Abhidhamma Studies III[1]
Origins of the Canonical Abhidha(r)mma Literature

L.S. Cousins†

In the first part of this paper I begin by making some general remarks on the early *abhidhamma* literature and then turn to the part played in European *abhidhamma* studies by the researches of Erich Frauwallner.[2] I examine in detail the topics explored by him and others. His chronological and compositional analysis of the *Dhammasaṅgaṇi* and *Vibhaṅga* is considered. He believed the earliest portions of the latter work to be the *suttantabhājanīya* sections at the start of most *vibhaṅgas* (chapters). I look at the opposite possibility: that it is the subsequent *abhidhammabhājanīya* sections which represent the original core.

In the second part I examine the precise nature of the contents of these sections and show that they fall into two distinct groups. On the basis of this and in the light of the parallels from the *abhidha(r)mma*[3] works preserved in Chinese translation, I envisage the Pali *Abhidhammapiṭaka* as originally a work in several parts with strong parallels to the four part arrangement of the **Śāriputrābhidharma*. I then turn to consider more fully the process by which the Pali *Abhidhamma* works took their current form, setting out an alternative hypothesis which sees the World sets and the Awakening sets of the *Vibhaṅga* as having a different history.

---

[1] For Abhidhamma Studies (AS) I, see Cousins 2011. For AS II: *Sanskrit Abhidharma Literature of the Mahāvihāravāsins* see Cousins 2015. AS IV *The Saccasaṅkhepa and its Commentaries* is in hand.

[2] An earlier version of the material in this article was given in two lectures as Bukkyo Dendo Kyokai Visiting Professor in February 2005 at the School of Oriental and African Studies in London and part of it earlier still in a paper given at the Spalding Symposium in Oxford in 2001.

[3] I utilize the form *abhidha(r)mma* to combine the Pali form *abhidhamma* with the most usual form in older Buddhist Sanskrit sources: *abhidharmma*. The spelling *abhidharma* probably derives mainly from modern Sanskrit conventions.

The third part of this article looks at Frauwallner's two (differing) statements on the chronology of the earlier Pali *abhidhamma* literature and argues for a date no later than the first century B.C. Some issues connected with the notion of *mātikā* as the origin of *abhidha(r)mma* are then addressed. *Mātikā*, often understood as originally meaning a mnemonic keyword or heading, is usually found in the plural: "headings". This gives rise to the later sense in the singular of "table of contents". I then try to place Frauwallner's work in the context of a chronological account of the development of European scholarship in the latter half of the last century. In conclusion, I reconsider in the light of this analysis the thesis put forward by Frauwallner and A.K. Warder that we should see the origin of the *abhidha(r)mma* literature in the development of mnemonic lists of topics (*mātikā/mātṛkā*).

PART ONE:
FRAUWALLNER AND ABHIDHA(R)MMA STUDIES

Piṭaka and Nikāya

I have elsewhere discussed the idea that at an earlier stage the Canon was divided into *Aṅgas* and rejected this as without foundation.[4] I discussed also the division into *Nikāyas* or *Āgamas*, a division which I believe to be both ancient and clearly founded upon the institutional arrangements for the oral transmission of the teachings.[5] I now address the alternative organization of the Canon into three *Piṭakas* or "Baskets".

Although it is clear that for the school of Buddhaghosa this was already the accepted division, he cites earlier sources for which it was equally possible to divide

---

[4]Cousins 2013, pp.104ff. See now: Klaus 2010.

[5]*Nikāya* in this sense is mainly found in Pali, but occasionally also in Sanskrit sources: Dutt, Bhattacharya, and Sharma 1984, 4. 139, 18: *catūrṇāṃ sūtranikāyānām* etc. = *Vinayavastu* IV (*Varṣāvastu* 1.8.2.1.7; 1.8.2.3.2). Laṅk X 221: *naikāyikāś* (opp. to *tīrthyaś*) and (acc. BHSD) Laṅk X 211f.: *nikāyagati* (questionable in the light of Abhidh-dīp 251: *prakāranaiyamyena tu duḥkhadarśanaprahātavyaiḥ sarvatragaiḥ pañcasu nikāyeṣvālambanataḥ saṃyuktaḥ | tatsaṃprayukteṣu saṃprayogataḥ | asarvatragaistu svanaikāyikeṣvālambanataḥ | saṃprayukteṣu saṃprayogataḥ*). Monks versed in the five *Nikāyas* gave donations at Sāñcī: *Devagirino pacanekayikasa bhichuno* (Lüders 299); Bhārhūt: *Budharakhitasa pa[ṃ]canekāyikasa* (Lüders 867) and Pauni: *Nāgasa pacanekāyikasa* (EI XXXVIII p.174). At Nāgārjunakoṇḍa a pupil of the Mahāsaṃghika Aparamahāvināseliyas is twice referred to as a master of the *Dīgha* and *Majjhima nikāyas*: *Dīgha-Majhima-nikāyadharena* (EI XX pp.15–17 & 19f. — so read).

the Canon into five *Nikāyas* or *Āgamas*. And indeed that remains a theoretical alternative in Pali literature down to the present day. Probably scholars have usually considered this as something of a scholastic exercise rather than any kind of historical development. With this I do not agree. It seems to me rather that this is the earlier arrangement from which the Three Baskets develop.

We see that the Fifth *Nikāya* contains one other work with the title *piṭaka*. It is easy to envisage in this context a work entitled *Abhidhammapiṭaka* also included in this collection. We should note also the existence of an early Mahāyāna text or texts with the name *Bodhisattvapiṭaka*. Although the arrangement as cited by Buddhaghosa includes also the *Vinayapiṭaka*, I suspect that originally the Five *Nikāyas* contained only *Dhamma* literature; *Vinaya* literature was treated differently and was part of a separate oral tradition.

I would suppose that the decision to separate the *Abhidhamma* work or works and to add the *Vinaya* texts is precisely what created the *tipiṭaka* in something approaching the form in which we know it. According to Oskar von Hinüber:

> "The origin and the idea behind this designation are not known."[6]

This seems to me to slightly overstate the case. Unlike the term *nikāya*, which is frequently used in the older literature in the sense of "class" or "category", the word *piṭaka* is not found often in precisely that kind of sense.[7] But the usage seems clearly extracted from the expression *piṭakasampadā(na)* found in the *Majjhimanikāya* and the *Aṅguttaranikāya*, as well as in later Pali and Sanskrit texts.[8] The context is always that of depending on an external source of authority rather than direct personal experience. I take *piṭaka* here to have precisely the sense of "authoritative collection".

Applied to the Buddhist texts, it occurs first in an inscription from Bhārhūt, where a *peṭakin* is referred to in a context which could refer to a monk who knows the Baskets, but is also open to several other possible interpretations. It could simply mean someone who has mastered the authoritative texts in general with no reference to a specific collection. This would be similar to the sense it has in the *Peṭaka* or *Peṭakopadesa*. Or, indeed, it could be referring to mastery of the *Peṭaka* method. Otherwise we meet references to the "three Baskets" first in the *Parivāra*

---

[6]Hinüber 1996, p. 7; Collins 1990.

[7]The literal sense of 'basket' is of course found, e.g. Vin I 225; 240.

[8]MN I 520; AN I 189–96; II 191ff.; NiddI 360; 400; 482; NiddII; Peṭ 74. *Yogācārabhūmi* 405S: *āgamaḥ katamaḥ | tatpratiyuktānuśravaparamparāpiṭakasampradānayogenaiṣām āgataṃ bhavati vidyata* eva hetau phalam iti ||*

as part of the verses expounding the lineage (*paramparā*). In fact these verses occur some thirteen times.[9] In that context the arrangement of the Canon into the *Vinayapiṭaka*, the five *Nikāyas* and the seven Manuals (*pakāraṇe*)[10] is explicit. The three Baskets seem also to be mentioned in an *uddāna* to the *Cūḷavagga* (Vin II 293), but that is difficult to date. The three categories of *Vinaya*, *Suttanta* and *Abhidhamma* are mentioned at Vin IV 344, but *piṭaka* is not.

The paracanonical *Milindapañha* contains a number of references to three Baskets and to the individual *Abhidhammapiṭaka* and *Vinayapiṭaka*. Of particular interest here is the occurrence of stanzas attributed to the Ancients (Porāṇā):[11]

> "and those monks, possessors of Three Baskets and those of
> Five Nikāyas,
> and those too of Four Nikāyas attended upon Nāgasena."

These verses should precede the *Milindapañha* in date and seem to reflect a time when honorific titles related to both earlier and later arrangements of the canonical literature were still in use.

In the light of all this and the ubiquity in Sanskrit literature too of the concept of Three Baskets, it seems that the existence of the Three Baskets probably precedes the first century A.D.

four or five Abhidha(r)mmapiṭakas

So it is very likely that it was in the course of the last century B.C. that the growing numbers of *abhidhamma* works achieved canonical status in some or all of the schools of Ancient Buddhism. By canonical status I mean simply that they were formed into collections of literature, oral or written, which had a recognized authority as *Buddhavacana* — whoever had actually written them. We cannot tell from earlier references to *Suttanta* or even *Dhamma* (in *Dhammavinaya*) whether or not *Abhidha(r)mma* works were included.

---

[9] Vin V 3 etc.. The exact number of times this occurs varies with the editions and manuscripts, depending on how far the repetitions are expanded.

[10] m.c.

[11] Mil 22: *tenāhu Porāṇā:*
bahussuto citrakathī nipuṇo ca visārado |
sāmayiko ca kusalo paṭibhāne ca kovido ||
te ca tepiṭakā bhikkhū pañcanekāyikā pi ca |
catunekāyikā c'eva Nāgasenaṃ purakkharuṃ ||

How much such canonical *abhidha(r)mma* literature there originally was, we do not know. At present the Pali Canon preserves the only surviving *Abhidhamma-piṭaka* that is complete in its original language. An apparently complete version of another is extant in a Chinese translation. This work is generally known as the **Śāriputrābhidharma*, although it may in fact have been written in the Gāndhārī dialect of Middle Indian. I believe that it was most probably the shared canonical text of the three Vibhajjavādin schools of the North-West, but it has usually been thought to belong specifically to one of them: the Dharmaguptakas.[12] As far as I know, little or none of their later exegetical literature survives, with the possible exception of some recently discovered and fragmentary exegetical works in Gāndhārī. A third *Abhidharmapiṭaka*, for Eastern and Northern Buddhism the most influential of all, survives in Chinese translation. This is part of the Canon of the Sarvāstivādins. The version in Chinese is not quite complete, but some of the missing material is preserved in Tibetan. There are also extant fragments and portions of some of the Sarvāstivādin *abhidharma* texts in Sanskrit, as well as a number of citations in later works. It is possible that the original language of the oldest of these works was not Sanskrit, but whether that is so or not, all subsequent literature of that school in India appears to have been written in Sanskrit.

We do not know for sure how many other such *abhidha(r)mma* canons there were. It is sometimes suggested that all of the supposed "eighteen schools" would have each had their own *Abhidha(r)mmapiṭaka*.[13] This is most unlikely. More reasonably, Bareau in 1951 affirmed the certain existence of the following *Abhidharmapiṭaka*: Theravādin, Sarvāstivādin, Mahāsaṃghika, Dharmaguptaka and Haimavata. He discussed the possibility of a number of other schools also having an *Abhidharmapiṭaka*. Of these, he considered it likely that the Mahīśāsakas and the Vātsīputrīyas and their sub-sects would have each had an *Abhidharmapiṭaka*. However, he also thought it likely that the *Abhidharmapiṭaka* shared by both the Dharmaguptakas and the Haimavatas was in fact the **Śāriputrābhidharma*. This would give a total of at least six.

I agree that there must have been an *Abhidha(r)mmapiṭaka* of some kind among the Pudgalavādin schools, but there is no reason at present to suppose they had more than one. Indeed, Paramārtha (who himself possibly came from Western India) specifically states that they shared a single **Dharmalakṣaṇābhidharma*,

---

[12] Another possibility is that it may have been shared with the Pudgalavādin schools too, but that seems less likely.

[13] See Bareau 1951a.

also described by them as the *Abhidharma of Śāriputra*.[14] Similarly, there was probably an *Abhidha(r)mmapiṭaka* in Prakrit among the Mahāsaṃghikas of the Deccan, probably in six parts, and possibly also one belonging to the Lokottara-vādins (in Sanskrit?). It is also possible (but not certain) that some schools might have rejected or not participated in the development of *abhidha(r)mma*. So we should not multiply instances! At present, all we can say is that there were probably around six distinct canonical *Abhidha(r)mmapiṭakas*.[15] Of these, only three are extant.

the work of Frauwallner

A leading role in more recent European studies of these works has been played by Erich Frauwallner. His influential series of *Abhidharma-studien* (published between 1963 and 1973) are widely held to be the most important recent attempt at understanding the historical development of *abhidharma*.[16] They are, for example, largely followed by Oskar von Hinüber in his survey of Pali literature.[17] Moreover, as a result of their translation into English, they have more recently been brought to the attention of a wider audience.[18]

One cannot read these and other writings of Frauwallner without being impressed by the clarity of his thought and the lucidity of his expression. I remain unconvinced by most efforts to determine the nature of the earliest form of Buddhism by separating earlier and later strata. But of the attempts to do so, Frauwallner's analyses of the formation of the *Vinayapiṭaka* and of the development of the Sarvāstivādin *abhidharma* works still seem to be some of the best available. I am much less happy with what he has to say about the Pali *abhidhamma*. This article is an attempt to give my reasons for this and, in part, to provide an alternative.

Before doing so, let me note that Frauwallner himself seems much less confident of his handling of this material. He writes: "There is still much exact philological work to be done here. Regretfully, I have only had limited access to the Pāli literature and the relevant secondary literature. I hope that I have not over-

---

[14]Demiéville 1932, p. 57f. See also Lamotte 1944, p. = *Traité*: T1509. ch. 2, p. 70a.

[15]I do not doubt that slightly varying recensions of some of these were also produced as time went on.

[16]Frauwallner 1963; Frauwallner 1964; Frauwallner 1971a; Frauwallner 1971b; Frauwallner 1972; Frauwallner 1973. Also: Frauwallner 1971c.

[17]Hinüber 1996, pp. 64–73.

