Linatthapakāsīni and Sāratthamaṇḍūṣā:  
The Purāṇaṭīkās and the Tikās on the Four Nikāyas

In Pāḷi bibliographical sources the tikās on the first four nikāyas are mentioned either:

(a) as two — more or less complete — different sets:

(1) the old set of four purāṇaṭīkās with a common name Linatthapakāsīni:
   
   Sumangalavilāsinī-purāṇaṭīkā, Paṭhamā Linatthapakāsīni;  
   Papañcasūdanī-purāṇaṭīkā, Dutiya Linatthapakāsīni;  
   Sāratthapakāsīni-purāṇaṭīkā, Tatiya Linatthapakāsīni;  
   Manorathapūraṇī-purāṇaṭīkā, Catutthā Linatthapakāsīni; and

(2) the later set of four tikās with a common name Sāratthamaṇḍūṣā:
   
   Sumangalavilāsinī-tikā, Paṭhamā Sāratthamaṇḍūṣā;  
   Papañcasūdanī-tikā, Dutiya Sāratthamaṇḍūṣā;  
   Sāratthapakāsīni-tikā, Tatiya Sāratthamaṇḍūṣā;  
   Manorathapūraṇī-tikā, Catutthā Sāratthamaṇḍūṣā; or

(b) as a single set in which the first three tikās are from the old set and are called Linatthapakāsīni (see (a-1) above) and the fourth tikā is from the later set and is called Sāratthamaṇḍūṣā (see (a-2) above), that is:
   
   Sumangalavilāsinī-purāṇaṭīkā, Paṭhamā Linatthapakāsīni;  
   Papañcasūdanī-purāṇaṭīkā, Dutiya Linatthapakāsīni;  
   Sāratthapakāsīni-purāṇaṭīkā, Tatiya Linatthapakāsīni;  
   Aṅguttaranikāya-tikā, Catutthā Sāratthamaṇḍūṣā.

I presented an earlier version of Part I of this article at the XIth World Sanskrit Conference, Torino, in April 2000.

1 The following bibliographic sources will be discussed: Saddhamma-s, Pagan inscription (see G.H. Luce and Tim Hway, 1976; PLB, pp. 102–109), Gv, Sās, Sās-dip, Pit-sm, and CPD.

2 For the etymology of the word tikā see Mayrhofer, EWA s.v. See also PLC, pp. 192–93; PL, pp. 148–51; Bollée, pp. 824–35; HPL, pp. 100–101.

The authorship of the purāṇatīkās (called Linatthapakāsini) is usually ascribed to Dhammapāla and that of the later tīkās (called Sāratthamaṇijūsā) is ascribed to Sāriputta of Polonnaruva. Although according to some catalogues of Pāli manuscripts held in various libraries in Burma and Sri Lanka, both sets of tīkās exist in manuscript form, only the tīkās belonging to the single set (b) have been published and the remaining ones belonging to the two sets (a) seem to have been ignored.

This discussion of the tīkās on the four nikāyas will be presented in two parts. In Part I, I will discuss printed editions and manuscripts of the nikāya-tīkās — with emphasis on Burmese and Sinhala manuscripts which have not yet been explored. In addition, I will discuss the possibility of the existence of two sets of nikāya-tīkās instead of just one, as is usually stated in works of modern Pāli scholarship. A special emphasis will be given to a recently discovered Burmese manuscript of the old Aṅguttara-tīkā, Catutthā Linatthapakāsini (Mp-pt), which will be discussed in more detail and will provide a completely new perspective on the research concerning the tīkās on the four nikāyas.

In Part II three parallel chapters (Ekanipata-tīkā III–V) from both Aṅguttara-tīkās (Mp-pt and Mp-t) will be compared and their major differences analysed in the light of the information about the nikāya-tīkās given in Saddhamma-s. The comparison will further evidence my proposition (based on the information in Saddhamma-s, see Part I, 1.1.) that two sets of nikāya-tīkās (Linatthapakāsini and Sāratthamaṇijūsā) were most probably compiled.

Part I: Bibliographical sources, manuscripts and printed editions

1. The tīkās in Pāli bibliographical sources

1.1. Saddhammasaṅgāha

Saddhammasaṅgāha (Saddhamma-s), the oldest known Pāli bibliographical reference work, was compiled in the 14th century by Dhammakitti Mahāsāmi, who visited Ceylon and was a pupil of Dhammakitti. After his visit to Ceylon he “returned to his own country, reached the city of Yodaya [Ayodaya] and while staying in a great residence called Lankārāma built by the king named Paramarāja he wrote Saddhammasaṅgāha”. From the colophon to Saddhamma-s it seems likely that Dhammakitti Mahāsāmi was a Thai who wrote Saddhamma-s in the ancient Siamese kingdom Ayudhya (Ayuthaya).

---


4 On Sāriputta of Polonnaruva, see Pecenko, 1997, pp. 159–79; HPL, pp. 172–73.

5 I would like to mention two important catalogues: (1) LPP and (2) Pit-sm (1989), a very important Burmese bibliographic work which also refers to the manuscripts held in the National Library, Rangoon. Of course, these two catalogues do not list all the Pāli manuscripts held in Burma and Sri Lanka (cf. 2.2. below).
during the rule of king Paramarāja I (Borommoracha I, 1370-88). Paramarāja I was “a contemporary of the [author’s teacher] Dhammakitti who lived during the reign of [the Sinhala king] Bhuvanaikabahu V (1372-1408)”.

It is also known that the Buddhism practised in Ayudhya at that time was the Theravāda of the Sinhala tradition. 

In Saddhamma-s two sets of tikās on the four nikāyas are mentioned: Linatthapakāsini and Sāratthamaṇjūsā. Linatthapakāsini was written by the porānas and was a subcommentary (athvaṇṇanā) on the atthaṇṭhās of the entire tipitaka. The second set of tikās on the first four nikāyas was called Sāratthamaṇjūsā and was compiled as a part of the “new” compilation of tikās on the entire canon — during the reign of Parakkamabahu I (1153-86) by the convocation of “elders” (thera bhikkha) presided over by Diṁbulāgala Mahākassapatthera,

Dhammakitti” (p. xxxii). See also Buddhaddatta, 1962, pp. 383-86.

9Wyatt, 1984, p. 312.

10Sirisena, pp. 101-102. According to Credèes, 1915, p. 43, “Il est impossible de fixer la date à laquelle ce texte fut compilé, ce nom de Paramarāja ayant été porté par plusieurs souverains d’Ayuthya.”


13Saddhamma-s 58.28-29: pīṭakattayaṭṭhakathāya linatthapakāsanattham atthavāṇṇanām purāṇehi katām. Although in this reference the tikās on the first four nikāyas are not listed explicitly, it seems probable that they were called Linatthapakāsini. H. Saddhatissa (“Introduction” in Upas, p. 47, n. 154) explains: “The Linatthavāṇṇanā is also called Linatthapakasini ... The Saddhammasangaha has freely used the word atthavāṇṇanā for tikā and further amplified it as the Atthavāṇṇanā for the purpose of elucidating the hidden meanings (Linatthapakāsanattham atthavāṇṇanām).” Cf. the title of Sv-pt, ed. by Lily de Silva: Dighanikāyaṭṭhakathāya Linatthavāṇṇanā.


16Saddhamma-s 60,25-27: ayam pīṭakattayaṭṭhakathāya atthavāṇṇanā ekasaṃvačcaren’ eva niṭṭhita.

17Saddhamma-s 59,23-35; cf. Saddhamma-s 61,21-23: pīṭakattayaṭṭhānaṃ ca linathassā pakāsānā, Sāratthādipānti nāma Sāratthamaṇjūsā pi ca (v. 18), Paramathapakāsani mahātherehi bhāṣāti, sattānām sabbabāhāsānām sā ahoi hitāvahā (v. 19).

18Saddhamma-s 58,30-31: taṃ sabbāṃ desantaravāṣānām bhikkhunām athaṃ na sādheti; translation by Law, 1941, p. 84. Cf. Saddhamma-s 61,9-10: pīṭakattayaṭṭhānaṃ linathassā pakāsānam, taṃ sabbatha bhikkhunām athaṃ sādheti sabbaṃ (v. 12); also O.v. Hinüber, HPL, pp. 172-73, §374: “... older works no longer served the purpose of the monks in the twelfth century.”

who was the first sāṅgharāja in Ceylon and the most senior monk from Udumberagiri-vihāra. The entire compilation was accomplished within one year.

While the individual tikās of the first set are not explicitly mentioned, Saddhamma-s lists the four tikās of the second set as follows:

tadanantaram suttantapitaka Dighanikāyaṭṭhakathāya Sumangalavālīsāṇi aṭṭhavāṇṇanām ārādhīvī mūlabhāṣāyā Māgadhi-kāya niruttīyā pathama- Sāratthamaṇjūsā nāma aṭṭhavāṇṇanāṃ ṭhapesuṃ. tathā Maṭhimaṇikāyaṭṭhakathāya Pāpaṇcasādāṇi yā ... dutiya-Sāratthamaṇjūsā nāma aṭṭhavāṇṇanāṃ ṭhapesuṃ. tathā Saṃyuttnikāyaṭṭhakathāya Sāratthamaṇjūsā ... tatiya-Sāratthamaṇjūsā nāma aṭṭhavāṇṇanāṃ ṭhapesuṃ. tathā Āṅguttaraniṭṭhakathāya Manorathapūrṇīya ... catutth-Sāratthamaṇjūsā nāma aṭṭhavāṇṇanāṃ ṭhapesuṃ.17
been mixed and confused with (Pāli) translations (bhāṣantarā) of the Gaṇṭhipadas.¹⁹ The Linathapakāsinī set was nevertheless used as a basis for the new “complete and clear atthavannāṇā”,²⁰ the mistakes (“versions, translations” — bhāṣantarā) in the old tikās were removed, but their essence was kept in its entirety.²¹

¹⁹ Saddhamma-s 58.31–59.2 : kattha ci anekesu gaṇṭhipadesu Sihaḷabhāṣāya niruttīyā likhitā ca kattha ci mulaḥbhāṣāya Māgadhikāya bhāṣantarena sammisṣam ākulaḥ ca katvā likhitā ca. Law’s translation, 1941, p. 84: “Some were written in many terse expressions [gaṇṭhipada] according to the grammar of the Sinhala language, some were written in the dialect of Magadha, which is the basic language, but they have been confused and twisted by translation”; cf. O.V. Hinüber, HPL, p. 173, § 374: “Particularly the Gaṇṭhipadas written in Sinhalese are difficult to understand (Sp-t [B® 1960] I 2.5-8) and [were] therefore summarized in Pāli.” On gaṇṭhipadas, see Lily de Silva, “General Introduction” in Sv-pt, pp. xxxii–xxxviii; O.V. Hinüber, HPL, pp. 170–71, §§ 367–71.

²⁰ Saddhamma-s 59.2–3 : mayam bhāṣantarāṇa apanetvā paripaṇṇaṃ anākulaṃ atthavannāṇam kareyyāma ti.

