Introduction

The Mūlaṭīkā is the oldest sub-commentary to the three primary *Abhidhamma* commentaries i.e. the *Atthasālinī* (a commentary on the *Dhammasaṅgaṇī*), the *Sammohavīnodanī* (a commentary on the *Vibhanga*), and the *Pañcappakaraṇaṭṭhakathā* (a commentary on the remaining five works of the *Abhidhamma-piṭaka*). These three commentaries are traditionally attributed to Bhadantācariya Buddhaghosa (5th century A.D.) who has carved a niche of his own in the Pāli literature as the greatest Tipiṭaka commentator. The Mūlaṭīkā attributed to Bhadantācariya Ānanda is so called for being the earliestṭīkā written in Pāli. The literal rendering of the Mūlaṭīkā is “the Fundamental, original or basic sub-commentary”. In the Pāli literature, theṭīkās (sub-commentaries) which came into vogue originally in Ceylon during the Polonnaruva period (10th and 11th centuries) under the Sanskrit influence can be divided into two categories:

1) ṭīkā written on the commentaries such as -Mūlaṭīkā; -Purāṇaṭīkā; -Mahāṭīkā; -Madhuṭīkā; -Anuṭīkā; -Navaṭīkā; -Abhinavaṭīkā.

2) ṭīkā written on *Abhidhammic* compendiums which can be understood without reference to another text. According to Myanmar tradition, there are nine texts such as *Abhidhammavatāra, Rūpārūpavibhāga, Nāmarūpasamāsa, Visuddhimagga*,

---

1 Bhadantācariya Buddhaghosa as the greatest commentator wrote the *Visuddhimagga* and the twelve commentaries (*atthakathā*) as follows:

Gv pp. 68-69, JPTS, 1886: “*Visuddhimaggo kato. 1) Dighanikāyaassa athīkathā gantho ... 2) Majjhimanikāyaassa athīkathā gantho ... 3) Samyuttanikāyaassa athīkathā gantho ... 4) Anguttaranikāyaassa athīkathā gantho ... 5) Samantapāsādikā ... gantho ... 6) Sattannāma abhidhamma-ganthānaṃ athīkathā gantho ... 7) Dhammapadassa-athīkathā gantho ... 8) Jātakassa-athīkathā gantho ... 9) Khuddakapāṭhassā athīkathā gantho, 10) suttanipātassā athīkathā gantho ... 11) Apadānassā athīkathā gantho ... buddhaghosacariyenā kato.”

Cf. K.R. Norman states “although there is some doubt about the last five, the remainders are generally accepted as being by Buddhaghosa”. See *A History of Indian Literature*, p. 121.

2 Sv (Mya) p. 37: “*Abhidhammatikam pana ānandatthero akāsi. Sā ca sabbāsāṃ ṭīkānām ādibhūtattā mūlaṭīkāsi pākaṭā.*”

Gv p. 60, JPTS, 1886: “*Ānando nāmacariyo sattābhīdhammaganthatṭhakathāya mūlaṭīkānāṃ nāma ṭīkān akāsi.*”

3 Cf. According to Lily De Silva, the ṭīkā literature flourished in exuberant abundance during the 12th and 13th centuries, i.e. the Polonnaruva period. See DN-a Vol I, p. xxxi.
Abhidhammatthaśaṅgaha, Paramatthavinicchaya, Nāmarūpapariccheda, Saccasaṅkhēpa, Nāmaćāradīpaka, and Mohaviccheda.⁴

This present work, being a Mūlaṭīkā, which is the sub-commentary on the Āṭthasālinī which, in turn, is the commentary on the Dhammasaṅgaṇī of the Abhidhamma-Piṭaka belongs to the first category.

The Abhidhamma-Piṭaka, according to the Theravāda orthodox school, is the Buddha’s own teaching, which He first taught to the deities for three months in the Tavatiṃsa heaven where His mother was reborn as a deity. The tradition says that the Buddha descended from the Tavatiṃsa to the human world for alms-food in the north continent of Uttarākuru, and He taught a synopsis of this teaching to venerable Sāriputta who presented it to the first Buddhist council.⁵ According to the Āṭthasālinī, the Abhidhamma which was realized by the Buddha under the Bodhi tree at the night of His enlightenment is the teaching of the ultimate truth, i.e. the suffering and the cessation of suffering, that appear only to the mind of a Fully Enlightened One.⁶ However, some modern scholars consider that the Abhidhamma-piṭaka, as it exists at present, is the outcome of a gradual evolution⁷ perhaps taking a couple of centuries.

The Abhidhamma-Piṭaka is literally interpreted as the ‘basket of higher or special doctrine’ of the Buddha. The Abhidhamma deals with the real nature of profound dhammas, that is, the four ultimate realities (paramattha dhamma) viz., citta, cetasika, rūpa and nibbāna with a comprehensive, systematic and an analytical treatment. In the Abhidhamma system, the dhamma is approached in the form of a disclosure of the true nature of existence as apprehended by a mind that has penetrated into the deepest

⁴ See Sumanapala Galmangoda, An Introduction to Theravāda Abhidhamma, p. 16.
⁵ This has been disputed by monks of ancient times. Thus, venerable Tissabhūti did not hold the Abhidhamma as the teaching of Buddha, whereas venerable Sumanadeva firmly asserted it to be the teaching of Buddha. See Dhs-a p. 30-31. Also see Pe Maung Tin, Exp pp. 38-39.
⁶ Dhs-a pp. 1-6.
⁷ G.C. Pande states “The Abhidhamma-piṭaka, consisting of seven books, is considered as relatively later than the Sutta-piṭaka and the Vinaya-piṭaka; it evolved out of the mātikās and is a systematization and development of the doctrines of the Suttas and the Vinaya; their growth belongs to the Post Nikāya period.” See SOB, p. 2. Also see Oskar von Hinüber HPL, p. 64; M. Winternitz, HIL, p. 157.
fathom of the totality of things with the subtlest and the finest detail, neither in the
form of a figment of speculative thought, nor in the form of a mosaic put together out
of metaphysical hypotheses. And, the *Abhidhammic* approach to the *dhamma* is
philosophically, psychologically, ontologically rigorous and analytical, whereas the
*Suttantic* approach to the *dhamma* is practical and pedagogical. Meanwhile, the
linguistic formula of the *Abhidhamma* is explicative, whereas the language of *Suttanta*
is of the old oral formulas.

Bhikkhu Bodhi says, according to the Theravada tradition, that the *Abhidhamma* is
the most perfect expression possible of the Buddha’s unimpeded omniscient
knowledge (*sabbaññutāñña*). Thence, the *Abhidhamma* is not so easy to grasp
without the guidance of an able teacher. However, the study of the *Abhidhamma*,
according to the *Atthasālini*, gives an infinite happiness and joy, because
understanding the *Abhidhamma* is most useful to those who want to know the
*Dhamma* in depth and in detail, and also because the *Abhidhamma* is one of the
pivotal instruments in pursuit of insight development of the three characteristics of
suffering (*dukkha*), impermanence (*anicca*) and non-self (*anatta*).

The basket of *Abhidhamma* consists of seven books, viz., *Dhammasaṅganī*, *Vibhaṅga*,
*Dhānukathā*, *Puggalapaññatti*, *Kathāvatthu*, *Yamaka*, and *Paṭṭhāna*. The first four
books generally deal with the analysis of *dhamma/phenomena*, and the *Kathāvatthu*,
ascribed to the Elder Moggaliputtatissa, consists of a polemical discussion between
the proponents of the *Theravāda* orthodoxy and its opponents, whereas the last book
the *Paṭṭhāna* throws light on the synthesis of *dhamma/phenomena* by showing their
conditional relation.

---

8 Bhikkhu Bodhi, CMS, pp. 2-3.
Out of the seven books, the Dhammaśaṅgaṇī as the first book of the Abhidhamma-Pitaka provides the basis for the entire system of Abhidhamma philosophy. According to venerable Nyanaponika, the Dhammaśaṅgaṇī together with the Paṭṭhāna, that exemplifies the mature version of the canonical Abhidhamma system, must be viewed in order to gain a comprehensive picture of the Abhidhamma methodology as a whole. So, among the Buddhist scholars, the Dhammaśaṅgaṇī is well-known as the quintessence and the most important book of the Abhidhamma. According to C.A.F. Rhys Davids, the Dhammaśaṅgaṇī has been compiled in the middle of the 4th century B.C. or even earlier; because the interval between the completion of the Nikāyas and the compilation of the Dhammaśaṅgaṇī is less than that between the latter work and the Kathāvattu.

The literal interpretation of the compound word ‘dhamma-saṅgaṇī’ is that the word ‘dhamma’ stands for the ultimate realities in mental phenomena as well as material phenomena, and mundane state as well as supra-mundane state, and that the word ‘saṅgaṇī’ means collecting or complete enumeration. The Dhammaśaṅgaṇī is also less frequently known as the Dhammaśaṅgaṇa. As depicted by the title, it deals with the classification and the definition of the dhammas. Let us briefly examine the scheme of the classification and the definition of the dhammas in the Dhammaśaṅgaṇī.

1) The Mātikā:

The Dhammaśaṅgaṇī begins with the mātikā which functions as a table of contents for the work, and which enumerates a list of subjects for analytical treatment. The Mātikā serves as a framework of a universal system of classification comprising the whole analytical teaching of the Buddha.

