

The Theravāda Tradition and Modern Pāli Scholarship: A Case of “Lost” Manuscripts Mentioned in Old Pāli Bibliographical Sources

Primoz Pecenko

Director, Center for Buddhist Studies
University of Queensland

Abstract

In this article I will discuss my research of the Pāli subcommentaries (*ṭīkā*) on the first four *nikāyas* and show that there exist two sets of such subcommentaries and not just a single set which we have in printed form (Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana edition). The works of modern Pāli scholarship, which in this case agree with the Theravāda tradition, also usually mention only one set of the subcommentaries. However, according to some Pāli bibliographic sources and catalogues of Pāli manuscripts held in various libraries in Burma and Sri Lanka, there seem to exist another set of the subcommentaries on the four *nikāyas* which has been ignored/omitted by the Theravāda tradition and also considered either “lost” or “non-existent” by modern Pāli scholarship.

My recent discovery of a Pāli manuscript of one of the “lost” subcommentaries in Burma gives a completely new perspective on the historical development of the two sets of the subcommentaries and, in a wider sense, also on our understanding of the available information about the history of Pāli literature. I will attempt to discuss the following important issues which resulted from this discovery:

The existence of the “lost” manuscript proves that the information in some older Pāli bibliographic sources—where both sets are mentioned—is correct and that both the Theravāda tradition as well as modern Pāli scholarship ignored the “lost” texts and the bibliographic information about them. Why?

The analysis of the available printed editions and catalogued manuscripts also indicates that the information on the subcommentaries given in the works of modern Pāli scholarship seems to be influenced by the traditional Theravāda scholarship (both mention only one set)—although the information on the “lost” texts was easily available.

My discovery of the above mentioned manuscript, which is listed in the oldest

Pāli bibliographic text (*Saddhammasaṅgaha*), also proves that this bibliographic text—often considered less reliable by modern Pāli scholarship—seems to be much more reliable than the later bibliographic sources (e.g. *Sāsanavaṃsa*) which have been used as main sources for modern history of Pāli literature. Therefore the sources for the available history of Pāli literature need to be re-examined in the light of the information given in the older bibliographic texts, catalogues of Pāli manuscripts, inscriptions, and the texts which—although existing in manuscript form—have not been researched yet.

Considering all this, our understanding of the traditional Theravāda transmission of Pāli texts will have to be re-examined as well.

Key words: 1. Theravāda Buddhism 2. Pāli Subcommentaries
3. Pāli Bibliographies 4. Textual Transmission
5. Pāli Manuscripts

Contents

Part 1: The Aṭṭhakathās and Ṭīkās on the Four Nikāyas

Part 2: The Ṭīkās in Pāli Bibliographic Sources

2.1. Saddhammasaṅgaha

2.2. The Pagan inscription

2.3. Gandhavaṃsa

2.4. Sāsanavaṃsa

2.5. Sāsanavaṃsadīpa

2.6. Piṭakat samuiṅ

2.7. Critical Pāli Dictionary

Part 3: Printed Editions and Manuscripts of the Ṭīkās

Conclusions

Abbreviations

In this article I will discuss my research of the Pāli subcommentaries (*ṭīkā*)¹ on the first four nikāyas and show that there exist two sets of such subcommentaries and not just a single set which we have in printed form (Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana edition). The works of modern Pāli scholarship,² which in this case agree with the Theravāda tradition, also usually mention only one set of the subcommentaries. However, according to some Pāli bibliographic sources and catalogues of Pāli manuscripts³ held in various libraries in Burma and Sri Lanka, there seem to exist another set of the subcommentaries on the four nikāyas which has been ignored/omitted by the Theravāda tradition and also considered either “lost” or “non-existent” by modern Pāli scholarship.

My recent discovery of a Pāli manuscript of one of the “lost” subcommentaries in Burma⁴ gives a completely new perspective on the historical development of the two sets of the subcommentaries and, in a wider sense, also on our understanding of the available information about the history of Pāli literature. I will attempt to discuss the following important issues which resulted from this discovery:

The existence of the “lost” manuscript proves that the information in some older Pāli bibliographic sources—where both sets are mentioned—is correct and

¹ For the etymology of the word *ṭīkā* see M. Mayrhofer, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1986) s.v. See also PLC, pp. 192–93; K.R. Norman, *Pāli Literature* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1983), pp. 148–51 [from now on: K.R. Norman, PL]; W.B. Bollée, “Die Stellung der Vinayaṭīkā in der Pāli-Literatur,” ZDMG, Suppl. 1, 17 (1969), pp. 824–35; Oskar von Hinüber, *A Handbook of Pāli Literature* (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1996), pp. 100–101 [from now on: O.v. Hinüber, HPL].

² For example, O.v. Hinüber, HPL.

³ Bibliographic sources: *Saddhammasaṅgaha* (Saddhamma-s; edited by Nedimāle Saddhānanda, JPTS 1890, pp. 21–90 = Ne 1961); Pagan inscription (edition: G. H. Luce and Tin Htway, “A 15th Century Inscription and Library at Pagan, Burma” in *Malalasekera Commemoration Volume* [Colombo: The Malalasekera Commemoration Volume Editorial Committee, 1976], pp. 203–217); *Gandhavaṃsa* (Gv; edited by I.P. Minayeff, JPTS, 1886, pp. 54–79); *Sāsanavaṃsa* (Sās Ne; edited by C.S. Upasak, Nālandā: Nava Nālandā Mahāvihāra, 1961); *Sāsanavaṃsadīpa* (Sās-dip Ce; edited by Vimalasārathera, Colombo: Satthāloka Press, 1880); *Piṭakat samuiṅ* (Piṭ-sm; edition: Rangoon: Tipiṭakanikāya Sāsanaṅ Pru Aphvai, 1989); *Critical Pāli Dictionary* (CPD; edited by V. Trenckner et al., Copenhagen: Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, 1924–); catalogues: K.D. Sōmadāsa, *Laṅkāvē puskola pot nāmāvaliya*, Vols. I–III (Colombo: Department of Cultural Affairs, 1959–64); *Piṭakat samuiṅ3* (Rangoon: Tipiṭakanikāya Sāsanaṅ Pru Aphvai1, 1989). Piṭ-sm is both a bibliographic source and a catalogue (see Part 2, 2.6. and Part 3 below).

⁴ The manuscript is described in detail in Primoz Pecenko, “Līnatthapakāsini and Sāratthamañjūsā: The Purāṇaṭīkā and the Ṭīkā on the Four Nikāyas,” JPTS 27 (2002), pp. 82–85.

that both the Theravāda tradition as well as modern Pāli scholarship ignored the “lost” texts and the bibliographic information about them. Why?

The analysis of the available printed editions and catalogued manuscripts also indicates that the information on the subcommentaries given in the works of modern Pali scholarship seems to be influenced by the traditional Theravāda scholarship (both mention only one set)—although the information on the “lost” texts was easily available.

My discovery of the above mentioned manuscript, which is listed in the oldest Pāli bibliographic text (*Saddhammasaṅgaha*), also proves that this bibliographic text—often considered less reliable by modern Pāli scholarship—seems to be much more reliable than the later bibliographic sources (e.g. *Sāsanavaṃsa*) which have been used as main sources for modern history of Pāli literature. Therefore the sources for the available history of Pāli literature need to be re-examined in the light of the information given in the older bibliographic texts, catalogues of Pāli manuscripts, inscriptions, and the texts which—although existing in manuscript form—have not been researched yet.

Considering all this, our understanding of the traditional Theravāda transmission of Pāli texts will have to be re-examined as well.

Part 1: The Aṭṭhakathās and Ṭīkās on the Four Nikāyas

Each of the four *nikāyas* has a commentary (*aṭṭhakathā*) compiled by Buddhaghosa in the fifth century CE in Sri Lanka (see Table 1.1. below), and the four commentaries have two sets of subcommentaries, the older ones (*purāṇaṭṭikā*), collectively called *Līnatthapakāsinī* (see Table 1.2. below), and the later ones (*ṭīkā*), collectively called *Sāratthamañjūsā* (see Table 1.3. below).

Table 1.1. Commentaries (*aṭṭhakathā*) on the four *nikāyas*

Pāli canon (four <i>nikāyas</i>) First written down 1st cent. BCE in Sri Lanka	Commentaries (<i>aṭṭhakathā</i>) Compiled 5th cent. CE by Buddhaghosa
Dīghanikāya (DN)	Sumaṅgalavilāsinī (Sv)
Majjhimanikāya (MN)	Papañcasūdanī (Ps)
Saṃyuttanikāya (SN)	Sāratthapakāsinī (Spk)
Anguttaranikāya (AN)	Manorathapūraṇī (Mp)

Table 1.2. The old subcommentaries (*purāṇaṭīkā*) on the four *nikāyas*

<i>Nikāya / Aṭṭhakathā</i>	Old subcommentaries (<i>purāṇaṭīkā=pt</i>) Compiled 6th–9th century CE by Dhammapāla
Dīghanikāya / Sumaṅgalavilāsini	Sumaṅgalavilāsiniṭīkā (Sv-pt), Paṭhamā Līnatthapakāsini [I]
Majjhimanikāya / Papañcasūdanī	Papañcasūdanīṭīkā (Ps-pt), Dutiya Līnatthapakāsini [II]
Samyuttanikāya / Sāratthapakāsini	Sāratthapakāsiniṭīkā (Spk-pt), Tatiya Līnatthapakāsini [III]
Anguttaranikāya / Manorathapūraṇī	Manorathapūraṇīṭīkā (Mp-pt), Catutthā Līnatthapakāsini [IV]

Table 1.3. The (later) subcommentaries (*ṭīkā*) on the four *nikāyas*

<i>Nikāya / Aṭṭhakathā</i>	(Later) subcommentaries (<i>ṭīkā = t</i>) Compiled 12th century CE by Sāriputta
Dīghanikāya / Sumaṅgalavilāsini	Sumaṅgalavilāsiniṭīkā (Sv-t), Paṭhamā Sāratthamañjūsā [I]
Majjhimanikāya / Papañcasūdanī	Papañcasūdanīṭīkā (Ps-t), Dutiya Sāratthamañjūsā [II]
Samyuttanikāya / Sāratthapakāsini	Sāratthapakāsiniṭīkā (Spk-t), Tatiya Sāratthamañjūsā [III]
Anguttaranikāya / Manorathapūraṇī	Manorathapūraṇīṭīkā (Mp-t), Catutthā Sāratthamañjūsā [IV]

The authorship of the *purāṇaṭīkā*s (*Līnatthapakāsini*) is usually ascribed to Dhammapāla⁵ and that of the later *ṭīkā*s (*Sāratthamañjūsā*) is ascribed to Sāriputta

