can either refer to that specifically or to the canon as a whole. The latter is what I meant by ‘a summary from scripture’.”]

<p><i>va tathā pi ca; (6)</i> <i>pāda c is na-vipulā; 6a. read paññāya</i></p>	<p>a room filled with darkness.</p>
<p><i>Evaṃ me nipphalaṃ kāya-jīvitam adhuvāṅgataṃ Saphalaṃ kātu-kāmo va citta-khedam acintayam (7)</i> 7c. B^m3: <i>ca</i> 7d. B^m3: <i>cittakkhevapagam</i></p>	<p>Accordingly, desirous of making fruitful my life and body <hitherto> unfruitful and without any lasting <result>, I was as if intent upon mental exhaustion.</p>
<p><i>Tassa nissāya porāṇa-kathā-maggaṃ anākulaṃ Karissāṃ' attha-vivaraṃ taṃ nisāmetha sādhavo ti. (8)</i> [8c. B^m3: <i>attha-civaraṃ</i>] 8d. B^m3: <i>nissāmeta</i></p>	<p>Relying on the way of explanation of the former <teachers> that is free from confusion, I will make an explanation (<i>vivaraṇa</i>) of the meaning of [that Saccasaṅkhepa]. Carefully attend to it, good people.</p>

This *ṭīkā* includes a certain amount of discussion in the first chapter, but after that largely confines itself to a rather workmanlike commentary on the actual text of Sacc. However, it is clear from the material in the first chapter that the author is familiar with the Abhidhamma commentary and the Visuddhimagga, and probably the Māhāṭīkā to the latter. There is one citation of the Paṭisambhidāmagga commentary⁶⁸ and one of Kaccāyana.⁶⁹ The Abhidhammaṭīkā is mentioned by name.⁷⁰ Similarly with a reference to the *ṭīkācariya*; this seems to refer to the Mūlaṭīkā, although it does not appear to be a literal citation.⁷¹

⁶⁸Sacc-viv to Sacc 1 refers to Paṭis-a 2.

⁶⁹Sacc-viv to Sacc 2: Kc 224; cf. Mogg 74.

⁷⁰Sacc-viv to Sacc 3: *Abhidhammaṭīkāyaṃ*. Presumably this is a reference to the Mūlaṭīkā.

⁷¹Sacc-viv to 32: *tenāha ṭīkācariyo: na hi uppādo atthī ti*, i.e. Dhs-mṭ 155,22–23: *anipphannattā pana tassa uppādo na kenaci sakkā vattun ti adhippāyo*. cf. Nett-pt 124,27: *na hi uppādo uppajjati*.

There is, however, one passage which establishes beyond doubt that the Vivaraṇa is later than the Sāratthasālinī. This is the comment on Sacc 11 which reads:

bhāvadvaṃsaṃ tu kāyaṃ va, byāpi no saḥavuttikaṃ.

The Sāratthasālinī interprets *va* as = *iva* and hence has to explain *kāyaṃ* as nominative neuter.⁷² This is because it understands *kāya* here as referring to the *kāyindriya*, i.e. the sensitive matter of the sense of touch and the male and female materiality cannot be said to pervade the sense of touch. The Vivaraṇa rejects this strongly.⁷³ It considers that referring to the *kāyindriya* here would entail imputing the defect of repetitiveness (*punaruttidosā*) to Dhammapāla. By this it must mean that the stillnesses (*pasāda*), i.e. the five kinds of sensitive matter (including *kāyindriya*) have already been given in Sacc 10 and so should not be mentioned again here. Instead it interprets *va* as = *eva* and understands *kāyaṃ* as the gross body. Gender materiality does indeed pervade the gross body; so this seems a more reasonable interpretation.

I do not think this can refer to anything other than the comment in the Sāratthasālinī. The Vivaraṇa then must be subsequent to the Sāratthasālinī despite being listed as a *porāṇaṅkā* in some Burmese mss, etc. Given that it attributes the authorship of Sacc to Dhammapāla, we might suspect that it was written in Burma; no early non-Burmese source offers that attribution.

⁷²*taṃ bhāvadvaṃsaṃ kāyaṃ va byāpi no saḥavuttī ti yojanā. ettha kāyaṃ ti lingavipallāso. kāyo ti vā pāṭho. kāyindriyaṃ viya sakalasaṅgāraṃ byāpi pharivā tiṭṭhati; bhinmanissayattā na saḥavuttikaṃ ti attho.*

⁷³*keci pana no saḥavuttī taṃ ti etassa taṃ bhāvadvaṃsaṃ pasādakāyena no saḥavuttī ti atthaṃ vadanti. taṃ ayuttaṃ, heṭṭhā vuttattā punaruttidoso ti. vimalabuddhinā atthadassinā Dhammapālācariyena nippayojanam eka-kkharam api no yojitaṃ ti.*

PART THREE

SACCASAṅKHEPAVAṆṆANĀ OR SĀRATTHASĀLINĪ

I turn now to the commentary which is referred to in its introductory verses as the Saccasaṅkhepavaṇṇanā (Sacc-ṭ) and in the manuscripts at the conclusion of each chapter as the Sāratthasālinī. Here are those verses:

<p><i>Buddhaṃ sad-dhamma-pajjotaṃ Dhammaṃ Buddha-ppaveditaṃ Saṅghaṃ ca sirasā vande sammā- sambuddha-sāvakaṃ. (1)</i></p> <p>[1d: B^m3: °sādhakaṃ]</p>	<p>I offer reverence with my head to the Buddha, light of the <i>saddhamma</i>, to the Dhamma made known by the Buddha and to the Saṅgha of the disciples of the Sammā-sambuddha.</p>
<p><i>Kato yo Saccasaṅkhepo nipuṇ'-attha- vinicchayo Ānanda-thera-pādena vicitta-naya- maṇḍito (2)</i></p> <p>2c: so HS & Saddhamma-s; mss: -vādena 2d: B^m3: vivittanayapaṇḍito</p>	<p>The Saccasaṅkhepa, determining subtle meanings and adorned with manifold methods, which was made by the venerable therā Ānanda,</p>
<p><i>Tam ahaṃ vaṇṇayissāmi, sikkhā- kāmena dhīmatā Therena Sāriputtena yācito 'rañña- vāsinā. (3)</i></p>	<p>I will comment on, since I have been requested by the wise forest-dwelling therā Sāriputta who loves training.</p>

There can be little doubt that the second verse has been adopted into the Saddhamma-saṅgaha (Saddhamma-s 9.16) from here. The author of this *ṭīkā* clearly identifies himself as a pupil of Sāriputta. This would date him in the period from the twelfth century to the thirteenth century. Since he was requested to compose the work by Sāriputta, it is likely that he began to work on it during Sāriputta's lifetime.

The dating of Sāriputta is currently rather difficult. There appear to be two options — one earlier and one later. Dragomir Dimitrov has attempted to identify Sāriputta with Vijayagarbha, the author of an *alamkāra* or subcommentary to Ratnamati's *Pañcīkā* commentary in

the grammatical tradition of Candragomin.⁷⁴ Portions of this *alaṃkāra* are extant in a manuscript in the Sindhura or Bhaikṣukī script. If this identification is correct, then Sāriputta wrote a grammatical work in Sanskrit ca. A.D. 1116. It is difficult to suppose that he did this much younger than 25 years of age. This would make him around 85 years of age at the death of Parākramabāhu in 1186. It seems unlikely that he could have lived much longer.⁷⁵

That is the earlier option. Alternatively, we may suppose that Sāriputta's *ṭīkā* or *alaṃkāra* on Ratnamati's Pañcikā was a different work. If so, we might expect a later dating for Sāriputta. He was a pupil of Mahākassapa, a leading figure in the early years of Parākramabāhu's reign; so he represents a later generation. It seems that a residence was made for Sāriputta by Parākramabāhu in the Jetavana at Polonnaruva. He appears to have been given the title of Mahāsāmi.⁷⁶ It is unclear what the exact implications of this title were at this point in time, whether administrative or more honorary. However, the fact that surrounding residences were also provided for the heads of the eight Mūla into which the Saṅgha was divided at this time seems to imply that it was not purely honorary. If Sāriputta was a young pupil of Mahākassapa at the time of Parākramabāhu I's accession in 1153, he may well have been alive for some decades after the king's death in 1186. This is the later option.