---

10 Bhikkhu Nyanaponika, Abhidhamma Studies, pp. x-xi.
13 Dh-a 1 p. 17: “Dhammaśaṅgaṇo, vibhango, dhārūkathā, puggalapaṇṇatti, kathāvattu, yamakaṃ, paṭṭhānanti- idam abhidhammapiṭakaṃ nāma.”
Various dhammas are differentiated on the basis of the Mātikā. The Mātikā consists of twofold division of themes under the Abhidhamma and the Suttanta:

a) Abhidhamma-mātikā: This classification which was directly imparted by the Blessed One is set forth in detail in the Abhidhamma system. It contains 122 sets of the dhamma, and consists of two parts:
   i) Tikamātikā: it consists of twenty-two sets grouping the dhammas into triads beginning with kusala, akusala and abyakata dhamma.
   ii) Dukamātikā: it consists of hundred sets grouping the dhammas into dyads beginning with 'hetu dhamma' and 'na hetu dhamma'.

b) Suttanta-mātikā: It was originated by venerable Sāriputta by extracting portions from the Ekakanipāta and the Dukanipata in the Aṅguttara-Nikāya and from the Saṅgīti and the Dasuttara suttas in the Dīgha Nikāya in order to facilitate the study of the Sutta-Piṭaka. Suttanta-mātikā consists of forty-two sets grouping the dhammas into dyads.¹⁴

2) The four kaṇḍas

a) Cittuppaḍa kaṇḍa: This analyzes the psychological phenomena dealing with 121 cittas and cetasikas to be obtained in the four different planes of existence under the three main divisions, i.e. kusala dhammas, akusala dhammas and avyākata dhammas which stand for the psychological ethic and which belong to the first triad in the Mātikā.

b) Rūpa kaṇḍa: This deals with the material phenomena by enumerating and classifying the 27 avyākata material dhammas.

c) Nīkkhepa kaṇḍa (chapter of summary): This offers concise explanations of all the tikas and dukas. This can be called as ‘the summary chapter’.

---

d) *Atthakathā kanda* (chapter of commentary): This provides a supplementary digest of the third chapter (*Nikkhepa kanda*). According to the *Atthasālinī*, this chapter was complied by venerable Sāriputta in order to elucidate the contents of the third chapter, to facilitate those who could not understand it.

According to Bhikkhu Bodhi's digest of venerable Nyanaponika's essays, the *Dhammasaṅgaṇī* discusses three interwoven strands of thought:

1) an underlying ontology framed in terms of bare ontological factors called *dhammas*;
2) the use of an “attribute-mātikā”, a methodical list of contrasting qualities, as a grid for classifying the factors resulting from ontological analysis;
3) the elaboration of a detailed typology of consciousness as a way of mapping the *dhammas* in relation to the ultimate goal or the summum bonum of the *dhamma*, the attainment of nibbāna.

Scholars consider the *Dhammasaṅgaṇī*, containing the classification and definition of the *dhammas*, as ‘a hand-book of psychological ethics’. The *Dhammasaṅgaṇī*, according to Frauwallner, is the youngest text among those found in the *Abhidhamma* Pitaka. Thence, it reflects a more elevated state in the *Theravāda* philosophy at the time of closing the *Abhidhamma Pīṭaka*. Hence, it reflects a more elevated state in the *Theravāda* philosophy at the time of closing the *Abhidhamma Pīṭaka*.

The commentary on the *Dhammasaṅgaṇī* is the *Atthasālinī* which is traditionally ascribed to Bhadantācariya Buddhaghosa who was born into a Brahmin family in

---

15 Cf. C.A.F. Rhys Davids attaches this chapter as two appendixes. See BMPE, p. 360.
17 Nyanaponika Thera, Abhidhamma Studies, p. xv.
18 Oskar Von Hinüber, A Handbook of Pāli Literature, p. 68.
19 Cf. P.V. Bapat says that the author of *Atthasālinī* cannot be Buddhaghosa when the *Atthasālinī*’s writing style and a doctrinal emphasis are compared with the *Visuddhimagga*. However, K.R. Norman rejects P.V. Bapat’s view as “the *Atthasālinī* was written by a pupil of Buddhaghosa need not perhaps be taken very seriously...” And, T. Hayashi reconsiders P.V. Bapat’s view in his article as the different doctrinal emphasis can be some aspects accommodated with the *Theravāda* tradition. See P.V. Bapat, *Atthasālinī*, pp. xxxv-xl; K.R. Norman, Pāli Literature, pp. 123-124; T. Hayashi, *On the...*
the outskirts of Bodhimaṇḍa in Jambudīpa of Magadha. Bhadantācariya Buddhaghosa, according to the Mahāvaṃsa and Sāsanavaṃsa, wrote the Nāgodaya and the Atthasāliṇī, and began to write the Parītaṭṭhakathā when he was staying with his teacher venerable Revata in Jambudīpa. Then, he went, on his teacher’s suggestion, to Mahāvihāra in Anurādhapura of Ceylon during the reign of the King Mahānāma (409 A.D. to 431 A.D.). This was for the purpose of translating Sinhalese Atthakathās into Pāli. It is said that on the request of Mahāvihāra, in order to prove his proficiency, he compiled the Visuddhimagga etc. Nevertheless, there are some ambiguous points in the Atthasāliṇī. If the Atthasāliṇī was composed prior to his visiting Ceylon, how should it be possible that the Atthasāliṇī presupposes the existence of the Visuddhimagga etc. which were composed later, for the former contains statements such as “visuddhimagge panidam...”, “vīthāro pana visuddhimagge vuttayaneneva veditabbo” , “samantrapāsādikām vinayāṭṭhakathām” etc.? The answer can be traced from the Saddhammasaṅgaha through two apparently inconsistent statements as:

---


20 The place Bodhimaṇḍa (the best place of Enlightenment) is not far from the present Buddhagaya in the North India.

21 Name for the North India.


24 Sv (Mya) p. 34: “Buddhaghoso ca āyasmatā revatassa santike niṣidanto nāgodayam nāma gantham aṭṭhasāliṇiṁca nāma gantham akāśi. Tato pacchā parītaṭṭhakathāṁ kattukāmo āhuṭvā ārabbi.”


26 Sv (Mya) p. 35: “...tvam gantvā mārgadhāhāsakkharena iikhehi... sīhāḷadīpam gantvā anurādhapare mahāvihāram pavisītvā... sīhāḷaṭṭhakathāya theravādeva suvā aṭṭhakathāṃ kurissattī arcessi... Buddhaghosā ca sādhim aṭṭhakathāya pīṭhākattayaṁ sankthīpitvā visuddhimaggam akāśi.” Also See Mv (Mya) p. 244. Cf. Wilhelm Geiger, Cūḷavamṣa, Part I, pp. 24-25.

27 Dhs-a p. 2; p. 168; p. 183; p. 186 etc.

28 The Samantapāsādika which is a commentary on the Vinaya-Pitaka was also composed by Bhadantācariya Buddhaghosa when he was in Ceylon. See G.P. Malalasekera, DDPN Vol. II, p. 307.

29 Dhs-a p. 97.

30 C.A.F. Rhys Davids, BMPE, p. xxi.
1) At Bodhimanda in Jambudīpa, Bhadantācariya Buddhaghosa wrote the Ndōnodaya, the Atthasālīni and began to write a Parittāthakathā. Then, he went to Ceylon to obtain better materials for his work.30

2) After arriving there, he wrote seven other works, and then he wrote the Atthasālīni.31

With regard to the same author making two different statements as above, C.A.F. Rhys Davids says that probably the author wants to show that the Atthasālīni, which was already written in the Bodhimanda and which, perhaps, is not referring to the present text, was revised or rewritten later in Ceylon.32 However, according to P.V. Bapat, if Bhadantācariya Buddhaghosa were really revising an earlier edition, it might have been expected that he would mention his change of mind.33 Besides, according to another point in the Saddhhammasangaha, the Atthasālīni was revised on the basis of the Mahā-paccariyaṭṭhakathā34 which is one of the Sinhalese commentaries,35 though Bhadantācariya Buddhaghosa came to Mahāvihāra primarily to study the Mahāṭṭhakathā of the Mahāvihāra tradition36. However, the Atthasālīni mentions a different view of the Mahāṭṭhakathā and the Āgamaṭṭhakathā, which are Sinhalese commentaries, whereas the Visuddhimagga depicts another view of the Vinayaṭṭhakathā, the Suttantaṭṭhakathā and the Majjhimaṭṭhakathā which are also

30 Ss, JPTS, 1890, pp. 52-53: “Bodhimaṇḍa-samipamhi jāto brāhmaṇa-māṇava...Tadā so tattha vihāre Ndōnodayam nāma pakaroṇam karvā Dhamma-saṁganiyā athakathān ca Atthasālīni-nāma parittāthakathān ca kātum ārūbhīto hoti.”
31 Ss (JPTS 1890) p. 56: “...Tadanataram Abhidhamma-piṭake Mahāpaccariyaṭṭha Kadhā Sihala-bhāsaṃ pariuvatteti mūlabhāṣāya Māgadhikāya niruttiyā Atthasālīni-nāma Dhamma-saṁganiṭṭhakatham ca thapesi.”
32 C.A.F. Rhys Davids, BMPE, p. xxi.
34 Cf. The Mahā-paccariyaṭṭhakathā was so called because it was composed on a raft in Ceylon. It was originated in Ceylon. The relevant schools are not certain. See L.R. Goonesekere, Buddhist Commentarial Literature, p. 6.
35 Ss (JPTS 1890) p. 56: “...Tadanataram Abhidhamma-piṭake Mahāpaccariyaṭṭha Kadhā Sihala-bhāsaṃ pariuvatteti mūlabhāṣāya Māgadhikāya niruttiyā Atthasālīni-nāma ... thapesi.”
36 Ss (JPTS 1890) p. 53: “...Anurādhapure Mahāvihāre bhikkhu-samgham passittā Mahāpadhānaghare Sānghāpālattherassa santikaṃ gantvā Sihalaṭṭhakatham sabbam theravādaṇa ca suṇīvā...”
Sinhalese commentaries. Thus, with regard to those views, we may presume as follows:

1) The *Atthasāliṇī* which was a first sketch of the later commentary on the *Dhammasaṅgaṇī* was probably revised in Ceylon by Bhadantācariya Buddhaghosa.

2) Or, the *Atthasāliṇī* written in *Jambudīpa* may probably be a different version and a different author from the present *Atthasāliṇī* text.

The *Atthasāliṇī* as the commentary on the *Dhammasaṅgaṇī* starts with the *Nidānakathā* which is not directly related to the *Dhammasaṅgaṇī*, though the commentary should explicate the meaning of the text according to the arrangement of the original text. It brings out Bhadantācariya Buddhaghosa’s erudite chronological knowledge of the *Vinaya*, *Suttanta* and *Abhidhamma*. Further, the *Atthasāliṇī*, while explicating the *Dhammasaṅgaṇī*, brings to light Bhadantācariya Buddhaghosa’s vast knowledge of philosophy, psychology, etymology, history, geography etc. The importance of the *Atthasāliṇī* apparently lies in the Bhadantācariya Buddhaghosa’s extensive and profound explication of the original text, which introduces in full measure the reflections, discussions, and judgements of the text. Therein, the *Atthasāliṇī* (quintessential meaning) fulfills the meaning of the title which is formed by the word ‘*attha* (meaning)’, the word ‘*sāra* (essential)’, the possessive suffix ‘*in*’ and the feminine suffix ‘*i*’, so that Pe Maung Tin who translates the *Atthasāliṇī* into English gives its title as ‘The Expositor’.