⁵ On the date(s) and works of Dhammapāla(s) see O.v. Hinüber, HPL, pp. 167–170; A.P. Buddhadatta, “The Second Great Commentator” in *Corrections to Geiger Mahāvamsa* etc. (Ambalangoda: Ananda Book Company, 1957), pp. 189–97; *Bhāratīya Bauddhacāryayō* (Colombo: K.M. Ratnasiri, 1949), pp. 63–68; *Theravādi Bauddhacāryayō* (Ambalangoda: S.K. Candratilaka, 1960), pp. 54–55; H. Dhammaratana Thera, *Buddhism in South India*, The Wheel Publication No. 124/125 (Kandy: Buddhist Publication Society, 1968), pp. 40–41; Lily de Silva, “Introduction” in Sv-pt, pp. xli–lv; Supphan Na Bangchang, “Introduction” in *A Critical Edition of the Mūlapariyāyavagga of Majjhimanikāya-aṭṭhakathāṭīkā* (Ph.D. diss., Univ. of Peradeniya, 1981), pp. xxiv–xxxix; H. Saddhatissa, “Introduction” in Upās, pp. 28 foll.; L.S. Cousins, “Dhammapāla and the Ṭīkā literature” [review of Sv-pt, ed. by Lily de Silva], *Religion* 2, pt. 1 (1972): pp. 159–65; A. Peiris, “The Colophon to the Paramatthamañjūsā and the Discussion on the Date of Ācariya Dhammapāla” in *Buddhism in Ceylon and Studies on Religious Syncretism in Buddhist Countries*, ed. by H. Bechert (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978), pp. 61–77; *EncBuddh*, vol. 4, fasc. 4, pp. 501–504; A.K. Warder, “Some Problems of the Later Pali Literature,” *JPTS* 9 (1981), pp. 198–207; P. Jackson, “A Note on Dhammapāla(s),” *JPTS* 15 (1990), pp. 209–211.

of Poḷonnaruva.⁶ Although according to some catalogues⁷ of Pāli manuscripts held in various libraries in Burma and Sri Lanka, both sets of *ṭīkās* exist in manuscript form, only the *ṭīkās* belonging to the single combined set (see Table 1.4 below) have been published and the remaining ones (see Tables 1.5–6 below) have not been investigated at all.

The two sets of subcommentaries on the first four *nikāyas* are mentioned in Pāli bibliographical sources (see p. 1, n. 3 above) in the following three ways:

First, as a single set consisting of the first three *ṭīkās* from the old set, called *Līnatthapakāsinī*, and the fourth *ṭīkā* from the later set, called *Sāratthamañjūsā*:

Table 1.4. One combined set of subcommentaries.

Pāli Canon Four <i>nikāyas</i>	Commentaries	Old subcomment. (<i>purāṇaṭṭīkā</i> = pṭ)	(Later) subcomment. (<i>ṭīkā</i> = ṭ)
Dīghanikāya	Sumaṅgalavilāsinī	Līnatthapakāsinī I	
Majjhimanikāya	Papañcasūdanī	Līnatthapakāsinī II	
Samyuttanikāya	Sāratthapakāsinī	Līnatthapakāsinī III	
Aṅguttaranikāya	Manorathapūraṇī		Sāratthamañjūsā IV

The set in Table 1.4 above was approved and published by the Sixth Council (Chaṭṭha-saṅgāyana).

Second, as one complete set of the old *ṭīkās* with an additional later *ṭīkā* on *Aṅguttara-nikāya*:

⁶ On Sāriputta of Poḷonnaruva see P. Pecenko, “Sāriputta and his works,” JPTS 23 (1997), pp. 159–179; O.v. Hinüber, HPL, pp. 172–173.

⁷ Here I mean the following two catalogues: 1) K.D. Sōmadāsa, *Laṅkāvē puskola pot nāmāvaliya*, Vols. I–III (Colombo: Department of Cultural Affairs, 1959–64), and 2) a very important Burmese bibliographic work which also refers to the manuscripts held in the National Library, Rangoon: *Piṭakat samuiṅ* (Rangoon: Tipiṭakanikāya Sāsana Pru Aphvai, 1989). Of course, these two catalogues, although sufficient for the topic of this article, do not list all the Pāli manuscripts that have not been investigated yet. Further research of old inscriptions and Pāli manuscripts is needed here and some work has already been done, see for example: U Than Tun, “An original inscription dated 10 September 1223 that king Badon copied on 27 October 1785,” *Études birmanes* (Paris: EFEO, 1998), pp. 37–55; Anne M. Blackburn, “Notes on Sri Lankan temple manuscripts collections,” JPTS 27 (2002), pp. 1–60; Oskar von Hinüber, “Chips from Buddhist workshops: Scribes and manuscripts from Northern Thailand,” JPTS 22 (1996), pp. 35–57; Oskar von Hinüber, “Remarks on list of books sent to Ceylon from Siam in the 18th century,” JPTS 12 (1988), pp. 175–83.

Table 1.5. A complete set of old subcommentaries with a later subcommentary

Pāli Canon Four <i>nikāyas</i>	Commentaries	Old subcomment. (<i>purāṇaṭṭikā</i> = pṭ)	[Later] subcomment. (<i>ṭikā</i> = ṭ)
Dīghanikāya	Sumaṅgalavilāsinī	<i>Līnatthapakāsinī I</i>	
Majjhimanikāya	Papañcasūdanī	<i>Līnatthapakāsinī II</i>	
Samyuttanikāya	Sāratthapakāsinī	<i>Līnatthapakāsinī III</i>	
Aṅguttaranikāya	Manorathapūraṇī	<i>Līnatthapakāsinī IV</i>	<i>Sāratthamañjūsā IV</i>

Here *Līnatthapakāsinī IV*, the old subcommentary on *Aṅguttaranikāya*, a manuscript of which was found in 1999 in Burma,⁸ is added to the Sixth Council's set.

Third, as two completely different sets:

Table 1.6. The two complete sets of subcommentaries on four *nikāyas*

Pāli Canon Four <i>nikāyas</i>	Commentaries	Old subcomment. (<i>purāṇaṭṭikā</i> = pṭ)	[Later] subcomment. (<i>ṭikā</i> = ṭ)
Dīghanikāya	Sumaṅgalavilāsinī	<i>Līnatthapakāsinī I</i>	<i>Sāratthamañjūsā I</i>
Majjhimanikāya	Papañcasūdanī	<i>Līnatthapakāsinī II</i>	<i>Sāratthamañjūsā II</i>
Samyuttanikāya	Sāratthapakāsinī	<i>Līnatthapakāsinī III</i>	<i>Sāratthamañjūsā III</i>
Aṅguttaranikāya	Manorathapūraṇī	<i>Līnatthapakāsinī IV</i>	<i>Sāratthamañjūsā IV</i>

Here three later subcommentaries on *Dīghanikāya*, *Majjhimanikāya* and *Samyuttanikāya* (*Sāratthamañjūsā I–III*), which are still in manuscript form, are added and thus we have two complete sets, a very different situation from the single set approved by the Sixth Council (see Table 1.4. above). In the next two sections (Part 2 and Part 3 below) I will analyse in detail the Pāli bibliographic sources and catalogues which mention the subcommentaries given in the Tables above.

⁸ At present I am working on a critical edition of this manuscript which will be published by the Pali Text Society. Three selected chapters from the manuscript were published in Primoz Pecenko, (2002), pp. 83–85.

Part 2: The *ṭikās* in Pāli Bibliographic Sources

2.1. Saddhammasaṅgaha⁹

In Saddhamma-s two sets of *ṭikās* on the four *nikāyas* are mentioned: *Līnatthapakāsini* and *Sāratthamañjūsā*. The *Līnatthapakāsini* was written by the *porāṇas*¹⁰ and was a subcommentary (*atthavaṇṇanā*) on the *atthakathās* of the entire *tipiṭaka*.¹¹ The second set of *ṭikās* on the first four *nikāyas* was called *Sāratthamañjūsā* and was compiled—as a part of the “new” compilation of *ṭikās* on the entire canon—during the reign of Parakkamabāhu I (1153–86) by the convocation of “elders” (*therā bhikkhū*)¹² presided over by *Diṃbulāgala Mahākassapattthera*, who was the first *saṅgharāja* in Ceylon and the most senior monk from Udumbaragirivihāra.¹³ The entire compilation was accomplished within one year.¹⁴

⁹ Cf. Primoz Pecenko (2002), pp. 63–66.

¹⁰ On *porāṇas* see Adikaram, EHBC, pp. 16–18; F. Lottermoser, “Quoted Verse Passages in the Works of Buddhaghosa: Contributions towards the Study of the Lost *Sīhaḷatthakathā* Literature” (Ph. D. diss., Univ. of Göttingen, 1982), pp. 209–13.

¹¹ Saddhamma-s 58, 28–29: *piṭakattayaṭṭhakathāya līnatthappakāsanatthaṃ atthavaṇṇanaṃ purāṇehi katam*. Although in this reference the *ṭikās* on the first four *nikāyas* are not listed explicitly it seems probable that they were called *Līnatthappakāsini*. H. Saddhatissa (“Introduction” in *Upās*, p. 47, n. 154) explains: “The *Līnatthavaṇṇanā* is also called *Līnatthappakāsini*. . . . The *Saddhammasaṅgaha* has freely used the word *atthavaṇṇanā* for *ṭikā* and further amplified it as the *atthavaṇṇanā* for the purpose of elucidating the hidden meanings (*Līnatthappakāsanatthaṃ atthavaṇṇanaṃ*).” Cf. the title of Sv-pt, ed. by Lily de Silva: *Dīghanikāyaṭṭhakathāṭikā Līnatthavaṇṇanā*.

¹² Cf. Saddhamma-s 59, 14–18: *atha kho therā bhikkhū . . . atthavaṇṇanaṃ ṭhapesuṃ*; 62, 13: *piṭakattayaṭṭikā ca ṭikācariyehi bhāsita* [v. 7].

The date of the assembly “is tentatively fixed at AD 1165” (V. Panditha, “Buddhism During the Polonnaruva Period” in *The Polonnaruva Period* (Dehiwala: Tisara Prakasakayo, 1973), p. 137). See also Mhv LXXII 2 foll.; LXXVIII 1–30; W. Geiger, “Introduction” in Mhv Trsl., pp. 28–29; Geiger, § 31 (literature), n. 4.

