

Ariyavaṃsa and Ariyavaṃsa-kathā

Sodō MORI

(1)

Several years ago, a comprehensive study on the Pāli Aṭṭhakathā literature¹⁾ conducted by Dr. Friedgard Lottermoser was published.²⁾ I reviewed it in English³⁾ comparing it with my own work on the same subject.⁴⁾ Lottermoser's book referred to above is a fundamental research of the 'Sihala Sources' or 'lost Sihalaṭṭhakathā literature' for the Pāli commentaries composed by Buddhaghosa (the first half of 5 c. A. D.) and other commentators, which is based upon a thorough investigation on all the verse passages in the texts, specifically in Buddhaghosa's works. Although her achievement is indeed quite remarkable, there still remain many unsolved problems and new questions have been raised. As one of various matters to be considered further, Lottermoser lists the following six kinds of 'vague source reference in the prose context':⁵⁾

1. Ariyavaṃsa (the lineage of the noble ones)
2. Ācariyagāthā (the verse of a teacher)
3. Ācariyaparamparā (the lineage of teachers)
4. Ānisaṃsakathā (talk on profits)
5. Pubbācariyehi (by the former teachers)
6. Māgandiyasuttupattiyam (the origin of the Māgandiyasutta)

The majority of these six references are not mentioned even in part I, the relevant section of my book which contains discourses on a total of thirty-five sources for the Pāli commentarial texts.⁶⁾ Therefore I examined each of the six and wrote an English article on the four 'source references' excluding the first and third ones. As regards these two omitted items, the third is not a reference to a source at all, but an indication of a topic to be investigated, as stated by Lottermoser herself. I have treated this topic in detail elsewhere.⁷⁾ The first item, 'Ariyavaṃsa' contains many aspects requiring careful and thorough examination calling for ample time. Another independent article is really necessary. This being the case, I have given this item fresh consideration and would like to examine it in some depth in the present paper, together with the 'Ariyavaṃsa-kathā', a different source with a similar name, which has been newly discovered during my research.

Concerning the Ariyavaṃsa, all that is stated by Lottermoser is as follows:

(1) " *ariyavaṃsa* (the lineage of the noble ones) "

(Sp 1016 (1)=Mp III 56). This source is discussed by Rahula (1943) (see fn. 26).

As is clear from the above statement, Lottermoser did not devote any discussion to the Ariyavaṃsa but just referred to Dr. W. Rahula's study.⁸⁾ In fact his study is practically the only detailed discussion available on this topic: no better research than this has been published so far.⁹⁾ His study begins with a criticism of the earlier view of Dr. S. Paranavitana. Rahula states that the word Ariyavaṃsa has been used in three ways: (1) a *sutta* bearing that name, (2) the preaching of it (*desanā*), (3) the practising of the teaching given in that *sutta*; and he discusses these aspects based on various texts and inscriptions. He also mentions that the assembly for preaching the Ariyavaṃsa became a very popular large-scale festival of Buddhism in ancient Sri Lanka. His research is not adequate, however, and leaves plenty of room for further investigation particularly concerning the historical changes in the meaning and content of the Ariyavaṃsa. To my knowledge, we are able to find in the canon the word, 'Ariyavaṃsa', but not 'Ariyavaṃsa-sutta', and furthermore we are unable to find the Ariyavaṃsa as the title of an independent *sutta* in the present canon. The name of the Ariyavaṃsa-sutta appears for the first time in the Aṭṭhakathā literature. This fact leads us to consider the Ariyavaṃsa as source material for the Aṭṭhakathās, which fact was merely hinted at by Lottermoser by listing it as a 'vague source reference' as stated before. I will therefore examine in some depth various aspects of the Ariyavaṃsa, especially its characteristics as a source reference, and I will do so by making use of some Chinese texts in the northern tradition which have not been taken up by Rahula.

(2)

With respect to the Ariyavaṃsa found in the Pāli canon, it can be seen in at least five (or six) *suttas*, i. e. the *Dīgha*, *Aṅguttara*, *Jātaka*, *Mahāniddeśa* and *Paṭisambhidāmagga* (plus *Cūlaniddeśa*).¹⁰⁾ The contents of the Ariyavaṃsa in these texts are all the so-called 'cattāro ariyavaṃsā'.¹¹⁾ Yet they are not identical, but are further divided into the following two sorts:

(1) teachings warning not to be avaricious with regards to the four necessities of life, i. e. clothing (*cīvara*), food (*piṇḍapāta*), dwelling (*senāsana*) and medicine (*gilānapaccayabhesajja*). They are found in the above MNd, and will hereafter be referred to as Type A.

