

UTTARAVIHĀRATṬHAKATHĀ AND SĀRASAMĀSA<sup>1</sup>  
Some Unattributed Non-Mahāvihāravāsin Sources for the Pāli  
Commentaries\*

Contents:

1. Controversial Points and Methodology
2. Examples found in the Visuddhimagga
3. Examples found in the Dīghatṭhakathā
4. Examples found in the Majjhimatṭhakathā
5. Examples found in the Saṃyuttatṭhakathā
6. Conclusion

**1. Controversial Points and Methodology**

The study of the sources is one of the most important and basic subjects in the field of Pāli Aṭṭhakathā literature<sup>2</sup>. The source material for this literature can be classified into six main groups:

1. The Tipiṭaka, i.e. the Pāli Canon
2. Three post-canonical texts: the Nettipakarāṇa, Peṭakopadesa and Milindapañha
3. The Pāli Aṭṭhakathās themselves
4. The so-called Sīhaḷatṭhakathā
5. Sources from schools other than the Mahāvihāra fraternity
6. Other minor sources

The fifth of these can be further divided into two:

- a. Views attributed to "Some" or "Others"
- b. Views attributed to "Sophists" (Vitaṇḍavādins)

Of these two, the latter has been discussed by me not only in Japanese<sup>3</sup> but also in English<sup>4</sup>; the former will be studied here.

The Pāli Aṭṭhakathās which have been transmitted down to the present time by the Mahāvihāra fraternity of the Theravāda school as its own texts frequently quote or refer to the views of "some" or "others" (aññe, itare, ekacce, eke, keci, pare, ye... te..., etc). These are almost always referred to in the plural form, which indicates a certain group, not a particular individual. The number of references is altogether about six hundred<sup>5</sup>. The names of these "others" are not usually given. Although the majority of them are unknown, some can be identified, through comments in the Ṭikās, the commentaries on the Aṭṭhakathās. Those which are so identified can be divided into three groups:

1. The Abhayagirivihāra fraternity and its offshoot, i.e. the non-Mahāvihāra fraternity of the Theravāda school
2. Some groups (sometimes particular individuals) belonging to the Mahāvihāra fraternity
3. Mahāyāna or Hīnayāna schools other than the Theravādins

Of these three, the first is the largest in number and of the greatest importance. The references in the Ṭikās are to "Abhayagirivāsino", "Uttaravihāravāsino (-vāsikā, -vāsikatherā)", "Sārasamāsa-ācariyā", "Upatissa as the author of the Vimuttimaggā", etc. These names are always in the plural with the exception of "Upatissa".

In addition, there can be found the proper name "Sārasamāsa", which is always in the locative singular, except in the compound "Sārasamāsa-ācariyā". This must be the name of a text. These names can be recognized as referring to non-Mahāvihāra fraternities or their texts. By investigating these unattributed quotations from the non-Mahāvihāravāsins, the present article aims to make clear the nature of the Aṭṭhakathā source materials as well as a certain relation between the Mahāvihāra and the non-Mahāvihāra traditions.

Several scholars have already paid attention to these unattributed sources. For instance, Rev. Nyanatiloka drew attention to those

which appear in the Visuddhimaggā in his German translation of that text<sup>6</sup>, as did Professor Mizuno in his Japanese translation of the same text<sup>7</sup>, and also Rev. Nyanamoli in his English translation of the Visuddhimaggā<sup>8</sup>. Professor Bapat also referred to them in his comparative study of the Vimuttimaggā and the Visuddhimaggā<sup>9</sup>. Professor de Silva threw new light on the unnamed figures mentioned in the Sumāṅgalavilāsini in the introduction to her edition of the Dīghaṭikā<sup>10</sup>. With reference to the unattributed sources found in the Buddhavaṃsaṭṭhakathā and other Aṭṭhakathās, Dr. Horner published two articles in recent years<sup>11</sup>. All these studies, however, either are limited to a particular text or are too brief in their discussion, so that they never do more than bring the matter forward for consideration or point out the problems. Accordingly, there has as yet been no comprehensive research of a kind that can be expected to produce reliable conclusions.

I shall now explain my methodology. The unnamed sources which are identified as non-Mahāvihāravāsins (with the various expressions already stated) in the Ṭikās<sup>12</sup> are forty-one in number, and they are found as follows:

1	[1]	Vism I 80	
2	[2]	Vism I 102	
3	[3]	Vism I 148	
4	[4]	Vism I 268	=[35]
5	[5]	Vism II 432	=[38]
6	[6]	Vism II 450	
7	[7]	Vism II 700	
<hr/>			
8	[8]	Sv I 80	=[28], [37], [41]
9	[9]	Sv I 84	
10	[10]	Sv I 86f	=[36]
11	[11]	Sv I 93	
12	[12]	Sv I 114	
13	[13]	Sv I 150	

14	[14]	Sv I 152	
15	[15]	Sv I 162	= [30]
16	[16]	Sv I 184	= [27], [34], [40]
17	[17]	Sv I 250	
18	[18]	Sv II 437	
19	[19]	Sv II 514	
20	[20]	Sv II 642	= [39]
<hr/>			
21	[21]	Ps I 28	
22	[22]	Ps I 38	
23	[23]	Ps I 54	
24	[24]	Ps I 63	
25	[25]	Ps I 69	= [33]
26	[26]	Ps I 123	
	[27]	Ps I 253	= [16], [34], [40]
	[28]	Ps I 211	= [8], [37], [41]
27	[29]	Ps II 302	
	[30]	Ps III 230	= [15]
28	[31]	Ps IV 62	
<hr/>			
29	[32]	Spk I 208	
	[33]	Spk II 42	= [25]
	[34]	Spk III 183	= [16], [27], [40]
	[35]	Spk III 270	= [4]
<hr/>			
	[36]	Mp II 293	= [10]
	[37]	Mp III 194	= [8], [28], [41]
<hr/>			
	[38]	As 421	= [5]
<hr/>			
	[39]	Vibh-a 308	= [20]
	[40]	Vibh-a 348	= [16], [27], [34]
<hr/>			
	[41]	Pp-a 241	= [8], [28], [37]

In the above list, the second column shows their original numbers and the fourth column other passages that are basically the same. Most of these duplicated examples are identical not only with respect to the unattributed quotations themselves but also to the passages which precede and follow. Therefore, the number in the first column in this list indicates the real number, excluding all duplications. That is to say, the total number of all the examples amounts to forty-one, while the real number of examples after eliminating the duplicates is twenty-nine. Although each example usually contains only one unattributed quotation, in some instances several quotations are found together, so that each example consists of a passage concerning one topic but not necessarily one quotation: in some instances there is more than one quotation. The twenty-nine examples are distributed as follows: seven in the Visuddhimagga, thirteen in the Dīghaṭṭhakathā, eight in the Majjhimaṭṭhakathā, and one in the Saṃyuttaṭṭhakathā. In the following sections of this article, they will be examined one by one in the order in which they appear in the list given above.

## 2. Examples found in the Visuddhimagga

### 1. Example One

#### A. Vism (I 79 foll.)

Tattha kusalattikato ti sabbān' eva hi dhutaṅgāni sekhaputhujjanakhināsavānaṃ vasena siyā kusalāni, siyā avyākatāni, n' atthi dhutaṅgaṃ akusalan ti . . . **Yesam** pi kusalattikavinimuttaṃ dhutaṅgaṃ, tesam atthato dhutaṅgaṃ eva n' atthi. Asantaṃ kassa dhunanato dhutaṅgaṃ nāma bhavissati, dhutaṅge samādāya vattatīti vacanavirodho pi ca nesam āpajjati; tasmā taṃ na gahetabban ti.

#### B. Vism-mhṭ (I 180, 4-6)

**Yesan** ti Abhayagirivāsike sandhāyāha. Te hi dhutaṅgaṃ nāma paññattī ti vadanti. Tathā sati tassa paramatthato avijjamānato kilesānaṃ dhunanaṭṭho pi na siyā, samādātabbatā cā ti tesam vacanaṃ Pāliyā virujjhatī ti dassetuṃ - "kusalattikavinimuttaṃ" ti ādi vuttaṃ.

C. Ged (Taishō Vol 32, p 406b)<sup>a</sup>

*Question:* Who is called an observer of the ascetic practice (dhutaṅga)? How many kinds of the ascetic practice are there? . . .

*Answer:* There are thirteen ascetic practices: these are taught by the Buddha and are the precepts of the Buddha. These are called the ascetic practice. As regards them, the skilful (kusala), the unskilful (akusala) and the non-characterizable (avyākata) should not be discussed.

D. mnam par grol baḥi lam las slyañs paḥi yon tan bstan pa<sup>13</sup>

De la sbyañs paḥi yan lag ni ci žig yin | . . . De la sbyañs paḥi yan lag ces bya ba ni gži bcu gsum po de dag gi spoñ ba gañ yin pa de ni sbyañs paḥi yan lag yin no | Sbyañs paḥi yon tan cir brjod par bya že na | dge bar brjod par byaḥo |

As shown above, the view on the dhutaṅga, which is recorded as a divergent opinion in the Visuddhimagga (A), and which is said to be that of the Abhayagirivāsikas in its Tikā (B), accords with a view stated in the Gedatsudōron, the Chinese version of the Vimuttimagga (C). On the other hand, the Tibetan translation of Vim (D) does not agree with the Gedatsudōron (C) in this passage.

2. Example Two

A. Vism (I 102 foll.)

Tatra purimā tāva tisso cariyā pubbāciṇṇanidānā dhātudosanidānā cā ti **ekacce** vadanti. Pubbe kira iṭṭhappayogasubhakammabahulo

rāgacarito hoti; saggā vā cavitvā idhūpapanno. Pubbe chedanavadhabandhanaverakammabahulo dosacarito hoti; nirayanāgayonihi vā cavitvā idhūpapanno. Pubbe majjapānabahulo sutaparipucchāvihīno ca mohacarito hoti, tiracchānayaniyā vā cavitvā idhūpapanno ti. Evaṃ pubbāciṇṇanidānā ti vadanti. Dvinnam pana dhātūnaṃ ussannattā puggalo mohacarito hoti: pathavidhātuyā ca āpodhātuyā ca. Itarāsaṃ dvinnam ussannattā dosacarito. Sabbāsaṃ samattā pana rāgacarito ti. Dosesu ca semhādhiko rāgacarito hoti, vātādhiko mohacarito, semhādhiko vā mohacarito, vātādhiko vā rāgacarito ti evaṃ dhātudosanidānā ti vadanti.