[18]Frauwallner 1995.

seen anything of importance." (Kidd's translation)[19] Unfortunately, I think he did indeed miss some important points.

Frauwallner's concern is to write a history of Indian Philosophy and perhaps also to some extent to rehabilitate Indian philosophy in the eyes of European philosophers. In doing so, he makes much use of the distinction between philosophy and scholasticism. This — with all its resonances of mediaeval darkness versus renaissance enlightenment and so on — is something of a distorting mirror in the Indian context. It belongs rather in an arena which one can refer to as 'triumphalist religious advocacy'. One is reminded of similar 'Aunt Sally' distinctions between Christian and Jewish positions in New Testament and Theological studies. Or, indeed, closer to home, certain types of Mahāyāna polemic against 'Hīnayāna'. As a result, differences in literary genre and style are elevated into differences of principle and kind in a manner which is historically quite anachronistic.

This philosophical interest makes Frauwallner rather scornful at times of texts whose *raison d'être* is of a different kind. The Pali *abhidhamma* works are much more concerned with the practice of Buddhism than with constructing an intellectual edifice, although that is certainly not absent. Frauwallner recognizes the intellectual aspects of this, but is rather unsympathetic to anything else. So his article on the *abhidharma* "of the Pali School" at intervals refers to "its rampant scholasticism" (p. 45) and to "the formalism of the Abhidharma which has overgrown and almost smothered it" (p. 58). Essentially, he emphasizes this formalism, the *abhidharma's* pointless repetition and what he considers to be a lack of intellectual content or systematic philosophical thought. So in his article on the earliest *abhidharma* we are told that: "This degeneration is probably at its worst in the Pāli school, which confined itself exclusively to the transmitted doctrinal material, and never really developed any original thought of its own." (p. 11)

No doubt, all of this (and there is much more in the same vein) tells us more about Frauwallner than about the history of the *abhidhamma* literature. Let us note that he takes no account of the needs of oral literature, which requires a considerable measure of "pointless" repetition to guarantee the preservation of necessary content. Probably because of a lack of interest in how Buddhists actually use these works, he is quite unaware of them as compositions for chanting with both

---

[19] Frauwallner 1971b, p. 107 n.7: *Für exacte philologische Arbeit ist hier noch sehr viel zu tun. Mir war leider die Pāli-literatur und die Arbeiten darüber immer nur in beschränktem Masse zugänglich. Hoffentlich habe ich nichts zu Wichtiges übersehen.*

a devotional aspect and a meditational aspect. Of course, Frauwallner is hardly unusual in this and his attitude to the canonical *abhidhamma* works stems largely from earlier European interpreters. Perhaps the greatest influence in this regard was the seemingly tireless labour of Caroline Rhys Davids. Let us note, however, two comments from the introduction to her edition of the *Vibhaṅga* in 1904. She refers to the *Vibhaṅga* as compiled for oral teaching and for learning by rote and comments that this is what "makes it and all Abhidhamma matter so impossible as food for the reader" (p. xx). She then compares "our own books of symbolic logic" which are "not so very possible for him either". Later she comments that the only possible way "for the burdened memory" was "that endless but orderly repetition of a verbal framework, wherein, it might be, only one term of a series was varied at a time."

In fact, it might be better to view the canonical *abhidhamma* works as transitional literature, rather than as pure oral literature. By this, I mean that they were composed at a time when memorized literature was still the norm for religious purposes. Yet writing had been adopted under the Mauryas and so written notes could be used as an aid to composition, allowing the production of more complex texts. The registers for individual *dhammas* used in most of the canonical *abhidhamma* works look as if they might be the product of a systematic jotting down on palm-leaves of different terms from the still entirely oral *sutta* literature.[20] It is probable that some *abhidhamma* works had already been preserved in written form for some time before the Canon as a whole was set in writing.

Returning to Frauwallner, it is perhaps a second aspect of his approach which is more critical. In the first of his *Abhidharma-studien* (published in 1964) Frauwallner makes much of the distinction between what he calls the **Pañcavastuka*[21] and the *Pañcaskandhaka*. He puts forward the thesis that the shift from an analysis in terms of the five aggregates to an analysis in terms of *citta*, *caitta*, *rūpa*, *viprayukta* and *asaṃskṛta* is a crucial stage in the development of *abhidharma*.[22] This must be in some sense correct, but unfortunately it is tied to developments specifically in the Sarvāstivādin school in a manner which is rather questionable.

---

[20] The use of slips at a later date in the work of Buddhaghosa has been suggested by von Hinüber: Hinüber 1996, §240 & n. 421. A second reference to the use of slips is perhaps found in the *Kṣudrakavastu* of the *Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya*: Schopen 1997 = Schopen 2004, pp. 395-407, particularly p. 402. (email OVH 13.4.2014).

[21] Or, **Pañcadharmaka*.

[22] Note that such an analysis (excluding *viprayukta*) is implied at Dhs §§1187–90.

The result of this is that Frauwallner is compelled by the logic of his own theory to assert the relative lateness of the Pali material even against his own observations.

I shall return to this later, but let me first set out the precise details of Frauwallner's theory of the development of the early canonical material. I shall then offer some criticisms of his arguments before attempting to provide an alternative account of the growth and formation of these works.

the Pali Abhidhammapiṭaka

There are seven works included in the *Abhidhammapiṭaka*. Of these, we can ignore for present purposes the *Yamaka* and *Paṭṭhāna*, usually considered to represent a later development in their present form. The *Kathāvatthu* and the *Puggalapaññatti* are also largely irrelevant to Frauwallner's thesis. This leaves three works to which he refers, but I shall not here have very much to say about the (relatively small) *Dhātukathā*. So our main concern is with the first two works of the *Abhidhammapiṭaka*: the *Dhammasaṅgaha* or *Dhammasaṅgaṇi* and the *Vibhaṅga*.

Frauwallner's analysis of the Dhammasaṅgaha

<div align="center">

TABLE 1
STRUCTURE OF THE DHAMMASAṄGAHA

</div>

MĀTIKĀ	TIKA 22 TRIPLETS
	DUKA: ABHIDHAMME 100 COUPLETS
	SUTTANTE 42 COUPLETS
A. CITTUPPĀDA-KAṆḌA	
B. RŪPA-KAṆḌA	MĀTIKĀ
	EKUTTARA METHOD: 1 TO 11
C. NIKKHEPA-KAṆḌA	TIKA
	(ABHIDHAMMA-)DUKA
	SUTTANTIKA-DUKA
D. AṬṬHUDDHĀRAKA-KAṆḌA OR AṬṬHAKATHĀ-KAṆḌA	TIKA
	(ABHUDHAMMA-)DUKA

As regards the *Dhammasaṅgaha*, Frauwallner proposes that the triplet *mātikā* and the *abhidhamma* couplet *mātikā* together with the parallel portions of the *Nikkhepakaṇḍa* are the earliest parts of this work. The *Suttanta* couplets and the corresponding portion of the *Nikkhepakaṇḍa* have been added to this at some

point.[23] The *Cittuppādakaṇḍa* and the *Rūpakaṇḍa* are separate works which have been inserted between the *Mātikā* and the *Nikkhepakaṇḍa*. Frauwallner in fact erroneously refers to the *Cittuppādakaṇḍa* as the *Cittakaṇḍa*.[24] He has been misled by the Nāgarī edition, where this must be a simple error. Finally, the *Atthuddhārakaṇḍa* is influenced by the "*Cittakaṇḍa*" and is alien to the "pure *Dhammasaṅgaṇi* tradition" (p. 86). The general outlines of this are based on the work of André Bareau in his supplementary thesis, published in 1951 (Bareau 1951b).

The weakness of this analysis lies in its treatment of the *Rūpakaṇḍa*. According to Frauwallner, this "was evidently included as a counterpart to the *Cittakaṇḍa*. A somewhat artificial link between the two texts is established by means of a connecting paragraph. The following description is entirely independent." The correct name *Cittuppādakaṇḍa* makes the *Rūpakaṇḍa* slightly less of a counterpart, but the crucial point here is: how far is it truly independent ? It is after all hardly a surprise that matter is described in a rather different way from mentality.

Other than a discussion of the list of *rūpas* implicit in the *Rūpakaṇḍa*, Frauwallner has in fact rather little to say about it, seeing it as "largely without significance". This I believe to be a mistake. So I want now to look at the manner in which it is structured. It is arranged after the *ekuttara* method, which proceeds numerically from single items to pairs of items and so on. At first sight it looks like a simple collection of things you can say about *rūpa*, but in fact it is arranged in a specific way and one which is linked directly to the *Abhidhammamātikā* at the beginning of the *Dhammasaṅgaha*.

TABLE 2
THE RŪPAKAṆḌA AND THE TRIPLET MĀTIKĀ

tikamātikā	rūpaṃ ekavidhena	includable
1. kusalā/akusalā/avyākatā	avyākataṃ	**1.**
2. sukhāya vedanāya sampayuttā/dukkhāya vedanāya sampayuttā/ adukkhamasukhāya vedanāya sampayuttā	×	
3. vipākā/vipākadhamma/ nevavipākanavipākadhammadhammā	nevavipākanavipāka- dhammadhammaṃ	**2.**
4. upādiṇṇupādāniyā/anupādiṇṇupādāniyā/ anupādiṇṇaanupādāniyā	2	

---

[23] Frauwallner suggests that they have probably come from a work corresponding to the *Saṅgītiparyāya,* i.e. a commentary on the *Saṅgītisuttanta*.

[24] It is tacitly corrected in: Hinüber 1996, p. 67.

5. saṃkiliṭṭhasaṃkilesikā/asaṃkiliṭṭha-saṃkilesikā/asaṃkiliṭṭhaasaṃkilesikā	asaṃkiliṭṭha-saṃkilesikaṃ	**3.**
6. savitakkasavicārā/avitakkavicāramattā/avitakkaavicārā	avitakkaavicāraṃ	**4.**
7. pītisahagatā/ sukhasahagatā/ upekkhāsaha-gatā	×	
8. dassanena pahātabbā/bhāvanāya pahātabbā/neva dassanena na bhāvanāya pahātabbā	neva dassanena na bhāvanāya pahātabbaṃ	**5.**
9. dassanena pahātabbahetukā/bhāvanāya pahātabbahetukā/ neva dassanena na bhāvanāya pahātabba-hetukā	neva dassanena na bhāvanāya pahātabbahetukaṃ	**6.**
10. ācayagāmino/apacayagāmino/ nevācayagāmināpacayagāmino	nevācayagāmināpa-cayagāmi	**7.**
11. sekkhā/asekkhā/nevasekkhanāsekkhā	nevasekkhanā-sekkhaṃ	**8.**
12. parittā/mahaggatā/appamāṇā	parittaṃ	**9.**
13. parittārammaṇā/mahaggatārammaṇā/appamāṇārammaṇā	×	
14. hīnā/majjhimā/paṇītā	2	
15. micchattaniyatā/sammattaniyatā/aniyatā	aniyataṃ	**10.**
16. maggārammaṇā/maggahetukā/maggādhi-patino	×	
17. uppannā/anuppannā/uppādino	?uppannaṃ (2)	**11. ?**
18. atītā/anāgatā/paccuppannā	3	
19. atītārammaṇā/anāgatārammaṇā/ paccuppannārammaṇā	×	
20. ajjhattā/bahiddhā/ajjhattabahiddhā	3	
21. ajjhattārammaṇā/bahiddhārammaṇā/ ajjhattabahiddhārammaṇā	×	
22. sanidassanasappaṭighā/anidassana-sappaṭighā/anidassanaappaṭighā	3	

Table Two lists the items of the Triplet mātikā in order on the left with the items from the singlefold analysis in the *Rūpakaṇḍa* to the right. The thirteen items given in the table under the heading "includable" are taken from eleven of the triplets. Of the missing eleven triplets, six are purely mental and five contain *rūpa* in more than one category. The eleven items given here are then the only

possible cases and they occur in exactly the same order as they do in the triplet *mātikā*.

Similarly, the 29 items beginning with *na hetu* given in Table Three below are likewise taken from the 100 couplets (numbered on the right). They too occur in precisely the same order as in the couplet *mātikā*. Since there is some duplication between triplets and couplets, I list on the left related triplets.

TABLE 3
THE RŪPAKAṆḌA AND THE COUPLET MĀTIKĀ

tika	ekavidhena rūpaṃ	duka
	na hetu	1.
	ahetukaṃ	2.
	hetuvippayuttaṃ	3.
	sappaccayaṃ	7.
	saṅkhataṃ	8.
	rūpaṃ [rūpiyaṃ (Cᵉ)]	11.
	lokiyaṃ	12.
	sāsavaṃ	15.
	saṃyojaniyaṃ	21.
	ganthaniyaṃ	27.
	oghaniyaṃ	33.
	yoganiyaṃ	39.
	nīvaraṇiyaṃ	45.
	parāmaṭṭhaṃ	51.
	upādāniyaṃ	70.
	saṃkilesikaṃ	76.
1.	avyākataṃ	
	anārammaṇaṃ	55.
	acetasikaṃ	57.
	cittavippayuttaṃ	58.
3.	nevavipākanavipākadhammadhammaṃ	
5.	asaṃkiliṭṭhasaṃkilesikaṃ	
6.	na savitakkasavicāraṃ	
6.	na avitakkavicāramattaṃ	
6.	avitakkaavicāraṃ	87–88.
	na pītisahagataṃ	89–90.
	na sukhasahagataṃ	91.
	na upekkhāsahagataṃ	92.

8.	neva dassanena na bhāvanāya pahātabbaṃ	
9.	neva dassanena na bhāvanāya pahātabbahetukaṃ	
10.	neva ācayagāmi na apacayagāmi	
11.	nevasekkhanāsekkhaṃ	
12.	parittaṃ	
	kāmāvacaraṃ	93.
	na rūpāvacaraṃ	94.
	na arūpāvacaraṃ	95.
	pariyāpannaṃ	96.
	no apariyāpannaṃ	
15.	aniyataṃ	98.
	aniyyānikaṃ	97.
17.	uppannaṃ	
	chahi viññāṇehi viññeyyaṃ	?13
	aniccaṃ	
	jarābhibhūtaṃ.	