(2) teachings warning against avarice in relation to the first three requisites as shown above, and in addition a teaching about pleasure in self-cultivation and in self-abandonment through meditation (*bhāvanārāma*, *paṇānārāma*). This replaces medicine as the fourth item. These teachings are given in the above DN and AN, and will hereafter be referred to as Type B.

Discrimination between Types A and B also appears in Chinese texts: the four items mentioned in the *Shūjū-kyō* (*Chun-chi-ching*) of the *Dirghāgama-sūtra* and the

Binibo-kyō (*P'i-ni-mu-ching*) of the *Vinaya-piṭaka* are Type A,¹²⁾ while on the other hand those in the *Sessho-kyō* (*Shuo-ch'u-ching*) of the *Madhyamāgama-sūtra*, the *Shūimon-sokuron* (*Chi-i-mên-tsu-lun*), *Hōun-sokuron* (*Fa-yün-tsu-lun*), *Honrui-sokuron* (*P'in-lei-tsu-lun*), *Daibibasha-ron* (*Ta-p'i-p'o-sha-lun*), *Kanromi-ron* (*Kan-lu-wei-lun*), *Kusha-ron* (*Chü-shê-lun*), *Junshōri-ron* (*Shun-chêng-li-lun*) are all Type B.¹³⁾ In this connection, according to the *Abhidharmakośa* the Sanskrit original words for Type B are: *civara*, *piṇḍapāta*, *śayanāsana* and *pahānabhāvanārāmatā*.¹⁴⁾ In the final explanations for each of the four items of the Ariyavaṃsa appearing in the Pāli texts (the above DN, AN, MNd), the following stereo-typed passages are repeated:

“Ayaṃ vuccati bhikkhave (bhikkhu, āvūso or no such a word) porāṇe aggaññe ariyavaṃse t̥hito.”

Concerning the original it is interesting to find certain corresponding sentences in some of the Chinese texts referred to above, e. g. the *Shūjū-kyō*, *Sessho-kyō*, *Shūimon-sokuron* and *Hōun-sokuron*. Such textual evidence suggests that the above mentioned stereo-typed expression had been composed at a fairly early period in the Buddhist history of India and transmitted into different schools.

As to the derivation and relation of the two types of the Ariyavaṃsa, the four items of Type A, i. e. the three living necessities (clothing, food and dwelling) plus medicine are none other than the so-called four resources of bhikkhu (*cattāro nissayā*, *cattaro paccayā*). However, only the first three are really the absolute essential requisites for human life. Although medicine is of course a very important material, it is still unnecessary while healthy, and even for sick persons no extra amount or higher quality of medicine is needed beyond that necessary for a return to good health. On this point then, it would be contradictory to stress on the same degree of importance for medicine as for clothing, food and dwelling. Moreover Buddhist practice cannot be complete simply by adhering to these aspects. For the above reason, positive practices such as pleasing in self-cultivation and abandonment through meditation, could at times have been exchanged for the practice of restricting medicine to a minimum. I imagine that the Ariyavaṃsa of Type B was formed in this way.

In spite of such situations, it was nevertheless impossible to deny Type A entirely and to alter it into Type B, partly because of its relation to the teachings of the four nissayas already explained. Then at least in Theravāda Buddhism in later times, they expounded that medicine was to be included as an item of food, or the two types were combined to form the 'Mahā-ariyavaṃsa' (Large Ariyavaṃsa) which therefore consisted of five items. I will make further points on this later in the present paper.

(3)

Let us now proceed to the investigation of many aspects of the Ariyavaṃsa

found in later Pāli literature, e. g. the Aṭṭhakathās, chronicles, narratives, etc. : the so-called Aṭṭhakathā literature in the broader sense. First of all, how are the passages commenting upon the Ariyavaṃsa appeared in the five suttas discussed earlier i. e. the *Dīgha*, *Aṅguttara*, *Mahānidessa*, *Jātaka* and *Paṭisambhidāmagga*? In the case of the commentaries upon the DN, AN and MNd (except for the J and Pt̥s),¹⁵⁾ their corresponding passages are essentially identical with the exception of the fourth item of the Ariyavaṃsa. With regard to the fourth, as explained before, the DN and AN show Type B, whereas the MNd shows Type A, hence the commenting sentences both in the DA and AA differ from that in the MNdA. Nevertheless a common textual tendency can be seen throughout the passages in question in those three commentarial works. In particular the corresponding passages in the DA and AA are almost identical.¹⁶⁾