²¹ Saddhamma-s 61.9–20 = Sp-Ṭ B® 1960 I 2.15–16 : bhāṣantarāṃ tato hitvā sāraṇaḥ ādāya sabbāso / anākulaṃ karissāmi paripaṇṇaṃvinicchayāṃ. The introductory passages in the existing printed editions of Sv-pt E®, Ps-pt B® 1961, Spk-pt B® 1961, and in the recently discovered manuscript of Mp-ṭ (see Part I, 2.2 and Part II below), which all belong to the old Linathapakāsinī set, are, with the exception of minor orthographic differences, practically identical. The introduction in Mp-ṭ E® 1996, which is the fourth (caturthā) tikā of the later Sāratthamañjūṣā set, is considerably different from Sv-pt E®, Ps-ṭ B® 1961, Spk-ṭ B® 1961, and the text in the manuscript of Mp-ṭ, and is much closer to Sp-Ṭ B® 1960 and Sv-ṭ B® 1961. See P. Pecenko, “Table of Parallel Passages” in Mp-ṭ I; also H. Saddhatissa, “Introduction” in Upās, p. 47, n. 154. For a detailed textual comparison of three parallel chapters from Mp-ṭ and Mp-ṭ, see Part II below.

1.2. The Pagan inscription

The second important source of information about the tikās on the four nikāyas is the Pagan inscription of 1442 (804 BE) inscribed in the beginning of the rule of Narapati (1442–68),²² less than three centuries after Parakkamabāhu I (1153–86). The inscription gives a list of 299 manuscripts,²³ amongst which the tikās on the four nikāyas are also mentioned.

The titles of the tikās given in this inscription are very similar to the titles given in Piṭ-sm (1989) (see 1.6 below),²⁴ which in turn are also very similar to the titles of the Chaṭhasāṅgāyana editions of these tikās. The tikās on D, M and S are listed as follows:

the tikā on D has three entries: tigā sīlakkhandhavā dighanikāy (no. 44), tigā mahāvāvā dighanikāy (no. 45) and tigā pādheyyavā dighanikāy (no. 46);²⁵

the tikā on M also has three entries: tikā mūlapāṇṇāsa (no. 53), tikā majhimapāṇṇāsa (no. 54) and tikā uparipāṇṇāsa (no. 55);²⁶

and the tikā on S has two entries: tigā sagāhavāvā sānyut (no. 63) and tigā khandhavaggādi sānyut (no. 65).²⁷

²³ Catalogue in Luce and Tin Htway, 1976, pp. 218–48. The tikās in this article are quoted according to their numbers in the Catalogue with the same transliteration of their titles. Cf. PLB, pp. 102–109; Niharranjan Ray, 1946, pp. 193–95.
²⁴ Also Piṭakat-tō samuṁḥ or Piṭakat sump puṁ cā iam ṭ. I consulted the edition of 1989.
In the section on A (List 934b45) two different tikās are listed: tīgā anguttuviw kri [mahā] (no. 75), which is translated by G. H. Luce and Tin Htway: “Greater Anguttara subcommentary” and further identified as Sāratthamañjūṣā, and tīgā anguttuviw nay [culla] (no. 76), which is translated: “Lesser Anguttara subcommentary”.

The names of the two sets of tikās are not mentioned in the inscription.

1.3. Gandhavamsa

Gandhavamsa (Gv), a much later work written by a Burmese araffavādsin Nandapāññā probably in the 17th century, lists both


30 Gv 80,5,6: iti pāmojjatthāyāraññavāsinā Nandapaññācariyena kato Cullagandhavanmā; Gv 79,26: Hamsārathajāto Nandapaññho ti visuto. Hamsārathajāto is the Pāli name for the kingdom of Pegu, the capital of which was Hamsavati. See PLB, p. 36.


32 Gv 60,11–12.

33 Gv 69,30–34: Dīghanikāyatthakathādīnām catunnaṃ atthakathānaṃ Linattha-pakāsinī nāma tikā.

34 and was, according to Gv, written independently by Dhammapāli-ācariyā.

35 Sāratthamañjūṣā is mentioned only as āṅguttara-āṭṭhakathāya Sāratthamañjūṣā nāma tikā, a work written by Sāriputta. Further on, this work of Sāriputta, which was written at the request of Parakrama-bāhu, king of Lankā, is also referred to as āṅguttar-āṭṭhakathāya navā tikā gandho.

According to Gv, the Linattha-pakāsinī set consisted of the tikās on all the four nikāyas and Sāratthamañjūṣā was the name of the tikā on A only. To distinguish it from the older tikā on A (Catuttha Linattha-pakāsinī), Sāratthamañjūṣā was also classified as a navā tikā. This confirms the information given in the Pagan inscription where these two tikās are mentioned as the “lesser” (nay) and the “greater” (kri) tikā. The other three tikās of the Sāratthamañjūṣā set (Paṭṭhamā, Dutiṣyā, and Tatiyā Sāratthamañjūṣā) are — as in the Pagan inscription — not mentioned at all.

1.4. Sāsanavamsa

Sāsanavamsa (Sās), a work “written in Burma in 1861 by Paññā-
sami, tutor of King Min-don who held the fifth council a few years later", does not give the names of the two sets of tikās (Linatthapakāsini and Sāratthamañjūsā); it simply states that the Dīghanikāyā-āṭṭhakāthāya tikā, Majjhimanikāyā-āṭṭhakāthāya tikā, and Saṃyuttanikāyā-āṭṭhakāthāya tikā were written by Ācārya Dhammapāla Thera, and the Aṅguttaranikāyā-āṭṭhakāthāya tikā was written by Sāriputta Thera at the request of King Parakkamabāhu.

The distinction between the two sets of tikās mentioned in Saddhamma-s, and in the case of A also in the Pagan inscription and Gv, is not made in Sās. The two authors are nevertheless clearly stated, and this indicates that in the year 1861, when Sās was compiled, the only known set of tikās on the four nikāyas consisted of two kinds of tikās — the older three on D, M, and S written by Dhammapāla, and the later one on A written by Sāriputta.

Sās also lists another much later tikā on D called Sādhhujaṇavilāsini (Sv-nt) written by the sāṅgharāja Nāṇābhivāṃsa.

1.5. Sāsanavāṃsadīpa

Sāsanavāṃsadīpa (Sās-dīp) is a work “comparable” to Sās, but “devoted to the authors and books of Ceylon”. It was completed in 1879 by Ācārya Vimalasāra thera, published in 1880 in Colombo, and covers “the history of Buddhism in Ceylon down to the time of the introduction of the Burmese upasampadā in A.D. 1802”. The information about the tikās on the four nikāyas in Sās-dīp is the same as in Sās. The names of the two sets of tikās (Linatthapakāsini and Sāratthamañjūsā) given in Saddhamma-s and Gv are not mentioned at all. Only one set of tikās is listed and it does not have any special name; the tikā on D, M, and S are ascribed to Dhammapāla, and a tikā on A is ascribed to Sāriputta.

Nāṇābhivāṃsa, who wrote Sādhhujaṇavilāsini. Silakkhandhavagga-abhinavatīkā (Sv-nt), is mentioned as the author of “several books

---


42 Nāṇābhivāṃsa, also mentioned as Nāṇābhivāṃsaśadhamasaṭṭhadhammarājaguruthera or Nāṇābhivāṃsaśadhammasanāpatimahādhammarājajagurūgurū (Sās NÐ 1961 123.13–14, 25–26) was a sāṅgharāja of Burma during the rule of King Bodōpayā (1782–1819) and also wrote, among several other works, Sāḍhu-jana-vilāsini (Sv-nt) and Peṭakalāṃkāra, Netti-(nava)-mahāṭīkā (Nett-mht). See PLB, pp. 77–78; Buddhadatta, 1960, pp. 175–78; HPL, p. 176.

43 PL, p. 182. Although most of the authors and books mentioned in Sās-dīp are from Ceylon, there are nevertheless also quite a few references to authors from India and Burma, e.g.: Aggavamsa (v. 1238), Buddhappiya (v. 1239), Dāthānāga (v. 1241), Coliyacariya Sāriputtathera (v. 1244), Chappata (v. 1247), Nāṇābhivāṃsa (v. 1215), etc. See also the Contents, Viṇāṇapānam and Śuccipattam (pp. i–vii) in Sās-dīp; PLC, p. 311 ; Buddhadatta, 1962, Vol. II, pp. 409–10.


45 PL, p. 182.

46 Sās-dīp, vv. 1231–32: ... tikā Dīghanamassāca, Majjhimaṭṭhakathā-āṭṭhakāthāya Saṃyuttakathāya ca, ... Dhammapālāna dhīmatā racita therapādeva suttanamassadassīna.

47 Sās-dīp, vv. 1201–1203: Aṅguttaranikāyā-āṭṭhakāthā-āṭṭhikā ... therena Sāriputtathero akāsī.
1.6. Piṭkat samuṁh

Piṭkat samuṁh “was composed in 1888 by Mahṅ-kriṅ Mahā-sirijeyasū, alias Uḥ Yam, Uḥ Yam, or Uḥ Ran, who had been the royal librarian of the last Burmese king”, and “represents an attempt to collect whatever information was available in Burma at that time on literary works in Pāli and Burmese and on their authors.” Piṭ-sm (1989) is “the largest and the best work of its kind”; the author “lists 2047 titles, and he provides additional knowledge on most of the works listed.”

Piṭ-sm (1989) lists the same tīkās on the four nikāyas as the Pagan inscription and Gv and, as already mentioned, the titles of the tīkās given in all three sources are very similar. The names of the two sets, Linatthapakāsini and Sāratthamaṇjūśā, and the two authors, Dhammapāla and Sāriputta, are mentioned as in Gv. The reference numbers of all the tīkās on the four nikāyas listed in Piṭ-sm (1989) are marked with asterisks, and according to this edition of Piṭ-sm that means the manuscripts of all these tīkās are held in the National Library, Rangoon.

The Linatthapakāsini-ṭīkās on D, M, and S, written by Dhammapāla, are listed as follows:

- the Linatthapakāsini on D is listed under three entries: Sut-


Bechert 1979, p. xiii. The last Burmese king was Thibaw (1878–85), who was the successor of king Min-dōn (1852–77). See Bechert, 1966, Vol. II, pp. 6–7; also HPL, p. 3.

In the edition of Piṭ-sm (1989) that I consulted, it is also mentioned that the reference numbers of the texts are marked with asterisks if manuscripts of them are held in the National Library, Rangoon (Piṭ-sm, 1989), p. 111, n. 5) — “so that the Piṭkat samuṁh represents a rather complete catalogue of the Burmese National Library too” (Bechert 1979, p. xxiv). Cf. also Thaw Kaung, 1998, pp. 403–14.

