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PREFACE

The essays collected here were read and discussed in a seminar organized by the Department of Buddhist studies of the University of Delhi in 1967. As the Director of the seminar I was fortunate in receiving full cooperation not only from those who contributed their papers but also from those who participated in discussions. I acknowledge my indebtedness to them all.

I had to drop my original plan of publishing complete proceedings of the seminar because printing arrangements took extraordinarily long time to come through. Instead I thought of making this a volume representative of the areas of Buddhist studies where Indian scholars are interested at present. Hence the last chapter has been included here which did not form a part of the seminar.

Since I have moved from the Department of Buddhist studies which I headed from 1966 to 1973 to the Department of Philosophy, I take this opportunity of thanking those colleagues of my former Department who cooperated with me in my academic and administrative functioning. This volume will always remind me of pleasant and fruitful experiences I had in that Department.

R. C. Pandeya
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Welcome Address

by

R. C. Pandeya

It is a matter of great pleasure for me and my colleagues in the Department of Buddhist Studies to warmly welcome scholars assembled here from different parts of the country. On the proposal made by my friend and colleague Dr. B. Jnanananda who was then the Head of the Department, the University Grants Commission gave us a small grant for convening a seminar on “Buddhism through the Ages”. As we received the final sanction only in the last week of February and we were required to utilize the grant before the close of the financial year, we had to rush through. But I am grateful to scholars who responded favourably to my request at a short notice by sending their learned papers and by attending this seminar. Paucity of funds, lack of time and our weaknesses may be the causes of many inconveniences that delegates might have already experienced or may have to experience during their stay with us for next three days. I apologise to them for this in advance.

I am specially happy to have Dr. P.L. Vaidya among us who, in spite of his advanced age, has kindly consented to be present here and to inaugurate this seminar. Among the present day scholars of Buddhism in this country he is perhaps the seniormost not only in age but, more significantly, also in the field of scholarly pursuits.

Our Vice-Chancellor, Dr. B.N. Ganguli, is an economist of very high repute. But few people know that he is equally well-versed in Indian Philosophy and religion. Without his blessings and support we could not have been able to assemble here today. Being the head of our academic family, kula, he is our guide. I welcome him, not only in this seminar but also in the Department of Buddhist Studies which he is visiting for the first time as Vice-Chancellor.

Buddhist Studies is not the same thing as practice of Buddhism. It is the scientific and objective study alone that
concerns us here. Even people belonging to academic institutions very often have formed the notion that the study of a religion is the same as its profession. While a person is free to choose any faith he likes, it is essential for him to cast aside religious convictions and dogmas before he enters the portals of a University, lest these may prevent him from arriving at a correct view of the religion of his study. What is required of us is a sympathetic though unbiased and non-dogmatic understanding. This is the aim of the Department of Buddhist Studies and this should also be the motive guiding deliberations of this Seminar.

In the history of Indian philosophy the age of reason starts with the great Buddhist Šāṅkara Nāgārjuna, and attains full glory with Dignāga and Dharmakīrti. When Buddhist Ācāryas became fully occupied with the practice of occultism and devotion the age of tantra and devotion (tantra and bhakti) began. A significantly large part of what is valuable in Indian philosophy is the product of the age of reason. It would be wrong to suppose, however, that in their achievements these Buddhist Ācāryas were not influenced by non-Buddhist thinkers. As a matter of fact for a philosophy to grow intellectual encounters and logical confrontations act as stimulants. If a person refuses to receive inspirations from outside, confining himself to his own hermetically sealed private chamber, his philosophical creations, if any, are bound to be received as strangers in the intellectual world. Thus open-mindedness is the first prerequisite for any real philosophical undertaking. From Nāgārjuna to Šāṅkara we find a grand succession of such thinkers the like of which we do not find in any other period of Indian history. This was perhaps made possible because Buddhism set aside its orthodox notions and espoused a catholic outlook which we call Mahāyāna. You will agree with me, perhaps, that no real study of Buddhism, nay, of any branch of knowledge concerning ancient India, as a whole is ever possible without a thorough understanding of philosophy, religion, literature and culture of this period.