In Myanmar, which is admitted by the Buddhist scholars as ‘the most advanced *Abhidhammic* land’, the *Atthasāliṇī* is regarded as one of the key commentaries for understanding Buddhist *Abhidhammic* teaching; and most Buddhist students in

---

37 See L.R. Goonesekere, Buddhist Commentarial Literature, p.p. 5-11.
38 Cf. fn. 19.
39 According to the Sanskrit etymology, the word ‘*Atthasāliṇī*’ is formed as follows: *artha* (Pali: *attha*) + *āl* (to shine) + *in* (the agent suffix) + *i* (the feminine suffix).
Myanmar study it committedly. Moreover, it is frequently quoted by the authors of the Abhidhammic works.\(^{40}\)

The *Atthasālinī* has two sub-commentaries viz. the *Dhammasaṅgaṇī-Mūlaṭīkā* and the *Atthasālinī-Atthayojanā*. The *Atthasālinī-Atthayojanā* was composed by a Thai monk venerable Ṛṣyakitti who lived in the latter half of the 15\(^{th}\) century A.D. in the *Panasārāma* monastery located in the northwest of Chiang Mai (*Abhinavapura*) in Thailand.\(^{41}\) According to Upali Karunaratna, the *Atthasālinī-Atthayojanā* is not very important as far as its subject matter is concerned.\(^{42}\) However, the *Dhammasaṅgaṇī-Mūlaṭīkā*, which is to be discussed later in detail, occupies an important place in the Buddhist philosophy as well as in the Pāli literature. It is very useful for students who study the *Atthasālinī*, since this work, the fundamental sub-commentary on the commentary of the *Dhammasaṅgaṇī*, not only clarifies obscure terms and ideas in the commentary but also sheds an additional light on it. In this regard, the critical study of this *Mūlaṭīkā* is essentially required.

My interest in this subject had been kindled since I started studying the *Atthasālinī* in my M.A. course. The fascination increased when I studied the *Cittuppādakaṇḍa* which builds up a typology of 121 acts of *citta* functioning in correlation with various *cetasikas* that perform more specific tasks in the act of cognition. At that time, I found that no attempt had been made to provide a translation in any language. Thus, it still remains a challenging subject for research. Hence, in this humble attempt, prior to the detailed explanation of this *Mūlaṭīkā* in the Pāli literature, let me first specify the aims, scope, sources and methodology of this research.

---

41 See Dhs-ay p. 569. Also see O.V. Hinüber, *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*, pp. 174-175.
1. Aims and scope of the thesis

The aims of the present study can be short-listed as: (i) to critically examine the various readings of the *Dhammasaṅgaṇī-Mūlaṭīkā*, (ii) to provide English translation with comprehensive critical annotations of significant technical terms and (iii) to observe as to how the author Bhadantacariya Ānanda clarifies obscure terms and ideas in the *Atthasālinī* and sheds additional light on it.

The scope of the present research is limited to the study of the mental phenomena discussed in the *Cittuppādaṇḍa* (chapter of risings of citta) of the *Mūlaṭīkā* of the *Atthasālinī*. As this itself is an onerous in understanding, it is better to exclude the *Māṭikās* in this same section and also the rest of the chapters for a comprehensive research and study in the future.

2. The sources and methodology

1) Romanized text

For the textual survey of the *Dhammasaṅgaṇī-Mūlaṭīkā*, the selected critical edition of the *Mūlaṭīkā* on the *Atthasālinī* is first presented in Romanized script with footnotes on various readings. It has been prepared by collating the five editions of the *Mūlaṭīkā* on the *Atthasālinī*, after printing out the selected portion of the *Mūlaṭīkā* from the *Chattha-Saṅgāyanā* CD-ROM published by the Vipassana Research Institute. The following editions have been collated for the textual survey of the *Dhammasaṅgaṇī-Mūlaṭīkā*:

i) The text in Devanāgarī script, edited by the Pāli text of the *Chattha Saṅgāyanā* and published by Vipassana Research Institute in 1998. (Ve)

ii) The text in Devanāgarī script, edited by Rāmaśaṅkara Tripāṭhi and published by the Sampūrṇānanda Sanskrit University in Varanasi in 1988. (Ue)

iii) The text in Myanmar script, edited by Bhadantacariya Dhammapāla Thera and published by Department of Religious Affairs in Myanmar in 1960. (Me)
v) The text in Thai script, Mahācullalonganrajavidayalyen Pakāsitā, Anussaranīyaṃ Buddhavasse 2538. (Te)

Out of these five editions, Devanāgarī editions, Myanmar edition, and Thai edition reflect more or less a similar reading, because Devanāgarī editions and Thai edition seemingly depend on the Chaṭṭha-Saṅgāyana (sixth council) of the Myanmar edition. However, the Sinhalese edition, which is the earliest among texts collated, presents a reading different to those found in others. For instance, in Sinhalese edition, the compound words appear frequently in decompounded form. The reading of the *Atthasālinībhasātikā* written in Myanmar language has also been occasionally consulted for this critical edition. Further, for the *Atthasālinī*-words which are quoted in the *Mūlāṭikā*, the following two texts/editions are collated:

i) The *Dhammasaṅgāṇi-Atthakathā* in Devanāgarī script published by the Vipassana Research Institute in Igatpuri in 1998.


The different readings of the five editions are enumerated in the footnote of the present work, but certain features which degrade its value to a great deal such as punctuation marks, inserting syllables etc. are not mentioned in the footnote. For example, the Sinhalese edition reads ‘kriya’, but Myanmar edition reads it as ‘kiriya’; the Sinhalese edition reads ‘vīriya’, but the Myanmar edition reads it as ‘viriya’; the Sinhalese edition reads ‘duvidhassāpi’, but the Myanmar edition ‘duvidhassapi’ etc. Besides, though the division of paragraphs is quite different in the Sinhalese edition
from other editions, these differences are not shown herein. The different readings of these editions can be roughly classified as follows:

i) examples for different places of punctuations:

Me, Ve, Te, Ue: "Tattha hi purato kusalādike pabhede vatvā pacchato dhammā vuttāti "pabhedavantadassanathan"ti niddesanā āhā."
Se: "Tattha hi purato kusalādike pabhede vatvā pacchato dhammā vuttāti. "Pabhedavantadassanathan"ti niddesanā āhā."

ii) examples for insertion of syllables:

Me, Ve, Ue: "Indriyavisayamanasikārādhīnaṃ viṣṇuṇantī evamaḍi sādhāraṇaphalaṃ dattaḥhabbam."
Se, Te: "Indriyavisayamanasikārādhīnaṃ viṣṇuṇantī evamaḍi sādhāraṇaphalaṃ dattaḥhabbam."

iii) examples for insertion of word or phrase:

Me, Ve, Te, Ue: "Abhisametabboti abhisamayo, abhisamayo attho abhisamayaṭṭhoti"
Se: "Abhisamayo abhisametabboti abhisamayo, abhisamayo attho abhisamayaṭṭhoti"

iv) examples for omission of syllables or word:

Me, Ve, Te, Ue: "Upari vuccamāṇī jhānaṅgāni uparijñānaṅgāni, tesam attano vipaccanikānaṃ paṭipakkhābhāvadassanattham tappaccanikanivaraṇavacanam."
Se: "Upari vuccamāṇī jhānaṅgāni, tesam attanopi paccanikanam paṭipakkhābhāvadassanattham tappaccanikanivaraṇavacanam."

v) examples for substitution of word:

Me, Ve, Te, Ue: "Adiṭṭham jotiyati etāyati adiṭṭhajotanā."
Se: "Adiṭṭham jotiyati etāyati adiṭṭhajotanā."

vi) examples for compound form into dissolved form or vice versa:

Me, Ve, Te, Ue: "kāmātanhārupatāṅhā-arūpataṅhānirodhatāṅhābhedo"
Se: "kāmātanhā rūpataṅhā arūpataṅhā nirodhatāṅhā bhedo"
In addition to the above classification, the way of designating and dividing the sections are slightly different in the Sinhalese edition from the other editions which divide more in detail than the Sinhalese edition as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sinhalese edition</th>
<th>The other editions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tikamatikavannanā</td>
<td>Tikamatikapadavannanā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dukamatikavannanā</td>
<td>Dukamatikapadavannanā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suttantamatiikavannanā</td>
<td>Suttantikadukamatikapadavannanā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāmāvacaravannanā</td>
<td>Kāmāvacaraksalām</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāyakammadvārakāthā</td>
<td>Kāyakammadvārakāthāvānṇanā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vociikammadvārakāthā</td>
<td>Vociikammadvārakāthāvānṇanā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manokkammadvārakāthā</td>
<td>Manokkammadvārakāthāvānṇanā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kammakāthā</td>
<td>Kammakāthāvānṇanā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dvārakāthā</td>
<td>Akusalakampatathāvānṇanā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhamuddesavārakāthā</td>
<td>Dhamuddesavārakāthāvānṇanā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niddesavārakāthā</td>
<td>Niddesavārakāthāvānṇanā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catukkanayavannanā</td>
<td>Catukkanayo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasinakāthā</td>
<td>Kasinakathāvānṇanā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abhibhāyatanaṅkathā</td>
<td>Abhibhāyatanaṅkathāvānṇanā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vimokkhamārakathā</td>
<td>Vimokkhamārakathāvānṇanā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahmaṅkāvasarathā</td>
<td>Brahmaṅkāvasarathāvānṇanā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ārūpapakathā</td>
<td>Ārūpāvacaraksalakathāvānṇanā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tebhāmakaṅkusalakathā</td>
<td>Tebhāmakaṅkusalavānṇanā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lokuttarakathā</td>
<td>Lokuttarakusalavānṇanā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akusalakathāvānṇanā</td>
<td>Akusalapadam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
And, in this critical edition, the criteria used for the adoption of particular readings are shown in the footnotes in this present translation, for example ‘Sinhalese edition reads ‘savisesitabbatā’’ for ‘visesitabbatā’. Here, the word ‘visesitabba’ indicates only the dhamma, so the prefix ‘sa’ which has the meaning of ‘together with’ is not befitted. Therefore, CSCD reading is more accurate’. The criteria used for the adoption in particular reading can be stated as being based on following considerations:

i) Contextual relation

ii) Accuracy of grammar and meaning

iii) General usage of the Pāli literature

2) English translation with annotations

In preparing the annotated translation of this Mūlañka, the other relevant sources such as the Anuñka on this Mūlañka, the Madhuñka on this Mūlañka, Visuddhimagga-ñikā, Abhidhammatthasahgaha, Abhidhammattha-vibhāvinī-ñikā and the other Abhidhamma texts have been duly consulted in the relevant, for clarity and precision of expression. The Atthasālinī-athhayojanā which is another sub-commentary on the Atthasālinī is also duly consulted, and, in order to compare and to clarify the definition of terms, the Atthasālinī-athhayojanā’s definitions and explanations that are
different from this Mūlaṭikā are mentioned in the footnote, as in the following example;

Dhs-mt p. 55: "Vatthuvisadakriyāti ajjhāttikabāhirānaṃ vatthūnaṃ nimmalabhāvakiriyā."