This brings us to the issue of Vācissara. The *Gandhavaṃsa* attributes eighteen books to Vācissara 'known as *mahā-sāmi*',⁷⁷ of which one is a *ṭīkā* to Saccasaṅkhepa [*saccasaṅkhepassa ṭīkā*, Gv 62,16]. Later, it refers to this as a *ṭīkā* to Saccasaṅkhepa made by Vācissara at

⁷⁴Dimitrov 2010, pp. 31–47.

⁷⁵Additional evidence in support of an earlier dating is provided by the Vinayārthasamuccaya of Diṃbulāgala Medhānkara which informs us that Sāriputta helped Mahākassapa in uniting the three *nikāyas* (Rohanadeera 1996, p. 44) cited from Gornall 2012, p. 35, n. 56.

⁷⁶Rohanadeera 1985.

⁷⁷[The assumption that Gv calls Vācissara *mahāsāmi* is erroneous. *Mahāsāmi* here is the title of the *ṭīkā* to the Subodhālaṅkāra (62,16): *Vācissaro nāmā-cariyo Mahāsāmi nāma Subodhālaṅkāraṃ ṭīkā*.]

the request of the elder named Sāriputta. That seems clearly to be a reference to the Sāratthasālinī. The Gandhavaṃsa also includes a Saccasaṅkhepa-vivarāṇa in a list of twenty-five works made by “teachers in such places as the island of Laṅkā” [Gv 75,19–20]. The *nigamana* to the Thūpavaṃsa claims that Vācissara wrote an *atthadīpanā* in Sinhalese to the Saccasaṅkhepa book, as well as the Thūpavaṃsa and other works.⁷⁸ However, it is not at all clear why the Gandhavaṃsa attributes so many works to Vācissara.

The conclusion (*nigamana*) to the Sāratthasālinī (Sacc-ṭ) seems to have been composed by a pupil [of the author].⁷⁹ It refers to the author as a pupil of Sāriputta, but does not give his name. It states that this work was commenced in Jambuddoṇi (Daṃbadeṇiya). This probably situates it to the period after Vijayabāhu III made his capital there in the 1230s. The author is said to have composed a number of works:

an explanation of the three Piṭakas,
the Vinayavinicchayaṭīkā,
the Nāmarūpaparicchavedavaṇṇanā,
a *padarūpavibhāvanā* to the grammar of Kaccāyana,
many small books.

⁷⁸Thūp 255,1–10:

Paṭisambhidāmaggaṣa yena Līlatthadīpani
Ṭīkā viracitā sādhu saddhammodayakāminā, (158)
Tathā pakaraṇe Saccasaṅkhepe atthadīpanā
Dhīmatā sukātā yena suṭṭhu Sīhaḷabhāsato, (159)
Visuddhimaggasaṅkhepe yena atthappakāsanā
Yogīnam upakārāya katā Sīhaḷabhāsato, (160)
Parakkamanarindassa sabbabhūpāna ketuno
Dhammāgāre nīyutto yo piṭakattayapārāgo, (161)
Sāsanaṃ suṭṭhitaṃ yassa antevāsikabhikkhusu,
Tena Vācissarattherapādena likhito ayan ti. (162)

All Mss read: Vāgissara-. [For some of the statements in this passage, see Kieffer-Pülz 2018, pp. 207–210.]

⁷⁹See Appendix One. Saddhamma-s 64 (9.36) also quotes part of a line from the *nigamana*.

The work was completed elsewhere in a residence provided by his pupil, a lay disciple named Dhammakitti. The name Kitti is rather frequent in this period and any layman with that name would be likely to become known as Dhammakitti; so this is not necessarily the same Dhammakitti that we meet elsewhere.

This possibly links the author to the name of Vācissara. The Sāsanavaṃsa attributes *porāṇaṭīkā*s to Saccasaṃkhepa, Nāmarūpa-pariccheda, Khema<pakaraṇa>, and Abhidhammāvatāra to Vācissara-mahāsāmi [Sās 34,7–9]. The Gandhavaṃsa, however, attributes a much longer list of eighteen works to the same author:⁸⁰

- | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| 1. <i>subodhālaṅkāraṣṣa ṭīkā</i> | 2. <i>vuttodayavivaraṇaṃ</i> |
| 3. <i>sumaṅgalappasādani nāma</i> | 4. <i>sambandhacintā</i> |
| <i>khudda-sikkhāya ṭīkā</i> | |
| 5. <i>sambandhacintāya ṭīkā</i> | 6. <i>bālāvatāro</i> |
| 7. <i>mogga<l>lānabyākaraṇassa</i> | 8. <i>yogavinicchayo</i> |
| <i>pañcīkāya ṭīkā</i> | |
| 9. <i>vinayavinicchayassa ṭīkā</i> | 10. <i>uttaravinicchayassa ṭīkā</i> |
| 11. <i>nāmarūpa-paricchedassa</i> | 12. <i>saddatthassa padarūpa-</i> |
| <i>vibhāgo</i> | <i>vibhāvanaṃ</i> |
| 13. <i>khemassa pakaraṇassa ṭīkā</i> | 14. <i>sīmālaṅkāro</i> |
| 15. <i>mūlasikkhāya ṭīkā</i> | 16. <i>rūpavibhāgo</i> |
| 17. <i>paccayasaṅgaho</i> | 18. <i>saccasaṅkhepassa ṭīkā</i> |

It is clear that much of this information has been collated from the introductory and concluding verses of some of these texts. Not all of them are available to me.

⁸⁰[The investigations of Kieffer-Pülz concerning the works to be assigned to Saṅgharakkhita therā by intertextual links (Kieffer-Pülz 2017) and the works to be assigned most probably to Vācissara therā (Kieffer-Pülz 2018) have shown that the texts listed as numbers 1, 3, 4, 7, and 8 are texts written by Saṅgharakkhita. Texts number 9, 10, and 18 can be assigned to Vācissara with high probability. From this it is evident that the ascription of the large numbers of texts in the Gandhavaṃsa at least partly result from a mixing up of Saṅgharakkhita and Vācissara. It cannot be excluded that even other persons' works are named in this list.]

The Saddhammasaṅgaha does not attribute anything to Vācissara by name, but does state that the Sāratthasālinī commentary on Saccasaṅkhepa was composed by a pupil of Sāriputta.⁸¹ This clearly indicates that the author or his source had seen the introduction to Sacc-ṭ. The name Sāratthasālinī is not given in the introduction nor in the *nigamana*, but it is found at the conclusion of each chapter in the manuscripts I have seen. The Sāsanavaṃsadīpa [A.D. 1880] gives Dhammapāla as the author of Sacc⁸² and Vācissara as the author of the *pubbaṭṭikā*.⁸³ The *Piṭakat samuñ* [A.D. 1888] attributes to Vācissara the Sīmālaṅkāra, Sīmāsaṅgaha,⁸⁴ Nāmarūpaparicchedaṭṭikā, the *porāṇaṭṭikā* to the Abhidhammāvātāra, the *porāṇaṭṭikā* to the Subodhālaṅkāra and the *porāṇaṭṭikā* to the Saccasaṅkhepa.⁸⁵

Given that such a large number of works are attributed to Vācissara in the Gandhavaṃsa, it is perhaps not surprising that in the nineteenth century it was already thought that two Vācissaras worked during the thirteenth century. In 1900 Wickremasinghe wrote: “Considering the large number of books which appear under the authorship of Vācissara Thera, it is thought that besides the pupil of Sāriputta, another writer having the same name Vācissara lived in the thirteenth century”.⁸⁶ He goes on to suggest that the author of the Thūpavaṃsa “may indeed have been identical with our Vācissara, for both seem to have been living in

⁸¹Saddhamma-s [9.36].

