	B. The five higher feeters (rebirth fetters)	
6. desire for form	no	yes
7. desire for the formless	no	yes
8. pride	yes	yes
9. desire for exitence	yes	(restlessness) yes
10. ignorance	yes	yes

This makes it clear that the traditional list of ten fetters does not make sense of the differences between the types of non-returner. The traditional teaching that one becomes a non-returner by getting rid of the five lower fetters totally ignores differences among non-returners or indeed among any noble persons besides the main four. As we saw above, there are non-returners who are known as *antarāparinibbāyin*s and who have got rid of at least two of the five higher fetters.

G.A. Somaratne

Remarks on the Rasavāhinī and the Related Literature

In 1992, I published the edited text of the Migapotakavagga and the Uttaroḷiya-vagga of Vedeha's Rasavāhinī (Ras), which is based upon my doctoral thesis submitted to the University of Göttingen[1]. As Telwatte Rahula had completed the romanized edition of the first four vaggas from manuscripts as his doctoral thesis submitted to the Australian National University in 1978, I edited the fifth and the sixth vaggas, that is to say, the first two vaggas of the Laṅkādīpuppattivatthūni, with the intention of continuing his work. Although my thesis was written in English, it seems that it has remained unknown on an international basis to most scholars of Pāli Buddhism and its literature because it was published in Japan. It was Prof. Oskar von Hinüber who suggested that I write a short article summarizing the contents of my book for those who are interested in this field in order to acquaint them with an idea of my work. It will be a great pleasure for me if this small contribution stimulates scholarly interest in Ras, one of the most popular post-canonical literatures in all Theravāda Buddhist countries.

Since a very good, compact explanation of Ras and its relation to other Pāli works, namely Sahassavatthuppakaraṇa (Sah), the Sahassavatthaṭṭhakathā (Sah-a) and the Rasavāhinī-ṭīkā (Ras-ṭ) is found in Prof. Oskar von Hinüber's *A Handbook of Pāli Literature* (§§ 410–415),[2] it seems unnecessary to repeat it here. In my edition, preceding the intro-

[1] J. Matsumura (1992) : *The Rasavāhinī of Vedeha Thera, Vaggas V and VI: The Migapotaka-Vagga and the Uttaroḷiya-Vagga*, Osaka: Toho Shuppan. This published thesis also includes a summary and table of contents in Japanese.

[2] *Indian Philology and South Asian Studies*, Vol. 2, Berlin : Walter de Gruyter, 1996.

duction, I have given a bibliography of all printed editions and translations of the Ras and relevant literature. That bibliography also includes much information about Sinhalese editions with paraphrases called *sannaya*, and editions and translations in other oriental languages such as Burmese and Thai.

I have also made a complete bibliography of the printed editions of the Saddharmālaṅkāraya (Sdhlk), a Sinhalese version of Ras written by Devarakṣita Jayabāhu Dharmakīrti (Dhammakitti) around the end of the fourteenth or at the beginning of the fifteenth century, and its commentaries. Prof. Heinz Bechert of the University of Göttingen spent a great deal of time and effort collecting the greater part of the books that are given in this bibliography for the Institute of Indology and Buddhist Studies (Seminar für Indologie und Buddhismuskunde). I will show later how this Sinhalese text, Sdhlk, is important in editing Ras. And his collection of these old Sinhalese printed books has become an invaluable treasure trove for us today, since these books may be very difficult to obtain outside of Sri Lanka.

In the introduction to the text I have dealt with the history of research covering the further elucidation of Ras (§ 1), discussion about the question of authorship (§ 2), the source of the stories in Ras (§ 3), the relation of Ras and Sdhlk (§ 4), Ras in South-East Asian countries (§§ 5-6), the relation of Ras to the Saddhammasaṅgaha (§ 7), commentaries on Ras, such as Ras-ṭ, the Rasavāhinī-gāthāsannaya, and the Rasavāhinī-gāṭapadaya (or -gaṇṭhipada) (§ 8), a description of the manuscripts of Ras I made use of (§ 9), problems of orthography (§ 10), editorial principles (§ 11), metrical analysis (§ 12), summaries of stories and their parallels (§ 13), and a table of verse parallels (§ 14).

