

Sri Lanka International Journal of Buddhist Studies (SIJBS)
Volume IV (2015), ISSN- 20128878

**A Chronological Approach to the Pali Commentaries:
with Reference to the *Madhuratthavilāsinī***

Dr. S. Vijitha Kumara

Chief Editor: Dr. Iromi Ariyaratne



**Sri Lanka International Buddhist Academy (SIBA)
Pallekele, Kundasale**

A Chronological Approach to the Pali Commentaries: with Reference to the *Madhuratthavilāsinī*

Dr. S. Vijitha Kumara

Acknowledgements

This research was completed under the Talent Management Project of Mahidol University. Hereby, I would like to thank Dr. Warren Todd, Mr. Thilina Wickramarachchi for their insightful feedback on an early draft of this article, to Ven. Rathanapala for discussing some metrical parts here described.

Abstract

The Pali commentarial literature is one of the most important sources of Theravada tradition in gaining a clearer understanding the Buddha's teachings. The history of Pali commentaries is formed with different layers. Particularly, the commentaries that we use currently were compiled by great Pali commentators in the 5th century AD.

Because the commentaries were completed during a few centuries, as multi-authored works and in different geographical backgrounds, occasionally, they contain interpretations discrepant with each other. In this case, stratification of the commentarial literature is required in order to make a proper assessment of their value. Through a precise stratification, it is possible to recognize how the cultural, geographical, historical and religious background influenced the varied interpretations in the commentaries.

Regarding the authorship and the date of compilation of the *Madhuratthavilāsinī* the commentary of the chronicle of the Buddha (*Buddhavaṃsa*), there are a few different views among modern scholars. In this paper, I intend to broadly analyze the external and internal evidence that can be used in terms of stratifying this commentary. In fact, this research will develop a clear framework that can be applied in stratifying all the Pali commentaries.

Introduction

The '*aṭṭhakathā*' is an exegetical work on Pali Canonical texts. In Sanskrit literature, the same feature is called 'bhāṣya'. Its aim is to elaborate the meanings of the Buddhist teachings in the Canon.¹

Two reasons led to the compilation of commentaries to the Pali canon. The first of them, as the *sutta*-s recorded, was that some of the teachings expounded by the Buddha were incomprehensible.² The second was the discrepancies relating to people's skill in understanding the Dhamma.³ Consequently, the commentaries became the vital support in the Pali literature to understand the original teachings of the Buddha.

The history of the well-systematized *aṭṭhakathā* is restricted to the 5th century AD.⁴ Nevertheless, the origin of the *aṭṭhakathā* can be traced back to the time of the Buddha.⁵ At that time, the explanatory works for the abridged teachings of the Buddha were made by Arahants. In the Pali literature, these are known as “*vibhaṅga*.”⁶

Besides, the *Niddesa* of the *Khuddaka-nikāya*, the commentarial works of the *Aṭṭhaka* and *Pārāyana vagga*-s of the *Suttanipāta* are deemed the most historic Pali canonical commentaries. Therefore, the first landmark of the Pali commentaries has to be set up with the *Niddesa* of the *Khuddaka-nikāya*. Secondly, there are the *Nettipakaraṇa*, *Peṭakopadesa* and *Milindapañha*, in which the content tallies with the *Piṭaka* but neither Pali cannon nor commentaries are counted as Post canonical literature.⁷ The third category is known as the work completed in between the period when the Post canonical and sub-commentarial literature took place. Among them, the *Madhuratthavilāsinī* is explicitly located in the third section.

*The Madhuratthavilāsinī*⁸ (Mv) sheds light the biographies of the historical Buddhas in Theravada Buddhist literature. It is the most informative literary work in the Theravada tradition, which describes the ten perfections (*dasapāramitā*). With regard to the authorship of this commentary, varied arguments have been put forward by modern Pali scholars. As the uncertain views on the authorship and its date have led to its devaluation, this article intends to affirm its true date and to set up its real consideration. In the course of this discussion, a few acceptable methods to date the commentaries also will be proposed.

Different standpoints of modern scholars

Venerable A. P. Buddhadatta suggests that the author of the Mv was master Buddhadatta, who was contemporary to Buddhaghosa. He arrived in Ceylon from Southern India to render the Sinhalese commentaries into Pali and gave up the effort due to his bad health.⁹ Prof. Malalasekara also agrees with the conclusion made by A. P. Buddhadatta, but the arguments he gives to come to the same conclusion were varied.¹⁰ In this regard, B. C. Law points out; “*Madhuratthavilāsinī* is a commentary on the *Buddhavamsa*. The author was Buddhadatta.”¹¹ It is clear that he also holds a similar notion to the aforementioned scholars.

Nevertheless, Law does not give precise accounts on which Buddhadatta he was. As Hinuber notes; “the author, Buddhadatta and the title, *Madhuratthavilāsinī* occur only in the colophon, where the length of the text is given as 26 *bhanavara*-s – 203000 *akkhara*-s, erroneously so, as it is 208000. All this taken together, gives rise to the suspicion that the colophon could be secondary, and added because Buddhadatta mentions about the initiator Buddhasīha.”¹² He observes that the Mv was written by two authors. Yet, K. R. Norman offers a different suggestion; “An examination of the commentary to the *Buddhavamsa* which is also ascribed to Buddhadatta, shows that it must have been compiled at a later date presumably by another Buddhadatta.”¹³

After examining the foregoing suggestions, it is possible to say that there is no clear agreement among the modern scholars on the authorship of the Mv. Moreover, the different suggestions in terms of the authorship and the date of this commentary denote the stratificational deficiency of the Pali commentarial literature. However, the following analyses are suggested by the above suggestions.

- a. The Mv was written by master Buddhadatta, who was contemporary to Buddhaghosa.
- b. It is a co-authored commentary (one of them was Buddhadatta who was contemporary to Buddhaghosa. The other one is unknown).
- c. It was compiled by a later Buddhadatta

Hence, we have to focus on two pivotal sides in this regard: the date and the actual author of the commentary.

Historical evidence

In Pali literature, except for the canonical texts, the accounts of the authorship are given occasionally at the outset or the end of the texts. But, the authors did not deem that it was essential to do so. The author of the Mv also does not record his personal information explicitly. Although the commentary contains hazy evidence regarding its authorship, one of the verses in the introductory notes¹⁴ attests that the initiator of Mv was Buddhasīha. Further, the text notes that the author dwelt at a monastery built by king *Kaṇhadāsa* at *Kāvīrapaṭṭana*. Because the Mv gives scanty facts respecting its authorship, I look for different but congruent and contemporary literature to determine in which century this was compiled.

Gandhavaṃsa: The eminent bibliographical text, the *Gandhavaṃsa*, in the Pali literature suggests that the author of the Mv was the master Buddhadatta who was entrusted with the *Vinayaviniccaya*, the *Uttaravinicchaya* and the *Abhidhammāvatāra*. But, the facts given in the *Gandhavaṃsa* are not adequate to affirm that master Buddhadatta, the author of the Mv was contemporary to Buddhaghosa.

