

## Mahāsīvattera as Seen in the Pāli Aṭṭhakathās<sup>1)</sup>

Sodō MORI

In the Pāli Aṭṭhakathā texts (commentaries)<sup>2)</sup>, we find a great many names of persons of ancient Sri Lanka as well as of ancient India. According to my investigation<sup>3)</sup>, these ancient Sri Lankans number nearly two hundred in all. Many of them, however, can be regarded either as different individuals with the same name or as identical persons with different names. Therefore they must be identified and dated as far as possible by a thorough examination for the sake of the study of the history of Sri Lanka in general, and of the history of Buddhism in Sri Lanka in particular, and also for the sake of the study of the philological nature of the Aṭṭhakathā texts themselves. Although these persons have been described in some earlier works such as Malalasekera's *Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names*<sup>4)</sup> and Adikaram's *Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon*<sup>5)</sup>, these descriptions are still inadequate and at places are incorrect. It is therefore necessary to investigate them again.

The name of Mahāsīvatthera<sup>6)</sup> is seen very frequently in numerous Aṭṭhakathās. To the best of my knowledge, it occurs forty-eight times in all. This does not include the occurrence of the identical name in the *Ācariyaṭṭhakaṭṭhā* of the *Samantapāsādikā*<sup>7)</sup> and of the *Vinayaṭṭhaka*<sup>8)</sup> as well. However, we see, in some cases, only the basic name, Mahāsīva, while in other cases, we see various other names or titles prefixed to that basic name; so that it is difficult to identify them by casual examination. It is only possible to do this and to fix their dates by comparing all their titles, views, deeds, and their treatment by Pāli commentators like

Buddhaghosa, etc., and by examining all records concerning persons with this name.

The following is the list of all the Mahāsīvas, and the places in the Aṭṭhakathā texts, where their names occur :

Gāmantapabbhāravāsi-Mahāsīva : 4 places

(DA III-727 ff. ; MA V-23<sup>9)</sup> ; AA I-40, 49)

Vāmantapabbhāravāsi-Mahāsīva : 1 place

(JA IV-490)

Vāmattapabbhāravāsi-Mahāsīva : 1 place

(JA VI-30)

Dīghabhāṇaka-Tipiṭaka-Mahāsīva : 3 places

(DA II-543=SA III-281 ; DA III-883)

Dīghabhāṇaka-Mahāsīva : 4 places

(DA III-881=SA III-211 ; DA III-805=MA I-301)

Tipiṭaka-Mahāsīva : 6 places

(DA I-202 f.=MA I-269 f.=SA III-198 ; DA II-375 ; DA II-430=MA IV-174)

Mahāsīva : 29 places

(DA I-203=MA I-270 ; DA II-430=MA IV-174 ; DA II-511=AA IV-28=CNidA p. 60 f.=PṭsA I-112 ; DA II-554=SA III-251=AA IV-149=UdA p. 323 ; DA III-805=MA I-301 ; DA III-1013=AA III-51=CNidA p. 122 ; DhsA p. 405=MNidA II-346 ; VA III-711 ; DA III-736, 892, 976 ; MA II-286 ; SA III-302 ; DhsA p. 220 f., 266 ; VA V-1101, 1138)

As is clear from this list, the name Mahāsīva appears in 17 places in the *Dīghatṭhakathā* ; in 8 places in the *Majjhimatṭhakathā* ; in 5 places in both the *Samyuttatṭhakathā* and *Aṅguttaratṭhakathā* ; in 3 places in both the *Dhammasaṅgaṇi-atṭhakathā* and *Vinayatṭhakathā* ; in 2 places in both the *Jātakatṭhakathā* and *Culla-Niddesatṭhakathā* ; and in 1 place in the *Paṭisambhidāmaggaṭṭhakathā*, *Mahā-Niddesatṭhakathā*, and *Udānatṭhakathā*.

