

ART. IV.—*The Upāsakajanāṅkāra*. By L. D. BARNETT.

THIS book, the work of the Mahāthera Ānanda, is all but unknown in Europe, and though copies exist in Ceylon they have never, I believe, been published.<sup>1</sup> A Sinhalese MS. in the possession of Mr. Easton, of Opawa, Christchurch, N.Z., was recently shown to me by the possessor, to whose courtesy I am indebted for permission to publish the following excerpts, to which I add a few doubtful conjectures.

The work consists of nine *pariccheda*s, and, as the title indicates, is of a popular and edifying character, containing some Jātakas. After the usual *namo tassa*, etc., it begins with the verse—

visuddhavaṇṇaṃ sugataṃ namitvā  
suvāṇṇitaṃ dhammavara[ñ] ca tena  
tathā vimuttaṃ gaṇaṃ aṅgaṇehi  
upāsakāṅkaraṇaṃ karissa[m]

and so on in the same metre for several more verses.

A greater interest, however, attaches to the historical and autobiographical statements contained in a sort of epilogue, which I transcribe—

iti abhinavasādhujanapāmojjatthāya kate upāsakajanā-  
lāṅkāre puññaphalasādhahananiddeso nāma navamo paricchedo.

Here follow six *śloka*s on the object, etc., of the book, which I omit. The author then proceeds as follows:—

sirivallabhanāmena vissute pavare pure |  
saddho mahaddhano pubbe visālakulasambhavo ||  
lokuttamo ti paññāto āsi yo bhikkhu tena tu |  
vītasūsanam (?) appe tu dinnovāde susaṇṭhito ||

<sup>1</sup> A MS. is in Copenhagen, and has been described by Westergaard in his *Codices Havnenses*, but briefly and imperfectly. It seems to be very corrupt.

paṇḍubhūmaṇḍale yo bhuvañño sāmantaḥhūmipo |  
 sadā saddho naye dakkho colagaṅgo ti vissuto ||  
 tena kārāpitā rammā viḥāraṇadassanā |  
 tayo āsu mahikantā kiritaṃ iva bhāsuraṃ ||  
 yo tesam pavaro āsi viḥāro cārudassano |  
 sīṭaladakasampanno nānādumagaṇālayo ||  
 anekaṇaṇasammodanayanālisamāgamo |  
 kulotassakittilatāpupphamañjariyabhāsuro ||  
 [tidasaṭṭhāyānissena[m] vijāyān tu parāyaṇe |]  
 abbhappaharaṇo rammo pharaṇīsu ti vissuto |  
 guṇākaraṇerampalli iti viññuhi dassito ||  
 laṅkāḍīpaṇhi sakale ḍaṃḍilāṇaṇasamākule |  
 āgatā pātum attānaṃ bhūyo sāsanaṇavuddhiyā ||  
 tambapaṇṇiddhajā therā sadā saddhammagocaraṃ |  
 āgamam anurakkhantaṃ yaṇṇiṃ vāsaṃ akappayum ||  
 tassa pubbuttare ramme pāsāde vasaṭā mayā |  
 racito 'yaṃ alaṅkāro sadā sajjanaṇaraṇjako ti ||  
 iti sīḥalācariyabhadaṇṭāṇaṇdamahāthera-  
 viracito upāsaḥkajaṇāṇāṇkāro niṭṭhito.

The scribe's colophon then follows.

The MS. in these verses contains a few mistakes in spelling, etc., which I have tacitly corrected; e.g., in the sixth *çloka* 'bhāsuraṃ, in the next line parāyaṇeṇā, and in the last *çloka*, by a touch of 'local colour,' alaṅkāre. The half-*çloka* after the sixth verse is evidently a fragment from some other work that has come here by accident. *Tambapaṇṇiddhajā* is a correction of the manuscript reading *tattha p.* *Vita* in the second verse should be *vuttaṃ* or the like.