The crucial fact that emerges is that the singlefold section of the *Rūpakaṇḍa* is structurally closely related to the *Abhidhammamātikā* and cannot be separated from it. By itself, this might cast doubt on Frauwallner's claim that the *Rūpakaṇḍa* has been inserted into the *Dhammasaṅgaha*. And of course, that could lead even to questioning how far the so-called *Cittakaṇḍa* is an insertion, given that the presence of the *Rūpakaṇḍa* by itself would make very little sense. However, matters are not quite so simple, since virtually all of the singlefold *mātikā* to the *Rūpakaṇḍa* is also found in the first section of the *Vibhaṅga,* i.e. that on the aggregates (*khandhas*). We could then suppose that the *Rūpakaṇḍa* derives from there.

Moreover, the rest of the *ekuttara* analysis of *rūpa* is closely parallel to the *ekuttara* analyses for the other four aggregates. They clearly belong together. Also, the fourfold analysis in part uses terminology closely associated with accounts of the five aggregates: *dūre/santike*; *oḷārika/sukhuma*. The set: *diṭṭha/suta/muta/viññāta* is otherwise rare in the Pali *Abhidhammapiṭaka*, except in the first part of the *Dhammahadayavibhaṅga*.[25] Indeed, even for the twofold, threefold and fivefold analysis it is clear that this *khandha* material is a source of part. Finally, it may be noted that the twofold analysis uses all the couplets from the *dukamātikā* for which both components include *rūpa*, with the exception of couplet 13 (*kenaci*

---

[25] Vibh 429f.; but cf. Vibh 387.

viññeyya).[26] It also uses triplet four (*upādiṇṇupādāniya*) — the only other triplets which could have been used are 14 (*hīna*) and 17 (*uppanna*): both doubtful. These same couplets and triplet are subsequently employed for the first part of the three-fold analysis. This is all intimately related to the *mātikā*.

Thus far it is clear that Frauwallner's analysis is unsatisfactory and needs to be substantially replaced. But first let us turn to the theory that relates *mātikā* (in a somewhat different sense) to the origins of *abhidha(r)mma*.

mātṛkā and the origins of abhidha(r)mma

It was in the first two of Frauwallner's *Abhidharma-studien*, which appeared in 1963 and 1964, that he first expounded the theory of the *mātṛkā*. He writes: "The oldest Buddhist tradition has no *Abhidharmapiṭaka*, but only *mātṛkā*." (p. 3). He understands this statement to mean that comprehensive lists of doctrinal concepts were collected, initially from the Buddha's sermons. "Lists of this kind," he says, "were called *mātṛkā*, and it was from these lists that the *Abhidharma* later developed." Frauwallner was not the originator of this view, but he has been widely influential in its propagation and his position has been further developed by others.[27]

I have problems with this terminology, since I do not think that just any list is a *mātikā*. Of course, any list could in principle be used as a *mātikā*, but I am not sure that we should confuse the two things. As a result of doing so, Frauwallner has to introduce the rather strange term "attribute-*mātṛkā*" (*Eigenschaften-Mātṛkā*) to refer to what seems to me to be the typical or normal kind of *mātikā*.

In fact, the view that the term *mātṛkā* originally refers to some kind of *abhidhamma* or proto-*abhidhamma* seems to me to be poorly founded. It is true that several Sarvāstivādin sources refer to the *Abhidhammapiṭaka* as the *Mātṛkāpiṭaka*, but that is plainly a late development. It belongs in the context of the period of conflict between Mahāyāna and Mainstream Buddhism which arose around the third century A.D. and continued a little longer until the Yogācāra synthesis of Mahāyāna and Abhidharma took the edge off matters. Part of this conflict was an inevitable attempt to downgrade the authority of *abhidharma* traditions, an attempt which took the form of the Sautrāntika critique.

---

[26] Probably not practical.
[27] See for example: Bronkhorst 1985.

In such a context the notion of *mātṛkā* could be used by both sides — either to claim references to the *Abhidharmapiṭaka* in the *Sūtrapiṭaka* or to claim that references to *mātṛkā* or *abhidharma* simply mean lists such as the *bodhipākṣikadharma*. All of this is much too late to give us any useful information on the early period.

The expression *mātikādhara* occurs 22 times in the *Vinayapiṭaka*, always in a stock expression describing the qualities of a learned monk (*bahussuto āgatāgamo dhammadharo vinayadharo mātikādharo paṇḍito vyatto medhāvī lajjī kukkuccako sikkhākāmo*).[28] It is striking that it is only found in the *Khandhaka* and is therefore entirely unknown to what are probably the earliest parts of the *Vinayapiṭaka*. It is found 19 times in the *Suttapiṭaka*, always in a shorter version of the above phrase, referring to a monk or monks who are *bahussutā āgatāgamā dhamma-dharā vinayadharā mātikādharā*. In the *Dīghanikāya* it is found only in the account of the four *mahāpadesas* in the *Mahāparinibbānasuttanta* (D II 124f.). In the *Majjhimanikāya* it is found only in the *Mahāgopālakasutta* (M I 221; 223). Significantly, it is never found in either the *Saṃyuttanikāya* or the *Khuddakanikāya*; so the great majority of passages are in the *Aṅguttaranikāya*. This strongly suggests a connexion with the *ekuttara* approach of the Aṅguttarabhāṇakas. Most striking of all is the fact that it does not occur at all in the *Abhidhammapiṭaka*.[29]

We can note here in passing that for Buddhaghosa the expression refers purely to *Vinaya*, although Dhammapāla the *ṭīkākāra* rejects that.[30] There seems, in fact, no way of determining with certainty whether the reference is to the *Pātimokkha*, to early *abhidhamma* in some form, or to both. Other than this, the word *mātikā* occurs in one simile in the *Aṅguttaranikāya* where *mātikāsampanna* is one of the qualities of a good field. On the authority of the commentary, this is usually taken as meaning some kind of irrigation channel.[31] This seems quite doubtful.

---

[28]Two are in the plural. (Oldenberg's edition abbreviates many of these references.)

[29]The only other pre-Buddhaghosa reference(s) in Pali is probably: Mil 344. Also in a passage found only in Mil (Sᵉ) 32 (after the verses cited above in n.10).

[30]Mp II 189; III 382; Mp-ṭ II 189: *Abhidhamme āgatā kusalādikkhandhādibhedabhinnā dhammā Suttanta-piṭake pi otarantī ti* **dhammadharā ti Suttanta-piṭaka-dharā** *icc eva vuttaṃ; na hi ābhi-dhammikabhāvena vinā nippariyāyato Suttanta-piṭaka-ññutā sambhavati.* **Dvemātikā-dharā** *ti bhikkhu-bhikkhuni-mātikā-vasena dve-mātikā-dharā ti vadanti; Vinayābhidhamma-mātikā-dharā ti yuttaṃ.* Vism-mhṭ I (Bᵉ) 141: *Suttābhidhamma-saṅkhātassa dhammassa dhāraṇena* **dhamma-dharā.** *Vinayassa dhāraṇena* **Vinayadharā.** *Tesaṃ yeva dhamma-vinayānaṃ mātikāya dhāraṇena* **mātikādharā.**

[31]A IV 238: *mātikāsampanna*. Or, does this mean "having good soil" from *mṛttikā* 'clay, soil'. (It probably corresponds to *sammāsati* here). If it does derive from *mātṛkā*, the meaning is perhaps "water source", i.e. the field is "well-watered".

In fact, the only place where the meaning of the word *mātikā* seems clear is in the *Vinayapiṭaka*.[32] Here it refers (in the plural) to a number of keywords or heading words for doing one of several activities connected with robes.[33] In canonical Pali, we should probably assume that *mātikā* is almost always nominative plural: "headings".[34] The sense of summary or "table of contents" (in the singular) would be a subsequent development.

I don't believe that this tells us anything about the origins of *abhidhamma*, although it does suggest, as Oskar von Hinüber points out, that there may be some influence of the technical vocabulary of "Buddhist law" here. Neither, I suppose, do most of the rare mentions of *abhidhamma* in early texts.[35] As has long been recognized, in context with *abhivinaya* it undoubtedly means originally "concerning the *dhamma*". Obviously, this is later extracted to give a name to an already prestigious (or aspiring) proto-*abhidhamma* literature.[36] The fact that this was done suggests to me that this literature was already well-developed before the name was adopted. Earlier it would simply have been classed as *dhamma*.

Frauwallner's analysis of the Vibhaṅga

The *Vibhaṅga*, the second book of the *Abhidhamma-piṭaka*, has eighteen chapters referred to as *vibhaṅgas* "detailed analysis" and concerned with specific topics. The first fifteen *vibhaṅgas* contain a section referred to as the *Abhidhammabhā-janīya* "belonging to *abhidhamma*" and in all but one of them that is followed by a *Pañhāpucchaka* (*pañha* + *āpucchaka*) or questionaire section applying the *abhidhamma-mātikā* of the *Dhammasaṅgaṇi* to the specific topic. In twelve cases these are preceded by one referred to as the *Suttantabhājanīya* "belonging to *sut-tanta*". The last three *vibhaṅgas* are organized somewhat differently.

---

[32] Vin I 255; 266; 309ff.; II 123(vl); III 196; 199; 204; V 136f.; 172ff.; cf. I 98 = V 86; IBH usually translates "grounds".

[33] Hinüber 1994, p. 116f.: *Stichwörter*.

[34] The later sense is found at: Paṭis I 1–3; II 177; 242–246; 246 (vl); Mil 362–5; 416; vl to 296; Dhātuk 1; Dhs 124–133; Vibh 142; 245?; 305–18; 344–349; Pp 1–10; Paṭṭh II 449f.; 34 occurrences in Paṭṭh III & IV.

[35] The exception is no doubt: Vin IV 144: *iṅgha tvaṃ suttante vā gāthāyo vā abhidhammaṃ vā pariyāpuṇassu, pacchā vinayaṃ pariyāpuṇissasī" ti bhaṇati*. This must represent a stage at which both some of the verse literature preserved for us in the *Khuddaka-nikāya* and some *abhidhamma* had developed on a sufficient scale to warrant separate mention. Anderson 1999, p. 154ff.

[36] I do not believe, however, that *Abhidhamma-piṭaka* is correctly translated as "the Basket of Things Relating to the Teaching". The new name was adopted precisely because it was understood as or could be argued to mean "higher or superior *dhamma*".

The basis for Frauwallner's explanation of the development of the *Vibhaṅga* is his theory of the *mātṛkā*. That I shall turn to later. For now, it is sufficient to address the result of his method. He supposes (following Bareau[37]) that the *Suttantabhājanīya* represents the earliest portion of each *vibhaṅga*, while the *Abhidhammabhājanīya* and the *Pañhāpucchaka* represent later additions. Moreover, he considers that two of the three last *vibhaṅgas* represent independent works that have been subsequently appended to the *Vibhaṅga*. Lastly, he points to the subject matter of the different *vibhaṅgas* as falling mainly into two groups. One group is the well-known seven sets which later tradition names as the *bodhipakkhiyadhammas*: "the *dhammas* which contribute to awakening" together with some additional related topics. I shall refer to these here as the Awakening sets, without trying to define a fixed number. The second group includes such things as the aggregates, elements, bases; I shall refer to these as the World sets.

In fact, contrary to Bareau and Frauwallner, it is just as possible to argue that it is precisely the *Abhidhammabhājanīya* that represents the earliest form of this work. Obviously *Suttanta* is older than *Abhidhamma*, but it would be really rather naive to suppose that this necessarily means that *Suttantabhājanīya* is older than *Abhidhammabhājanīya*. In this connexion it is perhaps crucial to note that only the *Abhidhammabhājanīya* is complete. It would have been extremely difficult to add a *Pañhāpucchaka* for the *Paccayākāravibhaṅga* by the nature of its subject matter. The twenty two *indriyas* do not have any treatment as a collected group in the *suttas* and so no *Suttantabhājanīya* could be added. Similarly, for the five training rules.

What of the three last *vibhaṅgas*, two of which Frauwallner considers to be independent treatises which have been appended to the *Vibhaṅga*? The first of these is the *Ñāṇavibhaṅga*. Frauwallner has relatively little to say about this and what he does say is fairly unsympathetic — he speaks of the "dull and meaningless fashion" in which items are combined and talks of lists which "in their vapidity are of little importance for the development of the doctrine" (p. 46). However, there is more here than Frauwallner allows. In fact, the *Ñāṇavibhaṅga* begins with a rather similar list to the one which we have already seen in the *Rūpakaṇḍa* and in the *Khandhavibhaṅga* (p.14 above*)*. This is the start of an *ekuttara* analysis, giving a number of distinct kinds of knowledge of the five sense discriminations (*viññāṇa*). What is interesting about the initial list of 42 items is that, unlike the previous list, this one is not taken directly from the *Abhidhammamātikā*. It is in

---

fact closely parallel to the list for *rūpa* and can only have originated in relationship to that. See Table Four below.