I have given a transliteration of the text of Ras-ṭ in an appendix dealing with Ras V and VI, and of the colophon of Ras-ṭ from MS Or 6601 (90) in the British Library, to show evidence that this commentary is closely related to the South-East Asian Ras tradition. I also give evidence to show that it was most probably composed not in Sri Lanka but somewhere in one of the other Theravāda Buddhist countries, and consequently, I conclude that the Sinhalese printed text is unreliable because the Sinhalese editors in those days had a strong tendency to change the readings in manuscripts to conform with other printed texts. Besides this transliteration, I added a concordance of verses in my edited text, the Sinhalese edition (C), Sdhlk, Ras-gāthāsannaya and the Madhura-rasavāhinīvatthu (the Burmese version of Ras), a concordance of stories in Ras, Sdhlk and Sah, and indices of words and phrases discussed in the notes to the text and of proper names in the text.

One focus of my work is to attempt to settle the dates for Vedeha, the author of Ras. Two of the most learned scholars of Pāli literature, S. Paranavitana and G. P. Malalasekera, held totally different views, the former ascribing Vedeha to the eleventh or to the twelfth century, and the latter placing him in the fourteenth century. How can such a difference of opinion have occurred? It seems it was because the early Pāli philologists were not careful enough in identifying authors of many literary works. Authors of post-canonical Pāli literature were usually Buddhist monks, and they very often had the same, quite common name of Ānanda, or Dhammakitti, etc. The different views of the two scholars also came about due to the careless identification of Vedeha's teacher, Ānanda.

According to the colophon of Ras, his teacher (guru) Ānanda was called Araṇṇāyatan'-Ānanda, "Ānanda, whose abode is the Forest". In the colophon to another of his works, the Samantakūṭavaṇṇanā, Vedeha praises his teacher as Araññaratan'-Ānanda, "The Forest Jewel, Ānanda", and Vedeha called himself *araññavāsī*, which means that Vedeha and his teacher belonged to the Forest Fraternity (called *vanavāsī* or *araññavāsī*). Malalasekera rightly identified this

Ānanda with the author of the Padasādhana-sannaya, Ānanda Vanaratana, "Ānanda, the Jewel of the Forest".

On the other hand, Paranavitana noticed the fact that the author of the Pajjamadhu, Buddhappiya, also called his teacher Ānand'-Arañña ratana. So far there was no problem. However, he further identified this Ānanda with the Ānanda Tambapaṇṇiddhaja, "Ānanda of the banner of Tambapaṇṇi" (= Laṅkā), who was the teacher of the author of the Rūpasiddhi, since the latter was also called Buddhappiya. This unjustified identification of the two Ānandas and the two Buddhappiyas seems to have become one of the reasons for much of the confusion that we confront when we try to establish teacher-pupil inheritance in the Sri Lanka mediæval Buddhist schools.

The Ānanda who is entitled Tambapaṇṇiddhaja is quite safely identified with the thera named Ānanda who was praised in the inscription of Sundaramahādevī, the queen of Vikkamabāhu II (1116–37), as "a banner raised aloft in the land of Laṅkā". And this is the main reason why Paranavitana ascribed Vedeha to the eleventh to twelfth century, since he was a co-pupil with Buddhappiya of this "Ānanda".

Buddhappiya as the author of the Rūpasiddhi was, however, referred to in the Padasādhana written by Piyadassi, to which Vedeha's teacher, Ānanda of Arañña ratana, wrote a *sannaya*. This fact obviously contradicts the above-mentioned fact that Pajjamadhu's author, Buddhappiya, was a pupil of Ānand'-Arañña ratana. The contradiction is, however, very simply resolved if we suppose that two different Ānandas and two different Buddhappiyas existed: namely, Ānanda of Tambapaṇṇiddhaja and his pupil Buddhappiya who was also called Coḷiya-Dīpaṅkara (the name suggests that he was an Indian native) and whose dates are quite clearly settled in the twelfth century; and Ānanda of the Forest Fraternity (with the title of Arañña ratana, Vanaratana, or Arañña yatana as in Ras), one of whose pupils was Buddhappiya, the author of the Pajjamadhu.

