




Some Points of Controversy between Abhidhammatthavibhāvinī-Ṭīkā and Parammathadīpanī-Ṭīkā

Ven. Visuddha^{[a]*}



^[a]*Ph.D. Student International Buddhist Studies College,
Mahachulalongkornrajavidyalaya University, Thailand*
** Author for correspondence; email: visuddha7@gmail.com*

[Abstract]

Regardless of the debate about the origin of Abhidhamma, there was a great debate about two Abhidhamma sub-commentaries in Myanmar; Abhidhammatthavibhān-Ṭīkā and Parammathadīpanī-Ṭīkā. Both Ṭīkāṣ are commenting on the same root Abhidhamma commentary: Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha. Of the two, the first sub-commentary was written on twelfth century and the second was on late nineteenth century. While commenting on the root text, the second criticized two hundred and forty-fives points that have been done by the first. This article has been written to present Abhidhamma debate with two objecties, To introduce the Abhidhamma debate between two Abhidhamma sub-commentaries, and To study the perspective of controversy points between two Abhidhamma sub-commentaries. The reason why this article is written is to attract the scholars in Buddhist studies field, specially the Pāḷi scholars in Tipitaka studies.

Keywords: Saṅgaha, Vibhāvinī, Dīpanī, Controversy, Commentary

Introduction

The Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha is a popular Pāli text, composed in approximately the twelfth century (K. R. Norman, 1983, 151), by ĀcariyaAnuruddhathera, and dominates TheravādaAbhidhamma studies as it enables students to grasp the essence of TheravādaAbhidhamma. ĀcariyaAnuruddhathera attempted to extract the essence of the seven AbhidhammaCanonical texts and their commentaries. Due to the purpose of summarizing enormous doctrines in a short and succinct manner, the Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha (referred to hereafter as Saṅgaha) is extremely terse and incomprehensible to most students unless they are guided by competent teacher or they have ancillary commentary on it. The text is thus described figuratively as a little boat to cross the ocean of Abhidhamma literature. In consequence of its popularity, there is a large collection of ancillary Ṭīkā literature on the Saṅgaha. There are nineteen Pāli sub-commentaries on the Saṅgaharecorded in History of Piṭaka Literature (U Yam, 1957, 121). Among those, two sub-commentaries have attracted scholars' attention in the field of Abhidhamma studies because they caused the great debate about Commentarial concepts in Myanmar.

The first is Abhidhammatthavibhāvinīṭīkā written by ĀcariyaSumaṅgalasāmi in the twelfth century in Sri Lanka and the text is very popular in Myanmar, under the names “Ṭīkāhla (beautiful ṭīkā) and Ṭīkākyaw (famous ṭīkā)”. Ṭīkāhla is so called because its writing style-sand ways of explanation are articulate and beautiful. The name “Ṭīkāhla” was later changed historically as “Ṭīkākyaw” due to exclamation that “the ṭīkā makes me famous” by ĀcariyaAriyavaṃsa who wrote a key text of Ṭīkākyaw, “Maṇīsāramaṅjūsāṭīkā” after being enlightened by the Ṭīkākyaw hence the name became ‘Ṭīkākyaw’ (Yazathinkyam, 2008, 138).

The second is Paramatthadīpanīṭīkā written by Ledī Saydaw, a Myanmar scholar-monk (1846-1923). Contradictory to Ācariya Ariyavaṃsa, He was not satisfied with some points of definition on the Saṅgaha by the former sub-commentaries, especially the Ṭīkākyaw. Therefore, he wrote a new Pāli sub-commentary on the Saṅgaha and mentioned that he had been requested to write a sub-commentary on the

Saṅgaha by those who felt that the former sub-commentaries were not able to satisfy them. Taking what he regarded as essential from previous commentaries, he wrote a new sub-commentary on the Saṅgaha. It seems to imply that while he takes essential interpretation, he will overtly turn down any interpretation if it is, to him, unnecessary or erroneous. In the Paramatthadīpanī, He points out and criticizes two hundred forty-five points, most of points from the Vibhāvinī and few from the other, which are, to him, not acceptable and to be rejected but he supports very few points. Therefore, he is well-known as “Anti-Ṭīkāyaw” or one who rejects the Ṭīkāyaw and his text is known as “Ṭīkāyaw: superior ṭīkā”. (hereafter, these terms will be used in this article: Ṭīkāyaw for Abhidhammatthavibhāvinīṭīkā and Dīpanī for Paramatthadīpanī). He uses following sample sentences when he rejects Ṭīkāyaw’s notion:

“taṃsabbamaṇapaccetabbam: all of that should not be believed.”