53 Piṭ-sm (1989) nos. 187, 189–90. Silakkhandhavagga-ṭīkā is listed as the “old” (honḥ) tīkā, i.e. Sv-pt, Pathāmā Linatthapakāsini, to distinguish it from the “new” (sv-n) which is in Piṭ-sm (1989) no. 188 listed as the “new” (sv-n) tīkā.


some additional information about this āṭṭā:

It was obtained by King Narapati of Pagan from Tambā[pāṇi]dīpa in Jambudīpa and was written during the reign of King Sirimahāparakkama Pāhuṭhū by a monk who was an expert in dhamma and had three names: Sāriputta, Sāritanuja, and Mahāsāmi. This new greater āṭṭā (āṭṭā sać krt) has eleven manuscripts/bundles, and it is called Sāratthamañjūsā and also Mahāāṭṭā.

Although Pit-sm (1989) gives essentially the same information about the āṭṭās on the four nikāyas as the Pagan inscription and Gv, it is interesting to note that the old āṭṭā on A written by Dhammapala is not mentioned as a part of the Līnatthapakāsiṇi set. Pit-sm (1989) also does not list any of the first three āṭṭās of the Sāratthamañjūsā set (Sv-t, Ps-t, Spk-t).

1.7. Critical Pāli Dictionary

The last bibliographical source I would like to cite is A Critical Pāli Dictionary (CPD), Epilegomena to Vol. I, pp. 40*-41*, which was published in 1948. Essentially it is very similar to the earliest bibliographical work, Saddhamma-s, because both sources mention two complete sets of āṭṭās, Līnasattapakāsiṇi and Sāratthamañjūṣā. According to CPD the first set was written by Dhammapala, and the second one by Sāriputta of Polonnaruva. The āṭṭās of the Līnasattapakāsiṇi set are also called purāṇāṭṭās (pt), while the āṭṭās of the Sāratthamañjūṣā set are called just āṭṭās (t). Saddhujanavilāsinī, a later āṭṭā written by Nāṇabhīvamaṣa, is called navaṭṭā (nt). For the first three āṭṭās of the older set (Sv-pt, Ps-pt, Spk-pt), for the fourth āṭṭā of the later set (Mp-t), and for the new āṭṭā on D (Sv-nt) some references are given to existing published editions or manuscripts.60 For the first three āṭṭās of the later set (Sv-t, Ps-t, Spk-t)61 no manuscripts or editions are mentioned, and the fourth āṭṭā of the older set (Mp-pt) is referred to Pit-sm (1989) nos. 199–201.62 This indicates that although in CPD both sets of āṭṭās are listed, only four āṭṭās were actually available to the editor of CPD: the first three of the Līnasattapakāsiṇi set and the fourth of the Sāratthamañjūṣā set.

The above discussion of the bibliographical references can be presented as shown in Table 1 overleaf:

---


60 The following sources are given: for Sv-ṛpt, B² 1924 I–III (1.1.11); for Ps-ṛpt and Spk-ṛpt, the transcripts (1934) from Burmese manuscripts of the National Library (former Bernard Free Library), Rangoon (2.1.11; 2.3.11; cf. Pit-sm (1989) nos. 191–98); for Mp-t, B² 1910 I–II (2.4.12); for Sv-nt, B² 1913–23 I–II (2.1.13). CPD, Vol. III, p. iv, mentions also Sv-ṛpt as “Silakkandhavagga-āṭṭā” by Dhammapāla, B², Vol. I–II, (Buddhasamsarasamitī), Rangoon, 1961”, which is a mistake; this could be either Sv-ṛpt B² 1961 I by Dhammapāla, or Sv-nt B² 1961 I–II by Nāṇabhīvamaṣa. Other editions and manuscripts of these āṭṭās will be discussed below.

61 CPD, nos. 2.1.12; 2.2.12; 2.3.12. The manuscripts of these āṭṭās listed in LPP will be discussed below.

62 CPD, no. 2.4.11.
### Table I: The tikās on the four nikāyas in bibliographical works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>D/Sv</th>
<th>M/Ps</th>
<th>S/Spk</th>
<th>A/Mp</th>
<th>Authorship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Sad-s&lt;sup&gt;63&lt;/sup&gt; (14th cent.)</td>
<td>pt*&lt;sup&gt;64&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>pt*</td>
<td>pt*</td>
<td>pt*</td>
<td>porānas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Pagan (1442)</td>
<td>t*</td>
<td>t*</td>
<td>t*</td>
<td>t*</td>
<td>theras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3. Gv (17th cent.)</td>
<td>pt*</td>
<td>pt*</td>
<td>pt*</td>
<td>pt*</td>
<td>Dhammapāla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4. Sās (1861)</td>
<td>(n)t*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sariputta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5. Sās-dip (1880)</td>
<td>(n)t</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nānabhivamsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6. Pit-sm (1898) (1888)</td>
<td>pt*</td>
<td>pt*</td>
<td>pt*</td>
<td>pt*</td>
<td>Dhammapāla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7. CPD (1948)</td>
<td>t*</td>
<td>t*</td>
<td>t*</td>
<td>t*</td>
<td>Sariputta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Manuscripts and editions of the tikās on the four nikāyas

The bibliographical sources in Table I can be divided into three groups: works which mention only one set of nikāya-tikās (i.e. Sv-pt, Ps-pt, Spk-pt, Mp-t, see 1.4, 1.5), works which list an additional Aṅguttara-tikā (i.e. Mp-pt, see 1.2, 1.3, 1.6), and works which list two complete sets of nikāya-tikās (the old set, Sv-pt, Ps-pt, Spk-pt, Mp-t, and the later set, Sv-t, Ps-t, Spk-t, Mp-t, see 1.1, 1.7). Here I would like to discuss manuscripts and printed editions of the nikāya-tikās belonging to both sets.

<sup>63</sup>Sad-s = Saddhamma-s.

<sup>64</sup>The tikās listed as Līnattaphakāsini (pt) or Sāratthamañjūsā (t) are marked with *.

---

2.1. One set of tikās on the four nikāyas

Sās and Sās-dip mention only one set of tikās,<sup>65</sup> consisting of the three “older” tikās (Sv-pt, Ps-pt, Spk-pt) ascribed to Dhammapāla and the fourth “later” tikā (Mp-t) ascribed to Sariputta. There is no distinction between Līnattaphakāsini and Sāratthamañjūsā; all are just called tikās. Besides the Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana editions<sup>66</sup> there exist several other editions<sup>67</sup> and manuscripts of these tikās. Because these are the only

---

<sup>65</sup>Sv-nt, compiled by Nānabhivamsa, will not be discussed from here onwards because it is a much later work. There exists a Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana ed.: Sv-nt B° 1961 I–II; CPD, Epilegomena to Vol. I, p. 40°, mentions also Sv-nt B° 1913–23 I–II (2.1.13). The Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana edition of this tikā is available also on CS CD-ROM.

<sup>66</sup>Sv-pt B° 1961 I–III; Ps-pt B° 1961 I–III; Spk-pt B° 1961 I–II; Mp-t B° 1961 I–III. The Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana editions of these tikās were reprinted by the Vipassana Research Institute, Igatpuri, India (Sv-pt N° 1993 I–III; Ps-pt N° 1995 I–IV; Spk-pt N° 1994 I–III; Mp-t N° 1996 I–III), and are available also on CS CD-ROM.


<sup>68</sup>MSS of Sv-pt are listed in: Lily de Silva, General Introduction in Sv-pt E°, pp. xi–xii (7 C MSS; these MSS are listed in LPP); LPP I 39 (16 C MSS); Fausbøll, 1890–96, p. 28 (1 B MS); H. Braun et al., 1985, pp. 276–278 (1 B MS); Rhys Davids, 1882, p. 52 (1 C MS); Pit-sm (1989) nos. 187, 189–90 (1
ones printed these tīkās are often considered to be the only existing tīkās on the four Nikāyas.69

2.2. Two Anguttara-tīkās

In the Pagan inscription, Gv, and Piṭ-sm (1989), an additional tīkā — not mentioned in Sās and Sās-dīp — is added: the old tīkā on A (Mā-pṭ), called Catuttha Linatthapakāsini.

According to one of the latest editions of Piṭ-sm (1989) (nos. 199–201) an incomplete manuscript of Mā-pṭ (containing the old tīkā on the first three Nikāyas) is now held in the National Library, Rangoon.70

During my stay in Burma in December 1999, I visited the National Library, Rangoon, and the Universities Central Library, Rangoon University Campus. In both libraries I searched for manuscripts of Manorathapūraṇī-purāṇa-tīkā, Catuttha Linatthapakāsini (Mā-pṭ). In the

B MS).

MSS of Ps-ṭ are listed in: Bangchang, 1981, p. xi (1 K MS, 4 C MSS; these 4 C MSS are listed in LPP); LPP, Vol. I, p. 71 (8 C MSS), Vol. II, p. 53 (6 C MSS); Rhys Davids, 1882, p. 51 (1 C MS); Faussboll, 1890–96, pp. 28–29 (1 B MS); Rhys Davids, 1883, p. 147 (1 B MS); Piṭ-sm (1989) nos. 191–93 (1 B MS).


This list is, of course, not exhaustive; it is possible that more manuscripts of the above mentioned tīkās can be found in Burma and perhaps also in Thailand.

69 See for example HPL, pp. 167, 173.
70 In May 1999, I met U Thaw Kaung, retired Chief Librarian of Universities Central Library, Rangoon, who confirmed that this manuscript could be held in the National Library, Rangoon. See also 1.6 and n. 50 above.

2.3. Two complete sets of tīkās on the four Nikāyas

Saddhamma-s and CPD mention two complete sets, Linatthapakāsini (Sv-ṭ, Ps-ṭ, Spk-ṭ, Mā-ṭ) and Sāratthamānūjaśa (Sv-ṭ, Ps-ṭ, Spk-ṭ, Mā-ṭ). Here, three later tīkās are added: a tīkā on D (Sv-ṭ) called Pathama Sāratthamānūjaśa, a tīkā on M (Ps-ṭ) called Dutiya Sāratthamānūjaśa and a tīkā on S (Spk-ṭ) called Tatiya Sāratthamānūjaśa.

I am not aware of any printed edition of these three later tīkās (Sv-ṭ, Ps-ṭ, Spk-ṭ); it is also interesting to note that they are not mentioned in the Burmese bibliographical works discussed above. Somadasa’s catalogue Lankāvē puskola pot nāmāvāliya (LPP), on the other hand, lists quite a few manuscripts of Sv-ṭ, Ps-ṭ and Spk-ṭ.71 Since the catalogue also clearly distinguishes the purāṇatīkās (Linatthapakāsini) from the later tīkās (navaṭīkā, dutiyatīkā) called Sāratthamānūjaśa, it seems that Somadasa as well as the temple librarians who gave him information about the manuscripts held in their temples was clearly aware of the difference between these two sets of tīkās. In LPP the manuscripts of Sv-ṭ, Ps-ṭ and Spk-ṭ are listed as follows:

Sv-ṭ: six manuscripts s.v. Dīghanikāya-dutiyatīkā, Pathama-Sāratthama- nūjaśa72

1 C MS in Tapodhanārāma Purāṇa Mahāvihāraya, Kātapalagoda,

National Library, which was in the process of moving into a new building, I was not able to find any manuscript of Mā-pṭ, but in the Universities Central Library I found, with the generous help of U Thaw Kaung, a manuscript (Acc. No. 10095) which contained both Anguttara-tīkās, Mā-pṭ and Mā-ṭ, in one bundle. For a detailed description of this manuscript of Mā-pṭ — the only one known to me — see Part II, 1 below.