Comparison of these passages shows that some of them are identical. For example, the passage about Tipiṭaka-Mahāsīva in the *Dīghatṭhakathā*

(I-202 f.) is basically the same as the passages in the *Majjhimaṭṭhakathā* (I-269 f.) and the *Samyuttaṭṭhakathā* (III-198); the passage regarding Mahāsīva with no other name prefixed, in DA (II-511), AA (IV-28), CNidA (p. 60 f.), and PtsA (I-112) agree with one another. Such duplicated sources are indicated by the sign of equality (=) in the above list. If we exclude these duplicates, the statements concerning all the Mahāsīvas in the Aṭṭhakathās number thirty. Of these thirty, the Mahāsīvas who have the names of their residences prefixed are :

Gāmantapabbhāravāsi-Mahāsīva

Vāmantapabbhāravāsi-Mahāsīva

Vāmattapabbhāravāsi-Mahāsīva.

The difference between these three names, needless to say, lies in the spelling of 'Gāmanta', 'Vāmanta', and 'Vāmatta'. Yet even in the case of 'Vāmanta' (JA IV-490), 'Gāmanta' is recorded in its footnote (n. 15) as a variant reading. In addition, considered from the point of view of meaning, 'Gāmantapabbhāra' which means 'cave (-monastery) at the verge of a village' makes sense. On the contrary, 'Vāmanta' (the left verge) or 'Vāmatta' (the left-self?) is completely meaningless as the name of a place. Consequently 'Gāmantapabbhāra' must be the correct spelling<sup>10)</sup>.

With respect to his date, from the evidence given below, he can be deduced to have been a contemporary of King Duṭṭhagāmaṇi Abhaya (B. C. 161-137)<sup>11)</sup>.

The *Jātakatṭhakathā* (IV-490) states that the following seven theras came late to the meetings held at Kuddāla and four other places :

- (1) Paṭhavicāla-Dhammagutta
- (2) Kaṭakandhakāravāsi-Phussadeva
- (3) Uparimaṇḍalakamalayavāsi-Mahā-Saṅgharakkhita
- (4) Maliya-Mahādeva
- (5) Bhaggirivāsi-Mahādeva
- (6) Gāmantapabbhāravāsi-Mahāsīva
- (7) Kāḷavallimaṇḍapavāsi-Mahānāga.

Of these seven, the fourth is recorded as one of the five elders who

were specifically offered a meal by King Duṭṭhagāmaṇī on the occasion of the Akkhakkhāyika famine, one of the four major famines in ancient Sri Lanka<sup>13)</sup>. Furthermore the first, fourth, and seventh are also described as elders who were offered a meal by Sāli, son of Duṭṭhagāmaṇī in his previous life story<sup>14)</sup>. Since the fourth appears in both these stories, all the theras in the both of them can be regarded as contemporaneous with Duṭṭhagāmaṇī.

On the other hand, JA (VI-30) also states a similar story to the above, which must have been derived from the same source. It lists the following seven elders as those who were late for the meetings held at the places that are identical with four among the five in the above story :

- (a) Maṅgaṇavāsi-Khuddatissa
- (b) Mahāvamsaka
- (c) Kaṭakandhakāravāsi-Phussadeva
- (d) Uparimaṇḍakamālavāsi-Mahā-Rakkhita
- (e) Bhaggarivāsi-Mahātissa
- (f) Gāmantāpabbhāravāsi-Mahāsīva<sup>15)</sup>
- (g) Kāḷavelavāsi-Mahā-Maliyadeva<sup>16)</sup>.

If we compare these two lists, we can see that four theras in the first list are basically identical with four in the second list [(2)=(c), (3)=(d), (4)=(g), and (6)=(f)], and probably a fifth is also the same [(5)=(e)]. Then thera (a) is listed in the *Mahāvamsa*<sup>17)</sup> as one of the theras who were offered a meal by Duṭṭhagāmaṇī during the famine. Consequently the four persons who can be dated here, i. e. (1), (4)=(g), (7), and (a), can all be considered as belonging to the period of Duṭṭhagāmaṇī. Therefore the remaining five including the Gāmantapabbhāravāsi-Mahāsīva under consideration [(b), (2)=(c), (3)=(d), (5)=(e), (6)=(f)] are consequently deduced to have been contemporaries of the same king.