Buddhaghosuppatti: The *Buddhaghosuppatti* is dated around 13th century C.E. Its author, seemingly, may have followed the ancestral sources in compiling this text. This biographical masterpiece notes the meeting of master Buddhadatta with Buddhaghosa. As it has recorded, once when they met at the sea, master Buddhadatta had not been involved with compiling commentaries or sub-commentaries.¹⁵ The trustworthiness of the information given in this text is strengthened by the implication that it was composed after the *Tika* originated. However, my special attention is drawn to two important facts that come out in it. The record about the text “*Jinālaṅkāra*” (the beauty of the Buddhas) is the first point. In other words, a hypothesis comes up whether the *Jinālaṅkāra* tallies with the commentary of *Buddhavaṃsa*. The second evidence is the introductory verse cited from the *Jinālaṅkāra* as follows:

“*Sukhañca dukkhaṃ samāthāyupekkhaṃ*
Nevicchi yo kāmaṃ akāmanītaṃ
Asaṅkhātaṃsaṅkhātasambhavaṃbhavaṃ
Hitvā gato taṃ sugataṃ namāmi ti”¹⁶

If this was a true citation from the *Jinālaṅkāra*, possibly it would be a work of Buddhadatta, who compiled *Uttaravinicchaya*. The alliteration employed in this verse conforms to the format of the verses of the *Uttaravinicchaya*.¹⁷

The lineage of the Theras: For a precise stratification of the commentaries, it is most important to analyze the lineage of the Theras referring to the Theravada tradition. The detailed lineage of Theras is found in the *Parivāra Pali*. It starts with Arahant Upāli and ends with Siva, who was eminent in Vinaya, in Ceylon.¹⁸ The account of elders living both in India and Ceylon, as Parivara records, could be arranged thus; Upāli, Dāsaka, Kosiyaputta, Siggava, Moggaliputta tissa, Mahinda, Ittiya, Uttiya, Sambala, Bhaddasāla, Ariṭṭha, Tissadatta, Kālasumana, Dīgha, Dīghasumana, second Kālasumana, Nāga, Buddharakkhita, Tissa, Deva, Sumana, Cūlanāga, Dhammapālita, Khema, Upatissa, Phussadeva, second Sumana, Puppha, Mahāsiva, Upāli, Mahānāga, Abhaya, Tissa, second Puppha, Cūlābhaya, Tissa, Cūladeva and Siva. The same list, again, comes in the *Samantapāsādikā*.¹⁹ Nevertheless, the *Atthasālinī*, the commentary of the *Dhammasaṅghanī*, gives a different list, which starts with Arahant Sāriputta and ends with the time of the third council.²⁰ The interesting point regarding this is that according to the list contained in the Mv also a lineage started from Arahant Sāriputta and ended around the time of the third Buddhist council.²¹

In an overview, it is obvious that two of them, written in Ceylon,²² start from Arahant Upāli. The other two start from Arahant Sāriputta. As the *Mahāvamsa* states, the *Atthasālinī* was compiled by Buddhaghosa in India before his arrival in Ceylon. In this manner, it is not improper to presume that there were congruent sources to write commentaries in India. So, it is reasonable to assume that the Mv also was compiled in India. To affirm this presumption, the ranges of the list of lineage of Theras found in these two works are more supportive. The lineage of the *Atthasālinī* and the Mv are restricted to the third council only. Considering the information traced in the *Gandhavamsa*, microscopic clues of the *Buddhaghosuppatti* and the outcome of the analyses of the lineage of Theras, the compilation has to be recognized as an Indian commentary. This speculation is further affirmed as the Mv does not hold even one reference related to Ceylon.

The introductory and colophon verses in the Mv: The accounts given in the introductory and the colophon verses of the Mv shed light on the authorship of the text. Firstly, the introductory verses mention that Venerable Buddhasīha was the initiator of the commentary,²³ who lived at a monastery built by *Kaṇhadāsa* in the southern part of India.²⁴ But, it seems that the author was aware of the method of Pali tradition of *Mahāvihāra*.²⁵ So, if he was the same Buddhadatta, who visited Ceylon, he may perhaps have compiled the Mv after his returning to India. Besides,

the colophon confirms that he passed away within a short period after he completed this commentary.²⁶ It implies that he was in his old age while he was compiling the Mv. As the colophon states, he has followed the *Porāṇaṭṭhakathā* and lived at *Kāveripaṭṭana* nearby the river *Godhāvarī*.²⁷

Another notable fact in this colophon is that this commentary was entitled by the author to be “*Maduratthappakāsini*”.²⁸ The usage “*Madhuratthavilāsini*” may have been introduced by ancestors, who handed down it in succession. Therefore, the last two verses have to be counted as non-original but added by later scholars. For the first time, the term “*Madhuratthavilāsini*” appears in the non-original verses in the colophon.²⁹ I suggest that the facts given in these verses are less valid. Based on these last two verses, Prof. Hinuber suggests that the Mv was a work authored by two persons.³⁰ Nevertheless, I believe that the source taken to validate his suggestion is doubtful. As he says, the colophon notes different numbers of the letters of 26 *bhāṇavāra*-s. On the surface, his viewpoint is accurate. But, this has to be considered as a miscalculation by the ancestors because the other two criteria are explicitly accurate; 26 *bhāṇavāra*-s and 6500 ganthas. If the first and the second statements are accurate, the third one would be inaccurate. In this case, in fact, it should be taken as a fault in counting.

According to the external evidence traced here, the origin of the Mv was in *Kāveri* city nearby the river *Godhāvarī* in Southern India. And, Buddhaśīha was the initiator of the text. Seemingly, its author was master Buddhadatta, who was a contemporary of Buddhaghosa and, was at his old age. But, moreover, a research problem is there to solve, namely, whether the Mv was a later or earlier work than the commentaries of Venerable Buddhaghosa.

Literary features

Especially, in this section, I would bring five facets onto the table; versification language, doctrinal matters, comparative literature and historical facts as internal evidence.

Versification: The multiplicity of the verses in the Mv manifests its identity among other commentaries. The verses that we come across in the Mv are divided into two groups. The first category is the verses borrowed from the Pali canonical literature and the second is known as the verses composed by the author himself. Although the common aim of the commentaries was to elaborate the incomprehensible words and simplify the meanings of the canon, occasionally they include verses to expound incidents, history and doctrinal matter. A mixed literary framework formed with both prose and verse was the common structure of the commentaries. However, it is obvious that the author of the Mv inclined more to verses than the other commentators. Consequently, this commentary is modified with prosody as well as rhetoric.

A well-developed metric system used by the author can be found in the Mv. My inspection focuses on the verses composed only by the author. Their numbers are applied as I.B. Horner had.

Anuṭṭhubha: 12,13,14,15,16,18,19,20-26,38-43,45,46, 61-63,78-84, 98-100,102-105,107-110, 119-125, (128, 129)³¹

Panti:

- a. *Campakamālā*-73

Tiṭṭhubha:

- a. *Indavajirā*- 4,6,27,29,48,56,57,76,90,92
 b. *Upendavajirā*-7,49,64,86,89,93,96³²,115,
 c. *Upajāti*-5,8,9,10,11,28,30-34,36,37,44,47,50-55,58, 59,75,77,87,88,91,95,
 112-114,116-119,
 d. *Svāgata*-97

Jagatī:

- a. *Vaṃsaṭṭha*- 1,2³³,3, 106
 b. *Indavaṃsa*-101
 c. *Toṭaka*-111
 d. *Bhujangappayāta*-35, 126, 126
 e. *Dutavilambita*-60

Addhasama:

- a. *aparavatta* 85,94

Complicated: 74, 101³⁴

As I. B. Horner sees, there are 130 verses entrusted to master Buddhadatta in the Mv out of around one thousand and twenty.³⁵ Among the metres he has used in his composition, the *anuṭṭhubha*, *indavajirā*, *upendavajirā* and *upajāti* take the highest numbers. They are all the religious metres, which were common to the Vedic and Brahmanic texts. Also, they were common in the Pali canonical literature as well. But, occasionally, non-religious metres like *dutavilambita*, *vaṃsaṭṭha*, *toṭaka*, *bhujangappayāta* are also to be found in the Mv. Overall, its metrical variation is unlike other commentaries. In a comparison with the metres of the *Abhidhammāvatāra* and the *Vinayaviniccaya*³⁶, the conformity with the Mv is evident. They also, as versified works, contain the metres; *anuṭṭhubha*, *upajāti*, *indavajirā*, *pamītakarā*. The metrics selected for both texts demonstrate that the Mv was a masterpiece of Buddhadatta. Further, it should be noted here that the metres used in the Mv do not totally correspond to nonreligious metrical features such as *vasantatilakā*, *mālanī*, *saddūlavikkīṭita*. Especially, the metres in the Mv do not

support the view that it was composed by a later Buddhadatta belonging to *Tika* period in the 12th century AD, when the metrical usage became more secular than the *Mv* depicts.