To take up the case of the DA, it starts with a detailed explanation on the word, Ariyavaṃsa itself, which is followed by verbatim comments on the original passages of the DN. Its annotation is comparatively rudimentary as Abhidhammic method : it gives equivalents to commented words or simply paraphrases original phrases. Such elementary comments are most probably based upon the older Aṭṭhakathā which originated in India.¹⁷⁾ While on the other hand, we are able to find some detailed narrative stories and references to certain later persons and later texts, which must have been inserted into these basic comments. That is to say, in the portion on the Ariyavaṃsa, several passages have been added : a story of an elder residing in the Cetiya-pabbata-vihāra ; a view of the well-known eminent Mahāsivatthera ;¹⁸⁾ and references to Dhammasenāpati Sāriputtatthera of India and to the *Visuddhimagga* (three times). It is clear that at least most of them were added later in Sri Lanka. Such insertions have increased the size of the passage regarding the Ariyavaṃsa quite considerably. In the case of the DA, it amounts to ten pages in total, although the commented passages of the DN is only a little more than a single page (34 lines to be exact). Comparing the commenting part with the commented part, we are compelled to conclude that the scale of expansion of the former is very unusual. From this angle, we can judge that the Ariyavaṃsa gradually obtained people's interest and became highly esteemed as time went on.

Furthermore we must pay attention to the following fact existing in the part of the Ariyavaṃsa of the DA and the AA : they give Type B as to the four items, and thereby medicine is not taken up here as the fourth. According to the four nissayas (or paccayas), however, the fourth should definitely be the item of medicine. Having some doubts about this, the composer of the old Aṭṭhakathā purposely made a reference to 'medicine' which was not found at all in the commented original. It is mentioned as follows :

“ Gilāna-paccayo pana piṇḍapāte yeva pavitṭho.¹⁹⁾

(The requisite of medicine is regarded as a kind of food.)

Even though medicine and food can be seen as something in common in that

they are both taken orally, nevertheless medicine is still medicine, and not a sort of food. The above interpretation therefore cannot as yet be considered a satisfactory explanation concerning the lack of medicine as the fourth. I think that the Mahā-ariyavaṃsa which consists of the five items was newly adopted in order to resolve this difficulty.

Let me now discuss the matter of the Mahā-ariyavaṃsa. As I have briefly mentioned, the Mahā-ariyavaṃsa is the larger ariyavaṃsa which contains the five items; the result of uniting Type A and Type B. This can be seen from the following three similar expressions:

- (1) catupaccasantosabhāvanārāma-mahā-ariyavaṃsa (AA II, 249)
- (2) catupaccayasantosabhāvanārāma-paṭimaṇḍitaṃ mahā-ariyavaṃsa-paṭipadaṃ (AA I, 192)
- (3) catupaccayasantosa-bhāvanārāmatādīpakaṃ mahā-ariyavaṃsa-paṭipadaṃ (Vis I, 93)

Strictly speaking the above expressions do not all include 'pahānārāma' (half of the fourth item of Type B). Nevertheless as the above obviously contains the five items, the result of combining Types A and B: it can be assumed that the pahānārāma is included here. In spite of the Mahā-ariyavaṃsa being the extended Ariyavaṃsa as discussed above, the two are not necessarily strictly differentiated: in fact it is said that the Mahā-ariyavaṃsa was often simply called the Ariyavaṃsa. However, I am more inclined to think that ever since a certain later period in ancient Sri Lanka, the name of the Ariyavaṃsa was generally adopted to mean the Mahā-ariyavaṃsa with the five items, and then the original Ariyavaṃsa of the four items was then forgotten. As a result of this it then became unnecessary to discriminate between these two. Because I think it rather difficult to assume that once the Mahā-ariyavaṃsa of the five items began to be popular, the original Ariyavaṃsa of either Type A or Type B was still being preached by persons who held fast to its old content.²⁰⁾

We are able to see in the Aṭṭhakathā texts the name of the 'Ariyavaṃsa-sutta' or the 'Mahā-ariyavaṃsa-sutta', a name which appears neither in any text of the Pali canon nor in the list of titles of the canon.²¹⁾ This is perhaps an indication of the developmental process of this sutta, showing that many additions and revisions were gradually made to the original minor part discussing the Ariyavaṃsa in a sutta, which finally formed an independent sutta both in quality and in quantity. One example of such an addition is the following story of Nāgattthera and Nāgatttherī.²²⁾ During the crisis caused by Brāhmaṇa-Tissa (or Caṇḍāla-Tissa) between 102 and 89 B. C., i. e. the interregnum of King Vaṭṭagāmaṇi who enthroned himself twice in Sri Lanka (a serious famine also happened at that time),²³⁾ Nāgattthera visited his sister, Nāgatttherī who was living in Bhātava Village. The sister intended to offer a meal which she had gained through alms, but the younger brother, afraid that it would be his own burden in mind on the occasion of preaching the Ariyavaṃsa

after this famine has once been over, refused the meal. From this story, it can be considered that the Ariyavaṃsa in those days already contained the teaching that a bhikkhu should not accept meals from a bhikkhuni. Such a minute discipline as this had not been probably included in the earliest Ariyavaṃsa, i. e. the Ariyavaṃsa in the canon.