Now according to the Padasādhana-sannaya, Ānanda's teacher was Medhaṅkara of Udumbaragiri who lived during the reign of Vijayabāhu III (1232–36). On the other hand, we know from the Sāratthasamuccaya that its author, whose name seems to be unknown, also had Ānanda of Arañña ratana as his teacher, and besides this that he was a contemporary of Anomadassi, whose date was clearly settled around the reign of Parakkamabāhu II (1236–71) based upon Mhv LXXXVI, 36–39.

The above is a very condensed outline of my discussion of the evidence of the Vedeha's date. In short, Buddhappiya, the author of the Pajjamadhu; Anomadassi, the author of the Sāratthasamuccaya; and Vedeha were all pupils of Ānanda, belonged to the Forest Fraternity, and were more or less contemporary. And so we may be allowed to ascribe Vedeha's date to the latter half of the thirteenth century. I examined this puzzle by closely comparing the colophons of each relevant work. And through this procedure I discovered a very important fact: the titles or sobriquets given to the distinguished monks were not mere casual fancies, but important marks or signs by which Sinhalese Buddhists of the middle ages recognized those bearing the same names. I would like to emphasize here the necessity of this kind of detailed historical examination of post-canonical Pāli literature with more attention to author identification.

The second major theme of my research is to identify the source of Ras. According to the opening verses of Ras, Vedeha states that his work is a revision of a previous work by Rāṭṭhapāla of Guttavaṃkapariveṇa at the Mahāvihāra, which is, in its turn, a Pāli translation of the ancient collection of stories transmitted in the language of the island (*dīpabhāsā*), *i.e.* the Sinhalese language. Walpola Rāhula identified Rāṭṭhapāla's work with Sah, which was published in 1959 by A.P. Buddhadatta. W. Rāhula's argument concerning the identification of Sah as Rāṭṭhapāla's work is sound, and more evidence for this identification can be

added, especially the fact that the order of stories in Sah and Ras is not arbitrary, but that the order of stories in Sah is clearly reflected in Ras, as though Vedeha sorted the stories in Sah into two parts almost automatically: those stories related to India (Jambūdīpa) and those related to Sri Lanka (Laṅkādīpa).

Problems remain, however. The stories in Sah are usually quite simple, and contain few verses. On the other hand, in Ras the stories are more elaborately related and sometimes contain information not found in Sah. The most conspicuous difference is that Ras contains many verses, some of which are quoted from Mhv and the Apadāna, and in those cases Vedeha himself makes definite statements, such as *tena vuttaṃ Mahāvaṃse*, etc. It is interesting that he also mentions *porāṇā* as the source of verses. Although I could identify some of these *porāṇā* verses as coming from the Saddhammopāyaṇa, it does not seem that Saddh is the direct source for these verses. Both Ras and Saddh rather owe them to a common source. However, verses introduced with definite source names are very limited in number. In most cases, verses are only introduced with phrases like *tena vuttaṃ, tathā hi, vuttaṃ hi*, or *gāthāyo bhavanti*, etc. Although these expressions indicate that those verses also have their own source, it is very difficult to find parallels of them in other Pāli literature. It is noteworthy that some verses are found to have their parallels in the Rājaratnākaraya, a Sinhalese historiographical work, in which verses are in Pāli, which is usual for similar Sinhalese literature of around that time.

From the above discussion we can already understand that Sah alone cannot be the single source of Ras. Moreover, Ras contains stories not found in Sah in the form we have it today. The question then arises: where did Ras adopt these stories that are missing in Sah from? At this point the relation of Sah and the Sahassavatthaṭṭhakathā (Sah-a), which is quoted or mentioned four times in Mhv-ṭ, comes

into dispute[1]. W. Rāhula mistakenly seems to regard Sah and Sah-a as one and the same work. S. Mori compared the Sah-a quotations in Mhv-ṭ with Sah and Ras more carefully and concluded that Sah-a represents the earlier stage of the Sah transmission and that Sah and Sah-a are essentially one and the same work. However, Mori, *a priori*, thought Sah-a was written in Pāli and did not pay attention to Malalasekera's suggestion that "Rāṭṭhapāla's translation is drawn from the ancient Sahasssa-vatthu-āṭṭhakathā ... quoted four times in Mahā-vaṃsa-ṭīkā".[2] He suggested that Sah-a is the original Sinhalese work (*sīhaḷāṭṭhakathā*) from which Rāṭṭhapāla made a translation into Pāli. And I have come to be of the same opinion in the course of my research, although it is very difficult to draw a definitive conclusion.