TABLE 4
COMPARISON OF SINGLE ITEMS IN
THE RŪPAKAṆḌA & THE ÑĀṆAVATTHU

ekavidhena rūpaṃ	ekavidhena ñāṇavatthu: pañca viññāṇā
1. na hetu	1. na hetu
2. ahetuka	2. ahetuka
3. hetuvippayutta	3. hetuvippayutta
4. sappaccaya	4. sappaccaya
5. saṅkhata	5. saṅkhata
6. rūp(iy)a	6. arūpa
7. lokiya	7. lokiya
8. sāsava	8. sāsava
9. saṃyojaniya	9. saṃyojaniya
10. ganthaniya	10. ganthaniya
11. oghaniya	11. oghaniya
12. yoganiya	12. yoganiya
13. nīvaraṇiya	13. nīvaraṇiya
14. parāmaṭṭha	14. parāmaṭṭha
15. upādāniya	15. upādāniya
16. saṃkilesika	16. saṃkilesika
17. avyākata	17. avyākata
18. anārammaṇa	18. sārammaṇa
19. acetasika	19. acetasika
20. cittavippayutta	
21. nevavipākanavipākadhamma	20. vipāka 21. **upādinnupādāniya**
22. asaṃkiliṭṭhasaṃkilesika	22. asaṃkiliṭṭhasaṃkilesika
23. na savitakkasavicāra	23. na savitakkasavicāra
24. na avitakkavicāramatta	24. na avitakkavicāramatta
25. avitakkaavicāra	24. avitakkaavicāra
26. na pītisahagata	26. na pītisahagata
27. na sukhasahagata	
28. na upekkhāsahagata	
29. neva dassanena na bhāvanāya pahātabba	27. neva dassanena 28. na bhāvanāya pahātabba

113

30. neva dassanena na bhāvanāya pahātabbahetukā	29. neva dassanena na bhāvanāya pahātabbahetukā
31. nevācayagāmināpacayagāmin	30. nevācayagāmināpacayagāmin
32. nevasekkhanāsekkha	31. nevasekkhanāsekkha
33. paritta	32. paritta
34. kāmāvacara	33. kāmāvacara
35. na rūpāvacara	34. na rūpāvacara
36. na arūpāvacara	35. na arūpāvacara
37. pariyāpanna	36. pariyāpanna
38. no apariyāpanna	37. no apariyāpanna
39. aniyata	38. aniyata
40. aniyyānika	39. aniyyānika
41. uppanna	40. uppanna
42. **chahi viññāṇehi viññeyya**	41. **manoviññāṇaviññeyya**
43. anicca	42. anicca
44. jarābhibhūta	43. jarābhibhūta

The items shown in blue in the above table differ between the lists, generally for obvious reasons. Other differences are quite few. Three items which cannot apply to the five *viññāṇa* as a group are omitted;[38] one item which does not apply to all *rūpa* is added here.[39] Much more significantly, a number of triplets and couplets which might have been expected are missing.[40] (See Table Five below.) So this and the *rūpa* section have been constructed in close connexion.[41] We may conclude thus far then that the *Ñāṇavibhaṅga* is not likely to have been an independent work. It is more probably part of the original portion of the *Vibhaṅga* together with the *Abhidhammabhājanīyas* of all or some of the previous 15 *vibhaṅgas*. This was also the view of André Bareau.[42]

---

[38]They are: *cittavippayutta*, *na sukhasahagata*, *na upekkhāsahagata*.

[39]*Upādiṇṇupādāniya*.

[40]Missing both here and for singlefold *rūpa*: from the triplets — *majjhima*; from the couplets — (*no*) *citta*, *appītika*, *sauttara*, *saraṇa*. Missing but expected here: from the triplets — *parittārammaṇa*, *paccupannārammaṇa*, *anidassanaapaṭigha*; from the couplets — *anidassana*, *apaṭigha*, *ajjhattika*, *no upādā*.

[41]The anomalies might also be accounted for by supposing that some or all of these items had not yet been added to the *abhidhammamātikā* at this point.

[42]Bareau 1951b, p. 27 n.42: "Car le *Ñāṇavibhaṅga*, seizième chapitre, a son parallèle dans les deux autres *Abhidharmapiṭaka*."

TABLE 5
FIVE DISCRIMINATIONS COMPARED TO TRIPLETS & COUPLETS

tika			duka
	1.	na hetū	1.
	2.	ahetukā	2.
	3.	hetuvippayuttā	3.
	4.	sappaccayā	7.
	5.	saṅkhatā	8.
	6.	arūpā	11.
	7.	lokiyā	12.
	8.	sāsavā	15.
	9.	saṃyojaniyā	21.
	10.	ganthaniyā	27.
	11.	oghaniyā	33.
	12.	yoganiyā	39.
	13.	nīvaraṇiyā	45.
	14.	parāmaṭṭhā	51.
	15.	upādāniyā	70.
	16.	saṃkilesikā	76.
1.	17.	avyākatā	
	18.	sārammaṇā	55.
	19.	acetasikā	57.
3.	20.	vipākā	
4.	21.	upādinnupādāniyā	cf. 68
5.	22.	asaṃkiliṭṭhasaṃkilesikā	
6.	23.	na savitakkasavicārā	cf. 87–88
6.	24.	na avitakkavicāramattā	
6.	25.	avitakkaavicārā	
	26.	na pītisahagatā	90; cf. 89
8.	27.	neva dassanena na bhāvanāya pahātabbā	
9.	28.	neva dassanena na bhāvanāya pahātabbahetukā	
10.	29.	nevācayagāmināpacayagāmino	
11.	30.	nevasekkhanāsekkhā	
12.	31.	parittā	
	32.	kāmāvacarā	93.
	33.	na rūpāvacarā	94.
	34.	na arūpāvacarā	95.
	35.	pariyāpannā	96.
	36.	no apariyāpannā	

15.	37.	aniyatā	98.
	38.	aniyyānikā	97.
17.	39.	uppannā	
	40.	manoviññāṇaviññeyyā	?13
	41.	aniccā	
	42.	jarābhibhūtā	

The penultimate *Khuddakavatthuvibhaṅga* was considered by Frauwallner to be a part of his original core, largely on the basis of a parallel with a similar section in the *Dharmaskandha*. It is possible that this is correct, given the *ekuttara* arrangement. However, given its similarity to some of the material in the *Suttanta-mātikā*, it seems more likely that it has been added at the same time as that. If so, it may not have been part of the original Pali *Abhidhammapiṭaka*.

The final chapter of the *Vibhaṅga* is the *Dhammahadaya*. Frauwallner rightly points out that this contains three distinct sections.[43] I shall call them A, B, and C. The middle section B begins with a passage also found near the end of the *Nikkhepakaṇḍa*.[44] The rest of the section is in a style which resembles the *Niddesa* and may perhaps represent the intrusion of a palm-leaf with a piece of an old commentary. If so, it represents evidence for the existence of an earlier written version of the *Nikkhepakaṇḍa* with a written commentary.[45]

The final section concludes with its own separate *uddāna*, which might lead one to suppose that it was originally a separate work. Frauwallner was in fact uncertain whether the sections I am calling A and C were originally one work or not. He believed that it was not in any case part of the original *Vibhaṅga*. As to this, I am less sure. *Dhammahadaya* C is partially based on *mātikā* categories.[46] Both sections utilize a list of world sets very close to that used in the *Cittuppādakaṇḍa*.

---

[43] He (rather inconveniently) gives references to the page numbers of the *Nāgarī* edition, instead of giving the PTS page numbers which are provided in the margin of that edition. The references he gives correspond to Vibh 401–420; 421– 426; 426–436.

[44] Note also that the singlefold analysis for *rūpa* omits the last two *abhidhamma* couplets and reverses the order of the previous two. It may then be the case that some of the four final couplets are a later addition. If so, this passage may have originally been at the very end of the *Nikkhepakaṇḍa*. It is commented on in the *Abhidhamma Commentary*. It is also found at Paṭis I 83f.

[45] The oldest known Buddhist text appears to be an *avadāna* text in Gāndhārī radiocarbon dated to the second century B.C. See Falk 2011, p.19. According to Falk (email 6.4.14) the Ms contains copying errors that indicate it has been copied from another Ms.

[46] The ten sections are based upon three couplets (55, 11, 12), five of the first six triplets (in order: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6) together with a fourfold and a fivefold list.

The difference, however, is perhaps significant. The *Dhammahadayavibhaṅga* adds to the seven world sets used in the *Cittuppādakaṇḍa* the set of the four truths, but does not utilize any of the awakening sets used there.

<div align="center">

TABLE 6
CONTENT OF THE 18 VIBHAṄGAS

</div>

vibhaṅgas	abhidhamma-bhājanīya	enlarged by:
1. khandha	*ekuttara* – to 10 or 11 +	*mātikā*
2. āyatana	*ekuttara* – *mana* + 3 *khandha*	*mātikā*
3. dhātu	*ekuttara* – 3 *khandha*	*mātikā*
4. sacca	moves *dhammas* between *saccas*	*lokuttara cittuppādas*
5. indriya	*ekuttara* – *mana*	*mātikā*
6. paccayākāra	16 × 9 types	all *cittuppādas*
7. satipaṭṭhāna	4 separately & as one *dhamma*	*lokuttara kusala* and *vipāka cittuppādas*
8. sammappadhāna	4 separately & as one *dhamma*	*lokuttara cittuppādas*
9. iddhipāda	4 separately & as four *dhammas*	*lokuttara cittuppādas*
10. bojjhaṅga	7 separately & as 7 *dhammas*	*lokuttara kusala* and *vipāka cittuppādas*
11. maggaṅga	eightfold/fivefold & as *dhammas*	*lokuttara kusala* and *vipāka cittuppādas*
12. jhāna	fourfold/fivefold	*(a)rūpāvacara* and *lokuttara cittuppādas*
13. appamaññā	3 in 3 *jhānas*; 1 in 4th *jhāna*	*rūpāvacara cittuppādas*
14. sikkhāpada	as *virati*, *cetanā* or 55 *dhammas*	eight *kusala cittuppādas*
15. paṭisambhidā	4 or 3 by object [*cittas*]	all *cittuppādas*
16. ñāṇa	*ekuttara* – to 10	*mātikā*
17. khuddakavatthu	*ekuttara* – to 10 + 108 & 62	?*duka-mātikā*
18. dhammahadaya (world sets)	A: B: intrusion? C: ten sections	?*cittuppāda-kaṇḍa* ?*mātikā*

In Part One, after an initial look at the questions as to whether the early Buddhist Canon(s) were originally structured on the basis of Piṭakas or of Nikāyas and how many distinct *Abhidha(r)mma-piṭakas* there would have originally been, I examine the theories concerning the development of the earlier Abhidhamma works developed by André Bareau and Ernst Frauwallner. I show that Frauwallner's work does not adequately understand the structure and contents of the *Rūpa-*

kaṇḍa of the *Dhammasaṅgaha*. In particular its relationship to the *Abhidhamma-mātikā* is not recognized. After some discussion of the origins and nature of *mātṛkā* in the canonical literature, I look at Frauwallner's analysis of the Vibhaṅga and raise the question as to whether Bareau and Frauwallner are right to see the *Suttanta-bhājanīya* sections of that as earlier.

PART TWO:
WHAT LIES BEHIND THE ABHIDHAMMA WE KNOW

an original three or four part Abhidhammapiṭaka?

I now examine the core of the *Vibhaṅga* which emerges if the *Abhidhammabhāja-nīya* sections are considered more likely to be original. What is immediately striking if we tabulate the contents is that it falls sharply into two groups. (See Table Six above.) One group is constituted by the World sets of the first three and the fifth *vibhaṅga*, together with the *Ñāṇavibhaṅga* and possibly the two final sections. The main features here are the use of an *ekuttara* method together with enlargement by utilizing the *abhidhamma-mātikā*. The second group includes all the groupings which could be classified as or with the Awakening sets, plus one or two additions. In these there is no sign of either the *ekuttara* method or the influence of the *mātikā*. Instead we see classification in terms of *dhammas* and *cittuppādas*. This is given in more detail in Tables Seven and Eight.

TABLE 7
WORLD SETS IN THE VIBHAṄGA

Vibhaṅga	Abhidhamma-bhājanīya	enlarged by:
1. khandha	ekuttara to 10/11 +	mātikā
2. āyatana	ekuttara: mana + 3 khandhas	mātikā
3. dhātu	ekuttara: 3 khandhas	mātikā
5. indriya	ekuttara: mana	mātikā
16. ñāṇa	ekuttara to 10	mātikā
17. khuddakavatthu	ekuttara to 10/108/62	?duka-mātikā
18. dhammahadaya	Part C: 10 sections	?mātikā

TABLE 8
AWAKENING SETS IN THE VIBHAṄGA

Vibhaṅga	Abhidhamma-bhājanīya	enlarged by cittuppādas:
4. sacca	moves dhammas between saccas	two are lokuttara
6.paccayākāra	16 × 9 types	all
7. satipaṭṭhāna	4 separately & as one dhamma	lokuttara
8. sammappadhāna	4 separately & as one dhamma	lokuttara
9. iddhipāda	4 separately & as one dhamma	lokuttara
10. bojjhaṅga	7 separately & as 7 dhammas	lokuttara
11. maggaṅga	eightfold/fivefold & as dhammas	lokuttara
12. jhāna	fourfold/fivefold	(a)rūpāvacara & lokuttara
13. appamaññā	3 in 3 jhānas; 1 in 4th jhāna	rūpāvacara
14. sikkhāpada	as virati, cetanā or 55 dhammas	8 kusala
15. paṭisambhidā	4 or 3 by object [cittas]	all

My hypothesis at this point is that these two groups represent a remainder from an earlier situation in which they were part of two separate works or sections. (I omit from consideration at this stage the *Puggalapaññatti* and the *Dhātukathā*.) If that were the case, then what we would have is something like the following:

TABLE 9
EARLY *ABHIDHAMMA* WORKS

Dhammasaṅgaha	Abhidhamma-mātikā
	A. Cittuppāda-kaṇḍa
	B. Rūpa-kaṇḍa
	C. Nikkhepa-kaṇḍa
Uncertain	17. Khuddakavatthu-vibhaṅga
	18. Dhammahadaya-vibhaṅga
Vibhaṅga A **World sets analysed by the** *Abhidhamma-mātikā*	1. khandha (5)
	2. āyatana (12)
	3. dhātu (18)
	5. indriya (22)
	16. ñāṇa (many)
Vibhaṅga B **Awakening sets analysed by** *Cittuppādas*	4. sacca (4)
	6. paṭiccasamuppāda
	7. satipaṭṭhāna (4)
	8. sammappadhāna (4)
	9. iddhipāda (4)
	10. bojjhaṅga (7)

11. maggaṅga (8)
12. jhāna (4/5)
13. appamañña (4)
14. sikkhāpada (5)
15. paṭisambhidā (4)

It is clear from what we have already seen that the groups listed under *vibhaṅga* A are closely related to the *Abhidhammamātikā*, while the *Cittuppādakaṇḍa* and the *Rūpakaṇḍa* are intrusive in their present position. So we can further rearrange as follows:

TABLE 10
EARLY *ABHIDHAMMA* REARRANGED

World sets analysed by the *Abhidhamma-mātikā* (now found in Dhammasaṅgaha and Vibhaṅga A)	Abhidhamma-mātikā = uddesa? Nikkhepa-kaṇḍa = niddesa? old commentary? = paṭiniddesa? khandha (5) old commentary? (Rūpa-kaṇḍa) āyatana (12) dhātu (18) indriya (22) ñāṇa (many)
Uncertain	17. Khuddakavatthu-vibhaṅga 18. Dhammahadaya-vibhaṅga
Awakening sets analysed by Cittuppādas (now found in Vibhaṅga B)	6. paṭiccasamuppāda 7. satipaṭṭhāna (4) 8. sammappadhāna (4) 9. iddhipāda (4) 10. bojjhaṅga (7) 11. maggaṅga (8) 12. jhāna (4/5) 13. appamañña (4) 14. sikkhāpada (5) 15. paṭisambhidā (4) 16. sacca (4)

We have already seen the close connexion between the *Rūpakaṇḍa* and the *Rūpakhandhavibhaṅga*. The singlefold *mātikā* for the *Rūpakaṇḍa* is identical to the singlefold treatment of the *rūpa* aggregate. The latter then may simply be the source for the former. Since such a treatment would always have required a

more detailed explanation, we may infer the presence of an old commentary to the *Rūpa* aggregate material. What then of the *Cittuppādakaṇḍa*? Logically, we might expect that it would derive from the treatment in the same chapter of the four mental aggregates. That is in fact partially the case, but only partially.