According to the *Mahāvamsa*<sup>18)</sup>, another Mahāsīvatthera who was a resident at Bhātivāṅka, i. e. Bhātivāṅkavāsi-Mahāsīva<sup>19)</sup>, also lived in the reign of Duṭṭhagāmaṇī. It seems likely that in order to discriminate between these contemporaries of the same name, they had the names of

places prefixed to their own names. These perhaps were the names of the monasteries where they resided.

With respect to the remaining theras with the identical name, i. e. Dīghabhāṇaka-Tipiṭaka-Mahāsīva, Dīghabhāṇaka-Mahāsīva, Tipiṭaka-Mahāsīva, and Mahāsīva without any prefix, I believe that all are identical, because it has been impossible to find any evidence which proves them to have been different persons. On the contrary, the following investigation leads me to the conclusion that all of these Mahāsīvas were one and the same person.

First, a very clear evidence can be found : DA (III-805=MA I-301) quotes twice the views of Mahāsīva with an interval of several lines on the same page. In the first reference, he is called Dīghabhāṇaka-Mahāsīvatthera, and in the second he is called simply Mahāsīvatthera without any prefix. This passage never introduces the views of two different Mahāsīvas, but it shows that the Mahāsīva with no name prefixed refers to Dīghabhāṇaka-Mahāsīva at least in this case. Two similar instances can be seen in DA and MA : DA (I-202 f.=MA I-269 f.) first quotes the views of Tipiṭaka-Mahāsīvatthera and on the next page it again refers to the same theras as Mahāsīvatthera with no title of Tipiṭaka prefixed. Another passage in DA (II-430=MA IV-174) also shows the exactly same instance of the relation between the name of Tipiṭaka-Mahāsīva and that of Mahāsīva with no title of Tipiṭaka.

Discussing as a whole, the views and opinions of these Mahāsīvas other than Gāmantapabbhāravāsi-Mahāsīva are actually quoted in many Aṭṭhakathās, and some similarity can be seen in the way of quoting them. That is to say, the passages of the Aṭṭhakathā texts, begin, in many cases, with comments on a particular word or phrase of the canon. Whenever (with a few exceptions mentioned later) the commentators like Buddhaghosa and others quote Mahāsīva's views and opinions, they first state the orthodox and standard exposition of the Mahāvihāra fraternity on the commented words or phrases, and then they introduce his views and opinions as an additional explanation. It is specifically to be noted that in some cases, his views and opinions are regarded as

authoritative as such very important sources of the Mahāvihāra, as the Pāli canon itself<sup>20)</sup>, the Sabbatṭhakathā<sup>21)</sup>, etc. In almost all instances, his views and opinions which follow the most basic comments are referred to in the following way<sup>22)</sup> :

Mahāsīvatthero pana āha : .....ti.  
 Mahāsīvatthero kira āha : .....ti.  
 Mahāsīvatthero pana : .....ti āha.  
 Mahāsīvatthero pana : .....ti vadati.  
 Ettha Mahāsīvatthero.....dessaesi : .....ti.  
 ..... ti Mahāsīvatthero āha.  
 ..... ti Mahāsīvatthero avoca.