⁸²Sās-dīp v.1220:

*Therena Dhammapālena Saccasaṅkhepa-nāmaṅgā
Gantho viracito sādhu paṇḍitehi pasamsiyo.*

⁸³Sās-dīp v. 1225

*Saccasaṅkhepa-ganthassa pubba-ṭṭikā matīmatā
Vācissara-mahāsāmi-pāden’ eva suvaṇṇitā.*

⁸⁴[Mahāsiriyejya-Sū 2012, p. 65, no. 270, lists a Sīmālaṅkāra-aṭṭhakathā; Mahāsiriyejya-Sū 2012, p. 65, no. 271, a Sīmāsaṅgaha-aṭṭhakathā. These are most probably only different titles for the same text, see Kieffer-Pülz 2021, pp. 1–9.]

⁸⁵Mahāsiriyejya-Sū 2012, Index.

⁸⁶Wickremasinghe 1900, pp. xvi; 141.

the thirteenth century". Geiger followed this position,⁸⁷ citing also Dhammaratana, the earlier editor of the Thūpavaṃsa.⁸⁸ Malalasekera interprets Wickremasinghe as advocating two Vācissaras, but thought that there might have been even "more than two, not all of them from Ceylon, but living about the same period".⁸⁹ This is the position adopted by Jayawickrama.⁹⁰ It seems clear that the Vācissara or Vāgissara who was the author of the Thūpavaṃsa dates from the reign of Parākramabāhu II. But I find the argument that there were two Vācissaras in the reign of Parākramabāhu I unconvincing. The author of the Cūlavāṃsa at least knows only one, who was absent from the island in the Tamil country during much of the time of Māgha, but returned when Vijayabāhu III established himself in the Malaya region. If indeed he was the senior monk instrumental in providing the bowl and tooth relics to that king, he could expect considerable honour from the king. This could be hinted at in the *nigamana* to Sacc-ṭ when it is stated that he was recognized as *garu* by the kings in Taprobane. The mention of "kings" in the plural probably refers to Vijayabāhu III and his successor Parākramabāhu II.

It is important to note that he need not have been a very senior monk at the time of Māgha's invasion in A.D. 1215. Such important relics would have been under the charge of the most senior monks in Polonnaruva, but the party that took them to Malaya and eventually concealed them would have included junior and middle ranking monks, if only to do the carrying. The senior monk or monks would probably no longer be alive by the time of Vijayabāhu's accession after 1232. If Vācissara had been around 40 years old in 1215 he would have been around 57 or so in 1232. This suggests he might not have lived very far into Parākramabāhu II's very long reign. He is at any rate senior enough

⁸⁷Geiger 1908, p. 84: "I am now of the opinion that this Vācissara is no other than the celebrated thera of the same name, who is spoken of in M. 81,18 *et seq.*"

⁸⁸Dhammaratana 1896 [1891] (not seen).

⁸⁹Malalasekera 1928, p. 202.

⁹⁰Jayawickrama 1971, pp. xviii*ff.*

to be referred to as a *mahāsāmi*,⁹¹ but we do not know how far this was purely honorific and how far it might have involved administrative responsibilities.

There is an earlier reference to a Vācissara/Vāgissara in the Cūlavamsa. At Mhv LXXVI 32 Vāgissara and Dhammakitti are mentioned together as envoys to the king of Rāmañña. The combination of the two names is unusual and in the light of the *nigamana* to Sacc-ṭ might refer to the same individuals. If Vācissara was sent as an envoy to Burma, it is quite natural that he would be attended by a young lay disciple. A monk sent as an envoy would also be likely to be relatively young. What is surprising is the mention of the names of the envoys, but it is much less surprising if a lay disciple named Dhammakitti was indeed the author of the first part of the Cūlavamsa (written soon after the end of the reign of Parākramabāhu I).⁹²

The usual dating of Parākramabāhu's military expedition to Burma ca. 1164 is, however, a problem. To be sent as an envoy he should have been aged around 30 years at the youngest. This is entirely compatible with the early dating of Sāriputta discussed above. However, it would make him probably a centenarian at the accession of Parākramabāhu II in A.D. 1236. Writing both Vin-vn-ṭ and Sacc-ṭ at such an advanced age is not at all plausible. The account of the Burmese expedition in the Cūlavamsa does not give a date as such, but immediately prior to this it mentions events occurring in the eighth and sixteenth year of the reign of Parākramabāhu I. After the Rāmañña episode the chapter continues with its account of Parākramabāhu's military interventions in South India. These go on until the end of the reign; so as far as the Cūlavamsa is concerned the Rāmañña expedition could have taken place at any time

⁹¹[Vācissara never had the office of *mahāsāmi*. This title is attached to his name only in the quite recent works — all nineteenth century A.D. — from Burma (Sās 34.7-9; Mahāsiriḷjeya-Sū 2012, nos. 313, 315, 322) and Sri Lanka (Sās-dīp v. 1225). In *Buddhadatta's Manuals* (Part II, London: Pali Text Society, 1928, p. xi) Vācissara is consequently titled Mahāsāmi. In the passage of the Cūlavamsa (Mhv LXXXI 20) Vācissara is designated as *mahāthera*.]

⁹²cf. Von Hinüber 1996, p. 173, n. 600.

between 1165 and 1186. However, it is usually dated on the basis of the Devanagala Inscription dated to Parākramabāhu's twelfth regnal year.

This leaves us with a difficulty. On the basis of the above data, Vācissara would have been around 30 or a little younger in 1165 as an envoy in Burma. This would make him about 80 years old at the time of Māgha's invasion in 1215 when the relics were concealed and about 97 at the beginning of the reign of Vijayabāhu III in 1232 when the relics were uncovered. That is perhaps just about possible. But it is hard to suppose that he went on at this advanced age to write both Vin-vn-ṭ and Sacc-ṭ after the accession of Parākramabāhu II in 1236 as a centenarian.

One or more of the following must be mistaken:

1. The reference in the Cūlavamsa to Vācissara and Dhammakitti may refer to a different Vācissara and a different Dhammakitti. That, however, is surprising if the author of Sacc-ṭ is named Vācissara, given the close association with his disciple Dhammakitti as revealed in the *nigamana*.⁹³
2. The date of Parākramabāhu's raid on Rāmañña⁹⁴ as given in the Devanagala Rock Inscription is ca. 1164. If this is wrong, the events concerned could have taken place twenty years later. Vācissara could then have written the two *ṭīkā*s in his 80s. Unfortunately, this does not seem to be possible. The date in this inscription was first read by H.C.P. Bell.⁹⁵ Parānavitana

⁹³[We know of other such pairs of teacher and pupil with identical names (both monastics) such as Ānanda and his pupil Buddhappiya in the thirteenth century A.D. and another couple in the twelfth century A.D. See Matsumura 1999, p. 158; Gornall 2014, p. 521.]

⁹⁴The inscription refers to the Burmese king Bhuvanāditta as living in Aramaṇa = Pali Rāmañña (from Rmeñ = Mon). Bell reads: *Aramaṇa (wasana)* and Parānavitana: *aramaṇā[dhipā]ti*. There is an even earlier dated reference to Rāmañña as a country, i.e. the Mon country in Sinhalese inscriptions: Vijayabāhu I in the eleventh century. Michael Aung-Thwin is sceptical, but Aramaṇa is very much the expected form of either Rmeñ or Rmañ in Sinhala and Rāmañña is an abstract formation, i.e. "belonging to the Ramaṇas". Aung-Thwin 2005, [pp. 49; 347, n. 182].

⁹⁵Bell 1892, pp. 73–76.

subsequently reedited the inscription with minor corrections.⁹⁶ Although the date is quite illegible in the published rubbing, it seems implausible that both scholars would be mistaken about this. We have to accept this date as correct.