The place showing most conclusive evidence in favour of Malalasekera's idea is, however, the last reference of Sah-a in Mhv-ṭ 607,8–9 in the romantic story of King Duṭṭhagāmanī's son Prince Sāli and his caṇḍāla wife (Mhv-ṭ 605,1–608,8). Sah gives the title of the Sālirājakumāravatthu, but omits the whole story, advising the readers to refer to the "Mahāvaṃsa" for the story (*Sālirājakumārassa vatthu Mahāvaṃse vuttanayena veditabbaṃ. Sālirājakumāravatthu dutiyaṃ.*). It is obvious that the "Mahāvaṃsa" mentioned in the passage cannot be the Mahānāma's metrical work, Mhv, since Mhv reports the story with only three verses (Mhv XXXIII 1–3). We may think that it refers to the story in Mhv-ṭ. However, the story in Mhv-ṭ reports the miracles

[1] O. von Hinüber's explanation that "The latter text is quoted three times in Mahv-ṭ [sic.]" (*op. cit.*, p. 190), is not quite correct. He does not count the passage, Mhv-ṭ 453,31 (*eso pi khīrasalākabhattadāyako ti* ***tatth' eva*** *vuttaṃ.*), as a reference to Sah-a. It is evident that *tatth' eva* indicates the work mentioned in the immediately preceding quotation, *i.e.* Mhv-ṭ 452,27–28 (*so pi Kassapasammāsambuddhakāle khīrasalākabhattadāyako ti* ***Sahassavatthaṭṭhakathāyaṃ*** *vuttaṃ.*).

[2] G.P. Malalasekera (1928; reprinted 1958): *The Pāli Literature of Ceylon*, Colombo: Gunasena, p. 225.

which happened at the birth of Prince Sāli, and following this description, Mhv-ṭ 607,8–9 reports: "it is said in the Sahassavatthaṭṭhakathā that the same [miracles] also happened on the occasion of [each of] the seven celebrations" (*sattasu pi 'ssa maṅgalesu tath' eva ahosī ti Sahassavatthaṭṭhakathāyaṃ vuttaṃ*). From this it is obvious that the author of Mhv-ṭ relates the story based upon a source other than Sah-a, and he here compares the two versions found in the two different sources.

We cannot know whether it was the author of Sah who omits the story, or if it was already omitted in the original Sinhalese work upon which Sah is based. However, Ras relates the Prince Sāli's story in full, and we find in it the passage whose content corresponds exactly to the statement in Mhv-ṭ:

> *Tassa mātukucchito nikkhamanakālasamanantaram eva sakala-Laṅkādīpe sālivassaṃ vassi. Antamaso uddhane ṭhapitakaṅgu-ādīnaṃ bhattaṃ parivattetvā sālibhattam eva ahosi. Kaṅguvarakādiparipūritakoṭṭhāgārāni pi parivattetvā sālim eva ahosuṃ. Tuccchakoṭṭhāgārāni pi tath' eva paripuṇṇāni ahesuṃ. Na kevalaṃ jātadivase yeva, tassa temāsa-sattamāsa-navamāsa-maṅgalesu ca sitthappavesana-kaṇṇavedhana-uparājāṭṭhānādi-maṅgala-divase ca tath' eva Sīhaladīpe sālivassaṃ vassi.*[1]
>
> At the very moment after he [Price Sāli] came out of his mother's womb, sāli rice fell like rain on the whole Lankā island. Even millet or other grains to be cooked as a meal on fireplaces changed into *sāli* rice. In granaries fully filled with millet, beans and other [cereals], all [of the grains] changed into *sāli* rice. Empty storehouses were in the same way filled with [*sāli* rice]. This miracle happened not only on the day of his birth, but also on the days of his attaining the ages of three, seven, and nine months. It also rained *sāli* rice in exactly the same way on Sīhala island on ceremonial days such as the day of his weaning, the day of his ear-piercing, and on the day of his coronation as viceroy.

[1] Saraṇatissa (ed.), Rasavāhinī, (Colombo: 1891–93; 2nd impression, 1896), pt. 2, 108,17–23. *Cf.* Matsumura (1992), p. xlv.