The following three passages, however, are the only exceptions :

- (1) In DA (III-736), there is a passage, “Mahāsīvatthera-bhāgineyya-Sīva-sāmaṇerassa viya”, after which an episode about Sīva-sāmaṇera, nephew of Mahāsīvatthera is mentioned.
- (2) In VA (V-1101), there is a dialogue on the discipline between Karavikatissatthera<sup>23)</sup>, the best specialist in the discipline and Mahāsīva himself. It starts with the following passage :  
 Tatv’idaṃ vatthu Karavikatissa kira vinayadharapāmokkho Mahāsīvattherassa santikaṃ agamāsi.
- (3) In DA (III-882 f.), there is a statement referring to “Therasal-lāpa” (discussion of elders<sup>24)</sup>). This is a discussion about the catu-sacca-dhammas among the three eminent elders of Sri Lanka : Kāḷhāla(vihāra)<sup>25)</sup>vāsi-Summatthera, Lokuttaravāsi-Cūlasīvatthera, and Dīghabhāṇaka-Tipiṭaka-Mahāsīvatthera himself. It can be recognized as an orthodox source of the Mahāvihāra fraternity.

Of these three exceptions, two instances are really nothing more than quotations of Mahāsīva’s views in his arguments with other elders. Thus the case of this Mahāsīva differs entirely from that of Gāmantapabbhāra-vāsi-Mahāsīva, of whom only the deeds or stories have been described. For example, a story about, not the views of, the latter begins with the following passage<sup>26)</sup> :

Assu-dhārā pavattanti gāmanta-pabbhāra-vāsi-Mahā-Sivattherassa viya. Thero kira atthārassa mahā-gaṇe vāceti. Tass' ovāde ṭhatvā tiṃsa-sahassa-bhikkhū arahattaṃ pāpuṃsu.

No elder of Sri Lanka is more frequently cited in the Aṭṭhakathās than Dīghabhāṇaka-Tipiṭaka-Mahāsīva. Moreover, the topics on which his views are recorded are full of variety. For instance, they are concerned with matters of 'bhojana-ānisamsa'<sup>27)</sup>, 'anuttara-sammā-sambodhi'<sup>28)</sup>, 'sammā-ājīva'<sup>29)</sup>, 'sīma'<sup>30)</sup>, 'catuttha-jjhāna-saññā'<sup>31)</sup>, 'cīvara'<sup>32)</sup>, 'kammaṭṭhāna'<sup>33)</sup>, 'nāṇa'<sup>34)</sup>, 'catu-sacca-dhamma'<sup>35)</sup>, etc. All these manifold topics are, needless to say, quite essential to Buddhist teaching and practice. This fact gives evidence that he was an elder with so broad and profound a knowledge that he appropriately name 'Tipiṭaka-Mahāsīva'. It should also be noted that his views occur most frequently in DA, as already stated. It seems to prove that he must have been a Dīghabhāṇaka, i. e. the reciter and commentator of the Dīghanikāya, even though, in some cases, he is called simply Mahāsīva.

I shall next discuss the date of this Dīghabhāṇaka-Tipiṭaka-Mahāsīva. In spite of many quotations of his views, there is hardly any clue as to his date in the Aṭṭhakathā texts themselves. The only passage to be noted is found in DhsA (p. 266 f.)<sup>36)</sup>, which is concerned with 'vipākacitta'. The quotation of Mahāsīva's exposition ends with the statement, "Tipiṭaka-Cūlanāgattherādayo viya". It is clear from this passage that Mahāsīva knew Tipiṭaka-Cūlanāgatthera's deeds, which indicates that he was either a contemporary of the latter therā, or lived after him. Cūlanāga was so distinguished an elder that he was also given the title "Tipiṭaka", and his views or stories about him can be seen at many places in various Aṭṭhakathā texts<sup>37)</sup>. Of these passages concerning Tipiṭaka-Cūlanāga, VibhA (p. 452) contains a story about him and King Kūṭakaṇṇatissa (B. C. 41-19); so that he can be considered to have lived in the latter half of the first century B. C. The Mahāsīva now in question, consequently, seems to have lived in the same period or thereafter, yet nothing more about him can be discovered from the records of the Aṭṭhakathās. In MhvṬ (II-555), however, a reference to 'Tepiṭaka Mahāsīva' and

King Vasabha (A. D. 65–109) can be found. It begins with the following passage :

Aparo Nigrodhapiṭṭhivāsiko sabbapariyattiko tepiṭako Mahāsīvatthero nāma Vasabharaṅṅo gehe nisīditvā dasabalassa Sihanādasuttaṃ ka-thento Mahācetiye dhātunidhānaṃ vaṇṇetvā suddantaṃ vinivaṭṭetvā niṭṭhāpesi.