The text tells us that a Cola king, *Colagaṅga* by name, came under the influence of a renowned Buddhist friar, and was thus induced to found three *viḥāras*; the finest of these was that styled *Guṇākara-pēraṇpalli*, whither came a colony of *theras* to take refuge on the occasion of some unspecified

incursion of the Tamils. Here also, on the north-eastern *pāsāda*, was the cell of the author, Ānanda Mahāthera. Whether Ānanda came with this colony of *theras*, or settled here later, is not distinctly stated; but in the absence of express statements to the contrary the text favours the former supposition.

The king mentioned is beyond a doubt Anantavarman Coḍagaṅgadeva, who succeeded in 1078 A.D. At that time the Cola kingdom was asserting itself vigorously at the expense of the Paṇḍya kings, to which our author distinctly refers in the word *paṇḍubhūmaṇḍale*, which, however, need not be pressed to mean that at the time Colagaṅga regularly held his court in the Paṇḍya capital. Probably it is vaguely used, and signifies merely the suzerainty of the Colas over the Paṇḍyas.

The next point to be raised is the personality and date of Ānanda. There is some probability, I think, that he is the famous Mahāthera Abhayagiri Kavicakravartī Ānanda, the author, among other works, of the *Saddhammopāyana*.<sup>1</sup> Now the *sanne* to that treatise is said to be written by an Ānanda Thera, a disciple of Dimbulāgala Medhaṅkara; the original work, then, can hardly have been written much, if at all, later than c. 1220. Whether these two Ānandas are really one is a question to which I shall return.

Incursions by the Tamils were unhappily only too frequent in that age; but one is tempted to refer that mentioned in our text to the particularly disastrous and bloody raid of Māgha and his Kaliṅgas in 1214. If so, and if, as seems to be suggested by our text, Ānanda came with the refugee *theras*, the date of the present work may be fixed at c. 1215–1220.

Against this must be set the statement of the Kalyāṇī inscription, which informs us that Ānanda Thera—probably our Mahāthera—set sail in 1181 for Pagan with Chapāṭa, Sivali, Tāmalinda, and Rāhula, and in his new home founded a *Sihalasaṅgha* of his own, as did his colleagues. But dates

<sup>1</sup> Edited by Dr. Morris in the Journal of the Pali Text Society for 1887.

of this sort should not be pressed too closely; and even supposing the statement of the inscription to be correct, it is conceivable that Ānanda may have later returned, at least for a time, to Ceylon, and there in his old age, *c.* 1215, have composed our present work. That such was actually the case is suggested by the fact that here no mention is made of any connection with Abhayagiri; evidently Ānanda had long before broken off all relations he may have had with it, probably before he left Ceylon for Pagan.<sup>1</sup>

But a further point rises. If our author is Abhayagiri Kavicakravartī Ānanda Mahāthera, who wrote the Saddhammopāyana, is he identical with the Ānanda Thera who composed the *sanne* on that work? I believe so. The evidence is strong. Besides the names, the dates strikingly agree, as we saw, for even *c.* 1200 Ānanda was not too old to learn from Medhaṅkara. Moreover, we should note the language in which Dīpaṅkara Buddhappiya speaks of himself and his master at the end of his Rūpasiddhi. Buddhappiya was, as we know, a devoted pupil of the Ānanda Thera who wrote this *sanne*; and if he speaks of his master in terms evidently borrowed from a work of the Mahāthera Ānanda, this strongly suggests that the Mahāthera and the Thera are one and the same. Now Buddhappiya actually calls himself *vikhyātānandatheravahayavaragarūṇaṃ tamba-panṇiddhajānaṃ sisso*, and this striking epithet applied to the master is again used by the author of the verses before us. It is surely not too bold an inference that the author of the Upāsakajanālaṅkāra and Saddhammopāyana is the same as the grammarian Ānanda Thera who commented on the latter work.

<sup>1</sup> The author of the Upāsakajanālaṅkāra, indeed, claims as a merit of his work that it is *mahāvihāravāsinaṃ pavattiphalanissito*. This statement admits of being taken as an argument against the identification of our writer with the Ānanda of the Saddhammopāyana, though it is not a very strong one. From the statement of the Kalyāṇī inscription that Ānanda spent fifty-four years in Pagan after founding his Sangha, and died in 1245 A.D., a like inference may be drawn, but hardly with safety.