3. The attribution of the Nissandeha is to Paṇḍita Parākramabāhu. If this attribution is wrong, or the work was written before his accession to the throne as Parākramabāhu II in 1236, then Vin-vn-ṭ could have been written a decade or so earlier. But this would still leave Vācissara writing in his 90s. Against this is the fact that the Nissandeha is cited a number of times in Vin-vn-ṭ and otherwise not often. This suggests it may be referred to because of royal prestige at a date close in time to its composition.⁹⁷ Against this also is the reference in the *nigamaṅga* to Sacc-ṭ which refers to the author as having been formerly living in Jambudonī. This should be after Jambudonī was made the capital following the accession of Vijayabāhu in 1232.

It is perhaps worth noting that if we follow the first alternative and reject the identification of our author with the Vācissara mentioned in the Cūlavamaṅsa, then we have no evidence at all that he was named Vācissara in any source prior to the Gandhavamaṅsa. Nothing suggests to me that the Vācissara who was the author of the Thūpavamaṅsa has anything to do with our author — the list he gives of his writings is different.⁹⁸ This is the view put forward by Jayawickrama.⁹⁹ The

⁹⁶Paranavitana 1933, [pp. 312–325].

⁹⁷[It is quoted at least once in the Kaṅkhāvitaraṇīpitapota (Kkh-pipo 131.9ff.), in Sinhalese, but the Pāli parallel in the Vin-vn-ṭ shows that the author of the latter most probably made use of the Nissandeha even where he does not quote it by naming his source (see for details Kieffer-Pülz 2016, pp. 11–12). This speaks against the assumption that the Nissandeha is quoted in the Vin-vn-ṭ only because of royal prestige.]

⁹⁸[A different conclusion is drawn by Kieffer-Pülz 2018, who thinks that Vācissara, the author of Sacc-ṭ, Vin-vn-ṭ, and Utt-vn-ṭ, may also have been the author of the Thūpavamaṅsa and possibly the Sīmālaṅkārasaṅgaha.]

⁹⁹Jayawickrama 1971, pp. xxi–xxiv.

nigamana states that this Vācissara was in charge of the *dhammāgāra* of King Parākrāmabāhu.¹⁰⁰ Jayawickrama seems uncertain whether this is a reference to Parākrāmabāhu I or II. However, the allusion is certainly to Parākrāmabāhu's building of a *dhammāgāra* (Mhv LXXIII 44ff.). From the description there this was certainly not a library, as Jayawickrama takes it. Geiger's "sermon hall" seems more to the point. In fact, the reference may very easily be to both Parākrāmabāhu I as the builder and to Parākrāmabāhu II or III as the current owner. We should note that Parākrāmabāhu III who reigned from 1287–93 seems to have ruled from Poḷonnaruva.

If it is correct that the same Vācissara as the author of Thūp wrote the *Sīmālaṅkāra*,¹⁰¹ which critiques the ordination practices of the Coḷiya monks,¹⁰² we should look to a period when the influence of South Indian monks was significant in Sri Lanka. Parākrāmabāhu II carried out a purification of the order and brought over from the Coḷa country many respected monks. He "established harmony between the two orders" (Mhv LXXXIV 10).¹⁰³ Later Parākrāmabāhu IV (reigned 1302–26) appointed a *mahāthera* belonging to the Coḷa country as *rājaguru*.¹⁰⁴

Comparison of the *nigamanas* to the *Sāratthasālinī* and to the *ṭīkā* to the *Vinayavinicchaya* make it clear that both are composed by the same author who was a pupil of Sāriputta.¹⁰⁵ Since the former refers to the

¹⁰⁰ *Parakkama-narindassa sabbabhūpālaketuno dhammāgāre niyutto yo Piṭakattayapārāgo.*

¹⁰¹ [For a discussion of the authorship of the *Sīmālaṅkāra* (saṅgha), see Kieffer-Pülz 2021, pp. 22ff.]

¹⁰² Kieffer-Pülz 1999; [Kieffer-Pülz 2021, pp. 24ff.].

¹⁰³ *Pasiddhe Coḷiye bhikkhū ānetvā Tambapaṇṇiyaṃ Kārāpesi samaggaṃ so rājā ubhayasāsanam.*

¹⁰⁴ Mhv LXXXX 8of. :
*Atha so Coḷadesīyaṃ nānābhāsāvisāradam
 Takkāgamadharam ekaṃ mahātheram susaṅṅatam
 Rājā rājaguruṭṭhāne ṭhapetvā tassa santike
 Jātakāni ca sabbāni sutvā sutvā nirantaram.*

¹⁰⁵ See Appendixes One and Two.

latter work, we know that it was written at a later date. Since the *ṭīkā* to the Vinayavinicchaya quotes from the Nissandeha ascribed to Parākrāmabāhu II (1236–1278),¹⁰⁶ it is not likely to have been written before the 1240s, unless it was written by him before his accession to the throne. We could then suppose a later date for the *Sārattha-sālinī* of c. 1250. But there are problems with this and I will return to the issue. The *nigamana* tells us that he began the work in Jambuddoṇi (Daṃbadeṇiya), then or later at the request of a learned lay disciple known as Dhammakitti. Subsequently the work was completed at a monastery in a different location, built by Dhammakitti. Vācissara was invited there for the rains retreat to complete the work. A library of 4,000 books is mentioned. This might well be Dhammakitti's own collection.

The *nigamana* indicates that the *Sāratthasālinī* was begun earlier and completed at a later time. This fits well with the contents. The first three chapters of Sacc are concerned with giving an outline of materiality, mental and mind respectively — in other words they outline the basic *abhidhamma* system. In commenting on these chapters, especially the first, the author of *Sāratthasālinī* draws heavily on Sumaṅgala's *Abhidh-s-mhṭ* and Sāriputta's *sanne* on *Abhidh-s*. Since the former is partly

¹⁰⁶Information from Petra Kieffer-Pülz (email: 8/4/14). “It is also in my Gaṅṭhi-pada book [Kieffer-Pülz 2013, I, pp. 30ff., 52f.]. But there I still thought the Vin-vn-ṭ must have been written in the second half of the thirteenth century A.D. Taking into account the secondarily added *nigamana* after the Utt-vn-ṭ, the texts of Vin-vn-ṭ and Utt-vn-ṭ most probably were taken to Burma by Sīvalī Thera. If he in fact died around 1240, then the time frame for the writing of the Vin-vn-ṭ must be very short [see now Kieffer-Pülz 2018, 199–200]. Taking into account that the author of Vin-vn-ṭ says in the Gaṅṭhā-rambhakathā, that there existed a Sinhalese exposition (*vivarāṇa*) to the Vin-vn which did not suffice for the monks abroad, and looking at the one passage from the Nissandeha which we have in Sinhalese in the Kkh-pipo, and which corresponds to the Pāli of the Vin-vn-ṭ [see now Kieffer-Pülz 2016, p. 12], it is very probable that the Vin-vn-ṭ author translated the Nissandeha even where he does not note it. [For the investigation of Vin-vn-ṭ in connection with Sacc-ṭ, see now Kieffer-Pülz 2018, pp. 190–97]. Since the Vin-vn-ṭ also takes over much material from Sp, it should not have taken a very long time to write the Vin-vn-ṭ.”

based on the latter, it is difficult to be sure how far he is using his teacher Sāriputta's *sanne* directly. But, since there are some verses cited which are only found in *Abhidh-s-mhṭ* and at least one that is only found in the *sanne*, it seems that he must have made use of both. After chapter III, however, verses are not taken from either work. These verses are in almost exactly the same order as in the two sources for chapter I and in the single example from chapter II. For the third chapter they do not follow any particular order.

In the first two chapters there is relatively little by way of other quotations or references to post-Buddhaghosa sources. Beginning with the third chapter we see a number of citations from the earlier *Abhidhamma* manuals, especially *Abhidh-av* and from the *ṭīkā* literature. Mentioned by name are the *Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha*, *Paramatthavinicchaya* and especially the *Abhidhammāvatāra*. The first two of these cannot be dated, while the last is certainly from a much earlier period. The *Abhidhammaṭīkā* and the *Visuddhimaggaṭīkā* are mentioned by name and more often cited without attribution. This could be in part due to the more difficult nature of the later chapters of *Sacc*, but it also fits well with the possibility that the work was started at an earlier date and then laid aside, to be resumed under more favourable conditions with better library access.

