

UNESCO COLLECTION OF REPRESENTATIVE WORKS

This Buddhist text has been accepted in the series of translations from the literature of Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, India, Laos, and Thailand, jointly sponsored by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), and the National Commissions for Unesco in these countries.

# THE PITAKA-DISCLOSURE (PETAKOPADESA)

According to

KACCĀNA THERA

Translated from the Pali by

BHĪKKHU ÑĀNAMOLI

London :

Published for the

PALI TEXT SOCIETY

by

LUZAC & COMPANY, LIMITED

46 Great Russell Street, London, W.C.1

1964

GENERAL CONTENTS

	PAGE
<b>K</b> OUTORIAL NOTE . . . . .	vii
<b>T</b> RANSLATOR'S INTRODUCTION . . . . .	xi
<b>L</b> IST OF ABBREVIATIONS . . . . .	xxxiii
<b>T</b> HINGS USED . . . . .	xxxiv
<b>D</b> ETAILED CONTENTS OF THE PITAKA-DISCLOSURE . . . . .	xxxv

THE PITAKA-DISCLOSURE

<b>C</b> HAPTER			
I.	The Display of the Noble Truths . . . . .	1	
II.	The Pattern of the Dispensation . . . . .	27	
III.	Terms of Expression in the Thread . . . . .	77	
IV.	Investigation of Threads . . . . .	95	
V.	16 Modes of Conveying in Separate Treatment . . . . .	105	
VI.	Compendium of the Thread's Meaning . . . . .	155	
VII.	16 Modes of Conveying in Combined Treatment . . . . .	210	
VIII.	The Moulding of the Guide-Lines (see § 1 to § 1041) . . . . .	328	

INDEXES

General Index . . . . .	351
List of Similes . . . . .	380
List of Quotations . . . . .	381
Glossary . . . . .	386

APPENDIX : Quotations from and references to the <i>Petaḷako-</i> <i>padesa</i> in the Pali Commentaries . . . . .	399
---	-----

*All rights reserved.*

## EDITORIAL NOTE

Before he died, in March, 1960, Nāṇamoli Bhikkhu<sup>1</sup> had finished, for the Pali Text Society, his translation of the *Nettipakarana* and had sent his typescript to me including the Introduction, the notes, the four Indexes, and the Appendix. So, there to be printed and published, was a whole book, provided, too, with the complete critical apparatus the translator had designed and executed for it. It was published as *The Guide*, PFS Translation Series, No. 33, in 1962. The translation of the *Petakopadesa* has not been so fortunate in all these respects. It was while he was working on the *Netti* that, feeling he had constantly to refer to *Pe*, the Bhikkhu Nāṇamoli devoted to translate this work also. His typescript, which forms the present volume, was sent to me from the Island Hermitage at Dalandawa in Ceylon after his death in accordance with written instructions he had left there and in accordance with the assurances he had made to me from time to time that this book also was intended for publication by the Pali Text Society—a project it is proud to undertake.

When I received this typescript I found he had finalized the translation itself no less than all the notes except for filling in some two dozen references.<sup>2</sup> I have been able to supply most of these, though a few still escape me, such as the exact reference to *D*. ii in § 232, references in §§ 370, 430, and 535, and a reference in note 602/1.

Naturally it was a very great thing to have the main body of the work and all the notes in their finished form, also to find that the List of Similes, the List of Quotations, and the Appendix were ready for printing. There was moreover hand-written material for ten Sections of the Introduction. Of these all but three had been carefully revised. These three exceptions are Sections III, IX, and XI. Section III, *Mistakes in the Texts*, had a note attached to it calling it “uncorrected draft” but, ignoring too a further note which said it needed “heavily and drastically cutting down”, I have presented it below more or less as I found it. It seemed

<sup>1</sup> He was an Englishman who was ordained into the Saṃgha in Ceylon in 1948 and lived at the Island Hermitage from then till he died.

<sup>2</sup> See my remarks there on p. lxiii.

<sup>3</sup> These are not the Untraced References spoken of in Section VIII of the Introduction to this book and listed on pp. 384—5.

unwise to tamper with it. I have also kept the numbering of the sub-headings as I found it though it tallies with neither of the lists of corruptions the translator had drawn up; both of these lists now appear in this Section.

For Section IX there were rough notes only, written on scraps of paper. Practically all of these notes now appear in this Section for the sake of their intrinsic interest and for the method they indicate, even in their incomplete state, for intelligent textual criticism. Whether, under the heading *Non-Pāli spellings and forms* the Bhikkhu Nānamoli would have arranged the entries alphabetically had he lived I have no means of telling. I have ventured to make no alterations as I know he disliked them.

It is a matter for great regret that there seemed to be no material at all for Section XI (General) which, judging by a list he had made of the Sections for the Introduction, he had planned to write. Perhaps the notes I have included at the end of Section IX really belong to what would have been Section XI; they were not marked in any way. But if they were meant in fact for Section XI then they provide some indication of points that might have been considered there in detail.

The Introduction therefore was not in a completely finished form. Nevertheless, the translator had to a large and valuable extent written about *Pe* in his Introduction to *The Guide*, a brilliant examination of various of its problems which most certainly should be consulted. Yet, unfinished though it may be, the Introduction to the *Pāṭika-Disclosure* still offers the student of the archaic *Pāṭikopadesa* a sound basis for some rational comprehension of why the work was composed and what, in its capacity as "guide" and "disclosure", it endeavoured to clarify and lay down; at the same time it refers to many topics of importance and interest that are further discussed in the abundant notes. These would also be of inestimable value to anyone who at any time were to try to reconstitute this very corrupt but rewarding text.

On the other hand, material for both the General Index and the Glossary was totally lacking. That the translator had certainly regarded them as necessary is evident from his type-written page listing the General Contents of the *Pāṭika-Disclosure*. In the event, I regarded the making of the General Index and the Glossary as my responsibility. In compiling the former I sought to follow the General Index to *The Guide* as faithfully as possible. The two books

is, if not exactly a pair, then readily comparable. Perhaps in order to emphasize or demonstrate this, the Bhikkhu Nānamoli rendered the same Pāli words by the same English words throughout both of his volumes. Their substance and their subject-matter covers a wide field of closely packed technical terms, each one of which warranted an entry in the Index.

Now that these two works have been translated with such great thought, the interpretations they put on the many verse and prose passages they adduce stand out with a clarity illuminating not only their meaning of these passages themselves but, through them, in any another context, ideally the whole Pāli Canon, as well.

I. B. HORNER.

London, 1962.

## TRANSLATOR'S INTRODUCTION

### 1. *The Pīṭaka-Disclosure*

The *Petākopadesa* (translated "Pīṭaka-Disclosure") and the *Nettipakaraṇa* (translated "The Guide")<sup>4</sup> set forth a method, the same in both cases, for composing commentaries on the Buddha's utterance as recorded in the Suttas. It has been established (in the Introduction to the translation of the *Nettipakaraṇa*) that *Petākopadesa* is the older prototype of the other work and not, as had been supposed, its continuation.

The later *Netti*, with its more polished and economical presentation of the method, its text later rectified and fixed by Ācariya Dhammapala in the 6th Century A.C., with its commentary by him and its 15th (?) Century *Tīkā*, quite eclipsed the older work. It would seem, in fact, that only veneration for the illustrious name connected with both books by tradition saved the *Pe* from the fate that overtook Upatissa Thera's *Vimuttimaggā*, superseded by Buddhaghosa Thera's *Visuddhimagga*, the older work being eventually lost in Pali and existing today only in Chinese versions.<sup>5</sup> There are still those who teach the *Method* using the *Netti* and its commentaries; but the *Pe* has remained through the centuries, and remains, in complete neglect, copied from time to time, but unread and uncorrected (till this century when a Burmese Thera compiled a commentary on it). Its very old unedited material has been kept frozen with all the mistakes of a single ancient MS.