This correspondence does not seem unlikely, if we suppose that Sah-a was still available to Vedeha, or at least that the tradition of Sīhaḷāṭṭhakathā was not totally lost at his time.[1]

Another important point is the basis for principles of text editing methods. Since Ras is a very popular book with both monks and lay people, not only in Sri Lanka but in all other Theravāda Buddhist countries (where Ras is usually called Madhurasavāhinī or Madhurarasavāhinī), over the centuries, countless manuscripts have been made. It is therefore impossible to establish a relationship among the limited number of manuscripts which we have access to. Moreover, manuscripts themselves usually give us scant information about their date, place, or scribe. So, my greatest concern is how we can treat the readings in the manuscripts logically and consistently. The following is a summary of my research, covering eighteen pages of the introduction of my thesis (§ 11).

In order to edit the text I used eight Sinhalese manuscripts (S1–S8), two Khmer manuscripts from Bangkok National Library (K1 and K2) and one modern Laotian manuscript (L). In addition, I used the oldest Sinhalese

[1] *Cf.* J. Matsumura, "Sahassavatthuppakaraṇa wo meguru shomondai" ["On the Sahassavatthuppakaraṇa"], *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies*, Vol. XLI, No. 1 (Dec. 1992), pp. 479–75; J. Matsumura, "Shīhara attakatā bunkenrui ni kansuru ichikousatu, sāri ōji monogatari wo daizai toshite" ["An Investigation of the So-called Sīhaḷa-Āṭṭhakathā Literature: Comparing Three Versions of the Sālirājakumāra Tale"], *Kobe International University Review*, No. 53 (Dec. 1997), pp. 161–73.

edition of Ras by Saraṇatissa (C)[1] as a basis for collation. In the course of my work, I have found that the mansucripts are largely divided in two: one group which is almost identical with C (S3–S8), and another group which sometimes has very different readings from C (S1, S2, K1, K2 and L). Now the question is which group of manuscripts may be supposed to reflect more exactly the original form of Ras. To solve the question, I compared the readings with Sdhlk, which contains the Sinhalese translation of all the stories in Ras.

As I mentioned above, Sdhlk was written at the turn of the fourteenth to the fifteenth century by Dhammakitti, the abbot of the Forest Fraternity at Gaḍalādeṇi. Since the author of Ras, Vedeha, also belonged to the Forest Fraternity, we may be allowed to form the hypothesis that the Ras text which Dhammakitti made use of was very close to the original form of Ras. And as we may also suppose that because Sdhlk was transmitted separately from Ras, Sdhlk would serve as a criterion to judge which group of manuscripts more closely reflects the original form of Ras. The result was that Sdhlk proved to reflect exactly the readings of the latter group of manuscripts. So I called the recension represented by the latter group of manuscripts "recension X", and the one represented by the former group manuscripts "recension Y".

We find the most striking differences between the two recensions at the beginning of Ras V.2, where recension Y and C omit a long description of the prosperity of Mahāgāma, the capital of Rohaṇa; and Ras VI.10, where they both omit the ten verses describing the beauty of Anurādhapura (VI.10); while recension X shares word-for-word correspondence with these two places in Sdhlk. For this reason, I chose as the first and most important principle that the text of my edition of Ras would be based upon the group of manuscripts

[1]See note 5. I actually made use of the second impression of Saraṇatissa's edition, because it was the oldest of all the Sinhalese editions to which I had access.

designated recension X. As a result I believe I identified the Ras text belonging to recension X, which is sometimes quite different from the popular Sinhalese editions of Ras.

The last point I would like to emphasize is the problem of Sinhalese printed editions of Ras. Complete editions of Ras have been published only in Sri Lanka up to now, and they seem to be derived from the the edition by Saraṇatissa,[1] which is the oldest edition and which I designated C. So we may suppose that C represents all the Sinhalese printed editions. In the course of my work, I found a very curious problem in C: the readings of the prose part coincide with the recension Y manuscripts, with some emendations;[2] but a larger number of verses in C are not found in that form in any manuscripts of Ras, or some verses in C coincide with the recension X manuscripts.