The fundamental structure of the *Cittuppādakaṇḍa* is a division by the first triplet, which is then subdivided by the four levels (*kāmadhātu*, etc.) and where that is appropriate subdivided again by the second couplet (*sahetukaduka*). This is the precise analysis into twofold, threefold and fourfold that we do in fact find at the beginning of the *ekuttaras* for the mental aggregates. So the structure for the *Cittuppādakaṇḍa* has indeed been taken from there.[47]

In fact, however, there is a simple explanation. If we look around for a source that could have contained all of the material on the *citta* arisings, there is in fact only one: the *Paṭiccasamuppādavibhaṅga*. That is slightly concealed in present-day editions, which tend to give only the first type of mentality in each group. But the commentaries are quite clear that you are meant to supply the remainder and indeed the whole treatment makes no sense without that. In that case, the work that I am calling *Vibhaṅga* 'B' began with a full treatment of the *cittuppā-das*. Subsequent *vibhaṅgas* can then refer to that in their own treatment, which inevitably then becomes abbreviated. Of course, it is quite possible that much of the material was originally compiled into the *Paṭiccasamuppādavibhaṅga* from other individual *vibhaṅgas*, e.g. the eight skilful *cittuppādas* may derive from the *Sikkhāpadavibhaṅga*, and so on.

The kind of arrangement postulated here has some parallel in the *Abbhantara-mātikā* to the *Dhātukathā*.

---

[47] It would also be possible to suppose that the remaining material comes from the postulated old commentary to the *Khandhavibhaṅga* material. Or, more probably, that could have been an intermediate stage.

TABLE 11
ABBHANTARA-MĀTIKĀ OF THE DHĀTUKATHĀ

1.	5 khandha
2.	12 āyatana
3.	18 dhātu
4.	4 sacca
5.	22 indriya
6.	paṭiccasamuppāda
7.	4 satipaṭṭhāna
8.	4 sammappadhāna
9.	4 iddhipāda
10.	4 jhāna
11.	4 appamaññā
12.	5 indriya
13.	5 bala
14.	7 bojjhaṅga
15.	8 magga
16.	phassa vedanā saññā cetanā citta adhimokkha manasikāra
17.	tika-mātikā
18.	duka-mātikā

Note that the sixteenth section is effectively a list of single items, followed by threefold and twofold analysis. The list falls clearly into three groups, but if we assume that the third group belongs originally with the first, we would have something quite similar to what I have proposed.

In putting forward this analysis I am obviously, like Frauwallner and others before him, influenced by the arrangement of the early *abhidhamma* works surviving in Chinese translation. So let us now turn briefly to that.

TABLE 12
THE FOURFOLD *ŚĀRIPUTRĀBHIDHARMA
(after Lamotte p. 180; Yoshimoto 1996; Cox 1995 p. 7f. & n.)

A: With Questions	B: Without Questions	C: *Saṃyukta-saṃgraha	D: *Prasthāna or *Nidāna
World sets	Path sets		

Chinese preface to the translation of the almost certainly Dharmaguptaka *Dīrghāgama* refers to an *Abhidharma* in four sections and five recitations:

A: With Questions	B: Without Questions	C: *Saṃyukta-saṃgraha	D: *Prasthāna or *Nidāna

The Chinese translation of the Dharmaguptaka Vinaya refers to an Abhidharma in five (or four) sections:

A: *Sasaṃcodana-viveka	B: *Asaṃcodana-viveka	C: *Saṃyoga	D: *Prayoga	E: *Sthāna

The Chinese translation of a Vinaya work (Haimavata or Dharmagupta)

A: With Questions	B: Without Questions	C: *Saṃgraha	D: *Saṃyoga	E: *Sthāna

These must all be different ways of referring to versions of the same work. Slightly more aberrant is the *Nandimitrāvadāna*:

A: *Saṃgraha	*Ṣaṭpraśnaka	C: *Saṃyoga	D: *Prasthāna

The Chinese translation of the *Śāriputrābhidharma* is in four parts. This closely corresponds to the description of an *abhidharma* in four sections and five recitations, found in the preface to the Chinese *Dīrghāgama*. Analogous *abhidharmas* in five sections are referred to in the Chinese translations of the *Dharmaguptaka Vinaya* and of a *Vinaya* text which is variously attributed to the Haimavatas or to the Dharmaguptakas.[48] It has long been known that the subject matter

---

[48]Yoshimoto 1996; Cox 1995, 7f. & n. Slightly more aberrant is the *Nandimitrāvadāna* with four sections: A. *Saṃgraha; B. *Ṣaṭpraśnaka; C. *Saṃyoga; D. *Prasthāna.

of the third section is closely related to that of the Pali *Dhātukathā*.[49] It is this third section which is subdivided into two to make the fivefold versions. It is possible that the original structure was fourfold, but the final section corresponds in title to the *Paṭṭhāna* and the *Jñānaprasthāna* which, as we have them, are both later works. We should remember also the Dharmaguptaka penchant for fourfold arrangements — as has been mentioned, their *Vinayapiṭaka* and their *Suttapiṭaka* were also arranged in four sections.[50]

The first and second sections deal precisely with the World sets and the Awakening sets. According to Yoshimoto, the first section is analysed throughout in a twofold, threefold and fourfold way.[51] This obviously parallels the triplet and couplet *mātikā*. So it is very natural to suppose that this and the Pali *abhidhamma* works have, as might be expected, a shared ancestry.

We might then suppose that the Pali *Abhidhammapiṭaka* originally looked like this:

<div align="center">

TABLE 13
EARLY RECENSION OF THE PALI ABHIDHAMMA?

</div>

A. With Questions	B. Without Questions	C. Saṅgaha-sampayoga?
Abhidhamma-mātikā Nikkhepakaṇḍa World Sets[52] Khuddakavatthu?	Awakening Sets[53] Puggalapaññatti?	Dhātukathā: Saṅgaha/asaṅgaha Sampayutta/vippayutta

I will postpone for the moment any attempt to explore the pre-history of this.

the subsequent development of the canonical abhidhamma literature

I turn now to the subsequent development of the canonical literature. We can take the hypothesis so far advanced as Phase 1. At some later point the need was perhaps felt to link all this more clearly to the earlier *Suttanta* material and at the

---

[49] Kimura; La Vallée Poussin 1924, vol. I, pp. LX–LXII. According to Bareau 1951b, p. 27, the parallel is "*assez lointain*", but exact in the *Prakaraṇa*.

[50] Przyluski 1927, pp. 353– 361; Bareau 1950.

[51] Yoshimoto 1996.

[52] World sets = *khandha; āyatana; dhātu; indriya; ñāṇa*.

[53] *satipaṭṭhāna; sammappadhāna; iddhipāda; bojjhaṅga; maggaṅga*; and probably also: *jhāna; appamaññā; sikkhāpada; paṭisambhidā; paṭiccasamuppāda; sacca.*

same time to point up the contrasts. It was then that the *Suttanta* couplets were added to the *mātikā* and to the *Nikkhepakaṇḍa*. We can call this Phase 2A.

Frauwallner himself considered the *Suttanta* couplets and their commentary in the *Nikkhepakaṇḍa* to be a later addition.[54] He in fact considered that both were inserted in Dhs by the redactors of the *Abhidhammapiṭaka* from a Pali work corresponding to the *Saṅgītiparyāya* of the Sarvāstivādins i.e. an old commentary on the *Saṅgītisutta*. But I did not earlier give in full my reasons for rejecting Bareau's and Frauwallner's claim that the core portion of the *Vibhaṅga* is constituted by the *Suttantabhājanīya* sections. Frauwallner lays considerable emphasis on the parallel with the *Dharmaskandha* here. His essential point is that the two texts both proceed by presenting a *sūtra* text and then subsequently explaining it.[55] He considers that the *Vibhaṅga* is using the same method, except that the typical setting of the *sūtra*, the *nidāna*, has been omitted. This method of treatment is, in his view, unusual and rare in both *Abhidharmas* and is therefore an important feature of correspondence between the two texts.

I am doubtful as to whether one work out of seven in each case can really be called "rare". The method itself is not in fact unusual. In Pali we have the *Paṭisambhidāmagga*, effectively an *abhidhamma* work, and commentarial material such as the *Niddesa* and parts of the *Peṭakopadesa* and *Nettipakaraṇa*. Indeed, the *Saṅgītiparyāya* itself in the Sarvāstivādin *Abhidharmapiṭaka* is a type of commentary. But Frauwallner has in mind a particular method of comment.

It is important to note that in fact such a method is adopted in only five of the eighteen *vibhaṅgas* — all of them concerned with the Awakening sets. It is precisely these which Frauwallner singled out as particularly close to the *Dharmaskandha*.[56] There is no evidence that such a method has ever been adopted for the World sets. For the remaining *Suttantabhājanīyas*, what we have is rather a presentation of the viewpoint of the *suttantas*, followed by a more detailed exposition in question and answer format. It is important to note that this is a presentation of the *Suttanta* viewpoint as an *ābhidhammika* might see it. They often contain the kind of *abhidhamma*-like elements which are usually considered evidence of lateness when actually found in *suttas*. We can note in particular the presence of a number of the registers for particular *dhammas*.[57]

---

[54]p. 83; cf. p. 54.

[55]p. 19.

[56]p. 17, n.14. The sets in question are those of *vibhaṅgas* 10–13.

[57]e.g. the register for the three *lokuttara indriya* is the same as in Dhs.

We have already seen that two of the *vibhaṅgas* do not have a *suttantabhājanīya* at all. At most, then, the second section of our postulated early recension, i.e. the section "Without Questions", could have contained old *suttantabhājanīyas* in a more commentarial style. Even if they did, we can suppose that at the same point that the *Suttanta* couplets were added to the couplet *mātikā*, new more *abhidhamma*-style *suttantabhājanīyas* were added to at least the World sets, and probably some of the Awakening sets were modified in the same direction. I have called this Phase 2A to distinguish it from Phase 2B when the *pañhāpucchakas* and the *Atthuddhārakaṇḍa* were added (see below). By the conclusion of Phase 2, however, we would, I believe, have had the *Dhammasaṅgaha* and *Vibhaṅga* substantially as we have them now.

That the final commentarial section – the *Atthuddhārakaṇḍa* – to the *Dhammasaṅgaha* is a later addition has in fact long been recognized. Indeed, in 1885 Edward Müller, the PTS editor of this work, already points out the distinctive nature of this work and the fact that it substitutes the term *nibbāna* for the term "unconstructed element" used in the rest of the *Dhammasaṅgaha*. This proves a rather acute observation. The term *asaṅkhatā dhātu* is frequent in the *Nikkhepakaṇḍa* and otherwise found almost nowhere else in the *Abhidhammapiṭaka*. Apart from a passage quoted from the *Majjhimanikāya* in the *Kathāvatthu*, the only other place in which the phrase is found is in the *Vibhaṅga*: three times in the *Āyatanavibhaṅga* and three times in the *Dhātuvibhaṅga*, i.e. precisely in the World sets.[58]

Further indications of the lateness of this section were identified by Caroline Rhys Davids in an Appendix to her translation of Dhs.[59] (She in fact did not translate the *Atthuddhārakaṇḍa.*) Frauwallner links the *Commentarial section* to the *Cittuppādakaṇḍa* and it does indeed utilize the system of the *cittuppāda* from there. Caroline Rhys Davids was however right to emphasize the link to later literature shown by the use of the ablatival forms: *kusalato*, *vipākato* and *kiriyato*.[60] This is the terminology of the commentaries of a later period. Also striking is the

---

[58] It is found once also in the passage of the *Dhammahadayavibhaṅga* which is an intrusion from the *Nikkhepakaṇḍa* (Vibh 421). Elsewhere it is found at: D III 274 (*Dasuttara*); M III 63 (*Bahudhātuka*); Paṭis I 84 in a passage from the *Nikkhepakaṇḍa*. cf. also Nett 48.

[59] Rhys Davids 1900, pp. 367–369.

[60] *Kusalato* and *kiriyato* are not found in the *Abhidhammapiṭaka* outside the final section of Dhs, except in a late addition to the *Paṭisambhidāvibhaṅga* (Vibh 303). Similarly, *vipākato* is only found in the *Dhammahadayavibhaṅga* and twice in the *hetu-gocchaka* of the *Nikkhepakaṇḍa*.

use of the terms *kiriyāvyākata* and *vipākāvyākata* so typical of the *Paṭṭhāna*.[61] We can also note that the structure of the *gocchakas* in the couplet *mātikā* seems to imply the absence of the kind of analysis given in the *Aṭṭhakathākaṇḍa*.

We can be confident then that the *Atthuddhārakaṇḍa* is a later addition. What then of the *pañhāpucchakas*? We cannot easily analyse individual word forms there, because most of the vocabulary is taken from the *mātikā*. It does seem clear that some items in the *pañhāpucchakas* imply the detailed analysis of *cittuppādas* given in the *Atthuddhārakaṇḍa*. An example of this would be the case of *bahiddhārammaṇa* in the *Jhānavibhaṅga*. In the *Nikkhepakaṇḍa* the *ajjhatta* triplet is explained simply: internal or personal *dhammas* are those of oneself, while external *dhammas* are those of other people. In the following *ajjhattārammaṇa* triplet, *bahiddhārammaṇa dhammas* are simply those whose object is the *dhammas* of other people. However, in the *Atthuddhārakaṇḍa*, these triplets are explained in more detail. So we learn that all *dhammas* can be internal or external with the exception of *nibbāna* and *rūpa* that is not included in the *indriyas*. It follows from this that the transcendent paths and fruits which have only *nibbāna* as their object must always be classified as having an external object. And the *pañhāpucchakas* consistently classify in this way.