B. Vism-mhṭ (I 221, 8)

**Ekacce** ti Upatissattheraṃ sandhāyāha, tena hi Vimuttimagge tathā vuttaṃ.

C. Ged (Taishō Vol 32, p 410a)<sup>b</sup>

*Question:* What are the causes of these three kinds of behaviour? How may it be known that this is a man of greedy temperament, that is a man of angry temperament and yet another is a man of infatuated temperament? . . . *Answer:* Deeds done in the past are causes of behaviour. The elements are causes of behaviour. The cardinal humours are causes of behaviour. How do deeds done in the past become causes of behaviour? One who has accumulated good actions in past existences through desirable means becomes a man of greedy temperament, and also one who, passing away from a heavenly mansion, is reborn here. One who (in past existences) has perpetrated many undesirable deeds of killing, maiming, capturing and bearing a grudge becomes a man of angry temperament, and also one who, passing away from hell or a serpent state, is reborn here. One who (in past existences) has enjoyed much drinking and has been devoid (of learning and questioning) becomes a man of infatuated temperament, and also one who, passing away from a bestial state, is reborn here. Thus

deeds done in the past become causes of behaviour. How do elements become causes of behaviour? Because of the heightening of two elements, one becomes a man of infatuated temperament. These are the earth element (element of extension) and the water element (element of cohesion). Because of the heightening of two elements, one becomes a man of angry temperament. These are the fire element (element of heat) and the wind element (element of mobility). Because of the equalising of all elements, one becomes a man of greedy temperament. Thus the different elements become causes of behaviour. How do the cardinal humours become causes of behaviour? One who has an excess of phlegm becomes a man of greedy temperament. One who has an excess of choler becomes a man of angry temperament, and one who has an excess of wind becomes a man of infatuated temperament.

There is another view: one who has an excess of phlegm becomes a man of infatuated temperament and one who has an excess of wind becomes a man of greedy temperament. Thus the cardinal humours become causes of behaviour.

The above comment of the Visuddhimaggaṭīkā (B) is the only reference so far known to Upatissa, the author of the Vimuttimagga, and also to the text itself throughout all the Aṭṭhakathās and Ṭīkāś. From this comment it is certain that Dhammapāla, the author of the Paramatthamañjūsā, consulted the Vimuttimagga of Upatissa. The above passage from the Chinese version of the Vimuttimagga (C) basically corresponds with the quotation by 'Some' in the Visuddhimagga (A).

### 3. Example Three

#### A. Vism (I 148)

Tatra paṭipadā-visuddhi nāma sasambhāriko upacāro, upekkhānubrūhaṇā nāma appanā, sampahaṃsanā nāma paccavekkhaṇā ti evam **eke** vaṇṇayanti. Yasmā pana: ekattagataṃ

cittaṃ paṭipadā-visuddhi pakkhannañ<sup>14</sup> c' eva hoti upekkhānubrūhitañ ca, ñāna ca sampahaṃsitaṃ ti. Pāliyaṃ vuttaṃ, tasmā anto appanāya eva āgamanavasena paṭipadā-visuddhi. Tatra majjhātupekkhāya kiccavasena upekkhānubrūhaṇā, dhammānaṃ anativattanādibhāvasādhanaṃ pariyodāpakassa ñānaṃ kiccanipphattivasena sampahaṃsanā ca veditabbā.

#### B. Vism-mhṭ (I 314, 11-12)

**Eke** ti Abhayagiri vāsino. Te hi evaṃ paṭipadā-visuddhi-ādike vaṇṇayanti, tad ayuttaṃ.

#### C. Ged (Taishō Vol 32, p 417a)<sup>c</sup>

(The three kinds of goodness: there are the initial, medial and final stages of goodness. Purity of practice is the initial stage; the increase of equanimity is the medial stage; and rejoicing is the final stage.) What is the purity of practice? It is the foundation of all goodness. What is the increase of equanimity? It is the fixed meditation (appanā samādhi). What is rejoicing? It is reviewing (paccavekkhaṇā). Thus there are three kinds of goodness in the First Meditation.

If we compare the quotation from **eke**, i.e. the Abhayagiri vāsins, in the Visuddhimagga (A) with the parallel passages in the Gedatsudōron (C), we find that these passages on the three kinds of goodness in the First Meditation accord with one another, except for the explanation of the purity of practice (paṭipadā-visuddhi). This minor difference arises probably from an incorrect translation into Chinese.

### 4. Example Four

#### A. Vism (I 266)

Idāni yan taṃ Bhagavatā: "Ayaṃ pi kho, bhikkhave, ānāpānasati-samādhī bhāvito bahulikato santo c' eva paṇīto ca asecanako ca sukho ca vihāro uppannuppanne ca pāpake akusale dhamme thānaso antaradhāpeti vūpasameti" ti evaṃ pasamsitvā; - "Kathaṃ bhāvito ca, bhikkhave, ānāpānasati-samādhī? Kathaṃ bahulikato santo c' eva paṇīto ca asecanako ca sukho ca vihāro uppannuppanne ca pāpake akusale dhamme thānaso antaradhāpeti vūpasameti? . . ."

#### B. Vism (I 268)

Asecanako ca sukho ca vihāro ti ettha pana n' āssa secanan ti asecanako; anāsittako abbokinno pāṭiyekko<sup>15</sup> āveniko. N' atthi ethha parikkamma vā upacārena vā santatā; ādi-samannāhāro pabhuti attano sabhāven' eva santo ca paṇīto cā ti attho. **Keci** pana asecanako ti anāsittako ojavanto sabhāven' eva madhuro ti vadanti. Evam ayaṃ asecanako<sup>16</sup> ca appitappitakkhaṇe kāyikacetasikasukhapaṭilābhāya saṃvattanato sukho ca vihāro ti veditabbo.

#### C. Vism-mhṭ (I 566, 8)

**Keci** ti Uttaravihāravāsike sandhāyāha.

#### D. Ged (Taishō Vol 32, p 429c)<sup>d</sup>

*Question:* What is the concentration by respiration? What is the practising of it? What are its salient characteristic, function, near cause and benefits? What is its procedure? *Answer:* Inhalation (āna) is in-breathing. Exhalation (apāna) is out-breathing. On the occasion of in-breathing and out-breathing, one concentrates, is concentrated and is rightly concentrating. This is called the concentration by in-breathing and out-breathing. The state in which one's mind is steady and undisturbed is called the practising of it. Causing the arising of perception as regards respiration is its salient characteristic. Attending to contact (phassa) is its function. Removal of discursive thought (vitakka) is its near cause. What

are its benefits? If a man practises the concentration of respiration, he attains to the calm (santa), the exquisite (paṇīta), the brilliant and lovely, and the blissful life (sukha vihāra).

This example, which is concerned with the exposition on "ānāpānasati" is exceptionally specific. It begins with two quotations from the Saṃyuttanikāya (A). After quoting these two passages from SN (V 321 §9; V 322 §11), Buddhaghosa comments on some words or phrases in the latter quotation. When commenting upon them, he refers to the Saṃyuttaṭṭhakathā of the Mahāvihāra. Buddhaghosa's comments, with almost identical wording, recur in Spk<sup>17</sup>. On the other hand, the parallel passage in the Gedatsudōron (D) does not contain any quotation from SN at this point, though it partially accords with the second quotation of Vism; with the result that it does not, unlike SN, have any comment on "asecanaka". Consequently, Buddhaghosa must have consulted the Saṃyutta commentary of the Uttaravihāra and taken from it an alternative explanation. It is to be noted that the explanation of "asecanaka" by the Uttaravihāra is not criticised or denied here by him.

#### 5. Example Five

##### A. Vism (II 432)

Tattha **keci** khaṇapaccuppannaṃ cittaṃ cetopariyañāssa ārammaṇaṃ hoti ti vadanti. Kiṃ kāraṇā? Yasmā iddhimato ca parassa ca ekakkhaṇe cittaṃ uppajati ti; idaṃ ca nesam opammaṃ: - Yathā ākāse khitte pupphamuttimhi avassaṃ ekaṃ puppham ekassa vaṇṭena vaṇṭaṃ paṭivijjhati, evaṃ parassa cittaṃ jānissāmi ti rāsivasena mahājanassa citte āvajjite avassaṃ ekassa cittaṃ ekena cittena uppādakkhaṇe vā thitikkhaṇe vā bhāṅgakkhaṇe vā paṭivijjhati ti. Taṃ pana vassasataṃ pi vassasahassaṃ pi āvajjanto yena ca cittena āvajjati, yena ca jānāti, tesam dvinnaṃ sahaṭṭhānābhāvato āvajjanajavanānaṃ ca anīṭṭhatthāne nānārammaṇabhāvappattidosato ayuttan ti Aṭṭhakathāsu

paṭikkhittam. Santatipaccuppannam pana addhāpaccuppannañ ca ārammaṇam hoti ti veditabbam.

B. Vism-mhṭ (II 935, 13)

**Kecī** ti Abhayagirivāsino.

The explanation attributed to "some", i.e. the Abhayagirivāsins, in the Visuddhimagga cannot be found in the Gedatsudōron<sup>18</sup>. Buddhaghosa quotes it not from the Gedatsudōron, but from some old Aṭṭhakathās which were his source materials and which are referred to at the end of the above passage (A). From this evidence, it is clear that some old commentaries of the Mahāvihāra had a reference on this matter to the view of the Abhayagiri, which was rejected by Buddhaghosa.

6. Example Six

A. Vism (II 450)

Imāni tāva Pāliyaṃ āgatarūpān' eva. Aṭṭhakathāyam pana balarūpaṃ, sambhavarūpaṃ, jātirūpaṃ, rogarūpaṃ, **ekaccānaṃ** matena middharūpan ti evaṃ aññāni pi rūpāni āharitvā: addhā muni 'si sambuddho, n' atthi nīvaraṇā tavā ti ādini vatvā middharūpaṃ tāva n' atthi yevā ti paṭikkhittam. Itaresu rogarūpaṃ jaratā-aniccatā-gahaṇena gahitam eva, jātirūpaṃ upacaya-santatigahaṇena, sambhavarūpaṃ āpodhātugahaṇena, balarūpaṃ vāyodhātugahaṇena gahitam eva. Tasmā tesu ekaṃ pi visuṃ n' atthi ti sanniṭṭhānaṃ kataṃ.

B. Vism-mhṭ (II 988, 3)

**Ekaccānaṃ** ti Abhayagirivāsinaṃ.

C. Ged (Taishō Vol 32, 445c)<sup>e</sup>

What are the derived material qualities (upādā-rūpas)? These are the sense-organs of eye, ear, nose, tongue, body, matter as a sense-object, sound as a sense-object, odour as a sense-object, taste as a sense-object, femininity, masculinity, life-principle, body-intimation, speech-intimation, element of space, buoyancy of matter, impressibility of matter, adaptability of matter, integration of matter, continuity of matter, occurrence of matter, decay of matter, impermanency of matter, solid food, the basis of the material element and the material quality of torpor.

According to the Khandhaniddesa in the Visuddhimagga (II 443 *fol.*), the rūpakkhandha is divided into the four bhūta-rūpas and the twenty-four upādā-rūpas: the former are the paṭhavī-dhātu, āpo-dhātu, tejo-dhātu and vāyo-dhātu, while the latter are cakkhu, sota, ghāna, jivhā, kāya, rūpa, sadda, gandha, rasa, itthindriya, purisindriya, jīvitindriya, hadayavatthu, kāyaviññatti, vacīviññatti, ākāsadhātu, rūpassa lahutā, rūpassa mudutā, rūpassa kammaññatā, rūpassa upacaya, rūpassa santati, rūpassa jaratā, rūpassa aniccatā and kabaḷīnkārāhāra.