“taṃsabbamaṇayuttam: all of that is not proper.”

“taṃ pi nasundaram: that is also not good.”

“taṃpaṭikkhittam: that is rejected.”

“sabbamaṇnirattakameva: all of that is only vain.”

“taṃakāraṇam: that is not a cause.”

“so duppātho: that is bad word”

“taṃtathānadaṭṭhbbam: that is accepted like that.”

“so idhanādhippeto: that is here not desired.”

“taṃaṭṭhakathāyanasameti: that is not fit with commentary.”

But he rarely supports Ṭīkāyaw’s notion. Then, he uses the following sentences:

“taṃpāliyaṃanāgatāpiyujjatiyeva: even though not coming to the Pāli canon, that is indeed reasonable.”

“taṃ pi tenariyāyenayujjatiyeva: that is too reasonable in meaning of that formula.”

“taṃ pi yuttaṃviyadissati: that is also seem to proper.”

Because of such strong objectionable remark, the Dīpanī has become a popular text among scholars and those who fond of the Ṭīkāyaw have been frustrated by it. As response to the Dīpanī, Some Myanmar scholars,

monks and lay men, contribute their arguments to the controversy points by writing sub-commentaries, books, articles in Pāli or Myanmar language. In return, those who fond of the Dīpanīreplies to those of the Ṭikākyaw in the same way. As a result, over forty scholarly woks, sub-commentaries, Pāli texts, Myanmar commentaries, article etc., has been done by the contributors. Many people think that the controversy points in the debate are concerned with Abhidhamma concepts or doctrinal concepts because the debate is about two Abhidhamma Sub-commentaries. In fact, the controversy points are concerned with not only Abhidhammaor doctrinal conceptsbut also Commentarial concepts, i.e., an interpretation of words, a philological perspective, demonstrated meaning of words, grammatical issues and so on.

Hence, though the debate is well-known in Myanmar, it is little-known, and the controversy points have not been raised among the international Pāli scholars because the texts exist in Myanmar language and Myanmar Pāli scripts and no scholar had not yet touched on this issue up to date. It is big gap in the field of Pāli literature and among international Pāli scholars and Myanmar Pāli scholars.

This academic article intends to fill the gap and to attract the scholars in field of Buddhist studies, specially, in Pāli literature studies. This article selects the exposition of two sub-commentaries on the introductory verse of Saṅgaha. In this verse, there are eleven points that the Dīpanīcriticizes the Ṭikākyaw. This article analyzes and explain these points as possible as simple way so that the readers could assess some knowledge of Commentarial concepts.

Five kinds of meaning

At the beginning of Saṅgaha, AnuruddhaMahāthera composes introductory verse that expresses a paying respect to the Triple Gem and an acknowledgement to write an Abhidhammatthasaṅgahatexts. It is called “nidānagāthā: introductory verse”.

Sammāsambuddhamatulāṃsasaddhammagañuttamaṃ
Abhivādiyabhāsissamaḥbidhammatthasaṅgahaṃ.
(Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha)

Having respectfully saluted the Fully Enlightened One, the Peerless One, along with the sublime Teaching and the Noble Order, I will speak the Manual of Abhidhamma – a compendium of the things contained in Abhidhamma. (Bhikku Bodhi, 2007, 23)

According to commentarial tradition, the commentators used to explore the condensed meaning of introductory verse and explains each word that expresses certain of meaning. Therefore, both Ṭīkākyaw and the Dīpanī explain the verse accordingly. Both agree on the point that this verse conveys five condensed meaning (pañcapiṇḍattha). The five are:

1. Paying respect to the Triple Gem (ratanattayapaṇāma)
2. The Theme of the Text (ganthābhidheyya)
3. The Writing style of the Text (ganthappakāra)
4. The Title of the Text (ganthābhidhāna)
5. The Advantage of the Text (ganthappayojana).