8. CONCLUSIONS

As to the date of the *Saccasaṅkhepa*, a plausible hypothesis is that it was written by Jotipāla ca. A.D. 600, but otherwise we can only postulate an unknown author between the seventh and tenth centuries but most probably towards the beginning of that period.

The *Saccasaṅkhepavivaraṇa* (*Sacc-viv*), although described as the older *ṭīkā* in some Burmese mss, is in fact later than the *Sāratthasālinī*, but there is no indication as to its likely date.

The *Sāratthasālinī* is the work of a pupil of Sāriputta in the thirteenth century, a pupil who was requested to write this work by Sāriputta himself.

APPENDIX ONE

NIGAMANA OF THE SACCASĀṅKHEPAṬĪKĀ¹⁰⁷

<p><i>Mahā-sāmi-samaññāya vissuto yati-puñ-gavo</i> <i>Sāriputta-mahā-thera-kappo nāma guṇehi yo (1)</i></p> <p>1b. so HS; B^m1&2: <i>visuto</i>; B^m3: <i>vibhūto</i></p>	<p>A leader of monks, renowned for his title of <i>mahā-sāmi</i>, in name and qualities resembling the <i>mahāthera</i> Sāriputta (i.e. the Buddha's pupil),</p>
<p><i>Piṭakesu ca sabbattha sadda-sathādikesu ca</i> <i>Pāra-ppatto mahā-pañño jotento Jina-sāsanam (2)</i></p> <p>2b. B^m2 & 3: <i>satt-</i> and below</p>	<p>one who had achieved mastery in every aspect both in the Piṭakas and in grammatical and other textbooks, one of great wisdom who makes the <i>sāsana</i> of the Victor shine,</p>
<p><i>Vinay'-aṭṭha-kathādīnam ṭīkaṃ</i> <i>sath'-antarassa ca</i> <i>Akāsi, tassa yo sisso piṭaka-ttaya-pāra-gū (3)</i></p> <p>3b: B^m2: <i>tikaṃ</i>; B^m3: <i>ṭīkā</i> 3c. B^m2: <i>akāsi tatth' assa yo piṭaka-</i></p>	<p>made a <i>ṭīkā</i> both to the commentaries to the Vinaya and other works and to a work (śāstra) of a different kind.¹⁰⁸ His pupil, who had gained mastery of the three Piṭakas,</p>

¹⁰⁷[This *nigamana* has also been translated in Kieffer-Pülz 2018, pp. 204–206, taking into account LSC's translation, but deviating in some points.]

¹⁰⁸Most probably the Jotisattha mentioned in the *ganthārambha* of the Vin-vn-ṭ I 2,8 (v. 6): *sathantarassāpi ca jotis'-attham*. [LSC characterised the way this is indicated in the text as “a strange expression”.]

<p><i>Vātādhutākhyā-Suneru-paramākhya-mahā-muni</i></p> <p><i>Mahato bhikkhu-saṅghassa piṭakattaya-vaṇṇanaṃ</i> (4)</p> <p><i>pāda a: savipulā</i> 4a. B^{m3}: <i>vātarutākhyadhuneru</i> 4b. B^{m3}: <i>hāramajjha-</i></p>	<p>a great sage reckoned supreme as Suneru is reckoned unshaken by wind, and made an explanation of the three Piṭakas for the great <i>bhikkhu-saṅgha</i></p>
<p><i>Akāsi, akāsi Tampaṇṇimhi garubhāvaṇ ca rājunaṃ</i> <i>Ṭikā ca racitā yena Vinayassa vinicchaye</i> (5)</p> <p><i>pāda a: savipulā</i> 5a: so HS; mss omit one <i>akāsi</i> 5b: mss: <i>rājūnaṃ</i></p>	<p>that <made him recognized as> <i>guru</i> (?) by the kings in Tampapaṇṇi and composed a <i>ṭikā</i> to the Vinaya-vinicchaya</p>
<p><i>Nāma-rūpa-pariccheda-vaṇṇanā ca samāsato</i> <i>Mahā-kaccāyana-tthera-racitassa samiddhiyā</i> (6)</p> <p><i>pāda c is sa-vipulā</i></p>	<p>and an explanation in brief of the Nāmarūpapariccheda, successfully composed a <i>pada-rūpa-vibhāvanā</i> to the grammar that the therā Mahākaccāyana composed, and, wishing to illuminate the <i>sāsana</i>, composed many small books</p>
<p><i>Racitaṃ sadda-sathassa pada-rūpa-vibhāvanaṃ</i> <i>Aneke khuddakā ganthā sāsan'-ujjotaṇ'-atthīnā*</i> (7)</p> <p>7b. B^{m3}: <i>vibhāvināṃ</i></p>	
<p><i>Sāsan'-ujjotaṇ'-atthīnaṃ racitā buddhi-vuddhiyā,</i> <i>Tenācariya-pādena suci-sīlanivutt<h>inā</i> (8)</p>	<p>for the sake of increase in understanding for those wishing to illuminate the <i>sāsana</i>. That worthy teacher, wise and</p>

8b. B ^m ₁ & 2 : <i>Buddha-</i> 8c. B ^m ₃ : <i>-pādena caritassa nirutti</i>	and dwelling with pure <i>sīla</i> , composed this explanation of Saccasaṅkhepa too. May it last long in the world, accomplishing the benefit of mankind.
<i>Dhīmatā racitāyam pi</i> <i>Saccasaṅkhepa-vaṇṇanā.</i> <i>Ciraṃ vattatu lokamhi, sādhentī</i> <i>janatā-hitam. (9)</i>	
<i>Āraddhā Jambu-doṇimhi kānane</i> <i>vasatā satā</i> <i>Vasatā Tilak'-uyyāne nivāsena</i> <i>mano-rame (10)</i> The <i>nivāsena</i> does not make sense. <i>pāda a</i> is <i>sa-vipulā</i> 10d. B ^m ₃ : <i>ramme</i> ; B ^m ₂ : <i>panorammaṇe</i>	It was begun by that good man when he was dwelling in a glade at Jambuddoṇi (Daṃbadeṇiya), when he was dwelling in the habitation in the delightful Tilaka Park.
<i>Dhamma-kittana-sañjāta-kitti-</i> <i>kittana-saññinā</i> <i>Upāsakena sissena paṇḍitena naya-</i> <i>ññunā (11)</i>	After being requested by his learned pupil, knowledgable as to methods, the <i>upāsaka</i> , known by the name of Kitti who has gained the name of Dhammakitti (“Dhamma- fame”), he was conducted to the fine city of Salaḷī in the very delightful Tilaka Park abode for forest- dwellers,
<i>Ajjhesitvā samānīto Salaḷī-nagaraṃ</i> <i>varam</i> <i>Suramme Tilak'-uyyāne nivāse</i> <i>'rañña-vāsinaṃ (12)</i> 12d. B ^m ₃ : <i>raññavāsina</i>	
<i>Yatīnaṃ pīya-sīlānaṃ* dhut'-aṅgādi-</i> <i>guṇ'esinaṃ</i> <i>Kūṭāpuravatī-nāma-vissutena</i> <i>yasassinā (13)</i> 13a. B ^m _{1&2} : <i>yatinaṃ</i> B ^m ₃ omits <i>pādas b & c</i>	monks of pleasing conduct who seek such qualities as the <i>dhutaṅgas</i> . The famous one who is renowned under the name of Kūṭāpuravatī,