It would be wrong to believe that a period of history can profitably be studied without the knowledge of its antecedents and repercussions. Antecedents contain the seeds of future development. History, whether it is of ideas or of
religion or culture or nation is an organic growth and therefore it cannot be fruitfully studied in bits and fragments. For example, in order to study the life of a person one cannot rest content with the observation of his childhood or his old age. Thus our aim in this Department is to study Buddhism in all its aspects. But in our study we focus our attention on its mature achievement in Mahāyāna; Pāli study and Vajrayāna form only the periphery of our academic endeavours. There are several reasons for this choice. Centres at Nalanda, Calcutta and Varanasi are doing good work in Pāli and early Buddhism. But unfortunately there is no centre in our country which is devoted to the study of Mahāyāna. Another important reason for our emphasis on Mahāyāna is that in comparison to the study of early Buddhism Mahāyāna sources yet remain unexplored. In other words, this study offers very good scope for fresh exploration. Lastly, Buddhism in its development in Mahāyāna has come in lively contact with other systems of Indian philosophy and religion. The impact of Mahāyāna on non-Buddhist thinking and vice-versa is so profound that without the knowledge of Mahāyāna, it becomes well nigh impossible to study Nyāya, Śāmkhya, Mīmāṁśā, Yoga and Vedānta. Similar is the case with Mahāyāna itself which cannot be properly understood and appreciated without the knowledge of these systems. So the study of Mahāyāna is in a way the study of the entire body of Indian knowledge. There has been a tendency among the writers on Indian philosophy either to completely ignore or to refer to only in passing the contribution of Buddhism. This has resulted in the presentation of one-sided view of Indian philosophy and religion. In fact even today Departments of philosophy, history and Sanskrit in our Universities continue to teach Indian philosophy and culture without giving Buddhism its due share. Thus by emphasizing the study of Mahāyāna we are endeavouring to create a climate where proper study of Indian philosophy, religion and culture could be made and the way is paved for writing a correct and balanced history of Indian thought, which unfortunately has yet to be written.

There are two methods in vogue for undertaking such a study. We may designate them as linguistic method and interpretative method. In majority of cases we find that one
method to the exclusion of the other is adopted. Those who adopt the first method run after words and phrases. As a result their activities are confined only to preparation of critical editions of texts and their translations. Those belonging to the other group catch hold of a few sentences from some text and weave out an article or even a voluminous book claiming it to be a study of Buddhism. But the fact is that such a study very often is Buddhistic merely because it mentions the name of the Buddha or a few other Ācāryas on every second page. In my opinion the correct method would be a synthesis of the two methods mentioned above. No study can be claimed to be Buddhistic unless it is firmly rooted in texts and it cannot be a real study unless it is interpreted in a language which a modern intelligent man can follow. One of the basic requirements for any interpretative study is the linking of the concepts to be interpreted with the concepts with which modern men are familiar. This requires ingenuity and knowledge of the contemporary trend of thinking. It is unfortunate that although we have good edited texts but we do not have studies of those texts before us. We want, therefore, to train our students in such a way that they can handle texts (in Pali, Sanskrit, Tibetan and Chinese) and at the same time can interpret them. This demands hard labour no doubt but we can justify our existence only when we teachers can cope with this by no means easy task. It pains me to note in this connection that scholars competent enough to undertake this task are not many.

My predecessors in the Department, Dr. P.V. Bapat and Dr. V.V. Gokhale, have made my task difficult. They have formulated the policy of the Department according to their very high standard of scholarship which I am afraid I do not possess. But I am alive to the task and I am not prepared, in spite of many shortcomings, to lower down this high academic aim. I want to assure them and all other scholars present here that with all energy and resources that I possess I shall endeavour to achieve the ideal.

We are fortunate to have the blessings of our Vice-Chancellor who is noted for his zeal to enhance and keep up the academic standard of this University. In passing I may mention that I have put a proposal for starting an
independent course in Comparative Religion in this University. Scholars assembled here know very well that Comparative Religion is neither philosophy nor history; it is an altogether independent branch of learning. In the Department of Buddhist Studies what we are doing is more or less nothing but a comparative study of Buddhism and other Indian religious systems. So the nucleus for comparative study of major religions of the world is already there. We only want this comparative study to be broad-based so as to include other religions which we are not concerned with at present. This course, if implemented, will be the first of its kind in our country which is known all over the world as a land of religions. The sympathy of our Vice-Chancellor is with us and we hope to launch this new project which is, to remind you, strictly in keeping with the aims and objects of this Department.

This seminar is a part of the activities of this Department. Therefore the aim of the seminar is not different from the aim and ideals of the Department outlined above. I hope that learned participants in the seminar will substantially contribute to the furtherance of the cause this Department champions.

With these words I once more welcome you all to this seminar and also to the Department of Buddhist Studies.
Seminar on Buddhism through the Ages

Inauguration Speech

by

Dr. P. L. Vaidya

Mr. Vice-Chancellor and friends,

I feel highly honoured by the invitation of the organisers of this seminar on Buddhism through the Ages to inaugurate it. I am really grateful to them. In this Capital of our country, the organisers could have easily found persons better qualified than me to perform the inaugural function. I bow to them, however, to have asked me to be here, and accept the honour they have done with a bit of bewilderment.