In any case, the (Mahā-)Ariyavaṃsa-sutta became highly valued in the course of time, and at long last there appeared a specialist who recited and expounded the text of this sutta for transmission. He is none other than the Mahā-ariyavaṃsa-bhāṇakatthera whose view is quoted in the SA (III, 182). A Bhāṇaka was initially the specialist in recitation for transmission of particular suttas, whereas later his task, as the expert on a respective sutta, was not limited to repeating the text from memory, but extended to discussing its content. The Bhāṇakas whose names are known to us through the Aṭṭhakathā texts are as below: the major figures are the Bhāṇakas of the *Dīgha*, *Majjhima*, *Samyutta*, *Aṅguttara*, *Jātaka*, and *Dhammapada*; and those minor figures are the Bhāṇakas of the *Ubhato-vibhaṅga* in the *Vinaya-piṭaka*, the *Mahācattāḷisaka*, *Ariyavāsa* and also *Mahā-ariyavaṃsa* now in question.²⁴⁾

In any case, the appearance of the Mahā-ariyavaṃsa-bhāṇaka as a specialist would fully prove the fact that this (Mahā-)Ariyavaṃsa-sutta developed into an important independent text.

The 'Ariyavaṃsika', a similar name to the (Mahā-)Ariyavaṃsa-bhāṇaka occurs in the identical passages of the DA (II, 524) and the AA (IV, 17). These passages describe that when there were many cases of transgressors of precepts during the rainy retreat season for practice and study, the Order made the Ariyavaṃsikas preach the Ariyavaṃsa on the last day of it. The above statement also testifies that the bhikkhus as specialists on the Ariyavaṃsa definitely existed in the Order, and that they performed their duty on request. We are then justified in regarding the (Mahā-)Ariyavaṃsa-bhāṇaka and the Ariyavaṃsika as equivalents.²⁵⁾

(4)

The next topic concerns the social aspects about the (Mahā-)Ariyavaṃsa-sutta in the Buddhist community of ancient Sri Lanka. Its main topic relates to the assembly or festival for preaching the Ariyavaṃsa, which Rahula has already discussed in considerable detail.

I would like to examine various materials in chronological order. The earliest statement so far datable exists in the AA (II, 249).²⁶⁾ It is a story that a woman living in Ullabhakolakaṇṇika took her baby and travelled a distance of five *yojanas* (about 35 miles) in order to listen to a sermon on the Ariyavaṃsa-paṭipadā delivered by Dighabhāṇaka-Mahā-Abhayatthera who is regarded to have been alive between the end of the 2nd century B. C. and the first half of the 1st century B. C.²⁷⁾ The date of this story coincides with that of Nāgatthera mentioned before. From this

story, the following two points can be concluded: (1) the Ariyavaṃsa-sutta itself and also the assembly for preaching this sutta became so popular that even a lady follower attended the assembly; also (2) the teaching was never so difficult as to be within the comprehension of elders, i. e. specialists only, nor was it useful to them only. In this connection, the *Daibibasha-ron* of the Sarvastivāda School²⁸⁾ contains very long Abhidhammic arguments on the Ariyavaṃsa, which are quite probably intended for the comprehension of elder experts only. On the contrary, the Ariyavaṃsa for Sri Lankan Buddhists must not have been like this, but rather a very practical text, familiar even to beginning lay-Buddhists.