But why are the other *rūpāvacara jhānas* said invariably to have an external object? They cannot have been thought to have had *nibbāna* as their object. So the natural assumption would be that their object is *anindriyabaddharūpa*, although that is understood by the commentators to mean external inanimate matter. In fact, the commentators unanimously explain that the object of these *jhānas* is a concept, but this doesn't seem to be clearly stated anywhere in the Canon itself. However one takes this, it is clear that the discussion of especially the *ārammaṇa* triplets in the *pañhāpucchakas* presupposes the details given in the *Atthuddhārakaṇḍa*.[62]

Given the close connexion of the two, we could presume that the *pañhāpucchaka* appendixes to the *vibhaṅgas* and the *Atthuddhārakaṇḍa* appendix to the *Dhammasaṅgaha* have been added at the same time.

---

[61] *Kiriyābyākata* is also found at Paṭis I 79 ff. in a section giving an early version of the *citta-vīthi* and in the later parts of the *Kathāvatthu* (from Kvu 444 (*anusayakathā*) onwards). It is found only once in Dhs outside the *Atthuddhārakaṇḍa*: Dhs §1062. In Vibh it is found only in the last three *Vibhaṅgas*.

[62] Note in particular the special treatment of skilful and *kiriyā* fourth *jhāna*.

a new proposal

I have up to this point been operating on the basis of my own initial hypothesis that the *suttantabhājanīyas* are late. Frauwallner's hypothesis, of course, was that they were early. It is perhaps possible to combine the advantages from both positions. Originally, we have two works or sections. (Table Fourteen) The first "with questions" consisted of *Mātikā* followed by their *Vibhaṅga*. This would closely parallel the arrangement of the *Vinayapiṭaka*. Appended to or part of that *vibhaṅga* were the World sets with their questionnaire sections. The second "without questions" consisted of a detailed account of conditioned origination with an explanation of how it operated in different *cittuppādas*. This was followed by an expanded version of the Awakening sets, each with its own *suttanta-* and *abhidhammabhājanīya*.

The advantage of combining the two positions is that for the *Abhidhamma* "with questions" the *suttantabhājanīya* is indeed a later addition, as I have suggested. For the *Abhidhamma* "without questions" the *suttantabhājanīya* portions are at least somewhat older, as Frauwallner believed. It remains possible that they are no older than the accompanying *abhidhammabhājanīya* and were constructed by the *ābhidhammikas* to contrast their understanding with that of the *Suttantas*.

TABLE 14
THE EARLY RECENSION − AN ALTERNATIVE HYPOTHESIS

A. With Questions (World sets analysed by the Abhidhamma-mātikā)	B. Without Questions (Awakening sets analysed by Cittuppādas)
Abhidhamma-mātikā	6. paṭiccasamuppāda
Vibhaṅga to the Mātikā	a) suttanta-bhājanīya
Nikkhepakaṇḍa	b) abhidhamma-bhājanīya
(old commentary?)	7. satipaṭṭhāna (4)
khandha (5)	a) suttanta-bhājanīya
old commentary?	b) abhidhamma-bhājanīya
pañhâpucchaka	8. sammappadhāna (4)
āyatana (12)	a) suttanta-bhājanīya
pañhâpucchaka	b) abhidhamma-bhājanīya
dhātu (18)	9. iddhipāda (4)
pañhâpucchaka	a) suttanta-bhājanīya
indriya (22)	b) abhidhamma-bhājanīya
pañhâpucchaka	10. **bojjhaṅga** (7)

ñāṇa (many)
　　pañhâpucchaka?
Khuddakavatthu?

　　a) suttanta-bhājanīya
　　b) abhidhamma-bhājanīya
11. **maggaṅga (8)**
　　a) suttanta-bhājanīya
　　b) abhidhamma-bhājanīya
12. **jhāna (4/5)**
　　a) suttanta-bhājanīya
　　b) abhidhamma-bhājanīya
13. **appamañña (4)**
　　a) suttanta-bhājanīya
　　b) abhidhamma-bhājanīya
14. **sikkhāpada (5)**
　　a) suttanta-bhājanīya
　　b) abhidhamma-bhājanīya
15. **paṭisambhidā (4)**
　　a) suttanta-bhājanīya
　　b) abhidhamma-bhājanīya
16. **sacca (4)**
　　a) suttanta-bhājanīya
　　b) abhidhamma-bhājanīya
Puggalapaññatti?

Uncertain are:

17. Khuddakavatthu-vibhaṅga
18. Dhammahadaya-vibhaṅga

Once the decision was taken to integrate the two, then the two main changes follow logically. The World sets were moved in with the Awakening sets and an attempt was made to provide *pañhāpucchakas* and *suttantabhājanīyas* throughout. To do this effectively, it would have been necessary to clarify some of the hitherto undeveloped details of the *mātikā* explanation. This was done in two ways. The first major change was to introduce systematic accounts of *cittuppādas* and *rūpas* between the *Mātikā* and the *Nikkhepakaṇḍa*, taking the material mainly from the first World set and the account of conditioned origination at the head of the Awakening sets. The second change was to replace any existing commentary to the *Nikkhepakaṇḍa* with an updated one explaining the relationship between the *Mātikā* and the new material.

If this alternative hypothesis should prove correct, then it would seem highly likely that all these changes took place at one specific point.

COMPARISON OF THE POSTULATED EARLY ABHIDHAMMA
WITH THE NORTHERN SOURCES
TABLE 14 WITH QUESTIONS

Precursor to Pali works	*Śāriputrābhidharma	Dharmaskandha (second part)
Mātikā + Nikkhepakaṇḍa	āyatana	khuddakavatthu†
khandha	dhātu	āyatana
āyatana	khandha	indriya
dhātu	sacca	khandha
indriya	indriya	dhātu
ñāṇa	bojjhaṅga	paṭiccasamuppāda†
khuddakavatthu	3 akusalamūla	
dhammahadaya	3 kusalamūla	
	4 mahābhūta	

TABLE 15
WITHOUT QUESTIONS

Precursor to Pali works	*Śāriputrābhidharma	Dharmaskandha (first part)
paṭiccasamuppāda	dhātu	sikkhāpada
satipaṭṭhāna	kamma	sotāpatti-aṅga †
sammappadhāna	puggala	aveccappasāda
idddhipāda	ñāṇa	sāmaññaphala
bojjhaṅga	paṭiccasamuppāda	paṭipadā
maggaṅga	satipaṭṭhāna	ariyavaṃsa
jhāna	sammappadhāna	sammappadhāna
appamaññā	idddhipāda	idddhipāda
sikkhāpada	jhāna	satipaṭṭhāna
paṭisambhidā	magga	sacca
sacca	akusalā dhammā	jhāna
		appamaññā
		āruppa
		samādhibhāvanā
		bojjhaṅga

† omitted in seventh chapter of Prakaraṇa

It is perhaps useful at this point to note the parallels with the two closest works of the North-western *abhidha(r)mma* traditions. (Tables 14–15) I have put all

items in Pali, as we do not know the language of the *Śāriputrābhidharma* and the items from the *Dharmaskandha* are in any case restorations from Chinese. The items marked in red are found in all three cases. The *khuddakavatthu* is missing in the "With Questions" section of the *Śāriputrābhidharma*, but perhaps has its correspondence in the final item of the "Without Questions" section: *akusalā dhammā*. The two items: *sacca* and *bojjhaṅga* are given in the "With Questions" section of the *Śāriputrābhidharma*, but are included with the Awakening Sets in the other two works. This looks like a late amendment — from some points of view the truths belong with the World Sets, while the *bojjhaṅgas* have been joined with the indriyas. Of course, the *indriyas* are a World Set if one thinks of the 22, but an Awakening Set if one thinks of the 5. The only anomaly in the *Dharmaskandha* list is the *paṭiccasamuppāda*, but this begins the *Dharmaskandha* in the extant Sanskrit fragments (followed immediately by *upāsakasya śikṣāpada*) and so is probably just a mistake in the Chinese translation.

Similarly, in the "Without Questions" section those which I count as in all three works are given in red, those in two of the three in blue. It is possible that the *paṭisambhidā* set in the first column is a late addition to the Pali tradition. The four initial items of the "Without Questions" section of the *Śāriputrābhidharma* have their correspondence in the *Puggalapaññatti* and in the final part of the *Dhammsaṅgaha*. We can note too that there are a few extra items in the list from the *Dharmaskandha*. André Bareau comments on the fact that the seven last chapters of the *Śāriputrābhidharma* do not have a *pañhāpucchaka*.[63]

The most plausible explanation of the early origin of all of this would seem to be the following. Just as the *Khandhakas* and *Parivāra* are sometimes considered as *abhivinaya* i.e. an additional portion or appendix to the *Vinaya* (i.e. both *Vibhaṅga*), so perhaps at some point there were *abhidhamma* appendices created by the Saṃyuttabhāṇakas and Aṅguttarabhāṇakas to their own *Nikāyas*, each using their own typical methodology. Subsequently, these were removed from their original context and collected into the earliest version of the *Abhidha(r)mma-piṭaka*.

I now turn to a different aspect of Frauwallner's views.

---

[63] Bareau 1951b, p. 27 n. 41.

PART THREE
FRAUWALLNER & THE DEVELOPMENT OF
EUROPEAN SCHOLARSHIP

the dating of the Pali abhidhamma works

Frauwallner declares: "… the works of the Pāli *Abhidharma* — apart from the oldest core of texts — were written in the period between 200 B.C. and A.D. 200 in the mother country and were brought to Ceylon from there." (p. 42)

It is possible that this closing date is intended to accommodate in particular the *Paṭisambhidāmagga*, which Frauwallner believed to be the last work of the Pali *abhidhamma* to be added to the Canon, albeit in the *Khuddakanikāya* rather than in the *Abhidhammapiṭaka*. If so, I cannot share his reasoning. The *Paṭisambhidāmagga* does not know the system of the *Paṭṭhāna* in its final form.[64] The latest substantial elements in the *Paṭisambhidāmagga* must be in fact earlier than the *Paṭṭhāna*.

Frauwallner's late dating is in fact dependent upon Sylvain Lévi's argument for a late date of the *Niddesa*.[65] Lévi showed that the *Niddesa* had geographical knowledge of locations in South-East Asia which were not known to classical writers before Ptolemy in the second century A.D. Since he also showed that the *Niddesa* lacked knowledge of the eastern coast of India, this might argue for an early date for the *Niddesa*. In any case, Roman ships did not sail further east because they could not do so and still catch the monsoon in both directions. So sailing further east meant a very substantial and uneconomic extension to the duration of the voyage.[66] Given that they embarked cargoes in southern India, it is unlikely that they could easily have obtained information about locations much further east. Middlemen are notoriously reluctant to tell their buyers much about their sources!

In any case Frauwallner seems subsequently to have modified his view. He is perhaps initially influenced by the late dates adopted in Bareau's early work, before carrying out his own analysis of the Pali works. In 1971 he stated:

---

[64] Paṭis II 49–55; 59f.; 73–77 knows five *paccayas*: *sahajāta-, aññamañña-, nissaya-, sampayutta-* and *vippayutta-* (perhaps *hetu* is implied). But this is likely to be based upon an earlier system of *paccayas*, given the obvious omissions.

[65] Rejected in Norman 1983, p. 86f. See also: Sarkar 1977; Sarkar 1981; Stargardt 1990, p. 43; Ray 2000 [1994].

[66] Bopearachchi 1997, p. xviii.

"… since … these texts predate the redaction of the Abhidharmapiṭaka in which they were included, I would like to assign them a date of between 250–50 B.C." (p. 125)

It seems clear from this that Frauwallner does not intend to give so late a date to the actual canonical works of the *Abhidhammapiṭaka*, only to the *Paṭisambhidāmagga*.[67] So it is unfortunate that von Hinüber cites only the later dating, as if for the canonical *abhidhamma* works.[68] Frauwallner does perhaps then intend to accept the writing down of the Canon in the first century B.C. as a closure date.

Elsewhere I have discussed what texts were written down with particular reference to the works of the *Khuddakanikāya*.[69] Regardless of that, the works preserved since time memorial (as it were) were the four *Nikāyas* together with the *Pātimokkha*, its *Vibhaṅga* and the *Khandhakas*. Major institutions of the Saṅgha existed to preserve these orally by means of group chanting. The decision to write them down officially had to be a major step. Nothing prevents the writing down of commentaries and *śāstras* long before this. Most probably, nothing prevented individuals from writing down particular *suttas* and so on for their own use — in larger monasteries at least. In small monasteries and for peripatetic monks, it must at first have been difficult or impossible to obtain writing materials.[70]

There must have been a council of some kind to establish the standard form of the Canon we know. It could not possibly be a hole in the corner minor event. Anyone who suggests that cannot have considered just what a major undertaking this would have been. There is no plausibility in the suggestion that this could be a local activity of a small group. It can only have been carried out under a royal or princely aegis. We can see this as associated with the writing down of the texts somewhere in the region of Karnataka and Andhra Pradesh. Or, we could see it as the Council in Ceylon which authorized those texts, thereby establishing a new canonical standard and eventually creating the Tambapaṇṇiya school as a group separate from other Vibhajjavādins.

But, quite clearly, there are those who will reject the idea of a council and suppose instead that the texts were written down piecemeal over a long period.

---

[67] Also probably to additions at the end of Kv and similar intrusions.

[68] Hinüber 1996, p. 64. OvH has perhaps not realized that Frauwallner's dating depends on the late date for the *Niddesa* (which he had earlier discussed cautiously: p. 58f.).

[69] Cousins 2013.

[70] This might not be the case in the North-West, where writing had probably been in use much longer.

I think this is quite incompatible with the kind of *Abhidhammapiṭaka* which we have. But, nonetheless, let us consider what other options we have to establish a dating for the Pali canonical *abhidhamma* works. I believe that we can, in the following way. For this we have to proceed backwards from the time of the commentaries.