Immediately after the passage listing these twenty-eight rūpakkhandhas (in the Visuddhimagga), we find the above quotation (A), which states that some others (ekacce) include the middharūpa in them. According to the Visuddhimaggaṭīkā (B), it is clear that these others were the Abhayagirivāsins. On the other hand, the Gedatsudōron (C) lists twenty-six upādā-rūpas. Almost all of them are the same as those in the Visuddhimagga, but the middha-rūpa is exceptionally included in them, as was pointed out by Dhammapāla. He must have known this passage of the Gedatsudōron.

7. Example Seven

A. Vism (II 700)

**Ye pana** vadanti: sotāpanno: phalasaṃpattim samāpajjissāmi ti vipassanaṃ paṭṭhapetvā sakadāgāmi hoti, sakadāgāmi ca anāgāmi ti, te vattabbā: evaṃ sati anāgāmi arahā bhavissati, arahā paccekabuddho, paccekabuddho ca buddho; tasmā na kiñci etaṃ, Pāḷivasen' eva ca paṭikkhittaṃ ti pi na gahetabbam. Idam eva pana gahetabbam: sekhassā pi phalam eva uppajjati, na maggo. Phalañ c' assa sace tena paṭhamajjhāniko maggo adhigato hoti, paṭhamajjhānikam eva uppajjati. Sace dutiyādisu aññatarajjhāniko, dutiyādisu aññatarajjhānikam evā ti. Evaṃ tāv' assā samāpajjanaṃ hoti.

B. Vism-mhṭ (III 1662, 1-2)

**Ye panā** ti Abhayagirivāsino sandhāyāha. Te hi maggaphalavipassanāya āloḷetvā vadanti.

The unnamed persons (ye ..., te ...) who are referred to in the Visuddhimagga (A) can be identified as the Abhayagirivāsins, according to its commentary (B). We cannot, however, find any passage closely corresponding to the above quotation of their view (in the Gedatsudōron); we can only find in this text an explanation which seems to have been made to answer the above criticism of the Mahāvihāra fraternity<sup>f</sup>.

### 3. Examples found in the Dīghaṭṭhakathā

#### 1. Example Eight

A. Sv (I 80) commenting upon DN (I 5)

Sāci-yogo ti kuṭila-yogo. Etesaṃ yeva ukkoṭanādinam etaṃ nāmaṃ. Tasmā ukkoṭana-sāci-yogā vañcana-sāci-yogā nikati-sāci-yogā ti evam ettha attho daṭṭhabbo. **Keci** aññaṃ dassetvā aññassa parivattanaṃ sāci-yogo ti vadanti, tam pana vañcanen' eva saṃgahītaṃ.

B. Sv-ṭ (I 160)

**Keci** ti Sārasamāsācariyā Uttaravihāravāsino ca.

From the above comment of the Dīghaṭṭikā (B), it is obvious that although the Sārasamāsa-ācariyas were not identical with the Uttaravihāravāsins, nevertheless they had so close a relationship with one another that they shared a common explanation on this subject. Further examples will be shown later on. Incidentally, the above quotation of Sv (A), together with the preceding and following passages, is basically the same as those of the Majjhimaṭṭhakathā (II 211), the Aṅguttaraṭṭhakathā (III 194) and the Puggalapaññatti-aṭṭhakathā (241). Of these parallel passages, the comments of the Majjhimaṭṭikā upon Ps<sup>19</sup> and of the Aṅguttaraṭṭikā upon Mp<sup>20</sup> accord with that of the Dīghaṭṭikā upon Sv; whereas the Puggalapaññattiṭṭikā upon Pp-a<sup>21</sup> does not give any comment on this passage.

#### 2. Example Nine

A. DN (I 6)

"Yathā vā pan' eke bhonto samaṇa-brāhmaṇā saddhā-deyyāni bhojanāni bhujjivā te evarūpaṃ visūka-dassanaṃ anuyuttā viharanti - seyyathidaṃ naccaṃ gītaṃ vāditaṃ pekkhaṃ akkhānaṃ pāñissaraṃ vetālaṃ kumbha-thūṇaṃ sobha-nagaraṃ . . . anika-dassanaṃ - iti vā iti evarūpā visūka-dassanā paṭivirato Samaṇo Gotamo ti".

B. Sv (I 84)

Peckhan ti naṭa-samajjā. Akkhānaṃ ti . . . Pāñissaraṃ ti . . . Vetālan ti ghana-tālaṃ, mantena mata-sariruttāpanan ti pi **eke**. Kumbha-thūṇan ti caturassara-ammaṇaka-tālaṃ, kumbha-saddan ti pi **eke**. Sobhanagaraṃ ti, naṭānaṃ abbhokkīraṇaṃ, sobhanagaraṃ vā paṭibhānacittaṃ ti vuttaṃ hoti.



## C. Sv-ṭ (I 163)

Sārasamāse pana pekkhaṃ mahan ti vuttaṃ . . . **Eke** ti Sārasamāśācariyā Uttaravihāravāsino ca. Yathā c' ettha evaṃ ito paresu pi **eke** ti āgataṭṭhāne . . . Sobhanagarakan ti sobhanāgāraṃ. Sobhanagarakan ti Sārasamāse vuttaṃ.

By the expression "Sārasamāse" (locative masculine singular) in the above passage (C), it is clearly proved that the Sārasamāsa was the name of a text, implying that the Sārasamāsa-ācariyas are the teachers who composed and transmitted this text.

## 3. Example Ten

## A. DN (I 7)

"Yathā vā pan' eke bhonto samaṇa-brāhmaṇā saddhā-deyyāni bhojanāni bhūṅṅhitvā te evarūpam uccāsayana-mahāsayanam anuyuttā viharanti - seyyathidaṃ āsandiṃ pallaṅkaṃ gonakaṃ cittakaṃ paṭikaṃ paṭalikaṃ tūlikaṃ vikatikaṃ uddha<sup>22</sup>-lomiṃ kaṭṭhissaṃ . . ."

## B. Sv, Sv-ṭ

(1) Sv (I 86): pallaṅko ti pādesu vāla-rūpāni ṭhapetvā kato. Sv-ṭ (I 164): Vāla-rūpāni ti āharimāni vālarūpāni. Akappiyarūp' ākulo akappiyamañco pallaṅko ti Sārasamāse.

(2) Sv (I 87): Uddha<sup>23</sup>-lomi ti ubhato dasaṃ uṇṇāmayattharaṇaṃ. **Keci** ekato uggata-pupphan ti vadanti. Sv-ṭ (I 164): Uddhalomiyaṃ **keci** ti Sārasamāśācariyā Uttaravihāravāsino ca.

(3) Sv (I 87): Ekanta-lomi ti ekato dasaṃ uṇṇāmayattharaṇaṃ. **Keci** ubhato uggata-pupphan ti vadanti. Sv-ṭ (I 164 - continued from (2) above): Tathā ek' antalomiyaṃ.

The same comment as Sv given above can be seen in Mp (II 292 *fol.*), and the comment of Sv-ṭ upon Sv shown above is also identical with that of Mp-ṭ (II 158, 7-8, 10) upon that passage of Mp.

## 4. Example Eleven

## A. Sv (I 93) commenting upon DN (I 9)

Bhūri-vijjā ti bhūri-ghare vasantena uggahetabba-manto.

## B. Sv-ṭ (I 167)

Bhūrivijjā sassavuddhikaraṇavijjā ti Sārasamāse.

(A) is, needless to say, the orthodox view of the Mahāvihāra given by Buddhaghosa and (B) is a divergent comment of the Sārasamāsa introduced by Dhammapāla.

## 5. Example Twelve

## A. DN (I 19)

Santi, bhikkhave, Khiddā-padosikā nāma devā. Te ativelam hassakhiḍḍā-rati-dhamma-samāpannā viharanti. Tesam ativelam hassa-khiḍḍā-rati-dhamma-samāpannānaṃ viharataṃ sati mussati, satiyā sammosā te devā tamhā kāyā cavanti.

## B. Sv (I 114)

Katame pana te devā ti? Ime nāmā ti aṭṭhakathāya vicāranā n' atthi. Devatānaṃ kammaja-tejo balavā hoti, karajam mandan ti avisesena vuttattā pana ye **keci** kabaliṅkārahārūpajivino devā evaṃ karonti, te evaṃ cavanti ti veditabbā, ye **keci** pan' āhu Nimmānarati-Paranimmita<sup>24</sup>-vasavattino te devā ti. Khiddāya padussana-matten' eva h' ete khiḍḍā-padosikā ti vuttā.

C. Sv-ṭ (I 207)

**Kecī** ti Abhayagirivāsino.

This is a very useful and interesting example. When Buddhaghosa was about to comment on the words "te devā" in DN, he could not find anything concerning this phrase in the old commentary of the Mahāvihāra, called simply "Aṭṭhakathā" here. He then consulted a commentary of the Abhayagiri, which gave the above comment upon "te devā" (B). It goes without saying that "te devā" (these heavenly beings), the particular phrase under consideration, is neither a technical term on doctrine nor a proper name, but a specific phrase which is to be properly commented upon only in a particular context. In other words, this phrase has no general meaning, independent of a particular context. Therefore the text which commented upon this phrase must have been a commentary, not an Abhidhammic thesis or a dictionary work. Some similar instances will be seen later.

#### 6. Example Thirteen

A. DN (I 49 foll.)

Atha kho rañño Māgadhatta Ajātasattussa Vedehi-puttassa avidūre Ambavanassa ahud eva bhayaṃ, ahu chambhitattam ahu lomahamso. Atha kho rājā Māgadho Ajātasattu Vedehi-putto bhīto samviggo loma-hatthajāto Jivakam komārabhaccam etad avoca . . .

B. Sv (I 150)

Kasmā pan' esa bhīto ti? Andhakārenā ti **eke** vadanti. "Rājagahe kira dvattimsa mahā-dvārāṇi catusatthi khuddaka-dvārāṇi. Jivakassa Ambavanam pākārassa ca Gijjha-kūṭassa ca antarā hoti. So pācīna-dvārena nikkhamitvā pabbata-chāyāṃ pāvīsī. Tattha pabbatakūṭena cando chādito, pabbata-chāyāya ca rukkha-chāyāya ca

andhakāraṃ ahoṣī" ti. Tam akāraṇaṃ. Tadā hi ukkānaṃ satahasassa pi paricchedo n' atthi.

C. Sv-ṭ (I 280)

**Eke** ti Uttaravihāravāsino.

Here the interpretation of the Uttaravihāravāsins is rejected by Buddhaghosa.

#### 7. Example Fourteen

A. DN (I 50)

Atha kho rājā Māgadho Ajātasattu Vedehi-putto yāvatikā nāgassa bhūmi nāgena gantvā, nāgā paccorohitvā pattiko va yena maṇḍalamāḷassa dvāraṃ ten' upasaṅkami, upasaṅkamtvā Jivakam komārabhaccam etad avoca: "Kahaṃ pana samma Jivaka Bhagavā?" ti. "Eso mahā-rāja Bhagavā. Eso mahā-rāja Bhagavā majjhimaṃ thambhaṃ nissāya puratthābhimmukkho nisinnopurakkhato bhikkhusaṅghassa" ti.