Long compounds: Another significant feature of the language style of the *Mv* is the long compounds untypical to other Pali commentaries. The Pali language, which became the language of the Tipitaka, is generally simpler than Sanskrit. Later on, the commentators also tried to keep the natural language style in compiling the commentaries. But, seemingly, the conformity was changed in the *Mv*. It contains long compounds like the prose works in Sanskrit literature such as *Daśakumāracarita*, *Lalitavistara*, *Kādambarī*. Examples of a few long compounds, are the following: here:

“*samavaṭṭakkhandham*
samuggatavipulakomalaphalapallavaṅkurasamalaṅkatasākham
sabbaphāliphullam sālārājam viya sīlamūlam”³⁷

Further, while the author was explaining Siddhartha’s visit to the park with Channa, the beauty of the vehicle is described with long compounds;

“So “*sādhū*’*ti paṭissuṇitvā mahāraham*
vararucirathirakubbaravarattaṃ thirataraneminābhiṃ
varakanakarajatamaṇiratanakhacitaīsāmukham
navakanakarajatatāarakhacitanemipassaṃ
samosaritivividhasurabhikusumadāmasassirikaṃ
ravirathasadisadassanīyaṃ vararatham”³⁸

Again, to explain the beauty of the girls, who were dancing in the palace, the author composes long compounds;

“*bimbaphalasadisadasanavasanā*
sitavimalasamasamhitāviraḷavaradasanā *asitanayanakesapāsā*
sujātañjanātinīlakuṭilabhamukā sujātahaṃsasamasamhitapayodharā
ratikaranavakanakarajataviracitavaramaṇimekhalā
parigatavipulaghanajaghanataṭā *karikarasannibhoruyugalā*
naccagītavāditesu kusalā”³⁹

Therefore, it is clear that the author was influenced by Sanskrit literary works and he applied long compounds as a poetical ornament in his work. In other words, it indicates that the language style of this commentary is explicitly different from the other commentaries because of its Sanskritization.

Alliterations- The alliteration as a rhetorical device appeared occasionally in the Suttas. ⁴⁰It prevailed equally in both verses and the prose passages in the *Mv*. For instance;

“*Anantañāṇaṃ karuṇālayam layam, malassa buddham susamāhitam hitam*
Namāmi dhammam bhavasamvaram varam, guṇākarañceva niraṅganam ganam.”⁴¹

The underlined words appeared twice in the same line, making alliteration “*anuprāsa*”. But, it should be noted that the meaning of these two different terms is varied from each other.

“*Dīpaṅkare cārukare kumāre, sivaṅkare santikareva jāte*

Pakampi saṅkampi tadā samantā, saḥassaṅkhyā dasalokadhātu.”⁴²

The alliteration traced in this verse is different from what the first citation manifested in. Throughout the first two lines, it contains the sound “kare/are” four times and the third line holds “kampi” for two times. Again, the fourth is adorned by “s”. Further, the letter “ā” that runs in the last two lines also produces rhythm related to alliteration.

“*Sikhīva loke tapasā jalitvā, sikhīva meghāgamane naditvā*

Sikhī mahesindhanavippahīno, sikhīva santiṃ sugato gato so”⁴³

Partly, this verse was shaded by the format of a verse of the *Kālundāyi Theragāthā* of *Dasaka nipāta* of the *Theragāthā*; “*Punappunaṃ vassati devarājā*”.⁴⁴ The term “*Sikhī*” appears at the beginning of all the lines, clearly evoking alliteration. The rhyme that comes at the end of all four lines is the next specific feature of this verse. The first two lines are based on “itva” and “īva” the second two lines are with vowel “o”. In addition to that, the second line produces different melodies with the letters “m” and “g” (see the underlined words).

“*Vibhūsitā bālaṅāṅālinī, vibhūsitāṅgī vaniteva mālinī*

Sadā janānaṃ nayanālimālinī, vilumpinīvātiviroci lumbinī”⁴⁵

Moreover, a verse is found with four-lined rhymes. And its first two lines further make a beautiful melody using “*vibhūsitā*” in the beginning of the lines.

“*Atha rājagahaṃ vararājagahaṃ, nararājavarā nagaraṃ tu gate*

Girirājavarā munirājavarā, miḡarājagato sugatopi gato”⁴⁶

The above verse is adorned with the term “*rāja*.” Meantime, a vowel “a” runs corresponding to the first two lines and the second two lines are formatted with the vowel “ī” and “o”. It is clear that the alliterations in the verses produce not only attractive sounds, but accent the meaning as well. For instance, the meaning of this verse, the walking style of the Buddha is symbolized by the melodies with breaking sounds rhythmically.

Aside from the verses, the alliteration can be seen in the prose passages too. In fact, this feature is very uncommon in the Pali literature. For instance;

“*anilabalasamuddhutatarāṅgabhaṅgaṃ asaṅgaṃ gaṅgaṃ nadiṃ
uttaritvā maṅgaṅaraṃsijālaviḡjotitarājagahaṃ rājagahaṃ nāma
nagaraṃ pavisitvā*”⁴⁷.

This fragment is of differing vowels and consonants. In the first part, “a” and “ī” are mixed up and make attractive melody. In the second part, two “u” are used. Next, two “ta” sounds are placed in the same place and produce different sounds. Yet,

“āṅga” mixed with different consonant and connected letters change the melody again. Moreover, it applies “n” in between vowels “a” and at the end, “ja” “rājagaha” used to twice also make up its alliteration. For further understanding, here, I cited a few examples as I did above.

[“sañjhāppabhānurañjitavarakanakagirisikharasadisasarīrasobhaṃ
timiranikaranidhānakaraṃ kamalavanavikasanakaraṃ”⁴⁸

“jalajāmalāvikalakamalamakulasadisam
dasanakhasamodhānasamujjalamañjaliṃ sirasmiṃ katvā”⁴⁹

“sītalasilātalamalaṅkataṃ paramaramaṇīyabhūmibhāgaṃ
surabhikusumataruvaranirantaraṃ
ramaṇīyapāsādahammiyamānavihāraddhuyogamaṇḍapādipaṭimaṇ
ḍitaṃ”⁵⁰

“saradasamayavimalakaranikaraṃ sabbajanaratikaraṃ
rajanikaramiva sītalajalatalagatakamalakaṇṇikāya nisinnaṃ
viya”⁵¹]

Similes and Metaphors: Similes and metaphors are common and a strong way of communication in the Pali commentaries. Particularly, the commentators did not use them in a mere poetical sense like poetics do. They particularly focus on illustrating the Dhamma. Nonetheless, the similes and metaphors applied in the Mv outrun the limitations of the Pali canon. For instance, I would select a few citations, which lead to metaphysical similes and metaphors as follows: “having assembled ten nails like an unbroken, pure and luminous lotus bud”⁵² “the earth trembled like dancing with pleasure.”⁵³ “Showed the double sided power like sprinkling the dust of the feet on the head of the relations.”⁵⁴ “The beautiful face like the full moon of the autumn season.” “Conception of the bodhisattva was very clear like a thread running through a gem.”⁵⁵ “The newborn bodhisattva was luminous like a gem thrown on the cloth of *Kasī*.”⁵⁶ “The leaves fell down at the Bo-tree like pearls on the golden plate”⁵⁷ “Great seer of sun” “Nibbana is a city”⁵⁸

A Comparison between the Mv, the Lv and the BC

As we have traced in this section, there is ample evidence to accept that the author applied Sanskrit poetical theories. Through deeper analyses, it can further be maintained that master Buddhadatta was influenced, predominately, by two Buddhist Sanskrit texts, the *Buddhacarita* (BC) and the *Lalitavistara* (Lv). Among them, the BC was completely a versified work and the Lv was a mixed work.