71 See LPP, Vol. I, p. 39, 71, 93. In 1995 I sent several letters to the temples in Sri Lanka listed in LPP and enquired about the tīkās held in their libraries, but I received no reply.
Karandeniya, Vatugedara, Ambalamgoda (temple no. 348);
1 C MS in Sailabimbaramaya, Dodanduwa (temple no. 365);
1 C MS in Sundararāma Mahāvihāraya (Dhammānanda Pustakālaya), Ambalamgoda (temple no. 371);
1 C MS in Gangārāma Mahāvihāraya, Padavota, Māhālla, Gālla (temple no. 381);
1 C MS in Subhadrarāma Vihāraya, Murutamurē, Hakmana (temple no. 487);
1 C MS in Kasāgal Rajamahāvihāraya, Udāyāla, Hakuruvela (temple no. 717).

Ps-t: eight manuscripts s.v. Majjhimanikāya-navaṭikā, Dutiya-Sarathamaṇṭūṣa: 73
1 C MS in Tapassarārāmaya, Moratuṃullu, Moratuva (temple no. 64); 74
1 C MS in Saddharmākara Pirivena, Pinvatta, Pānaḍuraya (temple no. 153);
1 B MS 75 in Vanavāsa Rajamahāvihāraya (Paṇḍītaratna Pirivena), Yāṭrāmulu, Bentara, Bentota (temple no. 326);
1 C MS in Tapodhanarāma Purāṇa Mahāvihāraya, Kātapalagoda, Karandeniya, Vatugedara, Ambalamgoda (temple no. 348).

73 LPP, Vol. I, p. 71 (cf. below this entry s.v. Majjhimanikāya-puraṇaṭikā, Dutiya-Linathaṭ-papakāsini, Linathaṭapakāsini, Linathaṭavāṇṇanā where 7 MSS of Ps-pt are listed). W.A. de Silva mentions also a manuscript of Majjhimanikāya-ṭikā, Panaḍītaratna-ṭikā, Dutiya-Sarathamaṇṭūṣā (i.e. Ps-t) held in the Library of the Colombo Museum; see de Silva, 1938, Vol. I, p. 36, MSS 108–109. However, the introductory passage quoted in the catalogue is identical with Ps-pt B° 1961 I 1.5–12 which indicates that the manuscript is most probably Ps-pt and not Ps-t. See also Bangchang, 1981, p. xii.

74 There is also a MS of Ps-pt held in the same temple; see LPP, Vol. I, p. 71, s.v. Majjhimanikāya-puraṇaṭikā, Dutiya-Linathaṭapakāsini, Linathaṭapakāsini, Linathaṭavāṇṇanā.

75 The Burmese manuscript listed here could indicate that in addition to Mp-ṭ, the other three later ṭikās (Sarathamaṇṭūṣā I–III) were also known in Burma. Cf. the discussion on the Pagan inscription, Gv, Sās and Piṭ-sm (1989) in 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.6 above. Here further research about nikāyaṭikās in Burma is needed.

Spk-ṭ: two manuscripts:
1 C Ms held in Yatagala Rajamahāvihāraya (Hetṭhāvala Pirivena), Unavaṭuṇa (temple no. 435) is listed s.v. Samyuttanikāya-navaṭikā, Tatiya-Sarathamaṇṭūṣā, 76
1 C MS in the same bundle with Spk-pt is mentioned s.v. Samyuttanikāya-ṭikā and is held in Jinajotikaramaya, Mūḍavela, Udūkinda, Fort Mekdonalḍ (temple no. 807).

The above list of the manuscripts of Sv-ṭ, Ps-ṭ and Spk-ṭ held in the temple libraries in Sri Lanka indicates that the information given in Saddhamma-s could be correct.

The editions and manuscripts of the two sets of ṭikās discussed above can be presented as follows:

77 LPP, ibid. Under the temple entry no. 807, the following note is added: mehi navaṭikā, puraṇaṭikā dekama misravi aṭa. This manuscript has also — as the Burmese MS of Mp-ṭ / Mp-ṭ discussed in Part I, 2.2, and Part II — both ṭikās (Spk-ṭ and Spk-ṭ) in one bundle.

In an email dated 23 May 2001, L.S. Cousins also informs me that Sister H. Vinita Tseng “on her visit to Taiwan last month ... obtained copies of some manuscripts (mostly Burmese) in a collection there. One was a ṭikā labelled Sarathamaṇṭūṣas, apparently to Spk [that is, Spk-ṭ].” This is a further indication that, as stated in n. 75 above, in addition to Mp-ṭ, the other three later ṭikās (Sarathamaṇṭūṣā I–III: Sv-ṭ, Ps-ṭ, Spk-ṭ) were probably also known in Burma.
Table II: Manuscripts and printed editions of the tikās on the four nikāyas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linathhapakāsini</th>
<th>Sarathamañjūsā</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>D/Sv</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sv-pt</td>
<td>Sv-ṭ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSS: 3 B, 17 C</td>
<td>MSS: 6 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M/Ps</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps-pt</td>
<td>Ps-ṭ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eds.: B° 1853, 1961; N° 1995</td>
<td>Ed. ——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSS: 3 B, 15 C, 1 K</td>
<td>MSS: 1 B, 7 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S/Spk</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spk-pt</td>
<td>Spk-ṭ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.: B° 1961, N° 1994</td>
<td>Ed. ——</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSS: 2 B, 19 C</td>
<td>MSS: 1 B (?), n. 79, 2 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A/Mp</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mp-pt</td>
<td>Mp-ṭ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed. ——</td>
<td>Eds.: Be 1910, 1961; Ce 1907, 1930; E° 1996; Ne 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSS: 1 B (see Part I, 2.2 above)</td>
<td>MSS: 11 B, 13 C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part II: Catutthā Linathhapakāsini and Catutthā Sāratthamañjūsā

1. Description of the Burmese manuscript of Mp-pt from Universities Central Library, Rangoon (Acc. No. 10095)

The titles on the cover of this manuscript read Anuttuirtikā-sac / [Anuttuirtikā-hoṇh], the same titles as used in Pit-sm (1989) (nos. 199–201, 202–12) for describing the “old” (hoṇh) and the “new” (sac) Anuttarataṭikā. The manuscript has regular Burmese foliation on the right margin verso of each folio; each folio has eleven lines written in small round Burmese letters, and there are very few of the orthographic errors which are common in Burmese manuscripts. The manuscript has two parts:

(1) Folios ka-thai (140 fol.) contain seven nipātā-tikās of Mp-ṭ; it begins with Pañcakapiṭāna-tikā and ends with Ekādasanipātaṭikā. On the left margin verso of each folio is written Anuttuirtikā-sac pāth (du[tiya]) and the last folio of this section (thai) has the title: Anuttara-mahāṭikā, that is, Mp-ṭ. According to the colophon the manuscript was edited by Paññājotābhidhaja in 1219 BE (1857 CE) in Bākarā monastery in Mandalay and copied by an unknown scribe in 1254 BE (1892 CE).

(2) Folios tho-po (108 fol.) contain the “old” Anuttuirtikā (Anuttuirtikā-hoṇh), that is, Manorathapuraṇī-purāṇatikā, Catutthā Linathhapakāsini (Mp-pt). On the left margin verso of each folio is written Anuttuirtikā-hoṇh pāth. This is the first manuscript of Mp-pt that is known to me; I am also not aware of any printed edition of the
"old" Anûgtarâ-ṭikâ.

The manuscript contains the ṭikâ on the first three nipâtas only: it contains most of the Ekanipâta-ṭikâ (folios ṭho'v.1–dho'v.10) and longer passages from Dukanipâtâṭikâ (folios dho'v.10–nà'v.8) and Tikanipâta-ṭikâ (folios nà'v.8–po'v.4).

The text on the first few folios of the newly discovered manuscript of Mp-ṭî is exactly the same (with minor orthographic differences) as in the other three "old" ṭikâs and in this respect differs considerably from Mp-ṭ. This is a very strong indication that the manuscript discussed here really belongs to the old Lithatthapakâsinî set.

The text on the last folio (po) ends abruptly in the middle of Tikanipâta-ṭikâ and a colophon follows. The title given in the colophon is Anguttuir-ṭikâ-honh-path, the editor (visodhaka) who "collated" the text from "different readings" (saṃsandiy' aṅnapâṭhehi) is Jotâbhinâmathera, who lived in Manipupphara monastery. The date of editing is not given and the date of copying is 1254 BE (1892 CE).

Although according to Saddhamma-s the "old" ṭikâ (Mp-ṭî) was a basis for the later one (Mp-ṭ), many passages in this manuscript of Mp-ṭî are nevertheless essentially different from the parallel passages in Mp-ṭ. The differences and similarities of some of these passages will be to some extent discussed in Part II, 2–3 below.

It is also interesting to note that in this manuscript both ṭikâs, Mp-ṭî and Mp-ṭ, are in the same bundle, which could indicate that these two ṭikâs were, probably at least during a certain period, consulted together, complementing each other.

2. Three chapters from Anûgtaranikâya-puranâtikâ, Catutthâ Lithatthapakâsinî (Mp-ṭî)

This section contains the following three chapters from the manuscript of Anûgtaranikâya-puranâtikâ, Catutthâ Lithatthapakâsinî (Mp-ṭî, see Part II, 1) and the differences from the parallel chapters in Mp-ṭ E* 1998 II:

- Mp-ṭî, Ekanipâta-ṭikâ III: Akammaniyâvaggo tatiyo (folio nu'v.5–nu'v.5); cf. Akammaniyâvagga-vannanânî, a parallel chapter in Mp-ṭ II 36.1–38.12;
- Mp-ṭî, Ekanipâta-ṭikâ IV: Adantavaggo catuttho (folio nu'v.5–8); cf. Adantavagga-vannanânî, a parallel chapter in Mp-ṭ II 39.1–14;
- Mp-ṭî, Ekanipâta-ṭikâ V: Anathavaggo pâñcacho (folios nu'v.8–ne'v.11); cf. Panihita-acchavagga-vannanânî, a parallel chapter in Mp-ṭ II, 40.1–60.17.

81 Cf. Pit-sm (1989), no. 199; and Part I, 1.6, above.
82 The text of Ekanipâta-ṭikâ corresponds approximately to Mp-ṭ E* I 1.1–III 163.8. There are considerable differences between Mp-ṭî and Mp-ṭ: most of the chapters of the Ekanipâta-ṭikâ of Mp-ṭî are, compared with the same chapters in Mp-ṭ, much shorter; e.g. Nettinayavannânî on Rûpadivagga is much longer in Mp-ṭ (cf. Mp-ṭ E* I 76.1–97.7) than in the MS of Mp-ṭî where it is given on three folios only (dhû'v.9–dho'v.8).
83 This corresponds approximately to Mp-ṭ E* III 195.5–253.7 (folios dho'v.10–nà'v.8 actually contain much less text, since on the folio dham'v.6 is a lacuna corresponding to Mp-ṭ E* III 204.3–241.12).
84 This corresponds approximately to Mp-ṭ B* 1961 II 83.16–148.2. This is at present the only known and available manuscript of Mp-ṭî; for a textual comparison of three selected parallel chapters from Mp-ṭî and Mp-ṭ see Part II, 2 below.
86 Cf. Mp-ṭ E* I 1.1 foll.
These three chapters were chosen because they clearly demonstrate the differences between the two tikās (Mp-pt and Mp-t) as described in Saddhamma-s. This is a short preliminary comparison of the two tikās and final conclusions will be drawn only when a critical edition of the entire manuscript of Mp-pt is completed and compared with Mp-t.