The second earliest mention is made in the *Mahavaṃsa*. Chapter 36 of this chronicle²⁹⁾ describes that King Vohārika Tissa (reigning: A. D. 214–236) gave continuous donations to wherever the Ariyavaṃsa was preached throughout the island of Sri Lanka. This statement proves that the Ariyavaṃsa assembly was extensively held all over the country in the reign of this king, and also that the king himself promoted this event by means of financial support. The *Visuddhimagga* (I, 66) also relates a story that once upon a time in a vantage an Ariyavaṃsa assembly was in session, in which a sincere bhikkhu who always lived only on food from begging took part even though his friends were absent. In spite of the fact that the exact date of this story is uncertain,³⁰⁾ it confirms that this assembly at that time was so popular that it was held even in remote country places. According to Rahula,³¹⁾ moreover, the *Rasavahinī* includes three stories concerning the Ariyavaṃsa. He has also researched the frequency and dates of the Ariyavaṃsa assembly or festival, and has concluded that although they were not necessarily fixed,³²⁾ it was generally held during the rainy retreat season of the Order (June—October).³³⁾ There are records that it was held once a year: one record gives it as being held on the last day of the rainy retreat period, while another says it was on the twelfth day (near the full-moon) of the Nikiṇi Month (the month starting from the middle of August) in that period. Other accounts state twice a year; or even twice a month on the Uposatha days in the retreat period. Even outside of the rainy retreat season, optional assemblies seem to have been occasionally held.

Today we are unable to know why or when the (Mahā-)Ariyavaṃsa-sutta and the assembly or festival connected with it which had been so prosperous ceased to exist. There are almost no traces left of this sutta or even of its assembly in present day Sri Lanka. Rahula reported that a book of the Ariyavaṃsa-sutta with its commentary in Pāli and an old Sanne (paraphrase) on it in Sinhalese was published in Colombo in 1898.³⁴⁾ This work is likely to be the same as the Sinhalese Sanne on the Ariyavaṃsa-sutta written by Bāminivatte Unnānse, which is referred to in a book entitled the *Saṅgharājasādhucariyāva* published in 1916. Its author is Āyit-tāliyadde Muhandirama who lived in Kandy in the reign of King Kirti Śrī Rajasiṃha, i. e. 1747–1780. However, no one can, at present, describe the content of this extant Ariyavaṃsa-sutta, or say whether or not it bears any close relation or similarity to

that of the ancient Ariyavaṃsa-sutta under consideration in this paper.

(5)

In this section the discussion centres on the ‘Ariyavaṃsa-kathā’ which, in spite of having a very similar name to the ‘Ariyavaṃsa’ already mentioned, can be concluded to be different material. Just like the Ariyavaṃsa itself, the Ariyavaṃsa-kathā is one kind of “Sihala Source” for the Pāli Aṭṭhakathā texts, to which kind no one has paid any particular attention.

To my knowledge, the Ariyavaṃsa-kathā appears only in Chapter 20, the Maggāmagga-nāṇadassana-visuddhiniddesa in the *Visuddhimagga* (II, 626 f.). This chapter is part of the section discussing the matter of *paññā* (wisdom) in the above work, the composition of which is based wholly upon the system of the three *sikkhās*, i. e. *sīla*, *samādhi* and *paññā*. That is to say, it is one of the five chapters (chaps. 18-22) which treat the ‘paññāya sarīra’ (trunk of wisdom) as the third topic of the ‘theory of how to practise the paññā sikkhā’. In this chapter, profound or superficial wisdom of varying levels and a great deal of methodology on how to obtain them are expounded in detail. As part of it, there is a full exposition of the method of comprehending “formations” (*saṅkhārā*) by attributing the three characteristics (*anicca*, *dukkha* and *anatta*) to them by means of the *rūpa-sattaka* (material septad) as well as the *arūpa-sattaka* (immaterial septad).

The quotations from the Ariyavaṃsa-kathā (discourse on the noble ones’ heritage) now in question can be seen in the passage explaining the way of the arūpa-sattaka. The Ariyavaṃsa-kathā is referred to in comparison with the ‘Visuddhi-kathā’ (discourse on purification). The arūpa-sattaka is as follows: (1) by groups, (2) by pairs, (3) by moments, (4) by series, (5) by removal of [false] view, (6) by abolition of conceit, (7) by ending of attachment. Of the above seven cases, both in the first and seventh, the method mentioned in the Visuddhi-kathā is described first, and then the method in the Ariyavaṃsa-kathā is cited. In the first case, moreover, it is stated that the method according to the Ariyavaṃsa-kathā is better than that according to the Visuddhi-kathā, and therefore the former is also taken up in all the other cases. In this manner the method of the Ariyavaṃsa-kathā is extensively adopted throughout all the seven methods of the arūpa-sattaka.