As Ven. Anandajithika observes, a number of metres are used in the BC. Among them, *Upajāti* takes the highest number. Additionally, both these two masterpieces are composed with long compounds and multiplied with alliterations. Because, they were the most popular and detailed works on the character of the Gotama Buddha, Master Buddhadatta may perhaps have closely studied these two works before he composed the Mv. Evidently, to some extent, the Mv was strengthened with the

content of the BC and structured by the writing style of the Lv. Particularly, the descriptions of the birth of Siddhartha in the three texts, the BC, the Lv and the Mv are similar. The Mv and the Lv mention that Prince Siddhartha was born without any dirt⁵⁹, but, he was taken by *Mahābrahma* and deity Sakka into a divine cloth immediately after he was born.⁶⁰ Further, the Lv notes that he was cleaned with aromatic water by deities.⁶¹ The contradiction between these two activities in the Lv was recognized by Buddhadatta and sidetracked the second statement that the prince was washed by *Mahābrahma* with aromatic water. As the Mv and the Lv note, the queen was also purified by the deities or female deities.⁶²

Sometimes, even the similes used to express the events are equal in these texts.⁶³ The extent to which there is conformity in the story of Gautama Buddha between the Mv and Sanskrit texts is known through descriptions pertaining to the groups of friends born with Siddhartha, exhibition of his skills, practicing hard practices, in both the Lv and the Mv.⁶⁴ While the Mv was explaining the hard practices of the Bodhisattva, it uses the term, which is equal to the Lv; “*ekatilatanduladihipi*.”⁶⁵ The abandoning of the five ascetics and defeating Mara is also running parallel.⁶⁶ But, there is no doubt that although the author was influenced by the Lv and the BC, the Pali *porāṇaṭṭhakathā* were the prime sources for his work. Structurally, it followed the narrative method that the Lv had. But, importantly, while he was describing the story in verses, he used to follow the Pali canonical references. Consequently, throughout the text, we find 130 verses created by the author out of around one thousand and twenty.

With this evidence, it is probable that the Mv was composed by Buddhadatta with the influence of two Buddhist Sanskrit biographical texts. I suggest that he completed the Mv after his returning to India from Ceylon and Buddhaghosa was aware of this commentary too. Consequently, Buddhaghosa abandoned the idea of writing a commentary to *Buddhavaṃsa*.

Commentarial Methods

As we have already analyzed, the Mv was composed by Buddhadatta in India. But, examining the sources applied in his work, it can be confirmed that a number of sources preserved by ancestors of Theravada tradition were used in it. However, the sources employed in the Mv are unequal to the sources that Buddhaghosa used in his works. Except a few points, the interpretations are largely parallel to the commentaries composed by Indian commentators.

Conciseness: Although sometimes Mv described the facts corresponding to the works of Buddhaghosa, overall, they are all more concise than Buddhaghosa has explained. Especially, a statement of Buddhadatta substantiates that he wanted to avoid the defect from the width of the text.⁶⁷ The details on the first twenty years of the Buddha given in the Mv⁶⁸ tally with *Manorathapūranī*.⁶⁹ But, the explanation in the Mv is brief. To explain *Sīla* and *Samādhi* he concisely notes “four types of *Sīla*” “Three types of *Samādhi*”.

An interesting point which comes across in the Mv is the explanation of “*karavīka madhurāṅgira*”. The Mv interprets what the sound of *karavīka* is and says that it is a sound of a cuckoo, which tasted a berried mango and makes sounds after being intoxicated with its juice.⁷⁰ Extending the comment, Buddhaghosa gives another fact in the commentary of the *Majjhima-nikāya*, referring to a historical incident that happened in the Asoka period.⁷¹ Similarly, I found an interpretation on the term “*jatā*” in the Mv⁷², which was illustrated by Buddhaghosa in the *Vism*⁷³ in detail, as a brief definition similar to the commentary of the *Samyutta-nikāya*.⁷⁴ It is clear that the concise method was not the way constantly applied by the commentators in the commentaries or sub commentaries. In this case, it is to say that the concise method demonstrates its date was not later than *Vism*. This suggests that the sources were brought by Sinhalese monks while they were migrating to India due to a serious drought that came up in Ceylon,⁷⁵

Buddhadatta may have used the sources belonging to *Sīhala vihāra* in southern India. Archaeologically, this hypothesis is provable referring to the inscription found at Sri Parvata in Andhra. As it notes, there were three Sihala monasteries in Andhra and two of them were affiliated to *Mahāvihāra* in Ceylon.⁷⁶

Illustrations: In some occasions, he illustrated essential details in the discussions. For instance, Buddhaghosa explains the term “*Bodhi*” in brief.⁷⁷ But the Mv gives more details than the commentary of *Majjhima-nikāya*.⁷⁸ The independence in using varied sources and the different manner of commenting imply that Buddhadatta’s tradition was different from what Buddhaghosa followed.

Referencing: Buddhadatta directly refers to the sources when he brings different facets in the discussion. Once, he refers to the commentary of *Dhammasaṅgānī*.⁷⁹ Again, he turns to the commentary of *Vimānavatthu* and suggests to follow its information further regarding the discussion.⁸⁰

Selecting sources: Sometimes, he chooses the most appropriate sources regarding his explanations. For instance; “*Isi* means; looks for, search for wholesome is *Isi*”⁸¹ this interpretation is restricted to Vv-a, Pv-a, Th-a and the Mv. Again, describing “*bhavābhava*” he defines how the aforementioned commentaries have been done.⁸² Additionally, he follows the commentary of *Apadāna* too.⁸³ This means that the author highly appreciated the commentaries of Dhammapāla or the sources that Dhammapāla used. But, Hinuber suggests that the author of the Mv closely followed the references and the methods used by Buddhaghosa rather than following Dhammapāla.⁸⁴ As I understand it, his suggestion should be revised. The point “*suttanikkhepa*” used to substantiate his viewpoint is not adequate here. Hinuber is partly right in that the author has skipped the reference of Ud-a regarding “*suttanikkhepa*” and he had referred the explanation, which is common not only to Sv but also to M-a and It-a too.⁸⁵

A different interpretation in terms of *suttanikkhepa* found in the Ud-a is formed based on the suttas of the Ud itself.⁸⁶ So, it would be understood as a description limited to Ud only. But the other explanations as I traced earlier are common to the

whole Tipitaka. That would be the reason why Buddhadatta did not refer to the Ud-a in regard to this. And the next point is that if the author of the It-a was Dhammapāla, why is it that the It-a also refers to the same explanation as the Mv does? This indicates that Dhammapāla, Buddhadatta and Buddhaghosa followed the same sources and the interpretation on the “*suttanikkhepa*” found in the Ud-a was an identified interpretation made by Dhammapāla as his own.

The statement found in the introductory verses “*saṅkara dosa hīnā*” signifies that this commentary is of “fewer defects of the nature of confusions”. In other words, he indicates that he followed an outstanding editorial process in compiling this commentary.⁸⁷ Perhaps in some instances, the same illustrations appear as a result of referring to common sources.⁸⁸ All the references regarding this, demonstrate that the sources used in these commentaries (Mv, Pv-a, Vv-a) were identical. Consequently, it can be said that all these commentators may have used common sources. Particularly, K. R. Norman holds the view that Buddhadatta and Buddhaghosa followed similar sources for their works.⁸⁹ If his suggestion is accurate, it is not impossible to make a link among Buddhadatta, Buddhaghosa and Dhammapāla, because Buddhadatta was influenced by Dhammapāla and the sources which he applied.