Here the main text is Mp-pt and the differences in Mp-t are given in the footnotes. In two cases, where the additions in Mp-t are very long (see Part II, 2, n. 140 and n. 217 below), the entire text from Mp-t is given in the endnotes (see Part II, 2, endnotes (1) and (2) below). Since the text in the manuscript of Mp-pt has only a few orthographic errors, the above three chapters will be reproduced here in Roman transliteration without any changes. Mp-t stands here for Mp-t E® 1998 II and Mp-pt stands for the manuscript of Aṅguttaranikāya-purāṇatikā, Catutthā Linathapakāsini (Mp-pt), described in Part II, 1, above.

[Akammaniya-vaggo tatiyō]89

(1) 90abhāvitan [52.1]91 ti samathāvippassanābhavaṇāvasena na bhāvitaṁ tathā abbhāvitaṭṭā. tāṁ hī avaddhitān [52.1] ti vuccati paṭipakkābhābhavena paribṛhanābhāvato. ten’ āha bhagavā akkamaṇiyāḥ hōti [52.3] ti.

(2) duttīye vuttaṭāvāyaṇena92 attho veditabbo [52.5]. paṭhame [52.6] ti tatiyavaggassa paṭhamasutta. vattavasena [52.6] ti vipākavaṭṭavasena. tebhūmakaṭṭān [52.8-9] ti tebhūmakaviṭṭaṭṭān.93 vattapatiṭṭāḥbhāya kamman [52.9] ti vipākavaṭṭasassa paṭilābhābhaya upanissayabhūtaṁ kamman, tassa sahāyabhūtaṁ *kilesaṭṭaṁ bhavaṇītā tathābhavaṇītā. tathā hī tāṁ vattapatiṭṭāḥbhāya kamman [52.9] ti vuttam.94 vīṭṭapatiṭṭāḥbhāya kamman [52.10-11] ti vīṭṭādhiṭṭhamassa upanissayabhūtaṁ kamman. yaṁ pana carabhabhāvattakakamman.95 tāṁ vāṭṭaṭṭapatiṭṭāḥbhāya kamman hōti, na hōti t. na hōti vattāṭāvṛddbhāvato. carimabhavaṭṭasampanna viya pana vīṭṭaṭṭpañassayo ti sakka viññātum. na hī kādī ti tiheṭukapatiṭṭasampanna viya vīṭṭaṭṭpañassayo sakka viññātāhā bhavati. imesu suttesu [52.11] ti imesu96 paṭhamadutiyāsutesu vuttān97 yathākammanā paṭṭa-vivattān eva kathitām.

(3) 98abhāvitan ti ettha bhāvaṇā nāma saṁdhībhavaṇā. sā yatha āsāṅkitaṁ, tāṁ kāmavacarapaṭṭhamamahākusalacittādi-abhāvānī tāṁ adhippetan ti āha devamanussasampattiyo [52.15] ti ādi.

(4) catutthe yasmā cittan [52.22] ti vīṭṭaṭṭvāsena99 uppannāṁ cittan100 adhippetan. tasmā jāti-jātāya-āḥaranaṁ āsangaṁ akīlaṁ akumāraṁ anibbattanato mahato athāya samvattatā ti yojanā veditabbā.
(5–6) **uppannam** [52,26] ti ekuppādādikhaṇṇattayaṃ**102** pi abhavitam**103** [52,26] bhāvanārahitam *āpūtthūtām* [52,26] eva pañditassa sammatassā **104** uppannakiccasā asādhārānato**105** yathā: aputto ti. [cf. Mogg III 17]


(7–8) **punappunam akhan** [53,8] ti bhāvanābhubhiṇādīvasena**115** punappunam na katāṃ. imāni pi dve [53,9] ti īmesu dvisu**116** suttasā āgatatā imāni pi dve cittāni.


(10) matthakapattam vippanāsukhaṃ pākatikajhānasukhato**120** santarapānenāti eva ti āha jhānasukhato vippanāsukhan [53,24] ti. ten’ āha bhagavā:

suññāgāram paviṭṭhassa santacittassā bhikkhuno amānasū rati**122** hoti samāṃ dhammaṃ vipassato yato yato sammassati khandhānām udayabbayaṃ labhate**123** pitipāmojam**124** amatatāṃ tam vijñānata ti. [Dhp 373–74]

---

101 Mp-t adds: pañchamacaṭṭhesu
102 Mp-t: avigatuppadādikhaṇṇattayam
103 Mp-t: abhavitam
104 Mp-t: pañditasammatassata (for: pañditassā sammatassā)
105 Mp-t: asādhano
106 Mp-t so 107 Mp-t: asādhento (for: asādheti so)
108 Mp-t omits
109 = Mp v.l. = Mp E®, C® 1923: yeva
110 = Mp E®, C® 1923: asamvutagharadāvādīvasena
111 = Mp E®, C® 1923: yathā pathāsā adanta-haththi
112 = Mp E®, C® 1923: uyathanāti upamabhavenā gahita, evam ettha sattapāṭhamesu
113 = Mp E®, C® 1923: sattapatthamesu
114 = Mp E®, C® 1923: adanta-hatthi-assadaya upamābham gahita, evam ettha sattapāṭhamesu
115 = Mp E®, C® 1923: sattapatthamesu
116 = Mp E®, C® 1923: sattamapathamesu
117 = Mp E®, C® 1923: sattamapathamesu
118 = Mp E®, C® 1923: sattamapathamesu
119 = Mp E®, C® 1923: sattamapathamesu
120 = Mp E®, C® 1923: sattamapathamesu
121 = Mp E®, C® 1923: sattamapathamesu
122 = Mp E®, C® 1923: sattamapathamesu
123 = Mp E®, C® 1923: sattamapathamesu
124 = Mp E®, C® 1923: sattamapathamesu
paṭhamāṃ vatvā pacchā atthāṃ dashsento upamāya atthāṃ parivāretvā
dasseti [55.4–5] nāma, tadubhayassa pi agatathānaṃ nidadsento
Vatthasatute viyā [55.3] ti ādīm āha.*141

kanakasadiso142 sālīphalassa bunde143 uppajjanakavālo sālisuṣaṃ144
[55.9], tathā yavaṣuṣam [55.10]. sukassa tanukabhāvato145 bhedavato
bheda nātimahā hoti ti āha bhīndissati,146 chāvī147 chhindissati ti 148
attho [55.13] ti. yathā micchāthapitāsālisuṣaṃ akkantāṃ pi hatthādīpi
na bhindati bhinditum ayoggabhāvena ṭhitattē, evam ācayaγāmicittām
avijjām na bhindati bhinditum ayoggabhāvena uppannattē ti imam
atthāṃ dassetī micchāthapatitēnē [55.14] ti ādīmā. atthasu thānesī [55.16]
ti 150 dukkhādīsaccesu151 punkbādīsī152 cā ti ṭāthathas u thānesī. ghanā-
balahanā [55.16] ti cīrākalāparibhāvanāya ativīya balahām. mahā-
visayātāya mahāpaṭipakkathāya bahupārivaṭthāya bahudukkhathāya
ci maḥatī avijjā ti mahā-avijjā. tam mahā-avijjām [55.17]. mahā-saddō
[55.17] ti bhahubhāvatho pi hotī mahājano ti ādisī154 viyā.155 vijihanti
arahantamaggaṁnaṇāṃ ukkamsagativijjānaṃ,156 tathāvānāto

akkantāṃ ti ruli hotī157 ti āha haththena — pa — vuttanā [55.25-
56.1] ti. ariyavohāro [55.1] ti ariyadesavāsīnāṃ vohāro. mahānāṃ

141This paragraph (*upama va opamaṃ ... ādīm āha.*) is in Mp-t replaced with
a much longer passage (Mp-t E° 1998 II 40,1–52,5); the entire text of this
addition is given in endnote (1) below (p. 96). This is a major difference
between Mp-pt and Mp-t in this chapter. 142= Mp-t v.l.; Mp-t: kanakasadiso
143= Mp-t v.l.; Mp-t: tunde (other v.l.l. thunde, kunde, phunde) 144 Mp-t:
(-)suka- (for:(-)suka- (here and below)) 145 Mp-t: tanu-
146 Mp-t: bhīndissati ti 147Mp-t = Mp E°: chāvīma im ādīmā.
chhindissati ti 149Mp-t: -ādīm; cf. Mp-t v.l.: hatthādī 150Mp-t adds: dukkke aṇāṇāṃ ti [Dhs § 1061]
ādīnā vutttesu. Cf. Dhs §1061: dukkke aṇāṇāṃ dukkhasamudaye aṇāṇāṃ
dukkhanirodhe aṇāṇāṃ dukkhanirodhagaminiyā paṭipadāyā aṇāṇāṃ
pubbante aṇāṇāṃ aparante aṇāṇāṃ pubbāpārante aṇāṇāṃ idpaccayata
paṭiccamuppampannesu dhammesu aṇāṇāṃ ... 151 Mp-t: dukkhasīdu catūṣu
saccesu 152Mp-t: -ādisu catūṣu 153Mp-t (= Mp E°): -bahālaa- (here and
below) 154Mp-t: ādisu 155Cf. Vism-mht B° 1960 I 452, 21–24 156Mp-t
omits: *vijihanti ... -gativijjānaṃ* 157Mp-t: rūḥi h' esā (for: ruli hotī)
158Mp-t: akkantāṃ t' eva vuttan (for: hadhthena — pa — vuttan (= hadhthena
uppilītam, rūḥiṇiṇīvasena pana akkantāṃ t' eva vuttan)

sippiyo [57.12] muttāsippiyādayo.¹ eighty sambukā [57.12] sāṅkah-pāṇṇakavisesā.¹ eighty
carantām pi tīṭhantam pī [57.15] ti yathālābhavacanam etam datṭhabbām. tam eva hi yathālābhavacanatanāṃ dassetum etṭāh [57.15] ti ‘ādi vuttaṃ.¹ eighty itarām pī [57.20] ti itarāṃ pi dvayaṃ carantām pi tīṭhantam pi vuttaṃ.¹ eighty

pariyonaddhena¹⁰⁰ [57.23] ti paṭīcchādītena. ta-y-īdaṃ kārāṇaṃ āvīlabhāvassa dassanāṃ.

dīṭṭhadhamme imasmiṃ attabhāve bhavo ditthadhammiko [57.24], so pana lokīyo pi hōti lokuttaraṃ pi ti ‘āha lokīyalokuttaramissakko [57.24-25] ti. pecca sampādetabbato samparāyō [57.25-26], paraloko. ten’ ‘āha so hi paraththe-aṭṭho ti paraththo [57.26-58.1] ti. iti dvīdhāpi sakaṃsantati-pariyāpanno eva gahito ti itarāṃ pi sāṅgahētvā dassetum api cā [58.2] ti ‘ādim ‘āha.

ayan [58.6] ti kusālakammapathasakkhā doṣavidhī dhammo. satthantararākappāvasāne [58.7-8] ti idāṃ tassa āsannaḥbāvaṃ sandhāya vuttaṃ. yassa kassa ci antarakappāvasesā¹ ninety veditabbaṃ.

ariyānam yuttan [58.11] ti ariyānam ariyabhāvāya yuttaṃ, tato eva ariyabhāvām¹ ninety kātum samaththām [58.11-12], nāṇaṃ eva neyassa pacakkhaṅkaraṇaṭṭhena dassanān ti ‘āha nāṇaṃ eva hī [58.13] ti ‘ādi. kim


pana tan ti dibbacakkhūtiṇādī [cf. 58.14-15].¹ ninety


pi¹ eighty vuccati. sevā[58.20] ti kaṇnikasevālaṃ. palākām² [58.20] udakamalaṃ.

cittassa āvīlabhāvo nīvaranahetuto¹ ninety ti ‘āha anāvīlenī ti paṇca-nīvaranāvippamuttena² [58.21] ti.


maggaphalāvahatāya viṇṇasānasvāsa bhāvitam [59.6] pi gahitaṃ.