Certain questions remain unanswered, such as, what really are the Visuddhi-kathā and the Ariyavaṃsa-kathā both quoted here in the Vis?; and what is the original material for them?; nor have we any clues towards solving the mystery as to whether these two were independent sources or parts of a certain large original source. Yet it should be obvious at least that these two ‘kathās’ could never have been derived from the *Vimuttimaggā* of the Abhayagiri fraternity in the Theravāda School, which text is surely one of the major sources for the *Visuddhimagga*, though no clear reference to the Vim is specifically made in the Vis. Because the *Vimutti-*

magga includes no quotation from nor any reference to the two 'kathās'. We are compelled, from the above, to conclude that they were two kinds (or two parts) of the Old Sihaḷa Source of the Mahāvihāra fraternity. This conclusion can be strengthened by a textual evidence that Buddhaghosa, the author of the *Vis* who belonged to the Mahāvihāra gives positive quotations from the two 'kathās', especially from the Ariyavaṃsa-kathā as stated before.

Although no further details are known,³⁵⁾ the following point is clear to say the least: judging from the quoted views of the Ariyavaṃsa-kathā, it is *not* the same as the Ariyavaṃsa-sutta teaching of the Ariyavaṃsa with four items nor as the Mahā-ariyavaṃsa-sutta teaching with five items as the enlarged later text. Consequently the Ariyavaṃsa-kathā under discussion, together with the Visuddhi-kathā, is most likely to another kind of Sihaḷa Source for the Pāli Aṭṭhakathās than the (Mahā-) Ariyavaṃsa-sutta.

Incidentally Rev. Nyānamoli comments in his English translation of the *Vis* as follows:³⁶⁾

"The 'Discourse on Purification (visuddhi-katha)' and the 'Discourse on the Noble Ones' Heritages (ariyavaṃsa-kathā)' are presumably names of chapters in Old Sinhalese commentaries no longer extant."

His conjecture as stated above, however, is not founded in thorough investigation; in particular there is no evidence at all for his opinion that the coupled 'kathās' are names of chapters in the Old Sinhalese commentaries. Notwithstanding, it cannot be denied that these 'kathās' are some kinds of the Sihaḷa source reference for the Aṭṭhakathā literature: this is in reality the sole possible conclusion.

(6)

To conclude, I would like to sum up as follows:

(1) The Ariyavaṃsa was originally *not* an independent sutta, because the name of this sutta cannot be found either in any text of the Pāli canon, or in the list of all the suttas.

(2) The Ariyavaṃsa in the Pāli canon always means the 'Cattāro Ariyavaṃsā' (the Ariyavaṃsa of the four items). It is divided into two types: Type A refers to the items of clothing, food, dwelling and medicine, while Type B refers to the first three above with the additional fourth item of 'pleasure in self-cultivation and self-abandonment through meditation'. Since these two types are differentiated in various Chinese versions of canon and later texts, it is therefore not a teaching peculiar to the Theravāda School only.

(3) In the Aṭṭhakathā texts, there appears the new Ariyavaṃsa consisting of five items as a joint system of the two types, which is generally named the Mahā-ariyavaṃsa.

(4) Buddhists in ancient Sri Lanka placed great importance upon the Ariyavaṃsa

and so enlarged and revised it adding abundantly to its content. As a result, the titles of the Ariyavaṃsa-sutta and Mahā-ariyavaṃsa-sutta occurred in the Aṭṭhakathās for the first time. This fact means that the Ariyavaṃsa developed into an independent text. This can also be proved by the fact that the name of the Mahā-ariyavaṃsa-bhāṇakatthera or the Ariyavaṃsika as a specialist for transmitting and expounding this sutta can be seen in the Aṭṭhakathās. However this is not a sutta listed in the canon, and therefore it should be regarded as one variety of the lost Sihala Sources for the Aṭṭhakathās.

(5) The (Mahā-)Ariyavaṃsa-sutta which became a valuable text both in terms of quality and quantity was often preached not only to elders but also to ordinary lay-believers at every place in Sri Lanka: the assembly or festival for teaching it became a big event in the Buddhist community. The event seems to have principally been held during the rainy retreat period on a particular day or days, but the frequency and dates it was held varied. The earliest story about the Ariyavaṃsa sermon can be traced back to around 100 B. C.

(6) It is unclear when and why the Ariyavaṃsa-sutta and its assembly declined. There is almost nothing left regarding them in Sri Lanka today.

(7) Another text called the Ariyavaṃsa-kathā, similar in name to the Ariyavaṃsa(-sutta) is quoted and referred to only in the *Visuddhimagga* during a comparison with the Visuddhi-kathā. Judging from its contents, however, it is not the same as the Ariyavaṃsa(-sutta), but one other kind of the Sihala source reference of the Mahāvihāra Order.

Abbreviations :

* References to Pāli texts refer to the Pāli Text Society's editions unless otherwise specified below.