<p><i>Sāsan'odaya-kāmena visāla-kula- ketunā</i> <i>Vassāvās'-attham ajjhīṭṭho,</i> <i>paccayehi upaṭṭhito</i> (14) 14c. so B^{m1} & 3; HS: <i>vāsāvās'-</i>; B^{m2}: <i>vasāvās'-</i></p>	<p>desirous of progress for the <i>sāsana</i>, leader of his extensive kin, requested him to stay for the rains and supported him with the requisites.</p>
<p><i>Ten'eva kārite ramme viharanto</i> <i>nivesane</i> <i>Paṇḍitenāpi ten'eva yathā-balam</i> <i>upaṭṭhito</i> (15) 15a. so B^{m1} & 3; B^{m2}: <i>rammaṇe</i>; HS: <i>kamme</i></p>	<p>Dwelling in the delightful abode, which had been constructed by the same <lay-follower>, he was supported by that same vigilant scholar according to his ability</p>
<p><i>Sap-pāya-paccay'oghena</i> <i>appamattena paccayaṃ</i> <i>Samajjhīṭṭho samāpetuṃ yato</i> <i>saṃvaṇṇanaṃ imaṃ</i> (16) 16b. B^{m3}: <i>paccayo yena</i></p>	<p>with a mass of suitable requisites for this reason (?) since he who convinces carefully (?) was thoroughly requested to complete this explanation,</p>
<p><i>Ācinna-citto cinnākhyo aṅga-nāyaka- potthaki-</i> <i>Susamiddhāya saddhāya pasanno</i> <i>Buddha-sāsane</i> (17) 17a. B^{m1} & 2: <i>-vitto</i>; B^{m3}: <i>ādinacitto</i></p>	<p>with practised mind reckoned as (?),¹⁰⁹ he had settled devotion for the <i>sāsana</i> of the Buddha, when the faith of the Aṅga- nāyaka-potthakin¹¹⁰ was so successful,</p>

¹⁰⁹[LSC: Unclear.]

¹¹⁰This could also be the *nāyaka-potthakin* Aṅga, but the title of *potthakin* is mostly given to Kittī in the Cūlavamsa, (Mhv 72.27, 207; 74.90). Does this mean that the Kittī, who is a general and administrator of Parākramabāhu, is one and the same as the *upāsaka* Dhammakittī? Several Kittīs were serving Parākramabāhu. See Liyanagamagē 1968, pp. 54ff.

<p><i>Upaṭṭhahanto sak-kaccaṃ paccayehi yathā-balaṃ Ajjhesanaṃ yato kāsi samāpetum atho imaṃ (18)</i> 18b. B^m2: -phalaṃ 18d. B^m2: ano; B^m3: ato</p>	<p>since, while providing with requisites in the proper way to his capacity, he then made the request to complete this,¹¹¹</p>
<p><i>Tato 'yaṃ vaṇṇanā sammā Buddha- sāsana-vuddhiyā catūhi gantha-sahashehi sādhikehi samāpitā ti. (19)</i> 19c. em. to catu; B^m3: vandha- 19d. B^m3: sādHITE; B^m2: samāpite</p>	<p>then this commentary was perfectly completed for the growth of the sāsana of the Buddha with <the aid of > more than four thousand books.¹¹²</p>

¹¹¹It seems from vs. 17 on that this refers to the pupil Dhammakitti. It seems that parts are doubled in that later stanzas.

¹¹²Compare the 2,047 books listed in the *Piṭakat samuṇṇ* (von Hinüber 1996, §4) and the nearly 300 books recorded as donated to the Order in an inscription from Pagan of A.D. 1442. In contrast, at an earlier date (in the reign of Parākramabāhu I), Sāriputta refers to 20,000 and 30,000 books in the conclusions to Mp-ṭ and Sp-ṭ. This may reflect the effects of destruction during the invasion of Māgha. [Another way of understanding this stanza is to consider *gantha* as used in the sense *gāthā* (i.e. 32 syllables) (suggestion, Peter Jackson). The two passages in Sp-ṭ (III 456,5-6) and Mp-ṭ (III 370,16-17), hinted at by LSC, certainly do not refer to 20,000 and 30,000 books, but to the number of *gāthās* or syllables which these commentaries comprise. Compare also Vin-vn-ṭ I 10,26-11,2 (*ganthaparimāṇaṃ pana Vinayavinicchaye asīti-ganthādhikāni cattāri ganthasahassāni* [≠ Utt-vn v. 969], *Uttare paññā-saganthādhikāni nava ganthasatāni* [≠ Utt-vn v. 968]) *honti*) where the number of stanzas of Vin-vn and Utt-vn are given in the Burmese edition reading *gantha* for *gāthā*. Assuming that *gantha* in v. 19 is used in this sense, we would be informed that “the commentary was perfectly completed ... with more than 4,000 *gāthās*”, that is more than 128,000 syllables. As we have it, the Saccasaṅkhepa-ṭikā has about 40,000 words and around 287,000 characters. If we reckon two characters for one syllable, we would reach 143,000 syllables, which is slightly higher than this number.]

APPENDIX TWO

THE GANTHĀRAMBHAKATHĀ OF THE VINAYAVINICCHAYAṬĪKĀ¹¹³

<p>1. <i>ādiccavaṃsambarapātubhūtaṃ</i> [Be I 1] <i>byāmapabhāmaṇḍaladevacāpaṃ</i> <i>dhammambunijjhāpitapāpaghamaṃ</i> <i>vandāmi' ahaṃ Buddhamahambuvantaṃ.</i></p>	<p>I pay homage to Buddha who resembles a great raincloud who appeared in the sky of the solar lineage. The circle of his radiant aura is like a rainbow. He consumes the fire of evil with the water of <i>dhamma</i>.</p>
<p>2. <i>pasannagambhīrapadālisotaṃ</i> <i>nānānāyānantataraṅgamālaṃ</i> <i>sīlādikhandhāmitamacchagumbaṃ</i> <i>vandāmi' ahaṃ Dhammamahāsavantiṃ.</i></p>	<p>I pay homage to the great river of the Dhamma, whose clear and deep flow is embanked with words, whose endless succession of waves is the various methods (<i>naya</i>) <of the teaching>, and whose countless shoals of fish are the collections of the precepts and so on.</p>

¹¹³[Characterised by LSC as a “very rough translation” of the only accessible edition of the Vin-vn-ṭ in the Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana edition. This introduction and its translation have been discussed by LSC and Petra Kieffer-Pülz. A translation partly based on that by LSC, partly deviating from it is contained in Kieffer-Pülz 2018, pp. 192–94. I kept LSC’s translation, and added his comments which originally were not meant for publication, for further information in the footnotes.]

<p>3. <i>sīloruvelaṃ dhutasāṅkhamālaṃ santosatoyaṃ samathūmicittaṃ padhānakiccaṃ adhicittasāraṃ vandāṃ' ahaṃ Saṅghamahāsamuddaṃ.</i></p>	<p>I pay homage to the great ocean of the Saṅgha, with precepts as its sandy shore, adorned with purification practices like conch shells, whose water is joyfulness, whose manifold waves are <i>samatha</i>, whose activity is effort (? <i>unclear</i>), whose motion is higher consciousness.</p>
<p>4. <i>ye tantidhammaṃ munirājaputtā yāvajjakālaṃ paripālayantā saṃvaṇṇanaṃ nimmalam ānayaṃsu te pubbake cācariye namāmi.</i></p>	<p>I bow down too to the former teachers, the sons of the king of sages who guarded the teaching of the scriptures until the present time and brought <to us> the pure explanation.</p>
<p>5. <i>yo [B° I 2] dhammasenāpatitulyanāmo tathūpamo Sīhaḷadīpadīpo mamaṃ mahāsānimahāyatindo pāpesi vuḍḍhiṃ Jinasāsanamhi.</i></p>	<p>I bow down to my teacher who embodied the qualities of a teacher, who shared the name of <Sāriputta>, the General of Dhamma and was like him a lamp to the island of the Sinhalese, a leader among great monks and a <i>mahāsāmi</i>. He made a <i>ṭīkā</i> to the commentary named Samantapāsādikā</p>
<p>6. <i>ṭīkā katā aṭṭhakathāya yena. Samantapāsādikanāmikāya Aṅguttarāy' aṭṭhakathāya ceva satthantarassāpi ca jotis'-atthaṃ.</i></p>	
<p>7. <i>nikāyasāmaggiyidhāyakena raññā Parakkantibhujena sammā Laṅkissarenāpi katopahāraṃ vande garuṃ gāravabhājanam taṃ.</i></p>	