At this point, Hinuber thinks that Dhammapāla came later than Buddhaghosa and sometimes he has followed different traditions too.⁹⁰ But, analyzing the statement he has traced, it can be suggested that on the one hand the works of Dhammapāla demonstrated similarities with the works of Buddhaghosa and on the other hand, Dhammapāla has included alternative descriptions too. In this regard, my viewpoint is that the similarities between them come up because they used the same sources related to *Mahāvihāra*. But, the disparities were embedded in his works because the sources used by Dhammapāla belonged to the monastery of Sīhala monks who migrated from Ceylon and lived in Southern India.⁹¹

The other notable point regarding his way of selecting sources has to be discussed with reference to the difference between the commentary and the Bv. The Mv does not comment on the last two chapters of the Bv. This controversial point has been already discussed widely by Adikaram, Oliver Abeynayake, and Toshichi Endo. Prof. Abeynayake’s striking point on this is that the Bv what we have today could be later than the Mv.⁹² After a careful analysis, Prof. Endo has given three possible explanations for this point. My preference is admitting the third amongst these three⁹³ because Buddhadatta applied standard editorial method in his commentary, especially, removing unnecessary explanations and keeping conciseness throughout his writing.⁹⁴

Own interpretations: Periodically, in the Mv, he puts forward his own interpretations too. The definition of “*gavapāna*” was one of them. As he defines, “*gavapāna*” means *chatumadhura*.⁹⁵ Again, he defines what the meaning of “*brahā*” is. It was his own interpretation, “*Brahā* means eighty cubits”.⁹⁶ Usually, when the author gives his own interpretation, he had to present the opinions of others

regarding the point. So, the interpretations made by the author as his own, supports to stratify the date of the works because additional references are also revealed.

Impartiality: The author follows a standard academic method to compose this commentary. Once, he found a referential difference regarding the ordination of Arahant Upāli and Anuruddha between *Khandhaka Pali* and the commentary of the *Petavatthu*. Then he points out the difference as he found and gives opportunity to judge it by the readers.⁹⁷ Also, this point favors the suggestion that before the compilation of the Mv the commentary of Pv was known. In this manner, if we admit that the Mv was a work of Buddhadatta who was contemporary to Buddhaghosa, it is obvious that Dhammapāla was earlier than Buddhadatta and Norman's suggestion that Dhammapāla was living in the sixth century AD⁹⁸ has to be revised.

Additional relevant details: The additional details referring to people, places, and activities given in the Mv are more supportive in stratifying the text. Especially, the Mv notes about different recitations regarding a few verses and terms among different traditions.⁹⁹ Sometimes, these differences reveal that the author was aware of different traditions and he was impartial to refer to other views too.

Linguistic methods: He constantly attempts to define the terms with reference to grammatical explanations. Because of this, the Mv became rich with the components of traditional grammar. Hence, the combinations,¹⁰⁰ compounds,¹⁰¹ gender,¹⁰² cases¹⁰³ *kāraka*¹⁰⁴ case omission¹⁰⁵ and case changing¹⁰⁶ are described carefully. Thus, grammatical explanations in the Mv demonstrate to what extent the author had mastered in Pali grammar. Also, the grammatical features found in it is helpful for determining how the work should be dated. All the technical terms of grammar used in this commentary have followed the traditional Pali grammar. The sixth compound and the term "*Vibhatti*"¹⁰⁷ which appeared only three times were the components influenced by Sanskrit grammar. Sometimes, he sees the linguistic background of the terms beyond the grammar.¹⁰⁸ By analyzing the grammatical references, it can be dated around the period when traditional Pali grammar was developed. And, certainly it was before the time that the modern grammar was introduced (12th Century C.E.).

Doctrinal facts

The doctrinal facts rendered by the evolution of conceptual differences also help to stratify the Mv. The major concept among them was the ten perfections.

Ten perfections: "*Pāramī*" is the term used to signify perfection in Pali. Its meanings, as the canon demonstrates, are known as practice,¹⁰⁹ mastering,¹¹⁰ and perfection.¹¹¹ Ten perfections is a well known concept in Theravada tradition which developed gradually.

This famous teaching is found even in the Mahayana tradition. However, numerically the perfections are different in these two traditions. Mahayana accepts

six types of perfections. But, Theravada admitted seven, ten and eventually it became thirty with its sub-divisions.

For the first time, ten perfections in Theravada appeared in the *Buddhavaṃsa*.¹¹² Before it became ten, the *Cariyāpiṭaka* contained seven; *dāna*, *sīla*, *nekkhamma*, *adhiṭṭhāna*, *sacca*, *mettā* and *upekkhā*.¹¹³ The *Cariyāpiṭaka* gives up *paññā*, *virīya* and *khanti*. This numerical difference, as Norman sees, came into existence as a gradual increasing in ascending order from six to ten.¹¹⁴ Explaining the reason for number ten, Har Dayal suggests that it was a result of the influence of the science of Arithmetic, which was influential in the third or fourth centuries.¹¹⁵ Nevertheless, his viewpoint is not possible to admit because the ten numbered perfection was from the *Buddhavaṃsa*, which was completed before the third Buddhist council in the 3rd century BC. However, differences in the Theravada texts can be analyzed with Mahayana as follows:

Cp	Mahayana	Significance in Mahayana	Bv	A comparison six with ten in Cp-a ¹¹⁶
Dāna	Dāna	Prajñā	Dāna	Dāna [adhiṭṭhāna], [nekkhamma]
Sīla	Sīla	Virīya	Sīla	Sīla [nekkhamma ¹¹⁷ , sacca] [adhiṭṭhāna]
Nekkhamma	Kṣānti	Dhyāna	Nekkhamma	Kṣānti [adhiṭṭhāna], [nekkhamma]
Adhiṭṭhāna	Virīya		Paññā	Virīya [adhiṭṭhāna], [nekkamma]
Sacca	Dhyāna		Virīya	Dhyāna [mettā, upekkhā], [adhiṭṭhāna], [nekkamma]
Mettā	Prajñā		Khanti	Prajñā [upekkhā] [adhiṭṭhāna], [nekkamma], [sacca]
Upekkhā			Sacca	
			Adhiṭṭhāna	
			Mettā	
			Upekkhā	

According to the above facts, a doubt comes up whether the tenfold perfections in the *Buddhavaṃsa* appeared as a combination of the perfections in *Cariyāpiṭaka* and Mahayana. This presumption could be reasonable because the *Buddhavaṃsa* was composed in between the second and third councils, after Mahayana originated. However, the tenfold perfections could be an outcome of mixing up two traditions because Mahayanists highly respected *prajñā* and *virīya*, the *Buddhavaṃsa* and its

commentary had to contain them. Nevertheless, Endo giving his suggestion on this point infers that this influence could be from any of different schools.¹¹⁸

Conclusion

The historical records as external evidence demonstrated that the Mv was composed by master Buddhadatta, who was the author of the *Abhidhammāvatāra*, *Uttaravinicchaya* and *Vinayavinicchaya*, in India. If the *Buddhaghosuppatti* is taken as a worthy source, master Buddhadatta compiled the Mv after his return to India. For this, the *Buddhaghosuppatti* attests that Buddhadatta himself confirmed that he had not compiled any commentary before he met Buddhaghosa on the sea. The restriction of the lineage of the Theras to Indian also affirms that it was a work by an Indian. But, as the introductory verses note the author follows the sources related to *Mahāvihāra* and he adapted the Pāli system followed by *Mahāvihāra* monks. Nevertheless, his commentary conformed to some extent to the structure, concepts, facts and language style of Buddhist Sanskrit texts too. It does not mean that he completely imitated Sanskrit sources. However, the metres applied in the Mv denote that the text was influenced by Sanskrit works like the BC and the Lv. Alliterations, multiplication of metaphysical similes and metaphors, conformed to the above texts. So, the Mv could be a work completed recently before these Sanskrit texts came into existence.