The earliest extant treatise in Pali on how to make commentaries is unrevised by Ācariya Buddhaghosa or any of his successors. It belongs to a period long before him, being composed presumably in India quite probably before the 1st Century B.C.

(The name<sup>6</sup> *Petākopadesa* presupposes a *pīṭaka* of which this is the *upadesa*. The word *pīṭaka* in the metaphorical sense of a "basket of scripture" appears in a single phrase repeated in

4 Translated by Nāṇamoli Bhikkhu and published as *The Guide* in *PTS*. Translation Series, No. 33, 1962 (I.B.H.).

5 Since Nāṇamoli Bhikkhu wrote this Introduction two events have occurred connected with *Vimuttimaggā*: (1) the first translation into English has been made under the title *The Path of Freedom*, translated from the Chinese by the Rev. N. R. M. Ehara, Soma Thera, and Kheminda Thera, Colombo, 1961; (2) a palm-leaf MS. of the work written in Sinhalese characters has been found in Ceylon (I.B.H.).

6 (Among the many notes for this Introduction left by the late Bhikkhu Nāṇamoli I found one which I decided to insert here. It is enclosed by brackets. I.B.H.)

various Suttas (e.g. *A. ii. 191*; *M. i. 520*) but is not applied to the Buddha's Utterance in the Suttas. The word *peṭakān* appears in an inscription at Sāñcī (2nd or 1st Century B.C.) in the sense of "one who knows the Piṭaka(s)". The words *Tiṭṭaka* and *Peṭakattaya* are found in Pali only in the Commentaries of Ācariya Buddhaghosa and his followers. Since the Sāñcī inscription uses the word *peṭakān*, the *Peṭakopadesa* could, on that count, be as early as the 2nd Century B.C. or even perhaps a little earlier. For the history of Pali literature and exegesis this rather dry work is thus a valuable and indeed unique document. In its rather copious exemplifying material it represents the oldest layer of exegetical thought in the Theravāda outside the actual Canon (excluding perhaps the *Mūlindapañhā*), a layer considerably older than that represented even by the *Netti* (itself prior to the main Pali commentaries).

What has been established in some detail elsewhere (see Introduction to *The Guide*) need only be summarized here. The *Netti* is a "revised and improved" version of the older *Pe*. Though dates are quite uncertain, the *Pe*'s mnemonic verses (the *Netti* has none) suggest a period when the oral transmission of books was still in full vogue (in Ceylon the *Tiṭṭaka* was committed to writing in the 1st Century B.C.). The marked difference in style between the two works suggests separation by a considerable distance in time or place or both. Both works set forth the same method. Its object is to set up scaffolding for building commentarial edifices. Ancient tradition attributes this method to the Buddha's disciple Mahākaccāna Thera, an attribution which modern European scholarship rejects. There is nothing whatever to indicate who were the compilers of the two works which present the method and exemplify it. The *Pe* itself, however, claims that the name of its author or originator is Kaccāyanagotta (§ 8) or Mahākaccāyana (terminals of Chs. I, III-V, VII, VIII, and conclusion). It is suggested in two different ways that he was personally known to and approved by the Buddha (terminals of Chs. I, VI); he is called Jambuvanavāsī (terminals of Ch. III, and the conclusion)<sup>7</sup> and Suttavebhangī (terminal of Ch. VIII).

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Jambou/Jambudīpa and Vanavāsī/Vanavāsa an ancient town on the coast of N. Kanara halfway up the Malabar coast (Lamotte, pp. 327-8). Any connexion? (I do not know whether Nanamōji Bhikkhu intended the last two sentences above, beginning with "The *Pe* itself", to go into his Introduction; they were on a loose piece of paper. The note about Jambou/Jambudīpa etc. given here is his, I.B.H.)

### II. Texts

The *Pe* has been printed three times in Pali, twice in Burmese script, and once in Roman script by the Pali Text Society. A third Burmese script edition can be reckoned if the Modern Commentary is also counted as one. There is no printed edition in Sinhalese script. All these editions are found, on examination, to be full of mistakes, some very gross, a great proportion of which are common to all editions. The 1949 *PTS* edition (though with some minor mistakes of its own) is the most useful as a document since it exhibits well, with a generous mass of variant readings, the general state of the MSS. and how they fall into two main groups, with none able to correct the huge number of errors common to all. Its four MSS., one in Sinhalese script (on paper and consequently modern) and three Burmese, are referred to respectively as *S*, *B*<sub>1</sub>, *B*<sub>2</sub>, and *B*<sub>3</sub>. The latter two, which closely agree, furnish its basic text. Against them an enormous number of variants are provided by *S*. and *B*<sub>1</sub>, largely in agreement together. Thus two, and only two, distinct sets of MSS. are shown by the *PTS* edition. Also in virtually every instance where *S*. and *B*<sub>1</sub> differ from *B*<sub>2</sub> and *B*<sub>3</sub> their version is worse and often consists not only of words wrong in context but often of meaningless jumbles of syllables. All this simply indicates that all four MSS. stem originally from a single (presumably rather dilapidated) ancient MS. containing the mistakes common to all, from which have descended one set of "good" copies represented by *B*<sub>2</sub> and *B*<sub>3</sub>, and another set based on a bad copy of the same single original or its offspring, represented by *S*. and *B*<sub>1</sub>. The first set can be called Type I and the second Type II. A supposed original MS. may have been imported into Burma (Thahton?) from Ceylon or S. India at an early date, all other Indian and Sinhalese MSS. having been subsequently destroyed by time and neglect, without offspring.

The first Burmese printed edition (1917) gives a text, without alternative readings, which is very close to the *PTS* edition as based on *B*<sub>2</sub> and *B*<sub>3</sub>. It shows only a few quite minor variants and so belongs to Type I. But its consistent concurrence with the *PTS*. basic text in all major mistakes is not unimportant in view of the independence of its MS. sources.

The text as accepted and presented by the modern commentary (1926) is virtually that of the first Burmese edition. The presence of many mistakes in the texts is noted by it and a large number of

emendations are put forward by the commentator, using his own good judgment. So here is a further text of Type I with modern revisions.

The second Burmese printed edition (1956) is also a text of Type I. It presents a few differences from the *PTS*, basic text and first Burmese edition, and it also gives a meagre number of variant readings in footnotes. These (too few to form a picture) are shown as from the following sources: "ka" ( " various Burmese books "); "I" ( " English book "; i.e. *PTS*, edn., and not, it seems, without an occasional mistake in citation, see, e.g. n. 399/1), "S" ( " Sinhalese book "; strangely only two such references cited on pp. 176 and 179; since there is no printed Sinhalese edn. and since even modern Sinhalese MSS. are very rare indeed it would have been interesting to know more about this), and "kām" (= " Cambodian book "; cited only once on p. 210, see Transh. n. 201/2). Given the decision to include variant readings, the extremely small number chosen seems very inadequate in view of the state of the texts as observed by the commentator. Some of the commentator's good emendations (see, e.g. n. 615/1) are ignored by the editors of this second Burmese edition. Again, on comparison with the first Burmese and the *PTS*, editions, a certain number of instances are found in it where quotations traced to Sutta texts have been corrected to agree with the Piṭaka version (e.g. § 194). It would have been helpful here to know if these corrections were based on any MS. authority or were made on the editors' judgment alone, but in the absence of any footnote to such effect the reader is left to form his own opinion as best he can. It would also have been helpful to know if other instances where this text differs (sometimes helpfully, sometimes not) from the *PTS*, and the first Burmese editions and the Commentary are based on MSS. authority; but in most cases there is no note.