From this passage, it is obvious that this Mahāsīva who obtained all things and who was given the title of 'Tepiṭaka', i. e. 'Tipiṭaka', was contemporaneous with King Vasabha. It is quite impossible that there should appear in ancient Sri Lanka two or more Mahāsīvas who were Tipiṭakadharas. As already stated at the beginning of the present article, there are nearly two hundred ancient Sri Lankans recorded in the Aṭṭhakathās (except in the *Ācariyaparamparā*), and of these the great majority are elders. Of these elders, those who are recognized as Tipiṭakadhara are only eight in number, excluding the Mahāsīva under consideration. (The name shown in brackets in each line refers to the king who was contemporary with each elder.) They are :

Cūḷa-Abhaya (Kūṭakaṇṇatissa)<sup>38)</sup>

Cūḷanāga (Kūṭakaṇṇatissa)<sup>39)</sup>

Cūḷasumana<sup>40)</sup>

Cūḷasumma (Kūṭakaṇṇatissa)<sup>41)</sup>

Tissa<sup>42)</sup>

Mahātipiṭaka (Vaṭṭagāmaṇi)<sup>43)</sup>

Mahādhammarakkhita (Vaṭṭagāmaṇi)<sup>44)</sup>

Vatṭabbaka-Nigrodha (Vaṭṭagāmaṇi)<sup>45)</sup>

Although some of these have the same 'basic names' as other elders, no other Tipiṭakatheras with the same 'basic name' are found.

In the case of the Mahāsīva under discussion, therefore, the Tepiṭaka-Mahāsīva mentioned in MhvṬ must have been identical with the elder called Dīghabhāṇaka-Tipiṭaka-Mahāsīva recorded in the Aṭṭhakathā texts. If this is correct, the residence of the Mahāsīvatthera who was a Dīghabhāṇaka and Tipiṭakadhara as well is thought to have been a place named Nigrodhapiṭṭhi, i. e. Nigrodha Dale. In addition, among the eight



Tipiṭakattheras listed above, six are datable and of these the earliest are Mahātipiṭakatthera, Tipiṭaka-Mahādhammarakkhita, and Tipiṭaka-Vattabaka-Nigrodhatthera. These three all lived during the reign of Vaṭṭagāmaṇi (B. C. 103–102; 89–77, restored): i. e. approximately in the early part of the first century B. C. No Tipiṭakatthera existed before the time of Vaṭṭagāmaṇi, when Buddhism in Sri Lanka, especially its doctrinal study, was probably not so developed as to produce an elder with the title of Tipiṭakadhara. From this point of view, it is also certain that Gāmantapabbhāravāsi-Mahāsīva, a contemporary of King Duṭṭhagāmaṇi, cannot be identified with Dīghabhāṇaka-Tipiṭaka-Mahāsīva.

Finally, I shall consider a Mahāsīva who is listed in the *Ācariyaṭṭharamparā*, because he has been omitted from our discussion. It goes without saying that the *Ācariyaṭṭharamparā* (succession of teachers) is the list of the elders who transmitted the discipline in the Theravāda school. That Mahāsīva is described as follows<sup>46)</sup>:

Mahākathī Mahāsīvo piṭake sabbattha kovido.

“The great orator Mahāsīva proficient in all the contents of the Piṭaka.”