	<p>and likewise to the commentary to the <i>Āṅguttara</i> and also to another textbook for the study of the stars.</p> <p>He it was who was properly given offerings by the lord of <i>Laṅkā</i>, <i>Parākramabāhu</i> the king who brought unity to the fraternities.</p>
<p>8. <i>namassamāno 'ham alattham evaṃ vatthuttayaṃ vanditavandaneyyaṃ yaṃ puññasando 'ham amandabhūtaṃ tassānubhāvena hatantarāyo.</i></p>	<p>Bowing down in this way to the three things which have been and should be honoured, I have obtained no sluggish inflow of good fortune. By the power of that good fortune may all obstacles be destroyed</p>
<p>9. <i>yo Buddhaghosācariyāsabhena viññuppasatthena pi suppasattho so Buddhadattācariyābhīdhāno mahākavī theriyavaṃsadīpo.</i></p>	<p>The great sage/poet (? <i>kavi</i>) and light of the Theriya lineage named as the teacher <i>Buddhadatta</i>, who was highly praised by <i>Buddhaghosa</i>, a hero among teachers, <himself> praised by the wise,</p>
<p>10. <i>akāsi yaṃ Vinayavinicchayaṃ sauttaraṃ pakaraṇaṃ uttamaṃ hitaṃ apekkhataṃ vinayanayesu pāṭavaṃ purāsi yaṃ vivaraṇaṃ assa Sīhalaṃ.</i></p>	<p>made the work called <i>Vinayavinicchaya</i> together with the <i>Uttara</i><<i>vinicchaya</i>>,</p>

	looking to the highest benefit and skill in the ways of Vinaya. [Because the Sinhalese exposition to it which existed before] ¹¹⁴
11. <i>yasmā [Be I 3] na dīpantarikānam atthaṃ sādheti bhikkhūnam asesato taṃ tasmā hi sabbattha yatīnam atthaṃ āsīsamānena dayālayena.</i>	does not fully accomplish the goal for monks belonging to other parts of the world; therefore, for this reason and because I was asked with respect
12. <i>Sumaṅgalattheravarena yasmā sakkacca kalyāṇamanorathena nayaññunāraññānivāsikena ajjhesito sādhuḡuṇākarena.</i>	by the excellent Elder Sumaṅgala, full of compassion, who wished to benefit monks everywhere, a forest-dweller who knows proper means and who is a mine of good qualities,
13. <i>ākaṅkhamānena cirappavattiṃ dhammassa dhammissaradesitassa Coḷappadīpena ca Buddhamittattherena saddhādiguṇoditena.</i>	[and] by the Elder Buddhamitta, luminary of the Coḷas, known for such qualities as faith, desiring that the Dhamma taught by Dhamma's lord should endure long,

¹¹⁴[This line was not translated by LSC].

<p>14. <i>tathā Mahākassapa-avhayena therena sikkhāsu sagāravena kudīṭṭhi-matte bha-vidārakena sīhena Coḷāvanipūjitenā.</i></p>	<p>[and] by the elder named Mahākassapa one with respect for the [three] trainings [who tears up error in one enthralled by wrong views]¹¹⁵ a “Lion” revered by the Coḷa realm.</p>
<p>15. <i>yo Dhammakittī ti pasatthanāmo tenāpi saddhena upāsakena sīlādinānāḡuṇamaṇḍitenā saddhammakāmen’ idha paṇḍitenā.</i></p>	<p>[and] here by the devout lay disciple who is praised by the name Dhammakitti and adorned with the various qualities of virtue and so on, a scholar who loves the <i>saddhamma</i>,</p>
<p>16. <i>saddhena paññānavatā vaḷattā- maṅgalyavaṃsena mahāyasena āyācīto Vāṇijabhāṇunāpi varaññunā sādhuḡuṇodayena.</i></p>	<p>[and] asked by Vāṇijabhāṇu, who is devout, intelligent, renowned, of auspicious lineage, generous and the source of good qualities,</p>
<p>17. <i>tasmā [B^c I 4] tam āropiya pāḷibhāsaṃ nissāya pubbācariyopadesaṃ hitvā nikāyantaraḷaddhidosāṃ katvātivitthāraṇayaṃ samāsaṃ.</i></p>	<p>therefore putting it into the language of the scriptures, depending upon the instruction of former teachers,</p>

¹¹⁵[Since the third line was unclear to LSC, he left it untranslated. I insert the translation by Crosby & Skilton 1999, pp. 176ff.]

	avoiding the defect of the views of other fraternities, [and] making a summary in a very detailed manner,
18. <i>avuttam atthañ ca pakāsayanto pāṭhakkamañ cāpi avokkamanto saṃvaṇṇayissāmi tadatthasāraṃ. ādāya ganthantarato pi sāraṃ.</i>	but explaining content that has not been given and not exceeding the sequence of the text, I will comment on its important content, taking important matter from other books.
19. <i>ciraṭṭhitim patthayatā janānaṃ hitāvahassāmalasāsanassa mayā samāsenā vidhīyamānaṃ saṃvaṇṇanaṃ sādhu suṇantu santo ti.</i>	Let good people listen well to the explanation, set out in brief by me, wishing for the stainless <i>sāsana</i> that brings benefit to mankind to last long.

ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations for names of texts used in this paper are those of *A Critical Pāli Dictionary*, unless otherwise indicated. Texts used are Pali Text Society editions, except for works not published by the PTS; the Burmese Chaṭṭha-saṅgāyanā editions (as given on the Dhammagiri CD [CSCD]) were used for these unless otherwise stated. [In addition the following abbreviations were used]:

VRI	Vipassana Research Institute Igatpuri
BJT	Buddha Jayanti Tipitaka
[CSCD]	Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana CD Rom (Vipassana Research Institute, Igatpuri)
Abhidh-s-sn	<i>Abhidhammattha sangaha</i> by Bhadantachariya Anuruddha Mahathera with the Sinhalese paraphrase by Sāriputta, ed. T. Pannamoli Tissa, rev. by W. Somaloka Tissa. Colombo: Anula Press, 5th ed., 2503/1960.
Gv	[Nandapañña's] Gandhavamsa [Gv without any further specification refers to Gv E ^c] B ^c CSCD E ^c <i>Gandha-Vamsa</i> , ed. by Professor [Ivan P.] Minayeff of St. Petersburg, <i>Journal of the Pali Text Society</i> 1886, pp. 54–80. N ^c <i>The Gandhavamsa</i> (A History of Pali Literature), ed. Bimalendra Kumar. Delhi: Eastern Book Linkers, 1992.]
Pm-vn	[Anuruddha,] Paramatthavinicchayo, ed. by A.P. Buddhadatta, <i>Journal of the Pali Text Society</i> Vol. X (1985), pp. 155–226.