The sources Buddhadatta used are similar to the sources that Dhammapāla used rather than the sources used by Buddhaghosa. Seemingly, masters Buddhadatta, Dhammapāla and the author of the commentary of *Petavatthu* (Dhammapāla?) may have followed the common sources in their works. But, they also adopted the style of the Mahāvihāra. How did it happen? As the historical texts recorded, at the time of a severe drought that took place in the 1st century AD in Ceylon, some group of monks have brought the *porāṇaṭṭhakathā* to India. The inscription found at Sri Parvata in Andhra also confirms that there were three Sinhalese monasteries in Andhra after Amaravati period. If this fact is accurate, indeed, Buddhadatta and Dhammapāla would have used these common sources.

Another considerable fact is the existence of the older commentaries in India, while Buddhadatta was compiling this commentary. The reference traced by Buddhadatta, from the commentary of *Petavattu*, in the Mv regarding the ordination of Upāli and Anuruddha substantiates that there was a commentary of *Pethavatthu* composed before him. Thus, it should be concluded that this commentary was later than the works of Dhammapāla and earlier than some works of Buddhaghosa. Eventually, it should be said that Buddhaghosa, Dhammapāla and Buddhadatta were living in the same period and used the sources related to *Mahāvihāra* but stored in different countries and Buddhaghosa among them was the youngest and Dhammapāla could be the oldest.

Abbreviations

BC	Buddhacarita
Bv	Buddhavamsa
Bv-a	Buddhavamsa aṭṭhakathā
Cp	Cariyāpiṭaka
Cp-a	Cariyāpiṭaka-aṭṭhakathā
D-a-t	Dīgha-nikāya-abhinav-tīkā
It-a	Itivuttaka-aṭṭhakathā
Lv	Lalitavistara
M-a	Majjhima-nikāya aṭṭhakathā
Mv	Madhuratthavilāsini
Pv-a	Petavatthu-aṭṭhakathā
Ud-a	Udāna-aṭṭhakathā
Vv-a	Vimānavatthu-aṭṭhakathā

References

- Abeynayake O. (1984) *A Textual and Historical Analysis of the Kuddaka Nikaya*, Colombo: Author publication.
- Adikaram, E. W. (1946) *Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon*. Ceylon: Migoda.
- Andersen Dines and Smith Helmer, (1913). *Suttanipāta*, ed., Oxford: Pali Text Society,
- Apte, V.S. (1965) *Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. Delhi,
- Barua, D. L. (1979) *Cariyapitaka aṭṭhakathā*. ed. London: Pali Text Society,
- Bose, M. M. (1977) *Itivuttaka-aṭṭhakathā*. ed. vol. I and II. London: Pali Text Society,
- Buddhadatta, A. P. (1960) *Pali Sahitya*. Vol. I and II. Ceylon,
- Cone, M. (2001) *Dictionary of Pāli*. vol I. Oxford,
- Cowell, E. B. (1893) *Buddhacarita*. ed and trans., London: Oxford University Press,
- Dayal, H. (1970) *The Bodhisatva Doctrine of Buddhist Sanskrit Literature*, Delhi: Motilal Banarasidass,
- De Silva, L. (1970) *Dighanikayaṭṭhakathā tīkā Līnatthavaṇṇanā*. ed. III vols., London: Pali Text Society,

- Endo, T. (2013) *Studies in Pali Commentarial Literature*, Hong Kong: Centre for Buddhist Studies.
- Fausboll, V. (1964) *Jataka*. ed. vol. VI., London: Pali Text Society,
- Geiger, W. (2000) *A Pāli Grammar*. Oxford : Pali Text Society,
- (1921) *Culavaṃsa*. ed. II vols. London: Pali Text Society,
- (1930) *Culavaṃsa*. trans. London: Pali Text Society,
- (1908) *Mahavaṃsa*. ed. London: Pali Text Society,
- (1934) *Mahavaṃsa*. trans. London: Pali Text Society,
- (1956) *Pali Literature and Language*. Calcutta,
- Goonaratne, E. R. (1886) *Vimānavatthu aṭṭhakathā (Paramatthadīpani)*. ed. London: Pali Text Society,
- Gray, J. (2001) *Buddhaghosuppatti*. ed and trans. London,
- Hardy, H. (1894) *Petavattu-aṭṭhakathā*. ed. London: Pali Text Society,
- Hazra, K. L. (1994) *Pali Literature and Language*. vol. I and II. Delhi,
- (1991) *Studies on the Pali Commentaries*. Delhi,
- Horner, I. B. (1946) *Buddhavaṃsa aṭṭhakathā (Maduratthavilāsini)*. ed. London: Pali Text Society,
- (1978) *The Clarifier of the Sweet Meaning (Maduratthavilāsini)*. trans. London: Pali Text Society,
- Jayawckrama N. A. (1974) *Cariyāpitaka*. ed. London: Pali Text Society,
- Law, B. C. (1933) *History of Pali literature*. vols. II. London,
- Malalasekera, G. P. (1983) *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*. vol. I-II. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers,
- (1928) *Pali Literature of Ceylon*. London,
- Minayeff, I. P. (1886) *Gandhavaṃsa*. ed. Journal of the Pali Text Society. London: Pali Text Society, 54-81
- Monier Williams, M. (2005) *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. 4thed. New Delhi: Motilal Banarshidass Publishers,
- Morris, R. (1976) *Aṅguttaranikāya*. ed. vols. II., London: Pali Text Society,
- Mullar, E. (1979) *Atthasālinī*. ed. London: Pali Text Society,
- Norman, K. R. (1997) *A Philological Approach to Buddhism*. London: SOAS,
- (1983) *Pali Literature*. Wiesbaden: Harrosowitz.

- Oldenberg, H. and Pischel, R. (1883) *Theragatha and Therigatha*. eds. London,
- Oldenberg, H. (1879) *Dipavamsa*. ed.. London,
- (1883) *Vinayapitaka*. ed. vol. V. London: Pali Text Society,
- Pannakitti, H. (2003) *Palisahityaye Itihasaya*. trans. Colombo: S. Godage.
- Rahula, W. (1956) *History of Buddhism in Ceylon*. Colombo,
- Rhys Davids, C. A. F. (1975) *Visuddhimagga*. ed. London: Pali Text Society,
- Rhys Davids, T. W. and Stede, W. (1993) *Pali-English Dictionary*. eds. London: Pali Text Society,
- Rhys Davids, T. W., and Carpenter, J. E. (1968) *Dīghanikāya aṭṭhakathā (Sumaṅgalavilāsini)*. ed.vols. I-III. London: Pali Text Society,
- Sree Padma A. W. B. (2008) *Buddhism in the Krishna River Valley of Andhra*. New York: State University,
- Stede, W. (1918) *Niddesa*. II ed. Oxford: Pali Text Society,
- Trenckner, V. A (1924) *Critical Pali Dictionary*. vol. I. Copenhagen: The Royal Danish Academy.
- (1983) *Majjhima-nikāya*. ed. vols. I. London: Pali Text Society,
- Vaidya, P. L. (1958) *Lalitavistara*. ed. Darbhanga: Mithila Institute, Vipassana Research Institute. *Uttaravinicchaya*. CSCD.
- von Hinuber, O. (1996) *A Hand Book of Pali Literature*. New York: Walter Gruyter,
- Walleser, M. and Kopp, H. (1967) *Aṅguttaranikāya aṭṭhakathā (Manorathapūraṇī)*. eds. vols. I. London: Pali Text Society,
- Warder, A. K. (1967) *Pali Metre*, London: Pali Text Society,
- Winternitz, M. (1933) *History of Indian Literature*. vol. II. Calcutta,
- Woods, J. H., Kosambi, D. and Horner, I. B. (1976-1979) *Majjhimanikāya aṭṭhakathā (Papañcasūdanī)*. eds. vols. I-III. London: Pali Text Society,
- Woodward, F. L. (1977) *Samyuttanikāya aṭṭhakathā (Sāratthapakāsinī)*. ed. vols. I-III. London: Pali Text Society,
- (1977) *Udāna-aṭṭhakathā*. ed. London: Pali Text Society.