(8)² ninety citassā parivattanām uppādanirodho eva ‘āha eva m lahu¹ forty uppajjīvā ti lahu nīruṣjhanakān [58.11-12] ti.

adicchattapamā̄ṇāthi [59,13] ti atikkantapamāṇāthi, paṃmānati-
tatāyān\textsuperscript{215} ti atho. ten’ āha ativīya na sukkārā [59,13-14] ti.

cakkhuññāṇam\textsuperscript{216} pi adhippetam evā [59,18] ti sabbassa pi cittaṃ
saṃānkhānantā vuttaṃ. cittaṃ ativīya lahu-parivattihāvam theravā
dena dipetum\textsuperscript{217} icasmiṃ paṇi atthe [59,18-19] ti ādi vuttaṃ.

cittasānkhārā [59,21] ti sasampayuttaṃ cittaṃ vuttaṃ.\textsuperscript{218} addhaculān
[59,22] ti thokena ānaṃ upadāhāṃ. kassa pana upadāhan ti. adhi-kārato
vāhassā ti viññāyati. adhi-kuccudasan ti keci. adhi-kuccutthi ti apiare.
sādhikādiyādhāsatām\textsuperscript{219} vāho\textsuperscript{220} ti dalhām katvā vaddanti, tam\textsuperscript{221}
vimarsitabbaṃ. catunālikā\textsuperscript{222} tumbo [59,23].

pucchāya abhāvenā [60,6] ti sakkā pana bhante upamaṃ\textsuperscript{224}
dhammasadesaṇapariyosana [60,7] ti sanni-patitaparisāya yathāraddha-
dhammasadesanā pariyosāne.

(9) \textsuperscript{225} pabhassaran [60,9] ti pariyođataṃ saha-vapaśrisuddhathetha.
ten’ āha padarāṃ parisuddhan [60,9] ti. pabhassaratādayo nāma
vannadhātu-yām labhamānakavisēsa\textsuperscript{226} ti āha kim pana cittaṃ vamana
nāma attāti [60,11]. itaro arūpatāya n’ attāti [60,11] ti paṭikkhipetvā\textsuperscript{227}
pariyāyakathā āyaṃ tādissāsa cittaṃ parisuddhābhavaparidipanāya\textsuperscript{228}
ti dassento nilāddinā\textsuperscript{229} [cf. 60,11-12] ti ādi āha. tathā hi:

so evan samāhite citte parisuddhe pariyođate ti [DI 76,13 foll.]

\textsuperscript{215} Mpi-t: -ātita- \textsuperscript{216} Mpi-t (= Mpi E®): cakkhuviññāṇam \textsuperscript{217} Mpi-t: dipetum
\textsuperscript{218} Here Mpi-t adds a passage in which vāhassatānaṃ kho mahāraja vihaṇāṃ [Mpi I 59, 22 = Mpi B° 1958, C° 1923, N° 1976] is discussed (cf. Mpi-t II 58.5-11). For details, see endnote (2) below. \textsuperscript{219} Mpi-t: sādhikam diyađhāsatāṃ \textsuperscript{220} = Mpi-t v.l.; Mpi-t: vāhā \textsuperscript{221} = Mpi-t omits \textsuperscript{222} Mpi-t: catunālikā \textsuperscript{223} Cf. Mil-t 22, 23-26 (ad Mil 102.1.14): ettha sādhikādiyādyādhāsatāṃ thokena ud[di]tam upadāhāṃ labhamānakavisēsa cittaṃ vamana nāma attāti [60,11]. itaro arūpatāya n’ attāti [60,11] ti paṭikkhipetvā pariyāyakathā āyaṃ tādissāsa pariyođataṃ saha-vapaśrisuddhathetha. ten’ āha padarāṃ parisuddhan [60,9] ti. pabhassaratādayo nāma vannadhātu-yām labhamānakavisēsa ti āha kim pana cittaṃ vamana nāma attāti [60,11]. itaro arūpatāya n’ attāti [60,11] ti paṭikkhipetvā pariyāyakathā āyaṃ tādissāsa pariyođataṃ saha-vapaśrisuddhathetha.
ENDNOTES:

(1) [See Part II, 2, p. 90, n. 140 above]
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249 Mp-t B⁰ 1958 ; Alagaddupamasutadisu


idha pana kattha ci atthena upamaṃ pariārētvā dasseti Vattha- sutte viya Pāricchattakopama-Aggikkhandhopamādisuttesu viya ca. kattha ci upamāya attham pariārētvā dasseti Lōnambilasutte viya Suvaṇṇakārasatta244. Suriyopamādisuttesu245 viya ca. imasmīṃ pana sālisūkupame upamāya attham pariārētvā dasseto: seyyathāpi bhikkhave tīādīnāhātai [Mp E I 55.2-8]

potthakesu likhanti, tam Majjhimatthakathāya Vattha-sutta-vānanāya na sameti. tattha hi idam vuttam:

seyyathā pi bhikkhave vattan ti bhikkhave yathā vattoṃ, upamāvacanam ev’ etam. upamaṃ karonto ca bhagavā kattha ci pāthamaṃ yeva upamaṃ246 dassetvā pacchā attham dasseti, kattha ci pāthamaṃ attham dassetvā pacchā upamaṃ, kattha ci upamāya attham pariārētvā dasseti, kattha ci aththena upamaṃ. 247

tatha h’ esa:

seyyathā pi-ssu bhikkhave dve agārā sadvārā, tattha cakkhumā puriso majhe thito passeyya ti [M III 178,21-22]

sakalam pi Devādutasuttaṃ”248 upamaya attham parivaretva dassento aha. svāyaṃ idha pāthamaṃ upamaṃ dassetvā pacchā atham dasseti ti. [cf. Ps I 165,28-66,18]

ettha hi Culasāropamādisu pāthamaṃ upamaṃ vatvā tadantarām upameyyatham vatvā puna upamaṃ vadanto: upamaṃ atham pariārētvā dasseti ti vutto. Alagaddusuttadisu249 pana atham pāthamaṃ upamaṃ vatvā tadantarām upamaṃ vatvā puna atham vadanto:

athan upamaṃ pariārētvā dasseti ti vutto. tena Vatthasutta-Linathappakāsiniyam vuttam:

upameyyatham pāthamaṃ250 vatvā tadantarām atham vatvā puna upamaṃ vadanto:

“upamaṃ atham pariārētvā dasseti” [Ps I 166,2] ti vutto.


242 Pānicamassā pathāme upamā va opamamaṃ, so eva aththo opamattam.243 tasmāṃ opamattam [55,1] bodhetabbe nipāto [55,1].

seyyathā pi [55,1] ti yathā ti aththo. ettha ca:

tatra bhagavā kattha ci aththena upamaṃ pariārētvā dasseti Vatthasutte viya, Pāricchattakopama-Aggikkhandhopamādisuttesu viya ca. kattha ci upamāya attham pariārētvā dasseti Lōnambilasutte viya Suvaṇṇakārasatta244. Suriyopamādisuttesu245 viya ca. imasmīṃ pana sālisūkupame upamāya attham pariārētvā dasseto: seyyathāpi bhikkhave tīādīnāhātai [Mp E I 55.2-8]

potthakesu likhanti, tam Majjhimatthakathāya Vattha-sutta-vānanāya na sameti. tattha hi idam vuttam:

seyyathā pi bhikkhave vattan ti bhikkhave yathā vattoṃ, upamāvacanam ev’ etam. upamaṃ karonto ca bhagavā kattha ci pāthamaṃ yeva upamaṃ246 dassetvā pacchā attham dasseti, kattha ci pāthamaṃ attham dassetvā pacchā upamaṃ, kattha ci upamāya attham pariārētvā dasseti, kattha ci aththena upamaṃ. 247

tatha h’ esa:

seyyathā pi-ssu bhikkhave dve agārā sadvārā, tattha cakkhumā puriso majhe thito passeyya ti [M III 178,21-22]

sakalam pi Devādutasuttaṃ”248 upamaya attham parivaretva dassento aha. svāyaṃ idha pāthamaṃ upamaṃ dassetvā pacchā atham dasseti ti. [cf. Ps I 165,28-66,18]
tattha Vatthasutte tāva:

seyyathā pi bhikkhave vattham sankiliṭṭhaṃ malagghitāṃ, tam enaṃ rajako yasmin yasmin rāngajāte upasamhareyya, yadi nilakāya, yadi pītakāya, yadi lohitakāya, yadi mañjiṭṭhakāya, durattavāṇṇam ev' assa, aparīsuuddhavaṇṇam ev' assa. taṃ kissa hetu. aparīsuuddhābhikkhave vatthassa. evam eva kho bhikkhave citte sankiliṭṭhe duggati pāṭikannkhā ti [M I 36,15-21]

ādinā paṭhamāṇaṃ upaṃsaṃ dasseṭṭvā pācchā upameyyattho vutto; na pana paṭhamāṇaṃ atthāṃ vatvā tadanantarāṃ upaṃsaṃ dasseṭṭvā puna aththo vutto, yena kathā ci atthena upaṃsaṃ parivāreṭvā dasseti Vatthasutte viyā [55.2-3] ti vadeyya.

tathā Pāricchattakopame pi:

yasmin bhikkhave samaye devanāṃ Tavatimsānaṃ pāricchattako kovilāro paṇḍupalāso hoti, attaranā bhikkhave devā Tavatimsā tasmiṃ samaye honti: paṇḍupalāso dāni pāricchattako kovilāro, na cirass' eva dāni pannapalāso bhikkhave samaye devanāṃ Tavatimsānaṃ pāricchattako kovilāro paṇḍupalāso hoti, attaranā bhikkhave devā Tavatimsā tasmiṃ samaye honti: paṇḍupalāso dāni pāricchattako kovilāro, na cirass' eva dāni pannapalāso [522] bhavissati ... pe ... evam eva kho bhikkhave yasmin samaye ariyasāvako agaṃasmā anāgāriyaṃ pabbajjāya ceteti, paṇḍupalāso bhikkhave ariyasāvako tasmiṃ samaye hoti ti [A IV 117,5-18,16]

ādinā paṭhamāṇaṃ upaṃsaṃ dasseṭṭvā pācchā attho vutto.