MANUSCRIPTS

Saccasāṅkhepa = Sacc

B ^m 1	British Library Ms I.O. Man/Pali 120 (formerly part of the Royal Library, Mandalay)
B ^m 2	Fragile Palm Leaves Ms 1250 (dated 1861)
B ^m 3	Fragile Palm Leaves Ms 1422 (dated 1771)

Saccasaṅkhepavaṇṇanā = Sacc-ṭ

- HS transcript kept in the Uppsala Universitetsbiblioteket prepared by Helmer Smith, from B^m1
- B^m1 British Library Ms I.O. Man/Pali 121 (formerly part of the Royal Library, Mandalay)
(Manuscript signed out to Helmer Smith 11/8/47) (conclusion by scribe in reign of Mindon after founding of Mandalay in 1857)
- B^m2 British Library Ms Or. 3001
- B^m3 Manuscript from the U Pho Thi Library, UPT 524.7 (Saddhammajotikārāma Monastery in Thaton, Myanmar)
[https://digicoll.library.utoronto.ca/mmdl/UPT524_7F.pdf;
last accessed, 26/6/2020]

Saccasaṅkhepavivarāṇa = Sacc-viv

- HS transcript kept in the Uppsala Universitetsbiblioteket prepared by Helmer Smith, from B^m1
- B^m1 British Library Ms I.O. Man/Pali 121 (formerly part of the Royal Library, Mandalay)
(Ms signed out to Helmer Smith 11/8/47)
- B^m3 Manuscript from the U Pho Thi Library, UPT 524.6 (Saddhammajotikārāma Monastery in Thaton, Myanmar)
[https://digicoll.library.utoronto.ca/mmdl/UPT524_6F.pdf;
last accessed, 26.6.2020]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aung-Thwin, Michael (2005), *The Mists of Rāmañña: The Legend that Was Lower Burma* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press)
- Bell, H. C. P. (1892), *Report on the Kégalla District of the Province of Sabaragamuwa* (Colombo: Archæological Survey of Ceylon XIX)
- Bizot, François (1992), *Le Chemin de Lan̄kā* (Textes bouddhiques du Cambodge; Paris: École française d'Extrême-Orient)
- Bodhi, Bhikkhu (1993), *A Comprehensive Manual of Abhidhamma: The Abhidhammattha Sangaha of Ācariya Anuruddha. Pali Text Originally Edited and Translated by Mahāthera Nārada* (Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society)
- Cousins, L.S. (1972), "Dhammapāla and the Ṭikā Literature", *Religion*, pp. 159–65
- (2011), "Abhidhamma Studies I: Jotipāla and the Abhidhamma Anuṭṭikā", *Thai International Journal for Buddhist Studies* II, pp. 1–36
- (2013), "Abhidhamma Studies II: Sanskrit Abhidharma Literature of the Mahāvihāravāsins", *Thai International Journal for Buddhist Studies* IV, pp. 1–61
- [——— (2015), "Abhidhamma Studies III: Origins of the Canonical Abhidha(r)mma Literature", *Journal of the Oxford Centre for Buddhist Studies*, 8, pp. 96–145]
- Crosby, Kate (2000), "Tantric Theravāda: A Bibliographic Essay on the Writings of François Bizot and Others on the Yogāvacara Tradition", *Contemporary Buddhism. An Interdisciplinary Journal* 1 (2), pp. 141–93
- (2012), "Scribal and Authorial Openings in Theravāda Manuscripts: Evidence from the Neville Collection", *Journal of the Oxford Centre for Buddhist Studies* 2, pp. 124–45
- [Crosby, Kate, and Andrew Skilton (1999), "A Note on the Date of Mahākassapa, Author of the Mohavicchedanī", *Bulletin d'étude indienne* 17–18, pp. 173–79]
- Dhammaratana, Vālivīṭṭiyē, Thera (1896 [1891]), *Pāli-Thūpavaṃsaya*, by Vāgīṣvara (Colombo)
- Dhirasekera, Jotiya (1970), "A Historical Introduction to the Sīmālaṅkāra-saṅgaha of Vācissara Thera", *Buddhist Studies (Bukkyō Kenkyū)* I, pp. 76–73
- Dimitrov, Dragomir (2010), *The Bhaikṣukī Manuscript of the Candrālaṅkāra: Study, Script Tables, and Facsimile Edition* (Cambridge, Mass.: published by The Harvard Oriental Series, The Department of

Sanskrit and Indian Studies, Harvard University; London: Harvard University Press [distributor]

- Geiger, Wilhelm (1908), *The Dīpavaṃsa and the Mahāvāṃsa and Their Historical Development in Ceylon*, trans. E.M. Coomaraswamy (Colombo: H. C. Cottle)
- (1956), *Pāli Literature and Language*, authorised English translation by Batakrishna Ghosh (Calcutta: University of Calcutta, 2nd ed. [Original German Version 1916])
- Gornall, Alastair (2012), *Buddhism and Grammar: The Scholarly Cultivation of Pāli in Medieval Lankā* (Ph.D. dissertation, Cambridge)
- [——— (2014), “How Many Sounds Are in Pāli? Schism, Identity and Ritual in the Theravāda saṅgha”, *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 42, pp. 511–50.]
- Von Hinüber, Oskar (1996), *A Handbook of Pāli Literature* (Indian Philology and South Asian Studies 2; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter)
- Jayawickrama, N.A. (1971), *The Chronicle of the Thūpa and the Thūpavaṃsa: Being a Translation and Edition of Vācissara’s Thūpavaṃsa* (Sacred books of the Buddhists 28; London: Luzac for Pali Text Society)
- Kieffer-Pūlz, Petra (1999), “Vācissara’s Sīmālaṅkārasaṅgha and the Disagreement Between Colīyas and Sīhaḷas”, *Buddhist Studies (Bukkyō Kenkyū)* XXVIII (March), pp. 11–18
- (2013), *Verlorene Gaṇṭhipadas zum buddhistischen Ordensrecht. Untersuchungen zu den in der Vajirabuddhīṭikā zitierten Kommentaren Dhammasiris und Vajirabuddhis*, 3 vols. (Veröffentlichungen der Indologischen Kommission, 1. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag)
- (2016), “Reuse of Texts in Pāli Legal Commentaries”, *Buddhist Studies Review* 33.1–2, pp. 9–45
- [——— (2017), “Saṅgharakkhita Mahāsāmi’s Oeuvre Based on Intertextual Links in his Texts”, *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University for the Academic Year 2016*, Vol. XX, pp. 23–55]
- [——— (2018), “The Relation of the *Saccasaṅkhepaṭīkā* Called *Sāratthasālinī* to the *Vinayavinicchayaṭīkā* Called *Vinayasāratthasandīpanī*”, *Buddhist Studies Review* 35.1–2, pp. 189–223]
- [——— 2021, *A Manual of the Adornment of the Monastic Boundary: Vācissara’s Sīmālaṅkārasaṅgha. Edition and Annotated Translation* (Veröffentlichungen der Indologischen Kommission, 8. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz)]

- Kim, Wan Doo (1999), *The Theravādin Doctrine of Momentariness: A Survey of Its Origins and Development* (D.Phil. dissertation, Oxford)
- Liyanagamagē, Amaradāsa (1968), *The Decline of Polonnaruwa and the Rise of Dambadeniya, circa 1180–1270 A.D.* (Colombo: Dept. of Cultural Affairs)
- Mahāsiriyejya-sū, Mañ"-krī" (2012), *Catalogue of the Piṭaka and other texts in Pāli, Pāli–Burmese, and Burmese (Piṭakat-tō-sa-muiñ"*), trans. Peter Nyunt (Bristol: Pali Text Society)
- Malalasekera, G. P. (1928), *The Pali literature of Ceylon* (Prize Publication Fund (Series) 10; London: The Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland)
- [Matsumura, Junko (1999), "Remarks on the Rasavāhinī and the related literature", *Journal of the Pali Text Society* XXV, pp. 155–72.]
- Norman, K. R. (1983), *Pāli Literature Including the Canonical Literature in Prakrit and Sanskrit of All the Hīnayāna Schools of Buddhism. (A History of Indian Literature, Vol. VII, Fasc. 2; Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz)*
- Paranavitana, S. (1933), "The Devanagala Rock-inscription of Parākramabāhu I", *Epigraphia Zeylanica* III, pp. 312–25
- Rohanadeera, Māndis (1996), *Śrī Lankāvē Mahāsāmi Saṅgharāja Parapura: madhyatana yugaya, Bu. Va. 1708-2135, Kri. Va. 1165–1592* (Nugegoda: Sīmāsahita/ Prakāśana (Paudgalika))
- Rohanadeera, Mendis (1985), "Mahāsāmi Sangha Rāja Institution in Sri Lanka. Its Origin, Development, Status, Duties and Functions", *Vidyodaya Journal of Arts, Sciences and Letters* 13 (1), pp. 27–43
- Wickremasinghe, Don Martino de Zilva (1900), *Catalogue of the Sinhalese Manuscripts in the British Museum* (London: British Museum)
- Wijeratne, R.P., and Rupert Gethin (2002), *Summary of the Topics of Abhidhamma (Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha)* (Oxford: Pali Text Society)