¹³ Saddhamma-s 59, 7: *Mahākassapatttherapamukhaṃ bhikkhusaṅghaṃ*; on *Mahākassapattthera* of Udumbaragirivihāra see also P. Pecenko, “Notes” in *Āṅguttaranikāyaṭṭikā* (Mp-ṭ Ee), vol. I, pp. 106–107, n. 1,5; PLC, pp. 176–77, 192–94; DPPN s.v. 2. *Mahā Kassapa*; A.P. Buddhadatta, *Theravādī Bauddhācāryayō* (Ambalamgoda: S.K. Candratilaka, 1960), pp. 75–77; H. Bechert, *Buddhismus, Staat und Gesellschaft* (Frankfurt: Alfred Metzner Verlag, 1966), vol. 1, p. 265.

¹⁴ Saddhamma-s 60, 25–27: *ayaṃ piṭakattṭhakathāya atthavaṇṇanā ekasaṃvaccharen’ eva niṭṭhita*.

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

tadanantaram suttantapiṭake Dīghanikāyaṭṭhakathāya Sumaṅgalavilāsiniyā atthavaṇṇanam ārabhitvā mūlabhāsāya Māgadhikāya niruttīyā paṭhama-Sāratthamañjūsā nāma atthavaṇṇanam ṭhapesuṃ. tathā Majjhimanikāyaṭṭhakathāya Papañcasūdanīyā . . . dutiya-Sāratthamañjūsā nāma atthavaṇṇanam ṭhapesuṃ. tathā Saṃyuttanikāyaṭṭhakathāya Sāratthapakāsaniyā . . . tatiya-Sāratthamañjūsā nāma atthavaṇṇanam ṭhapesuṃ. tathā Aṅguttaranikāyaṭṭhakathāya Manorathapūraṇīyā . . . catuttha-Sāratthamañjūsā nāma atthavaṇṇanam ṭhapesuṃ.¹⁵

Table 2.1. Two complete sets in *Saddhammasaṅgaha* (14th cent.)

Canon (4 <i>nikāyas</i>) First written in the 1st century BCE	Commentaries 5th century CE	Old sub-comment. (<i>purāṇaṭṭikā</i> = <i>pt</i>) 6th–9th century CE Authorship: <i>porāṇas</i>	Later subcomment. (<i>ṭikā</i> = <i>ṭ</i>) 12th century CE Authorship: <i>theras</i>
Dīghanikāya	Sumaṅgalavilāsini	Līnatthapakāsini	Sāratthamañjūsā I
Majjhimanikāya	Papañcasūdanī	Līnatthapakāsini	Sāratthamañjūsā II
Saṃyuttanikāya	Sāratthapakāsini	Līnatthapakāsini	Sāratthamañjūsā III
Aṅguttaranikāya	Manorathapūraṇī	Līnatthapakāsini	Sāratthamañjūsā IV

Saddhamma-s explains that the second set of *ṭikās* (*Sāratthamañjūsā*) was written because the existing set (*Līnatthapakāsini*) “did not serve the purpose of bhikkhus residing in different countries,”¹⁶ the reason being that many *Gaṇṭhipadas* (explanatory works which dealt with difficult expressions and passages) that belonged to the old set were written in the Sinhala language and what was written in Māgadhī had been mixed and confused with (Pāli) translations (*bhāsantara*)

¹⁵ Saddhamma-s 59, 23–35; cf. Saddhamma-s 61, 21–23: *piṭakattayaṇṇanā ca līnatthassa pakāsana, Sāratthadīpanī nāma Sāratthamañjūsā pi ca* [v. 18], *Paramatthappakāsani mahātherehi bhāsita, sattanaṃ sabbabhāsanaṃ sā ahosi hitāvahā* [v. 19].

¹⁶ Saddhamma-s 58, 30–31: *taṃ sabbaṃ desantarāvāsinaṃ bhikkhūnaṃ atthaṃ na sādheti*; translation B.C. Law, *A Manual of Buddhist Historical Traditions* (Calcutta: University of Calcutta, 1941), p. 84. Cf. Saddhamma-s 61, 9–10: *piṭakaṭṭhakathāyāhaṃ līnatthassa pakāsanaṃ, na taṃ sabbattha bhikkhūnaṃ atthaṃ sādheti sabbaso* [v. 12]; also O.v. Hinüber, HPL, pp. 172–173, § 374: “. . . older works no longer served the purpose of the monks in the 12th century.”

of the *Gaṇṭhipadas*.¹⁷ The *Līnatthapakāsini* set was nevertheless used as a basis for the new “complete and clear *attha-vaṇṇanā*,”¹⁸ the mistakes (*bhāsantara*: “versions, translations”) in the old *ṭīkā*s were removed but their essence was kept in its entirety.¹⁹

2.2. The Pagan inscription²⁰

The second important source of information about the *ṭīkā*s on the four *nikāyas* is the Pagan inscription of 1442 (804 BE), inscribed in the beginning of the rule of Narapati (1442–68),²¹ less than three centuries after Parakkamabāhu I (1153–1186).

¹⁷ Saddhamma-s 58, 31–59, 2: *kattha ci anekesu gaṇṭhipadesu Sīhalabhāsāya niruttiyā likhitañ ca kattha ci mūlabhāsāya Māgadhikāya bhāsantarena sammissaṃ ākulañ ca katvā likhitañ ca*. B.C. Law’s translation in *A Manual of Buddhist Historical Traditions* (Calcutta: University of Calcutta, 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-ṭ [Be 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, p. 170–171, §§ 367–71.

See also Saddhamma-s 61, 9–20 where the state of the *Līnatthapakāsini* set is described in more detail. These two passages from Saddhamma-s (14th cent.), especially Saddhamma-s 61, 9–20, are most probably based on a very similar passage from Sp-ṭ Be 1960 I 2, 5–16 ascribed to Sāriputta of Polonnaruva who lived about two centuries earlier—at the time of the compilation of the *Sāratthamañjūsā* set.

¹⁸ Saddhamma-s 59, 2–3: *mayam bhāsantaraṃ apānetvā paripuṇṇaṃ anākulaṃ atthavaṇṇanaṃ kareyyāma ti*.

¹⁹ Saddhamma-s 61, 19–20 = Sp-ṭ Be 1960 I 2, 15–16: *bhāsantaraṃ tato hitvā sāraṃ ādāya sabbaso, anākulaṃ karissāmi paripuṇṇavinicchayaṃ*. The introductory passages in the existing printed editions of Sv-pt Ee, Ps-pt Be 1961, Spk-pt Be 1961 and in the recently discovered manuscript of Mp-pt (see Part 3, Table 3.2. below), which all belong to the old *Līnatthapakāsini* set, are, with the exception of minor orthographic differences, practically identical. The introduction in Mp-ṭ Ee 1996, which is the fourth (catutthā) *ṭīkā* of the later *Sāratthamañjūsā* set, is considerably different from Sv-pt Ee, Ps-pt Be 1961, Spk-pt Be 1961 and the text in the manuscript of Mp-pt is much closer to Sp-ṭ Be 1960 and Sv-nṭ Be 1961. See P. Pecenko, “Table of Parallel Passages” in Mp-ṭ I; also H. Saddhatissa, “Introduction” in Upās, p. 47, n. 154.

²⁰ Cf. Primoz Pecenko (2002), pp. 67–68.

²¹ G.H. Luce and Tin Htway, “A 15th Century Inscription and Library at Pagan, Burma” in *Malalasekera Commemoration Volume* (Colombo: The Malalasekera Commemoration Volume Editorial Committee, 1976), pp. 203–217; PLB, p. 41. Cf. also U Than Tun, “An original inscription dated 10 September 1223 that king Badon copied on 27 October 1785,” *Études birmanes* (Paris: EFEO, 1998), pp. 37–55.

The inscription gives a list of 299 manuscripts,²² amongst which the *ṭīkās* on the four *nikāyas* are also mentioned.

The titles of the *ṭīkās* given in this inscription are very similar to the titles given in *Piṭakat samuiṅ3* (Piṭ-sm) (see 2.6. below),²³ which in turn are also very similar to the titles of the Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana editions of these *ṭīkās*.

In the section on AN (List 934b45) two different *ṭīkās* are listed: *ṭīgā aṅguttuiw krī [mahā]* (no. 75)²⁴ which is translated by G. H. Luce and Tin Htway: “Greater Aṅguttara sub-commentary” and further identified as *Sāratthamañjūsā*, and *ṭīgā aṅguttuiw ṇay [culla]* (no. 76)²⁵ which is translated: “Lesser Aṅguttara subcommentary.”

The names of the two sets of *ṭīkās* (*Līnatthapakāsinī* and *Sāratthamañjūsā*) are not mentioned in the inscription.

²² Catalogue in G.H. Luce and Tin Htway, Op. cit., pp. 218–248. The *ṭīkās* 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, *An Introduction to the Study of Theravāda Buddhism in Burma* (Calcutta: University of Calcutta, 1946), pp. 193–195.

²³ Also *Piṭakat to2 samuiṅ3* or *Piṭakat suṅ3 puṅ cā tam*. I consulted the edition published by Tipiṭakanikāya Sāsana Prū Aphvai in Rangoon, 1989.

²⁴ The title written on the first folio of the Ms. of Mp-ṭ held in the British Library (Or 2089) is very similar: *ṭīkā ekkaniṭāpāt aṅgutra krī*. Cf. Piṭ-sm 202–212: *Ekaṅguttaraṭīkāsac*, *Dukaṅguttaraṭīkāsac*, . . . , *Dasāṅguttaraṭīkāsac*, *Ekādasāṅguttaraṭīkāsac*; Mp-ṭ Be 1961 I-III: *Sāratthamañjūsā nāma Aṅguttaraṭīkā*. In Burmese *sac* means “new, revised,” *ṭīkāsac* therefore means the “new *ṭīkā*,” i.e. Mp-ṭ, *Catutthā Sāratthamañjūsā*. In Piṭ-sm 202 it is also called *Mahāṭīkā*. (All the Burmese words and sentences from Piṭ-sm which I quote here were translated into English by Elisabeth Lawrence, Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National University.)

²⁵ Cf. Piṭ-sm 199: *Ekaṅguttaraṭīkāhoṅ3*, 200: *Dukaṅguttaraṭīkāhoṅ3*, 201: *Tikaṅguttaraṭīkāhoṅ3*. *hoṅ3* in Burmese means “old, ancient”; *ṭīkāhoṅ3* therefore means the “old *ṭīkā*,” i.e., Mp-ṭ, *Catutthā Līnatthapakāsinī*.