For example, a most striking difference can be found in V.7 (Samaṇagāma-vatthu). Verse 13 of this vagga consists of five pādas: four Triṣṭubh-Jagatī pādas followed by one Vasantatilaka pāda according to the manuscripts:

Vīsādhike sattasate samantā
adhikehi chabbīsasatehi satta,
parivenapantīhi ca dassanīyo
tatth' āvasantī yatirājaputtā,
kāyādisaṇṇa-m-aratā paripuṇṇasīlā.

C makes two verses of four pādas each, discarding the most unpleasant Vasantatilaka pāda, and this reading is attested only by the Gāthāsannaya and Sdhlk:

Vīsādhike sattasate samantā
adhikehi chabbīsasatehi satta,

[1]There is also an edition in Roman script by S. Gandhi (Delhi, 1988), but it is merely a careless transcription from a Sinhalese edition. *Cf.* Von Hinüber, *op.cit.*, p. 191, n. 684.

[2]For example, the singular nominative of *mātugāma-* appears in our manuscripts always as a feminine (*mātugāmā*), which C usually reads as a masculine (*mātugāmo*).

pariveṇapanīhi sudassanīyo
pītiṃ pavaḍḍheti sadā janānaṃ.
Tahiṃ vasantā yatirājaputtā
supesalānekaguṇādhivāsā,
katādarā sabbajanehi sammā
karonti attatthaparatthasiddhiṃ.[1]

In C we often find "improved" verses like these which are not attested to by any of our manuscripts, and in such cases C's readings are usually attested to by the Gāthāsannnaya and Sdhlk, especially by the Gāthāsannaya. From this and other observations I surmise that the one who introduced such improvements to the verses is Dhammakitti, the author of Sdhlk, and that the compiler of the Gāthāsannnaya made use of Sdhlk along with Ras transmitted in the form of manuscripts. There is a good reason for the compiler of the Gāthāsannnaya to use Sdhlk. Although Dhammakitti did not adopt all the verses of Ras in the original Pāli into Sdhlk, he gave a Sinhalese paraphrase of all the verses of Ras, even of those whose original Pāli text he omitted, and this Sinhalese paraphrase of verses, I suppose, may have been of great use for the compilation of the Gāthāsannnaya.

From the circumstances discussed above, we may conclude that the editor of C adopted its verses not directly from Ras manuscripts but most probably from the Gāthāsannnaya, which had been transmitted separately from the Ras text. Therefore we must say that the Ras text of the Sinhalese editions cannot be consistent. They are artificially made from the Ras manuscripts and the Gāthāsannaya, and probably also using Sdhlk.

Ras has been a very popular and widely read collection of religious narratives among Buddhists not only in Sri Lanka but also in other Theravāda Buddhist countries, and there still exist innumerable manuscripts kept in temples and libraries. Nevertheless, we do not have a critically edited text

[1] Saraṇatissa, ed., pt. 2, p. 12,5-8.

of Ras, despite the obvious need of one for the reasons discussed above. Although my contribution may be small, I hope that it will stimulate scholars who are interested in the post-canonical Pāli literature to continue the attempt to publish a critical edition of the entire text of Ras,[1] for I believe that Ras itself is not only very important as historiography but also as one of the most sophisticated works in literature produced in mediaeval Sri Lanka, supplying us with much information about the lively culture of Theravāda Buddhists.

Junko Matsumura

[1] According to a letter from Mr Sven Bretfeld of the University of Göttingen which I received in May 1997, he intends to edit Ras VII.3–VIII.3, the vaggas which narrate the story of King Duṭṭhagāmaṇi and his ten worriers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE RASAVĀHINĪ
(Editions and translations)

A. Sinhalese printed editions and translations

1. Complete editions

a. Saraṇatissa, ed. *Rasavāhinī.* Colombo: Laṅkābhiññā Viśruta Press, 1891–93 (not accessible to the present author. *Cf.* W.A. de Silva, "A List of Pali Books Printed in Ceylon in Sinhalese Characters", *JPTS* 1910–12, p. 148, no. 154).
The following reprints were accessible to the author:
2nd impression, [Colombo]: Vijjāsāgara, 2439 B.E. (A.D. 1896).
3rd impression, Colombo: Jinālaṅkāra, part 1, 2444 B.E. (A.D. 1901); part 2, 2443 B.E. (A.D. 1889).
7th impression of part 1 and 4th impression of part 2 bound together in one volume, [Colombo]: Jinālaṅkāra, part 1, 2483 B.E. (A.D. 1939); part 2, 2470 B.E. (A.D. 1926).

b. M. Somaratana, ed. *Rasavāhinī.* Colombo: Jinālaṅkāra Press, 1906 (not accessible to the present author; *cf.* de Silva, *op.cit.*, p. 148, no. 155).

c. Kiriällē Ñāṇavimala, ed. *Rasavāhinī.* Colombo: Guṇasena, 1961.