Dhs-ay p. 175: "Vatthuvisadakriyāti sarirādi-ajjhāttikacīvarādibāhirānaṃ vatthūnaṃ visadabhāvakarānaṃ."

While presenting the English translation of the Dhammasaṅgaṇī-Mūlaṭikā, the relevant contexts of the Atthasālinī are provided in bold and italic type and their translations are also given in parenthesis - for example, "Lakkaṇaṃ (characteristic) means whatever nature which is desired to be known". For this purpose, the Expositor, that is the translation of the Atthasālinī by Pe Maung Tin, is consulted. However, an attempt has also been made to retranslate the relevant sentences in many cases. While attempting the retranslation of the relevant sentences, in order to make the readers clarify and compare my renderings and Pe Maung Tin’s renderings, the translations of Pe Maung Tin (the author of the Expositor) are cited in the footnote along with their relevant page numbers. And, the new renderings of particular technical terms such as saṅkhārika, mudulā, etc. are presented in the footnote alongside other scholar’s renderings. But, some technical terms of abhidhammic significance such as citta, javana, dhamma, kusala etc. are left untranslated for easy grasping of the meaning and for the benefit of the abhidhammic students.

And, with a view to give a clear understanding of the statements of this Mūlaṭikā, some words are additionally inserted in square brackets in this translation; for example: ‘[The corresponding-other-dhammas] are neither connected with the second word ‘hoti’ nor explained [in the section of Explanation]’. Further, in order to avoid the obscure meaning of the context, the pronouns such as ‘tam’, ‘tassa’ etc. are clarified by the appointed words. For instance, in Chapter three, the sentence
"Punasañājananapaccayabhūtaṃ vā nimittakaraṇaṃ puna ...pe... karaṇaṃ, tadassā kiccaṃ" is translated as “Or, making a sign being the cause of recognizing again is punasañājananapaccayanimittakaraṇaṃ. That making a sign being the cause of recognizing again (tam) is the function of this perception (assā).” Further, in order to clarify the meaning of the context, obscure nouns are clarified with specific nouns such as, in the sentence p. 58 “…āvajjanassapi viññattisamuṭṭhāpakabhāvo yathādhippāyavikārarūpuppādanena upapanno hoti…”, the word ‘āvajjanassa (adverting)’ stands for ‘manodvāravajjana citta (mind-door adverting citta)’. Therefore, I have translated the above statement as “…the state of producing the intimation by means of producing the mutable material phenomena in accordance with the intention is suitable for the mind-door adverting citta also…”

While attempting this present English translation of the Dhammasaṅgaṇī-Mūlaṭikā, the Atthasālinībhāṣāṭikā written in Myanmar language by venerable Janaka has been most often consulted. Without the Atthasālinībhāṣāṭikā, this work would have undoubted been a Herculean task. Along with some comprehensive annotations to the translation as well as the author’s particular views pertaining to the Atthasālinī, critical notes are also provided in the footnotes. Moreover, ‘ibid’, ‘op. cit’ terms have been less employed in the footnotes for easy recognition of the reference.

3. Some aspects of the Dhammasaṅgaṇī-Mūlaṭikā

The Mūlaṭikā, the first āṭika in the Pāli literature, is an exegetical treatise on the Atthasālinī of Bhadantācariya Buddhaghosa. The colophon of the Mūlaṭikā designates it as “Linatthajotaka” which means ‘illustrator of the hidden meaning’, and “Linatthapadavāṭanā” which means ‘explanation of words with a hidden meaning’. And, according to the Saddhamma-saṅgaṇa, the Mūlaṭikā is called as “Pathama-Paramatthapakāśani (the first book: explanation of ultimate truths)”. As

41 Ss, JPTS, 1890, p. 60: “Tadanantaram Abhidhammapiṭake Dhammasaṅgaṇiyā atthakathāya Attha-sāliniyā atthavāṭananām ārabhītāvā mālabhāṣāyā Māgadhikāya niruttīyā pāṭhama-Paramatthapakāśani nāma mūlaṭikaś ca anuṣṭikāś ca ṭhapesaṃ”.
the meaning of the title denotes, the *Mūlaṭīkā* works containing the *Atthisālinī* expositions which needs further elucidation for a correct interpretation; and it provides an additional explanation of the ultimate reality which is discussed in the line of the *Dhammasaṅgaṇī* and the *Atthasālinī*. Further, sometimes the author of the *Mūlaṭīkā* criticizes heedfully and carefully the view of the *Atthasālinī* with relevant arguments.

According to the *Theravāda* tradition, particularly in the Myanmar tradition where the *Abhidhamma* is highly venerated, the *Mūlaṭīkā* is known as the most difficult and extremely important text among the *Pāli* texts. During the reign of King Mindon who honored Buddhism (1859-1878) in many ways, highly educated monks taught the *Abhidhamma* by referring to the *Mūlaṭīkā* and to the *Anuṭīkā* written by venerable Dhammapāla, which comments on the *Mūlaṭīkā*. Even at present, the *Mūlaṭīkā* is studied only by the highly studious and erudite *abhidhammic* scholars. The author’s *abhidhammic* views are so subtle, profound and technical, and hence the *Mūlaṭīkā*’s linguistic expressions are thoroughly scholastic, deeply philosophical and totally psychological. Moreover, the *Mūlaṭīkā*, the sub-commentary on the *Abhidhamma*, contains detailed elucidations of various topics dealing with ethics, psychology or theory of knowledge etc. and the whole Buddhist philosophy in a nutshell. All these significant aspects have been duly taken into consideration as follows:

1) **Authorship of the *Dhammasaṅgaṇī*-Mūlaṭīkā**

The colophon of the *Dhammasaṅgaṇī*-Mūlaṭīkā leaves no doubt to its authorship as Bhadantācariya Ānanda. Another reference to the authorship of this *Mūlaṭīkā* is found in the *Sāsanavāṃsa*, and the *Cūlaganṭhaṃsa* as Bhadantācariya Ānanda composed a sub-commentary called the *Mūlaṭīkā* to the entire seven *Abhidhamma*

---

44 Nandamāḷabhivāṃsa, Fundamental Abhidhamma, part I, p. 15.
45 Dhs-mt p. 195: “...Ānandośī nāmena, katā gantāsubuddhināti.”
46 Sv (Mya) p. 37: “Abhidhammaṭīkatam pana ānandathero akāsi.”
47 Gv p. 60, JPTS, 1886: “Anando nāmācariyo sattābhīdhammagantaṭhaṭhakathāya mūlaṭīkam nāma ṭikaṃ akāsi.”
texts. And, the *Vajirabuddhi-ṭīkā* shows that Bhadantācariya Ānanda was born in Kalasapura. However, the *Cūlaganṭhavāṃsa* says that Bhadantācariya Ānanda was a South Indian, while Wilhelm Geiger merely states that he was born in Continental India. The *Sāsanavāṃsa* presumes that Bhadantācariya Ānanda went to Ceylon and played a leading role as a great teacher. Among the Ceylonese scholars, he was known as Vanaratana-Tissa or Vanaratana Ānanda due to his connection with the Vanavāsī School.

2) **Date of Bhadantācariya Ānanda**

The colophon of the *Dhammasaṅgaṇī-Mūlaṭīkā* gives a clue to trace the date of its author as follows:

> “Cattāri ca sahassāni, puna tiṇī satāni ca;  
> Atṭhasāliniyo ete, padā līnatthajotakā;  
> Dhammamittoti nāmena, sakkaccaṁ abhiyācito;  
> Ānandoti nāmena, katā gantā subuddhiniṁ.”

The four thousand and again three hundred words; These words of the *Atṭhasālini* is the illustrator of the hidden meaning. After having being respectfully requested by Dhammamitta, The text was composed by a very wise man called Ānanda

This colophon shows that Bhadantācariya Ānanda composed this *Mūlaṭīkā* at the request of Venerable Dhammamitta. And, a reference to venerable Dhammamitta can be traced in the *Cūlavāṃsa* as:

> “Therena dhammamittaṁ-sitthagamakavāsinā.  
> Pūjayaṁvānaṁ kāresi, abhidhammassa vaṇṇanaṁ.  
> Dāṭhānāgā bhiḥdāhānena, therena raññavāsinā;  
> Lāṅkālāṁkārabhāṭhānena, abhidhammam kāthāpayi.”

After having saluted by the Elder Dhammamitta who dwelt in Sitthagāma, The commentary to the *Abhidhamma* was compiled by him.

---

48 Vajirabuddhi-ṭīkā (Ve) p. 36: “...tattha tattha ācariyo nāma ānandācariyo kalasapuravāsīti gahetabbo.”


49 Gv p. 66, JPTS, 1886: “Buddhadattācariyo ānandācariyo dhammapalācariyo dve pubbācariyā mahāvajirabuddhācariyo cullavajirabuddhācariyo dipamkaračariyo culladhammapalācariyo kassapācariyo’i ime dasācariyo jambudīpikā hēṭṭhā vutappakāre gandhe akāṃsu.”