End Notes

¹ “*Attho kathiyati etāyāti atthakathā, sā eva aṭṭhakathā, ttha-kārassa ttha-kāraṃ katvā,*” Lyli de Silva., *Dīghanikayaṭṭhakathā tīkā Līnatthavaṇṇanā*. ed. I vol., (London: Pali Text Society, 1970), 19.

² “*adhigato kho myāyaṃ dhammo gambhīro duddaso duranubodho*” Trenckner, (1983: 166).

³ As the Suttas recorded, people are divided into four folds according to their abilities in understanding Dhamma. They are namely; *ugghaṭṭitaññu, vipaṭṭitaññu, ñeyya, padaparama*. [*Cattārome, bhikkhave,*

- puggalā santo saṃvijjamānā lokasmiṃ. Katame cattāro? Ugghaṭitaññū, vipaṭitaññū, ñeyyo, padaparamo*] Morris, (1976: 134).
- ⁴ Norman, (1983: 119).
- ⁵ But the D-t notes that the *aṭṭhakathā* were found by the elders (the reciters of the first council), and it was called “*ācariyavāda*”. The term *ācariyavāda* tallies with the *aṭṭhakathā*. [*Tenāha “ācariyavādo nāma aṭṭhakathāti”*] (de Silva, (1970: 217).] In this regard, von Hinuber categorizes Commentaries into two; older and later. Again, he notes that the old commentaries which were composed immediately are called to be “Pali”. von Hinuber, (1996: 100).
- ⁶ *Uparipaṇṇāsaka* of the *Majjhima-nikāya* and *Mahāstipatṭhana sutta* of the *Dīgha-nikāya* can be taken as such instances.
- ⁷ Yet, some of them, according to the different traditions, are accepted to be canonical works, especially, Burmese tradition accepts the *Nettipakaraṇa*, *Peṭakopadesa*, *Milindapañha* as canonical works. see von Hinuber, (1996:42).
- ⁸ This term was translated by I. B. Horner as ‘*The Clarifier of the Sweet Meaning*’ [I. B. Horner, *The Clarifier of the Sweet Meaning (Madhurattavilāsini)*. trans., (London: Pali Text Society, 1978)]. As Buddhaghosa proposed the term *Papañcasūdanī* for the commentary to the *Majjhimanikāya*, Theravada tradition used the term *Madhurattavilāsini* for the commentary to the *Buddhavaṃsa aṭṭhakathā*. However, the text itself gives *Madhurattappakāsini* [Horner, (1978: 299).]
- ⁹ Buddhadatta, (1960: 238).
- ¹⁰ Malalasekara, (1928: 109).
- ¹¹ Law, (1933: 389).
- ¹² von Hinuber, (1996: 146).
- ¹³ Norman, *Pali Literature*, 132. Moreover, he discusses deeply in the next chapter: “First, unlike the other commentaries attributed to Buddhadatta, the *Madhurattavilāsini* includes a reference to one of Buddhaghosa’s works, without naming the author. More important is the fact that it states that the story about Kanaka’s rebirth as a devaputta is to be taken from the commentary upon the *Vimānavatthu* named *Vimalattavilāsini*. The story is to be found in *Dhammapala*’s commentary upon the *Vimānavatthu* but, as already noted, this is entitled *Paramatthadīpanī*. The *Gandhavaṃsa*, however, calls the same commentary *Vimalavilāsini*, and it seems very likely that the reference is indeed to *Dhammapala*’s commentary. If this is so, then it is clear that the *Madhurattavilāsini* is not by the Buddhadatta who was a contemporary of Buddhaghosa.” Ibid, 146.
- ¹⁴ *Sakkaccasaddhammaratena - buddhasīhena sīlādiguṇoditena; Āyācitoḥaṃ sucirampi kālaṃ - tasmāssa saṃvaṇṇanamārabhissaṃ*. Horner, (1946: 1).
- ¹⁵ *Buddhasāsanam parivattetvā magadhabhāsāya likhītvā āgamanatthāya pesito ahañca jinālanākāradantadhātubodhivaṃsagante yeva bandhāmi na aṭṭhakathā tīkāyo*. Gray, (2001:50).
- ¹⁶ Ibid.
- ¹⁷ *Ato hi niccaṃ imamuttamaṃ tamaṃ
Vidhūya sikkhe guṇasamhitam hitam
Naro hi sakkaccavapūrato rato
Sukhassa sabbaṅgaṇakammadaṃ padaṃ*. Vipassana Research Institute. *Uttaravinichaya*. (CSCD), 959 (verse).
- ¹⁸ Oldenberg, (1883: 3).
- ¹⁹ Ibid.
- ²⁰ Mullar, (1979: 32).
- ²¹ Horner, (1946: 4).
- ²² The *Parivāra* is known as a work completed in Ceylon in 1st century AD. Norman, (1983: 26).
- ²³ Horner, (1946: 1).
- ²⁴ Ibid 299.
- ²⁵ Ibid 1.
- ²⁶ Ibid 299.
- ²⁷ Ibid.
- ²⁸ Ibid.

- ²⁹“*Thero katvā atṭhakatham, madhuratthavilāsiniṃ*.”- *ibid.* [“Buddhadatta thera renowned to be the master in poem, after composed the commentary called ‘*Madhuratthavilāsini*’”. Here, the term “Thero” indicates that this was not an original statement made by the author. Moreover, the next verse remarks “*Aciraṭṭhitabhāvena-aho maccuvasaṃ gato*”- [In a short while, alas! (he) passed away.] So, it is obvious that these two verses were not from the author and the usage “*Madhuratthavilāsini*” found in the Mv could be proposed by ancestors.
- ³⁰ von Hinuber, (1996 :146).
- ³¹ See footnote 29.
- ³² The first line consists of an additional syllable at the last word and it changes the metre too. This extra syllable could be a mistake made by the transcribers.
- ³³ To me, the second line has made a metrical complication (Its metre is deviated in the present edition).
- ³⁴ Gāthā?
- ³⁵ As I think, it is 128 only.
- ³⁶ *Gandhavaṃsa* entrusts these two texts to Buddhadatta. See I. P. Minayeff, (1886: 59-60).
- ³⁷ Horner, (1946: 45).
- ³⁸ *Ibid* 279.
- ³⁹ *Ibid* 281.
- ⁴⁰ Occasionally, certain Pali suttas also contain the characteristic of alliterations too.
- ⁴¹ Horner, (1946: 1).
- ⁴² *Ibid* 79.
- ⁴³ *Ibid* 247.
- ⁴⁴ Oldenberg, and R. Pischel, (1883: 56).
- ⁴⁵ Horner, (1946: 274).
- ⁴⁶ *Ibid* 286.
- ⁴⁷ *Ibid* 6.
- ⁴⁸ *Ibid* 7.
- ⁴⁹ *Ibid* 10.
- ⁵⁰ *Ibid* 21.
- ⁵¹ *Ibid* 125.
- ⁵² *Ibid* 10.
- ⁵³ *Ibid* 21.
- ⁵⁴ *Ibid* 31.
- ⁵⁵ *Ibid* 273.
- ⁵⁶ *Ibid* 275.
- ⁵⁷ *Ibid* 287.
- ⁵⁸ *Ibid* 155.
- ⁵⁹ Vaidya, (1958: 61). / Horner, (1946: 275).
- ⁶⁰ Horner, (1946: 275). / Vaidya, (1958: 61).. (The Lv says that there were both God Sakka and Mahābrahma. But, the Mv limits it to Mahābrahma only.)
- ⁶¹ Vaidya, (1958: 62).
- ⁶² Horner, (1946: 275).. / Vaidya, (1958: 66).
- ⁶³ Cowell, (1893:1-31)/ Horner, (1946: 275).
- ⁶⁴ Vaidya, (1958: 100). / Horner, (1946: 278).
- ⁶⁵ Horner, (1946: 286).. / Vaidya, (1958: 183).
- ⁶⁶ Vaidya, (1958: 193).. / Horner, (1946: 286)..
- ⁶⁷ Horner, (1946: 26).
- ⁶⁸ *Ibid* 3.
- ⁶⁹ Walleaser, and H. Kopp, (1967: 123).
- ⁷⁰ Horner, (1946: 61).
- ⁷¹ Horner, (1946: 382).
- ⁷² Horner, (1946: 233).
- ⁷³ Rhys Davids, (1975: 1).
- ⁷⁴ Woodward, (1977: 49).