Table 2.2. The *ṭikās* in the Pagan Inscription (1442 CE)

Canon (4 <i>nikāyas</i>) First written in the 1st century BCE	Commentaries 5th century CE	Old sub-comment. (<i>purāṇaṭikā</i> = pṭ) 6th–9th century CE Authorship: —	Later subcomment. (<i>ṭikā</i> = ṭ) 12th century CE Authorship: <i>theras</i>
Dīghanikāya	Sumaṅgala-vilāsinī	[Līnatthapakāsinī I]: 1. ṭīgā <i>silakkhandhavā</i> dīghanikāy, 2. ṭīgā mahāvā dīgha- nikāy, 3. ṭīgā pādheyyavā dīghanikāy	
Majjhimanikāya	Papañca-sūdanī	[Līnatthapakāsinī II]: 1. ṭikā mūlapaṇṇāsa, 2. ṭikā majhimapaṇṇāsa, 3. ṭīgā uparipaṇṇāsa	
Saṃyuttanikāya	Sārattha-pakāsinī	[Līnatthapakāsinī III]: 1. ṭīgā sagāthavā saṅyut, 2. ṭīgā khandhavaggādi saṅyut	
Aṅguttaranikāya	Manoratha-pūraṇī	[Līnatthapakāsinī IV]: ṭīgā aṅguttuiw ṇay [culla]	[Sāratthamañjūsā IV]: ṭīgā aṅguttuiw krī [mahā]

2.3. Gandhavaṃsa²⁶

The *Gandhavaṃsa* (Gv), a much later work written probably in the 17th century,²⁷ lists both *Līnatthapakāsinī* and *Sāratthamañjūsā*. The first one is mentioned as *Dīghanikāyāṭṭhakathādīnaṃ catunnaṃ aṭṭhakathānaṃ Līnatthapakāsinī nāma*

²⁶ Cf. Primoz Pecenko, “*Līnatthapakāsinī* and *Sāratthamañjūsā*: The *Purāṇaṭikās* and the *Ṭikās* on the Four *Nikāyas*,” JPTS 27 (2002), pp. 68–69.

²⁷ PLB, p. x. According to Oskar von Hinüber this is “a later systematic survey of unknown date” (O.v. Hinüber, HPL, p. 3). See also Winternitz, HIL, vol. 2, p. 176, n. 4; A.P. Buddhadatta, *Pālisāhityaya* (Ambalamgoda: Ānanda Potsamāgama, 1962), vol. 2, pp. 410–11; K.R. Norman, PL, pp. 180–81; K.L. Hazra, *The Buddhist Annals and Chronicles of South-East Asia* (New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1986), pp. 89–91.

ṭikā,²⁸ and was according to Gv written by Dhammapālācariya.²⁹

Sāratthamañjūsā is mentioned only as *Āṅguttaraṭṭhakathāya Sāratthamañjūsā nāma ṭikā*,³⁰ a work written by Sāriputta.³¹ Further on this work of Sāriputta, which was written at the request of Parakkamabāhu, king of Laṅkā, is also referred to as *Āṅguttaraṭṭhakathāya navā ṭikāgandho*.³²

According to Gv, the *Līnatthapakāsini* set consisted of the *ṭikās* on all the four *nikāyas* and *Sāratthamañjūsā* was the name of the *ṭikā* on AN only. To distinguish it from the older *ṭikā* on AN (*Catutthā Līnatthapakāsini*), *Sāratthamañjūsā* was also classified as a “new subcommentary” (*navā ṭikā*).

Table 2.3. The *ṭikās* in *Gandhavaṃsa* (17th century)

Canon (4 <i>nikāyas</i>) First written in the 1st century BCE	Commentaries 5th century CE	Old sub-comment. (<i>purāṇaṭikā</i> = pṭ) 6th–9th century CE Author: Dhammapāla	Later subcomment. (<i>ṭikā</i> = ṭ) 12th century CE Author: Sāriputta
Dīghanikāya	Sumaṅgalavilāsini	Līnatthapakāsini	
Majjhimanikāya	Papañcasūdanī	Līnatthapakāsini	
Saṃyuttanikāya	Sāratthapa-kāsini	Līnatthapakāsini	
Āṅguttaranikāya	Manoratha-pūraṇī	Līnatthapakāsini	Sāratthamañjūsā navā ṭikāgandho

2.4. Sāsanavaṃsa³³

The *Sāsanavaṃsa* (Sās), a work “written in Burma in 1861 by Paññāsāmi, tutor of King Min-dōn-min who held the fifth council a few years later,”³⁴ does not give the

²⁸ Gv 60, 11–12.

²⁹ Gv 69, 30–34: *Dighanikāyaṭṭhakathādīnaṃ catunnaṃ aṭṭhakathānaṃ ṭikāgandho ... attano matiyā Dhammapālācariyena katā.*

³⁰ Gv 61, 32–33.

³¹ Gv 61, 30. Cf. H. Saddhatissa, “Introduction” in *Upās*, p. 47, n. 154.

³² Gv 71, 10–14: *Sāratthadīpanī nāma ...Āṅguttaraṭṭhakathāya navā ṭikāgandho ti ime cattāro gandhā Parakkamabāhunāmena Laṅkādīpissarena raññā āyācitena Sāriputtācariyena katā.* Cf. Piṭ-sm 202 where the later *ṭikā* on Mp (Mp-ṭ) is mentioned as “new greater *ṭikā*” (*ṭikā sac kri*).

³³ Cf. Primoz Pecenko (2002), pp. 69–70.

³⁴ K.R. Norman, PL, pp. 181–82. King Min-dōn (1852–1877), also called the “Convener of the Fifth Council,” held the council in Mandalay in 1868–71 (PLB, pp. 92–94). On Sās see also A.P. Buddhadatta, *Pālisāhityaya* (Ambalamgoda: Ānanda Potasamāgama, 1962), vol. 2, pp. 407–409; V.B. Lieberman, “A new look at the Sāsana-vaṃsa,” BSOAS 39 (1976): pp. 137–49; K.L. Hazra,

names of the two sets of *ṭikās* (*Linatthapakāsini* and *Sāratthamañjūsā*); it simply states that *Dīghanikāyaṭṭhakathāya ṭikā*, *Majjhima-nikāyaṭṭhakathāya ṭikā* and *Samyutta-nikāyaṭṭhakathāya ṭikā* were written by Ācariya Dhammapāla,³⁵ and *Aṅguttara-nikāyaṭṭhikā* was written by Sāriputta thera at the request of the king Parakkamabāhu.³⁶

Table 2.4. The *ṭikās* in *Sāsanavaṃsa* (1861)

Canon (4 <i>nikāyas</i>) First written in the 1st century BCE	Commentaries 5th century CE	Old sub-comment. (<i>purāṇaṭṭhikā</i> = pṭ) 6th–9th century CE Author: Dhammapāla	Later subcomment. (<i>ṭikā</i> = ṭ) 12th century CE Author: Sāriputta
Dīghanikāya	Sumaṅgalavilāsini	[Linatthapakāsini] Dīghanikāyaṭṭha- kathāya ṭikā	
Majjhimanikāya	Papañcasūdanī	[Linatthapakāsini] Majjhimanikāyaṭṭha- kathāya ṭikā	
Samyuttanikāya	Sāratthapakāsini	[Linatthapakāsini] Samyuttanikāyaṭṭha- kathāya ṭikā	
Aṅguttaranikāya	Manorathapūraṇī		[Sāratthamañjūsā] Aṅguttaranikāya-ṭikā

The distinction between the two sets of *ṭikās* mentioned in Saddhamma-s, and in the case of AN 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 *ṭikās* on the four *nikāyas* consisted of two kinds of *ṭikās*—the older three on DN, MN and SN written by Dhammapāla, and the later one on AN written by Sāriputta.

The Buddhist Annals and Chronicles of South-East Asia (New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1986), pp. 91–94.

³⁵ Sās Ne 1961 31, 10–12: *Visuddhimaggassa mahāṭṭhikā*, *Dīghanikāyaṭṭhakathāya ṭikā*, *Majjhima-nikāyaṭṭhakathāya ṭikā*, *Samyuttanikāyaṭṭhakathāya ṭikā sā ti imāyo ācariya-Dhammapālathero akāsi*.

³⁶ Sās Ne 1961 31, 13–14: *Sāratthadīpaniṃ nāma ṭikam*, *Aṅguttaranikāyaṭṭhikā ca Parakkama-bāhuraññā yācito Sāriputtathero akāsi*.

2.5. Sāsanavaṃsadīpa

Sāsanavaṃsadīpa (Sās-dip) was completed in 1879 by Ācariya Vimalasāra Thera, published in 1880 in Colombo³⁷ and covers “the history of Buddhism in Ceylon down to the time of the introduction of the Burmese *upasampadā* in AD 1802.”³⁸ The information about the *ṭīkās* on the four *nikāyas* in Sās-dip is the same as in Sās. The names of the two sets of *ṭīkās* (*Līnatthapakāsinī* and *Sāratthamañjūsā*) given in Saddhamma-s and Gv are not mentioned at all. Only one set of *ṭīkās* is listed and it does not have any special name; the *ṭīkās* on DN, MN, and SN are ascribed to Dhammapāla,³⁹ and a *ṭīkā* on AN is ascribed to Sāriputta.⁴⁰

Table 2.5. The *ṭīkās* in *Sāsanavaṃsadīpa* (1880)

Canon (4 <i>nikāyas</i>) First written in the 1st century BCE	Commentaries 5th century CE	Old sub-comment. (<i>purāṇaṭīkā</i> = pṭ) 6th–9th century CE Author: Dhammapāla	Later subcomment. (<i>ṭīkā</i> = ṭ) 12th century CE Author: Sāriputta
Dīghanikāya	Sumaṅgalavilāsinī	[Līnatthapakāsinī] Dīghāgamassa ṭīkā	
Majjhimanikāya	Papañcasūdanī	[Līnatthapakāsinī] Majjhimaṭṭhakathā- ṭīkā	
Samyuttanikāya	Sāratthapakāsinī	[Līnatthapakāsinī] Samyuttaṭṭhakathā- ṭīkā	
Aṅguttaranikāya	Manorathapūraṇī		[Sāratthamañjūsā] Aṅguttaranikāya- ṭṭhakathāṭīkā

³⁷ The book has two title pages: the first one in Sinhala letters and the second in Roman letters. The Sinhala title page reads: *Sakyamunivasse 2423 [1879 CE]-Sāsanavaṃsadīpo-ācariya-Vimalasārattherapādena viracito -- tassānumatiya Balanāsara Vīrasīhāmaccena c’ eva tada-ññehi ca budhikehi janehi Koḷambaṭṭhānīyasmim Sathālokayantasālāyaṃ muddapito -- Saugate saṃvacchare 2424 [1880 CE]*; the second title page reads: *The Sasanavansa dipo or The History of the Buddhist Church in Pali verse, compiled from Buddhist Holy Scriptures, Commentaries, Histories, & c., & c. by Acariya Vimalasara Thera. AB 2423. -- Colombo. Printed at the Sathhaloka Press for Balatasara Virasinha Amacca and others -- AB 2424.*

³⁸ K.R. Norman, PL, p. 182.