Aggikkhandhopame:

passathā no tumhe bhikkhave amuṃ mahantaṃ aggikkhandhaṃ ādittāṃ sampajjalitaṃ sajotibhūtan ti. evam bhante ti. tam kiṃ maṃñāatha bhikkhave katamnuṃ y游客 amuṃ mahantaṃ aggikkhandhaṃ ādittāṃ sampajjalitaṃ sajotibhūtan ā-liṅgetvā upaniṣideyya va upaniṣideyya va, yāṃ khattiyakaṅñaṃ va brahmaṅkaṅñaṃ va gaṅgapatikaṅñaṃ va mudutalunahatthapādāṃ ā-liṅgetvā upaniṣideyya va upaniṣideyya va ti [A IV 128,7-15]

ādinā paṭhamāṇaṃ upaṃsaṃ yeva dasseṭṭvā pācchā attho vutto, na pana paṭhamāṇaṃ atthāṃ vatvā tadanantarāṃ upaṃsaṃ dasseṭṭvā puna attho vutto. tasmiṃ kathā ci atthena upaṃsaṃ parivāreṭvā dasseti


Vatthasutte viyā Pāricchattakopama-Aggikkhandhopamsādisuttesu viyā cā [55.2-4] ti na vattabbāṃ.

keci pan' ettha evaṃ vannayanti:

atthāṃ paṭhamāṇaṃ vatvā pacchā ca upaṃsaṃ dassento attthena upaṃsaṃ parivāreṭvā dasseti [55.1] nāma, upaṃsaṃ pana paṭhamāṇaṃ vatvā pacchā atthāṃ dassento upaṃsāya atthāṃ parivāreṭvā dasseti [55.4-5] nāma, tadubhavāssa pi āgataṭṭhānaṃ nidassento Vatthasutte viyā [55.3] ti ādīm āhā ti. [cf. Anathavaggo (Mp-pt), par. (1) above 254]


Loṇambilasutte pi hi:

seyyathā pi bhikkhave paṇḍito byatto 255 kusalo sūdo rājānaṃ va rājamahāmattam va nānaccayehi 256 sūpehi paccupattihito assa ambilaggehi pi titakaggehi pi katukaggehi pi madhuraggehi pi khārīkehi pi akhārīkehi pi lonikehi pi aloṅikehi pi.

sa kho so bhikkhave paṇḍito byatto kusalo sūdo sakassa bhattassa nimittam ughanāhi: idam va me ajja bhattsāsāyaṃ ruccati, imassa va abhiharati, imassa va bhum ganhati, imassa va vanṇam bhāsati. ambilaggam va me ajja bhattsāsāyaṃ ruccati, ambilaggaṃ va abhiharati, ambilaggassa va bhum ganhati, ambilaggassa va vanṇam bhāsati ... pe ... aloṅikassa va vanṇam bhāsati ti.

sa kho so bhikkhave paṇḍito byatto kusalo sūdo lābbī c' eva hoti acchādannassa, lābbī vetanassā, lābbī abhihāraṇāṃ. taṃ kissa hetu. tathā hi so bhikkhave paṇḍito byatto kusalo sūdo sakassa bhattanimittam ughanāhi:

evam eva kho bhikkhave idh' ekacco paṇḍito byatto kusalo

253Mp-† so; Mp-† v.l. (= Mp-pt) omits 254This passage, here ascribed to keci, is clearly a citation from Mp-pt; see the beginning of Anathavaggo pāñceyyo above. 255Mp-† v.l.: byatto (here and below) 256Mp-† v.l.: nānaggarasehi
bhikkhu käye käyñupassi viharati ... pe ... vedanäsü ... pe ... citte ... pe ... dhammesu dhammänupassi viharati atäpi sampajaño stäma vineyya loke abhijjhädomanassäm. tassa dhammesu dhammänupassimo viharato cittañ samädhäyati, upakkilesä pahiyanti. so tañ nimittäm ugasäññäti.

sa kho bhikkhave paññito byatto kusalo bhikkhu läbhi c’ eva hoti diññh’ eva dhamme sakkhañäññamä, läbhi hoti satisampajaññàsä. tañ kisä hetu. täthä hi so bhikkhave paññito byatto kusalo bhikkhu sakassa cittäsä nimittäm ugasäññäti ti. [S V 151.5—52.10]

evam paññhäm upamäm dassetvä pacchä attho vutto.

Suvänñañkära—Suriyopamädisuttesu viya cä [cf. 55.5—6] ti idäñ ca udäharañnanattañ sanghañ gacchati Suvänñañkärasuttädisu paññhäm upamäya adassättä. etesu hi Suvänñañkäropamasutte täva:

adhicittam anuyutto bhikkhave bhikkhunä tîni nimittäni kälena käläm manasi kätabbäni, kälena käläm samäðhinimittäm manasi kätabbäm, kälena käläm paggahänimittäm manasi kätabbäm, kälena käläm upekkhänimittäm manasi kätabbäm.

saçe bhikkhave adhicittam anuyutto bhikkhu ekantäm samäðhinimittäm yeva manasi kareyya, thänam tañ cittäm kosajjäya samvätteyya. saçe bhikkhave adhicittam anuyutto bhikkhu ekantäm paggahänimittäm yeva manasi kareyya, thänam tañ cittäm uddhacciäya samvätteyya. saçe bhikkhave adhicittam anuyutto bhikkhu ekantäm upekkhänimittäm yeva manasi kareyya, thänam tañ cittäm na samä samäðhiyäya äsävänäm khaäyä. yato ca kho bhikkhave adhicittam anuyutto bhikkhu käläna käläna samäðhinimittäm ... pe ... paggahänimittäm ... pe ... upekkhänimittäm manasi karoti, tañ hoti cittäm mudüñ ca kamämiyäñ ca pabhassaräñ ca, na ca pabhängu, samä samäðhiyäti äsävänäm khaäyä.

seyäthä pi bhikkhave suvänñañkäro vë suvänñañkäran teväsi vë ukkañ bandhäti, ukkañ bandhivetä ukkämukhañ älimpeti, ukkämukhañ älimpetvä sanäñäsa jätäruäpañ gahetvä ukkämukhe
dhammänañ to bhikkhave ekantäm samäðhinimittäm yeva manasi kareyya, thänam tañ cittäm kosajjäya samvätteyya. saçe bhikkhave adhicittam anuyutto bhikkhu ekantäm paggahänimittäm yeva manasi kareyya, thänam tañ cittäm uddhacciäya samvätteyya. saçe bhikkhave adhicittam anuyutto bhikkhu ekantäm upekkhänimittäm yeva manasi kareyya, thänam tañ cittäm na samä samäðhiyäya äsävänäm khaäyä. yato ca kho bhikkhave adhicittam anuyutto bhikkhu käläna käläna samäðhinimittäm ... pe ... paggahänimittäm ... pe ... upekkhänimittäm manasi karoti, tañ hoti cittäm mudüñ ca kamämiyäñ ca pabhassaräñ ca, na ca pabhängu, samä samäðhiyäti äsävänäm khaäyä.

seyyäthä pi bhikkhave suvänñañkäro vë suvänñañkärañ teväsi vë ukkañ bandhäti, ukkañ bandhivetä ukkämukhañ älimpeti, ukkämukhañ älimpetvä sanäñäsa jätäruäpañ gahetvä ukkämukhe

257A: kamämiyäñ

258A: nibäyäyä
259A: giäyyäke
260A: kho so (for: so kho)
261A: (= Mp-† v.l.) omits: kadä ci karäha ci dighassa addhuno accayena
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avassante ye keci 'me bijagāmabhūtagāmā 262 osadhitīṇavananappatayo, te ussessanti visussanti 263 na bhavanti. evam aniccā bhikkhave saṅkhārā, evam adhuvā bhikkhave saṅkhārā, evam anassāsikā bhikkhave saṅkhārā ti [A IV 100,5-18]

adhinā pathamaṁ atthaṁ dassetvā tadanantāraṁ upamaṁ vatvā puna pi attho vutto.
atha vā. 264

suriyassa bhikkhave udayato etam pubbāngamaṁ etam pubbaṁnimittam, yad idam arunuggam. evam eva kho bhikkhave bhikkhuno ariyassa aţhāṅgikassa maggassa uppādāya etam pubbāngamaṁ etam pubbaṁnimittam, yad idam kalyāṇamittatā ti [S V 29,27-30,3]
yad etam Samyuttanikāyā āgatam, tam idaṁ Suriyopamasuttan ti adhippetam siyā. tam pi kattha ci upamāya atthaṁ parivāretvā dassetī [55,4-5] ti iminā na sameti pathamaṁ upamaṁ vatvā tadanantāraṁ atthaṁ dassetvā puna upamāya avuttattā. pathamaṁ eva hi tattha upamaṁ dassitā, imasmiṁ pana sālisūkopame upamāya atthaṁ parivāretvā dassento seyyathā pi bhikkhave ti ādīm āhā [55,7-8] ti idam pi vacanam asaṅghahaṁ Vatthasuttassa imissas vissabhāvato. ubhayathāpi hi pathamaṁ upamaṁ dassetvā pacchā attho vutto, tasmā evam ettha pāṭhena bhavitabbam:

tatra bhagavaṁ kattha ci pathamaṁ yeva upamaṁ 265 dassetvā pacchā atthaṁ dassetvā Vatthasutte viyā Pāricchattakopama-Aggikkhandhopamādisuttesu viyā ca, kattha ci athānaṁ upamaṁ parivāretvā dassetī Suvaṇṇakāra-Sattasuriyopamādisuttesu viyā, imasmiṁ pana sālisūkopame pathamaṁ upamaṁ dassetvā pacchā atthaṁ dassento seyyathā pi bhikkhave ti ādīm āhā ti. [cf. Mp I 55,2-8]


(2) [see Part II, 2, p. 94, n. 217 above]

vahasatanam 266 kho mahārāja vihiṇān [59,22] ti pothakesu likhanti,
vahasataṁ kho mahārāja vihiṇān ti [Mil 102,10-11; cf. Mil-ṭ 22,19-26]

3. Mp-pt and Mp-ṭ: Differences and similarities

The above three chapters from Mp-pt and their parallels from Mp-ṭ are relatively short and final conclusions will be drawn only after a critical edition of the entire manuscript of Mp-pt is completed. However, the differences and similarities between the two tikās nevertheless seem to agree to a great extent with the description of the old and later tikās in Saddhamma-s. 267

Although the texts from Mp-pt and Mp-ṭ given in Part II, 2 are sometimes identical or very similar, the later tikā (Mp-ṭ) is in many respects very different from the old one (Mp-pt). As stated above (Part II, 1) the text on the first few folios of the newly discovered manuscript of Mp-pt is exactly the same (with minor orthographic differences) as in the other three "old" tikās (Sv-pt, Ps-pt, Spk-pt) and in this respect differs considerably from Mp-ṭ. This is a very strong indication that the manuscript of Mp-pt discussed here really belongs to the old Linatthapakāsinī set. The later tikā (Mp-ṭ) has several additions, corrections or omissions.