2. Partial editions and Sinhalese translations

d. [Ras I–IV] Polvatta Siri Sudassi, ed. *Rasavāhinī* (*Paṭhamo Bhāgo*). Ambalaṃgoḍa: Laṃkāputta Muddaṇālaya, 2493 B.E. (A.D. 1951).

e. [Ras I with *ṭīkā*] Silōgama Sōbhita, ed. *Rasavāhinī.* Colombo: Guṇasēna, 1962.

f. [Ras I.4–7] G.K.F. Wickramasekera, ed. *Rasavāhinī* (*Prescribed for the J.S.C. Examination*). Kotagala: Barnes, 1936.

g. [Ras I–II] L. Guṇaratna, ed. and tr.. *Rasavāhinī, Dhammasoṇḍa Vagga hā Nandirāja Vagga.* Colombo: Ratna Pot, n.d.

h. [Ras V–VI] Nāvullē Dhammānanda, ed. and tr. *Rasavāhinī: Migapotaka-Uttaroliya Vagga.* Colombo: Jinālaṃkāra, 1963.

i. [Ras V–VI] L. Guṇaratna, ed. and tr. *Rasavāhinī, Laṃkādīpuppattikathāvehi Migapotaka Vaggaya hā Uttaroliya Vaggaya.* Colombo: Ratnapot, 2527 B.E. (A.D. 1983).

j. [Ras VII–VIII] Nikahäṭiyē Somānanda, ed. *Rasavāhiniya, 1–2-Yodhavarga.* Colombo: Guṇasēna [1960].

3. Editions with Sinhalese paraphrase (*sannaya*)

k. [Ras I–IV] M.J. Dharmasēna, *Rasavāhinī-sannaya.* 1st impression, fasc. 3 (pp. 161–240), n.p.: Śrībhāratī, 2459 B.E. (A.D. 1915).
2nd impression, n.p.: Sevyaśrī, 2471 B.E. (A.D. 1928).
3rd impression, fasc. 1 (pp. 1–80), [Colombo]: Vidyāprabodha, 2477 B.E. (A.D. 1934).

l. [Ras I–IV] Mābōpiṭiyē Medhaṅkar, ed. *Pāṭhaśodhanapūrvaka Rasavāhinīvyākhyāva*, Bihalpola Śrī Devarakṣitābhidhāna nāyaka māhimiyan vahansē visin liyana ladī. 1st ed., A.D. 1917 (?); 2nd ed., 2473 B.E. (A.D. 1930).

m. [Ras I] Devinuvara Ratanajoti and Kurṇāgoḍa Piyatissa, eds.. *Sanna sahita Rasavāhinī, Prathama Bhāgaya* (with *sannaya* by Bihalpola Devarakṣita). Colombo: Jinālaṃkāra, 2502 B.E. (A.D. 1958).

B. Other Oriental Editions

a. [Ras I–IV] Ūḥ Janainda, ed. *Rasavāhinīpāḷi, Jambudīpuppatti kathākaṇḍa.* Rangoon: Sudhammavatī, 1930. B^{e}.

b. [Ras I–IV] Bhikṣu Mahānāma, ed. *Rasavāhinī, Jambudīpuppatti Kathā*. Lumbinī: Rājakīya Buddha Mandira, 1983. N[e].

C. Other Oriental Translations

1. Complete translations

a. Seng Manavidūra, tr. *Rasavāhinī*. Bangkok, 2513 B.E. (A.D. 1969). Thai translation from the 3rd impression of Saraṇatissa's Sinhalese edition (I-A-a).