AA	Aṅuttaraṭṭhakathā, Manorathapūraṇī
AN	Aṅuttaranikāya
CNd	Culla-Niddesa
CNdA	Culla-Niddesaṭṭhakathā, Saddhammapajjotikā
DA	Dīghaṭṭhakathā, Sumaṅgalavilāsini
DN	Dīghanikāya
J	Jātaka
Kośa	Abhidharmakośabhāṣya (ed. P. Pradhan, Patna 1967)
MA	Majjimaṭṭhakathā, Papañcasūdani
Mhv	Mahāvaṃsa
MNd	Mahā-Niddesa
MNdA	Mahā-Niddesaṭṭhakathā, Saddhammapajjotika
Pṭs	Paṭisambhidāmagga
PTS	Pāli Text Society
SA	Samyuttaṭṭhakathā, Sāratthappakāsini

Taishō	Taishō Edition of Chinese Buddhist Texts
VibhA	Vibhaṅgaṭṭhakathā, Sammohavinodanī
Vim	Vimuttimagga (the original text is lost.)
Vis	Visuddhimagga
VisṬ	Visuddhimaggaṭṭhikā, Paramatthamañjūsā (ed. B. N. Shukla, 3 vols. Varanasi 1969-71)

Notes :

- * I am grateful to Miss B. A. Scott, a British ex-Visiting Professor, Women's Junior College of Jōsai University, Japan, for having looked over my English in the present article.
- 1) This here refers to the *Visuddhimagga* and the primary commentaries upon the Pāli canon, and is also called the (Pāli) Aṭṭhakathās, the Aṭṭhakathā texts, the (Pāli) commentaries, etc.
 - 2) Friedgard Lottermoser: *Quoted Verse Passages in the Works of Buddhaghosa—contributions towards the study of the lost Sihalāṭṭhakathā literature—*, Göttingen 1982, xxviii + 631 pp.
 - 3) The *Bukkyō Kenkyū (Buddhist Studies)* Vol. XV (Hamamatsu 1985) pp. 125-143.
 - 4) S. Mori: *Pāli Bukkyō Chūshaku-bunken no Kenkyū—Aṭṭhakathā no Jyōzabuteki-yōsō (A Study of the Pāli Commentaries—Theravādic aspects of the Aṭṭhakathās—)*, Tokyo 1984, 20+6+viii+8+718 pp. (in Japanese with English summary and table of contents).
 - 5) Lottermoser: *op. cit.* (n. 2) p. 216 f.
 - 6) Mori: *op. cit.* (n. 4) pp. 75-307.
 - 7) S. Mori: "Some Minor Sources for the Pāli Aṭṭhakathās—with reference to Lottermoser's study—", *Indological and Buddhist Studies—volume in honour of Professor J. Takasaki on his 60th birthday—*, Tokyo 1987, pp. <143>-<154>.
 - 8) W. Rahula: "The Significance of 'Ariyavaṃsa'", *University of Ceylon Review* Vol. I, No. 1 (April 1943) pp. 59-68.
 - 9) The essential points of this study are reproduced in his own work, the *History of Buddhism in Ceylon* (Colombo 1956, pp. 268-273), and C. Witanachchi's statement on this topic in the *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism* (ed. by G. P. Malalasekera, Colombo, Vol. II, Fasc. 1, pp. 89-92) never surpasses Rahula's study.
 - 10) DN III, 224 f.; AN II, 27 f.; J II, 441; Pṭs I, 84. According to Professor K. Mizuno's Japanese translation of the *Cullanidesa (Nanden-daizōkyō)* Vol. XXIV, p. 415 f.), the CNd contains a passage on the Ariyavaṃsa almost identical with that of the MNd. Yet his translation is not of the PTS edition (by W. Stede, 1918) which is an abridged text, but of a Siamese edition (1926) which is a full text. The passage under consideration in the CNd is included in the prose part for Verse No. 42, and this part and the later parts for some unknown reason do not exist in other editions such as the Burmese Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana edn., the Indian Nālandā edn. and the Sri Lankan Buddha Jayanti edn. There arises, therefore, the possibility that all these parts are later additions occurring only in the Siamese edn. However as these parts complete the text, it would be better for the text to include them from the point of view of content, and moreover the PTS's commentary on the CNd also contains the part commenting upon Verse No. 42 and the later parts. In any case, since the passage on the Ariyavaṃsa in the CNd is almost the same as that in the MNd, only the passage in the latter is dealt with here. For the present study, no difficulty arises from this method.
 - 11) Only in the Pṭs (I, 84) does "cattāri ariyavaṃsāni" (nt., pl.) appear, and here its content is not shown.
 - 12) Taishō I, 51 a; XXIV, 804 c.
 - 13) Taishō I, 563 bc; XXVI, 392 bc, 466 bc, 738 abc; XXVII, 907 af.; XXVIII, 978 bc; XXIX, 117 bc, 970 a, cf. the *Abhidon-shinron-kyō (A-p'i-t'an-hsin-lun-chin)*, Taishō XXVIII, 862 b).
 - 14) Kośa p. 336, II. 7-11.
 - 15) In the case of the *Jātaka*, the type of the Ariyavaṃsa is unknown, and in the case of the Pṭs, only the name of the Ariyavaṃsa is given (cf. n. 11).