Besides the three printed editions, the translator was also able to have access to a Sinhalese palm-leaf MS. It was examined only in regard to certain major corruptions common to all editions and given a very general survey. This clearly established that it belonged to Type II with some additional errors of its own of a minor nature (see nn. 4/1, 4/3, 18/1, 19/1, 52/1, 619/1, 1002/3, 1027/1, 1027/2).

In general, texts of Type II can be disregarded altogether since their contribution consists almost invariably in adding the con-

tion of absolute nonsense to the garblings consistent in all Type I texts. Their interest lies in the fact that they confirm all the major mistakes in those of Type I. Consequently no use could be made of variants provided by Type II texts. Of the variants to the *PTS*, which provided by Type I texts, only those which were helpful have been used in the translation and its notes, though in some doubtful passages all readings have been given when they differed. The translator's attempts at a restoration of the text will be discussed below.

### III. Mistakes in the Texts

When the best is made of Type I texts as they stand they present a rather fantastic number of errors. Seeing how gross and frequent they are, it is remarkable that the sense can be made to emerge quite satisfactorily, and, with the exception of the lost end of Ch. VI, there is nothing really insoluble in it. Some general discussion of these mistakes is necessary in justification of the translation and the restorations suggested. They fall roughly under the following heads:—

1. Wrong word-division
2. Wrong punctuation
3. Wrong syllables and groups of syllables
4. Insertion of syllables
5. Wrong repetition of phrases
6. Omission of syllables
7. Omission of words or phrases
8. Inversion of phrases
9. Substitution of words
10. Forward and backward displacement of a sentence
11. Rearrangement of Schedules irrespective of detail that follows
12. Displacement of a palm-leaf
13. Reversal of a palm-leaf
14. Loss of a palm-leaf
15. Intrusion of an extraneous palm-leaf

Some of them need discussion but others will be obvious from the respective notes referred to. The amount of corruption varies greatly in different parts of the book. *PTS*, pp. 1-5, 6-28, 112-139, and Ch. VIII are reasonably free from it but, for instance, pp. 29-42 and Chs. III, V, and p. 146 to the end of Ch. VI and most of Ch. VII are full of corruptions.

(The Bhikkhu Nāpamoli had drafted another list of headings of *Varieties of Corruption*. It is as follows) :

1. Discrepant versions, § 491, 518 : Silamūlaka (p. 44/88)
2. Corruption of letters, § 246 *paññ-* for *pañc-*
3. Corruption of words, §§ 302, 305
4. Substitution of words, §§ 13, 246, 305, 676
5. Insertion of letters, § 829 vi(c)riyam
6. Inversion of words or phrases, § 305 (*na hāpeti . . .*)
7. Omission of words, §§ 324, 363 (*sattindriyāṇaṃ*)
8. Omission of phrases, §§ 194, 323, 514, 591-3
9. Mispunctuation, § 281 ff.
10. Exchange of blocks (reversal of ola-leaf), Ch. VII, §§ 374-9, 380-4
11. Intrusion of extraneous ola-leaf, Ch. VII
12. Loss of ola-leaves, Chs. VI-VII
13. Displacement of ola-leaves, Ch. VI
14. Insertion of reduplications, §§ 91, 485
15. Muddle of mātikās, §§ 21, 194
16. Mistaken attempts at improvement. All *PTS*'s, *S*., and *B*<sub>1</sub>

(Nāpamoli Bhikkhu's notes then proceed as follows) : *N.B.*—The modern Sinhalese alphabet does not go back beyond the 9th Century or so and before that was a form of brahmi. Similar considerations apply to the modern Burmese alphabet. Consequently early copyists' mistakes of the kind consisting in misreading a letter will not follow the same lines as the familiar modern Sinhalese or Burmese mistakes of this sort.

1. *Wrong Syllables and Words.* (§ 164) *Balavaṇi bālopanamasuttam* *yaṃ āsāye vā vedanāyaṃ kammaṇ gāhati taḥā ce pi yaṃ yaṃ pāpakammaṇaṃ anubhoti . . . bhāvitaṅgo bhāvitaṅgo bhāvitaṅgo Mahānāmo aparittacetaso* (*PTS*, *B*<sub>1</sub>, *B*<sub>2</sub> all agree to the letter). The passage as it stands suggests something on the following lines : "The strong child (fool) simile (or § 193 'the salt-barb simile') or the action which is to be felt through need even if one experiences any evil action . . . Mahānāma had kept cognizance in being, kept the body in being, kept understanding in being with not little heart" — which is rather nonsense and not at all what the author meant. On the strength of the word Mahānāmo, the Commentary has identified this passage with a Sutta at *S*. v, 408-10, where the name Mahānāma appears, and attempts to explain the words *balavaṇi bālopanamasuttam* ("a strong fool-simile sutta" — sic) by that

**Sutta** But in the mnemonic in § 193 this quotation is represented by the words *atha lopasallopamaṃ*. Now the words in the quotation in § 164, *bhāvitaṅgo bhāvitaṅgo bhāvitaṅgo bhāvitaṅgo* with *aparittacetaso*, suggest instead the Sutta at *A*. i, 249, lines 30-31, on *pāpakamma* (line 18 and 21). That this Sutta is meant is shown by the simile of the *loṇaphala* (*N.B.*—*loṇasalla opamaṃ*, the salt-barb simile, in § 193) and so *balavaṇi bālopanamaṃ* can be corrected to *loṇaphaloṇamaṃ* (the salt-grain simile). The misleading word Mahānāma (proper name) then turns out to be a corruption of *mahattā* at *A*. i, 249, line 31. With this there is no doubt that the amended version must read : *Loṇaphalopanasuttam* : *yaḥā yaḥā vedanāyaṃ kammaṇ karoti taḥā taḥā vedanāyaṃ vāpākamaṇ anubhoti . . . bhāvitaṅgo bhāvitaṅgo bhāvitaṅgo bhāvitaṅgo mahattā aparittacetaso*. While the identification is thus unmistakable, once made, this is a rewritten version of the Sutta, not a proper quotation. The instance is a good one since the garblings in it are identical in all printed editions (even the MSS. of Type II only disagree on the first two words : *PTS*. and *S*. *lavakam bālosamaṃ* and *Ba*. *lavamaṃ sallosamaṃ*) ; once identified it is easily corrected, and it shows the extent of the corrections needed on occasion, and how the Type II MSS. agree on the discordant chaotic alternatives they offer.

Another, on which all editions agree in the main, remains a puzzle. In § 156 occur the words *Nandiko* (so *PTS*. and *Ba*. ; *Bb*. *nandāgo*) *Sukko isuttaparikkāmakarakkhe suttam* (Type II MSS. have : *PTS*'s *S*. *parikkā ca eka-* and *Ba*. *parikkāya ca eka-*). *Bb*. has *ruttha* for *-vutta*. See n. 156/2. The identification with the Nandiya Sutta at *A*. v, 334 f. does not solve all these difficulties. Commentary explains as follows : (see *Cy.* on *PTS*., p. 45, line 8). The passage at *PTS*., p. 87, lines 20-1 (= *Ba*.) *Yo tu na c' eva te apparisam uggarāṇi* is corrected in *Bb*. to the version at *A*. without reference to *Ba*. or *PTS*.