Abhidhammatthavibhāvinī definition

The Ṭīkākyaw analyzes and explains these five kinds of meaning by matching word and meaning as follow:

The phrase “sammāsambuddhamatulaṃsasaddhammagāṇuttamaṃ abhivādiya” indicates the meaning of “paying respect to the Triple Gem”. The word “abhidhammatthasaṅgahaṃ” indicates the meaning of “the theme of the text, the writing style of the text, the title of the text”.

In detail, the word “abhidhammatthasaṅgahaṃ” indicates the state of being compendium text which summarizes the meaning of Abhidhamma. This compendium texts enables to understand the meaning of Abhidhamma. The theme of this text is also to understand the meaning of Abhidhamma. Therefore, “the theme of the text” is indicated by the word “abhidhammatthasaṅgahaṃ”.

The word “abhidhammatthasaṅgahaṃ” indicates the meaning of “the writing style of the text” because it indicates the state of being compendium text which summarizes the meaning of Abhidhamma.

The word “abhidhammatthasaṅgahaṃ” indicates the meaning of

“the title of the text” because it indicates the name that accords with the meaning.

The word “saṅgahaṃ” indicates the Advantage of the Text. It means that the word “saṅgahaṃ” expresses the state of being compendium text which summarizes the meaning of Abhidhamma. This compendium text enables to understand the meaning of Abhidhamma. Those who understand the meaning of Abhidhamma will get benefits in this life and next lives. Therefore, the advantage of the text is indicated by the word “saṅgahaṃ” (Abhis-Ṭ. 70).

Paramatthadīpanī’s definition

The Dīpanī analyzes and explains these five kinds of meaning by matching word and meaning as follow:

The phrase “sammāsambuddhamatulaṃsasaddhammagāṇuttamaṃ abhivādiya” indicates the meaning of “paying respect to the Triple Gem”. “The theme of the texts” means the major subjects of Abhidhamma, consciousness, mental factors, matters and nibbana which are explained in the whole Abhidhamma texts. “The Theme of the Text” is indicated by the word “abhidhammattha”, (a part of combination word of “abhidhammattha-saṅgahaṃ”). In this case, the Dīpanī disagrees and criticizes the Ṭikākyaw for assuming that summarizing also should be the theme. It is not good because the summarizing is not the major meaning here. (Controversy point [1])

“The writing style of the text” is the way of compilation by gathering Abhidhamma subjects. It is indicated by the word “saṅgaha”. In this case, the Dīpanī disagrees and criticizes the Ṭikākyaw because the word “abhidhammattha” does not indicate the writing style of the texts. (PD, 3) (Controversy point [2])

“The title of the text” is indicated by the word “abhidhammatthasaṅgahaṃ” because it expresses the name that accords with the meaning.

There are many kinds of advantage such as the original advantage and the subsequent advantage. Original advantage is understanding the

nature of dhamma and subsequent advantage is the complete extinction free from grasping (anupādāparinibbāna). These advantages can be attained by learning this compendium text without trouble. Therefore, “the advantage of the text” is indicated by the word “abhidhammatthasaṅgaha”. In this case, the Dīpanī disagrees and criticizes the Ṭīkāyaw because the word “saṅgaha”, without the combination word “abhidhammattha”, cannot convey such a special advantage of complete extinction free from grasping. And another reason is that the word “saṅgaha” can convey other meaning such as the summarizing of untrue dhamma. (PD, 3). (Controversy point [3])

Abhidhamma perspective on kamma

This controversy is concerned with Abhidhamma perspective and it occurs in the exposition on the benefits of paying respect to the Triple Gem. The Ṭīkāyaw explains that the paying respect to the Triple Gem is, as to core meaning or as to Abhidhamma perspective, the wholesome volition (kasalacetanā) which produces the action of paying respect to the Triple Gem. The volition functions as immediately effective kamma (diṭṭhadhammavedanīyakamma) because it possesses two conditions: The Triple Gem, to which the author pays respect, is the soil of the merits (puññakhetta) and the author who pays respect to the Triple Gem has pious intention (ajjhāsaya). This immediately effective kamma supports to reproductive kamma (janaka) which is the cause of successful life. The reproductive kamma might be hindered by obstructive kamma (upapīḷaka) and destructive kamma (upacchedaka). Or on the other word, the successful life might be destroyed by the occurrence of disease etc. then, the author could not accomplish the text successfully. The wholesome volition accomplishes a desirable benefit that is non-occurrence of the obstacles of disease etc., so that the author can accomplish the text successfully (Abhidhs-Ṭ, 70). the Dīpanī explains that the paying respect to the Triple Gem is a process of great merit (puññābhisanda), a stream of great merit (puññapavāha) which produces the action of paying respect to the Triple Gem. The process arises seven impulsion-moments in each term and it accumulates many hundred thousand terms in number. The process is superior merit and it produces great benefits because of two conditions: it grows on the soil of merits, and

it is fertilized by pious intention, faith and wisdom of the author.