- 16) DA III, 1009-16; AA III, 44-56. As concerns the close reference between DA and AA, it seems that the AA consulted the DA, because it has been concluded that the DA was composed earlier than the AA. See my book (n. 4) pp. 92-104.
- 17) Cf. my book (n. 4) p. 52 f.
- 18) As regards Mahāsīvatthera, see S. Mori: "Mahāsīvatthera as Seen in the Pāli Aṭṭhakathās", *Sri Lanka Journal of Buddhist Studies* Vol. I, Colombo 1987, pp. 117-127.
- 19) DA III, 1016; AA III, 56.
- 20) But even in the Aṭṭhakathā texts, there exist certain passages explaining the Ariyavaṃsa of the four items, e. g. the Vis (I, 59) shows Type B of it. It should be understood that they are derived from an older stratum of sources of Indian origin which would be more or less common to the canon. Generally speaking, the Aṭṭhakathā texts have two basic strata: an older stratum mentioned above and a newer stratum added in Sri Lanka. Cf. my book (n. 4) p. 52 f.
- 21) MA I, 15 for the former; MA II, 246, AA III, 44 (as Mahā-ariyavaṃsa-suttanta) for the latter.
- 22) DA II, 535 f.; MA II, 399; AA II, 343 f.
- 23) As to the dates of the reigns of Sri Lankan kings, those given in "A Chronological List of Ceylon Kings" composed by S. Paranavitana, which is contained in the *University of Ceylon, A Concise History of Ceylon* (Colombo 1961, pp. 341-346), are adopted here as the most recent and reliable ones.
- 24) With respect to the Bhāṇakas, cf. my book (n. 4) pp. 274-282, and VibhA p. 459 (only for the Ariyavāsa-bhāṇaka).
- 25) Yet this sutta was not necessarily preached by the Mahā-ariyavaṃsa-bhāṇakas only; e. g. it is mentioned that Nāgattthera and Dighabhāṇaka (Mahā)Abhayattthera who were both not the Ariyavaṃsa-bhāṇakas preached this sutta. DA II, 535 f.; MA II, 399; AA II, 249, III, 343 f.
- 26) According to Rahula (n. 8: p. 67 f.), in the Bhābru Edict of King Asoka, there appears the name of "Aliyavasāṇi" as one of the seven suttas which were widely recommended to both elders and lay-Buddhists by this king. Rahula considers this sutta to be the Ariyavaṃsa. If this is so, then this inscription would be the oldest datable material referring to the Ariyavaṃsa.
- 27) As regards him, cf. S. Mori: "Chronology of the 'Sihaḷa Sources' for the Pāli Commentaries (II)", *Bukkyō Kenkyū* (n. 3) Vol. XVII, 1988, p. 126 f.
- 28) Taishō XXVII, 907 a-909 c.
- 29) Mhv. chap. XXXVI, v. 38.
- 30) Rahula (n. 8: p. 62 f.) thinks that it dates from the time of Buddhaghosa (first half of the 5th c.), but his opinion has no solid basis. In fact it should be dated back to a much earlier period. Cf. S. Mori: *op. cit.* (n. 27) pp. 150-161.
- 31) Rahula: *op. cit.* (n. 8) p. 62.
- 32) His judgement is likely to be sound, because the assembly or festival had continued throughout Sri Lanka during a long period stretching over several centuries or more. There are a variety of likely possibilities.
- 33) Rahula: *op. cit.* (n. 8) p. 68.
- 34) *do.*
- 35) Regarding this, VisṬ (III, 1473 f, 1476 f.) makes no comment.
- 36) Bhikkhu Nyānamoli, tr.: *Path of Purification—Visuddhimagga—*, Colombo 1964 (2nd edn.) p. 729, n. 25.

[本稿は次の記念論文集にも掲載される: *Felicitation Volume for Professor A. K. Warder*, University of Toronto, Canada, 1989 (or 1990?)]