For other like instances see nn. 192/2, etc.

Of mistakes of this type belonging to the presumed single original MS. from which all the extant MSS. must have descended, some may have been in the original MS., presuming it to have been a Sinhalese one taken to Burma, and the rest will have arisen in the transcribing of it into Burmese script by a copyist.

A classification of these correctible mistakes of this nature does not seem to show any particular tendency. For instance, in modern Sinhalese script (as used on palm-leaf MSS.) the following confusions



are common : na/ta, ca/va, ce/d, bb/b, and less easy g/bh, s/p, while in modern Burmese script v/g/p, t/bh/s, dhu/ra are the easiest. That the more unfamiliar the subject-matter the more likely are mistakes is well instanced in this work. But, before trying to apply this method, it has to be admitted that the assumed prototype MS. may well have been written in Ceylon and then transcribed in Burma before the appearance of the modern Burmese and Sinhalese scripts. Both are ultimately derived from a form of the Indian Brahmi script, the Ceylon form of which was in use in the Island, apparently, till about the 7th Century A.C., when transition to the modern ("sounded") alphabet began to take place. The modern alphabet, with some differences, began by about the 13th Century A.C. The modern Burmese script probably does not go back, in its present form, beyond the time of King Anawrahta (11th Century). The (Ceylon MS. might have been first transcribed in Thaton before its conquest or in Upper Burma after that. The question thus of the scripts in which these "original" mistakes of syllables and words took place looks as if it must remain undecided. They can only be rectified by whatever means is to hand ; by identified quotation or allusion or by cross-reference to another part of the work when recognized, or by the needs of the context judged according to the general trends of the *Pe* itself and of the Suttas as a whole.

2. *Omission of a Word, Sentence or Clause.* There is the omission in all editions (not checked in *Sa.*) of the clause No. 13, Injunction and Means, in both the Schedule (§ 72) and the detail (§ 155). That this is an omission is shown by the quotation from the *Pe* at *Nettā* p. 42 where it is included but only the verse-quotation given (see n. 155/4 and Appx. No. I, end). (*cutto ti* for *cuttopapattī ti*, § 283, cf. p. 6).

The words missing in § 194 alike in both *PTS.* and *Ba.* are replaced in *Bb.* (whether on the authority of a MS. or by the editor's judgment is not shown). That the version in *Bb.* is right is shown by the detail that follows this Schedule.

There are other similar instances in §§ 514, 538, 591, etc;

3. *Wrong repetitions of a line or half-line* occur in several instances. The worst instance is in § 91 which contains two long ones (see n. 91 1). All editions agree to the letter, only *PTS.*'s Type II MSS. adding some confusion of their own, and a single instance of a variant in its Type I *Bb.* (*PTS.*, p. 31, n. 8). This is rectifiable by a

study of the subject-matter's pattern (by making up a table) and excising the repeated matter (as shown in n. 91/1). That the paragraph makes perfect sense after the excision of the repetitions (obvious enough once detected) without any adjustment is clear justification for this correction. Another (corrected by Commentary) appears in § 955 where the words *te akatasattā lokā māgha remattatāya pāṇḍitā. Kāṭamo parikkhāro* from §§ 958-9 are wrongly repeated.

4. *Rearrangement of a Schedule* with consequent disruption of reference to the detail that follows occurs in § 21. This has a curious feature in that it substitutes for a system of 6 dyad and 4 triad combinations another, superficially rather similar, of 12 pairwise combinations. All editions agree (with only one discordant note from *PTS.*'s Type II MS. *S.*). The restoration is easy from the heads of the detail that follows on *PTS.*, pp. 13-19 (§§ 49-58).

5. *Forward or backward displacement of a sentence or phrase.* There are several of these. Two occur in §§ 815-817. In another, between §§ 891 and 892 the words *Imāni cattāri saccāni* appear displaced five lines up in all editions, corrected by Commentary. A bigger instance occurs on *PTS.*, p. 196, where the contents of §§ 801 and 802 have changed places. All editions agree. That this is a mistake is plain from the continuity of the sense.

6. *Displacement of a palm-leaf.* One of these occurs at the end of Ch. VII. It is a double one. First, the two final examples are interchanged, and then part of the first is displaced into the second. See §§ 985, 994, 1027. All editions agree ; only Commentary corrects. Another is the displacement of the end of Ch. VI backwards to the middle of it, see §§ 569-72, and n. 619/1. Some further displacements in some MSS. only are noted on *PTS.*, pp. 137-42 and 188-93, which corrects them.

7. *Intrusion of a palm-leaf from another MS.* A palm-leaf from a *Samangalavāsini* MS. intrudes into the middle of § 1002 (see n. 1002/3) ; all editions agree and *Cy.* accepts. The obviousness of the intrusion, once it is noticed and traced, the fact that when it is excised the two ends put together make, with a minor adjustment, the good sense required, and that this agrees with the version of this treatment appearing in the *Nettā*, remove all possible doubt here. This is the only such intrusion.

8. *Loss of palm-leaves.* This must have occurred at the end of Ch. VI and with the opening phrase of Ch. VII as indicated in

nn. 619/1 and 620/1. Lastly, there is the absurd mistake, which all editions insist on presenting, in the name of Ch. VIII; see n. 1041/1. This must have arisen quite recently since initial titles and page-headings are a European conceit.

#### IV. Restorations

The modern Commentary, alive and how could it not be—to the corruptness of the text, observes as follows (p. 353 in relation to the middle at the end of Ch. VII): *Tattha yaṃ yaṃ vattabbam atthi / suttam pi atthi kamokkamanā / suttam pi atthi sankarāṃ / padam pi atthi kamokkamanā / padam pi atthi sankarāṃ / suttatthe pi atthe kamokkamo / suttattho pi atthi sankaro / Hārasampāto pi atthi kamokkamo / hārasampāto pi atthi sankaro / evaṃ tam tam vattabban tena tena hārasampātalaḥkhanena vicinivā vicinivā asankarāṃ vejjātan supariuddhalhāne yutte yeva hi sati yuttatthāne nikkhepiya ṭhapayessāma / suttam pi suttattham pi hārasampātāṃ pi yathāsānapaṭṭhāne tathā āgatanayānukkamena vaṇṇāyissāma // na hi agatigamanāṃ ariyehi gandhabban dhammāṃ saṃvaṇṇāntena nāma ṭṭhāseṇa bhavitabban ti manasikatavā dhammāṃ yeva garuṇ katvā // kema kāraṇena? // Yena hi ekena pi akkhareṇa padena pi dhamnikkhitto attho pi dunnayo hoti duggahito / ten' assa sāsanaṃ cātaraḍdhānāya saṃvattati (see A. ii, 147) // yenaṃpi ekenakkharenāpi sunikkhito attho pi sunayo hoti sugahito ten' assa sāsanaṃ anantara-dhānāya saṃvattati //*

It is with these sentiments in mind that the translator has attempted restorations of the text in the notes to this translation beyond what the Commentary suggests. For this a few useful minor corrections are furnished by *Bb.* but they are only a drop in the ocean. The Commentary, however, is, in general, and in spite of its rather opulent length and wordiness, greatly helpful to an extent to which the notes to this translation do not do justice. Constantly it keeps coming to the rescue with ingenuity and judgment on numberless occasions. Only in certain instances its explanations seemed unacceptable, as for example in § 164 where, misled by the corruptions, “*balavaṃ bālopamaṃ*” and “*Malānāma*”, to a wrong identification of a Sutta, it has explained accordingly (see p. xvi above); or in the case of the confusion at the end of Ch. VI, where it constitutes an extra chapter called “*Pakīpaka*” (see § 619) between Chs. VI and VII, and treats the material of §§ 619-620 as a single sentence (as shown in all edms.), whereas this is where the

break between the material of Ch. VI and that of Ch. VII comes. Its explanation of *kāramahattā*, see n. 409/2, seems rather out of keeping with this early work and there is no reason to accept, as it does, this strange reading. Sometimes it seems to overlook the considerations of context, as in its acceptance of and comment on the phrase *Mahāvibhaṅgo acivatapānādo*, see n. 192/2. Other instances where it was necessary to differ from it are mentioned in the notes. This apart, however, the translator would pay a willing tribute to the careful and helpful work of a greatly respected Burmese scholar.