The date of Buddhaghosa remains uncertain, since there is no good reason to accept the very late traditions that place him in the fifth century A.D. Petra Kieffer-Pülz has shown evidence that the Vinaya commentary probably dates from the fourth century A.D.[71] She in fact concluded that the writing of the *Samanta-pāsādikā* was completed in 387 A.D. I believe this to be plausible. The *Vinaya* and *Abhidhamma commentaries* are probably works of the school of Buddhaghosa rather than actual writings of the famous commentator himself. On the evidence of the colophons, etc. we can suppose that Buddhaghosa wrote the *Visuddhi-magga* and at least presided over the compilation of the four *Āgama* commentaries. He probably then wrote his works no later than the fourth century A.D.

No figure later than the reign of king Vasabha is mentioned in the authentic commentaries of Buddhaghosa. Even in the works of the "school of Buddhaghosa" there is only one possible later reference, i.e. in the *Vinaya commentary*, which refers to a King Mahāsena. But the story is otherwise unknown in the early sources and may easily not refer to the historical king Mahāsena. Or, it may have been added by the fourth century *Vinaya* commentator, since it would certainly be to Mahāsena's discredit.

The *Abhidhamma commentary*, which was written at the specific request of "*bhikkhu* Buddhaghosa", gives a detailed account of controversies concerned with the detailed working out of the *Paṭṭhāna* system, as it applies to resultant *citta*. These discussions are attributed to the views of named individuals: tipiṭaka-Cūḷanāga-tthera, Moravāpivāsī Mahādatta-tthera, and tipiṭaka-Mahādhamma-rakkhita-tthera. It is quite clear that the old Sinhalese commentaries prior to Buddhaghosa already contained accounts of these debates. Since they presume

---

[71] Kieffer-Pülz 1992, pp. 163–167. Hinüber 1996, p. 102f.; 142f. has a different view. Part of the problem here is that he dates the *Niddesa commentary* (Nidd-a) of Upasena to the ninth century. I am not really convinced by his arguments for this, but he goes on to claim that Nidd-a quotes Dhammapāla and thereby establishes that Dhammapāla is earlier than the ninth century. This, however, appears to be an error. He cites Nidd-a I 177–184 with reference to Ud-a 128–155. But the same passage is found in the *Paṭisambhidā-magga commentary* (I 207–13), the work of Mahānāma in the sixth century A.D. It is far more likely that Nidd-a is quoting Paṭis-a (or vice versa), since these works have many similarities.

the existence of the *Paṭṭhāna* system, we can be sure that at the date these *ābhi-dhammikas* lived, the *Paṭṭhāna* system had already been established in general.[72] It is certain that the commentaries situate these elders in the reigns of Vaṭṭagāmini and his successor.

The post-canonical *abhidhamma* discussions which we would expect immediately after the establishing of the *Abhidhammapiṭaka* in its present form are then precisely located to the first century B.C. Moreover, what is depicted there is plainly a time of great interest in *abhidhamma* discussion. Again, the major work involved in establishing the *Abhidhammapiṭaka* in its present form could only have taken place in such a period.

To add to this, we should note that several controversies in the later parts of the *Kathāvatthu* refer to the *paccayas* and the *paccaya-kathā* in particular seems to clearly presuppose the *Paṭṭhāna-niddesa*.[73] It is quite possible, however, that some *kathā* have been added to Kv at a very late date. Similarly, the *Parivāra* knows a number of *paccayas*, but again the date is disputed.[74]

the development of European scholarship

In the first volume of his history of Indian philosophy (published in 1953) Frauwallner lays some stress on the standard form of what we are calling the Awakening sets as likely to be the oldest form of Buddhism.[75]

The first to develop the notion of the importance of the lists subsequently referred to as *mātṛkā* was probably André Bareau.[76] He gives a fairly clear statement of his position in an article published in 1951.[77] I will translate the whole paragraph as his work on this has remained remarkably little known:

> "The result of an examination of the three complete works which have come down to us and of some brief summaries[78] is that all the

---

[72] Mori 1989, 121–136.

[73] Kv 508ff.; cf. 313; 618ff.

[74] Vin V 173: *anantara-, samanantara-, nissaya-, upanissaya-, purejāta-, pacchājāta-* and *sahajāta-*. This could be based upon an earlier set of *paccayas*, but in fact many of the missing ones could not have been used here, e.g. because they are purely mental. So the full set is probably implied.

[75] Frauwallner 1953, p. 174ff. = Trsl. p. 138ff.

[76] Bareau 1951b.

[77] Bareau 1951a, p. 4f.; cf. Bareau 1951b, p. 11.

[78] In a footnote he refers to T1509, p. 70ab (i.e. the *Upadeśa*) and to Lamotte's translation: Lamotte 1944, p. 105–114; to Przyluski 1923, p. 322f.; Przyluski 1927, *passim*.

Abhidharmapiṭakas contain certain parts that are similar: the list of *dharmas* and their definitions; the *defining and dividing up between the different* dharmas *of the* skandha, āyatana, *dhātu, satya, indriya, smṛtyupasthāna, samyakpradhāna, ṛddhipāda, bodhyaṅga, dhyāna, jñāna, pratyāya (sic), mārgāṅga*; the list of *dharmas* which are *samprayukta* and *saṃgraha*; often a list of *pudgalas* and a work containing refutations of heresies. That did not prevent the general structure of these works from varying considerably between each other. Likewise, the details of each of these parts differed greatly, and that is more serious because it here concerns precisely those numerous propositions, regarding which the sects were in opposition to one another. We might be able to fill these gaps to a certain degree, thanks to various documents which cite heresies, that is to say extraneous opinions, but we would obtain in that way only a reconstruction that would be very partial and very doubtful."

We may note that the list of thirteen groupings given here is in large part made up of precisely those which I am calling the World sets and the Awakening sets.

This no doubt influenced A.K. Warder when in 1961 in his PTS edition of Kassapa's commentary (c. A.D. 1200) on the *mātikā* to the seven canonical *abhidhamma* works, he set forth his theory of the development of *abhidhamma* literature from an original *mātikā* of twenty one items.[79]

There are two main sources for what he says. The first is a Sarvāstivādin account, found in the *Kṣudrakavastu* and in the *Aśokāvadāna*, of the First Communal Recitation. There we are told that Kāśyapa was responsible for the recitation of the **Matṛkāpiṭaka*. Its contents are listed as twenty one items beginning with the standard seven Awakening sets. The list was known to him from the translations of Rockhill and Przyluski.[80] The second main source was the account of the contents of the *Dharmaskandha* given by Takakusu in 1904–5.[81] In fact, Nyanatiloka had already pointed out in 1939 the similarities between the *Vibhaṅga* and the *Dharmaskandha*, but Warder probably did not know this.[82]

---

[79] Warder 1961, p. xx ff.

[80] Rockhill 1884, p. 160; Przyluski 1923. See also: Przyluski 1927, p. 45f. and, for a more recent translation of the list, Watanabe 1983, p. 44.

[81] Takakusu 1904–5.

[82] Nyanatiloka 1938.

Warder arranges his suggestions in three groups of seven. The first is made up of the standard Awakening sets, the last mainly of World sets with the middle grouping mostly composed of the additional items we have already met in the *Vibhaṅga*. Warder makes it clear that this is "very conjectural" and even offers a second alternative version of the third set.[83] He also takes the position that the triplet and couplet *mātikās* are a rather late development, although he does not give in full his reasons.[84] Possibly he is following André Bareau in this respect.

At all events, in his supplementary thesis (published in 1951) Bareau had already given a rather detailed analysis of the development of the triplets and couplets. As we have seen, this approach is flawed and needs to be redone. It does, however, underlie much of the later work.[85] Let us note that Bareau concluded that there was a primitive set of five couplets and also one of four or five triplets. Frauwallner (p. 5f.; 143) follows him in this, but is more aware of the possibility that earlier longer *mātikā* lists have been shortened. One problem here is that Bareau has falsely invented an early Theravādin list which by chance coincides with some of the material in Sarvāstivādin sources. Another is that he counts all of the numerous occurrences of the standard Theravādin list as one and then includes under a series of titles a number of lists from late sources which are of doubtful relevance.[86]

The first two of Frauwallner's *Abhidharma-studien* appear in 1963 and 1964; so it is unclear whether he was aware of Warder's work, but he does refer to Nyanatiloka and Bareau. The essence of his theory of the development of *abhidharma* is that it originates with lists of fundamental concepts. In particular, he sees the groups that I am calling the World sets as important. "Lists of this kind constitute the first attempt at systematization and formed the basis for the Pañcaskandhaka." (p. 4) The method of composing lists of "attributes" with which to discuss the World sets (i.e. the *mātikā* proper) he sees as a development in parallel, found quite early on. He notes that early *abhidharma* also involved various methods

---

[83] The account in Jaini and Buswell 1996, p. 89 slightly over-simplifies Warder's position.

[84] Warder 1961, p. xxvii.

[85] As well as Frauwallner himself, see also: Jaini 1960, pp. 41–45; Jaini and Buswell 1996, pp. 84–88.

[86] It is clear that the Sarvāstivādin canonical works, the **Śāriputrābhidharma* and the Pali *Abhidhammapiṭaka* all share a list of couplets, which begins with nearly all of the *cūḷantaraduka*, follows with a list of eight or more negative *dhammas* similar to the *gocchakas* and then has something resembling the *mahantaradukas*. See Bareau, *op. cit.*, p. 18. This might suggest that some of the *piṭṭhiduka* were added when the decision was made to integrate the treatment of the World sets and the Path sets.

of considering the relationships between elements and adds that the treatment is often in the form of question and answer.

The justification of this theory comes some pages later in his treatment of the canonical works of the Sarvāstivādins, particularly the *Dharmaskandha*. He compares this with the *Vibhaṅga* as Warder had already done, but in a much more careful and detailed way. He understands that the *Dharmaskandha* is in three parts. The first part consists of chapters based on an extended list of what I am calling Awakening sets. The second part is the *Kṣudrakavastuka*, dealing with afflictions and minor afflictions. The third part contains chapters dealing with World sets.

Frauwallner concludes on the basis of a comparison of this with the chapters of the *Vibhaṅga* that the two are "versions of the same work" (p. 20). He can therefore use them to derive his understanding of the *mātṛkā* which he supposes to underlie both works. It is important to realize that at this point, when Frauwallner had already formed his theory, neither he nor A.K. Warder had taken the material in the **Śāriputrābhidharma* into account. Indeed, he specifically states that he has "not taken the Śāriputrābhidharma into account as it is as far removed from the Abhidharma of the other schools as the Vinaya of the Mahāsaṅghika is from the other Vinaya." (p. 211, n. 23) When Frauwallner renewed his work on *abhidharma* at the end of the 1960s, he substantially modified that judgement. We should also note that at this point neither he nor Warder seems to have been directly aware of some of the work on *abhidharma* done in the pre-War period by Far Eastern scholars.[87]

By the end of the 1960s Warder too had become aware of the importance of the **Śāriputrābhidharma*. He now elaborated a new model of the development of the early canonical works.[88] In particular, he concluded that "the earliest form of *Abhidharma* that we can reconstruct" (p. 222) consisted of three sections. These were: 1) the Awakening sets; 2) the World sets; and 3) a study of conditionality. Note the similarity of the first two to the kind of early recension that I have proposed above. Of course, Warder presumably reached his conclusions purely on the basis of a comparison of the chapter headings in the three works, whereas I

---

[87] Bareau, however, does refer to the work of T. Kimura and Baiyū Watanabe: see Bareau 1950, p. 1. All three scholars would have known the brief summary of Kimura's work in Demiéville 1932, p. 57f.. See also: Mizuno 1961; Cox 1995, p. 7–10 and notes.

[88] Warder 1970, pp. 220–224.

have based what I have to say on detailed analysis of differences in the actual texts of the *Dhammasaṅgaha* and *Vibhaṅga*.[89]

When, in his 1972 publication, Frauwallner did come to refer in detail to the **Śāriputrābhidharma*, he was already fully committed to his three part analysis of the *Dharmaskandha* and to his reconstruction of the *mātṛkā* on which it was based. So he interprets what he found as a secondary development. He declares: "the first two parts of the Śāriputrābhidharma are based on the first two parts of the Vibhaṅga *mātṛkā*." (p. 103). With this I cannot quite agree. However, Frauwallner does go on to make the following interesting observation. The **Śāriputrābhidharma*, he tells us, differs "in that its first part is only treated in the style of the Pañhāpucchaka, and the second in the style of the Suttantabhājanīya, which corresponds to the method of the Dharmaskandha."

European scholarship after Frauwallner

In 1982 A.K. Warder returned to the subject of the history of *Abhidhamma* in more detail than before.[90] He indicates that what he has to say is highly tentative, but in fact makes some important points. He comments on the "organic" nature of much of the growth of the *Abhidhamma* texts, suggesting that as new triplets or couplets were added, a text "would be correspondingly elaborated internally by incorporating these new classifications" (p. xxix).

The important point for us is that he postulates that after the initial schism with the Mahāsaṃghikas the "Theravāda school" had an *Abhidhamma* with four sections. "The first two of these correspond in content to the extant *Vibhaṅga*, the third to the *Dhātukathā* and the fourth to the *Paṭṭhāna*, though no doubt with comparatively little of the elaboration we now find in all of these texts, especially the last." (p. xxx) He clearly recognizes that the treatment of the World sets was in the form of questions and answers, elaborated by applying to them some at least of the couplets and triplets. In contrast, the World sets "were expounded simply by quoting relevant passages from the *suttas*."

Warder goes on to argue that a "collation of all the available sets" (p. xxx) of couplets and triplets indicates that even before the First Schism there was a set of twelve couplets and three triplets. This dating is quite worthless, as it depends

---

[89] Warder's theory was developed a little further around this time by his pupil Fumimaro Watanabe in his doctoral thesis (not seen) and subsequently published as: Watanabe 1983.

[90] In the section entitled: "The History of Abhidhamma and the Date of the Paṭisambhidāmagga" in Warder 1982, pp. xxix–xxxix.

on the (unlikely) possibility that the *Tattvasiddhiśāstra* is a Bahussutika work. In any case such later sources cannot be used to fully reconstruct the old *mātikā* lists. As Rupert Gethin points out: "the triplets and couplets are not treated fully in the *Visuddhimagga*, a comparable Pāli summary work".[91]

What Warder has to say in regard to Dhs and Vibh is obviously quite similar to part of what I have been arguing above; so I should make clear that there are also important differences. I have not so far been discussing the situation at the time of the "First Schism", only the nature of an earlier recension of Dhs and Vibh. This may well be close to or even identical with the common ancestor of these works and the *Śāriputrābhidharma*, but it will require much more detailed and careful study of all of these texts to determine the exact relationships with certainty. I do not believe that it is possible at present to determine whether there was a fourth section or not.