50 Wilhelm Geiger, Pāli Literature and Language, p. 33.

51 Sv (Mya) p. 46: “Ikevaṁ sīhaladīpikassā ānandattherassā sissam dhammavilāsaṁ paṭicca rāmaṇārattthe sīhaladīpato sasanassā āgatamaggoti.”


53 Dhs-mt p. 195.

54 Mv (Mya) p. 342.
Abhidhamma was recited by an Elder called Dāthānāga, a forest-dweller who was an ornament to Lanka.55

According to the Cūlavamsa, venerable Dhammamitta lived at the Sitthagāma-Parivena in the region of the king Mahinda IV who lived in Ceylon during the 956 A.D. to 972 A.D.56 And, the name ‘Dāthānāga’ can be the supportive reference for assuming the date, because the name ‘Dāthānāga’ is also mentioned in the colophon of the Paramatthamaṇṇājūsā as ‘venerable Dāthānāga residing in the Siddhagāma-Parivena requested venerable Dhammapāla to write the Paramatthamaṇṇājūsā’57. And, according to the Cūlaganthavamsa, venerable Dhammapāla who was a senior pupil of Bhadantācariya Ānanda composed the Saccasankhepa.58 Most of the scholars agree that the Paramatthamaṇṇājūsā and the Saccasankhepa were written by the same author who was known as Culla-Dhammapāla who wrote also the Dīghanikāyāṭṭikā, the Majjimanikāyaṭṭikā and the Saṃyuttanikāyaṭṭikā.59 60 However, A.K. Warder says...
that according to Saddhatissa, the *Pajipattisaṅgaha* was written at the suggestion of Yuvarāja Kassapa who probably was King Kassapa V of Ceylon (914 A.D. to 923 A.D.); and he refers to venerable Culla-Dhammapāla’s works. Further, he says that venerable Culla-Dhammapāla could not have a connection with the king Mahinda IV of Ceylon. Therefore, the date of Bhadantācariya Ānanda who is the author of the *Mūlaṭikā* can be dated as the 10th century A.D.

However, the *Cūlaganthavamsa* states that Bhadantācariya Ānanda composed the *Mūlaṭikā* at the request of venerable Buddhamitta. Here, a conspicuous controversy about the date of Bhadantācariya Ānanda is seen in the accounts of the colophon of the *Dhammasaṅgani-Mūlaṭikā* and the statement occurring in the *Cūlaganthavamsa*. It should be noted that the *Cūlaganthavamsa* also mentions that venerable Buddhamitta had also requested the great commentator Buddhaghosa to write the *Majjhimanikāya-atṭhakathā*. If this Venerable Buddhaghosa is the same person who requested Bhadantācariya Ānanda to write the *Mūlaṭikā*, then Bhadantācariya Ānanda was a contemporary of Bhadantācariya Buddhaghosa who was born in a village near Buddhagayā in northern India during the 5th century A.D.

Another reference related to the date of Bhadantācariya Ānanda can be found in the colophon of the *Rūpasiddhi* and of the *Pajjamadhu* written by venerable Buddhappiya. The colophon of the *Rūpasiddhi* goes as follows:

---


63 See Gv, JPTS, 1886, p. 69: “Abhidhammakathāya mūlaṭikā nāma ṭikkā gantho buddhamitta nāma therena ayācitena ānandācariyena kato.”

64 Gv p. 68, JPTS, 1886: “Majjhimanikāyassa atṭhakathā gantho buddhamittanāmena therena ayācitena buddhaghoṣācariyena kato.”

65 See C.A.F. Rhys Davids, BMPS, p. xxi; Étienne Lamotte, History of Indian Buddhism, p. 141. Cf. According to Oskar Von Hinüber, the brackets for Buddhaghosa’s dates are about AD 370 to 450. See A Handbook of Pāli literature, p. 103.

66 The *Rūpasiddhi* is the Pāli grammar re-arranging the *Kaccāyaṇa-vyākaraṇa*.

67 The *Pajjamadhu* is a Pāli poem consisting of 104 stanzas, describing the beauty of the Buddha’s personality, His teaching and the Saṅgha.
”Vikhyātānanda atther avhayavaragurunāṃ tambapanaṇiddhajānam, 
Sisso dipāṅkaraṇākyaddamiḷavasumatī dipaladdhappakāso. 
Bālādiccādvāsavādityamadhivasatī sāsanaṃ jotayi yo, 
Soyām buddhappiyavha yati imamujukam rūpasiddhiḥ akāsi.”

“This perfect Rūpasiddhi was composed by that monk who received the title 
of Buddhappiya and was named Dipāṅkara – a disciple of Ananda, the 
eminent preceptor who was like unto a standard in Tambapāṇī – he 
(Dipāṅkara) was renowned like a lamp in the Damila country, and, being 
the resident Superior there of two monasteries including Bālādicca, caused 
the Religion to shine forth.”

And, the colophon of the Pajjamadhu goes as follows:

“Ānanda raṇa rataṇī mahaṇa yatīnā 
Niccappabuddha padumappiyasevināṅgī 
Buddhappiyena Ghana Buddha gunappiyena 
Therālinā racitā Pajjamadhumpi bantu”

“May they drink deeply of these nectar-like verses (Pajjamadhu) – 
composed by the bee Buddhappiya, delighted with the Buddha’s virtues – 
who constantly attended upon that lotus, the Venerable Elder Ananda 
Vanaratana (Jewel of the Forest), heavily-laden with the perfume of his 
virtues and always in bloom.”

According to venerable Walpola Rahula, the date of Bhadantācariya Ānanda can be 
assigned to the 10th or 11th century, through which, it is possible to assume that the 
author of Moggallāyana who lived during the reign of Parakkamabāhu I (1153 to 
1186 A.D.) knew a disciple of Bhadantācariya Ānanda, venerable Buddhappiya.72

K.R. Norman, however, says that if the Rūpasiddhi and the Pajjamadhu were written 
by the same author, venerable Buddhappiya belongs to the second half of the 13th 
century.73 However, according to Talwatte Rahula, Bhadantācariya Ānanda and 
venerable Buddhappiya belong to a period prior to the 12th century A.D. Further, it is 
said that the Rūpasiddhi and the Pajjamadhu could not have been written by the same 
author. Because, the author of the Rūpasiddhi is known as ‘Dipāṅkara’ in its colophon, 
but the Pajjamadhu does not mention that name in its colophon; besides, the author of 
the Rūpasiddhi refers to his teacher as ‘vikhyātānanda atther avhayavaragurunāṃ

68 Prs p. 421.
70 Pajjamadhu, JPTS, 1887, p. 16.
72 Walpola Rahula, History of Buddhism in Ceylon, p. xxvii.
73 K.R. Norman, Pāli literature, p. 164.
and the author of the *Pajjamadhu* describes his teacher as ‘*araṇāratanānanda*’.⁷⁴

Meanwhile, the name of another pupil of Bhadantācāriya Ānanda, venerable Vedeha is found in the colophon of the *Rasavāhinī*. The colophon of the *Rasavāhinī* goes as follows:

```
...Yassa acarīyo asi sabbasatthavisāvado 
araṇāyatanānandamahāthero mahaganī 
Garuttimagato yassa satthasāgarāpiṇī 
yovippagāmavamseka ketubhūto tisuhalesa 
Yo’kā sīhalabhāsaya sīhalam sāddalakkhānam 
yo ca samantakūṭassa vannanam vannayīsūbhām 
Tena vedehatherena katā’yam rasavāhinī...
```

“The Rasavāhinī was composed by Vedeha Thera, author of the beautiful *Samanta-kūṭa-vannana*, and the Sinhalese Grammar, was born of the Brāhmaṇa caste, and was a banner to the three divisions of Ceylon. His tutor was venerable Ānanda of the Forest Hermitage, leader of a large chapter of monks, and one who has crossed over the Ocean of knowledge...”⁷⁵

According to K.R. Norman, venerable Buddhappiya and venerable Vedeha were contemporaries and probably lived at the end of the 13th century or beginning of the 14th century,⁷⁶ while G.P. Malalasekera asserts that venerable Vedeha who was a pupil of Bhadantācāriya Ānanda lived in the 13th century.⁷⁷ Meanwhile, venerable Talwatte Rahula states that venerable Vedeha belongs to the mid-13th century.⁷⁸ However, according to Nevill, in his manuscript Catalogue, Bhadantācāriya Ānanda who was the teacher of venerable Buddhappiya and venerable Vedeha lived in as early as the seventh century.

Scholars do not dispute over the authorship of the *Dhammasaṅgaṇī-Mūlaṭīkā*. Nevertheless, as we have noticed, there is no unanimity with regard to the date of Bhadantācāriya Ānanda. Given the assumption that the beginning of the *ṭīkā*

---

⁷⁶ K.R. Norman, Pāli literature, p. 159.
literature took place in the 10th or 11th century A.D., the 10th century A.D. becomes
the most agreeable date of Bhadantacariya Ānanda who was the author of the Mūlaṭīkā.