In making the restorations in the notes the translator has used all available aids. Where quotations from the Suttas are concerned and these can be traced, restoration is made easy. But at the same time it seemed not always justifiable simply to replace the Pīṭaka version for the garbled one without careful consideration. For instance, in the case of §§ 43 and 304, a circumspect treatment of the quotation produces a version that is free from corruptions but differs quite a little from the Pīṭaka version; and such may indeed have been the version used by the compiler who had a variant before him or in his memory. Such as these therefore have been left in a state restored to good grammar and sense but not (as in *Bb.*) replaced outright by the Pīṭaka version as we have it now (correct and better though that may be).

Displacements of sentences and paragraphs and whole sections (see above, p. xix) can be rectified by simple considerations of the flow of the sense.

Some corrupt passages can be found to be doubled elsewhere in an ungarbled form (e.g. §§ 91, 485), in which case a restoration is not difficult, it being not hard to judge the better version. And likewise the “*Schedules*” and the mnemonic verses against their detail help to correct each other.

Other corrupt passages have to be judged on their merits in the contexts in which they appear and a restoration can often be attempted after consideration of what meaning the whole context, immediate and distant, requires that the corrupt passage embedded in it should have.

While familiarity with the *Netti* is essential in restoring the text, nevertheless care has to be taken not to introduce into the *Pe* ideas that are peculiar to the later *Netti* (such as, say, the 4 kinds of co-ordination in Mode 16, which are not in the *Pe*).

Sometimes, as in § 117, a knowledge of the tenets likely to have been handled has to be relied on. These are, of course, the least certain and depend most on the translator's opinion; but if such a version can be produced which is not too far from the garbled one, word for word, this is a good indication that it is about right.

These are general considerations. The particular cases are dealt with in the notes. The first reaction to the work as it stands in these texts is (because one is used to the general reliability of normal Pali texts) to be over timid in restoration; but after repeated experience of drastic amendments unquestionably to be made on tracing certain quotations, the timidity wears off, and then over-boldness has to be guarded against in restoring meaningless or dubious passages in the body of the text. No restoration or alteration has been made without very careful consideration. The test of a restoration is that it must, as it were, "fall into place," make good sense where there was either none or bad sense, and fit both the immediate context and the whole work.

With all the necessary restorations, some of which may well need revision and adding to, the text as a whole is nowhere incomprehensible, and is indeed fairly straightforward. It is claimed that this translation, even including the at present unrestorable § 329, both makes good sense and represents closely what the author intended to convey. There is no reason to suppose he wrote nonsense. The only inescapable difficulty is the loss of the end of Ch. VI.

#### V. The "Disclosure" and its Elements

(a) *The Form in which the "Disclosure" is set out.* The *Pe* has eight Chapters, while the *Netti* has three summaries and four Chapters. The first Section of *Pe* Ch. I summarizes part of the Method, which summary is supplemented by the verses to the Sections of Ch. V, and by material at the end of Ch. VIII. All this summary material has been used by the *Netti*'s author for his three initial summaries. The *Pe*'s Ch. II presents classifications of Suttas and corresponds to the *Netti*'s Ch. IV. Its Ch. V, exemplifying the 16 Modes in a treatment showing each separately, corresponds to the *Netti*'s Ch. II. Its Ch. VII, exemplifying the 16 Modes combined on single passages, corresponds to the *Netti*'s Ch. III. Its Ch. VIII, setting out the 5 Guide-lines, corresponds to *Netti*'s Ch. IV. Its Chs. I (except for its first Section, see above),

III, IV, and VI are no more than introductory to the Chapters that immediately follow them, and their material has almost all been absorbed by the *Netti* into its first two Chapters variously under the 16 Modes.

The work contains a number of part-summaries (*mātikā, ullāna, etc.*) which are listed at the beginning of the *Detailed Contents* of this translation (q.v.), and it is mainly on the basis of them that the translation is divided into heads and sub-heads.

(b) *Elements of the Method.* The Method proper, as set out summarily or partly in the first Section of Ch. I, and finally in Chs. II, V, VII, and VIII, consists of the following elements. The Buddha's Teaching—the "Thread"—as a whole is in its individual "Threads" classifiable under three alternative comprehensive groupings (Ch. II). Since any individual "Thread", when reworded in explanation of it, must be reworded in agreement, not in conflict, with the Teaching as a whole, and since the Teaching as a whole is enormously bulky, 16 Modes of Conveying a communication (§ 8) are set up so as to represent together the Teaching as a whole. When an individual "Thread" is then expanded and explained in accordance with these 16, the resulting new material for a commentary should thereby escape conflict with the Teaching as a whole. The 16 are set out separately in Ch. V and are combined on single "Threads" in Ch. VII. These 16 Modes deal only with *phrasing*. For guiding such acceptable and established phrasing to the *meaning-as-aim* (namely liberation from suffering) prescribed by the Teaching as a whole, 5 *guide-lines* (§§ 10 and 1107-1109) are set forth in Ch. VIII. Of these five, three (§§ 1101 and 1107-1109), which are alternative, deal with guiding the tested phrasing to the verbal expression of its meaning-as-aim, while the other two, both in combination with one of the other three, have the respective functions of separating the phrasing (corrected by the 16 Modes) into ethical unprofit and profit (§ 1101), and then subsuming that ethically separated phrasing (§ 1111) under a pair of tetrads, or a pair of triads, or a pair of dyads, of *Root-Terms*, so that they can be guided to the meaning-as-aim by one or other of the three meaning-guide-lines. Of these three meaning-guide-lines, the first, which uses the tetrads, is called the *Play of Lions*; the second, which uses the triads, is called the *Trefoil*; and the third, which uses the dyads, is called the *Conversion of Relishing*. These Pairs of Tetrads, Triads, and Dyads are the 18 *Root-Terms*, nine unprofitable and

nine profitable, as set out in §§ 11 and 1101 ff. (For further details see Introduction to *The Guide*.)

The whole Method with its exemplification is conceived simply for the purpose of correct rewording of known ideas. It is composed for the help of those who already intellectually know the Buddha's Teaching and the ideas contained in it. It is not intended as a means to discover anything new or to prove any conclusion at all, and if used for such purposes it is misused. Again, it is addressed not to those who do not yet know but wish to learn the Buddha's Teaching but, on the contrary, to those who wish to explain and expand the Teaching they have already intellectually learnt to those who do not know and wish to learn. Providing as it does a compendious substitute for the hugely bulky Suttapitaka as a testing measure, its object is simply to avoid wrong exegesis that may unwittingly lead to contradictions and to straying out of the Teaching as a whole. (See *The Guide*, Introduction, Section 5, for comparison of the form of the two books and for further details of the Method they both set forth.)

#### VI. Rendering of Technical Terms

This subject is treated at length in the Introduction to *The Guide* (q.v.). The same renderings have been used throughout in this translation of the *Pe* in order to facilitate comparison.