The process of merits supports to reproductive kamma (janaka) which has a chance already since the time of rebirth and, to other good kammas as well which do not have yet a chance of giving results. These kammas produce powerful physical and mental processes in the continuity of the author. Then, undesirable results, the obstacles of disease etc., have no chance to arise in the continuity of the author and the bad kammas which produce undesirable result are removed in the continuity of the author. In this way, the process of great merits prevents the obstacles of the text that is to say the benefits for the author. The benefits of paying respect to the Triple Gem are not only for the author, but for the students as well.

The Dīpanīcriticizes that the Tīkāyaw seems to explain that the paying respect to the Triple Gem, as to core meaning, is the first impulsion-moment [pathamajavana] of wholesome kamma because he said the volition functions as immediately effective kamma (diṭṭhadhammavedanīyakamma). It is not good because it needs here only the function of supporting (upatthambanakkicca) and the function of supporting is also found in all of seven impulsion-moments of wholesome kamma (PD, 4, 5). (Controversy point [4])

The reason of saying the word “atula”

This controversy is concerned with the reason of saying the word “atula”.

The word is said with the purpose of paying respect to the Buddha. Herein, only the word “sammāsambuddhaṃ” is sufficient for the purpose but it is said another word “atulaṃ”. Both Tīkā explain the reason of saying the word “atula”.

The Tīkāyaw explains that the word “sammāsambuddhaṃ” expresses only an appellation of the Buddha. It needs to be qualified by the virtues of the Buddha. Therefore, the word “atulaṃ” is said to qualify the word “sammāsambuddhaṃ” (Abhidhs-Ṭ, 55).

The Dīpanī explains that AnuruddhaMahāthera says the word

“atulaṃ” to make his veneration more powerful. It is noted that the veneration by uttering several words of the virtues of the Buddha is more powerful. Herein, there might be a question that the veneration by uttering a single word can accomplish the benefits of preventing dangers. Then, why is it said a second word? The answer is that it can accomplish but the wise men do not limit themselves to utterance of the virtues of the Buddha. AnuruddhaMahāthera is one of the wise men. Moreover, the desirable benefit of veneration is not only prevention of dangers. The benefits of having high intelligence, of accomplishment of the text successfully and of being qualified text are also to be desired. Contemplation on the virtues of the Buddha can support to concentration of the mind. The concentrated mind can develop the quality of intelligent. The Buddha said “samāhitobhikkhaveyathābūtaṃpajānāti: (S, III, 13) Oh, Monks, the concentrated mind can see as they really are”. Therefore, AnuruddhaMahāthera says the word “atulaṃ” to make his veneration more powerful for such benefits.

The Dīpanī criticizes that the Ṭīkāyaw seems to explain that the word “sammāsambuddhaṃ” expresses only an appellation of the Buddha. It needs to be qualified by the virtues of the Buddha. Therefore, the word “atulaṃ” is said to qualify the word “sammāsambuddhaṃ”. It is not good because the word “sammāsambuddhaṃ” is great word among the words of virtue of the Buddha like the moon among the stars. Therefore, the word should not be just appellation for those who know pāli language. For the others, who do not know the pāli language, even thousand words would be appellation (PD, 8, 9). (Controversy point [5])

Philological perspective of the word “tula”

This controversy is concerned with a philological perspective of the word “tula”, a partial word of atulaṃ.

The Ṭīkāyaw explains the formation of the word “tula” that tulāyasammitotulyo. Soyevatuloyakāralopavasena. The person who is measured [by a knowledge] is tulya: comparable one. The word “tulya” becomes “tula” because of elision of the letter “y”. in other way, by using “a” suffix in the sense of measurement (sammitattha), tulāyasammitotulo: The person

who is measured [by a knowledge] is “tula: comparable one”. Na tuloatulo: he is not comparable person: incomparable person (Abhidhs-Ṭ, 71).