2. Partial translations

b. [Ras I–IV] Ūḥ Ācar, tr. *Rasavāhinīvatthu, Jambudīpuppatti-kathā*. Charā Ñāṇ, ed. Rangoon: Mranmā amyuiḥ sāḥ cā Press, 1925. Burmese translation.

c. [Ras I–IV] Bhikṣu Aniruddha, tr. *Rasavāḥinī*, in 2 parts: part 1, Lumbinī: Lumbinī Dharmodaya Samiti 1979; part 2, Lumbinī: Rājakīya Buddha Mandira, 1980. Nepalese translation.

d. [Ras V–VI] Anāgārikā Suśīlā, tr. *Rasavāhinī, Laṅkādīpuppatti Kathā*. Part 1, Omabahāla: Śākya Press, 1982. Nepalese translation; the Lankā section is to be published in 3 parts.

D. European Editions (including English publications in Oriental countries) with or without translations

a. [Ras I.1–4] Friedrich Spiegel, *Anecdota Pālica*. Leipzig, 1845, pp. 1–74. Edition in Devanāgarī script with German translation.

b. [Ras I.5–6] Sten Konow, "Zwei Erzählungen aus der Rasavāhinī", *ZDMG* 43 (1889), pp. 297–307. Edition in Roman script with German translation.

c. [Ras I.7] P.E. Pavolini, "Il Settimo Capitolo della Rasavāhinī", *GSAI* 8 (1894–95), pp. 179–86. Edition in Roman script with Italian translation.

d. [Ras I.8–10] P.E. Pavolini, "Rasavāhinī, I 8–10", *GSAI* 10 (1896–97), pp. 175–98. Edition in Roman script with Italian translation.

e. [Ras II] Magdalene and Wilhelm Geiger. *Die zweite Dekade der Rasavāhinī*. Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-philologische und historische Klasse, 1918, 5. Abhandlung. München, 1918. Edition in Roman script with German translation.

f. [Ras I.1] D.J. Gogerly, "Buddhism", *The Orientalist*, vol. 1, part 9 (1884) pp. 204b–205b. A detailed English summary.

g. [Ras I.3] W. Goonetileke, "Comparative Folklore", *The Orientalist*, vol. 1, part 11 (1884), pp. 252a–55a. Text in Devanāgarī script and English translation (*avasānagāthā* is omitted).

h. [Ras VII.2] Edmund R. Goonaratne. "The Telakaṭāhagāthā", *JPTS* 1884, pp. 53–54. Part of the text is quoted with English translation.

i. [Ras I.9, IV.1, V.4, IX.4, IX.8, II.5] Dines Andersen, *Rasavāhinī, Buddhistiske Legender: paa dansk i udvalg med indledning*, Studier fra Sprog- og Oldtidsforskning udgivne af det philologisk-historiske Samfund, no. 6. Kjøbenhavn, 1891. Danish translation.

j. [Ras II.4] I.P. Minayeff. *Recherches sur le Bouddhisme: traduit du Russe par R.H. Assier de Pompignan. Annales du Musée Guimet*, tome 4. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1894. The text is quoted without any mention of the source. The original Russian work is not accessible to the author: I.P. Minaev, *Buddizm: isledovanija i materialy*, 1887.

k. [Ras IV.8] H.C. Norman. "Buddhist Legends of Asoka and his Times: Translated from the Pāli of the Rasavāhinī by Lakṣmaṇa Śāstrī", *JASB*, new series 6 (1910), pp. 57–72. English translation.

l. [Ras III.6–10] Klaus Wille. *Rasavāhinī von Vedeha: Edition, Übersetzung und quellenkritische Bear-*

beitung eines ausgewählten Textabschnittes. Unpublished MA thesis, Göttingen, 1977.

m. [Ras I–IV] Telwatte Rahula. *Rasavāhinī*: *Jambudīp' uppattivatthu* (a critical edition together with an English translation). Unpublished PhD thesis, Australian National University, Canberra, 1978.

An Index to JPTS Volumes IX–XXIV

An Index to The Journals of the Pāli Text Society (1882-1927 = Volumes I-VIII), compiled by P.D. Ratnatunga (Mudaliyar) and revised with an Appendix and arranged by S.S. Davidson, was published by the Society in 1973. This index lists, by author, the articles published in the Journals since it was revived in 1981. The years of publication are: IX (1981), X (1985), XI (1987), XII (1988), XIII (1989), XIV (1990), XV (1990), XVI (1992), XVII (1992), XVIII (1993), XIX (1993), XX (1994), XXI (1995), XXII (1996), XXIII (1997).