3) **Style and characteristics of the Dhammasaṅgaṇī-Mūlaṭīkā**

Bhadantacariya Ānanda commences his versatile comment on the *Atthasālinī*
abruptly without his own introduction and keenly with terse, precise, straightforward
and elegant style, in order to make clear and correct interpretation of terms. His
vocabulary is astonishingly rich. However, his use of vocabulary is precisely
technical without superfluous embellishments. For example, the word
‘avohāradesanā’ is used for the term ‘abhidhammadesanā’ with reference to the
*Atthasālinī* phrase “naiyaṇ vohāradesanā”. On that account, in some places, word-to-
word explanations are apparently tedious, but are certainly useful for understanding
the text. However, some expressions of the *Mūlaṭīkā* are full of wit and tact with
concise words. For example, the author of the *Mūlaṭīkā* compares ‘killing others
(parāpaghāta)’ to ‘breaking a water-pot (ghaṭabheda)’ hinting it as similar to the
total destruction of the five aggregates, and ‘losing supernormal power (iddhivināsa)’
to ‘losing water (udakavināsa)’ suggesting the point of losing the spiritual
attainment.⁸⁰

In order to illustrate the shades of meaning of terms and abstruse points, the author of
this *ṭīkā* duly consults the *Sutta-piṭaka, Vinaya-piṭaka, Abhidhamma-piṭaka,
Visuddhimagga* and *Mahā-āṭṭhakathā*, and in order to justify and demonstrate his
view, he quotes them methodically and precisely. Moreover, this *Mūlaṭīkā* contains
many allusions to the doctrines of the other schools of *Abhidhamma*. For example,
the theory of ‘bhāva-anyathāva (change in mode of being)’ which is one of the main
theories of the *Sarvāstivāda* is illustrated with a simile as “yathā suvannavisuddhi

⁷⁹ Cf. fn. 3.
⁸⁰ Dhs-mt (Ve) p. 74.
However, while rejecting the Sarvāstivādin viewpoint\(^2\), and advocating the Theravādin's position, the Ahutvābhavavāda theory\(^3\) is elucidated as (p. 46) “Kālopi hi cittaparicchino sabhāvato avijjamānopi ādhārabhāveneva saññāto ‘adhikaraṇan’iti vutto tāmkhaṇṇappavatāṇaṃ tato pubbe parato ca abhāvā.” These facts illustrate his encyclopedic knowledge of the Tipiṭaka as well as the Abhidharma.

And, this Mūlaṭikā deals with Indian philosophies such as Saṅkhya, Vedānta, Vai eśika that are criticized by the author from the orthodox standpoint. Further, the author's erudite, scientific knowledge can be observed in many places such as when dealing with the aspect of sound etc. as (p. 56) “sadda-vatthunam thāna-karaṇānaṃ sasadda-ppavatti-karaṇamevāti”.

The author of this Mūlaṭikā displays his keen interest in grammar and syntax. He comments on the traditional grammatical explanation of the words such as (p. 48) “kāme avacāretiī kāmāvacāran’iti vattabbe cā-saddassa rassattam katam (although it should be said “kāme avacāretiī kāmāvacāram”, the vowel of the syllable ‘cā’ is shortened but also on the etymological principles of the words), etc. He employs a method of giving popular etymologies whereby words are infused with definite semantic values, so that they connote only a qualified standard meaning when used in Buddhist philosophy. Here follows a specimen of such examples:

---

\(^1\) Cf. The Sarvāstivāda has four main theories according to the four great teachers as follows:
1) Venerable Dharmatīrtha says the theory of 'change in mode of being' (bhāva-anyathātva), just as milk turning into curds.
2) Venerable Ghoṣaka says the theory of 'change in characteristic' (lakṣaṇa-anyathātva), just as the case of a man being attached to one particular woman – he is not said to be detached from other women.
3) Venerable Vasumitra says the theory of 'change in state' (avastha-anyathātva), just as the case of moving a token into different positions.
4) Venerable Buddhadeva mentions the theory of 'change in temporal relativity' (anyathā-anyathātva) just as the case of one and the same woman who is called 'daughter' relative to her mother, and 'mother' relative to her daughter. See Bhikkhu K.L. Dhammajoti, Sarvāstivāda Abhidharma, pp. 147-149.


\(^3\) The Ahutvābhavavāda theory is the dhamma which exists only at present.
Dhs-mt p. 48: “... ruḥhena saddena ... ṇāṇasampayuttesu vā pavattitvā anavajjasukhāvipākatāya tāṃsadiṣesu ... vā kīci nimitṭhā gaḥetvā satipi aṇṇasmiṃ tāṃnimitṭhayutte kismiṃcideva visaye sammutiyā cirakālāvatasaṃa nimittavirahepi pavatti ruḥhī nāma yathā “mahiyāṃ setīti māhiṃso, gacchanīti gāvo”ti, evaṃ kusalasaddassapi ruḥhibhāvo veditabbo.”

Dhs-mt p. 84: “Samphusitassa ārammaṇena samāgatassa cittassa bhāvo samphusitattanā. Yasmiṃ sati cittam samphusitanti vuccati, so tassa bhāvo.”

And, when the author of this Mūlaṭīkā elucidates the nature of dhammas occurring in the Atthasālini, he adopts, for precise interpretation, the four defining devices, i.e. characteristic (lakkhana), function (rasa), manifestation (paccupaṭṭhāna) and proximate cause (padaṭṭhāna), by means of which it can be delimited. Further, in order to make clear understanding and easy comparing of the terms, the way of paired-associate method is precisely adopted. An example can be cited as follows:

Dhs-mt p. 51: “kittinti parannukhā kittanaṃ patthaṭṭayasaṃtaṃ (‘glory’ means glorification in one’s absence, that is, wide-spread fame), pasamsanti sammukhā pasamsanam thutim (praise means praising in the presence, that is, commendation).”

Moreover, by adopting the paired-associate method, the author of this Mūlaṭīkā shows his abhidhammic knowledge of neyyattha which is the conventional truth (sammuti) and nītattha which is the ultimate truth (paramattha) in a terse yet lucid style: 84

Dhs-mt p. 65: “Vacanantarena gametabbattham neyyattham (the meaning depicted by another statement is called ‘inferred meaning’), sayameva gamitabbattham nītattham (‘direct meaning’ is the meaning depicted by itself only).”

When the author of this Mūlaṭīkā advocates the Atthasālini’s view, first he brings into sharp focus some dubious points, and then starts supporting the Atthasālini’s view with detailed evidences. The following is a specimen:

84 For further understanding the two kinds of truth i.e. neyyattha and nītattha see AN II, p. 118.
The Atthasālinī says “Rūpūpapattiyā ito aṇṇo maggo nāma natthitī⁸⁵. First, in order to clarify the word ‘magga’, the author of this Mūlaṭikā says (p. 92) “Jhānassa amaggabhāvepi sati maggavacanāḥ aṇṇamaggabhāvanīva ranathanti”. Secondly, he puts a question with an assumption which confirms the first step, as “imasmīṃ atthe maggaggahanassa payojanaṃ vuttam, na sabbassa kusalajjhānassa maggabhāvoti”. Thirdly, he clarifies the dubious idea with sharp insight as “Tattha maggassa bhāvanāya samayavatthānassa katattā amaggabhāvanāsamaye pavattānaṃ phassādināṃ kusalabhāvo na dassito sivā, tasmā sabbassa maggabhāvo dassetabboti ... evaṃ aṇṇabhūmikavidhuro sati paccayantare rūpūpapattijanakasabhāvo vipākadhhammasabhāvo viya vipākadhhammavasena sabbasamāno maggasaddena vuttoṭī”. Finally, the author of the Mūlaṭikā concludes his idea which supports the view of the Atthasālinī, as “ito aṇṇo maggo natthiti dassetīti veditabbatī”. In this way, he subtly demonstrates the Atthasālinī’s view in an indirect manner.

However, when the author of the Mūlaṭikā defines some terms, he defines the terms straightaway with lucid and eloquent explanation. For example, the action of killing (atipāto) is defined as (p. 67) “Saraseneva ca patanasabhāvassa pānassa antarā eva aṭṭha pātanam atipāto, saṇikaṃ patitum adatvāva sīgham pātananti atho. Atikkamma vā satthādīhi abhībhavitvā pātanam atipāto.” And, when he starts his arguments about the Atthasālinī’s view, the way in which he presents his argument is quite logical and intuitive without losing his composure. When the followings section is carefully observed, his logical acumen becomes abundantly clear.

---

⁸⁵ Dhs-a p. 163.
4) Contrasting views and additional information in the Mūlafikā

Contrasting views between the Atthasālinī and its Mūlafikā

Even though this Mūlafikā is structured on the basis of the Atthasālinī which is the commentary of the Dhammasaṅgaṇī, in some places, it shows certain dissension as in the following example:

(1) The Atthasālinī analyzes the word-definition of Kusala in Sense-Sphere into four parts:
   i) Pucchā (Question): Katame dhammā kusalā?
   ii) Samayaniddesa (explanation of time): yasmiṇī samaye kāmāvacaraṇi kusalam cittaṇi ... tasmiṇī samaye;
   iii) Dhammuddesa (outline of dhammas): phasso hoti ... avikkhepo hoti;
   iv) Appanā (conclusion): Ye vā pana ... arūpino dhammā, ime dhammā kusalā.

However, this Mūlafikā includes the statement “Ye vā pana ... arūpino dhammā” into the Outline of dhamma (the Dhammuddesa) and into the Explanation of dhamma (dhammaniddesa), and only the statement “ime dhammā kusalā” is only included in the Conclusion. According to this Mūlafikā, the nine dhammas such as attention (manasikāra) etc. are grouped as ‘yevāpanaka dhamma (corresponding-other-dhamma)’ by its nature (sarūpena). Though these nine dhammas are not enumerated like contact dhamma etc., they are also cetasikas which are grouped, like contact (phassa) etc. Therefore, it is proper to include the statement “Ye vā pana ... arūpino dhammā” into the Outline of dhamma and into the Explanation of dhamma.

(2) This Mūlafikā shows grammatical explanations different from the Atthasālinī as follows:

A. The Dhammasaṅgaṇī words “yam tasmiṇī samaye hiriyati hiriyitabbenā” is construed in the Atthasālinī as:

However, this *Mūlākā* construes it differently that the word ‘yaṃ’ is interconnected with the word ‘hiriyati’ as follows:


B. Different ways and the interpretations of the compound are evident through the word ‘Pitisomanassasampayogato’ as follows:


However, according to the author of this *Mūlākā*, the compound word of the *Atthasarini* ‘Pitisomanassasampayogato’ should be replaced as ‘sātavedanāsampayogato’, because ‘somanassa’ is a condition for one’s joyous mind (sumano), and ‘pīti’ also gets into the state of ‘somanassa’. And, the word of ‘pitisomanassa’ is interpreted by way of tatiyā tappurisa compound (instrumental case compound). Let us observe this *Mūlākā* in this regard:

Dhs-m t p. 79: “Pitisomanassasampayogatoti vutte yena yogā sumano hoti, tam somanassanti vuccatīti pītiyā ca somanassabhāvo āpajjati, tasmā vināpi kāyena vatthunā sātavedanāsampayogatoti yojetabbanā. Evaṃcā nippītiśaṃ somanassāṃcā sāṅgāhitāṃ hoti, pīti-upalakkhitāṃ vā somanassāṃ sappītiśaṃ nippītiśaṃ somanassāṃ caito datṭhabbo.”