It means that the word “tula” is secondary derivative form (tad-dhita). The formation of it could be two ways, “tula” stem with “ya” suffix or “a” suffix. Both are used in the sense of measurement (sammita). In the first way, the combination of “tula” stem and “ya” suffix becomes tulya. (tula+ya= tulya). In this step, the “y” is elided, then becomes “tula”. In the second way, it is combination of “tula” and “a”, it simply becomes “tula” (tula+a= tula) (AshinJanakābhivamsa, 1998, 27).

The Dīpanī explains that tulayitabboaññenasahapamitabbotitulo: one who can be compared with another is called “tula”. It means that the word “tula” is primary derivative form, a combination of “tula” root and “a” suffix. The “a” suffix is used in the sense of accusative (Kammasādhana). It simply becomes “tula” ($\sqrt{\text{tul+a}} = \text{tula}$)

The Dīpanī criticizes that the Ṭikākyaw said the “tula” is formed by means of using “yya” or “a” in sense of measured (sammitattha). It is not good because the word “tula” is possible to be formed by means of root and in the sense of accusative (Kammasādhana). The word “atula” is defined in Ṭikā that tulayituṃasakkuṇeyyotiātulo. Appameyyoti: (Abhidhammatt hasaṅgahaṭkā, 1). “atula” is so called because one cannot be measure; it means ‘measureless one’. The definition denotes that the word “tula” is in the sense of accusative (Kammasādhana). If so, the desirable meaning is complete with Kammasādhana. It is useless to think of using ‘yya’ or ‘a’ in the sense of measured (sammitattha). There might be an argument that there is a rule: “vatticchānugatosaddappayogo: the terminology is according to a speaker”. It should be noted because it is thinking of a way what has not been heard, having put aside the way what has been heard and appropriated (PD, 10). (Controversy point [6])

Implied meaning of the word “sammāsambuddhamatulaṃ”

These controversy points are concerned with implied meaning (neyyattha) of the two words “sammāsambuddham, atulaṃ”. Both Ṭikās agree on that these two words imply three accomplishments (sampadā) that are

being to the Buddha. They are:

The accomplishment of the cause (hetusampadā)

The accomplishment of result (phalasampadā), and the accomplishment of great help to beings (sattupakārasampadā).

Among these three, the accomplishment of result is four-fold. Regarding these four, two Ṭīkās explain slightly different (Abhidh-sṬ. 72).

The Ṭīkāyawexplains that the accomplishment of result is fourfold. They are:

The accomplishment of knowledge (ñāṇasampadā),

The accomplishment of removing (pahānasampadā),

The accomplishment of majesty (ānubhāvasampadā), and

The accomplishment of physical appearance (rūpakāyasampadā).

Among these, the accomplishment of knowledge is the path-knowledge (maggañāṇa) which is a proximate cause of Omniscience (sabbaññutañāṇa) and the knowledges that consist of ten powers etc., that are the sequence of the path-knowledge. The accomplishment of removing (pahānasampadā) is achieving the state of complete non-arising of all the defilements together with habitual impression (vāsanā).

The Dīpanī explains that the accomplishment of result is fourfold. They are:

The accomplishment of removing (pahānasampadā),

The accomplishment of knowledge (ñāṇasampadā),

The accomplishment of majesty (ānubhāvasampadā), and

The accomplishment of physical appearance (rūpakāyasampadā)

Among these, the accomplishment of removing is expelling the mental defilements together with habitual impression (vāsanā). It is absolute eradication. As to core meaning, it is the noble path (ariyamagga) or it is the highest-knowledge [i.e. arahattamaggañāṇa]. (PD, 11)

The accomplishment of knowledge is the knowledge of Omniscience Buddha, the knowledge of tenfold power (dasabala) and so on.