#### VII. The Pālī Commentaries' Debt to the *Pe*

The Pālī Commentaries' indirect debt to the *Pe* is their direct debt to the *Netti*. This, which is very large indeed, is discussed in the Introduction to *The Guide*. Their direct debt to it is limited to the quotations and allusions collected in the Appendix to this translation (q.v.).

#### VIII. Quotations from the *Tipitaka*, etc. in the *Pe*

See the list of quotations. There are some 211 traced quotations and 42 untraced, of which latter 17 are verse and 27 prose. Only 1 verse and 5 prose out of the untraced are shared with the *Netti*'s untraced quotations (check with the *Netti* (translation) Introduction<sup>8</sup>). As far as possible the same Sutta references have been given for the traced quotations as in the *Netti* Translation.

<sup>8</sup> (The words in brackets are an instruction the translator wrote to himself, I.B.H.)

The *Pe* has the habit of giving one verse and one prose quotation to illustrate its headings as in Chs. I, II, III, its Ch. VI taking up (with one exception) pairs of quotations already used in Ch. II.

Its way of presenting quotations is often disagreeably abbreviated, and lacking the *Netti*'s orderly precision. It often summarizes them (e.g. § 57 (a rare exception to the 1-verse-1-prose rule), §§ 74, 76, etc.). Sometimes it appears to rewrite a quotation as at § 43 (the *Sn.* verse but not as given in *Bb.* whose emendation of the *Sn.* text version does not seem authorized by a MS.), or § 188 (verse) or perhaps the author had variant texts. Sometimes it seems as if the quotations were made from memory. An instance of rewriting involving notable changes is found in § 273 (the *Sainyutta* quotation—see nn. 273/6 and 273/7). In § 184 the prose quotation is stated so over abbreviated (even after restoration) as to obscure what is meant, which the *Netti* shows properly. A *Majjhima* text is abbreviated in § 204. In § 395 the word *taco* is replaced by *chavican-mam*. Also §§ 796 and 76.

The *Pe*'s choice of quotations is not invariably happy, e.g. its choice in § 185 for the heading *Our own Statement and someone else's Statement* is rejected by the *Netti*'s author and replaced by others, using this quotation in its § 187—also § 200-1. The *Netti* (§ 847-8) also rejects, under its parallel head, the quotations chosen by the *Pe* in its § 80, though the reason why is not clear.

Explicit references are made to the (*Cūḷa*) "*Niddesa*" (§ 283), the "*Anguttara*" (§ 53), the "*Ekuttarika*" (= *Anguttara* : §§ 22, 31), the "*Sainyutta*" (§§ 28, 35, 43, 49, 74, 159), to the *Udāna* (§ 175, not traced), and to individual Suttas (§§ 174, 192), to the *Majjhima Nikāya* (§ 271), to the *Pañcanikāya* (§ 45), the "*Maggavibhanga*" (§ 353), the *Mahākammavibhanga* (§ 702) and to the *Aṭṭhakavagga* (§ 884).

The only quotation that seems neither traceable nor properly restorable is that in § 329 (*PTS.*, p. 92).

#### IX. Special Features<sup>9</sup>

*Some Terms and Expressions of doubtful establishment (possible corruptions)*

ananvemāni (*PTS.*, p. 101)

anupulla (ger.) (*PTS.*, p. 109)

<sup>9</sup> The Bhikkhu Nāpanoli left rough notes only for Section IX.

palika (*PTS.*, p. 142)  
 bujjhitassa (pp. in gen.) opposed to buddha (*PTS.*, p. 204)  
 kilesomam (§ 260)  
 anāgamī (= anāgata) (*PTS.*, p. 177)  
 kitapaññatti (only in *Bh.*, others defective) (§ 389)  
 dve puggalakatāni (§ 142)  
 anajj(h)abhāvanā, anajj(h)abhihāvo (*PTS.*, p. 35, line 10; p. 40,  
 line 19)

*Some Terms accepted by Commentary but certainly corruptions*

mahāvibhango aciratapanādo (§ 192)  
 isivutt(h)apuririkāma-ekarakkhe (*PTS.*, p. 45)  
 kāramahattassa (*PTS.*, p. 105)  
 bhava-apevirittā (*PTS.*, p. 106)  
 niottāna (§ 556)  
 tath' abhicchedo (*PTS.*, p. 108)

*Special Terms*

2 pariññā (§ 444)  
 4 upādānāni with bhavopādāni (§ 342)  
 2 atthā : purisattho vacanattho (*PTS.*, p. 182)

*Misuse of Similes*

3rd jhāna simile (§ 418)

*Wrong Order*

4 paṭisambhidā, (§§ 103-106)  
 10 Tathāgatabalāni (§ 96 ff.)  
 4 perversions<sup>10</sup> (§§ 415, 513, 1063)  
 4 saññā (§§ 480, 505 ff.)

*Non-Pali spellings and forms*<sup>11</sup>

duve (for dve) 1, 4, 228 (but dve 5, 86, 258)  
 sutamayī (for sutamayā) 5, 245, 747, 1017, 1025, 1035 (but -mayā  
 858)  
 cintāmayī (for cintāmayā) 5, 245, 747, 1017, 1025, 1027, 1035, 1038  
 bhāvanāmayī (for bhāvanāmayā) 245, 747, 1017, 1086  
 yad uccate (for yam vuccate) 714

<sup>10</sup> *cīpattāsa*.

<sup>11</sup> The numbers after each entry are paragraph numbers.

paṇḍagha (for pariāha) 28, 47, 947 ff. (but pariāha 826, pariāha  
 651, 738, paridāhanti 714)  
 Ekuttarika (for Anguttara) 22, 31 (see *Mib.*, p. 392; cf.  
 Ekottarāgama, Lamotte, p. 169-71)—but Anguttara 53  
 jhānaparamitā (principal virtue of the fifth Mahāyāna Bodhi-  
 sattva stage, Skr dhyānapāramitā, Obermüller, p. 35, n. 2)  
 600, No. xv, 619 (not a term current in Pali)  
 anajjā-bhāva(nā) 114, 137  
 ajvaka, aññajvaka (in sense of tam jvāṃ tam sarīraṃ and  
 aññam jvāṃ aññam sarīraṃ) 137, 138  
 Samyuttake (for Samyutta-nikāye) 28, 35, 43, 159, 160  
 sūni (for saka- in *Dh.* 240) 31, 170  
 kulānkata (for kālakata) 35, 83  
 kulāṃ kriyam (for kālakriyā) 468  
 anekadhātūhi (for anekadhātūsu) 55  
 muna (for mayā) 55  
 ceti (for cāti = ca + iti) 63  
 niddesayati (for niddis(s)iyati) 66  
 niccam iti (for niccam ti) 66  
 silavatam (for silabbatam) 82 (but sīlabbatam 138)  
 cha abhiññe (for chaḷabhiññe) 85  
 akammassa vihāriā 604  
 akammassa vihārissa 82  
 thitakappi as arahant 93  
 pativedhanabhāvo as arahant 93  
 cetanābhabbo as arahant 93  
 rakkhañābhabbo as arahant 93  
 sūce ceteti na parimibbāyi, no ce ceteti parimibbāyi as arahant 93,  
 cf. 950  
 sūce anurakkhati na parimibbāyi, no ce anurakkhati parimibbāyi  
 as arahant 93  
 pubbulho (for bubbulo) 173, twice (note Burmese spellings of this  
 word favour pupphulo)  
 vācamma (for vacikamma) 237  
 dānamayikaṃ (for dānamayam) 199, 984, 994  
 dosajanitena (for dosajena) 201  
 sabhaggato (for sabhā-gato) 204  
 parisaggato (for parisā-gato) 204  
 samaggata (for samatā-gata) 819  
 khalu (for kho) 208