(3) The *Atthasarini* says that the resultant citta is clean due to cleanliness of the base. However, the author of this *Mūlākā* disagrees with the view of the

---

86 For detailed explanation see 1055.
87 Dhs-a p. 262: “Niddesavāre cakkhuviññānam paṇḍaranti vatthuto vutthā. Kusalaṃhi attano parisuddhatāya paṇḍaranti nāma, akusalāṃ bhavaṅganissandena, vipākāṃ vatthupaṇḍarattā (in the
Atthasālinī. In order to prove his idea, firstly he explains the intention of the Atthasālinī with an additional explanation as (p. 122) “sayam kaṇhādhammānaṃ appatīpakkhattā sabhāvaparisuddhānaṃ pasādahadayavatthunissayānaṃ vasena paṇḍarasabhāvam jātanti”. Secondly, in order to show his disagreement, he brings in an exceptional case such as the realm of infinite space (ākāsānaṅcāyatana) which does not have the rūpa/ base. Finally, the author of this Mūlaṅkūṅkā elucidates his own view ‘the clearness of citta is due to the intrinsic nature’, which is supported by the Āṅguttara-nikāya.

(4) In the Dhammasaṅgani, the word ‘sammāsaṅkappo’ is not mentioned in the kusala-resultant rootless citta (ahetukakusalacitta). The Atthasālinī shows the reason as to why the word ‘sammāsaṅkappo’ is not mentioned therein. The reason, according to the Atthasālinī, is that the kusala-resultant rootless citta is neither kusala nor akusala, therefore the word ‘sammāsaṅkappo’ and the word ‘micchāsaṅkappo’ are not mentioned. However, the author of this Mūlaṅkūṅkā does not agree with the Atthasālinī’s opinion. Thus, he brings out his own view that the word ‘sammāsaṅkappo’ is not mentioned in the kusala-resultant rootless citta of the Dhammasaṅgani due to absence of the equal state with the kusala which can cause the kusala itself to arise like of the great resultant cittas.

(5) The Atthasālinī says that in the second futile course, the determining citta can get the repetition condition. However, this statement of the Atthasālinī is rejected
by this Mūlaññāka citing evidence from the Paṭṭhāna. The reason is that the determining citta cannot get the state of the repetition condition, because the Paṭṭhāna mentions “āsevanapaccayā na magge ekam”, na maggapaccayā āsevane ekam”. The second futile course which describes in the Atthasāliṇī and in this Mūlaññāka can be diagramed as follows.\textsuperscript{96}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Sense-Door Processes in the Second Futile Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Texts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atthasāliṇī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mūlaññāka</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P = past bhavanga; V = vibrational bhavanga; A = arrest bhavanga; F = five-door advertting; C = consciousness; R = receiving; I = investigation; D = determining; J = javana; B = stream of bhavanga.

(6) According to the Atthasāliṇī, since the smile-producing-citta is neither kusala nor akusala (neva kusalaṁ nākusalaṁ), the word ‘samādhi-bala (power of moments of citta arises. Then, after getting the repetition condition, persisting as javana, it again lapses into the life-continuum).’” Cf. Pe Maung Tin, Exp p. 357.

\textsuperscript{94} Ptn (Ve) I p. 344.

\textsuperscript{95} Ptn (Ve) I p. 55.

\textsuperscript{96} The above Table 1 is made on the basis of the following two statements:


concentration)’ and the word ‘vīrīya-bala (power of energy)’ are not mentioned in the smile-producing-citta in the Dhammasaṅgani. However, the author of this Mūlaṭikā does not agree with the reason ‘neither kusala nor akusala’ which is given by the Atthasālinī. Therefore, first he clarifies the Atthasālinī’s view and then he exposes his own argument as follows:\footnote{Dhs-a p. 295: “Uddesavāre pana ‘samādhibala hoti vīrīyabalām hoti’ ti anāgatattā paripuṇṇena balaṭṭhetanam dvaṇḍam balaṃ nāma na hoti. Yasū saṇhā “neva kusalaṃ nākusalaṃ” tasmā balanti vatvāna ṣaṭṭhitaṃ.” Cf. Pe Maung Tin, Exp, p. 387.}

i) Since the rootless citta does not have any root, there is no state of being firmly established. Thus, the condition of the power is not fulfilled. Therefore, the word ‘samādhibala’ and the word ‘vīrīyabala’ are not mentioned in the Section of Outline (Uddesā) and in the section of Summary (Sāṅgahīta) in the Dhammasaṅgani.\footnote{Dhs-mt p. 132: “Ahetukassa mūlābhāvena suppatīṭhitātthātī ti balabhāvo aparipuṇṇo, tasmā uddesavāre “samādhibalaṃ hoti, vīrīyabalām hoti” ti na vattaṃ. Tato eva hi ahetukānaṃ saṇhāvāraṃ jhānāṅgānaṃ ca na uddhaṅgānaṃ. Teneva imasmiṃpi ahetukadvaye balāni anuddesāsāṅgahātānaṃ. Yasū pana vīryassa vijjāmānattātthātīti balavom, yasmā ca ettha vitakkādīnaṃ jhānapaccayamattātāti viya samādhi-vīrīyānaṃ balaṃ-mattatātī ti, tasmā nīdesavāre “samādhibalaṃ vīrīyabalān” ti varvā ṣaṭṭhitaṃ. Yasū pana neva kusalaṃ nākusalaṃ, tasmā samādhisādhisti, sammāvāyāmo, miccāvāyāmo ca na vuttanti adhippādo. Evam sati mahākīriyācittesa ca ettha na vattaṃbāṃ siyā, vuttaṅca, tasmā samā, miccā vā nīyanikasaḥvābhāvāvato maggapaccayabhiṇṇo appattā samādhi-vīrīyāṃ idha tathā ca na vuttaṃ daṭṭhābhū.”}

ii) However, the word ‘samādhibala’ and the word ‘vīrīyabala’ are mentioned in the section of Explanation (nīdesavāre) due to the following reasons:\footnote{Dhs-a p. 121; No. 568.}
- Because, the smile-producing citta is stronger than the remaining rootless cittas because it is embodied with the energy.
- And, because in this smile-producing citta, ‘samādhi’ and ‘vīrīya’ have the state of mere power just as the initial application etc. (vitakkādi) have the state of mere jhāna-condition.

iii) This Mūlaṭikā clarifies the Atthasālinī’s view as:
- since this smile-producing citta is neither kusala nor akusala, the words ‘sammāsamādhi’, ‘miccāsamādhi’ and the words ‘sammāvāyāmo’, ‘miccāvāyāmo’ are not mentioned.\footnote{Dhs-a p. 121 No. 571-571. Dhs-a p. 121 No. 571-572.}
iv) This Mūlaṭikā starts to bring his argument as follows:

- If the word ‘sammāsamādhi’ and the word ‘sammāvāyāmo’ are not mentioned, because this smile-producing-citta which is a functional citta is neither kusala nor akusala, they should not be also mentioned in the great functional citta (mahākiriya-citta). However, the word ‘sammāsamādhi’ and the word ‘sammāvāyāmo’ are mentioned in the great functional cittas.\textsuperscript{102}

v) The author of this Mūlaṭikā concludes as follows:

- due to the absence of the nature of either rightly or wrongly leading to salvation, the concentration (samādhi) and the effort (vāyāma) which do not reach the state of the path-condition are not mentioned as the ‘sammāsamādhi’ and the word ‘sammāvāyāmo’ in this smile-producing citta. Therefore, the word ‘samādhibala’ and the word ‘vīriyabala’ are not mentioned in the Section of Outline and in the section of Summary, due to the absence of being firmly established without root; and the word ‘sammā’ is not mentioned due to the absence of the nature leading to salvation. Thus, it is not that the word ‘samādhibala’ and the word ‘vīriyabala’ are not mentioned in the Section of Outline and in the section of Summary, because the smile-producing-citta is neither kusala nor akusala.

Additional information in the Dhammasaṅgaṇī-Mūlaṭikā

The author of the Dhammasaṅgaṇī-Mūlaṭikā displays his expert knowledge which throws additional light on the Atthasālinī. Here follows some specimens, which give additional information, from this Mūlaṭikā:

1) The Atthasālinī explains as to how the word-order of the words ‘katame dhamma kusala’ in the Question and “kusala dhamma” in the Table of Content is arranged.\textsuperscript{103} According to the Atthasālinī, in the Table of Content, dhammas are

\textsuperscript{102} See Dhs pp. 122-123 No. 576.
Cf. Actually, in the Dhammasaṅgaṇī No. 576, the words ‘sammāsamādhi (right-concentration)’ and ‘sammāvāyāmo (right-effort) are omitted with the repetition symbol ‘pe’.
dealt with not merely in general, but by way of distinctive aspects such as ‘kusala’ etc., and the words ‘katame dhammā kusalā’ is arranged in order to show which dhammas possess the distinction of kusala etc. Regarding this statement of the Atthasālinī, this Mūlaṭīkā starts to comment on it as (pp. 41-42) “Pabhedato dhammānaṃ desananti mātikādesanam... itikattabbatāyyuttassa visesanattā”. And then, he shows his own additional idea about the word-order ‘katame dhammā kusalā’, as follows:

(p. 42) “...uddeso dhammappadhāno, pucchā saṃsrayitappadhānā, na ca dhammabhāvo saṃsrayito, kusalađībheda pana saṃsrayitoti nicchitasamsayıtasenāyam padānukkamato.”

2) The author of this Mūlaṭīkā defines the terms occurring in the Dhammasaṅgaṇī in a manner different from the Atthasālinī which is the commentary on the Dhammasaṅgaṇī. The following specimens can be cited as examples in this regard:

A. The Atthasālinī shows the function of ‘absence of greed (alobho)’ and the ‘absence of hatred (adoso)’ which are defined as “alobho rāgavasena upagamanassa abhāvakaro, adoso dosavasena apagamanassa”. However, the author of this Mūlaṭīkā depicts his own view as (p. 81) “ārammaṇe vā rūpādiṃhi anurodhavirodhā” after summarizing the definitions of the Atthasālinī as “Rāgavasena mittasanthavo dosavasena virodhō ca tabbisesena upagamāpagaṃa”.