The Dīpanī criticizes the Vibhāvinī for the order of accomplish-

ment that Vibhāvinī states ñāṇasampadā first and then, pahānasampadā. Pahānasampadā should be stated first because it is the forerunner and the cause of ñāṇasampadā as well (PD, 11) (Controversy point [7])

The Vibhāvinī said the accomplishment of knowledge is the highest-knowledge (aggamaggañāṇa) which is a proximate cause of Omniscience (sabbaññutañāṇa). It is not reasonable because the highest-knowledge should be certainly the accomplishment of removing (pahānasampadā). There is no other thing apart from highest-knowledge to be called the accomplishment of removing. Perhaps, someone may say that the path-knowledge is either knowledge (ñāṇa) or eradication (pahāna). Therefore, it should be both (ñāṇa and pahāna). It is also not reasonable because it would be a mixture of accomplishment (sampadāpasaṅga) (PD, 11). (Controversy point [8])

The Vibhāvinī should mention the knowledge of Omniscience Buddha first in the explanation on accomplishment of knowledge but it did not mention. It is not good. Someone may say that by the word “ādi” in the phrase “tammulakānicadasabalādiñāṇāni”, the knowledge of Omniscience Buddha is also included. It is also not reasonable because it is not proper way to express the minor points directly and the major point by the word “ādi”. (PD, 12). (Controversy point [9])

Terminology and contextual meaning of the word “sasaddhammagāṇuttama”.

This controversy is concerned with a terminology and contextual meaning of the word “sasaddhammagāṇuttama”.

The Vibhāvinī explains that AnuruddhaMahāthera has worshipped to the Buddha by the words “sammāsambuddhaṃ and atulaṃ” that express three accomplishments. Now he said the word “sasaddhammagāṇuttamaṃ” to worship the other two Gem, the Dhamma and the Saṅgha. The fact should be known is that the Dhamma and Saṅgha are worth to be worshipped (abhivādettabba) though they are here placed at minor position (guṇībhūta) because they associate with the Buddha. It is like an example such as “he come together with his wife and children”, [one understands that] the wife and the children come too”. (Abhidh-sṬ. 72).

The Dīpanī explains that AnuruddhaMahāthera said the word, “sasaddhammagāṇuttamaṃ” to make his worship more powerful. By this word, he pays respect to the Dhamma and the Saṅgha too. It is like a passage that “from distance, I pay respect to the Lord of the word together with the Saṅgha”. Herein, the paying respect to the Saṅgha can be known through the word “together (sa)”. The same way is to be applied here too (PD, 12). The Dīpanī criticizes the Vibhāvinī for a usage of “tabba” suffix in the word “abhivādetabba”. It should not be said “abhivādetabbabhāvo” (worth to be worshipped), but it should be said “abhivāditabhāvo” (have been worshipped) or “abhivādanam” (worshipping). Then, the meaning will be that Anuruddhathera worships the Dhamma and the Saṅgha too because these words convey the desirable action of worshipping. Otherwise, the word “abhivādetabbabhūto” would convey the meaning of the group of virtues that is worth to be worshipped because the suffix “tabba” conveys the meaning of “deserving”. It is not desirable here and it is also not according with his example “one comes together with his wife and children” (PD, 12). (Controversy point [10])

It is possible to say that Anuruddhathera paid respect to the Triple Gem when he is about to begin compiling his text; then, he composed this verse to denote his worship together with his acknowledgement to write the text. Therefore, he used the word “abhivādiya (having worshipped)”, not used the word “abhivādiyāmi (I worship)” (PD, 12).

A formal definition of the word “gaṇuttamo”

This controversy is concerned with philological perspective that is making a formal definition of the word “gaṇuttamo”, a partial word of “sasaddhammagāṇuttamo”.

Vibhāvinī explains the meaning of the word “gaṇuttamo” by making three types of formal definitions (viggaha); Adjectival Compound (kammadhārayasamāsa) and two Dependent Determinative Compounds (chaṭṭhī-tappurisa, sattamī-tappurisasamāsa). (Prof. A. P. BuddhadattaMaha Thera, 2006, 40, 46).

Adjectival Compound is that gaṇoca so aṭṭhannaṃariyapuggalāna

ṃsamūhabhāvato: the community (gaṇa) is so called because it is a state of gathering of noble persons. Uttamo ca suppaṭipannatādiguṇavisesayo gato: the supreme (uttama) is so called because it is associated with special qualities beginning with “well-practice” etc. Its core definition is that gaṇo ca so uttamocāṭigaṇuttamo; the community that is supreme is called supreme-community (gaṇuttamo).