- asubbhāya upaparikkhā (for asubhassa u-) 210  
 anagghāta (for anāghāta) 501  
 nibbati (for nivatti) 234  
 pahineyya (for pahāta-abba) 257, 258, but pajahitabbā and  
 pahātabbā 262  
 anāgāmī (for anāgata) 258, 712  
 upadisiyati (for upadissati) 258  
 byādhimatta (for na adhimatta) 268  
 anuññātam-khamam (for anuññātakhamam) 273, but anuññāta-  
 khama at end of 273  
 gati (in sense of scope) 347  
 anomattiya 389, anomaddiya 600 (non-lapse)  
 appamāna (for appamañña) 562, 602, 1070  
 abhibhūmi-āyatana (for abhibhāyatana) 602  
 palirodha (for paḷibodha) 615, but palibodha 609-10  
 lokika (for lokiya) 72, 123, 165, 217, 312, 691, 709, 724, 988, but  
 lokiya 81, 214  
 adhina (for adhina) 362, 733  
 manosankhāra (for citta-) 790  
 paccate (middle form) 857  
 makkha (for vi-) 861  
 ajjhosanna (but ajjhosita elsewhere) 911

*Words reliably established*

	PTS. <i>Pe</i> p.	Para. No.
vipuriṣa	91, 92	321, 322
pariyesiyanto (ppr. pass.)	93	334
nirutti . . . niropayitabbam	92	327
orambhāgyāni indriyāni	179	723 (but see n. 723/1)
vāreṭabbā (4 mahābhūtāni)	103	393
pīḷhā (pl.)	109	425
atha . . . atha (for yadi . . . yadi)	78	269
uttīla (m.)	75	258
ālapati (unusual use)	96	355
abhinīhita	38	125

The verse at § 278 does not distinguish clearly what the function of this *lāra* (conveying) is, i.e. to show the Teaching as the four Truths, and it does not distinguish it from *vicāya*.

§ 279 f. makes the whole of Ch. I redundant, which has been corrected in *Netti*, by absorbing all the exposition of the four Truths under the first *lāra* (cf. § 283). Also the mention here of the

14 Root words" is out of place.

It is quite impossible that the *Pe* Desanā-hāravibhanga (*Pe*, III 2) could have been composed either by the same person or after the *Netti* Desanā-hāravibhanga (*Netti*, p. 5). Similarly the *Vāyulāravibhanga*.

The *Pe* Adhiṭṭhānahāra forgets to mention *sattādhīṭṭhāna* etc., in Ch. II, an omission corrected in *Netti* Adhiṭṭhānahāra.

*Theories of Causality and Conditionality*

In Ch. III a three-membered causal (*word illegible*<sup>12</sup>) is used in connexion with the Six Roots (§§ 198 f., 208, 211, 245, 370). This consists of the cause (*hetu*), which has an outcome (*niṣṣanda*) in this same life, and a fruit (*phala*) upon reappearance (*nibbatti*) in the next existence. Though the three terms are found here and there in the Suttas, they are not apparently specifically organized, as here. This is then given as a threefold division of Dependent Arising (§ 375).

(Cause (*hetu*) and condition (*paccaya*) are differentiated (§ 312 ff.) and defined. But the definitions of cause and condition in § 402 ff. do not seem adhered to in § 830.

*Niṣṣanda* = physical causality, and *phala* = moral causality.

The *soṭāpanna* and *sakadāgāmi* need not have any *jhāna* for their paths and fruitions. The *anāgāmi* and *arahant* must have at least the first *jhāna* for their paths and fruitions (see e.g. § 741-2)—this is the meaning of *vītarāgabhūmi*.

X. *Quotations from the Pe in the Pali Commentaries*

Quotations from the *Pe* in the Commentaries are given as an Appendix (q.v.). There may be others as well but all those traced have been included.

The name in the form "*Petake*" is used in introducing some of these quotations, some of which are not found in the *Pe* now. This has led to a suggestion that the term *Petake* might refer to another work now lost (P. V. Bapat, *VM.*, p. xlili f.); but this can

<sup>12</sup> It might be "action".

be ruled out since the term is used in the *NettiA* of a quotation traceable in the *Pe* (Appx. quotation No. 1). Accordingly, as to the other quotations attributed to the "*Piṭaka*" by the Commentaries but not found in the *Pe* as it exists now, two explanations are possible. The one is that there may have been variant versions of the *Pe* current at the time the Commentaries were composed, some of which lacked the missing quoted passages, and the *Pe* version today is the descendant of one of them. (There are differences in the version in No. 1 as compared with the *Pe* texts; similarly there are even today some texts of the *Mūlinda-parāha* which contain paragraphs lacking in other texts.) The other is that the missing passages were from that part of the end of Ch. VI which is now lost. The explanation may actually be either or both. The work calls itself *Piṭakopadesa* (§§ 71, 193, 249, 435, 1040, 1112) and *Piṭaka* (§ 572).

*Appx. Quotation No. 1.* Seven paragraphs from the *Pe* cited by *NettiA* (*Pe*, pp. 44-6) but with some differences from the published *Pe* texts. First, some sentences in the *Pe* texts are missing in the quotation. It can be assumed with practical certainty that this is simply due to abbreviation by Ācariya Dhammapāla, who merely wanted to illustrate a point, and this would also explain why some paragraphs are out of order in the quotation as compared with the present *Pe* text.

The first paragraph in the quotation (equivalent to § 161 and missing clause) fortunately supplies a deficiency in the *Pe* text, which is obvious. The citation of the same second Piṭaka text from the *Dīgha* in this paragraph is made differently in the *NettiA* quotation. This may be due to Ācariya Dhammapāla's sense of editorship (cf. *Netti*, p. 200 ff.).

The second paragraph in the quotation from the *Pe* (cf. § 162) gives the same two Piṭaka citations, the second being again more tidily presented; but in both instances the observations found in the present *Pe* texts are missing in the *NettiA* quotation. This can be put down to abbreviation by Ācariya Dhammapāla, whose object in quoting was to illustrate a point.

The third paragraph in the quotation has the same heading as that in *Pe* § 163, but only a verse Piṭaka citation is given and that is a different one from the one found in the present *Pe* texts. This could be accounted for by assuming that a variant version was before the quoter, containing a different illustrative verse. It seems

be likely that the quoter would have changed the verse because he disagreed with its employment under this head.

The fourth paragraph (see § 164) simply gives the heading and the same verse citation but no more.

These four paragraphs in the quotation follow the order of the present *Pe* texts.

After a passing sentence there follow in the *NettiA* three more paragraphs quoted from the *Pe*, two of which correspond to *Pe* §§ 155, 156 but in reverse order and the third, not in the *Pe*, supplies part of a paragraph which examination of the composition of the *Pe*'s list of headings shows it ought to contain for completeness both in the Schedule (§ 72) and the detail between § 155 and § 156 as they appear in the present *Pe*. The headings and the Piṭaka citations in the first two agree with the present *Pe* text, but no prose citation or observation is quoted in any of the three. The verse citation in the third paragraph (heading missing in the present *Pe*) is found also at *Pe* § 51 in a different context.