In this passage, the word ‘Piṭaka’ is ambiguous. It may have two meanings, since it can refer either to the Tipiṭaka or to the Vinaya Piṭaka. Similar expressions can be found in the *Ācariyaṭṭharamparā*<sup>47)</sup>:

- (1) Punar eva Sumano medhāvī vinaye ca visārado.
- (2) Tassa sisso mahāpaṇṇo Khemanāmo tipetako.
- (3) mahākathī Mahāsīvo piṭake sabbattha kovido.
- (4) Punar eva Upāli medhāvī vinaye ca visārado.
- (5) Punar eva Abhayo medhāvī piṭake sabbattha kovido.
- (6) Tissatthero ca medhāvī vinaye ca visārado.
- (7) Cuḷābhaya ca medhāvī vinaye ca visārado.
- (8) Cūladevo ca medhāvī vinaye ca visārado.
- (9) Sivātthero ca medhāvī vinaye sabbattha kovido.

Of these passages, the first, fourth, sixth, seventh, eighth, and ninth are obviously descriptions of elders as experts in the Vinaya, and the second is a reference to a Tipiṭakatthera named Khema(nāma), although

an elder of this name is not seen anywhere in the Aṭṭhakathā texts except here in the *Ācariyaṭṭhakaṭṭhā*. On the other hand, it is not clear whether the elders in the third and the fifth passages are experts in the Tipiṭaka or in the Vinaya Piṭaka only. It entirely depends upon the interpretation of the word 'Piṭaka', as already stated. Prof. Jayawickrama takes the Piṭaka to be the Vinaya Piṭaka<sup>48)</sup>; Prof. Nagai takes it to be the Tipiṭaka<sup>49)</sup>; but Dr. Horner takes it as just 'Piṭaka<sup>50)</sup>', which is rather ambiguous. If 'Piṭaka' means here the Tipiṭaka, then Mahāsiva was a Tipiṭakadhara; if it means the Vinaya Piṭaka only, he was a Vinayadhara. I am inclined to regard this Mahāsiva as a Tipiṭakadhara, because I do not consider that there were two Mahāsivas (other than Gāmantapabbhāravāsi-Mahāsiva) in ancient Sri Lanka, one being a Tipiṭakadhara, and the other a Vinayadhara<sup>51)</sup>. Moreover, it is certainly understandable that any Tipiṭakatthera would definitely be regarded as an expert in the Vinaya Piṭaka, namely a Vinayadhara, who is qualified to be listed in the *Ācariyaṭṭhakaṭṭhā*, because the Tipiṭaka, of course, consists of the three Piṭakas: the Vinaya, the Sutta, and the Abhidhamma Piṭaka; in other words, the Vinaya Piṭaka is a part of the Tipiṭaka.

To sum up, the elder who has Mahāsiva as his 'basic name', who lived in ancient Sri Lanka, and who is recorded in the Aṭṭhakathā texts is in fact two different Mahāsivas: one is Gāmantapabbhāravāsi-Mahāsivātthera (at places misspelt as Vāmanta or Vāmatta), who lived in the reign of King Duṭṭhagāmaṇi Abhaya (B. C. 161–137); and the other is Dīghabhāṇaka-Tipiṭaka-Mahāsivātthera, who was sometimes called Dīghabhāṇaka-Mahāsiva, Tipiṭaka-Mahāsiva or Mahāsiva with no other name prefixed, and who lived at Nigrodha Dale during the time of King Vasabha (A. D. 65–109). The latter seems to be identical with another Mahāsiva who is listed in the *Ācariyaṭṭhakaṭṭhā*.