B. Sv (I 152)

Kahaṃ pana sammā ti. Kasmā pucchati? **Eke** tāva ajānanto ti vadanti. "Iminā kira dahara-kāle pitarā saddhiṃ āgamma Bhagavā diṭṭha-pubbo. Pacchā pana pāpa-mitta-samsaggena pitu-ghāṭam katvā abhimāre pesetvā dhana-pālakaṃ muñcāpetvā mahāparādho hutvā Bhagavato sammukhī-bhāvaṃ na upagata-pubbo ti asañjānanto pucchati" ti. Tam akāraṇaṃ. Bhagavā hi ākiṇṇa-varalakkaṇo anuvyañjana-paṭimaṇḍito chabbanṇāhi rasmīhi sakalā-ārāmaṃ obhāsetvā, tāra-gaṇa-parivuto viya puṇṇa-cando, bhikkhugaṇa-parivuto maṇḍala-māla-majjhe nisinnop. Tam ko nāma na jāneyya? Ayam pana attano issariya-līlāya pucchati. Pakati h' esā rāja-kulānaṃ, yaṃ sañjanantā pi ajānantā viya pucchanti. Jivako pana tam sutvā, "Ayaṃ rājā paṭhaviyaṃ thatvā 'Kuhim paṭhavi' ti,

nabhaṃ oloketvā 'Kuhim candima-suriyā' ti, Sineru-mūle ṭhatvā 'Kuhim Sinerū' ti vadamāno viya, Dasabalassa purato va ṭhatvā 'Kuhim Bhagavā' ti pucchati. Hand' assa Bhagavantaṃ dassemi" ti, yena Bhagavā ten' añjaliṃ paṇāmetvā "Eso Mahārājā" ti ādim āha.

C. Sv-ṭ (I 280)

Eke ti Uttaravihāravāsino.

Here also the interpretation of the Uttaravihāravāsins is rejected by Buddhaghosa.

8. Example Fifteen

A. DN (I 53 foll.)

Cuddasa kho pan' imāni yoni-pamukha-sata-sahassāni saṭṭhiṃ ca satāni cha ca satāni, pañca ca kammuno satāni pañca ca kammāni tīni ca kammāni kamme ca aḍḍha-kamme ca . . .

B. Sv (I 161 foll.)

Yoni-pamukha-satasahassāni ti, pamukha-yonīyaṃ uttama-yonīyaṃ cudasa-satasahassāni, aññāni ca saṭṭhi-satāni, aññāni ca cha-satāni, pañca ca kammuno satāni ti pañca kamma-satāni c' āti kevalaṃ takkamattakena niratthakaṃ diṭṭhiṃ dīpeti. Pañca ca kammāni tīni ca kammāni ti ādisu pi es' eva nayo. **Keci** pan' āhu "Pañca kammāni ti pañca-indriyavasena bhaṇati, tīni ti tīni kāya-kammādi-vasenā" ti. Kamme ca aḍḍha-kamme c' āti, ettha pan' assa kāya-kammañ ca vacī-kammañ ca kamman ti laddhi, mano-kammaṃ upaḍḍha-kamman ti.

C. Sv-ṭ (I 289)

Es' eva nayo ti iminā kevalaṃ takkamattakena niratthakaṃ diṭṭhiṃ dīpeti ti imam ev' atthaṃ atidisati . . . **Keci** ti Uttaravihāravāsino. Te hi pañca kammāni ti cakkhu-sota-ghāṇa-jivhā-kāya, imāni pañca' indriyāni pañca kammāni ti paññāpentī ti vadanti.

The passage from DN (A) is also found in MN (I 517), and the comment of Ps (III 230) upon this is also basically identical to that of Sv given above (B). However, the above comment of Sv-ṭ (C) differs from the comment of Ps-ṭ (III 109, 26 foll.) upon the parallel passage of Ps. In particular, the comment of Ps-ṭ on "keci" does not agree with the above comment of Sv-ṭ on "keci" and remarks:

**Keci** ti Sārasamāsa-ācariyā.

If Ps-ṭ was written by the same Dhammapāla as the author of Sv-ṭ, what does the difference between these two comments mean? I suggest that when Dhammapāla commented upon this passage of Sv, he consulted the old commentary of the Uttaravihāra, omitting any reference to the Sārasamāsa, while on the other hand, when he commented upon the identical passage of Ps, he paid attention only to the Sārasamāsa, omitting the work of the Uttaravihāra. In many other instances, he consulted the views of both these two works.

9. Example Sixteen

A. DN (I 70)

Kathañ ca mahā-rāja bhikkhu sati-sampajaññena samannāgato hoti? Idha mahā-rāja bhikkhu abhikkante paṭikkante sampajāna-kārī hoti, ālokite vilokite sampajāna-kārī hoti, sammāñjite pasārite sampajāna-kārī hoti, saṃghāṭi-patta-civara-dhāraṇe sampajāna-kārī hoti, asite pite khāyite sāyite sampajāna-kārī hoti, uccāra-passāva-kamme sampajāna-kārī hoti, gate ṭhite nisinne sutte jāgarite bhāsīte tuñhi-bhāve sampajāna-kārī hoti.

## B. Sv (I 184)

Sampajāna-kāri hoti ti, sampajāññena sabba-kicca-kāri, sampajāññass' eva vā kāri. So hi abhikkantādisu sampajāññam karot' eva, na katthaci sampajāñña-virahito hoti. Tattha sātthaka-sampajāññam sappāya-sampajāññam gocara-sampajāññam asammoḥa-sampajāññan ti catubbidham sampajāññam. Tattha abhikkamana-citte uppanne citta-vasen' eva agantvā, "Kin nu me ettha gatena attho atthi n' atthi" ti athānatham parigaṇetvā attha-parigaṇhanam sātthaka-sampajāññam. Tattha ca attho ti Cetiyaḍassana-Bodhidassana-Saṃghadassana-Theradassana-asubhadassana-ādi vasena dhammato vaḍḍhi. Cetiyaṃ disvā pi hi Buddhārammaṇam, Saṃghadassane Saṃghārammaṇam pītiṃ uppādetvā, tad eva khayato sammasanto arahattam pāpuṇāti. There disvā tesam ovāde patitṭhāya, asubham disvā tattha paṭhamajjhānam uppādetvā, tad eva khayato sammasanto arahattam pāpuṇāti. Tasmā etesam dassanam sāttham. **Keci** pana āmisato pi vaḍḍhi attho yeva. Tam nissāya brahmacariyānuggahāya paṭipannattā ti vadanti.

## C. Sv-ṭ (I 316)

**Keci** ti Abhayagirivāsino.

The above statement of Sv, together with the passages preceding and following it, can be seen in Ps (I 253 *fol.*, especially 253), Spk (I 181 *fol.*, especially 182 *fol.*), and Vibh-a ( 347 *fol.*, especially 347 *fol.*). As regards these three, only Spk-ṭ records the same comment as that of Sv-ṭ shown above (C), i.e. Keci ti Abhayagirivāsino, while the other two Ṭikās, Ps-ṭ (I 354, 28) and Vibh-mṭ (180, 27) have no comment of this sort.

## 10. Example Seventeen

A. DN (I 88 *fol.*)

Sace agāraṃ ajjhāvasati rājā hoti cakkavatti dhammiko dhamma-rājā cāturanto vijitāvī janapadatthāvariyaṃ patta satta-ratana-samannāgato . . . Paro sahaṣṣaṃ kho pan' assa puttā bhavanti sūrā viraṅga-rūpā parasenappamaddanā.

## B. Sv (I 250)

Sūrā ti abhīruka-jātikā. Virāṅga-rūpā ti deva-putta-sadisa-kāyā. Evaṃ tāv' **eke** vaṇṇayanti, ayam pan' ettha sabhāvo. Virā ti uttama-sūrā vuccanti. Virānam āṅgam viraṅgam, Vira-kāraṇam viriyan ti vuttaṃ hoti. Virāṅga-rūpaṃ etesan ti viraṅga-rūpā, viriyamaya-sarirā viyā ti vuttaṃ hoti.

## C. Sv-ṭ (I 383)

**Eke** ti Sārasamās' ācāriyam āha.

## 11. Example Eighteen

## A. DN (II 14)

Dhammatā esā bhikkhave, yadā Bodhisatto mātu kucchismā nikkhamati, devā paṭhamam paṭiggaṇhanti, pacchā manussā. Ayam ettha dhammatā.

## B. Sv (II 437)

Devā paṭhamam paṭiggaṇhanti ti khīṇ'āsavā Suddhāvāsa-Brahmāno paṭiggaṇhanti. Kathaṃ? "Sūti-vesam gaṇhitvā" ti **eke**. Tam pana paṭikkhipitvā idam vuttaṃ: "Tadā Bodhisatta-mātā suvaṇṇa-khacitam vattham nivāsetvā macch' akkhi-sadisam dukūla-paṭtam yāva pād' antā pārupitvā aṭṭhāsi. Ath' assā sallahukam gabbhavuṭṭhānam ahosi dhammakarakato udaka-nikkhamana-sadisam. Atha te pakati-Brahma-vesen' eva upasaṅkamitvā paṭhamam suvaṇṇa-jālena paṭiggahesum; tesam hatthato cattāro Mahā-rājāno ajina-ppaveniya paṭiggahesum; tato manussā dukūla-cumbaṭakena

paṭiggahesum". Tena vuttaṃ devā paṭhamam paṭiggaṇhanti pacchā manussā ti.

C. Sv-ṭ (II 36)

**Eke** ti Abhayagirivāsino.

12. Example Nineteen

A. Sv (II 514 *fol.*) commenting on DN (II 71)

Ubhato-bhāga-vimutto ti dvīhi bhāgehi vimutto, arūpa-samāpattiyā rūpa-kāyato vimutto, maggena nāma-kāyato vimutto ti . . . So pan' esa ubhato-bhāga-vimutto ākāsānañc' āyatan' ādisu aññatarato vuṭṭhāya arahattaṃ patto ca anāgāmī hutvā, nirodhā vuṭṭhāya arahattaṃ patto cā ti: pañcavidho hoti. **Keci** pana yasmā rūpāvacara-catutthajjhānam pi duvaṅgikaṃ upekkhā-sahagataṃ arūpāvacarajjhānam pi tādisam eva, tasmā rūpāvacara-catutthajjhānato vuṭṭhāya arahattaṃ patto pi ubhato-bhāga-vimutto ti. Ayam pana ubhato-bhāga-vimutta-pañho heṭṭhā Lohapāsāde samuṭṭhahitvā Tepitaka-Culla-Sumanattherassa vaṇṇanam nissāya cirena vinicchayaṃ patto.