³⁹ Sās-dip Ce 1880, vv. 1231–1232: . . . *ṭīkā Dīghāgamassa ca, Majjhimaṭṭhakathāṭīkā Samyuttaṭṭhakathāya ca, . . . Dhammapālena dhīmatā racitā therapādena suttantanayadassinā.*

⁴⁰ Sās-dip Ce 1880, vv. 1201–1203: *Aṅguttaranikāyaṭṭhakathāṭīkā . . . therena Sāriputtena katā.*

2.6. Piṭakat samuiṅ

Piṭakat samuiṅ (Piṭ-sm)⁴¹ lists the same *ṭikās* on the four *nikāyas* as the Pagan inscription and Gv and, as already mentioned, the titles of the *ṭikās* given in all three sources are very similar.⁴² The names of the two sets, *Līnatthapakāsinī* and *Sāratthamañjūsā*, and the two authors, Dhammapāla and Sāriputta, are mentioned as in Gv.⁴³

Piṭ-sm lists two *ṭikās* on AN: a *ṭikā* written by Dhammapāla and a *ṭikā* written by Sāriputta. The first *ṭikā* is listed as incomplete and has three entries: *Ekaṅguttaraṭṭikā-hoṅ*, *Dukaṅguttaraṭṭikāhoṅ* and *Tikaṅguttaraṭṭikāhoṅ*. Although it is called the “old” (*hoṅ*) *ṭikā*, the common name *Līnatthapakāsinī* is not mentioned at all.⁴⁴ According to Piṭ-sm 199 “the remaining 8 manuscripts of the old *ṭikā*, i.e., the *ṭikā* on *Catukaṅguttara*, *Pañcaṅguttara*, . . . *Ekādasāṅguttara*, cannot be found anywhere in Burma.”⁴⁵

The second *ṭikā* on AN is mentioned as a “new, revised” *ṭikā* (*sac*) and it has the following eleven entries:⁴⁶ *Ekaṅguttaraṭṭikāsac*, *Dukaṅguttaraṭṭikāsac*, *Tikaṅguttaraṭṭikāsac*, . . . *Dasāṅguttaraṭṭikāsac*, *Ekādasāṅguttaraṭṭikāsac*.

Sīlakkhandhavaggaṭṭikā is listed as the “old” (*hoṅ3*) *ṭikā*, i.e. Sv-pt, *Paṭhamā Līnatthapakāsinī*, not to distinguish it from Sv-t, *Paṭhamā Sāratthamañjūsā*, but to distinguish it from *Sādhujanavilāsiniṭṭikā* (Sv-nt) which is in Piṭ-sm 188 listed as the “new” (*sac*) *ṭikā*.

Although Piṭ-sm gives essentially the same information about the *ṭikās* on the four *nikāyas* as the Pagan inscription and Gv, it is interesting to note that the old *ṭikā* on AN written by Dhammapāla is not mentioned as a part of the *Līnatthapakāsinī* set. Piṭ-sm also does not list any of the first three *ṭikās* of the *Sāratthamañjūsā* set (Sv-t, Ps-t, Spk-t).

⁴¹ Cf. Primoz Pecenko (2002), pp. 72–74.

⁴² Cf. 2.2. and 2.3. above.

⁴³ The reference numbers of all the *ṭikās* on the four *nikāyas* listed in Piṭ-sm 187–212 are marked with asterisks which means that, according to the 1989 edition of Piṭ-sm, the manuscripts of all these *ṭikās* are held in the National Library, Rangoon.

⁴⁴ Piṭ-sm 199–201.

⁴⁵ Piṭ-sm 199 (translated by Elisabeth Lawrence).

⁴⁶ Piṭ-sm 202–212.

Table 2.6. The *ṭikās* in *Piṭakat samuīh3* (1888)

Canon (4 <i>nikāyas</i>) First written in the 1st c. BCE	Commentaries 5th century CE	Old sub-comment. (<i>purāṇaṭṭikā</i> = pṭ) 6th–9th century CE Author: Dhammapāla	Later subcomment. (<i>ṭikā</i> = ṭ) 12th century CE Author: Sāriputta
Dīghanikāya	Sumaṅgala- vilāsinī	Līnatthapakāsinī: Sutsīlakhanṭikā hoṇ, Sutmahāvāṭikā, Sutpātheyyaṭikā (Piṭ-sm 187, 189–190)	
Majjhima- nikāya	Papañcasūdanī	Līnatthapakāsinī: Mūlapaṇṇāsaṭikā, Majjhimapapañṇāsa-ṭikā, Uparipaṇṇāsaṭikā (Piṭ-sm 191–193)	
Samyutta- nikāya	Sāratthapa- kāsinī	Līnatthapakāsinī: Sagāthavagga- samyuttikā, Nidānavagga- . . . Khandhavagga- . . . Saḷāyatanavagga- . . . Mahāvaggasamyuttikā (Piṭ-sm 194–198)	
Aṅguttara- nikāya	Manoratha- pūraṇī	Ekaṅguttaraṭikā-hoṇ Dukaṅguttaraṭikā-hoṇ Tikaṅguttaraṭikā-hoṇ	Sāratthamañjūsā: Ekaṅguttaraṭikāsac Dukaṅguttaraṭikāsac Tika- . . . Dasa- . . . Ekādasāṅguttaraṭikāsac

2.7. Critical Pāli Dictionary⁴⁷

The last bibliographical source I would like to cite is the *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 *ṭikās*, *Līnatthapakāsinī* and *Sāratthamañjūsā*. According to CPD the first set was written by Dhammapāla, and the second one by Sāriputta of Poḷonnaruva. The *ṭikās* of the *Līnatthapakāsinī* set are also called *pūraṇaṭṭikās* (pṭ), while the *ṭikās* of the *Sāratthamañjūsā* set are called just *ṭikās* (ṭ).

⁴⁷ Cf. Primoz Pecenko (2002), pp. 74–75.

Table 2.7. Two complete sets in the Critical Pāli Dictionary (1948)

Canon (4 <i>nikāyas</i>) First written in the 1st c. BCE	Commentaries 5th century CE	Old sub-comment. (<i>purāṇaṭṭikā</i> = <i>pt</i>) 6th–9th century CE Author: Dhammapāla	Later subcomment. (<i>ṭikā</i> = <i>ṭ</i>) 12th century CE Author: Sāriputta
Dīghanikāya	Sumaṅgalavilāsinī	Līnatthapakāsinī I pūraṇaṭṭikā	Sāratthamañjūsā I ṭikā
Majjhimanikāya	Papañcasūdanī	Līnatthapakāsinī II pūraṇaṭṭikā	Sāratthamañjūsā II ṭikā
Samyuttanikāya	Sāratthapakāsinī	Līnatthapakāsinī III pūraṇaṭṭikā	Sāratthamañjūsā III ṭikā
Aṅguttaranikāya	Manorathapūraṇī	Līnatthapakāsinī IV pūraṇaṭṭikā	Sāratthamañjūsā IV ṭikā

For the first three *ṭikās* of the older set (Sv-pt, Ps-pt, Spk-pt) and for the fourth *ṭikā* of the later set (Mp-ṭ) some references are given to existing published editions or manuscripts.⁴⁸ For the first three *ṭikās* of the later set (Sv-ṭ, Ps-ṭ, Spk-ṭ)⁴⁹ no manuscripts or editions are mentioned, and the fourth *ṭikā* of the older set (Mp-pt) is referred to Piṭ-sm 199–201.⁵⁰ This indicates that although in CPD both sets of *ṭikās* are listed, only four *ṭikās* were actually available to the editor of CPD: the first three of the *Līnatthapakāsinī* set and the fourth of the *Sāratthamañjūsā* set, i.e. the set published by the Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana.

⁴⁸ In CPD, Epilegomena to vol. 1, pp. 40*–41* the following sources are given: for Sv-pt: Be 1924 I–III (2.1,11); for Ps-pt and Spk-pt: the transcripts (1934) from Burmese manuscripts of the National Library (former Bernard Free Library), Rangoon (2.2,11; 2.3,11; cf. Piṭ-sm 191–198); for Mp-ṭ: Be 1910 I–II (2.4,12); for Sv-nṭ: Be 1913–23 I–II (2.1,13). CPD, vol. III, p. iv mentions also Sv-ṭ as “Sīlakkandhavaggaṭṭikā by Dhammapāla, Be, Vol. I–II, (Buddhasāsanasamiti), Rangoon, 1961” which is a mistake; this could be either Sv-pt Be 1961 I by Dhammapāla, or Sv-nṭ Be 1961 I–II by Nāṇābhivamsa. Other editions and manuscripts of these *ṭikās* will be discussed below.

⁴⁹ CPD, Epilegomena to vol. 1, pp. 40*–41*: 2.1,12; 2.2,12; 2.3,12. The manuscripts of these *ṭikās* listed in Sōmadāsa’s catalogue *Laṅkāvē puskola pot nāmāvaliya* (LPP) will be discussed below.

⁵⁰ CPD, Epilegomena to vol. 1, pp. 41*: 2.4,11.

The above analysis of the old and later subcommentaries (*purāṇaṭṭikās* and *ṭṭikās*, see Tables 1.2 and 1.3. above) in bibliographical sources can be presented as follows.⁵¹

Table 2.8. The subcommentaries in the Pāli bibliographic sources

Bibl. sources \ Nikāyas	Dīghanikāya	Majjhima-nikāya	Samyutta-nikāya	Aṅguttara-nikāya
Saddhamma saṅgaha 14th century	old subcom./ later subcom.	old subcom./ later subcom.	old subcom./ later subcom.	old subcom./ later subcom.
Pagan inscription 1442	old subcom.	old subcom.	old subcom.	old subcom./ later subcom.
Gandhavaṃsa 17th century	old subcom.	old subcom.	old subcom.	old subcom./ later subcom.
Sāsanavaṃsa 1861	old subcom.	old subcom.	old subcom.	later subcom.
Sāsanavaṃsadīpa 1880	old subcom.	old subcom.	old subcom.	later subcom.
Piṭakat samuiṅ 1888	old subcom.	old subcom.	old subcom.	old subcom./ later subcom.
CPD 1948	old subcom./ later subcom.	old subcom./ later subcom.	old subcom./ later subcom.	old subcom./ later subcom.

⁵¹ Cf. Primoz Pecenko (2002), p. 76 (Table I).

Part 3: Printed Editions and Manuscripts of the *Ṭikās*

The subcommentaries discussed above can be divided into two groups: those which have been published in printed editions and those which have remained only in manuscript form.⁵² The printed editions are shown in the Table 3.1. below:

Table 3.1. Printed editions of the sub-commentaries

Nikāyas	Dīghanikāya/ Sumaṅgala- vilāsinī	Majjhima- nikāya/ Papañca- sūdanī	Samyutta- nikāya/ Sāratthapa- kāsinī	Āṅguttara- nikāya/ Manoratha- pūraṇī
Two sets				
Old subcom.: Līnattha- pakāsinī set	Editions: Burmese: 1904–6, 1912, 1915, 1924, 1961; Sinhala: 1967 Roman script: 1970 Indian: 1993	Editions: Burmese: 1853, 1961 Indian: 1995	Editions: Burmese: 1961 Indian: 1994	
Later subcom.: Sārattha- mañjūsā set				Editions: Burmese: 1910, 1961; Sinhala: 1907, 1930; Indian: 1966; Roman: 1996, 1997, 1999

The *ṭikās* in Table 3.1. are listed in Sās and Sās-dip as the only existing set (Tables 2.4.–2.5.); this set, which has been also approved by the Theravāda tradition, consists of the three “older” *ṭikās* (Sv-ṭ, Ps-ṭ, Spk-ṭ) ascribed to Dhammapāla and the fourth “later” *ṭikā* (Mp-ṭ) ascribed to Sāriputta. Besides the Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana editions⁵³

⁵² For details, see Primoz Pecenko (2002), pp. 76–86.

⁵³ Sv-ṭ Be 1961 I–III; Ps-ṭ Be 1961 I–III; Spk-ṭ Be 1961 I–II; Mp-ṭ Be 1961 I–III. The Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana editions of these *ṭikās* were reprinted by Vipassana Research Institute, Igatpuri, India, (Sv-ṭ Ne 1993 I–III; Ps-ṭ Ne 1995 I–IV; Spk-ṭ Ne 1994 I–III; Mp-ṭ Ne 1996 I–III) and are available also on Chaṭṭha Saṅgāyana CD-ROM (Versions: 1.1; 2.0; 3.0) published by Vipassana Research Institute (website: www.vri.dhamma.org).

there exist several other editions⁵⁴ and manuscripts of these *ṭīkā*s.⁵⁵ Because these

⁵⁴ Sv-pt: Ee 1970 I–III, ed. by Lily de Silva; Be 1904–06 I–III, ed. by U Hpye; Be 1912 I–III, ed. by Hsaya Tin of Nanmadaw; Be 1915 I–III, ed. by Hsayas Kyī, Kyaw, Thein and Hba Kyaw (all the Be are called *Līnatthappakāsanā*, see T.C.H. Raper, M.J.C. O’ Keefe, eds., *Catalogue of the Pāli printed books in the India Office Library* (London: The British Library, 1983), p. 34); Be 1924 I–III (see A.K. Warder, *Indian Buddhism* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 1980), p. 529); Ce 1967, ed. by H. Kalyānasiri and H. Kalyāṇadhamma, *Somavaṭṭi Hēvāvitāraṇa ṭīkāganthamālā* (Colombo: Anula Press).

Ps-pt: Supaphan Na Bangchang mentions a very old Be published in 1853 (see “Introduction” in *A Critical Edition of the Mūlapariyāyavagga of Majjhimanikāya-aṭṭhakathāṭīkā* (Ph.D. diss., Univ. of Peradeniya, 1981), p. xi).

Spk-pt: Besides the Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana edition (Spk-pt Be 1961 I-II = Ne 1994 I-III) I am not aware of any other edition of Spk-pt.

Mp-ṭ: Ee I (1996), II (1998), III (1999)—PTS edition by P. Pecenko, vols. I–III contain *Eka-* and *Dukanipātaṭīkā*; Be 1910 I–II (see CPD, Epilegomena to vol. I, p. 41*); Ce 1907 (see W.A. de Silva, “A List of Pali Books Printed in Ceylon in Sinhalese Characters,” JPTS (1910–12), p. 150); Ce 1930 (see *EncBuddh*, vol. 1, fasc. 4, p. 629, s. v. *Āṅguttara-nava-ṭīkā*). Mp-ṭ Ce 1907 and 1930 contain only *Ekanipātaṭīkā*. For a detailed description of Ce 1907, Be 1910 and Ce 1930, see Primoz Pecenko, “Introduction” in Mp-ṭ Ee (1996) I, pp. xxxvii–xlii.

⁵⁵ Mss. of Sv-pt are listed in: Lily de Silva, “General Introduction” in Sv-pt Ee, pp. xi–xii (7 C Mss.; these Mss. are listed in LPP); LPP, vol. 1, p. 39 (16 C Mss.); V. Fausböll, “Catalogue of the Mandalay MSS. in the India Office Library (Formerly Part of the King’s Library at Mandalay),” JPTS (1894–96): p. 28 (1 B Ms.); H. Braun et al., *Burmese Manuscripts* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1985), pt. 2, pp. 126–28 (1 B Ms.); T.W. Rhys Davids, “List of Pāli, Sinhalese, and Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Colombo Museum,” JPTS (1882), p. 52 (1 C Ms.); Piṭ-sm 187, 189–90 (1 B Ms.).

Mss. of Ps-pt are listed in: Supaphan Na Bangchang, introduction, “A Critical Edition of the *Mūlapariyāyavagga* of *Majjhimanikāya-aṭṭhakathāṭīkā*” (Ph. D. diss., Univ. of Peradeniya, 1981), p. xi (1 K Ms., 4 C Mss.; these 4 C Mss. are listed in LPP); LPP, vol. 1, p. 71 (8 C Mss.), vol. 2, p. 53 (6 C Mss.); T.W. Rhys Davids, *Op. cit.*, p. 51 (1 C Ms.); V. Fausböll, *Op. cit.*, pp. 28–29 (1 B Ms.); T.W. Rhys Davids, “List of Pāli Manuscripts in the Copenhagen Royal Library,” JPTS (1883), p. 147 (1 B Ms.); Piṭ-sm 191–93 (1 B Ms.).

Mss. of Spk-pt are listed in: LPP, vol. 1, p. 93 (1 B, 11 C Mss.), vol. 2, p. 71 (7 C Mss.); W. A. de Silva, *Catalogue of Palm Leaf Manuscripts in the Library of the Colombo Museum* (Colombo: Ceylon Government Press, 1938), vol. I, pp. 36–37 (1 C Ms.); Piṭ-sm 194–198 (1 B Ms.).

Mss. of Mp-ṭ are listed in: LPP, vol. 1, p. 2 (5 C Mss.), vol. 2, p. 1 (7 C Mss.), vol. 3, p. 164 (1 B Ms. from British Museum, Or 2089); W.A. de Silva, *Catalogue of Palm Leaf Manuscripts in the Library of the Colombo Museum* (Colombo: Ceylon Government Press, 1938), vol. I, p. 37 (1 C Ms.); Piṭ-sm 202–212 (1 B Ms.); Fragile Palm Leaves project, Thailand (4 B Mss; Ms ID Nos.: 906, 949, 983, 1645); National Library, Rangoon (3 B Mss; Acc. Nos.: 800, 1846, 1937); Universities Central Library, University of Rangoon (2 B Mss; Acc. Nos.: 7691, 9816/10095).

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

are the only subcommentaries on the four *nikāyas* that have printed editions they have been often considered to be the only existing *ṭikās* on the four *nikāyas*.⁵⁶

In my earlier research I have also investigated the *ṭikās* on the four *nikāyas* which have never been published in a book form; these texts are listed in some catalogues of Pāli manuscripts and are held in various libraries in Burma and Sri Lanka. According to my research a number of these manuscripts still exist (see Table 3.2. below) and one of them—the old *ṭikā* on *Āṅguttaranikāya*—was recently discovered in Burma.⁵⁷ This discovery shows that the bibliographic information in earlier texts like *Saddhammasaṅgaha* is very reliable and needs further investigation.

Table 3.2. The sub-commentaries existing in manuscript form

Nikāyas Two sets	Dīghanikāya/ Sumaṅgala- vilāsinī	Majjhima- nikāya/ Papañca- sūdanī	Samyutta- nikāya/ Sāratthapa- kāsinī	Āṅguttara- nikāya/ Manoratha- pūraṇī
Līnatthapakā- sinī set				Manuscripts: Burm. script: 3 (1 ms. microfilmed, Burma 1999)
Sārattha- mañjūsā set	Manuscripts: Sinhala script: 7	Manuscripts: Burm. script: 1 Sinh. script: 7	Manuscripts: Burm. script: 1 Sinh. script: 2	

The information given in Table 3.2. above also agrees with some bibliographical texts. In the Pagan inscription, Gv and Piṭ-sm (Tables 2.2., 2.3., 2.6.) an additional *ṭikā*—not mentioned in Sās and Sās-dip—is mentioned: the old *ṭikā* on AN (Mp-pt), called *Catutthā Līnatthapakāsinī*. Saddhamma-s and CPD (Tables 2.1. and 2.7.) mention two complete sets of *ṭikās*, *Līnatthapakāsinī* set (Sv-pt, Ps-pt, Spk-pt, Mp-pt) and *Sāratthamañjūsā* set (Sv-t, Ps-t, Spk-t, Mp-t). Here three later *ṭikās*—not mentioned in any other bibliographic work—are added: a *ṭikā* on DN (Sv-t) called *Paṭhamā Sāratthamañjūsā*,⁵⁸ a *ṭikā* on MN (Ps-t) called *Dutiyā Sāratthamañjūsā*

⁵⁶ See e.g. O.v. Hinüber, HPL, pp. 167, 173.

⁵⁷ Primoz Pecenko (2002), pp. 78–86 (the Burmese Ms. is described on pp. 82–85).

⁵⁸ Another manuscript of the later *ṭikā* on DN (Sv-t) with the title *Dīgha-nikāya Dvītiya Ṭikā* held in Saṅgharāja Pansala in Malvatu Vihāraya is mentioned in Anne M. Blackburn, “Notes on Sri Lankan temple manuscripts collections,” JPTS 27 (2002), p. 22 (Ms. No. 21).

and a *ṭīkā* on SN (Spk-ṭ) called *Tatīyā Sāratthamañjūsā*.

If we combine Tables 3.1. and 3.2. above we get Table 3.3. below in which it is clearly evident that two different sets of *nikāyaṭīkā*s were in fact compiled: the older set called *Līnatthapakāsinī* and the later set called *Sāratthamañjūsā*. This leads to important conclusions which will be discussed below.

Table 3.3. Manuscripts and editions of the two sets of subcommentaries

Nikāyas Two sets	Dīghanikāya/ Sumaṅgala- vilāsinī	Majjhima- nikāya/ Papañca- sūdanī	Saṃyutta-nikāya/ Sāratthapa- kāsinī	Aṅguttara- nikāya/ Manoratha- pūraṇī
Old subcom.: Līnatthapakā- sinī set (6th–9th cent. CE)	Editions: Burmese: 1904-6, 1912, 1915, 1924, 1961; Sinhala: 1967 Roman script: 1970 Indian: 1993	Editions: Burmese: 1853, 1961 Indian: 1995	Editions: Burmese: 1961 Indian: 1994	Manuscripts: Burmese script: 3 (1 ms. discovered and microfilmed in Burma 1999)
Later subcom.: <i>Sārattha- mañjūsā</i> set (12th cent. CE)	Manuscripts: Sinhala script: 7	Manuscripts: Burmese script: 1 Sinhala script: 7	Manuscripts: Burmese script: 1 Sinhala script: 2	Editions: Burmese: 1910, 1961; Sinhala: 1907, 1930; Indian: 1966; Roman: 1996, 1997, 1999

Conclusions

From the above analysis of the *nikāyaṭīkās*, their manuscripts and printed editions we can conclude, that it is most probable that two different sets of *nikāyaṭīkās* were in fact compiled: the older set called *Līnatthapakāsinī* (Sv-pt, Ps-pt, Spk-pt, Mp-pt) and the later set called *Sāratthamañjūsā* (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 Tables 2.1. and 2.7. above), all the eight *ṭīkās* from the two sets seem to still exist either in printed editions or in manuscript form (see Table 3.3. above). Here it is very interesting to note that the manuscripts in Table 3.2. have never been properly investigated and it also seems that they have been neglected by both the Theravāda tradition⁵⁹ as well as modern Pāli scholarship.⁶⁰

My recent discovery of a manuscript of the old *Āṅguttaraṭīkā*, *Catutthā Līnattha-pakāsinī*, further proves the existence of two sets of *ṭīkās* and also throws new light on the development of the *nikāyaṭīkās* and their Pāli bibliographic

⁵⁹ It is not made explicit why certain *ṭīkās* (Sv-t, Ps-t, Spk-t, Mp-pt) were ignored by the Theravāda tradition (see e.g. Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana editions) and only some (i.e. Sv-pt, Ps-pt, Spk-pt, Mp-t) were published—in spite of the fact that the manuscripts of the unpublished *ṭīkās* are held in different libraries in Burma and Sri Lanka and according to the introduction in the Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana editions “all the existing *ṭīkās*” were recited. In the *Nidānakathā* of Mp-t Be 1961 (p. ca) it is clearly stated that all the existing *ṭīkās* in Burma and outside Burma were edited and published:

Evaṃ saṅgītim āropitassa pana tepītakassa buddhavacanassa attha-saṃvaṇṇanābhūtā yā ca atṭhakathāyo saṃvijjanti yā ca tāsam atthappakāsanavasena pavattā ṭīkāyo saṃvijjanti manoramāya tantinayānucchavikāya bhāsāya ācariy’ / nanda-ācariya-Dhammapālādīhi theravarehi katā, tāsam pi atṭhakathāṭīkānaṃ sadesīyamūlehi c’ eva videsīyamūlehi ca saṃsanditvā tepītakassa viya buddhavacanassa visodhanapaṭivisodhanavasena mahātherā pāvacanadassino saṃvaṇṇanā-kovidā pāṭhasodhanam akamsu, icc evam atṭhakathāṭīkāyo pamādakhalitādhikap aribhaṭṭhapāṭhānaṃ nirākaraṇavasena visodhitā c’ eva paṭivisodhitā ca hutvā Buddhasāsanam uddāyantalāye samappitā sutṭhu muddāpaṇāya.

This contradicts the information about the manuscripts of the *nikāyaṭīkās* discussed above (see Table 3.3. above). If the Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana edited “all the existing *ṭīkās*” (*yā ca tāsam attha-ppakāsanavasena pavattā ṭīkāyo saṃvijjanti*) “originating from Burma and from outside” (*sadesīyamūlehi c’ eva videsīyamūlehi ca saṃsanditvā*), why were the manuscripts of Sv-t, Ps-t, Spk-t and Mp-pt omitted? Further research is needed here.

⁶⁰ Modern Pāli scholarship seems to agree to a great extent with the Theravāda tradition (i.e. the Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana editions) that most probably only one set of *nikāyaṭīkās* (i.e. Sv-pt, Ps-pt, Spk-pt and Mp-t) still exists at present. Cf. Table 1.4. above; O.v. Hinüber, HPL, p. 167, § 357; p. 173, §§ 375–376; A.P. Buddhadatta, *Pālisāhityaya* (Ambalamgoda: Ānanda Potsamāgama, 1956), vol. 1, pp. 259–62; C.E. Godakumbura, *Catalogue of Ceylonese Manuscripts* (Copenhagen: The Royal Library, 1980), p. xxvii, n. 1.

information. According to Saddhamma-s (see 2.1. above) the old *nikāyaṭīkā*s, called *Līnatthapakāsinī*, were “incomplete” (*aparipuṇṇa*) and had to be replaced by the later set of *ṭīkā*s, called *Sāratthamañjūsā*, which were “comprehensive” (*paripuṇṇa*) and “clear, not confused” (*anākula*). My comparative research of three parallel chapters from the older (Mp-pt) and later (Mp-ṭ) *Āṅguttaraṭīkā*s published in the Journal of Pali Text Society⁶¹ indicates that the description of these two *Āṅguttaraṭīkā*s in Saddhamma-s is very accurate. This is a further indication that the information about the two different sets of *nikāyaṭīkā*s in Saddhamma-s (see 2.1. above) is most probably correct.

In the light of the above discussion we can further conclude that the information about the *nikāyaṭīkā*s in Saddhamma-s, the oldest Pāli bibliographical text, is more accurate than in all the other later Pāli bibliographic sources. Although some of these sources (Pagan inscription, Gv, Piṭ-sm) mention the old *Āṅguttaraṭīkā* (Mp-pt), none of them mentions two complete sets of *nikāyaṭīkā*s (cf. Table 2.8.). Saddhamma-s seems therefore the most accurate—although it has been usually considered to be one of the least reliable sources.

The information about the *ṭīkā*s on the four *nikāyas* in modern Pāli scholarship is mostly based on the Pāli bibliographical works, on the existing printed editions, and rarely also on the catalogues⁶² of Pāli manuscripts. Since we have, as shown above, printed editions of only one “combined” set of *nikāyaṭīkā*s (i.e. Sv-pt, Ps-pt, Spk-pt, Mp-ṭ; see Table 1.4. above), it is often assumed that only one set of *nikāyaṭīkā*s exists at present and that only one complete set was also most probably composed. This approach is sometimes also supported by references from the later bibliographic works (e.g. Sās), which are sometimes considered more reliable than the earlier ones (e.g. Saddhamma-s). It also seems clear that it has been—perhaps “subconsciously”—influenced by the Theravāda tradition and its Sixth Council (the Chaṭṭha-saṅgāyana) which published exactly the same “combined” set of *ṭīkā*s.

In the case of the two sets of *nikāyaṭīkā*s discussed above—especially considering Sv-ṭ, Ps-ṭ, Spk-ṭ and Mp-pt which are, although still existing in manuscript form (see Table 3.2.), usually mentioned as “lost” or “a fiction”—the information in the oldest bibliographic source (Saddhamma-s) appears to be the most reliable of all (cf. Table 2.1.).

To illustrate this, let me conclude with an example of the treatment of the *ṭīkā*s

⁶¹ Primoz Pecenko (2002), pp. 78–79, 82–105.

⁶² For example, in Geiger § 31 (literature), nn. 5–6, Fausböll’s “Catalogue of the Madalay MSS. in the India Office Library,” JPTS 1894–96, is cited.

on the four *nikāyas* in one of the most recent works on Pāli literature, *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*. Although *A Handbook of Pāli Literature* mentions all the *ṭīkā*s of the two sets, those which have printed editions (Sv-pṭ, Ps-pṭ, Spk-pṭ, Mp-ṭ, see Table 1.4. above) are considered to be the only set that still exists and the others are either mentioned as “lost” or “a fiction.”

The older set of *ṭīkā*s on the four *nikāyas* (*Līnatthapakāsinī*), ascribed to Dhammapāla, which contains also the older *ṭīkā* on *Aṅguttaranikāya* (Mp-pṭ, see Table 3.2. above), is mentioned as follows:

Dhammapāla wrote subcommentaries, among them those on the commentaries by Buddhaghosa on the first four *Nikāyas* according to Gv 60, 11 and Piṭ-sm no. 199–201. However, Mp-pṭ is not mentioned in Sās 33, 20 = Ne 31, 10 sq. and, if it ever existed, does not seem to survive.⁶³

The later set of *ṭīkā*s on the four *Nikāyas* (*Sāratthamañjūsā*), ascribed to Sāriputta, which contains also the first three later *ṭīkā*s on *Dīghanikāya*, *Majjhimanikāya* and *Samyuttanikāya* (Sv-ṭ, Ps-ṭ, Spk-ṭ, see Table 3.2. above), is mentioned as follows:

Sāriputta is sometimes credited with a complete set of *Suttanta* subcommentaries called *Sāratthamañjūsā*. Only the subcommentary on Mp seems to actually exist: *Sāratthamañjūsā Aṅguttaraṭīkā*.

It seems that only this single *Suttanta* subcommentary was written by Sāriputta. For the supposed *Sāratthamañjūsā* on Sv-pṭ, Ps-pṭ, Spk-pṭ [?] seems to be a fiction: these subcommentaries, listed without reference to any source in CPD (Epil.), are neither mentioned in Sās 33, 22 = Ne 31, 13 nor in Piṭ-sm.⁶⁴

All this contradicts the information about the manuscripts of Sv-ṭ, Ps-ṭ, Spk-ṭ and Mp-pṭ discussed above (cf. Table 3.2. above). One of three manuscripts of the older *ṭīkā* on *Aṅguttaranikāya* (Mp-pṭ)—mentioned in *A Handbook of Pāli Literature* as “lost”⁶⁵—was recently discovered in Universities Central Library, Rangoon,⁶⁶ and the manuscripts of the three later *ṭīkā*s on *Dīghanikāya*, *Majjhimanikāya* and *Samyuttanikāya*—mentioned as “a fiction”⁶⁷—are according to Sōmadāsa’s

⁶³ O.v. Hinüber, HPL, p. 167 (§ 357), see also p. 173 (§ 376; in § 357 is a wrong reference to § 375 where no Mp-pṭ is mentioned).

⁶⁴ Ibid, p. 173 (§§ 375–376).

⁶⁵ Ibid (§ 376).

⁶⁶ For details, see Primoz Pecenko (2002), pp. 78–79, 82–85.

⁶⁷ O.v. Hinüber, HPL, p. 173 (§ 376).

Laṅkāvē puskola pot nāmāvaliya,⁶⁸ held in the temple libraries in Sri Lanka. It is also interesting to note that although two sets are mentioned, only one “combined” set—exactly the same as the one published by the Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana—was accepted as still available today. Here the Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana’s influence seems very clear and it is also supported by “properly chosen” bibliographic text, the *Sāsanavaṃsa* (see Table 2.4. above). Why were the *Saddhamma-saṅgaha* and other bibliographic sources—which list also other *ṭīkā*s (see Table 2.8.)—ignored?

The above analysis of the *nikāyaṭīkā*s and their manuscripts and printed editions clearly indicates that further research of Pāli sub-commentaries and their bibliographic information needs to be done. It is possible that more manuscripts of the less known *nikāyaṭīkā*s (i.e. Sv-ṭ, Ps-ṭ, Spk-ṭ, Mp-ṭ) are held in various temple libraries in the Theravāda countries. These *ṭīkā*s 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 *ṭīkā* literature and about the editions/versions of the canonical and post-canonical Pāli texts used at the time of their compilation.

⁶⁸ For details, see Primoz Pecenko (2002), pp. 79–82.

Abbreviations

Abbreviations and the quotation system of Pāli sources follow the *Critical Pāli Dictionary* (Epilegomena to vol. 1, 1948, pp. 5*–36*, and vol. 3, 1992, pp. II–VI) and H. Bechert, *Abkürzungsverzeichnis zur buddhistischen Literatur in Indien und Südostasien* (Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990). The only exception are the PTS editions which will be cited—unless required for emphasis—without edition and date, e.g. Sv-pṭ = Sv-pṭ Ee 1970 I–III, edited by Lily de Silva. For transliteration of Burmese see “Table of Transliteration” in H. Bechert et al., *Burmese Manuscripts, Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland*, vol. XXIII, 1 (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1979), p. xxi.

Adikaram, EHBC	E.W. Adikaram, <i>Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon</i> . Colombo: M.D. Gunasena, 1953.
AN	<i>Aṅguttaranikāya</i>
B	(manuscript) text in Burmese script
Be	Burmese edition
BE	Burmese era, (Culla-)Sakkarāj, beginning 638 CE
BSOAS	<i>Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies</i>
C	(manuscript) text in Sinhala script
Ce	Ceylonese edition
CPD	<i>Critical Pāli Dictionary</i> . V. Trenckner et al., eds. Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, 1924–. (see 2.7.)
DN	<i>Dīghanikāya</i>
DPPN	G.P. Malalasekera, <i>Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names</i>
ed(s).	edition(s)
Ee	European (PTS) edition
EFEO	<i>École française d' Extrême-Orient</i>
EncBuddh	G.P. Malalasekera, ed., <i>Encyclopaedia of Buddhism</i>
Geiger	W. Geiger, <i>Pāli Literature and Language</i> . Calcutta: Calcutta University Press, 1956.
Gv	<i>Gandhavaṃsa of Nandapaññā</i> . I.P. Minayeff, ed. JPTS, 1886, pp. 54–79. (see 2.3.)
JPTS	<i>Journal of the Pāli Text Society</i>
K	(manuscript) text in Cambodian script
K.R. Norman, PL	K.R. Norman, <i>Pāli Literature</i> . Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1983.
LPP	K.D. Sōmadāsa, <i>Laṅkāvē puskola pot nāmāvaliya</i> , vols. I–III. Colombo, Department of Cultural Affairs, 1959–64.
Mhv	<i>Mahāvaṃsa of Mahānāma</i> . W. Geiger, ed. London: PTS, 1958; and <i>Cūlavamsa of Dhammakitti</i> . W. Geiger, ed. London: PTS, 1980.
MN	<i>Majjhimanikāya</i>

Mp	<i>Manorathapūraṇī, Aṅguttaranikāya-aṭṭhakathā of Buddhaghosa</i>
Mp-pt	<i>Manorathapūraṇīpurāṇaṭṭhikā, Līnatthapakāsini IV</i>
Mp-t	<i>Manorathapūraṇīṭṭhikā, Sāratthamañjūsā IV of Sāriputta of Poḷonnaruva</i>
Ms(s).	manuscript(s)
Ne	edition in Devanāgarī print
nṭ	<i>navāṭṭhikā</i>
O.v. Hinüber, HPL	Oskar von Hinüber. <i>A Handbook of Pāli Literature</i> . Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1996.
PED	The Pāli Text Society's <i>Pāli-English Dictionary</i>
Piṭ-sm	<i>Piṭakat samuiṇ</i> . Rangoon: Tipiṭakanikāya Sāsana Pru Aphvai, 1989. (see 2.6.)
PLB	M.H. Bode, <i>The Pāli Literature of Burma</i> . London, 1909.
PLC	G.P. Malalasekera, <i>The Pāli Literature of Ceylon</i> . Colombo: M.D. Gunasena, 1958.
Ps	<i>Papañcasūdanī, Majjhimanikāya-aṭṭhakathā of Buddhaghosa</i>
Ps-pt	<i>Papañcasūdanīpurāṇaṭṭhikā, Līnatthapakāsini II of Dhammapāla</i>
Ps-t	<i>Papañcasūdanīṭṭhikā, Sāratthamañjūsā II</i>
pṭ	<i>purāṇaṭṭhikā</i>
PTS	Pāli Text Society
Saddhamma-s	<i>Saddhammasaṅgaha of Dhammakitti</i> . Nedimāle Saddhānanda, ed. JPTS 1890, pp. 21–90 = Ne 1961. (see 2.1.)
Sās	<i>Sāsanavaṃsa of Paññāsāmi</i> . C.S. Upasak, ed. Nālandā: Nava Nālandā Mahāvihāra, 1961 = Ee 1897. (see 2.4.)
Sās-dip	<i>Sāsanavaṃsadīpa of Vimalasārathera</i> . Colombo: Satthāloka Press 1880. (see 2.5.)
Se	edition in Siamese print
SN	<i>Samyuttanikāya</i>
Sp	<i>Samantapāsādikā, Vinaya-aṭṭhakathā of Buddhaghosa</i>
Sp-t	<i>Sāratthadīpanīṭṭhikā of Sāriputta of Poḷonnaruva</i>
Spk	<i>Sāratthapakāsini, Samyuttanikāya-aṭṭhakathā of Buddhaghosa</i>
Spk-pt	<i>Sāratthapakāsiniṭṭhikā, Līnatthapakāsini III of Dhammapāla</i>
Spk-t	<i>Sāratthapakāsiniṭṭhikā, Sāratthamañjūsā III</i>
Sv	<i>Sumaṅgalavilāsini, Dīghanikāya-aṭṭhakathā of Buddhaghosa</i>
Sv-nṭ Be	<i>Sumaṅgalavilāsiniṭṭhikā, Silakkhandhavagga-abhinavaṭṭhikā, Sādhujanavilāsini of Nāṇabhivaṃsa</i>
Sv-pt	<i>Sumaṅgalavilāsiniṭṭhikā, Līnatthapakāsini I of Dhammapāla</i>
Sv-t	<i>Sumaṅgalavilāsiniṭṭhikā, Sāratthamañjūsā I</i>
Trsl.	Translation
ṭ	<i>ṭhikā</i>
Upās	<i>Upāsakajanālaṅkāra</i> . H. Saddhatissa, ed. London: PTS, 1965.
Winternitz, HIL	M. Winternitz, <i>A History of Indian Literature</i> , 3 vols. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1981.
ZDMG	<i>Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft</i>

上座部傳統與當代巴利學界

——古老巴利書誌所述及的「已佚失」寫本之個案

Primoz Pecenko

昆士蘭大學佛學研究中心主任

提要

本文將探討筆者對前四部《尼柯耶》之《疏鈔》(*tika*)所作的研究,指出實際上存在著兩組《疏鈔》,而非僅有我們目前所見的一組刊印本《疏鈔》(第六次結集版)。當代巴利學術著作對於此論題的看法,與上座部傳統所持的意見相同,經常只提及一組《疏鈔》。然而,依據一些巴利書誌資料,以及緬甸、斯里蘭卡若干圖書館中的寫本目錄來看,前四部《尼柯耶》似乎還存在著另一組《疏鈔》,只不過它卻為上座部傳統所忽略,同時也被當代巴利學界認為是已佚失或根本不存在。

筆者近來在緬甸發現一份被認為是已佚失的疏鈔之巴利寫本,這個寫本的發現,使我們對兩組《疏鈔》的歷史發展,有一個全然嶄新的看法,乃至也讓我們對於那些與巴利文獻史相關的現有資訊,能有全新的瞭解。筆者將試著探討此新發現所衍生的一些重要議題:

被認為「已佚失」的寫本仍存在。這事實證明:一些較古的巴利書誌所提供的資訊——存在著兩組疏鈔——是正確的;然而,上座部傳統和當代巴利學界,卻忽視那「已佚失」的疏鈔以及相關的書誌資訊。為什麼?

分析現存刊印本與輯入〔館藏〕目錄的寫本之後,顯示出當代巴利學術著作所提供的有關巴利疏鈔之資訊,似乎受到上座部傳統的影響(二者都只提及一組《疏鈔》),即便那「已佚失」的疏鈔之相關資訊唾手可得。

上述「已佚失」的文本,在最古老的巴利書誌即《正法輯錄》(*Saddhammasaṅgaha*)之中,早有記載。筆者新發現的、被視為「已佚失」的鈔疏寫本,證明了:通常被當代巴利學界認為較不可靠的《正法輯錄》,似乎較後期的書誌如《教史》(*Sāsanavaṃsa*),更為可靠,雖然後者常被視為巴利文獻史的主要資料。因此,我們有必要根據古代書誌、館藏寫本目錄、碑文,以及仍未被研究的寫本,重新檢視巴利文獻的發展歷史。

有鑑於此,吾人對於上座部巴利文本之傳播情況的理解,也必須重新被檢視。

關鍵詞: 1. 上座部佛教 2. 巴利疏鈔 3. 巴利書誌 4. 文本傳播 5. 巴利寫本