*Appx. Quotation No. 2.* This passage, which would seem to be prose rather than verse, is missing from the present *Pe* texts. It sums up the aim of the *Modes* in Combined Treatment (Ch. VII) and reflects a similar sentence introducing the *Modes* in Separate Treatment (Ch. VI, § 277). Since the opening words of Ch. VII are missing along with the end of Ch. VI, it can be fitted in here with question.

*Appx. Quotation No. 3.* This passage is not found in the *Pe* texts now. Its subject-matter suggests it could have come from the regions of §§ 560-99 or § 654 or from the missing end of Ch. VI. That it was highly regarded as a statement is evidenced by the fact that it is quoted in no less than four commentaries and referred to twice in another, involving three different commentators.

*Appx. Quotation No. 4.* Found only in the *Niddesa* Commentary is really rather puzzling. If it belongs to the *Pe* at all and the attribution is not a mistake, it must either belong to the missing portion of Ch. VI, or have been found only in some versions whose descendants have not survived.

*Appx. Quotations Nos. 5-7.* These are strictly rewritten passages rather than direct quotations from the *Pe*, though their similarity is obvious. No source is acknowledged for Nos. 5 and 6, while No. 7 is attributed to "the Ancients" (porāṇā).

*Appx. Quotation No. 10.*<sup>13</sup> Differences from the present *Pe* text are only such tidying up as might be expected from a meticulous commentator quoting a poorly copied MS. It would be interesting to know, which is impossible unfortunately, whether the corrections which Ācariya Dhammapāla's quotation of this paragraph in his *Netti* Commentary show against the present *Pe* texts might indicate the amount of work he did in cleaning up the *Netti* texts which he edited and commented on.

*Appx. Quotation No. 11.* This is not so much a quotation as a tidied up and partly rewritten (version) of the 16 Sections of the *Pe*'s Ch. VII. The way in which Ācariya Dhammapāla has done this suggests a tacit criticism by him of the manner in which the same two Sections are presented in the *Pe* itself.

---

<sup>13</sup> In Nāṇamoli's MS. this and the next are both called No. 11. I think I am right in attributing the remarks in this paragraph to No. 10 (I.B.H.).

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

(References are to page-numbers in *PTS*. editions unless otherwise stated)

<i>A.</i>	Anguttara-Nikāya
<i>Ba., Bb.</i>	Burmese-script printed edns. of <i>Pe</i>
<i>C'P'D.</i>	Trenckner's Critical Pali Dictionary (Copenhagen), vol. I
<i>C'y.</i>	Modern Commentary on the <i>Pe</i>
<i>Dh.</i>	Dhammapada (verse no.)
<i>D.</i>	Dīgha-Nikāya
<i>Dhs.</i>	Dhammasaṅgani (para. no.)
<i>Iti.</i>	Itivuttaka
<i>Jā.</i>	Jātaka
<i>M.</i>	Majjhima-Nikāya
<i>MA.</i>	Commentary on M (Papañcasūdamī)
<i>Netti</i>	Nettipparāna
<i>NettiA</i>	Commentary on <i>Netti</i> (by Dhammapāla Ācariya) (Part <i>PTS. Netti</i> edn., rest Sinhalese-script Hewavitārne edn.)
<i>Pe</i>	Petakopadesa
<i>PTS.</i>	Pali Text Society
<i>PED.</i>	Pali Text Society's Pali-English Dictionary
<i>Ppm.</i>	"Path of Purification," English Translation of the <i>Visuddhimagga</i> , Colombo
<i>Ps.</i>	Paṭisambhidā-magga
<i>PmI.</i>	Tika Paṭṭhāna
<i>Vbh.</i>	Vibhanga
<i>Vis.</i>	Visuddhimagga
<i>S.</i>	Samyutta-Nikāya
<i>Sa.</i>	Sinhalese-script Palm-leaf MS. of <i>Pe</i>
<i>Sn.</i>	Suttanipāta (verse no.)
<i>Thag.</i>	Theragāthā (verse no.)
<i>Ud.</i>	Udāna



TEXTS USED

*Peṭakopadesa*

1. Printed Latin-script edition, published by the Pali Text Society, London, 1949 (referred to as *P.T.S.*).
2. Printed Burmese script edition, published by the Zabu Meit Swe Press, Rangoon, 1917 (referred to as *Ba.*).
3. Printed Burmese script Chatthasangīti Piṭaka edition, Rangoon, 1956 (referred to as *Bb.*).
4. Palm-leaf MS. in Sinhalese script, belonging to the Library at the Valapola Vihāra, Pānadura, Ceylon (referred to as *Sa.*).

*Peṭakopadesa-Atthakathā*, Modern 20th-century Commentary on the Peṭakopadesa composed in Burma, published by the Ratanasiddhi Piṭaka Press, Mandalay, 1926. (This is the only commentary, since no ancient one appears to have ever existed; the reference to a commentary to this work in the Gandhavamsa (*JPTS.*, 1886, p. 65) is almost certainly a mistake by the author of the G.) (referred to as *Cy.*).

THE PITAKA-DISCLOSURE  
CONTENTS IN DETAIL

(Note: The following "schedules", etc., are found in the body of the work, which give the contents of parts of it; some are terminal and refer back while some are initial and refer forward):—

<i>Para. Rang.</i>	
Ch. I	284 Gives number of heads under which Truth is presented in Chs. I-VII Initial schedule for §§ 22-58
	47 Terminal mnemonic verse for §§ 22-42
	61 Terminal summary of heads presenting Truth-combinations
	71 Terminal mnemonic verse for §§ 49-58
Ch. II	72 Initial schedule heads for 3 Groupings in Ch. II; refers to §§ 73-80 and 152-92
	111 Terminal summary of knowledge of instance and non-instance; refers back to §§ 97-109
	151 Terminal mnemonic verse for §§ 73-80
	193 Terminal mnemonic verse for §§ 152-92
(Ch. III)	194 Initial schedule for §§ 195-248
	249 Terminal mnemonic verse for §§ 195-246
(Ch. IV)	276 Terminal mnemonic verse for §§ 250-75 (4 headings)
(Ch. VI)	436 Initial summary for §§ 437-45 (Section I)
	548 Terminal summary for §§ 446-547 (Section II)
	549 Initial summary for §§ 550-? (Section III)
	600 Initial schedule of heads for §§ 601-19
(Ch. VIII)	1112 Terminal mnemonic verse for §§ 1041-111

\* \* \*

CHAPTER I.—THE DISPLAY OF THE NOBLE TRUTHS

<i>Trstn.</i>	<i>P.T.S. edn.,</i>
<i>Para.</i>	<i>p. and line</i>
I	11-4
	Homage
2-7	The Arising of Right View
8-15	The Guide in the Search
	I. INTRODUCTION
16-21	II. THE DISPLAY OF THE NOBLE TRUTHS
	1. SCHEDULE AND DEFINITIONS
	2. ILLUSTRATIVE QUOTATIONS
	i. <i>The 4 Truths—Unshared</i>
	[A] Suffering's Specific Characteristics
22-34	(a) 13 Unshared
35-6	(b) 2 Shared
37-8	Discussion
39-41	[B], [C], [D], 3 remaining Truths—Unshared
42	[ABCD] 4 Truths—Shared
43	Extinction Element
44-6	Discussion
47	Mnemonic verse (§§ 22-42)
	6 <sup>21</sup> -9 <sup>12</sup>
	9 <sup>13</sup> -22
	9 <sup>23</sup> -10 <sup>4</sup>
	10 <sup>5</sup> -21
	10 <sup>22</sup> -11 <sup>12</sup>
	11 <sup>13</sup> -18
	11 <sup>19</sup> -27
	12