Giri-vihāre kira therassa antevāsiko ekassa piṇḍa-cārikassa mukhato va taṃ pañham sutvā āha: "Āvuso heṭṭhā Lohapāsāde amhākaṃ ācariyassa dhammaṃ vaṇṇayato na kenaci suta-pubban?" ti, kim pana bhante thero avacā? ti. "Rūpāvacara-catutthajjhānam kiñcāpi duvaṅgikaṃ upekkhāsahagataṃ kilese ca vikkhambheti, kilesānam pana āsannapakkhe virūhanaṭṭhāne samudācarati. Ime hi kilesā nāma pañca-vokāra-bhave nil' ādisu aññataram ārammaṇam upanissāya samudācaranti. Rūpāvacarajjhānañ ca taṃ ārammaṇam na samatikkammati, tasmā sabbaso rūpaṃ nivattetvā arūpajjhānavasena kilese vikkhambhetvā arahattaṃ patto va ubhato-bhāga-vimutto". Idaṃ āvuso thero avaca. Idañ ca pana vatvā idaṃ suttaṃ āhari: - "Katamo ca puggalo ubhato-bhāga-vimutto? Idh' ekacco puggalo aṭṭha-vimokkhe kāyena phussitvā viharati, paññāya

c' assa disvā āsavā parikkhiṇā honti. Ayam vuccati puggalo ubhato-bhāga-vimutto" ti.

B. Sv-ṭ (II 155 *fol.*)

Tattha **keci** ti Uttaravihāravāsino Sārasamās' ācariyā ca. Te hi: Ubhato-bhāga-vimutto ti ubhayabhāgavimutto samādhivipassanāto ti vatvā rūpāvacarasamādhinā pi samādhiparipanthato vimuttaṃ maññanti. Evaṃ rūpajjhānabhāgena arūpajjhānabhāgena ca ubhato vimutto ti Sārasamāse.

13. Example Twenty

A. DN (II 213)

Katame cattāro? Idha bho bhikkhu chanda-samādhi-padhāna-samkhāra-samannāgataṃ iddhipādaṃ bhāveti, viriya-samādhi . . . citta-samādhi . . . vīmaṃsā-samādhi-padhāna-samkhāra-samannāgataṃ iddhipādaṃ bhāveti.

B. Sv (II 642)

Yath' eva hi chandaṃ adhipatiṃ karitvā paṭiladdha-samādhi chanda-samādhi ti vutto. Evaṃ viriyaṃ cittaṃ vīmaṃsaṃ adhipatiṃ karitvā paṭiladdha-samādhi vīmaṃsa-samādhi ti vuccati. Api ca upacārajjhānaṃ pādo paṭhamajjhānaṃ iddhi sa-upacāraṃ paṭhamajjhānaṃ pādo dutiyajjhānaṃ iddhi ti. Evaṃ pubbabhāge pādo aparabhāge iddhi ti: evam ettha attho veditabbo; vitthārena iddhipāda-kathā Visuddhimagge ca Vibhaṅgaṭṭhakathāya ca vuttā. **Keci** pana: "Nipphannā iddhi anipphanno idhipādo" ti vadanti. Tesam vāda-maddan' atthāya Abhidhamme Uttara-cūḷika-vāro nāma āgato. Cattāro iddhipādā: chand' iddhipādo viriy' iddhipādo citt' iddhipādo vīmaṃs' iddhipādo.

C. Sv-ṭ (II 268)

**Keci** ti Abhayagirivāsino. Tesu ekacce "Iddhi nāma anipphannā, iddhipādo nipphanno" ti vadanti. Ekacce "Iddhipādo pi anipphanno" ti vadanti. Anipphanno ti ca param' atthato asiddho, n' atthi ti attho.

The topic of this example is the interpretation of the "cattāro iddhipādā". As is clear from the above statement in the Dīghaṭṭhakathā, other detailed explanations of the "cattāro iddhipādā" are available in the Visuddhimagga<sup>25</sup> and the Vibhaṅgaṭṭhakathā. Of these two explanations, which are not exactly the same, that of the Vibhaṅgaṭṭhakathā is more closely connected with the above passage from Sv. The Iddhipāda-vibhaṅga in Vibh-a (308) reads as follows:

Ken' aṭṭhena iddhi? Ken' aṭṭhena pādo ti? Ijjanakattthen' eva iddhi; patiṭṭhānattthen' eva pādo. Evam idhāpi iddhi ti vā pādo ti vā aññassa kassaci adhivacanaṃ, sampayuttakānaṃ catunnaṃ khandhānaṃ yeva adhivacanaṃ ti. Evam vutte pana idam āhaṃsu: Catunnaṃ khandhānaṃ eva adhivacanaṃ bhaveyya yadi Satthā parato Uttaraṭṭhakathāyānaṃ nāma na āhareyya; Uttaraṭṭhakathāyānaṃ pana chando yeva chandiddhipādo, viriyam eva, cittaṃ eva, vimamsā va vimamsiddhipādo ti kathitaṃ ti.

**Keci** pana iddhi nāma anipphannā, iddhipādo nipphanno ti vadiṃsu. Tesam vacanaṃ paṭikkhipitvā iddhi pi iddhipādo pi nipphanno tilakkhaṇabbhāhato ti sannitṭhānaṃ kataṃ.

Upon "keci" in the above passage, the Vibhaṅgaṭṭhikā (169, 8 foll.) comments as follows:

**Keci** ti Uttaravihāravāsitherā kira.

For the unnamed sources "keci" in the Aṭṭhakathās which refer to the non-Mahāvihāra fraternity, the respective Ṭikās give as their explanation the apparently alternative names: "Abhayagirivāsino" and "Uttaravihāravāsitherā". This fact does not prove that these

anonymous sources differed from one another, but rather suggests that the names given in the different Ṭikās refer to one and the same group.

#### 4. Examples found in the Majjhimaṭṭhakathā

##### 1. Example Twenty-one

###### A. MN (I 1)

Idha bhikkhave assutavā puthujjano ariyānaṃ adassāvī ariyadhammassa akovido ariyadhamme avinīto sappurisānaṃ adassāvī sappurisadhammassa akovido sappurisadhamme avinīto paṭhaviṃ paṭhavito sañjānāti, paṭhaviṃ paṭhavito saññatvā paṭhaviṃ maññati, paṭhaviyā maññati, paṭhavito maññati, paṭhaviṃ me ti maññati, paṭhaviṃ abhinandati; taṃ kissa hetu: aparimātaṃ tassā ti vadāmi.

###### B. Ps (I 28)

Paṭhavito maññati ti ettha pana paṭhavito ti nissakkavacanaṃ. Tasmā sa-upakaraṇassa attano vā parassa vā yathāvuttappabhedato paṭhavito uppattiṃ vā niggamaṇaṃ vā, paṭhavito vā añño attā ti maññamāno paṭhavito maññati ti veditabbo. Ayam assa diṭṭhimaññanā. Tasmim yeva pan' assa diṭṭhimaññanāya maññite vatthusmiṃ sinehaṃ mānañ ca uppādayato tanhā-mānamaññanā pi veditabbā. **Apare** āhu: Paṭhavikasiṇaṃ parittaṃ bhāvetvā tato ca aññaṃ appamānaṃ attānaṃ gahetvā paṭhavito bahiddhā pi me attā ti maññamāno paṭhavito maññati ti.

###### C. Ps-ṭ (I 74, 25)

**Apare** ti Sārasamāsācariyā.

The view of "apare", i.e. the Sārasamāsa-ācariyas, quoted in Ps (B) is not found in the detailed interpretation on "paṭhavi-kasiṇa" in

the Gedatsudōron<sup>26</sup>. We may conclude that it has been extracted from the Sārasamāsa itself, because the passage referred to is a comment upon a particular phrase, "paṭhavito maññati", which can be expounded only in a particular context. The text which expounded a word or a phrase (especially a phrase) in this way must have been a commentary (upon the Canon).

## 2. Example Twenty-two

### A. Ps (I 37 foll.) commenting on MN (I 3 foll.)

Evam sabbam sakkāyabhedam diṭṭhādīhi catuhi dassetvā, idāni tam eva samāpannakavārena asamāpannakavārena ca dvidhā dassento, ekattam nānattan ti āha. Ekattan ti iminā hi samāpannakavāram dasseti; nānattan ti iminā asamāpannakavāram. Tesam vacanatto: ekabhāvo ekattam, nānābhāvo nānattan ti. Yojanā pan' ettha samāpannakavāram catuhi khandhehi, asamāpannakavārañ ca pañcahi khandhehi bhinditvā, "Rūpam attato samanupassati" ti (S III 44) ādinā sāsana-nayena paṭhavivārādisu vuttena ca aṭṭhakathā-nayena yathānūrūpam vimaṃsitvā veditabbā. **Keci** pana ekattan ti ekattanayam vadanti, nānattan ti nānattanayam; **apare** "Ekattasaññi attā hoti arogo param maraṇā . . . nānattasaññi attā hoti" ti (D I 31) evam diṭṭhābhinivesam. Tam sabbam idhānadhīpetattā ayuttam eva hoti.

### B. Ps-ṭ (I 88, 2-3)

**Keci** ti Abhayagirivāsino.

**Apare** ti Sārasamāśācariyā.

This example is very important. The passage quoted above from Ps (A) refers in parallel to two different views of unnamed groups. These unnamed groups are respectively identified as the Abhayagirivāsins and the Sārasamāśā-ācariyas (B). It means that these two groups were different.

## 3. Example Twenty-three

### A. MN (I 6)

Tasmātiha bhikkhave Tathāgato sabbaso taṇhānaṃ khayā virāgā nirodhā cāgā paṇinissaggā anuttaram sammāsambodhiṃ abhisambuddho ti vadāmi ti.

### B. Ps (I 54)

Sammāsambodhin ti sammā sāmāñ ca bodhiṃ. Atha vā pasattham sundarañ ca bodhiṃ. Bodhī ti rukkhō pi, maggo pi, sabbaññutaññānaṃ pi, nibbānaṃ pi. "Bodhirukkhamūle paṭhamābhisambuddho" ti (Vin I 1) ca, "Antarā ca Bodhiṃ antarā ca Gayan" ti (Vin I 8; MN I 170) ca āgataṭṭhānesu hi rukkhō bodhī ti vuccati. "Bodhi vuccati catusu maggesu ñānaṃ" ti (Nd I 456) āgataṭṭhāne maggo. "Pappoti bodhiṃ varabhūrimedhaso" ti (DN III 159) āgataṭṭhāne sabbaññutaññānaṃ. "Patvāna bodhiṃ amataṃ asaṅkhatan" ti ( ) āgataṭṭhāne nibbānaṃ. Idha pana Bhagavato arahattamaggañānaṃ adhippetam. **Apare** pana sabbaññutaññānaṃ pi vadanti.

### C. Ps-ṭ (I 115, 3)

**Apare** ti Sārasamāśācariyā.

It is to be noted here that the different explanation of "apare", i.e. the Sārasamāśā-ācariyas, is introduced in parallel with the orthodox view of the Mahāvihāra, yet it is not rejected by Buddhaghosa.

## 4. Example Twenty-four

### A. MN (I 7)

Bhagavā etad avoca: Jānato ahaṃ bhikkhave passato āsavānaṃ khayam vadāmi, no ajānato no apassato . . . ti.