I do not doubt that some kind of proto-*Abhidha(r)mma* was inherited by all of the non-Mahāsaṃghika schools, but much more study is needed before we can say exactly what it contained. On the other hand, we are not in a position to say whether the early Mahāsaṃghikas also had such a text. This is because no Mahāsaṃghika *abhidha(r)mma* recension survives. In actual fact, if it were not for the survival of the Mahāsaṃghika *Vinaya* in Chinese translation (and some portions in Sanskrit), we would be in precisely the same situation for *Vinaya* studies. This should make us extremely cautious in any claim that that school had no *Abhidha(r)mmapiṭaka*.

I therefore do not at all agree with Étienne Lamotte when he states: "If … the various Buddhist schools used an identical Sūtrapiṭaka and several similar Vinayapiṭakas, it must be accepted that, if they had an Abhidharmapiṭaka at their disposal, they had put it together themselves."[92] This overstates the case; perhaps he is influenced too much by Kumārajīva's systematic dethroning of the *Abhidharma*. Nothing at present rules out the possibility that some kind of *Abhidha(r)mmapiṭaka* is as old as the *Khandhakas* of the *Vinayapiṭaka*.

Subsequently to Warder, the most important contribution seems to be that of Rupert Gethin.[93] Gethin analyses in detail the use of the term *mātikā* in the *Abhidhammapiṭaka*, taking it as meaning: "… any schedule or table of items or lists — but especially one built up according to a system of numerical progression

---

[91] Gethin 1992, p. 172 n.64.
[92] Lamotte 1988, p. 180.
[93] Gethin 1992. Gethin's suggestions are further developed in Anderson 1999, pp. 108–130.

— that acts as a basis for further exposition." (p. 160) I would prefer to say that the word *mātikā* in the sense of "headings" precedes its use to mean a table of items or lists and only subsequently does it come to be used in the singular with that meaning.

Gethin emphasizes the relationships of the "core *mātikā*" i.e. the list of *mātṛkā* as identified by Frauwallner and the triplet-couplet *mātikā* with the *Saṃyutta-* and *Aṅguttaranikāyas* respectively. He goes on to stress that in the *Dhamma-saṅgaṇi* and *Vibhaṅga* as we have them these two approaches are interdependent and quite fundamental to the development of the *abhidhamma* method. This is obviously correct and no doubt is part of the reason that they have been combined in the way they have.

Lastly, Gethin lays some stress on the strong relationship between the *mātikās* and Buddhist meditation. I would want to stress also the fundamental importance of actual chanting methods to the development of both Buddhist "meditation" and as a form of devotion. I suspect that changes in such methods may of themselves sometimes account for the popularity of new forms of literature.

in conclusion

Clearly any conclusions as to the development of the earlier works of the *Abhi-dhammapiṭaka* can at present only represent a hypothesis — at least until more detailed analysis of the **Śāriputrābhidharma* is available. Nevertheless, it seems plausible that the *abhidha(r)mma* material now contained in the *Dhammasaṅgaṇi* and *Vibhaṅga* on the one hand and the first two sections of the **Śāriputrābhi-dharma* on the other had its origins in appendices developed by the Saṃyutta-bhāṇakas and Aṅguttarabhāṇakas. This neatly accounts for the mixture of nu-merically and thematically organized material.

More certainly, when this pre-existent material was organized into a single work, its structure, but not necessarily its detailed content, was essentially that of the first two sections of the **Śāriputrābhidharma*. (The final two or three sec-tions would correspond to the material preserved in the *Dhātukathā* and an ear-lier recension of the *Paṭṭhāna*.) In the Pali tradition the first two sections were reorganized and integrated into the first two books of the *Abhidhamma-piṭaka*. This made it possible to set out an *abhidhamma* system based on the *mātikā*. It is likely, however, that most of the material utilized is much older.

Bibliography

Anderson, Carol S. (1999), *Pain and its Ending. The Four Noble Truths in the Theravāda Buddhist Canon*, eds Charles S. Prebish and Damien Keown (Curzon Critical Studies in Buddhism; Richmond, Surrey: Curzon Press).

Bareau, André (1950), 'Les origines du Śāriputrābhidharmaśāstra', *Le Muséon,* LXIII, 69–95.

—— (1951a), 'Les sectes bouddhiques du petit véhicule et leurs Abhidharmapiṭaka', *Bulletin de L'École française d'Extrême-Orient,* XLIV (1947–1950), 1–11.

—— (1951b), *Thèse: Dhammasaṅgaṇi, traduction annotée* (Paris: Tournier et Constans).

Bopearachchi, Osmund (1997), 'Foreword', in D.P.M. Weerakkody (ed.), *Taprobanê: ancient Sri Lanka as known to Greeks and Romans* (Indicopleustoi 1; Turnhout (Belgium): Brepols), ix–xxii.

Bronkhorst, Johannes (1985), 'Dharma and Abhidharma', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies,* 48, 305–20.

Collins, Steven (1990), 'On the Very Idea of the Pali Canon', *Journal of the Pali Text Society,* XV, 89–126.

Cousins, L.S. (2011), 'Abhidhamma Studies I: Jotipāla and the Abhidhamma *Anuṭīkā*', *Thai International Journal for Buddhist Studies,* II, 1–36.

—— (2013), 'The Early Development of Buddhist Literature and Language in India', *Journal of the Oxford Centre for Buddhist Studies,* 5, 89–135.

—— (2015), 'Abhidhamma Studies II: Sanskrit abhidharma literature of the Mahāvihāravāsins', *Thai International Journal for Buddhist Studies,* IV ([2556] 2013), 1–61.

Cox, Collett (1995), *Disputed Dharmas. Early Buddhist Theories on Existence. An Annotated Translation of the Section on Factors Dissociated from Thought from Saṅghabhadra's Nyāyānusāra* (Studia Philologica Buddhica, Monograph Series XI; Tokyo: International Institute for Buddhist Studies).

Demiéville, Paul (1932), 'L'origine des sectes bouddhiques d'après Paramārtha', *Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques,* I, 15–64.

Dutt, Nalinaksha, Bhattacharya, D. M., and Sharma, Shivnath (1984), *Gilgit manuscripts* (Delhi: Sri Satguru).

Falk, Harry (2011), 'The 'Split' Collection of Kharoṣṭhī Texts', *Annual Report of The International Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University,* XIV (March), 11–23.

Frauwallner, E. (1963), 'Abhidharma-Studien I. Pañcaskandhakam und Pañcavastukam', *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens,* 7, 20–36.

—— (1964), 'Abhidharma-Studien II. Die kanonische Abhidharma-werke', *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens,* 8, 59–99.

—— (1971a), 'Abhidharma-Studien III. Der Abhisamayavāda˙', *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens,* 15, 69–102.

—— (1971b), 'Abhidharma-Studien IV. Der Abhidharma der anderen Schulen. Der Abhidharma der Pāli-Schule und der Śāriputrābhidharma˙', *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens,* 15, 103–21.

—— (1972), 'Abhidharma-Studien IV. Der Abhidharma der anderen Schulen. (Fortsetzung)', *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens,* 16, 95–152.

—— (1973), 'Abhidharma-Studien V. Der Sarvāstivāda. Eine entwicklungsgeschichtliche Studie', *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens,* 17, 97–121.

Frauwallner, Erich (1953), *Geschichte der indischen Philosophie. Vol. I Die Philosophie des Veda und des Epos der Buddha und der Jina. Das Sāṃkhya und der klassische Yoga-System* (Reihe Wort und Antwort 6; Salzburg: Otto Muller).

—— (1971c), 'Die Entstehung der buddhistischen Systeme', *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse,* 6, 115–27.

—— (1995), *Studies in Abhidharma Literature and the Origins of Buddhist Philosophical Systems*, trans. Sophie Francis Kidd and Ernst Steinkellner (SUNY Series in Indian Thought: Texts and Studies; Albany, NY: State University of New York Press).

Gethin, Rupert (1992), 'The Mātikās: Memorization, Mindfulness and the List', in Janet Gyatso (ed.), *In the Mirror of Memory: Reflections on Mindfulness and Remembrance in Indian and Tibetan Buddhism* (Albany: State University of New York), 149–72.

Hinüber, Oskar von (1994), 'Vinaya und Abhidhamma', *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik,* 19 (*Festschrift G. Buddruss*), 109–22.

—— (1996), *A Handbook of Pāli Literature* (Indian Philology and South Asian Studies 2; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter).

Jaini, P.S. and Buswell, Robert E. (1996), 'The Development of Abhidharma Philosophy', in Karl H. Potter, et al. (ed.), *Abhidharma Buddhism to 150 A.D.* (Encyclopaedia of Indian Philosophies, Vol. VII; Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass), 73–119.

Jaini, Padmanabh S. (1960), *Abhidharmadīpa with Vibhāshāprabhāvṛtti* (2nd edn., Tibetan Sanskrit works series 4; Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute).

Kieffer-Pülz, Petra (1992), *Die Sīmā: Vorschriften zur Regelung der buddhistischen Gemeindegrenze in älteren buddhistischen Texten* (Monographien zur indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie 8; Berlin: D. Reimer).

Klaus, Konrad (2010), 'Zu den buddhistischen literarischen Fachbegriffen *sutta* und *suttanta*', in Eli Franco and Monika Zin (eds.), *From Turfan to Ajanta: festschrift for Dieter Schlingloff on the occasion of his eightieth birthday* (Bhairahawa, Rupandehi: Lumbini International Research Institute), Vol. I pp.513–26.

La Vallée Poussin, Louis de (1924), *L'Abhidharmakośa de Vasubandhu* (Paris: P. Geuther).

Lamotte, Étienne (1944), *Le Traité de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse de Nāgārjuna (Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra). Première Partie (Traduction annotée)* (Bibliothèque du Muséon 18, I Chaps I–XV; Louvain: Institut Orientaliste, Université de Louvain).

—— (1988), *History of Indian Buddhism: from the origins to the Śaka era*, trans. Sara Webb-Boin and Jean Dantinne (Publications de l'Institut orientaliste de Louvain, 36; Louvain-la-Neuve: Université catholique de Louvain Institut orientaliste).

Mizuno, Køgen (1961), 'Abhidharma Literature', in G.P. Malalasekera (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism, Vol. I* (Government of Ceylon), 64–80.

Mori, Sodō (1989), *Studies of the Pāli Commentaries: A Provisional Collection of Articles* (Saitama: Sodo Mori).

Norman, K. R. (1983), *Pāli literature: including the canonical literature in Prakrit and Sanskrit of all the Hīnayāna schools of Buddhism*, ed. J. Gonda (A History of Indian Literature, vol. vii, fasc. 2; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz).

Nyanatiloka (1938), *Guide through the Abhidhamma-pitaka, being a synopsis of the philosophical collection belonging to the Buddhist Pali canon, followed by an essay on the paticca-samppāda* (Colombo: Printers: The Associated Newspapers of Ceylon ltd).

Przyluski, Jean (1923), *La légende de l'empereur Açoka (Açoka-avadāna) dans les textes Indiens et Chinois* (Paris: Paul Geuthner).

—— (1927), *Le concile de Rājagrha: introduction à l'histoire des canons et des sects bouddhiques* (Buddhica. Documents et travaux pour l'étude du bouddhisme. Mémoires 2; Paris: P. Geuthner).

Ray, Himanshu P. (2000 [1994]), *Winds of Change: Buddhism and the Maritime Links of Early South Asia* (Oxford India Paperbacks; New Delhi: OUP).

Rhys Davids, C.E. (1900), *A Buddhist manual of psychological ethics of the fourth century B.C.: being a translation ... of the first book in the Abhidhamma piṭaka entitled Dhamma-sangaṇi (Compendium of states or phenomena)* (Oriental Translation Fund. New series XII; London: Royal Asiatic society).

Rockhill, William Woodville (1884), *Life of the Buddha and the Early History of his Order. Derived from Tibetan Works in the Bkah-hgur and Bstan-dgyur. Followed by Notices on the Early History of Tibet and Khotan* (London: Trübner).

Sarkar, Himansu Bhusan (1977), 'The date of the Pali Niddesa and its implication for the history of South-East Asia', *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal,* 19, 44–45.

—— (1981), 'The date of the Pali Niddesa and its Implications for the History of South-East Asia', *K.P. Jayaswal Commemoration Volume* (Patna), 207–29.

Schopen, Gregory (1997), 'If you can't remember, how to make it up. Some Monastic Rules for Redacting Canonical Texts', in Petra Kieffer-Pülz and Jens-Uwe Hartmann (eds.), *Bauddhavidyāsudhākara: studies in honour of Heinz Bechert on the occasion of his 65th birthday* (Indica et Tibetica 30; Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica Verlag), 571–82.

—— (2004), *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters: Still More Papers on Monastic Buddhism in India* (Studies in the Buddhist traditions; Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press).

Stargardt, Janice (1990), *The Ancient Pyu of Burma* (I; Cambridge: PACSEA in association with the Institute of Southeast Asian Studies Singapore).

Takakusu, J. (1904–5), 'The Abhidharma Literature of the Sarvāstivādins', *Journal of the Pali Text Society*, 67–146.

Warder, A. K. (1961), *Mohavicchedanī Abhidhammamātikatthavaṇṇanā by Kassapatthera of Coḷa* (London: Luzac & Co. for the Pali Text Society).

—— (1970), *Indian Buddhism* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass).

—— (1982), 'Introduction', *The Path of Discrimination* (London: Pali Text Society), v–lxiv.

Watanabe, Fumimaro (1983), *Philosophy and its Development in the Nikāyas and Abhidhamma* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass).

Yoshimoto, Shingyo (1996), 'Śāriputrābhidharmaśāstra', in Potter Karl, et al. (ed.), *Abhidharma Buddhism to 150 A.D.* (Encyclopaedia of Indian Philosophies, Vol. VII; Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass), 317–25.