Dependent Determinative Compound is that gaṇānaṃ, gaṇesuvāde vamanussādisamūhesuuttamoyathāvuttagaṇavasenāṭigaṇuttamo: it is called supreme community because it the most supreme of, or among, communities, gathering of gods and men, by way of qualities that have been said. Its core definition is that gaṇānaṃuttamogaṇuttamo: the supreme community is so called because it is the most supreme of the communities. Alternatively, gaṇesuuttamogaṇuttamo: the supreme community is so called because it is the most supreme among the communities (Abhidh-sṬ, 73).

The Dīpanī explains the meaning of the word “gaṇuttamo” by formal definition of Adjectival Compound (kammadhārayasamāsa) that the word community (gaṇa) is used for the community of those have common views and moralities in the word. The high is used for the Saṅha, disciples of the Buddha because of high virtues of moralities etc. the core meaning if that uttamo ca gaṇocāṭiuttamagaṇo: that high that is community is called “uttamagaṇo”. This word “uttamagaṇo” is used as “gaṇuttamo” in reversed order, like “munisetṭho (noble sage) and “munivaro (exalted sage)” (PD, 16).

The Dīpanī criticizes the Vibhāvinī for the formal definition of Dependent Determinative Compound: gaṇānaṃ or gaṇesuuttamogaṇuttamo: the supreme community is so called because it is the most supreme of, or among the communities. It is not good because in the definition, the word “uttama” would convey a major meaning (padhānabhūta). The word “uttama” conveys only the sense of adjective or minor meaning (guṇībhūta). Therefore, it cannot convey the meaning of the Ariyaśaṅha(PD, 16).(Controversy point [11])

Conclusion

This article has introduced the debate about two Abhidhamma sub-commentaries and analyzes and explains eleven points of controversy that contained in introductory verse. After examining the exposition on the introductory verse, this article has proved that in the debate of controversy, very few points are concerned with Abhidhamma concepts or doctrinal concepts and most of points are concerned with commentarial concepts because among the eleven points, only one point, the fourth, is concerned with doctrinal concepts and the rest are concerned with commentarial concepts. As an art of literature, these points are very attractive for scholars in the field of Buddhist studies. The correct knowledge of Abhidhamma concepts and commentarial concepts is necessary to find the conclusions of those points. And these knowledges are vitally important to preserve the correct understanding of Pāli literature, The Cannon, Commentaries, Sub-commentaries and so on. This article has made part of contribution to preserve Pāli literature.

Abbreviation

Abhidh-sṬ.: Abhidhammatthavibhāvinī-Ṭīkā
PD : Paramatthadīpanī-Ṭīkā

References

- Anuruddha; Sumaṅgala, Thera; Hammalawa Saddhātissa .(1989).
Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha and Abhidhammatthavibhāvinī-Ṭīkā, ed.
Oxford : Pali Text Society.
- Vipassana Research Institute (Dhammagiri, Igatpuri, India); Corporate
Body of the Buddha Educational Foundation.(2003)
Paramatthadīpanī-Ṭīkā, ed. Editorial board, Yangon: Hantharwati
Press, reprinted.
- Aung, S.Z. and Davids, Rhys.(1995). Compendium of Philosophy: A
Translation of the Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha. Oxford: PTS.
- Gethin, Rupert and Wijeratne, R P.(2007). Summary of the topics of
Abhidhamma and Exposition of the Topics of Abhidhamma

- (Abhidhammatthavibhāvinī-Ṭīkā). London: Oxford, PTS.
- Ashin Janakābhivamsa.(1995). *Sanḅyobhāsāṭīkā*. Amarapūra:
Mahāgandhārum Press.
- _____.(2000).*Ṭīkākyaw Nissaya*. Amarapūra: Mahāgandhārum
Press,reprinted.
- G. P. Malasekera.(1958). *The Pāli literature of Ceylon*. Colombo: M. D.
Gunasena &Col, LTD.
- K. R Norman. (1983). *A history of Indian Literature, Vol II (pāli litera
ture)*. Wiesbanden, Harrassowitz.
- Myint Swe.(1992). *Ṭīkā-Sipwe (the war of sub-commentaries included in
the translation of the Dīpanī)*. Yangon: MyintSwe press.
- Yazathinkyam.(2008). *Sāsanālan̄kārasātam (History of Buddhist
lineage)*. Yangon: The Religious Affairs Dept.
- Prof. A. P. BuddhadattaMaha Thera. (2006). *The New Pāli Course,
Vol. II*. Kandy: Buddhist Cultureal Centre.