## B. Ps (I 63)

Idāni jānato ahan ti ādisu jānato ti jānantassa. Passato ti passantassa. Dve pi padāni ekatṭhāni, byañjanam eva nānā. Evaṃ sante pi jānato ti nānalakkhaṇaṃ upādāya puggalaṃ niddisati. Jānalakkhaṇaṃ hi nānaṃ. Passato ti nānappabhāvaṃ upādāya. Passanappabhāvaṃ hi nānaṃ. Nānasamaṅgi puggalo, cakkhumā viya cakkhunā rūpāni, nāṇena vivate dhamme passati. Api ca yoniso manasikāraṃ uppādetuṃ jānato, ayoniso manasikāro yathā na uppajjati evaṃ passato ti. Ayam ettha sāro<sup>27</sup>. **Keci** pan' ācariyā bahū papañce bhaṇanti. Te imasmim atthe na yujjanti.

## C. Ps-ṭ (I 147, 17-20)

**Keci** ti Abhayagirivāsi-Sārasamāsa-ācariyā. Te hi "samādhinā jānato vipassanāya passato jānaṃ jānāti passaṃ passati. Evaṃ jānanā samatho passanā vipassanā" ti ca ādinā papañcenti.

## 5. Example Twenty-five

## A. MN (I 8)

So evaṃ ayoniso manasikaroti: Ahoṣin nu kho ahaṃ atītam addhānaṃ, na nu kho ahoṣiṃ atītam addhānaṃ, kin nu kho ahoṣiṃ atītam addhānaṃ, kathan nu kho ahoṣiṃ atītam addhānaṃ, kiṃ hutvā kiṃ ahoṣiṃ nu kho ahaṃ atītam addhānaṃ . . .

## B. Ps (I 69)

Kin nu kho ahoṣin ti jātiliṅgupapattiyo<sup>28</sup> nissāya, khattiyo nu kho ahoṣiṃ, brāhmaṇa-veśa-sudda-gahaṭṭha-pabbajita-deva-manussānaṃ aññataro ti kaṅkhati. Kathan nu kho ti saṅṭhānākāraṃ nissāya, diḡho nu kho ahoṣiṃ, rassa-odāta-kaṅha-ppamāṇika-appamāṇikādīnaṃ aññataro ti kaṅkhati. **Keci** pana, Issaranimmānādiṃ nissāya kena nu kho kāraṇena ahoṣin ti hetuto kaṅkhatī ti vadanti. Kiṃ hutvā kiṃ ahoṣin ti jāti-ādīni nissāya,

khattiyo hutvā nu kho brāhmaṇo ahoṣiṃ -pe- devo hutvā manusso ti attano paramparaṃ kaṅkhati. Sabbath' eva pana addhānan ti kālādhivacanam etaṃ.

## C. Ps-ṭ (I 155, 29 - 156, 3)

**Keci** ti Sārasamāsa-ācariyā. Te hi "kathaṃ nu kho ti Issarena vā Brahmunā vā pubbakatena vā ahetuto vā nibbato ti cinteti" ti āhu. Tena vuttaṃ "hetuto kaṅkhatī ti vadanti" ti. Ahetuto nibbatti-kaṅkhāpi hi hetuparāmasanam evā ti.

It is noteworthy that the above view of "keci", i.e. the Sārasamāsa-ācariyas, in Ps (B) is introduced as a reference, but is not rejected. We can find identical passages in MN (A) and SN (II 26 §18); in Ps (B) and Spk (II 42); and in Ps-ṭ (C) and Spk-ṭ (II 56, 6 foll.). The above passage of Spk-ṭ is the comment upon the above passage of Spk, which is the comment upon that of SN.

## 6. Example Twenty-six

## A. MN (I 21)

Āraddhaṃ kho pana me brāhmaṇa viriyaṃ ahoṣi asallīnaṃ, upaṭṭhitā sati asammutṭhā passaddho kāyo asāraddho, samāhitam cittaṃ ekaggaṃ.

## B. Ps (I 123)

Evaṃ Bhagavā Buddhagūṇapaṭilābhāvasānaṃ attano asamhavihāraṃ brāhmaṇassa dassetvā idāni yāya paṭipadāya taṃ koṭipattaṃ asamhavihāraṃ adhigato taṃ pubbabhāgato pabhuti dassetuṃ, āraddhaṃ kho pana me, brāhmaṇā ti ādim āha. **Keci** pan' āhu: Imaṃ asamhavihāraṃ sutvā brāhmaṇassa cittaṃ evaṃ uppannaṃ: kāya nu kho paṭipadāya imaṃ patto ti. Tassa cittaṃ aññāya imāyā 'haṃ paṭipadāya imaṃ uttamaṃ asamhavihāraṃ patto ti dassento evaṃ āhā ti.



C. Ps-ṭ (I 221, 28 foll.)

**Keci** ti Uttaravihāravāsino.

7. Example Twenty-seven

A. MN (I 252 foll.)

Ekamantaṃ nisinnaṃ kho Sakkam devānaṃ idaṃ āyasmā Mahāmogallāno etad avoca: Yathākathaṃ pana te Kosiya Bhagavā saṅkhittena taṇhāsāṅkhayavimuttiṃ abhāsi, sādhu mayam pi etissā kathāya bhāgino assāma savanāyāti. - Mayaṃ kho mārisa Moggallāna bahukiccā, mayaṃ bahukaraṇiyā, app eva sakena karaṇiyena api ca devānaṃ yeva Tāvatisānaṃ karaṇiyena. Api ca mārisa Moggallāna sussutaṃ yeva hoti suggahitaṃ sumanasikataṃ sūpadhāritaṃ yan no khippam eva antaradhāyati . . .

B. Ps (II 301 foll.)

Yan no khippam eva antaradhāyati ti yaṃ amhākaṃ sīgham eva andhakāre rūpagataṃ viya na dissati. Iminā 'haṃ, bhante, taṃ pañhaviṣṣajjanaṃ na sallakkhemī ti dīpeti. Thero, kasmā nu kho ayaṃ yakkho asallakkhaṇabhāvaṃ dīpeti, passena pariharatī ti āvajjanato, devā nāma mahāmūlhā honti, chadvārikehi ārammaṇehi nimmathiyamānā attano bhuttābhuttabhāvaṃ pi, pītāpītabhāvaṃ pi na jānānti, idha kataṃ ettha mussanti ti aññāsi. **Keci** pan' āhu: Thero etassa garu bhāvaniyo. Tasmā, idān' eva loke aggapuggalassa santike pañhaṃ uggahetvā āgato, idān' eva nātākānaṃ antaraṃ pavīṭṭho ti evaṃ maṃ thero tajjeyyā ti bhayena evam āhā ti. Evaṃ pana kohaññaṃ nāma hoti. Ariyasāvakaṃ ca kohaññaṃ nāma n' atthi. Tasmā mūlhabhāven' eva na sallakkhesi ti veditabbaṃ. Upari kasmā sallakkhesi ti? Thero tassa somanassa-saṃvegaṃ janetvā tamaṃ nīhari, tasmā sallakkhesi.

C. Ps-ṭ (II 221, 8 foll.)

**Keci** ti Sārasamāsācariyā.

8. Example Twenty-eight

A. MN (II 262)

Kāyassa bhedaṃ param maraṇā thānaṃ etaṃ vijjati yaṃ taṃ saṃvattanikaṃ viññānaṃ assa āṇāṇjūpagaṃ. Ayaṃ, bhikkhave, paṭhamā āṇāṇjasappāyā paṭipadā akkhāyati.

B. Ps (IV 61 foll.)

Taṃ saṃvattanikaṃ viññānaṃ assa āṇāṇjūpagan taṃ kāraṇaṃ vijjati ti attho. Ettha ca taṃ saṃvattanikaṃ ti tassa bhikkhuno saṃvattanikaṃ yena vipākaviññānaṃ so bhikkhu taṃ saṃvattati nibbattati taṃ viññānaṃ āṇāṇjūpagan ti kusalāṇāṇjasabhāvaṃ upagataṃ assa tādisam eva bhaveyyā ti attho. **Keci** kusalaviññānaṃ vadanti yan tan tassa bhikkhuno saṃvattanikaṃ upapattihetubhūtaṃ kusalaviññānaṃ āṇāṇjūpagataṃ assa vipākakāle taṃ nāmakam eva assā ti attho.

C. Ps-ṭ (III 254, 31)

**Keci** ti Abhayagirivāsino.

### 5. Example found in the Saṃyuttaṭṭhakathā

1. Example Twenty-nine

A. SN (I 142)

Tena kho pana samayena Bakassa brahmuno evarūpaṃ pāpakaṃ dīṭṭhigataṃ uppannaṃ hoti. Idaṃ niccaṃ idaṃ dhuvaṃ, idaṃ sassataṃ idaṃ kevalaṃ idaṃ acavanadhammaṃ, idaṃ hi na jāyati na mīyati na cavati na uppajjati, ito ca pan' aññaṃ uttariṃ nissaraṇaṃ n' atthi ti.

## B. Spk (I 208 foll.)

Ito ca pan' aññān ti, ito pan' okāsā Brahma-tṭhānā uttarim aññam nissaraṇam nāma n' atthi ti. Evam assa thāma-gatā sassata-ditṭhi uppannā hoti. Evaṃ vādī ca pana so upari tisso jhāna-bhūmiyo cattāro magge cattāri phalāni nibbāna ti sabbam paṭibāhati. Kadā pan' esā ditṭhi uppannā? ti. Paṭhama-jjhāna-bhūmiyam nibbatta-kāle dutiya-jjhāna-bhūmiyan ti **eke**. Tatr' ayaṃ anupubbī-kathā: - Heṭṭh' ūpapattiko kir' esa Brahmā. Anupanne Buddh' uppāde isipabbajjam pabbajitvā, kaṣiṇa-parikkammaṃ katvā, samāpattiyo nibbattetvā, aparihīna-jjhāno kālam katvā, catuttha-jjhāna-bhūmiyam Vehapphala-brahmaloke pañca-kappa-satikam āyūṃ gahetvā nibbatti. Tattha yāvatāyukam thatvā, heṭṭh' ūpapattikam katvā, tatiya-jjhānam paṇitam bhāvetvā, Subhakiṇṇa-brahmaloke catusatṭhi-kappam āyūṃ gahetvā nibbatti. Tattha dutiya-jjhānam bhāvetvā, Ābhassare aṭṭha-kappe āyūṃ gahetvā nibbatti. Tattha paṭhama-jjhānam bhāvetvā, paṭhama-jjhāna-bhūmiyam kappāyuko hutvā nibbatti. So paṭhama-kāle attanā kata-kammañ ca nibbatta-tṭhānañ ca aññāsi. Kāle yeva pana gacchante ubhayaṃ pamussitvā sassata-ditṭhim uppādesi.

## C. Spk-ṭ (I 241, 26)

**Eke** ti Uttaravihāravāsino.

## 6. Conclusion

All the twenty-nine examples found in the major Aṭṭhakathā texts with reference to the comments or discussions of the Mahāvihāra and the non-Mahāvihāra fraternities, which are recorded in parallel, have been investigated in the previous sections. On the basis of these examples, I shall comment on various aspects of the relation between these two traditions and their respective works.