- ⁷⁵ The commentary of *Majjhima-nikāya* mentions that there was a serious drought in Ceylon after a short period of the establishment of the Pagoda *Maricavaṭṭi* and nuns and monks lived in Anuradhapura left for abroad. J. H. Woods, and D. Kosambi, *Majjhimanikāya aṭṭhakathā (Papañcasūdanī)*. eds. vols. II. (London: Pali Text Society, 1979), 145. It can be presumed that they left for southern India. The *Sāsanavaṃsa* notes that the Theras decided to leave for India due to the drought appeared “*nāvaṃ pana ārūhitvā jambudīpaṃ gacchatha*” CSCD, *Sasanavamsa*. 24 But, around sixty monks stayed with the difficulties in Malaya region. After the drought (12 years), the monks returned to Ceylon and assembled a council with the monks who underwent the difficulties and lived in the Island; “*Tepi saṭṭhimattā bhikkhū tameva vihāraṃ gantvā aññamaññaṃ sammantevā sajjhāyimsu. Tadā aññamaññaṃ samenti, na virujjhanti*,”- Ibid There recitations at the council were equal. In this story, we find a considerable point regarding a reasonable presumption. If the Sinhala monks lived for twelve (12) years somewhere, there would be a temple, a tradition, students or followers. In other words, while they were staying in India for 12 years, they may have founded a well-established tradition in India.
- ⁷⁶ Sree Padma, (2008: 116).
- ⁷⁷ Woods, and Kosambi, (1977: 54).
- ⁷⁸ Horner, (1946: 55).
- ⁷⁹ “*Ayaṃ gāthā aṭṭhasālīniyā dhammasaṅgahaṭṭhakathāya nidānavañṇanāyā dīpaṅkarabuddhavaṃse likhītā. Imasmiṃ pana buddhavaṃse natthi. Natthibhāvoyeva panassā yuttataro.*” Ibid, 126.
- ⁸⁰ “*Tassa uppatti vimalatthavilāsiniyā vimānavatthuṭṭhakathāya gahetabbā*”. Ibid 284.
- ⁸¹ Ibid 51.
- ⁸² Ibid 161.
- ⁸³ Ibid 68 / 134.
- ⁸⁴ von Hinuber, (1996: 146).
- ⁸⁵ Woods, and Kosambi, (1977: 15). / Bose, (1977: 35).
- ⁸⁶ Woodward, (1977b: 29).
- ⁸⁷ Horner, (1946: 2).
- ⁸⁸ Ibid, 147-150.
- ⁸⁹ Norman, (1983: 132).
- ⁹⁰ von Hinuber, (1996: 141).
- ⁹¹ As the historical texts recorded, in the time of a severe drought that took place in the 1st century AD in Ceylon, some group of monks have brought the *porāṇaṭṭhakathā* to India. If this fact is accurate, indeed, Buddhadatta and Dhammapāla would have used these common sources. (see foot note 75)
- ⁹² Abeynayake, (1984: 109).
- ⁹³ Endo, (2013: 173)
- ⁹⁴ See notes 87 & 88
- ⁹⁵ Horner, (1946: 149).
- ⁹⁶ Ibid 198.
- ⁹⁷ Ibid 51.
- ⁹⁸ Norman, (1983: 137).
- ⁹⁹ Someone is reciting “*Bhagavāti lokādhipatī naruttamo, -Katañjalī brahmagaṇehi yācito ’ti*, Horner, *Buddhavaṃsa aṭṭhakathā (Maduratthavilāsini)*, 13., Someone says “*channaṃ asādhāraṇañānametaṃ adhivacanaṃ paññābala ’nti vadanti*”. Ibid 27., Someone recites as “*Nabhe ratanamaṇḍita ’nti paṭhanti*”. Ibid 27., Someone is saying “*satena satena puññakamma nibbattaekelakkhaṇo ’ti vadanti*. Ibid 32., Someone is reciting “*paṭākā vividhā gagane vattanti*” Ibid 40.,
- ¹⁰⁰ Ibid 36,59, 76, 103, 105, 123, 176.
- ¹⁰¹ Ibid 39.
- ¹⁰² Ibid 41,66,70,108,123,166,185,208.
- ¹⁰³ First case;37,53,55,71,103,116,127,186., Instrumental ;85, 101., Instrumental agent;53,57,66,89,98,124,173,194,238,252., Dative;139., Abalitive;124., Genitive; 46,105,116,123,164,173,200,260., Locative;48,52,71,139,171,204.
- ¹⁰⁴ Horner, (1946: 204).

¹⁰⁵ Ibid 70,99,180.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid 12.

¹⁰⁷ For “*vibhatti*” or case, the traditional grammar used the term “*vacana*” or “*attha*”. [The term *vibhatti* usually comes in the Tikā literature i.e. “*karaṇattheti tatiyā vibhatti atthe, kattari hetam sāmi vacane*” – de Silva, (1970:427), “*sattamiyatthetam tatiyā vacanam*”]- CSCD, D-a-t II 425., the reason for this was the origination of Tika literature after introducing modern Pali grammar texts like Kaccāyana and Moggallāyana. They were introduced recently before the Tika were composed. But, occasionally, Tikā also contains the term “*vacana*” for the “case”. Thus, it can be presumed that in early commentaries we find traditional technical terms for the usage of grammar and after introduced the modern grammar texts, the usages were changed to Sanskritized Pali grammatical terms like “*vibhatti*”.

¹⁰⁸ Horner, (1946: 152).

¹⁰⁹ V. Fausboll, (1964: 543).

¹¹⁰ Andersen and Helmer Smith, (1913: 195).

¹¹¹ Stede, (1918: 207).

¹¹² Horner, (1946: 6).

¹¹³ See Cp.

¹¹⁴ As is well known, most schools except the Theravadins accept the smaller number, but it would seem more likely that ten represents an increase from six rather than that the rest reduced the number from ten to six, as Dhammapāla suggests. Norman, (1983: 136).

¹¹⁵ Dayal, (1970: 167).

¹¹⁶ “*Etāsu hi nekkhammapāramī sīlapāramiyā saṅgahitā, tassā pabbajjābhāve, nīvaraṇavivekabhāve pana jhānapāramiyā kusalahammabhāve chahipi saṅgahitā. Saccapāramī sīlapāramiyā ekadeso eva vacīviratisaccapakkhe, ñāṇasaccapakkhe pana paññāpāramiyā saṅgahitā. Mettāpāramī jhānapāramiyā eva. Upekkhāpāramī jhānapaññāpāramīhi. Adhiṭṭhānapāramī sabbāhipi saṅgahitāti*” D. L. Barua, *Cariyapitaka aṭṭhakathā*. ed., (London: Pali Text Society, 1979), 321.

¹¹⁷ In the sense of wholesome, it is connected to all the six perfections.

¹¹⁸ Endo, (2013: 223).