#### Abbreviations :

- AA : Aṅguttaraṭṭhakathā, Manorathapūraṇi  
 CNidA : Culla-Niddesaṭṭhakathā, Saddhammapajjotikā  
 DA : Dīghaṭṭhakathā, Sumaṅgalavilāsini

- DAṬ : Dīghaṭṭhakathāṭīkā, Līnatthavaṇṇanā  
 DhsA : Dhammasaṅgaṇi-aṭṭhakathā, Atthasālinī  
 IBK : Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū, or Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies  
 (Tokyo)  
 JA : Jātaḱaṭṭhakathā  
 MA : Majjhimaṭṭhakathā, Papañcasūdanī  
 Mhv : Mahāvamsa  
 MhvṬ : Mahāvamsaṭīkā, Vamsatthappakāsini  
 MNidA : Mahā-Niddesaṭṭhakathā, Saddhammapajjotikā  
 PTS : Pāli Text Society  
 Pṭsa : Paṭisambhidāmaggaṭṭhakathā, Saddhammappakāsini  
 PugA : Puggala-Paṇṇatti-aṭṭhakathā (JPTS 1913-1914)  
 SA : Saṃyuttaṭṭhakathā, Sāratthappakāsini  
 SHB : Simon Hewavitarne Bequest Series  
 ThagA : Theragāthā-aṭṭhakathā, Paramatthadīpanī  
 VA : Vinayaṭṭhakathā, Samantapāsādīkā  
 VibhA : Vibhaṅgaṭṭhakathā, Sammohavinodanī  
 Vin : Vinaya Piṭaka  
 Vis : Visuddhimagga

### Notes :

(The Pāli texts referred to are the PTS editions unless specified otherwise.)

- 1) This is an English revision of my article in Japanese, entitled “Aṭṭhakathā ni arawareta Mahāsiva-chōrō”, IBK Vol. 26, No. 1, December 1977, pp. 105-110.
- 2) This refers to the *Visuddhimagga* and the primary commentaries on the Pāli canon. They are also called in this article the Aṭṭhakathās.
- 3) Sodō Mori: *Pāli Bukkyō chūshaku bunken no kenkyū, Aṭṭhakathā no Jyōzabu-teki yōsō*, or *A Study of the Pāli Commentaries, Theravādic aspects of the Aṭṭhakathās*, Tokyo: Sankibo 1984, pp. 309-466.
- 4) G. P. Malalasekera, ed.: *Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names*, London: PTS (first published 1937-38), 2 vols.
- 5) E. W. Adikaram: *Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon*, Colombo: M. D. Gunasena, 1953 (First Impression 1946).
- 6) Although we can see in various editions of Pāli text different spellings of his name such as ‘Mahā-Siva’, ‘Mahā Siva’, ‘Mahāsiva’, ‘Mahāsīva’, etc. it is standardized as ‘Mahāsīva’ in this article.
- 7) N. A. Jayawickrama, ed., tr.: *The Inception of Discipline and the Vinaya Nidāna*, London: Luzac 1962, pp. 180-82. Cf. VA (PTS) pp. 61-63.
- 8) H. Oldenberg, ed.: *Vinaya*, London 1883, V-2 f.
- 9) This passage is briefer than those in the other sources listed here, but it gives a reference to DA, which is included here, a more detailed statement.
- 10) The confusions of spelling between ‘G’ and ‘V’, and between ‘nt’ and