(1) Of the seven examples found in the Visuddhimagga, the quotations from the non-Mahāvihāra fraternities' views for which

parallel passages can be seen in the Gedatsudōron, the Chinese version of the Vimuttimagga, are only four: Examples 1, 2, 3 and 6. For the remaining three examples, i.e. 4, 5 and 7, no such parallel passages can be found in the Gedatsudōron. As is already well known, the Vimuttimagga, composed by Upatissa of the Abhayagirivihāra, pre-dates the Visuddhimagga written by Buddhaghosa of the Mahāvihāra, and the former text is referred to without attribution as one of the basic source materials for the latter text. Comparative studies of these two doctrinal works have already been done in detail<sup>29</sup>. The Vimuttimagga was not, however, the only text of the Abhayagirivihāra to have been consulted by Buddhaghosa when he was writing the Visuddhimagga. Example 4 mentioned above proves that he referred to a certain old commentary, now lost, of the Uttaravihāra(/Abhayagirivihāra) on the Saṃyuttanikāya, of which further discussion will be made later. Moreover, examples 5 and 7 suggest that he made use of some other unknown source of the Abhayagirivihāra, besides the above two texts. It might have been some oral transmission on doctrine or a commentarial work which will be considered later.

(2) In regard to the way in which the "different views" of the non-Mahāvihāravāsins are evaluated, the twenty-nine examples can be classified into two groups:

(a) The "different view" is criticised and rejected with some reason or evidence: these examples are 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 13, 14, 18, 19, 20, 22, 24 and 29 - altogether fifteen in number. Most of the examples in the Visuddhimagga are included here.

(b) The "different view" is neither criticised nor rejected. This group is further divided into two:

(i) The "different view" is stated in parallel with the orthodox view of the Mahāvihāravāsins as a supplementary explanation. These



there is more than one reference in a given Example, a second reference is denoted by the letter 'b' and a third by the letter 'c'; (2) when 'a' or 'b' appears against more than one name in respect of a given Example, this is because more than one name is given by the Ṭikās for the one reference; whilst (3) a letter in parentheses means that alternative identifications are given in other Ṭikās when commenting upon the identical unnamed sources quoted in parallel passages in different Aṭṭhakathās. The commentaries cited are as follows:

- Sv A: cty on the Brahmajālasutta (DN-1)  
 B: cty on the Sāmaññaphalasutta (DN-2)  
 C: cty on the Ambaṭṭhasutta (DN-3)  
 D: cty on the Mahāpadānasuttanta (DN-14)  
 E: cty on the Mahānidānasuttanta (DN-15)  
 F: cty on the Janavasabhasuttanta (DN-18)
- Ps A: cty on the Mūlapariyāyasutta (MN-1)  
 B: cty on the Sabbāsavasutta (MN-2)  
 C: cty on the Bhayabheravasutta (MN-4)  
 D: cty on the Cūḷataṇhāsāṅkhasuttanta (MN-37)  
 E: cty on the Āṇāṇjasappāyasutta (MN-106)
- Spk Cty on the Brahmasaṃyutta (SN-6)

From this Table, the following conclusions can be drawn:

- (1) With respect to the Visuddhimagga, the name of the Abhayagirivāsins is the most frequent, and the Vimuttimagga of Upatissa is expressly mentioned. Yet the Visuddhimagga makes no reference to the Sārasamāsa.
- (2) In contrast to this, in the Dīghaṭṭhakathā, the references to the Sārasamāsa and the Sārasamāsa-ācariyas are in the majority, and the name of the Uttaravihāravāsins is the next most frequent. Throughout the whole commentary on the Dīghanikāya, only the

parts commenting on six suttas headed by the Brahmajālasutta contain the names under consideration. (Other anonymous sources are found in the parts of the Dīghaṭṭhakathā which comment upon these and other suttas).

(3) In the Majjhimaṭṭhakathā also, the references to the Sārasamāsa-ācariyas are in the majority. The parts of the commentary in which the names under consideration can be seen are limited to the sections commenting upon only five suttas headed by the Mūlapariyāyasutta.

(4) With regard to the examples in which more than one name is given for the same unnamed source (i.e. the names with the same marks in the same examples in the diagram), the grouping together of the Uttaravihāravāsins with the Sārasamāsa-ācariyas is the most frequent: five (or six) in all; and there is one instance of the grouping of the Abhayagirivāsins and Sārasamāsa-ācariyas. The grouping of the Abhayagirivāsins with the Uttaravihāravāsins, however, does not occur. It is quite clear from Example 22 that the Abhayagirivāsins were never identical with the Sārasamāsa-ācariyas. In this example, the "keci" who are first referred to are the Abhayagirivāsins, and "apare" who are next referred to are the Sārasamāsa-ācariyas. The textual evidence in Example 20 proves positively that the Abhayagirivāsins and the Uttaravihāravāsins were one and the same. This conclusion agrees with the fact that the grouping of these two as different fraternities does not occur, as described above. Therefore the Abhayagirivāsins, i.e. the Uttaravihāravāsins, were entirely different from the Sārasamāsa-ācariyas.

(5) Next it will be asked what the Abhayagirivāsins, i.e. the Uttaravihāravāsins, and the Sārasamāsa-ācariyas really were. In this respect, the view of Professor de Silva should be considered here. She also considered the grouping of the above three kinds of names. As an explanation for the fact that there is a grouping of the Sārasamāsa-ācariyas with the Uttaravihāravāsins in the material

she investigated (i.e. DAT), but none of the former with the Abhayagirivāsins, she stated as follows<sup>30</sup>:

"Soon after the dissension in the Buddhist church during the reign of Vaṭṭagāmini Abhaya, the schismatics came to be called Abhayagirikā as opposed to the orthodoxy - the Mahāvihārikā. This usage may have gone on until the time of Goṭhābhaya. The Nikāyasāṅgrahava records that during the reign of Goṭhābhaya (A.D. 309-22) an influential monk named Ussiliyatissa declined to accept the Vaitulyavāda, though the residents of Abhayagiri welcomed the new doctrine, and went to reside at the Dakkhiṇāgiri together with a retinue of 500 monks. This group, under the leadership of Sāgala, came to be called Sāgaliyas. Perhaps it was after this event that the headquarters at Abhayagiri came to be designated Uttaravihāra to distinguish it from the sub-division at Dakkhiṇāgiri. Now, both Uttaravihāra and Dakkhiṇāgiri are heterodox, therefore they are both included in the name of the first schismatics, i.e. Abhayagirivāsino. When the term Uttaravihāra is used it only means the section at the headquarters. Therefore when DAT identifies a view as being held by the Abhayagirivāsins, it virtually means non-Mahāvihāravāsins, and has a wide connotation. But when it uses Uttaravihāra, only the headquarters of the heterodox schools set at Abhayagiri is to be understood."

With reference to this view, I can agree in part, yet cannot agree entirely. Only the examples in the Dīghaṭṭhakathā were examined by Professor de Silva in the process of editing the PTS edition of the Dīghaṭṭikā. That is to say, the material for her search was very limited. She did not refer to Example 24 in the Majjhimaṭṭhakathā, nor the examples in the Visuddhimagga, although the latter had been studied to a certain extent. (This is a weak point of her methodology). Certainly, the discussion would

be simpler and clearer were we to regard Abhayagirivāsins as the name of the whole of the non-Mahāvihāra fraternity, including the Dakkhiṇāgirivihāra, and the Uttaravihāravāsins as the name only of the headquarters of the heterodox fraternities at Abhayagiri. I do not think, however, that in reality these names were so strictly defined or were used in that way. Nevertheless, I consider it reasonable for her to have suggested that the Sārasamāsa-ācariyas were the group of monks in the Dakkhiṇāgirivihāra, forming a sub-fraternity of the Abhayagirivihāra.

Now I shall state my view. Although the original name of the Abhayagirivihāra which was founded by king Vaṭṭagāmaṇi Abhaya was "Abhayagiri", being named after a part of his name, there is the possibility that from the beginning this vihāra was also called the Uttaravihāra (North Monastery) because of its location to the north of Anurādhapura, the then capital of Sri Lanka. Moreover, as the Mahāvihāra was situated in the central part of the capital, and as the Dakkhiṇāgirivihāra was in the southern part, the Abhayagiri was always regarded as the "monastery of the north" by the monks of these two monasteries.

In any case, of the twelve examples in which the name of the Uttaravihāravāsins is referred to in the Tikās, in five (or six) examples their name is referred to in parallel with that of the Sārasamāsa-ācariyas. This fact shows that there was a clear contrast between these two groups. The Sārasamāsa-ācariyas must have been the monks who lived in the Dakkhiṇāgirivihāra mentioned above and who composed and transmitted a work entitled "Sārasamāsa". Consequently, the Abhayagirivihāravāsins were identical with the Uttaravihāravāsins, and the Sārasamāsa-ācariyas were identical with the Dakkhiṇāgirivāsins. Among the forty-three references to these names in all, the references concerning the Abhayagirivihāra in general are twenty-five in number, and those concerning the Dakkhiṇāgirivihāra in general are eighteen in number. However, if we omit the seven references contained in the Visuddhimagga, which does not refer to the

Sārasamāsa, the remaining thirty-six references which appear in the commentarial texts such as Sv, Ps and Spk are equally divided into eighteen from the Abhayagirivāsins, or the Uttaravihāravāsins, and another eighteen from the Sārasamāsa-ācariyas or the "Sārasamāsa". This suggests that generally speaking these two sources were treated as equally authoritative and were referred to in these commentaries.

(6) Finally, I shall put in order the unattributed sources from which the views of "some" were quoted. As has already been described in (1) of this Section, of the seven examples found in the Visuddhimagga, the four headed by Example 1 are from the Vimuttimagga of the Abhayagirivihāra, though this source is not acknowledged. The source for Example 4 was the old commentary, now lost, of the Abhayagiri fraternity on the Saṃyuttanikāya. The sources for the remaining two are still unknown, which suggests that some other unknown texts or oral transmission on doctrinal matters of this fraternity existed in the past.

It has been shown clearly that a text entitled "Sārasamāsa" of the Dakkhiṇāgirivihāra, the sub-fraternity of the Abhayagirivihāra, must have existed. It can be deduced that the quotations from Sārasamāsa-ācariyas were in fact from the Sārasamāsa itself. Judging from the contents of the quotations from the Sārasamāsa, this text can be regarded as being a commentary on the Nikāyas. For instance, as in Example 8 which is the explanation of the word "sāciyoga", most of the quotations from this text consist of interpretations of something or descriptions of something. Moreover, in Examples 22 and 24, the quotations are interpretations of words which form a pair ("ekatta" and "nānatta"; "jānato" and "passato"), and in Examples 21, 25 and 27 what is being interpreted is not a word but a phrase consisting of several words ("paṭhavito maññati"; "kathaṃ nu kho ahoṣiṃ"; and "yaṃ no khippam eva antaradhāyati"). These phrases, needless to say, make sense only in a particular context, and can be properly expounded

upon only in relation to a particular sentence. From the above discussion, it is clear that the text named "Sārasamāsa" was a work which commented in detail upon passages from specific suttas; yet it was not a systematic thesis on doctrine such as the Visuddhimagga or the Vimuttimagga. Through the investigation of the instances concerned, this text seems to have been a commentary upon (at least) DN, MN, SN, and AN. Incidentally, as to the commentary on AN, there is no example except the duplicated ones (36 and 37 in the list of Section One), but it is rather difficult to imagine the existence of a commentary on the first *three* Nikāyas alone. At the same time, it is also difficult to imagine the existence of a single commentary on all five Nikāyas, though I have no Tikā material to help me to examine any references to such a source in the commentaries on the fifteen texts of the Khuddakanikāya. On the other hand, we find one example in Pp-A (No. 41) as the only instance in the Abhidhamma-ṭīṭaka commentary concerning the Sārasamāsa. This is, however, a duplicate of passages in three other commentaries, i.e. Sv, Ps and Mp. To sum up, I believe the Sārasamāsa to have been a commentary of the Dakkhiṇāgirivihāra on the first *four* Nikāyas as stated above.