In Mp-ṭ three kinds of additions can be found:

1. Some additions are used to clarify the structure of the text; such additions are usually in the beginning of the tikā on a particular sutta from a particular vagga where the numbers of that sutta and vagga are

266 = Mp E°, B° 1958, C° 1923, N° 1976; Mil E°, B° 1982, N° 1979 (= Mp N° v.l.): vahasataṁ
267 See Part I, 1.1 above (especially nn. 18-21).
added. For example, in Part II, p. 87, n. 90, where in Mp-t tatiyassa [vaggassa] pathame [sutte] is added before abhāvitan ti.²⁶⁸

(2) Some additions are further clarifications of already existing explanations.²⁶⁹

(3) Some additions are explanations of additional words from Mp that are not included in Mp-pt.²⁷⁰

Among the corrections²⁷¹ of the old tikā (Mp-pt) found in Mp-t the most important is a long passage²⁷² that thoroughly analyses and corrects both the Mp-pt (the first paragraph of Anathavagga)²⁷³ and a passage from Mp that the old tikā (Mp-pt) comments upon. At the end it also suggests a better reading for the passage from Mp²⁷⁴ which the old tikā (Mp-pt) does not explain properly. This correction is much longer than the first paragraph of Anathavagga that it replaces. It is very interesting to note that Mp-t cites, among many canonical and postcanonical texts, including Ps and Ps-pt, also the first paragraph of Anathavagga from Mp-pt (i.e. the passage that it replaces) and introduces it with: keci pan' ettha evam vannayanti.²⁷⁵ This is very significant because Ps-pt, for example, is introduced with: tena Vatthasutta-Linathappakāsini-yam vuttam,²⁷⁶ but a passage from Mp-pt — another tikā from the same Linathapakāsini set — is simply ascribed to “some” (keci). Sāriputta of Polonnaruva, to whom Mp-t is ascribed,²⁷⁷ obviously considered this passage from Mp-pt to be one of the versions maintained by “some” (keci).²⁷⁸

In Mp-t certain passages from Mp-pt are omitted; some of these passages²⁷⁹ should perhaps be included in Mp-t and the reasons for their omission are not clear. However, they do not seem to be as significant as the additions and corrections discussed above.

The above comparison shows that the later tikā (Mp-t) is better organized (anākula) and more comprehensive (paripuṇṇa) than the old one (Mp-pt).²⁸⁰

Conclusion

From the above discussion of the nikāya-tikās, their manuscripts and printed editions — with special emphasis on the two Aṅguttara-tikās (Mp-pt and Mp-t; see Part I, 2.2 and Part II) — we can conclude that it is most probable that two different sets of nikāya-tikās were in fact compiled: the older set called Linathapakāsini (Sv-pt, Ps-pt, Spk-pt, Mp-pt) and the later set called Sāratthamajjusā (Sv-t, Ps-t, Spk-t, Mp-t). Although the two complete sets are mentioned only in Saddhamma-s (and in the much later CPD, see Part I, Table 1), all the eight tikās from the two sets seem to still exist (see Part I, Table II) either in printed editions (Sv-pt, Ps-pt, Spk-pt, Mp-pt, see Part I, 2.1) or in manuscript form (Sv-t, Ps-t, Spk-t, Mp-pt, see Part I, 2.2–3). The manuscripts of Sv-t, Ps-t, Spk-t and Mp-pt discussed in Part I, 2.2–3²⁸¹

²⁶⁸Similarly also Part II, nn. 98, 101, 113, 127, etc. Such additions are very common in Mp-t — and this is also perhaps one of the reasons why in Saddhamma-s the later tikās are described as “clear, not confused” (anākula).

²⁶⁹See, for example, Part II, 2, nn. 150–51; also nn. 177–79.

²⁷⁰See Part II, 2, n. 218 and endnote (2); this addition is obviously explaining another “version” (bhāsantara?) of Mil cited in Mp.

²⁷¹See Part II, 2, nn. 94, 141, 179, 193.

²⁷²Part II, 2, p. 96, endnote (1) = Mp-t II 40.1–52.5.

²⁷³See Part II, 2, n. 141, and endnote (1).

²⁷⁴Cf. Mp E I 55.2–8 and the corrected version of this passage at the end of endnote (1) in Part II, 2.

²⁷⁵Mp-t II 55.2–8, cf. Part II, 2, n. 141 and endnote (1).

²⁷⁶Mp-t II 42.10.


²⁷⁸Cf. Saddhamma-s 61.13–14; Sp-t B⁵ 1960 29-10.

²⁷⁹See Part II, 2, nn. 119, 129, 130, 189.

²⁸⁰This comparison is of course very limited and it is not clear how “incomplete” (aparipuṇṇa) the original Mp-pt actually was. The Burmese manuscript of Mp-pt discussed above contains only the first three nipātas with many longer omissions (see Part I, 2.2 and Part II, 1) and the manuscript listed in Pit-sm (1989) nos. 199–201 also contains the first three nipātas only (see Part I, 1.6).

²⁸¹Although all the manuscripts of three later nikāya-tikās (Sv-t, Ps-t, Spk-t) are
have never been investigated and it seems that they have been neglected by both the Theravāda tradition and modern Pāli scholarship.

held in Sri Lanka (see Part I, 2.3), there is among them also a Burmese manuscript of Ps-t (LPP, vol. 1, p. 71, temple no. 326) which indicates that these tīkās were used in Burma as well.

It is possible that more manuscripts of these tīkās are still extant, most probably in Theravāda countries. According to U Nyunt Maung, Manuscript Consultant, Universities Historical Research Centre, University of Rangoon, “there are still many uncatalogued manuscripts of Pāli tīkās in temple libraries in Burma” (personal communication, Rangoon, December 1999).

It is not made explicit why certain tīkās (Sv-t, Ps-t, Spk-t, Mp-pt) were ignored by the Theravāda tradition (see e.g. Chatthasangayana editions) and only some (Sv-pt, Ps-pt, Spk-pt, Mp-t) were published — in spite of the fact that the manuscripts of the unpublished tīkās are held in different libraries in Burma and Sri Lanka and according to the introduction in the Chatthasangayana editions “all the existing tīkās” were collected and compared (see n. 80 above). In the Nidānakathā of Mp-t B° 1961 (p. ca) it is clearly stated that all the existing tīkās in Burma and outside Burma were edited and published:

evam sangītīm āropiśatassa pana tepītaṇassa buddhavaccanassā athha- 

samāvānaṇābhūtā yā ca atṭakhāthāya samvījjanī yā ca tāsaṃ attha-

ppakāsanaṇasena pavattā tīkāyo samvījjanī manoraṇyā tattanayaṇučcā-

vīkāya bhāsāya ācariy’ Ananda-ācariya-Dhammapālādīhi theravarehi 

katā,

tāsaṃ pi atṭakhathāṭkānāṃ sadesīyamālehi c’ eva videsīyamālehi ca 

samsanditvā tepītaṇāsā viya buddhavaccanassā visodhanapavijitasodhana-

vasena maṭhārā pāvacaṇadassino samvaṇṇanākoviḍā pāṭhasodhanan 

akamṣa,

ic evam atṭakhathāṭkāyātā namādakhalitaṭhikaparībhāṭṭhāṭnam 

nirākatvasenasa visodhitā c’ eva paviṇivitiḥ ca hūtvā Buddhāsāna-

muddanayantālaye samappitā suḥtu muddapāṇāya.

This contradicts the information about the manuscripts of the nikāya-tīkās discussed above (see Part I, Table II). If the Chatthasangayana edited “all the existing [nikāya] tīkās” (yā ca tāsaṃ atthapakkāsanaṇasena pavattā tīkāyo samvījjanī) “originating from Burma and from outside” (sadesīyamālehi c’ eva videsīyamālehi ca samsanditvā), why were the manuscripts of Sv-t, Ps-t, Spk-t and Mp-pt omitted? Further research is needed here.

Modern Pāli scholarship seems to agree to some extent with the Theravāda tradition (i.e. the Chatthasangayana editions) that most probably only one set of nikāya-tīkās (i.e. Sv-pt, Ps-pt, Spk-pt and Mp-t) still exists at present.
nikāya-ṭikās discussed above — especially considering Sv-ṭ, Ps-ṭ, Spk-ṭ and Mp-ṭ, which are usually mentioned as lost or non-existent — the information in the oldest bibliographic source (Saddhamma-s) appears to be the most reliable of all (cf. Part I, Tables I–II).

The above analysis of the nikāya-ṭikās and their manuscripts and printed editions clearly indicates that further research about the Pāli sub-commentaries and their bibliographic information needs to be done. It is possible that more manuscripts of the less known nikāya-ṭikās (i.e., Sv-ṭ, Ps-ṭ, Spk-ṭ, Mp-ṭ) are held in various temple libraries in the Theravāda countries. These āṭikās are an important link in Pāli textual transmission and their further investigation may give us — among many other things — new information about the development of the āṭikā literature and about the editions and versions of the canonical and post-canonical Pāli texts used at the time of their compilation.

Primoz Pecenko
Brisbane
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### Abbreviations


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td>Anguttara-nikāya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B MS(S)</strong></td>
<td>Burmese manuscript(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bhb</strong></td>
<td>Bhāratiya Bauddhācaryayā. Colombo: K.M. Ratnasiri, 1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C MS(S)</strong></td>
<td>Sinhalese manuscript(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CPD</strong></td>
<td>Critical Pāli Dictionary. V. Trenckner et al., eds. Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, 1924–.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CS CD-ROM</strong></td>
<td>Chattha Sangāyana CD-ROM (Versions: 1.1, 2.0, 3.0) published by Vipassana Research Institute (Website: &lt;www.vri.dhamma.org&gt;).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td>Dīgha-nikāya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dhs</strong></td>
<td>Dhammasaṅgaṇī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DPPN</strong></td>
<td>Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EncBuddh</strong></td>
<td>Encyclopedia of Buddhism. G.P. Malalasekera, ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gv</strong></td>
<td>Gandhāvamsa. I.P. Minayeff, ed. <em>JPTS</em>, 1886, pp. 54–79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIL</strong></td>
<td>J. Gonda, ed. <em>A History of Indian Literature</em>. Wiesbaden, 1973–.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>K MS(S)</strong></td>
<td>Cambodian manuscript(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
<td>Majjhima-nikāya</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Mayrhofer, Manfred** | Mayrhofer, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindo-