

ABHIDHAMMA STUDIES I

Jotipāla and the *Abhidhamma Anuṭikā*¹

L.S. Cousins

summary of argument

1. We learn from the *Cūlavamsa* that a monk named Jotipāla played an important role in the Buddhism of the island of Ceylon at the end of the sixth century and during the first decade of the seventh century.
2. In the thirteenth century *sanne* to the *Visuddhimagga* (Vism-sn), on two separate occasions Sanskrit verses are ascribed to a Jotipāla who is given an epithet appropriate for a monk of very high status.
3. In Sumaṅgala's thirteenth century *ṭikā* to the *Abhidhammāvātāra* (Abhidh-av-t) the views of Jotipāla are cited nine times. He is referred to as rejecting the views of Ānanda. He is clearly regarded as a very prominent figure, since sometimes the reference is simply to Jotipāla and others and on two occasions he is cited with Dhammapāla in second place.
4. Some of the views ascribed to Jotipāla in Abhidh-av-t are found in the *Anuṭikā* (i.e. commentary on a *ṭikā*) to Ānanda's *Mūlaṭikā* on the *Abhidhamma Commentary*. Moreover, Vism-sn quotes a passage from what it calls the *Jotiya-anuṭikā*. The passage is indeed found in the *Anuṭikā*. The identification of Jotipāla as author of the *Anuṭikā* (or of a predecessor to that work) seems then very plausible.
5. If Jotipāla is dated to c. 600 A.D., a basis can now be provided to narrow the range of possible dates for such works as the *Mūlaṭikā*. Since most (if not all) of the works ascribed to Dhammapāla must be subsequent to the writing of Jotipāla's *Anuṭikā*, their authorship and dating can also now be reconsidered.

¹ Thanks are due to K.R. Norman, Oskar von Hinüber and Richard Gombrich for helpful comments on earlier drafts of this article.

*argument in detail***1. Who was Jotipāla?**²

It is clear that Jotipāla was a figure of importance in the *abhidhamma* tradition of the Mahāvihāravāsins. The number of times he is quoted by Sumaṅgala in the early thirteenth century and by Parākramabāhu II in the mid-thirteenth century would be enough to establish this. Indeed at Abhidh-av-ṭ II 177 and 185 he is cited with Dhammapāla in second place!³ In the *Nikāyasamgraha* a list of leading writers prior to the twelfth century begins with Buddhaghosa and Buddhadatta, followed by Dharmapāla and then Jotipāla.⁴

Who was he then? A *thera* named Jotipāla who had previously dwelt with Buddhaghosa in Kañcipura is said (in the colophons) to have requested the latter to write his commentaries to the *Samyutta* and *Aṅguttara Āgamas*. This Jotipāla may well have been of South Indian origin and might well have known Sanskrit, but he is certainly too early to be the elder in question. In fact, the Jotipāla with whom we are concerned is shown by Sumaṅgala to be responding to the views of Ānanda whom Sumaṅgala probably believed to be the author of both the *Mūlaṭīkā* and the *Saccasaṅkhepa*. In effect then, he must be later than the fifth and sixth century commentaries at minimum — the ideas of Ānanda are very important to the development of the *abhidhamma* component of the *ṭīkā*s, but completely unknown even to Nidd-a and Paṭis-a.⁵

As far as I know, this leaves only one possibility, but a very good one. In the *Cūlavamsa* (XLII 35) we are told that during the reign of Aggabodhi I at the end of the sixth century A.D. a *mahā-thera* named Jotipāla(ka) defeated the Vetulla-vādins on the island in debate. (It is evident from his donations that this king actively supported the Mahāvihāra, although probably not exclusively). In the following verses we have the story of an individual raising his hand against Jotipāla and

² On Jotipāla, see: Malalasekera 1928, p. 210f.; Godakumbura 1943, p. 91; Rahula 1966, p. 103f.; Saddhātissa 1965, Introduction, p. 109; Pieris 1978, p.74.

³ See section three below.

⁴ Nikāyas 81. There are eight more names: Kṣema, Dharmasrī, Nanda, Ānanda, Anuruddha, Upaṭiṣya, Buddharakṣita and Maudgalyāyana. This list includes practically all important writers of *abhidhamma* material prior to the twelfth century whose names are known to us. (The only obvious omissions are Mahānāma and Upasena.) If it is assumed that the last two names are a late addition, then it is possible (but not certain) that this was in fact originally a list of specifically South Indian authors.

⁵ I shall leave aside the author of the *Kavi-dappana-nīti*, certainly a Jotipāla by the evidence of its introduction and conclusion, on the (preliminary) assumption that he is probably later in date.

promptly getting a swelling (*gaṇḍa*) on his hand from which he later died. The king had faith in him and had him dwell *vihāre yeve* — either in the *vihāra* where the debate was held (so Geiger) or, more probably, in the Mahāvihāra itself. There is no way of knowing for certain how much historical basis there is for such a legendary story, first found in a source more than six centuries later. But there is a strong tendency in South Asian literature for legends of victory in debate to be told of well-known literary figures. So we might reasonably expect that the Jotipāla in question would be the author of major writings.

There are two further mentions of Jotipāla in the reign of the following king: Aggabodhi II (604–14 A.D.). We are told (vv. 44–49) that a Kaliṅga king with his chief queen and minister came to Ceylon and all three ordained under Jotipāla. Later we are told that Jotipāla persuaded the king to carry out repairs to the Thūpārāma and played a major part in the ceremonies at the conclusion of this work (vv. 51–60). Clearly the name of Jotipāla was preserved very prominently in the traditions of the Mahāvihāra relating to this period. He is then a very suitable candidate both as the author of the Sanskrit verses cited in *Vism-sū* and as the Ācariya-Jotipāla-thera whose views are mentioned in *Abhidh-av-ṭ*.

According to the *Nikāyasaṃgraha* Jotipāla came from Jambudīpa.⁶ That is perhaps also implied in the *Cūlavamsa*, if we understand that the king is specifically mentioned as arranging for him to dwell in the Mahāvihāra. Of course, Jambudīpa could refer to North India or South-East Asia, but it is much more likely that he came from the major centre of non-Mahāyāna Theravādin tradition in the Tamil country.⁷ Given the obvious similarity of the names Dhammapāla and Jotipāla,⁸ we could look to some kind of pupil-teacher or monastic relation between the two (and possibly with Ānanda, the author of the *Mūlaṭīkā* too), if some of the works attributed to Dhammapāla do indeed belong to this period.⁹ But more evidence would be needed to confirm this.

⁶ Nikāyas 72.

⁷ According to Hsüan-tsang, in the early sixth century there were 100 monasteries and over 10,000 monks of the Sthavira school in the kingdom whose capital was Kāñcīpura (Rongxi 1996, p. 320). Since he normally refers to the Abhayagiri school by the name of Mahāyāna Sthāvira/Sthavira, this suggests that the Mahāvihāra tradition or something similar was predominant here. This is exactly what we would expect, given the literary importance of Pali writers from South India in this period.

⁸ In modern times, at least, the ordination names of monks in the same monastic lineage sometimes contain a common component. Compare the well-known group of monks with names beginning with Nāṇa- ordained in modern Ceylon.

⁹ See also: Malalasekera 1928, p. 210f.

2. The verses ascribed to Jotipāla in Vism-sn

Sanskrit stanzas are twice attributed to Jotipāla by name in the Sinhalese *sanne* to the *Visuddhimagga* (Vism-sn) and no doubt others of the numerous Sanskrit quotations in that work are from Jotipāla too, although that is more difficult to establish. We should note that on both occasions he is referred to as *māhimi* = *mahā-sāmi*, a title likely to have been used of a monk considered (in the thirteenth century) to have been of very high status.

I shall treat the two contexts in turn:

in defence of the heart-base

Vism-sn III 1060 (to Vism 447) attributes the following *śloka* to Jotipāla:

me ma kīha Jotipāla-māhimiyo:

*Vastv-āśrayor dvayor dhātvo rūpāvabaddha-vṛttitah
hrdd hi tau dvāv upādāya rūpāśrayo bhava-dvaye yi. (1)*

“Because the two elements that have the <heart->base as their support operate bound up with *rūpa*, the heart is certainly the support for *rūpa* in two <kinds of> existence¹⁰ in dependence upon those two <elements>.” (1) (cp. Abhidh-av 674; Sacc 12)

This is a presentation of part of the arguments in support of the Theravādin notion of the heart-base (*hadaya-vatthu*). This was known in Sanskrit Buddhist circles as a view specific to the Sthaviravādin tradition.¹¹

Vism-mhṭ II 96f. has a prose equivalent to this:

*Mano-dhātu-mano-viññāṇa-dhātūnaṃ nissaya-lakkhaṇaṃ
hadaya-vatthū ti katham etaṃ viññātabban? ti. Āgamato,
yuttito ca. ...¹² Yutti pana evaṃ veditabbā: nipphanna-
upādāya-rūpa-nissayaṃ dhātu-dvayaṃ pañca-vokāra-bhave.*

¹⁰ The two kinds of *bhava* are *kāma-bhava* and *rūpa-bhava*. Five-constituent existence consists of both of these (excluding *asañña* existence).

¹¹ See most recently: Skilling 1993, pp. 160ff.; Skilling 1994, p. 195f. Note that the term *vatthu*, used in this sense, originates with the *Paṭṭhāna*, not as suggest by Skilling with Buddhaghosa.

¹² I omit a section citing the *Paṭṭhāna* as canonical support and discussing the reason for the absence of any mention of *hadaya-vatthu* in the *Rūpakaṇḍa* of Dhs.

Tattharūpāyatanādīnaṃ, ...¹³ pārisesato hadaya-vatthu tesañ nissaya ti viññāyati; sakkā hi vattuṃ nippahanna-upādāya-rūpa-nissayaṃ dhātu-dvayaṃ pañca-vokāra-bhave rūpa-pañibaddha-vutti-bhāvato. Yaṃ yañ hi¹⁴ rūpa-pañibaddha-vutti, taṃ taṃ nippahanna-upādāya-rūpa-nissayaṃ diṭṭhaṃ¹⁵ yathā cakkhu-viññāṇa-dhātū ti. ‘Pañca-vokāra-bhave’ ti ca visesanaṃ mano-viññāṇa-dhātu-vasena kataṃ. Mano-dhātu pana catu-vokāra-bhave n’atth’eva. (cf. Abhidh-av-ṭ II 139)

“[Objection:] If it is said that the heart-base has the characteristic of being the support (*nissaya*) for mind element and mind discrimination element, how is that to be known?

[Reply:] From scripture and from reasoned argument (*yutti*). ... [Scriptural evidence is given, then:] But the reasoned argument should be understood as follows: in five-constituent existence the two elements [i.e. mind discrimination element and mind element] have as their support *rūpas* which are both dependent and *nippahanna*.¹⁶ Among <the fifteen> *rūpas* of that kind, the form and other bases [i.e. the sense objects] cannot be the support of these two elements because ... [similarly there are objections to *ojas*, to the male and female *indriyas* and to the life *indriya*]. Consequently it is known that the heart-base is their support; for the statement that the two elements have as their support *rūpas* which are dependent and *nippahanna* in five-constituent existence can be made because they are operative when bound up with *rūpas*. For whatever is operative when bound up with *rūpas*, all such <discrimination> is found to have (*diṭṭhaṃ*) as its support *rūpas* which are dependent and *nippahanna*, just as <in the case of> eye discrimination element.¹⁷ But ‘in five-constituent existence’ is specified with reference to mind discrimination element. By contrast (*pana*), mind element is never found in four-constituent existence.”

¹³ Again, I omit the refutation of various other *rūpa-dhammā* as *nissaya* for mental states. A verse version of the omitted passage is found at Abhidh-s-sn 173; Abhidh-s-mhṭ 152 = Sacc-ṭ to Sacc 12. This could be a Pali rendering of this portion of Jotipāla’s work.

¹⁴ Omitted in some texts.

¹⁵ B^e cites (from Sī) a variant: *niddiṭṭhaṃ*, but cp. Abhidh-av-ṭ: *dissati*.

¹⁶ See Vism 450 for the division of the 28 kinds of *rūpa* into 18 which are *nippahanna* and ten which are *anippahanna*.

¹⁷ Tikap 4: *cakkhāyatanam cakkhu-viññāṇa-dhātuyā ... nissaya-paccayena paccayo*.

The arguments concerning the heart-base continue with another Sanskrit stanza on the next page of Vism-sn (unattributed but likely to be from the same source):

*Tad vastu-bhāvāt karmotthaṃ dṛśvat pratīyana-kriyaṃ
hṛt-khedāc cārtha-cintāyāṃ tatra-stham iti gamyate. (2)*

“That is known to be originated by *karma* because it is a base (*vastu*), to be fixed in its function like the eye and to be positioned there <in the chest> because the heart becomes tired when one reflects on matters.” (2)

A Pali rendering of this stanza at Abhidh-av-ṭ II 139 is cited as: *yathāhu ācariyā:*

*Kamma-jaṃ vatthu-bhāvā taṃ cakkhuṃ va niyata-kriyaṃ
cintāya ca uro-khedā tatra tiṭṭhan ti vijāniyan ti.*

Vism-mhṭ II 97f.:

*Hotu dhātu-dvaya-nissayo hadaya-vatthu, upādāya-rūpañ ca;
etaṃ pana kamma-samuṭṭhānaṃ, paṭiniyata-kiccaṃ, hadaya-
padese ṭhitam evā ti kathaṃ viññāyatī? ti. Vuccate: vatthu-rūpa-
bhāvato kamma-samuṭṭhānaṃ; cakkhu viya tato eva paṭiniyata-
kiccaṃ (vatthu-rūpa-bhāvato ti ca viññāna-nissaya-bhāvato
<ca> ti attho); aṭṭhiṃkatvā, manasi-katvā, sabba-cetasā
samannāharitvā, kiñci cintentassa hadayassa khijjanato tatth’
etaṃ avatṭhitan ti viññāyatī.¹⁸*

“[The objection might be raised: ‘One may concede that the <heart-> base is the support for the two elements and that it is dependent *rūpa*, but how is it known that the <heart-base> is originated by *kamma*, has a fixed function and is positioned in the region of the heart?’ The answer is as follows: ‘it is known that it is originated by *kamma* because it is the *rūpa* of a base; it is known that it is fixed in its function like the eye for the

¹⁸ cf. Abhidh-av-ṭ II 139: *Hotu tāva dhātu-dvaya-nissayo vatthu, upādāya-rūpañ ca; taṃ pañ’ etaṃ kamma-samuṭṭhānaṃ paṭiniyata-kiccaṃ hadaya-ppadese ṭhitam ekan ti daṭṭhabbaṃ kathaṃ etaṃ viññāyatī? Vuccate: vatthu-rūpa-bhāvato kamma-samuṭṭhānaṃ cakkhu viya (yañ hi viññānaṃssa vatthu-bhūtaṃ rūpaṃ, taṃ kamma-samuṭṭhānaṃ yathā cakkhu-pasādo); tato eva paṭiniyata-kiccaṃ; aṭṭhiṃkatvā manasikatvā sabbaṃ cetasā samannāharitvā kiñci cintentassa hadaya-ppadesassa khijjanato tatthedaṃ tiṭṭhatī ti viññāyatī.*

same reason (*tato eva*) (i.e. both because it is the *rūpa* of a base <and> because it is the support of discrimination) <and it is known> that it is placed there <in the chest> because one's heart becomes tired when one reflects on something after giving heed to it, paying attention to it and considering it with the whole of one's mind'.¹⁹

abhijñā

Again, at Vism-sn III 1098 (to Vism 456) two *gāthās* are attributed to Jotipāla:

me ma kiha Jotipāla-māhimiyo da:

*Nātrāpy abhijñā dhyānasya dānāder artha-lābhavat
ihānṛśamsa-bhūtatvāt phaladāsambhavād api. (3)*

*Nānya-bhū-phaladaṃ karma rūpa-pākasya go-caraḥ
karmālamba<ḥ> parittādi na cety ayam asambhavaḥ. (4)*

“Higher knowledge does not give results because it is the reward in this existence of *dhyāna* just as the obtaining of wealth <is the reward of> giving and the rest; also because it is impossible. (3) The reason that it is impossible is that *karma* does not give fruit on a different level <to its own> and the object of resultant <*citta*> of the *rūpa* <level> is <sign of> the *karma*, not such objects as small <*dhammas*>.” (4)

The content of these verses is close to material we find in the *ṭīkā*s, as a passage in Vism-mḥṭ demonstrates clearly. They are almost certainly from a Theravādin source.²⁰

Vism-mḥṭ II 128:

*Yaṃ paṇ' ettha pañcama-jjhāna-cittaṃ abhiññāppattaṃ, tassa vipāko
eva n'atthi. Kasmā n'atthi? Asambhavato, ānisamsa-bhūtattā ca.
Taṃ hi vipākaṃ dentaṃ rūpāvacaram eva dadeyya. Na hi añña-
bhūmikaṃ kammaṃ añña-bhūmikaṃ vipākaṃ deti. Kamma-
nimittārammaṇatā ca rūpāvacara-vipākassa vuttā ti na taṃ*

¹⁹ Or, read *sabbaṃ cetasā* as with Abidh-av-ṭ: ‘mentally adverting to it in full.’

²⁰ The *abhidhamma* system involved is closely related to or identical to the Theravādin and very different to the understanding of the *abhiññā* in the Sarvāstivādin *abhidharma*. Compare: Dhs §1408.

aññaṃ ārabha pavattati parittārammaṇādi-ārammaṇā ca taṃ na hotī ti ayam asambhavo; jhānassa ānisaṃsa-bhūtaṃ ca dānādīnaṃ tasmim̐ attā-bhāve paccaya-lābho viyā ti.

“Now fifth *jhāna citta* which has obtained higher knowledge has no resultant. Why does it have none? (a) Because it is impossible and (b) due to it being the reward.” (a) If <fifth *jhāna citta* which has obtained higher knowledge> gave a resultant, it could only give one which is *rūpāvacara*; for *kamma* of one level does not give a resultant of a different level. Since it has been declared <in the commentarial literature²¹> that *rūpāvacara* resultant <*citta*> has as its object the sign of the *kamma*, it does not operate with a different <object> and does not have such objects as small objects.²² This is <what is meant by saying that it is> impossible. (b) And being the reward of *jhāna* is comparable to obtaining requisites in the same body (*attabhāva*) <as rewards of> giving and other such acts.”

This may best be seen as a simpler and clearer presentation of material garnered from both *Mūlaṭīkā* and *Anuṭīkā*. In Appendix A I give longer quotations (passages 1 and 2) to illustrate the way in which these texts are related, since they are not always conveniently available.

3. References to Jotipāla in the *Abhidhammāvatāra-ṭīkā*

Jotipāla is mentioned nine times in Sumaṅgala’s *Abhidhammāvatāra-ṭīkā* (*Abhidh-av-ṭī*) with reference to eight opinions. Not all of these passages can be related to the *Anuṭīkā*. In four cases Jotipāla is mentioned in the singular. These items relate rather to the verse text in Sanskrit which Vism-sn attributes to him or to other Sanskrit material also found in Vism-sn. But four of those given with Jotipāla’s name together with Dhammapāla and/or unnamed *theras* are closely related to the *Anuṭīkā*; all four mention the views of Ānanda and plainly derive from this context. It is on the basis of these four passages that I confirm the authorship of the (or an) *Anuṭīkā* by Jotipāla. For the sake of having all the material conveniently cited in one source, however, I give the remaining contexts in Appendix B with some further discussion.

²¹ e.g. Vism 457: reading with most editions *kammanimittam* for E° *kammakammanimittam*.

²² i.e. the object is a *paññatti* and not any of the *dhammas* of the *paritta* triplet; cf. Dhs §1022ff.; 1408.

Mentions of Jotipāla together with others

item no.	<i>ṭikā</i> page	debated issue	exact name used
(a)	II 66	can a <i>tad-ārammaṇa</i> follow a <i>kiriya-javana</i> ? (view of ‘ <i>Ānandācariyo</i> ’ rejected)	<i>Ācariya-Jotipāla-ttherādayo pana: ... ti vadanti.</i>
(b)	II 177	<i>rūpa</i> in the Brahma realm (view of ‘ <i>Ānandācariyo</i> ’ rejected)	<i>Ācariya-Jotipāla-Dhammapāla-ttherā pana taṃ paṭikkhipanti.</i>
(c)	II 181	can those of <i>opapātika</i> or <i>saṃseda-ja</i> rebirth lack the sense of smell? (view of <i>Ānandācariyādayo</i> rejected)	<i>Jotipāla-ttherādayo pana:</i>
(d)	II 185	is there a <i>ṭhiti-khaṇa</i> ? (view of ‘ <i>Ānandācariyo</i> ’ rejected)	<i>Ācariya-Jotipāla-Dhammapāla-ttherānaṃ paṇ’ etaṃ na kkhamati.</i>
(e)	II 303	the nature of <i>nirutti</i>	<i>Ācariya-Jotipāla-ttherādayo paṇāhu: ...</i>

a. *tad-ārammaṇa* after a *kiriya javana*

Abhidh-av-ṭ II 66 ≠ Vism-mhṭ II 134:

Ānandācariyo pana: Paṭṭhāne “kusalākusale niruddhe vipāko tad-ārammaṇatā uppajjati” ti (e.g. Tikap 331²³) vipāka-dhamma-dhammānaṃ evānantaraṃ tad-ārammaṇaṃ vuttaṃ; vipphāravantañ hi javanaṃ nāvaṃ viya nadī-soto bhav’āṅgaṃ anubandhati, na pana chaḷ-āṅg’-upekkhāvato santa-vuttiṃ kiriya-javanaṃ paṇṇa-putaṃ viya nadī-soto ti kiriya-javanānantaraṃ tad-ārammaṇaṃ na icchati. Ācariya-Jotipāla-ttherādayo pana “labbhamānassa pi kenaci adhippāyena katthaci avacanaṃ dissati, yathā taṃ Dhamma-saṅgahe akusala-niddese labbhamāno pi adhipati na vutto. Tasmā yadi avyākatānantaraṃ pi tadārammaṇaṃ

²³ The reading at Tikap 331 requires correction. My software counts 21 occurrences of this sentence in the VRI edition of Paṭṭh.

vuḍḍeyya, tadāvoṭṭhapanānantarampi tassa pavattiṃ maññeyyuntikiriya-javanānantaram tadārammaṇaṃ na vuttaṃ, na pana alabbhāto. Yañ c'ettha paṇṇa-puṭaṃ nidassitaṃ, taṃ nidassitabbena samānaṃ na hoti, nāvā-paṇṇa-puṭānaṃ hi nadī-sotassa āvaṭṭanaṃ gati ca visadisī ti nāvāyaṃ nadī-sotassa anubandhanaṃ, paṇṇa-puṭassa ananubandhanañ ca yujjati, idha pana kiriya-javanetara-javanānaṃ bhav'aṅga-sotassa āvaṭṭanaṃ gati ca sadisī ti etassa ananubandhanaṃ, itarassa anubandhanañ ca na yujjati, tasmā vicāretabbam eva tan" ti vadanti.

“The teacher Ānanda does not allow <that there can be> *tad-ārammaṇa citta* after a *kiriya* active mind (*javana*). This is because it is said in the *Paṭṭhāna* (in the passage: ‘when skilful and unskilful *citta* has ceased, a resultant *dhamma* which is associated with the same object (*tad-ārammaṇatā*) <as the *citta* which has ceased> arises’) that *tad-ārammaṇa* occurs after *dhammas* capable of giving results only; for the *bhav'-aṅga* mind imitates (*anubandhati*) the disturbing active mind (*javana*) as the river’s flow (wake) follows a boat, but the does not imitate the peacefully operating²⁴ active mind of <the arahat> who has the six kinds of equanimity, just as the river’s flow (wake) does not follow a reed basket <floating in the water>.

The teacher Elder Jotipāla and others say rather: ‘This should be reflected upon for the following reasons: that which does occur is not mentioned in some places with some specific intention; e.g. in the *Dhamma-saṅgaha*, in the description of the unskilful, *adhipatis* are not mentioned, even although they exist. Therefore *tad-ārammaṇa* is not mentioned after *kiriya* active mind since, if *tad-ārammaṇa* were mentioned after undeclared (*avyākata*) *citta*, people might suppose that it would occur after establishing mind,²⁵ but <the reason that it is not mentioned is> not because it does not occur. Also, the reed basket which is given as a simile here is not comparable to what is being explained; for the diverting and movement of the river’s flow are dissimilar in the cases of a boat and a reed basket. A river’s flow follows a boat, but no such following is appropriate in the case of a reed basket, whereas in this case it is not appropriate <for the flow of

²⁴ The comparison is intended to recall the difference between *vitakka* and *vicāra*: Vism 142, etc.

²⁵ i.e. when the consciousness process reaches only as far as the stage of establishing and lapses into *bhav'-aṅga* that would also involve the succession from *kiriya citta* to resultant.

the *bhav'-aṅga* mind> to imitate the <non-*kiriya* active mind> and not to imitate the <*kiriya* active mind> because the diverting and movement of the flow of the *bhav'-aṅga* <mind> are similar in the cases of *kiriya* active mind and the other kinds of active mind.’ ”

The debate here concerns two distinct understandings. For Ānanda the reason that the mind does not always revert to its normal flow immediately after an episode of activity is that such activity (*javana*) involves skilful and unskilful *kamma* (*vipākadhamma*). The active mind of an arahat does not involve such *kamma* and therefore does not disturb what follows — it leaves no wake. For Jotipāla and the later tradition the activity (*javana*) seems to be inherently disturbing regardless of the nature of the activity. This is perhaps because they attribute the *tad-ārammaṇa* which can follow after active mind to the strength or clarity of the object of the active mind.

It can easily be shown that the mentions (in Abhidh-av-ṭ and the *Mahāṭikā*) of Ānanda and Jotipāla, etc. correspond quite closely to the *Mūlaṭikā* and the *Anuṭikā* respectively. At Dhs-mṭ 134, Ānanda cites the same passage from the *Paṭṭhāna* and another from the same work, pointing out that there is no place where a *tad-ārammaṇa* after *kiriya citta* is mentioned; so ‘this *thera-vāda* should be examined’ and he then gives the same simile.²⁶ Dhs-anuṭ 140f. gives the two canonical passages more fully and points out that it is because Ānanda understands that the absence of mention of a *kiriya* active mind followed by *tad-ārammaṇa* is because that does not occur that he then gives a *yutti* (reasoned argument). (It is normal practice in the *ṭikās* to decide issues by reference to scriptural statements, but to resort to *yutti* where there is no conclusive statement.)

The *Anuṭikā* continues:

“As to this, some²⁷ say that the reed basket which has been put forward as a simile is not comparable because even in the case of <the arahat> who has the six kinds of equanimity the disturbing action (*kiriya*) of the *kiriya* active mind cannot be rejected on the grounds that the *citta* is *kiriya-maya*. <They also say that> the absence of mention in the *Pāli* of the existence²⁸

²⁶ *Vipphārikañ hi javanaṃ nāvaṃ viya nadī-soto bhav'-aṅgaṃ anubandhatī ti yuttaṃ; na pana chaḥ-aṅg'-upekkhavato santa-vuttiṃ kiriya-javanaṃ paṇṇa-putaṃ viya nadī-soto.*

²⁷ This suggests the existence of an earlier subcommentary on the *Mūlaṭikā*.

²⁸ Correct °*abhāva*- to °*bhāva*-.

of *tad-ārammaṇas* after *kiriya citta*, even although they exist, is not a <valid> reason, because that which does occur is not mentioned in some places with some specific intention e.g. in the case of *adhipatis* which are not mentioned in the description of the unskilful in the *Dhamma-saṅgaha*, even although they exist. Therefore the absence of *tad-ārammaṇas* immediately after *kiriya* active mind should be investigated.”²⁹

Sumaṅgala is clearly following *Vism-mhṭ* closely (and not the *Anuṭṭikā* itself) but adds the name of *Jotipāla* where *Vism-mhṭ* simply has *keci*. The *Anuṭṭikā*, however, continues:

“Given that it is *kiriya-maya*, the active mind of <*arahats*> who have destroyed the *āsavas* and gained the state of *tādin* is invariably free from causing disturbance, unlike that of others. However, the simile of the reed basket has been used for that because due to its peaceful nature it would have the quality (*rasa*) of settling <the mind>.”³⁰

It goes on to point out that the argument from the absence of any specific mention of the *adhipatis* in *Dhs* is invalid because the *Aṭṭha-kathā* (*Dhs-a* 261, referring back to 256 and 259) at that point specifically mentions that the method given earlier should be applied, i.e. they do exist.³¹ Therefore, since it does not so indicate in the case of *tad-ārammaṇas* after *kiriya citta*, it cannot be argued that such a method should be applied in the case of *kiriya citta*, which is quite different in nature to skilful or unskilful *citta*.³²

²⁹ *Ettha keci*: “*chaḷaṅg’-upekkhāvato pi kiriya-maya-cittatāya kiriya-javanassa vipphārika-kiriya-bhāvo na sakkā nisedhetun ti nidassana-bhāvena paṇṇa-puṭam upanītam asamānam. Kiriya-javanānantaram tad-ārammaṇābhāvassa pāliyaṃ avacanam pi akāraṇam labbhamānassa pi katthaci kenaci adhippāyena avacاناتo; tathā hi Dhamma-saṅgāhe akusala-niddese labbhamāno pi adhipati na vutto. Tasmā kiriya-javanānantaram tad-ārammaṇābhāvo vīmaṃsitabbo” ti vadanti.*

³⁰ *Sati pi kiriya-mayatte, sabbattha tādi-bhāva-ppattānam khīṇāsavānam javana-cittam na itaresam viya vipphārikam. Santa-sabhāvatāya pana sannisinna-rasam siyā ti tassa paṇṇa-puṭam dassitam.*

³¹ To be exact, the first three *adhipatis* are found in greed and hate *citta*, but only *sahajātādhipati* and not *ārammaṇādhipati* are found in hate *citta*. No *adhipatis* are found in *moha citta*.

³² *Tathā hi vuttam tattha Aṭṭha-kathāyam: “heṭṭhā dassita-nayattā” (Dhs-a 261) ti, na c’ettha dassita-nayattā ti sakkā vuttum vipāka-dhamma-dhammehi kusalākusalehi atam-sabhāvānam naya-dassanassa ayujjamānakattā.*

The *Anuṭṭikā* then adds an additional point:

“Moreover, because the *adhipati* of investigation is absent in that case [i.e. unskillful *citta*] and all <four *adhipatis*> are absent in some cases, one can say that it has been set out to present the teaching in a consistent way (*eka-rasā desanā*). But <Ānanda> says that there is no reason for the lack of mention because no such reason for the lack of mention is found in this case.”³³

This point is not made in the later sources, including *Vism-mhṭ*, perhaps because it is rather specific to the text of *Dhs*. In effect, it is saying that the presence and absence of *adhipatis* is rather variable and therefore the variations are omitted in *Dhs* for the sake of simplicity of presentation. But that argument is not applicable to the case of *tad-ārammaṇas* after *kiriya citta*, since the position of Buddhaghosa (*Vism* 459) is that they can be present in all cases. Ānanda, of course, thinks that they are absent in all cases.

b) *rūpa* in the Brahma realm

The *Abhidhamma Commentary* and the *Visuddhimagga* each contain a very long and similar account of conditioned origination.³⁴ In the section commenting on the link between *saṅkhāras* and *viññāṇa* both works give (largely identical) summary verses with a commentary. One of these verses defines the minimal number of material groupings which can arise at the first moment of rebirth. A subsequent verse indicates that Brahmās have 39 *rūpas* at the moment of rebirth; the commentary explains that this is made up of four *kalāpas* (i.e. the decads of eye, ear and base with the nonad of life). The earlier *Vimuttimagga* (Trsl. p. 244) seems to have allowed 49 *rūpas* in this case (including the body decad).

In the *Mūlaṭṭikā* Ānanda rejects this on the grounds that it is incompatible with the relevant canonical passages:

³³ *Api ca tattha vīmaṃsāya kesuci sabbesaṅ ca adhipatīnaṃ abhāvato, eka-rasaṃ desanaṃ dassetuṃ, uddhaṭo ti ca sakkā vattuṃ. Idha pana na tādisaṃ avacane kāraṇaṃ labbhatī ti avacane kāraṇaṃ n’atthī ti vuttaṃ.*

³⁴ The exact relationship between the two is unclear, but the following seems likely. The *Visuddhimagga* has used as its source partly the account in the earlier *Vimuttimagga* and partly an earlier commentary of some kind on the *Paccayākāra-vibhaṅga*. (Notably, the *Vimuttimagga* version makes little use of *abhidhamma* material.) The *Abhidhamma Commentary* has probably used both an earlier commentary on the *Vibhaṅga* and the *Visuddhimagga*. It is difficult to tell how much is innovative in either case.

“In other cases (than birth in a womb) many *kalāpas* arise together. Therefore in the body (*attabhāva*) of a Brahma, many *gāvutas* in height, because many *kalāpas* arise together, the *rūpas* exceed thirty, even given that they consist of the septads of eye, ear and base with the hexad of life, since odours, tastes and food are excluded <in the case of the Brahma world>. <That is so> because there are many such <septads and hexads>. But in the *Aṭṭha-kathā* the arising in that place of the decads of eye, ear and base with the nonad of life is spoken of.”³⁵

He then goes on to cite Vibh 418f., which allows only five *āyatana*s and five elements at the time of rebirth in the form realm as compared with Vibh 405, which allows six *āyatana*s and nine elements *in toto* in the form³⁶ realm and then refers to the discussions at Kv 374ff. and in the *Yamaka*. All of this is reproduced in Abhidh-av-ṭ, which then continues:

Ācariya-Jotipāla-Dhammapāla-ttherā pana taṃ paṭikkhipanti. Tathā ca vuttaṃ tehi: “rūpāvacara-sattānaṃ ghāna-jivhāyatanābhāvato vijjamānā pi gandha-rasā āyatana-kiccaṃ na karontī” ti, te anāmasitvā, Pāliyaṃ ‘pañcāyatanāni pātubhavanti’ ti ‘cha āyatanāni’ ti ca ādi vuttaṃ. (Abhidh-av-ṭ II 177)

“The teachers Elders Jotipāla and Dhammapāla rejected that and said as follows: ‘Since form-frequenting beings do not have the senses of smell and taste, odours and tastes, although existent, do not carry out the task of an *āyatana* for them. Therefore they were not taken into consideration in the Pāli and it <simply> referred to five *āyatana*s and six *āyatana*s.’”

The passage is cited from Vi.bh-anuṭ 120 and/or Vism-mhṭ II 305. The latter is clearly quoting from the former (or its predecessor), as it precedes the passage with ‘*ettha vuccate*’:

Ettha vuccate: rūpāvacara-sattānaṃ ghāna-jivhāyatanābhāvato vijjamānā pi gandha-rasā āyatana-kiccaṃ na karontī ti te anāmasitvā,

³⁵ Vibh-mṭ 108f.: *Aññattha hi aneke kalāpā saha uppajjanti. Brahmatta-bhāve pi hi aneka-gāvuta-ppamāṇe aneke kalāpā sah’ uppajjanti ti tiṃsato adhiḱān’eva rūpāni honti gandha-rasāhārānaṃ paṭikkhittatā cakkhu-sota-vatthu-sattaka-jīvita-chakka-bhāve pi tesam bahutā. Aṭṭha-kathāyaṃ pana tattha pi cakkhu-sota-vatthu-dasakānaṃ jīvita-navakassa ca uppatti vuttā. cp. Sacc 67.*

³⁶ The difference is because sounds (and sensory discriminations) only arise subsequent to the moment of rebirth.

Pāḷiyaṃ ‘pañcāyatanāni pātubhavanti’ ti, ‘cha āyatanāni’ ti ca ādi vuttaṃ.

c) the sense of smell

The next passage follows after the long citation of the views of Ānanda referred to above. *Abhidh-av* 756–7 (752) allows a minimum of thirty *rūpas* for *kāmāvacara* beings who are apparitionally born. Ānanda (*Vibh-mṭ* 109 to *Vibh-a* 162f.; cp. *Sacc* 65) denies the possibility of a rebirth without the sense of smell (*ghānāyatana*) for those who are apparitionally reborn and those who are born from warm moisture (*saṃseda*), on the basis of *Vibh* 411f. Ānanda also cites the *Yamaka* as support for the position that everything applies equally to the three senses of touch, smell and taste. The *Abhidhamma Commentary* in fact only refers to the apparitionally reborn and those who are born from warm moisture when it gives the maximum figure and leaves that to be understood when it gives the minimum figure. So the *Anuṭṭikā* is able to understand the minimum as applying only to those who are born from warm moisture. It is precisely this view which is ascribed to Jotipāla:

*Jotipāla-ttherādayo pana: “saṃseda-jassa ‘jacc-andha-badhira-aghānaka-na-puṃsakassa jivhā-kāya-vatthu-dasakānaṃ vasena tiṃsa-rūpāni uppajjanti ti (Vibh-a 162) vuttaṃ, na opapātikassa.”*³⁷

“But the Elder Jotipāla and others <said as follows>: it was said <in the *Vibhaṅga commentary*> that ‘thirty *rūpas* arise i.e. the decads of tongue, body and <heart>-base for those born blind and deaf, lacking the sense of smell and gender’ who are moisture-born; <it does> not <say that> for those who are apparitionally reborn.”

That others did understand the *Abhidhamma Commentary* in the way it is taken by Ānanda is clear from the fact that the *Anuṭṭikā* goes on to reject the claim of some that the old Sinhalese commentary specifically mentions that some of the apparitionally reborn are born blind, etc.³⁸ That, it says, is a scribal error (*pamāda-pāṭha*).

³⁷ *Abhidh-av-ṭ* II 181. This is the position of the *Anuṭṭikā*, which goes on to cite *Yam-a* 76 in support: *Vibh-anuṭ* 123 ≠ *Vism-mṭ* II 308: *Saṃseda-jass’eva ca jacc-andha-badhira-aghānaka-na-puṃsakassa jivhā-kāya-vatthu-dasakānaṃ vasena tiṃsa rūpāni uppajjanti ti vuttaṃ, na opapātikassā ti ayam ettha Aṭṭha-kathāya adhippāyo.*

³⁸ *Ye pana ‘opapātikassa jacc-andha- ... pe ... uppajjanti ti Mahā-aṭṭhakathāyaṃ vuttan’ ti vadanti, taṃ na gaḥetabbaṃ.*

Part of the problem here lies in the fact that the *Vibhaṅga* does not refer to those who are born from warm moisture in its account, nor to the egg-born. The only minimum it offers is that of the womb-born who at the time of conception have only the mind sense (*manāyatana*). The issue here of course is twofold. Can beings in such rebirths as the *petā* realm be deficient in the sense of smell? And can very small creatures have only the three senses of mind, taste and touch? What must underlie this is the tendency in some Indian thought to classify beings as ‘one-sensed’, ‘two-sensed’ and so on. ‘One-sensed beings’, i.e. plants, are generally excluded in early Buddhism, as they were not conceived of as having minds or being subject to rebirth.³⁹ ‘Two-sensed beings’ correspond in *abhidhamma* terms to those with only the senses of taste and touch (as well as mind), i.e. everything with a body has touch and all creatures that eat have taste. It would also be possible for them to have been conceived of as existing, like plants, outside the process of rebirth.

To sum up, the *Vibhaṅga* does not concern itself with small animals and does not allow the possibility of rebirth as a *petā*, etc. without the three minimal physical senses of touch, taste and smell. The commentary appears to accept that some small animals and some *petas*, etc. lack the sense of smell. Ānanda denies that any of these lack that sense. The *Anuṭṭikā* and many subsequent writers take the intermediate position that some small animals lack the sense of smell, but there is no possibility of rebirth as a *petā*, etc. without the three minimal physical senses of touch, taste and smell.

At all events, there seems no doubt that it is the extant *Anuṭṭikā* (or a predecessor) that is meant by ‘Jotipāla’ in this case.

d) the *ṭhiti-khaṇa*

That Ānanda, the author of the *Mūlaṭṭikā*, rejected the moment of presence and taught only the moments of arising and break-up is well-known. The controversy on this has recently been discussed in detail by Wan Doo Kim.⁴⁰ So I will not address it here, but the relevant portions of the *Mūlaṭṭikā* and *Abhidh-av-ṭ* are given in Appendix A in passages 3 and 4. It suffices to notice that the rejected view is that of Ānanda. There is no corresponding passage in the *Mahāṭṭikā*; so the source of the view

³⁹ But see: Schmithausen 1991.

⁴⁰ Kim 1999, especially pp. 188–195.

ascribed to Jotipāla and Dhammapāla may be two different *Anuṭṭikās*, i.e. the extant work of Dhammapāla and an earlier work of Jotipāla.⁴¹

e) *nirutti-paṭisambhidā*

In Sumaṅgala's discussion prior to his final mention of Jotipāla, we find:

nirutti māgadhā-bhāsā, atthato nāma-sammūtī ti.

This is part of a treatment of the four *paṭisambhidā/pratisamvid*.⁴² Five verses of this are separately cited (without attribution) in Vism-sn III 1034–39 (to Vism 440–42):

*Arthe dharṃe niruktau ca taj-jñānesu ca tatra tu
kramād bhedaṃ gatās samkhyā catasraḥ pratisamvidāḥ. (5)
Pratyayotpanna-vāg-artha-mukti-pāka-kriyā-vaśāt
pañcāṅgo 'rthah; punaḥ kāryajñāpyaprāpya iti tridhā. (6)
Dharmaḥ pratyaya-vān mārgaḥ śuklaṃ kṛṣṇaṃ ca pañcadhā;
sa punaḥ kāraḥ hetur jñāpakāḥ prāpakas tridhā. (7)
Niruktir Māgadhī-bhāsā sā cārthān nāma-samvṛtiḥ;
keci dhvāna iti prāhur vijñāpty-ākāra-samyutaḥ. (8)
Lābhas tāsām asammoḥāc chaikṣāśaikṣa-pathaḥ kṣaṇe;
prayoge 'rthādim ālambya varttanatas tu sāśravaḥ. (9)⁴³*

⁴¹ Sumaṅgala does not give the *keci-vāda* which immediately precedes in Vibh-anuṭ 30: *ettha ca keci: "Yathābhūto dhammo uppajjati, kiṃ tathā-bhūto va bhijjati, udāhu aññathā-bhūto? Yadi tathā-bhūto va bhijjati, na jaratāya sambhavo. Atha aññathā-bhūto, añño eva so ti sabbathā pi ṭhiti-kkhaṇassa abhāvo yevā" ti vadanti.* This could mean he is quoting from the earlier *Anuṭṭikā*.

⁴² On the *paṭisambhidā/pratisamvid*, see now: Pagel 1995, pp. 272ff.; 359ff. Also, Samtani 1971, pp. 53f.; 115ff.; 275 (refs); Griffiths 1994, p. 116n; Dessein 1999, Vol. I pp. 433–6.

⁴³ In the last two *pādas*, *prayoge* is perhaps being used in place of *pabheda(gata)* in the Pali works; *sāśrava* is employed to show that it is not transcendent (*anāśrava = lokuttara*). (See below note 49) The second line has been recast in a Pali version of this stanza (cited Abhidh-av-ṭ II 303):

Tenāhu Porāṇā:

*Lābho tāsām asammoḥā sekhāsekha-patha-kkhaṇe;
attha-paññā yathālambyā sā dvidhāññā tu sāsavā ti
(pāda b: C° 1961: °phala-kkhaṇe)*

The second line must mean:

"But understanding of *attha* can have <*nibbāna* as its> object; <so> it is of two kinds (i.e. subject to *āsavas* or not subject to *āsavas*); the other <three Discriminations> are subject to *āsavas*."

textual notes: the following readings in Vism-sn II (C^e 1954) have been amended: 5b *tajñānesu*; 6c. *kāryya*; 7a *dharmā*.

For ease of reference I add a continuous numbering of all the Sanskrit verses which I attribute to Jotipāla. The first two *pādas* of stanza six correspond to the line cited in Abhidh-av-ṭ. I translate:

“The Discriminations number four <and> are divided in sequence into the knowledges of *artha*, *dharmā*, *nirukti* and the knowledge of those <knowledges>. (5)

Artha is fivefold by way of a) what has arisen by a condition; b) the meaning of speech; c) liberation; d) resultant <*citta*>; e) *kriyā* <*citta*>. ⁴⁴ Furthermore, it has three kinds because it may be the result (*artha*) which follows from doing, the meaning (*artha*) which has to be made known or the goal (*artha*) which must be attained. (6)⁴⁵

Dharma is fivefold: a) condition; b) speech; c) the path; d) the white and e) the black. Furthermore it is the three kinds of cause: that which does, that which finds out and that which attains. (7)⁴⁶

Nirukti is the Māgadhī language; this means that it is what causes one to understand names.⁴⁷ Some say that it is sound joined with a form of communication. (8)⁴⁸

The obtaining of the <Discriminations> is <nothing but> the *śaikṣa* or the *aśaikṣa* path because it is due to absence of

⁴⁴ Vibh-a 386.

⁴⁵ Vism-mḥ II 81: *Bhāsitaṃ pi hi avabodhana-vasena atthaṃ pavatteti. Maggo pana nibbānaṃ pāpeti ti tasmim pacchimo attho; nibbānaṃ hi pattabbo attho, bhāsitaṃ-attho ñāpetabbo attho, itaro nibbattetabbo attho ti evaṃ tividho hoti.*

⁴⁶ Compare: Vism-mḥ II 81f.:... *evaṃpāliyaṃvuttānaṃevavasena pañcadhammāveditabbā. Tatthamaggosampāpako, bhāsitaṃñāpako, itaraṃnibbattakoti evaṃti-vidho hetuveditabbo.*

⁴⁷ I translate *nāma-samvrti* as the intended equivalent of *nāma-paññatti*; cf. Vism-mḥ II 82 ≠ Abhidh-av-ṭ II 301: *Sā paññattiṃ sabhāva-nirutti Māgadhā-bhāsā. Atthato nāma-paññattiṃ ti ācariyā. Apare pana yadi sabhāva-nirutti paññatti-sabhāvā, evaṃ sati paññatti abhilāpitabbā, na vacanan ti āpajjati*; cf. Vibh-a 387f.

⁴⁸ Nett-a 121: *Tattha idaṃ dukkhaṃ ti ayaṃ paññattiṃ ti kakkhala-phusanādi-sa-bhāve rūpārūpa-dhamme atūṭādi-vasena aneka-bheda-bhinne abhinditvā pīḷana-saṅkhata-santāpa-vipariṇāma-aṭṭhatā-sāmaññena yā kucchita-bhāvādi-mukhena ekajjhaṃ gahaṇassa kāraṇa-bhūtā paññatti. Kā pana sā ti? Nāma-paññatti-nibandhanā taj-jā paññatti. Viññatti-vikāra-sahito saddo evā ti apare. Sacc 374: *saviññatti-vikāro hi saddo sacca-dvayassa tu*; cf. Sadd II 379; Pm-vn 1121.*

confusion at that moment. But <a Discrimination> is subject to *āśravas* in operation (*prayoge*) because it occurs taking *artha* and the rest as its object.(9)⁴⁹

The second and third verses give a fivefold analysis of *attha* and *dhamma*. This corresponds closely to the similar fivefold account of the four *paṭisambhidā* given at Vibh-a 386f. and Vism 440f. These analyses are completely dependent upon the canonical *abhidhamma* account given in the *Vibhaṅga* (Vibh 293ff.). They are quite different to anything at present known from the extant non-Theravādin *abhidharma* traditions. So these verses, although in Sanskrit, can only derive from the Buddhist traditions of Ceylon or a closely related school.

To spell this out a little. The *Vibhaṅga* begins with a *Suttanta-bhājanīya* treatment. The four *paṭisambhidās* are applied to the four truths, to the relationship between *hetu* and *phala*, to the relationship between existent *dhammas* and the *dhammas* by which they are produced and to conditioned origination. This initial approach is given some primacy by the commentators, since they explain *attha* and *dhamma* as meaning in short (*saṅkhepato*) causal result and condition (*paccaya*) respectively. The analysis in detail (*pabhedato*) is precisely the fivefold analysis with which we are concerned here, but in fact the first of the five is rather close in sense to the ‘meaning in short’: *attha* is whatever is produced (*samuppanna*) by a condition, while *dhamma* is whatever cause produces (*nibbattaka*) a result.

The distinction between *attha* and *dhamma* is well-grounded in *suttanta* usage, but is here applied in a manner which is not always clearly recognized by those who have translated the earlier Buddhist texts. Of course, it is well-known that *attha* can mean result, aim or goal, but it is less often acknowledged that *dhamma* has a strongly

⁴⁹ The position of verse 9 in Vism-sn is such that it cannot have been understood as referring to the fourth Discrimination; so presumably one or more stanzas have been omitted. In the first line *lābhas* corresponds to *adhigama* (Vibh-a 390) which is glossed as *paṭilābha* by Vism-mṭ 193. That is explained by the *Anuṭikā* as follows: *paṭilābho nāma pubbayoga-sampattiyā atthādi-visayassa sammohassa samucchindanaṃ; taṃ pana magga-kiccā evā ti āha: so lokuttaro ti* (Vibh-anuṭ 193). Obtaining the four *paṭisambhidās* involves some kind of complete removal of delusion and hence must occur at the moment of the path itself. That can only be transcendent. For the *Vibhaṅga* only *attha-paṭisambhidā* can be transcendent; so the commentaries carefully distinguish the *adhigama* of the Discriminations from their separate operation as different varieties (*pabhedā*) of knowledge. The latter (according to the *Mūlaṭīkā*) is invariably *kāmāvacara*. This is close to the position of the *Vibhaṅga*, which specifies that (with the above exception for *attha-paṭisambhidā*) the four Discriminations occur only in the eight *citt’-uppādas* associated with knowledge.

causative sense.⁵⁰ Such an interpretation of the difference between *attha* and *dhamma* has deep roots in *Suttanta* teachings, but it does not seem entirely appropriate in the context of the four *paṭisambhidā*. It is perhaps placed first because of its relationship to subsequent *abhidhamma* interpretations.

The *Vibhaṅga* concludes its *Suttanta-bhājanīya* treatment with an explanation of the *paṭisambhidā* in terms of the ninefold *dhamma* — the so-called list of the nine *Aṅgas*. Here *dhamma* refers to the texts or to the teachings prescribed in the texts, while *attha* is the meaning of what is said. This too is a distinction which derives from earlier literature and seems to fit well with the senses of the last two *paṭisambhidās*.

The following *Abhidhamma-bhājanīya* section classifies *dhammas* in the manner of the *Cittuppāda-kaṇḍa* of the *Dhamma-saṅgaha*. Knowledge of those which are skilful or unskilful is explained as *dhamma-paṭisambhidā*, while knowledge of those which are undeclared (*avyākata*) is explained as *attha-paṭisambhidā*. This gives us two more of the five kinds of *dhamma*: skilful (= white) and unskilful (= black). Similarly, since the undeclared is divided into resultant and *kiriya*, two more of the five kinds of *attha* are indicated. This leaves only the explanations of *nibbāna* (= *mukti*) as *attha* and the noble path as *dhamma*, but these really follow from the preceding, since the *ariya-magga* is a kind of skilful and *nibbāna* is one kind of undeclared, conclusions which are already reached in the text of the *Vibhaṅga* itself. In effect, the material given in the *Abhidhamma-bhājanīya* amounts to a specifically *abhidhamma* analysis in terms of cause and result. So these last three senses of *attha* and *dhamma* amount to particular applications of the first.

It is the fourth of these stanzas (Jotipāla v. 8) with which we are most concerned here. It refers to debates over the nature of the language used to describe the Buddha's teaching. The first view cited is that it is conventional in nature.⁵¹ This is attributed to unnamed teachers.⁵² Such a view is rejected in the *Abhidhamma Commentary* and by other *aṭṭhakathā* authors, perhaps even by Buddhaghosa himself.⁵³ These follow rather the position of the canonical *abhidhamma* writings, for which it is sound which is the object of *nirutti-paṭisambhidā* — in the more exact language of the later writers: sound accompanied by particular forms of <verbal> communication (*viññatti-vikāra*).

⁵⁰ cf. Vibh-a 386: ... *yasmā taṃ taṃ vidahati pavatteti c'eva pāpeti ca, tasmā dhammo ti vuccati* i.e. *dhamma* is that which puts things in their proper place.

⁵¹ i.e. its object is a *paññatti*.

⁵² Vism-mhṭ II 82; Abhidh-av-ṭ II 301.

⁵³ cf. Vibh-a 387; Paṭis-a I 5; Vism 433f.

According to the *ṭīkās* some subsequent interpreters of this position understood it to mean that *nirutti-paṭisambhidā* is operational in a mind door process which follows after the auditory process that apprehends the relevant sounds (*nirutti-sadda*). Sumaṅgala attributes a detailed criticism of this position to Jotipāla (*ācariya-Jotipāla-ttherādayo panāhu*). According to him Jotipāla and others argued that the possessor of the *paṭisambhidā* is able to directly apprehend and understand the sounds of the true language (*sabhāva-nirutti*) at the mind door without any necessary intervention of the normal auditory process. This is supported by a comparison with the manner in which *dibba-sota* is understood to function.

This quotation is taken from the *Mahāṭīkā*, but no author is mentioned in that source. That it is a quotation in that work too is simply indicated by the use of *ti* at the end of the passage. Perhaps confused by his own earlier citation of the Sanskrit verses mentioned above (and these may well be the work of Jotipāla), Sumaṅgala seems to have assumed that the quotation in the *Mahāṭīkā* (as so often) was from the *Anuṭīkā*. This is perhaps because he knew from other sources that it was indeed the position of Jotipāla. In fact, it is taken verbatim from the *Mūlaṭīkā*.⁵⁴ In this particular case the author(s) of the *Mahāṭīkā* and the extant *Anuṭīkā* simply accept the view of Ānanda in full; indeed the *Mahāṭīkā* does not even cite the additional points made in the *Anuṭīkā*.

4. The authorship of the *Anuṭīkā*

As we have seen, at least four of these five items from *Abhidh-av-ṭ* have an explicit connexion to the rejection of the views of Ānandācariya. It is of course well-known that, on the one hand, Ānanda as the *Ṭīkā-kāra par excellence* is highly respected in the later *abhidhamma* literature, yet on the other hand he is quite often criticized. It is unusual in the Pali commentarial tradition to meet frequent criticism of a revered figure, but the reason for it is clear enough in this case.⁵⁵

Ānanda's *Mūlaṭīkā* to the *Abhidhamma Commentary* is an innovative and often brilliant work which influences the later *abhidhamma ṭīkās* enormously. This is quite well demonstrated in some of the passages I have cited above. Influential though it was, the fact that it is on occasion criticised is clearly due in part to the fact that criticisms are embedded in both the *Anuṭīkā* and the even more influential *Mahāṭīkā* to the

⁵⁴ See Appendix A passage 5.

⁵⁵ He is often criticized in *Vinaya* literature too, but the reasons for that are less obvious. Note that in Vjb it is explicitly stated that whenever *ācariya* is referred to tout court, it means Ānanda. This might mean that Vajirabuddhi was a senior pupil of Ānanda.

Visuddhimagga. Sumaṅgala is directly or indirectly familiar with these works and they are therefore almost certain to be the source of the criticisms of the views of Ānanda which he gives.⁵⁶ It is clear that when Sumaṅgala mentions Dhammapāla, he is nearly always referring to Vism-mhṭ; so it cannot be that to which he is referring when he mentions Jotipāla in these four cases. There is then a *prima facie* case that he considered Jotipāla to be the author of the *Anuṭikā*.⁵⁷

This possibility gains considerable support from the mention at Vism-sn 1378 of a *Jotiya-anuṭikā* from which the following two passages are cited:

*tesaṃ matena uddhacca-cetanāya gahaṇe payojanaṃ
vicāretabbam eva paṭisandhiyā pi paccaya-bhāvassa vuttattā.*

and then:

*Dvādasākusala-cetanā-bhedo ti na-y-idaṃ samāsa-padaṃ,
sandhi-vasena paṇ'etaṃ vuttaṃ. Dvādasā ti ca bhumm'-atthe
paccatta-vacanaṃ. Dvādasasu akusala-cetanāsu, ekādasākusala-
cetanā-ppabhedo cā ti attho veditabbo. Evaṃ hi sati, n'atth' ettha
kiñci vicāretabbam*

These passages are extracted (in reverse order) from Vibh-anuṭ 126:

*Dvādasākusala-cetanā-bhedo ti na-y-idaṃ samāsa-padaṃ,
sandhi-vasena paṇ'etaṃ vuttaṃ. Dvādasā ti ca bhumm'-atthe
paccatta-vacanaṃ, dvādasasu akusala-cetanāsu. Akusala-
cetanā-bhedo ti ekādasākusala-cetanā-pabhedo, dvādasākusala-
cetanā-pabhedo cā ti attho veditabbo. evañ hi sati na ettha kiñci
vicāretabbam heṭṭhā vitthāritattā. Keci pana “dvādasākusala-
cetanā-bhedo ti idaṃ ‘channaṃ pavatte’ ti-ādinā yojetabban” ti
vadanti; tesaṃ matena uddhacca-cetanāya gahaṇe payojanaṃ
vicāretabbam eva paṭisandhiyā pi paccaya-bhāvassa vuttattā.*

Portions of anuṭ which are missing in Vism-sn are underlined, but the differences do not appear significant. What is being discussed is Vibh-

⁵⁶ Since Sumaṅgala refers to a previously existing *Sīhala-samvaṇṇanā* to Abhidh-av, it is also possible that he took them over from there. This would still leave the *Anuṭikā* or its predecessor as the likely ultimate source.

⁵⁷ A passage in which Sumaṅgala refers to Dhammapāla (Abhidh-s-mhṭ 118 Ì Abhidhav-ṭ II 56) is cited in VRI as referring to Dhs-anuṭ 140. In fact, it more probably relates to Vism-mhṭ (to Vism 458).

mṭ 113: *dvādasākusala-cetanā-bhedo ti ettha uddhacca-sahagatā kasmā gahitā ti vicāretabbam etaṃ*. So there can be no doubt that this passage is from a subcommentary on that work. It may then very plausibly be supposed that Vism-sn is referring here to the *Anuṭṭikā* as ‘the *Anuṭṭikā* belonging to Joti<pāla>.’ Two possibilities emerge: either the extant *Anuṭṭikā* is the work of Jotipāla, not Dhammapāla, or the quotation is from an earlier (no longer extant) *Anuṭṭikā* by Jotipāla which would be the source for some of the content in the later work by Dhammapāla.

Alternative A: a single *Anuṭṭikā*, the work of Jotipāla

In the former case the evidence for Dhammapāla’s authorship of this work needs to be considered. In many later sources beginning with the *Gandhavaṃsa* the *Anuṭṭikā* is specifically attributed to Dhammapāla, but at an earlier period *Aggavaṃsa* simply refers to the author of the *Anuṭṭikā* to the *Abhidhamma*, without giving any name.⁵⁸ The account in the *Saddhamma-saṅgaha* is confused and unhelpful, but at all events the only *ṭṭikā* it attributes to Dhammapāla is *Vism-mṭ*.⁵⁹ Given the similarity at times of the *Anuṭṭikā* and Dhammapāla’s *Mahāṭṭikā* to *Vism*, it is not really surprising that they could have been thought to be by the same author. The date of the *Gandhavaṃsa* is uncertain; it can, however, be said that authorship of the *Anuṭṭikā* does not appear to be explicitly ascribed to Dhammapāla in any source which is definitely older than the 17th century.

The earliest passage bearing on this which I have so far been able to find is in Sāriputta’s *ṭṭikā* to the *Vinaya*: *khīṇāsavānaṃ pana brahmānañ ca sambhavo natthī ti ācariya-Dhammapāla-ttherena vuttaṃ* (Sp-ṭ II 301). This appears to be citing Dhs-anuṭ 155: *tathā hi khīṇāsavānaṃ brahmānañ ca sambhavo natthī ti*. This is not quite conclusive, since passages derived from the *Anuṭṭikā* are found in various of the *ṭṭikās* attributed to Dhammapāla and not all of such *ṭṭikās* are currently accessible.⁶⁰ Even if it is accepted that Sāriputta believed that the *Anuṭṭikā* was the work of Dhammapāla, this may simply have been an inference on his part or on the part of predecessors. It is certain that there is a strong tendency in Indian (and non-Indian) literature to ascribe works of unknown authorship to famous names. Buddhaghosa would not have been a possibility in this case; so the choice of Dhammapāla becomes almost inevitable.

⁵⁸ *Tenāha Abhidhammassa Anuṭṭikā-kāro*: “*deva-saddo yathā kīlā-vijigimsā-vohāra-juti-gati-attho, evaṃ satti-abhiṭṭhava-kamaṇ’-attho pi hoti dhātu-saddānaṃ anekattha-bhāvato*” *ti ādi* (Sadd II 476, quoting Patṭh-anuṭ 223).

⁵⁹ *Saddh-s* 60; 63.

⁶⁰ e.g. Ja-pt; Bv-ṭ; Mp-pt.

If the *ābhidhammika* Sumaṅgala has chosen to depart from his teacher on this matter, then it is far from certain that Sāriputta is right. Clearly, he must have had a reason for doing so. Given that he is rather well-read and knowledgeable in regard to *abhidhamma*, he is more likely to be correct than Sāriputta, who does not seem to have been interested in the canonical *Abhidhamma* literature or its commentarial exegesis. Most probably Sumaṅgala had obtained access to manuscripts or literary sources which led him (and others) to believe that Jotipāla was the author of this work. These passages could possibly have been taken from an earlier commentary to the *Abhidhammāvatāra*. If so, it could be earlier than Sāriputta in date — conceivably much earlier. This would then be our earliest evidence for the authorship of the *Anuṭṭikā*. Another possibility is that a Sanskrit work about (or by) Jotipāla had become available. This would be particularly likely at the end of the long reign of Parākramabāhu, which would have provided opportunities to access manuscripts previously inaccessible. We could provisionally accept his authority on the matter and ascribe the *Anuṭṭikā* to Jotipāla.

Alternative B: two *Anuṭṭikās*, the work of Jotipāla and Dhammapāla

The second alternative assumes that the reference in *Vism-sn* to the *Jotiya-anuṭṭikā* is specifically to distinguish it from the well-known work of Dhammapāla. In that case Sāriputta's citation of *Vibh-anuṭ* as a work of Dhammapāla is correct and there would be no conflict with the information given by his pupil Sumaṅgala, since the latter would be referring to this earlier *Anuṭṭikā* when he mentions Jotipāla's criticisms of Ānanda.

In support of this possibility is the fact that the extant *Anuṭṭikā* seems, as we have seen, to be on occasion referring to an earlier commentary on the *Mūlaṭṭikā*. Against is only the fact that there is no clear reference to the existence of two *Anuṭṭikās* in the subsequent literature. So overall it is perhaps the more probable of the two alternatives.

5. Implications for the chronology of the *ṭṭikā* literature

Since the *Udāna Commentary* of Dhammapāla cites an *Anuṭṭikā*,⁶¹ the writing of the commentaries associated with the name of Dhammapāla

⁶¹ Ud-a 94 = Nett-pt 67, referring to *Vibh-anuṭ* 122f. (Nett-pt confirms that the reading is correct.) Note that at Spk-pt II 253, when the *Aṭṭhasālinī-ṭṭikā* is referred to, it is unclear whether the reference is again to the *Anuṭṭikā*: *So kammaṣṣa vicitta-bhāvo taṅhā-vasena jāyatī ti vedītabbo. Svāyam attho Aṭṭhasālinī-ṭṭikāyaṃ vibhāvito*. The *Abhidhamma-ṭṭikā* is referred to at Ps-pt II 87, meaning Pp-mṭ 35; at Ps-pt II 135, meaning Dhs-mṭ 137; at

cannot be earlier than the time of Jotipāla. This is equally true of the *ṭikās*, since at least some are written subsequently to some or all of the commentaries. So the direction of borrowing is clear. What is less clear is the date of the various works ascribed to Dhammapāla. One possibility is that he could be a contemporary figure. His commentaries would have been written earlier and would take little account of the new developments. Subsequently, inspired by the *Mūlaṭṭikā* and *Anuṭṭikā*, he would have written some of his major *ṭikās*, no doubt as a distinguished senior monk aided by his pupils. Equally possibly, he could have written both at some later date. A third possibility is that the author of *Vism-mhṭ* is a later (even possibly a much later) figure than the author of the commentaries. I hope to return to the question of the dating of Dhammapāla on a subsequent occasion.

The *Cūlavamsa* refers to Jotipāla as a *mahā-thera* when he defeats the Mahāyāna in debate in the reign of Aggabodhi I (A.D. 571–604),⁶² but we cannot be sure that the title is not being applied retrospectively. Still, he can hardly have been much younger than thirty years of age and would probably have been older than that. If the debate took place at the end of the reign, then that would in theory allow him to be born as late as c. 575. This would make him only thirty-nine at the death of Aggabodhi II in 614 A.D. This does not seem compatible with so senior a role during the reign of that king. It seems more likely that either the debate took place earlier in the reign of Aggabodhi I or that he was older than that. At the other extreme, if the debate took place at the beginning of the reign and he was much older, say fifty years old, he could have been born as early as c. 500 A.D. But that is rather unlikely because it would make him 104 at the accession of Aggabodhi II. More probably he was not above sixty years of age at that point and hence could not have been born earlier than c. 545. So if we take his date of birth as c. 560 A.D. we are unlikely to be much more than a decade out.

Since he would probably not have written much before the age of thirty or after the age of sixty, this suggests that Jotipāla's *Anuṭṭikā* would have been written between c. 590 and c. 620 A.D. But there is no mention of him in the *Cūlavamsa* after 614 A.D.; so it is probably best to narrow the range slightly. The *Mūlaṭṭikā* can therefore be no later than the early years of the seventh century and the commentaries of Dhammapāla⁶³ no earlier. Assuming that there was at least some

Spk-pt I 221, meaning Dhs-anuṭ 19f. Note that the *Suttanta ṭikās* refer to *Vism-mhṭ*, but not *vice versa*.

⁶² Geiger gives the slightly earlier dates of A.D. 568–601 for this king and 601–611 for his successor. Here and elsewhere, I follow the list of regnal years given in De Silva 1981, p. 567.

⁶³ Strictly, this applies to Ud-a. For the rest, it will depend on whether they were written before or after Ud-a, etc. Nett-a at least incorporates some *ṭikā* material.

gap between the writing of the *Mūlaṭīkā* and the (first) *Anuṭīkā*, a sixth century date for the work of Ānanda seems highly probable.

6. Conclusions

(a) Given the references to Jotipāla in Abhidh-av-ṭ and the quoted passages ascribed to the *Jotiya-anuṭīkā* in Vism-sn, there can be little doubt that in the thirteenth century both Sumaṅgala and Paṇḍita-Parākramabāhu (or their sources) attributed an *Anuṭīkā* to a Jotipāla.

(b) Since both refer to Jotipāla with clear respect, there seems also every reason to suppose that the Jotipāla in question was understood by them to be the Jotipāla known to us from the *Cūlavamsa* and *Nikāyasaṅgraha*.

(c) Vism-sn cites Sanskrit verses attributed to Jotipāla and others whose author it does not name, but one of which is associated (in a Pali version) with Jotipāla by Sumaṅgala. So there can be little doubt that the same Jotipāla was believed to have also written in Sanskrit.

(d) There does not seem to be any reason to question the accuracy of Sumaṅgala's information. He wrote at a time when Sinhalese scholars would have been fluent in Sanskrit and still had access to a considerable body of literature in Sinhalese (now lost) as well as to the traditions of (still active) Buddhist centres in the Tamil country. Especially as regards *abhidhamma* literature, in which he was clearly very well-read, we are unlikely to find any more reliable authority. Therefore:

(e) Ānanda, the author of the *Mūlaṭīkā*, wrote during the sixth century A.D.

(f) The earliest possible *floruit* for Dhammapāla is c. 600 A.D.

APPENDIX A

Related passages in *ṭikā* literature

1. Vibh-mṭ 95 (to Vibh-a 145):

Aṭṭha-kathāyaṃ abhiññā-cetanā na gahitā viññāṇassa paccayo na hoti ti. Kasmā pana na hoti? Nanu sā pi kusalā vipāka-dhammā cā ti? Saccam, anupacchinna-taṇhā-vijjāmāne pana santāne sa-vyāpāra-ppavattiyā tassā kusalatā vipāka-dhammatā ca vuttā, na vipāk'-uppādanena; sā pana vipākaṃ uppādayanti rūpāvacaram eva uppādeyya. Na hi añña-bhūmikaṃ kammaṃ añña-bhūmikaṃ vipākaṃ uppādeti ti attanā sadisārammaṇaṃ ca ti-ṭṭhānikaṃ taṃ uppādeyya Citt'-uppāda-kaṇḍe rūpāvacara-vipākassa kamma-sadisārammaṇass' eva vuttattā, na ca rūpāvacara-vipāko parittādi-ārammaṇo atthi, abhiññā-cetanā ca parittādi-ārammaṇā va hoti. Tasmā vipākaṃ na uppādeti ti viññāyati. Kasīnesu ca uppāditassa catuttha-jjhāna-samādhissa ānisaṃsa-bhūtā abhiññā. Yathāha: “so evaṃ samāhite citte” (D I 76f.; M I 22f., etc.) ti-ādi. Tasmā samādhi-phala-sadisā sā, na ca phalaṃ deti ti dāna-sīlānisaṃso tasmim bhava paccaya-lābho viya sā pi vipākaṃ na uppādeti.

2. Vibh-anuṭ 101 has a long comment on similar lines to Vism-mṃt:

Evam pi yadi vipāka-dhammā abhiññā-cetanā, kathaṃ avipākā ti? Asambhavato ti. Taṃ asambhavaṃ dassetuṃ: sā panā ti-ādi vuttaṃ. Abhiññā-cetanā hi yadi vipākaṃ uppādeyya, sabhūmikaṃ vā uppādeyya añña-bhūmikaṃ vā. Tattha añña-bhūmikassa tāva uppādanaṃ ayuttaṃ paccayābhāvato, tathā adassanato ca. Tenāha: na hī ti-ādi. Sa-bhūmikaṃ na-vattabbārammaṇaṃ vā uppādeyya parittādi-ārammaṇaṃ vā, tesu attano kamma-samānārammaṇatāya rūpāvacara-vipākassa dassitattā, parittādi-ārammaṇattā ca abhiññā-cetanāya na-vattabbārammaṇaṃ na uppādeyya. Tathā ekanta-na-vattabbārammaṇattā rūpāvacara-vipākassa parittādi-ārammaṇaṃ ca na uppādeyyā ti ayam asambhavo. ... Svāyam asambhavo parittādi-ārammaṇāya abhiññā-cetanāya vipākābhāvaṃ sādheti, na na-vattabbārammaṇāya; na-vattabbārammaṇā pi hi sā atthi ti na vyāpī ti vipākānuppādane tassā aññaṃ kāraṇaṃ dassetuṃ, kasīnesu cā ti-ādīm āha. Samādhi-vijambhana-bhūtā abhiññā samādhissa ānisaṃsa-mattan ti samādhi-phala-sadisā ti vuttaṃ. Tassa tassa adhiṭṭhāna-vikubbana-dibba-sadda-savanādikassa

*yad-icchitassa kiccassa nipphādana-mattaṃ pana abhiññā-cetanā ...*⁶⁴

3. Vibh-mṭ 22f.:

Yo c'ettha cittassa ṭhiti-kkhaṇo vutto, so ca atthi n'atthi ti vicāretabbo. Citta-yamake hi "uppannaṃ uppajjamānaṃ ti? bhaṅga-kkhaṇe uppannaṃ, no ca uppajjamānaṃ" ti ettakam eva vuttaṃ; na vuttaṃ "ṭhiti-kkhaṇe bhaṅga-kkhaṇe cā" ti. Tathā "nuppajjamānaṃ nuppannaṃ ti? bhaṅga-kkhaṇe nuppajjamānaṃ, no ca nuppannaṃ" ti ettakam eva vuttaṃ; na vuttaṃ: "ṭhiti-kkhaṇe bhaṅga-kkhaṇe cā" ti. Evaṃ "na niruddhaṃ na nirujjhamānaṃ, na nirujjhamānaṃ na niruddhaṃ" ti etesaṃ paripuṇṇa-vissajjane "uppāda-kkhaṇe anāgatañ cā" ti vatvā, "ṭhiti-kkhaṇe" ti avacanaṃ, atikkanta-kāla-vāre ca "bhaṅga-kkhaṇe cittaṃ uppāda-kkhaṇaṃ vītikkantaṃ" ti vatvā, "ṭhiti-kkhaṇe" ti avacanaṃ ṭhiti-kkhaṇābhāvaṃ cittassa dīpeti. Suttasu pi hi "ṭhitassa aññathattaṃ paññāyati" (S III 37–40; A I 152) ti tass'eva ekassa aññathattābhāvato "yassā aññathattaṃ paññāyati, sā santati-ṭhiti" ti na na sakkā vattun ti, vijjamānaṃ vā khaṇa-dvaya-samaṅgiṃ ṭhitan ti.

This is partially translated by Kim (Kim 1999, p. 190f. and p. 191f., n. 418).

4. Sumaṅgala:

Ācariya-Jotipāla-Dhammapāla-ttherānaṃ pan'etaṃ na kkhamati. Tehi "eka-dhammādhāra-bhāvepi uppāda-nirodhānaṃ añño uppāda-kkhaṇo, añño nirodha-kkhaṇo; uppādāvatthañ hi upādāya uppāda-kkhaṇo, nirodhāvatthaṃ upādāya nirodha-kkhaṇo. Uppādāvatthāya ca bhinnā nirodhāvatthā ti ekasmiṃ yeva ca sabhāva-dhamme yathā icchitabbā, aññathā añño

⁶⁴ A dissenting view is then discussed: *Keci pana: "samāna-bhūmikato āsevana-lābhena balavantāni jhānāni ti tāni vipākaṃ denti samāpatti-bhāvato, abhiññā pana sati pi jhāna-bhāve tad-abhāvato tasmim tasmim ārammaṇe āgantukā vā ti dubbalā, tasmā vipākaṃ na deti" ti vadanti. Taṃ akāraṇaṃ punap-punaṃ parikamma-vasena abhiññāya pi vasī-bhāva-sabbhāvato. Yaṃ pana vadanti: "pādaka-jjhāne attanā samāna-sabhāvehi javanehi laddhāsevane sammad eva vasī-bhāva-ppatte parisuddhatādi-aṭṭh'-aṅga-samannāgamena sātisaye jāte abhiññā nibbattanti, tāsaṃ ca catuttha-jjhānikattā catuttha-jjhāna-bhūmiko eva vipāko nibbatteyya, so ca yathā-vutta-guṇena balavatā pādaka-jjhānen'eva kat'-okāsenā sijjhatī ti anokāsātāya abhiññā na vipākaṃ detī ti. Tam pi akāraṇaṃ avipāka-bhāvato tāsaṃ; sati hi vipāka-dāyi-bhāve vipākassa anokāsa-codanā yuttā, avipākatā ca tāsaṃ vutta-nayā eva; cf. Dhs-anuṭ 32.*

*yeva dhammo uppajjati, añño nirujjhatī ti āpajjeyya, evaṃ
nirodhāvattāya viya nirodhābhimukhāvattāya pi bhavitabbaṃ,
sā ṭhiti jaratā cā” ti sampācchitabbaṃ etaṃ.*

This is taken from Vibh-anuṭ 30 (cf. Abhidh-s-mhṭ 107); cf. also Spk-pt I 75; II 217f.; Vism-mhṭ I 343, etc. It is translated by Kim (Kim 1999, p. 192, n. 421).

5. Vibh-mṭ 192 (cited Vism-mhṭ II 83 ≠ Abhidh-av-ṭ II 302)

*“nirutti-pāṭisambhidā paccuppannārammaṇā” ti ca
vacanaṃ saddaṃ gahetvā pacchā jānanaṃ sandhāya vuttan
ti. Evaṃ pana aññasmiṃ paccuppannārammaṇe aññaṃ
paccuppannārammaṇan ti vuttan ti āpajjati. Yathā pana
dibba-sota-ñāṇaṃ manussāmanussādi-sadda-ppabheda-
nicchayassa paccaya-bhūtaṃ taṃ-taṃ-sadda-vibhāvakaṃ,
evaṃ sabhāvāsabhāva-nirutti-nicchayassa paccaya-bhūtaṃ
paccuppanna-sabhāva-nirutti-saddārammaṇaṃ taṃ-
vibhāvaka-ñāṇaṃ nirutti-pāṭisambhidā ti vuccamāne na pāli-
virodho hoti. Taṃ sabhāva-niruttiṃ saddaṃ ārammaṇaṃ
katvā paccavekkhantassā ti ca paccuppanna-saddārammaṇaṃ
paccavekkhaṇaṃ pavattayantassā ti na na sakkā vattuṃ. Taṃ pi
hi ñāṇaṃ sabhāva-niruttiṃ vibhāventaṃ yeva taṃ-taṃ-sadda-
paccavekkhaṇānantaraṃ taṃ-taṃ-pabheda-nicchaya-hetuttā
niruttiṃ bhindantaṃ paṭivijjhantaṃ eva uppajjatī ti ca pabheda-
gatam pi hotī ti.*

APPENDIX B
Further citations of Jotipāla in Abhidh-av-ṭ

item no.	ṭikā page	debated issue	exact name used
(f)	I 258	can those reborn with causeless <i>paṭisandhi</i> experience three-caused resultants (<i>tad-ārammaṇa</i>)?	<i>Ācariya-Jotipāla-tthero</i>
(g)	I 355	as previous	<i>Ācariya-Jotipāla-ttherassa adhippāyena</i>
(h)	II 120	does the eye see?	<i>Ācariya-Jotipāla-ttherenāpi hi iminā va adhippāyena idaṃ vuttaṃ.</i>
(I)	II 174	there are ten <i>rūpas</i> in a <i>kalāpa</i> , counting both <i>nippanna-rūpa</i> and <i>anippanna-rūpa</i>	<i>Ācariya-Jotipāla-ttherena pana: ... ti vatvā, puna taṃ samatthan'-atthaṃ idaṃ vuttaṃ: ...</i>

f) and g) three-caused resultants

Abhidh-av-ṭ I 258:

Ācariya-Jotipāla-tthero pana: sahetukan ti avisesena vuttatā ahetukānam pi ti-hetuka-tad-ārammaṇaṃ icchati. Vuttañ hi tena: sa-hetukan ti avises'opadesena du-hetukaṃ, ti-hetukañ ca gahetabbaṃ; tathā hi Atthakathāyaṃ ahetukassāpi ti-hetuka-tad-ārammaṇaṃ abhihitam. Yañ carahi Attha-samāse ahetukānam ti-hetuka-phalāni deti ti vuttaṃ, taṃ kathaṃ? So eva pucchitabbo, yo tassa kattā ti. Apare pana: mūla-sandhiyā jaḷattā tassa ti-hetuka-tad-ālambanaṃ na labbhati yevā ti vadanti. (cf. Pm-vn 271 cited below note 68; and Dhs-a 416; Vibh-a 15)

“But the teacher Elder Jotipāla prescribes a three-caused *tad-ārammaṇa* even for causeless <beings> because ‘caused’ is given <in *Paṭṭhāna*> without specifying. For he said the following: since ‘caused’ does not specify <either two-caused or three-caused>, it should be taken as two-caused and three-caused; for in the *Atthakathā* a three-caused *tad-ārammaṇa* is mentioned in this way even

for a causeless <being>. [An objection was offered:] ‘How now does this fit with the statement in the *Attha-samāsa*⁶⁵ that it does not give three-caused fruits to causeless <beings>?’⁶⁶ [The objection was rejected:] ‘ask the author of the *Attha-samāsa* himself’. But others say that the <causeless being> definitely does not get a three-caused *tad-ālambaṇa* because his fundamental connecting (i.e. *paṭisandhi-citta*) lacks intelligence.

This is a specifically Theravādin *abhidhamma* debate, as it is linked to the theory of the *citta-vīthi*. In effect, the canonical *Paṭṭhāna* does not specify beyond indicating that the sequence from caused to causeless *bhav’-aṅga* is legitimate. Since this refers to what the later terminology calls the succession from *tad-ārammaṇa* to the (*mūla-*) *bhav’-aṅga*, it establishes for the author of the fifth century *Abhidhamma* commentary that a being whose *bhav’-aṅga* is causeless does sometimes have a caused *tad-ārammaṇa*, i.e. one of the eight *mahā-vipāka*. This is explained as being the result of a *kamma* other than the one which led to that particular rebirth. Some writers wished to limit this to the four *mahā-vipāka* without knowledge, but Jotipāla rejected that view.

Sumaṅgala is commenting here on *Abhidh-av* 443, which simply denies the possibility of even a two-caused *tad-ārammaṇa* for a causeless being, i.e. one who is reborn in an *apāya* or as a human being who is incomplete in some major way (from conception). After citing *Paṭṭhāna* he refers to teachers who say: “causeless <beings> have caused <resultants> by means of other *kamma* (*hoti aññena kammaṇa, sahetukaṃ ahetunanā*)” and permit caused for the causeless, similarly three-caused <resultants> for two-caused <beings>. The stanza he cites is from the *Saccasaṅkhepa* (*Sacc* 149).

Sumaṅgala refers to the view of others who reject the possibility of a three-caused *tad-ārammaṇa* in this case because the fundamental (re)connecting mind is stupid. The argument would seem to be that, since the rest state (*bhav’-aṅga*) to which the mind continually reverts throughout life is dull and stupid, it will not support even temporary rest states (*tad-ārammaṇa*) with wisdom. The ‘others’ in question must

⁶⁵ The name *Attha-samāsa* can be compared with *Sāra-samāsa*. See: de Silva 1970, *Introduction*, pp. lix ff.; Mori 1988. The suggestion that the *Sāra-samāsa* was a commentary on the four *Nikāyas* belonging to the Jetavana school is probably correct.

⁶⁶ The Burmese edition (and C^o1961) must be in error here, by omitting a *na* or something similar. Compare *Abhidh-s-mhṭ* 121, where Sumaṅgala gives a briefer version of the same debate: *idha ñāṇa-sampayutta-vipākābhāva-vacanassa parihāsa-vasena, so eva pucchitabbo, yo tassa kattā ti vuttaṃ*.

include Anuruddha, the author of *Paramatthavinicchaya* (Pm-vn), since the wording at Pm-vn 271 is very close. That it is Anuruddha to whom Sumaṅgala refers is clear from his treatment of this issue in his *mahā-ṭīkā* to the *Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha* (Abhidh-s-mhṭ 121).

For Sumaṅgala, Anuruddha is also the author of the *Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha* (Abhidh-s). So the discussion in Abhidh-s-mhṭ starts from the position of Abhidh-s, which explicitly denies resultants with knowledge for two-caused and causeless beings in a fortunate destiny. Indeed, it goes further and denies that any caused resultants occur to beings in an *apāya* (Abhidh-s IV 41f.). Sumaṅgala commences his comments by acknowledging that the *Paṭṭhāna* source text allows the possibility of a two-caused *tad-ārammaṇa* due to miscellaneous *kamma*. He then points out that Anuruddha rejects this explicitly and gives as the reason for this that the fundamental (re) connecting mind is stupid. Thus far his argument expands the *sanne* of Sumaṅgala's teacher Sāriputta (Abhidh-s-sn 124). He now adds further material, drawn from Abhidh-av-ṭ (cited above).⁶⁷

“But the teacher, Elder Jotipāla, said that there is a three-caused *tad-ārammaṇa* even for causeless <beings> because ‘caused *bhav’-āṅga*’ is given <in Paṭṭhāna> without specifying. Then he said the following: ‘ask the author of the <*Attha-samāsa*> himself’, as a humorous rejection of the claim that there are no resultants joined with knowledge in the case <of causeless beings>.”

Sumaṅgala goes on to point out that, although this was said humorously, in fact the right thing to do is to consult an (or the) *ācariya* (presumably meaning Anuruddha, the author of both Abhidh-s and Pm-vn) and then quotes from Pm-vn explicitly.⁶⁸ He adds that others comment: “just as there is a caused *tad-ārammaṇa* for causeless beings, similarly there is a three-caused *tad-ārammaṇa* for two-caused beings. And in compliance with their understanding, people say that the rejection of resultants joined with knowledge at this point <in Abhidh-s> applies only to <the case of> the causeless.”

⁶⁷ As von Hinüber points out (Hinüber 1996, §346), Abhidh-s-mhṭ was ‘finished within the astonishingly short time of 24 days’. This is no doubt best accounted for by supposing that Sumaṅgala is translating his teacher's *sanne* into Pali and adding material from an already written Abhidh-av-ṭ.

⁶⁸ *Taṃ pana parihāsa-vasena vuttam pi ācariyaṃ pucchitvā va vijānan’-atthaṃ vuttavacanaṃ viya ṭhitam. Tathā hi ācariyen’ev’ ettha kāraṇaṃ Param’-attha-**vinicchaye** vuttam:*

nāṇa-pākā na vattanti, jaḷattā mūla-sandhiyā ti (Pm-vn 271).

He then comments that, since there is no authoritative text for this, their words should be accepted after investigation, as the *ācariya* has classified the *cittas* nicely (*samakam eva*) by declaring the cause of the absence of resultants joined with knowledge through what is common to both.⁶⁹ Sumaṅgala refers again to this view of Jotipāla later in *Abhidh-av-ṭ*.⁷⁰

This passage, which is attributed to Jotipāla in *Abhidh-av-ṭ*, is cited as from the *Jñeya-saptati-ṭikā* in *Sacc-ṭ*, but I will postpone treatment of that for another occasion.

h) visual perception

Sumaṅgala's fourth reference to Jotipāla concerns the debate on visual perception.⁷¹ I shall not attempt to treat that in detail here, as I hope to return to it in part on a future occasion in connexion with other Sanskrit passages in *Vism-sn*.

Abhidh-av-ṭ II 120f. (to *Abhidh-av* 656):

Kiñcāpi cakkhu rūpaṃ na passati, kiñ carahi tan-nissitaṃ viññāṇam eva. Tathā hi "mañcā ukkuṭṭhiṃ karontī" ti-ādīsū viya nissita-kiriyaṃ nissaye viya katvā vohāra-sambhavato "cakkhu-pasādena passatī" ti vuttaṃ. Ācariya-Jotipāla-ttherenāpi hi iminā va adhippāyena idaṃ vuttaṃ.

"Although the eye does not see forms, how is it the case that only <visual> discrimination which is supported by the eye <does see forms>? Accordingly it is said that it sees by means of the sensitive matter of the eye (*cakkhu-pasāda*) just as in such examples as 'the benches make a clamouring' where there is an expression which refers to the support in place of the activity of the <people> supported. For this was said by the teacher Elder Jotipāla with just this intent."⁷²

⁶⁹ *Tattha pana pamāṇa-pāṭhābhāvato ācariyena ubhinnaṃ pi sādharāṇa-vasena nāṇa-sampayutta-vipākābhāve kāraṇaṃ vatvā samakam eva citta-paricchedassa dassitattā tesam vacanaṃ vīmaṃsitvā sampañcchitabbaṃ.*

⁷⁰ *Abhidh-av-ṭ* I 355: *Ahetukānaṃ paṭisandhi-sadisa-tad-ārammaṇa-vasena 'satta-tiṃs' evā' ti vuttaṃ; añña-kammaṇa pana dvi-hetuka-tad-ārammaṇassāpi sambhavato eka-cattālīsa honti. Ācariya-Jotipāla-ttherassa adhippāyena ti-hetuka-vipākehi pi saddhiṃ pañca-cattālīs' evā ti daṭṭhabbaṃ.*

⁷¹ Dhammajoti 1997.

⁷² cf. *Vibh-anuṭ* 163: *Kiles'-uppatti-nimittatāya uppatti-rahāṃ kilesaṃ ārammaṇaṃ antogadha-kilesaṃ ti vuttaṃ; tañ ca kho gāhake labbhamānaṃ gahetabbe upacaritvā, yathā nissite labbhamānaṃ nissaye upacaritvā 'mañcā ukkuṭṭhiṃ karontī' ti.*

i) ten kinds of *rūpa* in a *kalāpa*

The last of these points is not so much a debated issue as a reference to a statement of Jotipāla, i.e. where most sources refer to a minimum of eight *rūpas* in a *kalāpa*, he allows ten by including also two kinds of *anipphanna-rūpa*. But he then gives a verse:

*Avinibbhoga-vuttīni, catu-jān' eka-lakkhaṇā
nipp hannān' aṭṭha vā tesu, hitvānākāsa-lakkhaṇe*⁷³ ti.

“<The nine *rūpas*> originating from all four causes and one of the <four> 23 operate inseparably. Alternatively, omitting space and a *lakkhaṇa*, there are eight *nipp hanna-rūpas*.”

This may well be a Pali version of a stanza which was originally in Sanskrit. Possibly it may eventually be found cited somewhere in the Sinhala *sanne* literature. Note that this idea does not appear to be mentioned in the extant *Anuṭṭkā*.

Texts used

Abbreviations used in this paper are those of the *Critical Pāli Dictionary*. Texts used are Pali Text Society editions, except for works not published by the PTS; the Burmese Chaṭṭha-saṅgāyanā editions were used for works not available in Roman script (except for those listed below). Minor details of orthography have been standardized to conform to the norms of European Pali scholarship.

Abhidh-s-sn: Toṭagamuva Paññāmolī Tissa, ed. *Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha with the Purāṇasanne of Sāriputta Saṅgharāja*, 5th ed., Colombo, 1960.

Nikāyas: Samaranāyaka, ed., *Nikāya saṃgrahaya*, Colombo, 1966.

Vism-sn: Bentara Śradhātīṣya, ed., *The Visuddhimagga with the Commentary written by King Parākramabāhu II*, four volumes, Kalutara, 1949–1955.

VRI: Text cited from version three of the Dhammagiri CD issued by the Vipassana Research Institute.

⁷³ B^c reads: *hitvāna kāya-lakkhaṇe*, but C^c rightly has: *hitvānākāsa-lakkhaṇe*.

Bibliography

- K.M. De Silva, *A History of Sri Lanka*, London, 1981.
- Lily de Silva, ed. *Dīghanikāyaṭṭhakathāṭīkā Līnatthavaṇṇanā*, London, 1970.
- Bart Dessein, *Samyuktābhidharmahṛdaya. Heart of Scholasticism with Miscellaneous Additions*, Delhi, 1999.
- Bhikkhu J. Dhammajoti, “The Abhidharma Controversy on Visual Perception,” in *Recent Researches in Buddhist Studies. Essays in Honour of Professor Y.Karunadasa*, eds., Kuala Lumpur Dhammajoti et al., 70–117, Colombo, 1997.
- C.E. Godakumbura, “References to Buddhist Sanskrit Writers in Sinhalese Literature,” *UCR*, I, 1, 1943, 86–93.
- Paul J. Griffiths, *On being Buddha. The Classical Doctrine of Buddhahood*, Albany, 1994.
- Oskar von Hinüber, *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*, Berlin/New York, 1996.
- Wan Doo Kim, “The Theravādin Doctrine of Momentariness: A Survey of its Origins and Development” Ph.d, Oxford, 1999.
- G.P. Malalasekera, *Pali Literature of Ceylon*, London, 1928.
- Sodō Mori, “Uttaravihāraṭṭhakathā and Sārasamāsa,” *JPTS*, XII, 1988, 1–47.
- Ulrich Pagel, *The Bodhisattvapiṭaka. Its Doctrines, Practices and their Position in Mahāyāna Literature*, Tring, 1995.
- Aloysius Pieris, “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. Heinz Bechert, 61–77, Göttingen, 1978.
- Reverend Walpola Rahula, *History of Buddhism in Ceylon*, 2nd ed., Colombo, 1966.

Li Rongxi, *The Great Tang Dynasty Record of the Western Regions*, Berkeley, 1996.

Hammalawa Saddhātissa, *Upāsakajanālaṅkāra*, London, 1965.

N.H. Samtani, ed., *The Arthaviniścaya-sūtra & its Commentary (Nibandhana)*, Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series Vol. XIII, Patna, 1971.

Lambert Schmithausen, *The Problem of the Sentience of Plants in Earliest Buddhism*, Tokyo, 1991.

Peter Skilling, “Theravādin Literature in Tibetan translation,” *JPTS*, XIX, 1993, 69–201.

Peter Skilling, “Vimuttimagga and Abhayagiri: the form aggregate according to the Saṃskṛtāsāṃskṛtaviniścaya,” *JPTS*, XX, 1994, 171–210.