Next, what was the source material, besides the source for the Visuddhimagga, from which the interpretation of the Abhayagirivāsins, i.e. the Uttaravihāravāsins, was quoted? As has already been explained, of the examples concerning this group, Examples 8, 9, 10, 19 and 24 are common to the Sārasamāsa. Examples 12, 14, 16, 18, 26, 28 and 29 show interpretations of words or phrases, which can make sense only in particular contexts. Example 12 is typical on this point: as discussed before, the phrase commented upon is "te devā" (these heavenly beings) and this cannot possibly be properly interpreted independent of its context. From the above evidence, this source was beyond all doubt a commentary upon the canon. As regards the subjects of its comment, the great majority are from the first four Nikāyas, while a few are from Abhidhamma-ṭīṭaka texts such as Dhs

(No.38), Vibh (Nos.39-40), and Pp (No.41). However, as to the examples concerning AN and these three Abhidhamma-ṭīṭaka texts, the situation is exactly the same as with the Sārasamāsa. The examples concerning these texts are duplicated by passages in other Nikāyas.

This commentary, as the Sārasamāsa, can be regarded neither as a commentary on the first *three* Nikāyas, i.e. DN, MN and SN, nor as a commentary on both the Nikāyas and the Abhidhamma-ṭīṭaka. Therefore, as in the case of the Sārasamāsa, this text must have been a commentary on the first *four* Nikāyas. This unacknowledged commentary that is lost today must have been the "Uttaravihāra-ṭṭhakathā". This text is referred to at eight places in the Mahāvamsaṭīṭakā<sup>31</sup>, and is sometimes referred to as the "Uttaravihāravāsinaṃ ṭṭhakathā". In this connection, the same Ṭīkā quotes from another text of the Abhayagiri fraternity, i.e. the "Uttaravihāravāsinaṃ Mahāvamsa"<sup>32</sup>, that is now also lost.

Saitama, Japan

Sodō Mori

\* I am grateful to Mr. K. R. Norman of the University of Cambridge for the discussions that I had with him about this subject during my stay in England in 1985 and for one year since.

#### Notes

Abbreviations are as in the Epilegomena to V. Trenckner, A Critical Pāli Dictionary, Vol I, Copenhagen 1924-1928. In addition, Chṭ = Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana edition; Ged = Gedatsudōron; JIABS = Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies; Nanden = Nanden Daizōkyō; SHB = Simon Hewavitarne Bequest edition; Sv-ṭ = Dīghaṭīkā; Taishō = Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō; Vim = Vimuttimaggā.

References to Pāli texts are to PTS editions except for the following: Vism-mḥ = B. N. Shukla, Rewatadhamma eds., Visuddhimaggā with Paramatthamañjūsāṭīkā, 3 vols, Varanasi, 1969-72; Ps-ṭ I, II = Mūlapaṇṇāsaṭīkā I, II; Ps-ṭ III = Majjhimaṇṇāsaṭīkā and Upariṇṇāsaṭīkā; Spk-ṭ, Mp-ṭ, Vibh-mṭ, Pp-ṭ (in Ppk-ṭ) being Chṭ editions.

<sup>1</sup> This is a revised and abridged translation of Part IV of my book entitled Pāli bukkyō chūsaku bunken no kenkyū: Attakatā no jōzabu-teki yōsō or A Study of the Pāli Commentaries: Theravādic Aspects of the Aṭṭhakathās, Tokyo, Sankibō Busshorin 1984, 19, 6, viii, 8, 718pp. The original title (in England) of that Part (pp 559-689) is "Comparison of Views between the Mahāvihārikas and the Abhayagirikas' Lineage: An Aspect of the Commentaries".

<sup>2</sup> This refers to the Visuddhimaggā and the direct commentaries on the Pāli canon. They are sometimes called in this article the Aṭṭhakathās, the Aṭṭhakathā texts, or the (Pāli) commentaries.

<sup>3</sup> Sodō Mori, op cit (n 1), pp 128-139.

<sup>4</sup> Sodō Mori, "The Vitaṇḍavādins (Sophists) as Seen in the Pāli Aṭṭhakathās", in Essays on the Pāli and Buddhist Civilization, or Pāli bukkyō bunka kenkyū, edited by the Pāli Bunka Kenkyūkai, Tokyo, Sankibō-Busshorin, 1982, pp 171-188.

<sup>5</sup> The list of all of them is available in my work (n 1), pp 111-128.

<sup>6</sup> Nyanatiloka, trans., Der Weg zur Reinheit, Konstanz, Verlag Christiani, 1931-42. Ex. p 93, n 126 (p 873); p 123, n 79 (p 876); p 175, n 146 (p 883); p 309, n 133 (p 904); p 511, n 42 (p 916); p 842.

<sup>7</sup> Kōgen Mizuno, The Shōjōdōron, 3 vols, (Nanden, Vols 62-64), Tokyo, Daizō Shuppan, 1937-40. Ex I-160, 206, n 8 (p 219), 293; II-79, 420; III-26, 480.

<sup>8</sup> Bhikkhu Nyanamoli, trans., The Path of Purification, Colombo, R. Semage, 1956. Ex. pp 180, n 18; 104, n 19; 154, n 32; 287, n 38; 474, n 25; 502, n 31; 822, n 5.

<sup>9</sup> P. V. Bapat, Vimuttimaggā and Visuddhimaggā: a Comparative Study, Poona, 1937. Ex. pp xli, 24, 35, 49 n 2, 95, 127 n1.

<sup>10</sup> Lily de Silva, ed., Dighanikāyaṭṭhakathāṭīkā, Linathavaṇṇanā, 3 vols, London, PTS 1970. Vol I, pp lviii-lxv.

<sup>11</sup> I. B. Horner, "Keci: 'Some' in a Pāli Commentary", JIABS, Vol I, No 2, 1979, pp 52-56; "Keci: 'Some' in the Pāli Commentaries", JPTS, Vol IX, 1981, pp 87-95.

<sup>12</sup> Here the Ṭīkās refer to the Paramatthamañjūsā: Visuddhimaggā Mahāṭīkā and the commentaries on the Aṭṭhakathās of the Pāli canon, except for the commentaries on the Khuddakaṭṭhakathās, which either do not exist or have not been published.

- 13 P. V. Bapat, *Vimuktimārga Dhutagaṇa-nirdeśa*, New York, Asia Publishing House, 1964, pp 74-76. Cf Genjun Sasaki, *Gedatsudōron*, Kyoto, Hōzōkan, 1958, p 56.
- 14 "Pakkhanda" (PTS ed.) and "pakkhanta" (HOS ed.) have been emended to "pakkhanna" by Professor Mizuno (Nanden, Vol 62, p 299, n 53).
- 15 Following the HOS edition (p 221), the reading "paṭiyekko" in the PTS edition has been emended to "pāṭiyekko".
- 16 Following the HOS edition (p 221), the reading "secanako" in the PTS edition has been emended to "asecanako".
- 17 Spk III 270.
- 18 Cf. Taishō, Vol 32, p 443b.
- 19 Ps-t II 160, 1.
- 20 Mp-t II 374, 24.
- 21 Pp-mṭ p 61, 13 (in the *Ṭikā* on Ppk-a).
- 22 Following Sv-t, the reading "udda-lomi" in both DN and Sv has been emended to "uddha-lomi".
- 23 See n 22.
- 24 The original "Paranimmita" has been corrected to "Paranimmita".
- 25 *Vism* II 385; cf. *Ged* (Taishō, Vol 32, p 441c).
- 26 Taishō, Vol 32, p 412b *fol.*
- 27 The reading "saro" in the PTS edition has been corrected to "sāro", following the SHB edition's Ps (I 58, 35) and the Chṭ edition's Ps (I 65, 22).
- 28 The reading "jātiliṅguppattiyo" in the PTS edition has been emended to "jātiliṅgupapattiyo", following the SHB edition's Ps (Vol 35, p 64, 7) and the Chṭ edition's Ps (I 71, 21).
- 29 See n 9. Cf. Kōgen Mizuno, "Gedatsudōron to Shōjōdōron no Hikaku-kenkyū - P. V. Bapat, *Vimuttimārga and Visuddhimārga*", *Buddhist Studies*, (old edition), Vol III, No 2, May 1939, pp 114-137 (a detailed review article on Bapat's work).
- 30 de Silva, *op cit* (n 10), p lxi.
- 31 Mhv-t pp 125, 155, 177, 187, 247, 249, 289, 290.
- 32 *ibid*, p 134.

## Chinese Passages

- a. 問、誰名頭陀分。頭陀有幾種法。...。  
答、有十三頭陀、是佛所說、佛所制戒、此謂頭陀分。此不應說善不善無記。
- b. 問、此三行何因緣。云何可知此欲行人、此瞋行人、此癡行人。...。答、初所造因緣、諸行界為因緣、過患為因緣。云何諸行初所造因緣。於初可愛方便故、多善業成欲行人、復從天堂落生於此。多起殺割桁械怨業成瞋行人、不愛業所覆、從地獄從龍生、墮落生此。初多飲酒離間、成癡行人、從畜生墮落生此。如是行初造因緣。云何界為因緣。二界最近故、成癡行人、所謂地界水界。二界最近故、成瞋行人、所謂火界風界。四界等故、成欲行人。如是諸行界為因緣。云何過患為因緣。最多痰成欲行人、最多膽成瞋行人、最多風成癡行人。復有說、最多痰成癡行人、最多風成欲行人。如是過患因緣。
- c. (三種善者、謂初中後善。以清淨修行為初善、以捨增長為中善、以歡喜為後善。)云何清淨修行、謂諸善資具。云何捨增長、是謂安定。云何為歡喜、是謂為觀。如是初禪成三種善。
- d. 問曰、云何念安般。何修、何相、何味、何處、何功德、云何修行。答曰、安者入、般者出、於出入相、彼念隨念正念、此謂念安般。心住不亂、此謂修。令起安般想為相。觸思惟為味。斷覺為處。何功德者、若人修行念安般、成寂寂、成勝妙、成莊嚴可愛、自娛樂。
- e. 云何四大所造色。眼入、耳入、鼻入、舌入、身入、色入、聲入、香入、味入、女根、男根、命根、身作、口作、虛空界色、輕色、軟色、堪受持色、增長色、相續色、生色、老色、無常、揣食、處色、眠色。
- f. Taisho Vol. 32, p. 461a: 問、阿那含人為果定現觀、何故性除無隔、阿羅漢道不生。答、非樂處故、不生觀見、無力故。