- 'tt' are probably caused by the striking similarity between 'O' (ga) and 'O' (va) in the Burmese script and 'ᳵ' (na) and 'ᳶ' (ta) in the Sinhalese script.
- 11) As for the dates of the reigns of the kings of Sri Lanka, those given in "A Chronological List of Ceylon Kings" composed by Paranavitana, which is contained in *University of Ceylon, A Concise History of Ceylon* (Colombo 1961, pp. 341-46) are adopted in the present article.
  - 12) Originally 'Vāmanta' as already discussed.
  - 13) Mhv chap. XXXII, vv. 29-30, 49-54. Cf. H. Ellawala: *Social History of Early Ceylon*, Sri Lanka 1969, p. 133.
  - 14) MhvṬ II-606.
  - 15) Originally 'Vāmatta' as already discussed.
  - 16) The footnote (13) shows a variant, Mālāya Mahā-Deva.
  - 17) Mhv chap. XXXII, v. 53.
  - 18) Mhv chap. XXX, vv. 46 ff.
  - 19) His name is never referred to in the Aṭṭhakathās, so that he is not listed in this article.
  - 20) VA III-711.
  - 21) do.
  - 22) The names prefixed to Mahāsīva are all omitted here even if any.
  - 23) He is referred to several times only in VA (III-646 f; V-1047, 1101; VI-1166).
  - 24) DAṬ (III-79 f.) comments: *Therasallāpo* ti therānaṃ sallāpasadiso vinic-chayavādo ("Discussion of elders" is the point of agreement in elders' discussion).
  - 25) The word "vihāra" is supplied on the basis of a comment of DAṬ (III-80): "Kāḷhālāvāsīti Kāḷhālavihāravāsī."
  - 26) DA III-727 ff.
  - 27) DhsA p. 405; MNidA II-346.
  - 28) DA III-881; SA III-211 f.
  - 29) DhsA p. 220 f.
  - 30) VA V-1138.
  - 31) DA II-511; AA IV-28; Pṭsa I-112; CNidA p. 60 f.
  - 32) DA III-1013; AA III-51; CNidA p. 122.
  - 33) MA I-301.
  - 34) DA II-375.
  - 35) DA III-882 f.
  - 36) Cf. P. V. Bapat, R. D. Vadekar, ed.: *Aṭṭhasālinī*, Poona 1942, p. 215.
  - 37) Vis II-398; VA III-699; IV-892; DA III-744; MA I-230; V-103; SA II-276; III-264, 277; AA I-26; II-133; V-48; Pṭsa III-574; DhsA pp. 229, 230, 266, 267, 284; VibhA pp. 16, 342, 452; PugA pp. 190, 223.
  - 38) He is referred to in Vis I-69, 96; II-394; VA III-591; DA II-442, 530; MA I-155; IV-94, 148, 189; SA III-230, 264, 277; AA I-26; II-24; DhsA p. 230; VibhA pp. 11, 16, 457; PugA pp. 190, 223.

- 39) See n. 37.
- 40) He is referred to in DA II-514 (as Tepiṭaka-Culla-Sumanatthera). Cf. DA (SHB Vol. 4) p. 353, l. 21; DA (Burmese Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana edition) II-104, l. 27.
- 41) He is referred to in DA III-744 f. (as Tipiṭaka-Cūḷasuma<or Culla-summa°>-tthera); MA I-230 (as Tipiṭaka-Culla-Summatthera).
- 42) He is referred to in AA II-311 (as Tepiṭakatissatthera).
- 43) He is referred to in VA III-695.
- 44) He is referred to in Pṭsa III-574; DhsA p. 267; PugA p. 190. Cf. VA I-55, 64, 67; ThagA II-229; Vis I-96; DhsA pp. 278, 286, 287; VibhA p. 81.
- 45) He is referred to in VibhA pp. 449-52.
- 46) N. A. Jayawickrama: *op. cit.* (in n. 7) p. 181. Cf. VA (PTS) I-63.
- 47) *ibid.* p. 181 f. Cf. VA (PTS) I-62 f.
- 48) *ibid.* pp. 56, 107 (the second n. 5).
- 49) M. Nagai, tr.: *Issai zenken ritsu chū jo* or *Japanese Translation of the Bāhiraṇidāna in the Samantapāsādikā: the Nanden daizōkyō* Vol. 65, Tokyo: Daizō-shuppan 1941, p. 80.
- 50) I. B. Horner, tr.: *The Book of the Discipline: Vinaya-Piṭaka*, Vol. VI, London: Luzac 1966, p. 6.
- 51) As is clear from passage No. 9 in the above list, an elder named Sīva is recorded in the *Ācariyaṭṭhakaṭṭhā* as a specialist in the Vinaya, yet he is called Sīva, not Mahāsīva.

(I am grateful to Mr. K. R. Norman of the University of Cambridge for the discussions I had with him about this topic during my stay there from 1985 till 1986.)