B. From the compound word occurring in the Dhammasaṅgaṇī “tajjā-manno-viññāṇa-dhātu-samphassajam”, the word ‘tajjā’ is defined in the Atthasālinī as p. 139 “... Anucchavikatthopi hi ayaṃ ‘tajjā’-saddo hoti (... For the word ‘tajjā’ means ‘suitable’)”. And, with additional word ‘phalassa’, the Mūlaṭīkā


defines it as (p. 85) “Tajjanti tassa phalassa anucchavikaṃ (Tajja means suitable for its result)”. Further, the Atthasālinī says “Tehi vā rūpādhi ārammanehe imassa ca sukhassa paccayehi jātātipi tajjā”105. However, in order to establish the view as ‘the element of mind-consciousness is the cause of the pleasure, because when the contact (phassa) together with the element of mind-consciousness arises, the pleasant feeling also has to arise’, the Mūlaṭhikā puts it as (p. 85) “tassa jāta kāraṇabhāvena phassaṭham pavattāti tajjā”.

C. The Atthasālinī defines the Dhammasaṅgani word ‘abyāpajjo’ as (p. 150) “Kodhadukkhapatipakkhato na byāpajjoti”. In addition, the Mūlaṭhikā defines it as (p. 87) “byāpādena dukkhena domanassasaṅkhātena dosena viya na byāpādetabboti”.

3) The Atthasālinī says that akusala is also clean as it is issued from the life-continuum.106 Firstly, the Mūlaṭhikā summarizes the idea of the Atthasālinī as (p. 85) “Akusalampi paṇḍaranti vuttam, ko pana vādo kusalanti adhippāyo. Tañhi paṇḍaratā nikkhantam sayaṅca paṇḍaranti”. Secondly, the Mūlaṭhikā brings out its own opinion as ‘all kinds of citta are clean from the point of their intrinsic nature’. The statement in the Mūlaṭhikā goes as “sabbampi cittaṃ sabhāvato paṇḍarameva, āgantukopakkilesavodānehi pana sāvajānavajjānaṃ upakkiliṭṭhavisuddhataratā hontiti”.

4. Conclusion

Herein, it is intended to recapitulate the result of this survey. Among the collated editions of the Mūlaṭhikā, the Sinhalese tradition seems to be less reliable than the other four traditions, though the Sinhalese edition might have helped in guiding the other editions which were edited later.

106 Dhs-a p. 140: “Tamevaparisuddhatthena paṇḍaranti. Bhavangam sandhāyetam vuttam ... Tato nikkhantātā pana akusalampi (mind also is said to be ‘clean’ in the sense of ‘exceedingly pure’, with reference to the life-continuum...though akusala, it is called ‘clean’ because it issues from the life-continuum – Exp p. 185)”.
The internal evidence from the *Dhammasāṅgaṇī-Mūlaṭīkā* as well as the evidences from the chronological Pāli literature closely establish the fact that the author of the *Mūlaṭīkā* is Bhadantācariya Ānanda. However, there is no consensus about the date of Bhadantācariya Ānanda. On all the evidences available, Bhadantācariya Ānanda could be reasonably placed at the end of the Anuradhapura period (10th century A.D).\(^{107}\)

The *Mūlaṭīkā* is the commentary on the *Atthasālinī*\(^{108}\), and also has two kinds of sub-commentaries which throw much light on this *Mūlaṭīkā*. These sub-commentaries are:

i) The *Anuṭīkā* written by venerable Dhammapāla who is a senior pupil of Bhadantācariya Ānanda;

ii) The *Madhuṭīkā* composed by venerable Mahānanda.\(^{109}\)

The *Mūlaṭīkā* contains invaluable materials culled from the Buddhist canonical literature as well as from the numerous earlier sources which are not available at present. It presents the traditional interpretations of the Buddha's teachings in different dimensions. Thence, the *Mūlaṭīkā* is quoted by many other sub-commentators, especially by venerable Dhammapāla\(^{110}\) who is a pupil of Bhadantācariya Ānanda,\(^{111}\) though some sub-commentaries,\(^{112}\) sometimes, dispute the

---

\(^{107}\) The Anuradhapura period of Ceylon is from 463 B.C to 1055 A.D.

\(^{108}\) The *Atthasālinī* is probably the work of a close associate of Buddhaghosa rather than of Buddhaghosa himself. However, this possibility is not yet definitely established.

\(^{109}\) Venerable Mahānanda lived during the Hansāvadi period (17th century A.D.) in Myanmar.

\(^{110}\) Gv p. 60, JPTS, 1886: "Dhammapāḷaciḍiyavīrtiṭṭhakaṭṭhā, itivuttakakāṭṭhakaṭṭhā, udānaṭṭhakaṭṭhā, cariyāpiṭakaṭṭhakaṭṭhā, therakāṭṭhakaṭṭhā, therīkāṭṭhakaṭṭhā, vimāṇavatthussa vimalavilāsini nāma aṭṭhakathā, petavatthussa vimalavilāsini nāma aṭṭhakathā, visuddhimagassa paramathamaṭṭhānā nāma iṭkā, dighakāṣāya aṭṭhakathādinām catunnaṃ aṭṭhakathānaṃ linathapakkāsani nāma iṭkā, jātakaṭṭhakathāya linathhappakkāsani nāma iṭkā, nettipakaraṇaṭṭhakathāya iṭkā, buddhavamsaṭṭhakathāya paramathadhāpāni nāma iṭkā, abhidhammatthakathāyaṭṭhā iṭkā, linathavamsanānā nāma anuṭīkāti ime cuddasa mate gane akāsi.”

\(^{111}\) For example, the statement “Atthi hi eso pariyaṭṭhāya aṭṭhūyadībhūyati tānī ce kaṭāci vaṇṇavasena abhūtāni honti suvanṇadubbhaṇṇāni aṭṭhūyadībhūyati” occurs in the Dhs-mt (Ve) p. 101; AN-t (Ve) II p. 229; MN-t II p. 207.

\(^{112}\) The *Mūlaṭīkā*’s opinion is disputed by the *Visuddhimagga-mahāṭīkā*, *Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha-vibhāvinīṭīkā*, *Paramatthadhāpāni* etc.
Mūlaṭīkā’s opinion. Therefore, the Mūlaṭīkā is vital for any research on the Theravāda as well as other schools.

However, during the course of this research on the Dhammasaṅgaṇī-Mūlaṭīkā, some problematic issues came into light. This introduction would be concluded with a brief account of some of the problematic issues embodied in this Mūlaṭīkā as follows:

1) This Mūlaṭīkā states five kinds of questions depicted in the Mahāniddesa\textsuperscript{113}.

   However, the Mahāniddesa and the Cūlaniddesa enumerate only three kinds of questions, that is, adīṭṭhajotanāpucchā (question to show something not seen before), diṭṭhasaṃsandanāpucchā (question to discuss what is already seen), vīmativicchedanāpucchā (question to clear up doubts). Even though the Mahāniddesa-atthakathā comments that “Tattha katameti kathetukamyatdpucchā, pañcavidhā hi pucchā, tāsaṁ vibhāgo upari pāliyamyeva āvi bhavissati (Out of those sentences “katame vatthukāmā” etc., the sentence katame etc., is a question originating from a wish to explain. Indeed, there are five kinds of questions, their classification would become clear later in the Pāli itself (that is, in the text of Mahāniddesa itself)”\textsuperscript{114}, the questions which belong to the Buddha, that is, anumatipucchā (question to discover opinion) and kathetukamyatāpucchā (question to explain) cannot be found even in the entire Tipiṭaka. However, in the Atthakathās and the Ṭikās, the five kinds of questions are mentioned. Therefore, the following two kinds of tentative answers can be suggested as follows:

   i) The two kinds of questions of the Buddha might have been added by the commentator.

   ii) The present Mahāniddesa edition is different from the Mahāniddesa edition which had been consulted by the author of the Mūlaṭīkā.

2) In this Mūlaṭīkā sentence (p. 50) “Kammanibbattato liṅgato pavattamāna-liṅgasañṇā mūlakāraṇato kammato āsannakāraṇato liṅgato ca pavattā hoti”, the

\textsuperscript{113} Dhs-mt (Ve) p. 55: “Pañcavidhā hiti mahāniddese āgatā pucchā dasseti”

\textsuperscript{114} Mnd-a 1 p. 12.
word ‘hoti’ should be read as ‘honti’ which is a plural form of the verb ‘hoti’, because the words ‘pavattā hoti’ is the definition of the words “kammato liṅgato ceva, liṅgasaṅñā pavattare (from kamma and feature, feature and perceptions come)” in the Atthisālīni. It is also because the Atthisālīni word ‘pavattare’ is the present reflective of the 3rd person plural form of the word ‘pavattati’.

3) In this Mūlaṭikā sentence (p. 74) “Yathā hi pāṇiyā pāṇimhi saṅghattanam ... (just as the impinging of one hand on another hand)”, the word ‘pāṇi’ represents the masculine gender. Thus, the word ‘pāṇiyā’ which denotes the feminine gender and the genitive singular seems to be changed as ‘pāṇino’ or ‘pāṇissa’ which denotes the masculine gender and the genitive singular case.

4) In this Mūlaṭikā sentence p. (75) “Dīgumussāḥati na digunam vīriyayogam sandhāya vuttam, attano eva pana byāpārakiccassa mahantabhāvam dīpeti, the word ‘dīpeti’ does not look proper in comparison with the traditional Pāli idiomatic usage.

5) In this Mūlaṭikā sentence (p. 111) “svāyamattho...ajjhāsayamattena asijjhano...” (this meaning which is not accomplished/asijjhāna by mere inclination...), it is better to be read the word ‘asijjhāna’ as ‘asijjhano’, because the word ‘asijjhāna’ is used as an adjective of the word ‘svāyamattho’ which is in the nominative case of the masculine gender.

---

115 Dhs-a p. 66. Also see Ab-ṭ II p. 545. Cf. Pe Maung Tin, Exp, p. 88.
116 See Prs (Mya) p. 68.
117 See Ab-ṭ II p. 640.