The University of Delhi is unique university in India to have a Department of Buddhist Studies in the widest sense of the term. The credit of establishing this department goes to our revered President, Dr. Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan. I need not and cannot fully recall here how during the years of 1955-56, when Dr. Radhakrishnan was the Vice-President of India and Chancellor of Delhi University, he impressed upon the Government of India to have a festival to mark the 2500 years of Buddhism in 1956. Among various cultural and academic activities in connection with this festival, a sumptuous volume on Buddhism to be published on the occasion was planned, and its execution was entrusted to my friend Dr. P.V. Bapat. A Symposium lasting for a week on the Contribution of Buddhism to World Culture was another feature of the festival to which dignitaries from the whole globe were invited as honoured guests which included the Dalai Lama, Panchan Lama and several others. Film shows and dramatic performances, specially suited for the festival, played a significant part in the programme. Of the lasting literary and cultural activities, I have already mentioned the volume on 2500 years of Buddhism, there were many other activities
organised of publications on the occasion. Prominent among them were an edition in Devanāgarī script of the entire Pali Tripiṭaka in 40 volumes. This project with necessary funds was entrusted to Bhikkhu Jagadish Kasyap of Nava Nalanda Mahāvihāra, and has been accomplished, a project for which the late Prof. C.V. Rajwade of Poona, late Prof. Bhagwat of Bombay, Dr. Bapat and myself as humble people in 1916 were struggling hard, but had to abandon the idea for want of funds and encouragement. An edition in 25 volumes of Buddhist Sanskrit Texts with necessary funds was entrusted to me as Director of the Mithila Institute, Darbhanga, of which I could publish only 17 volumes. The project is not yet complete for no fault of mine or for funds. Yet another feature of the festival was the renovation of ancient holy sites for the Buddhists such as Kapilavastu, Gaya, Sarnath and Kusinārā, and many others. But in my opinion the most important and lasting feature of that festival is the establishment of the Department of Buddhist Studies in Delhi University. I do not know how, but in the Advisory Body of the Department my name figures at the top, and I may tell you that I did my humble bit in the selection of all the three Heads of the Department as well as some other members of the staff during the last ten years. Dr. P.V. Bapat was the first professor in the Department, who successfully established good traditions for it. Dr. V.V. Gokhale who succeeded him, also enhanced these, and Dr. Ramchandra Pandeya, though young, is full of enthusiasm and fresh with new ideas, and I feel sure, would bring glory to the Department in the years to come.

A university Department like the Department of Buddhist Studies, cannot be and should not be put on par with Department of Economics, Chemistry or Physics. It is essentially a department of Culture preservation. The success or otherwise of this department should not be judged by the number of students or fee-income, but rather by the research programme and publications of its Professors and students. I feel that during the short period of ten years of its existence the work put out by the Department is not negligible, but I would say, promising and satisfactory. The Department is a growing department, and should not find it difficult to discover new and unexplored horizons.
Buddhism is a religious movement which sprang out of the ancient Indian religion, call it Vedic or Hindu. It presupposes all literary works belonging to Vedic schools like the Vedas, Brāhmaṇas and Upaniṣads. It also presupposes all cults within the society as well as free-thinkers. Buddhism revolted against some of the doctrines and practices current in that religion, which, as a result, stopped contributing to the progress of humanity. The founder of Buddhism, Siddhārtha Gautama, a scion of the kṣatriya race of the Śākya clan, found that the current religious practices were no longer conducive to progress of humanity, and started on his quest for a new path for that purpose. For this, he had to go through the older ways of studies of philosophical schools like Sāṁkhya and Yoga, as well as through the discipline. All this went in vain for him. He did not realise his objectives. He, therefore, abandoned them all and started his normal ways of life, and one day, in deep meditation, he discovered an ethical solution to his problems which is called the Middle Path and also a philosophical doctrine known as Pratītya-samutpāda, the theory of Dependent origination, four noble Truths and eightfold path of conduct. This, in fact, is the essence of Buddhism.

For a common man, Buddhism is a very simple religion in practice. It consists of three-Śāraṇa gamanas to Buddha, Dharma and Saṁgha, faith in four Noble Truths, observance of five śīlas or vows and the eightfold path, constituting a practical and ethical basis of his day-to-day conduct. Pratītya-samutpāda serves as a philosophical background. It is no wonder that this new doctrine of Buddha at once caught the imagination of the people who were tired of endless ritualism and caste system. It is wrong to suppose that Buddhism is meant for monks only. The existing literature of the Buddhists seems, no doubt, to be dominated as a faith for monks, and although this class has done immense good to the faith, it depended on the Upāsakas or laity, whose number, compared with that of monks, was immensely larger. The Bhikṣuṇīsaṁgha came in later and disappeared earlier. It is a well-known fact that the Buddha was reluctant to admit women as nuns, and had even prophesied that, due to the admission of women as nuns, his faith may not last longer than five hundred years. The
class of monks depended entirely for their maintenance on laity who supplied them their needs, and also spent huge sums of money for them and also for other charitable establishments like temples and universities like Nalanda and Vikramasila.

Buddhism attained great popularity in no time and spread not only to the nooks and corners of India, but was introduced to regions beyond Indian border like Ceylon. ना एकेक नै अग्निक्षत् Do not go ye monks, two in one direction, rather each may go in different direction so that the spread of the new religion would be quick. This direction was responsible for the rapid spread of Buddhism. Gradually it led to admission into its fold highly cultured classes of śramaṇas and Brāhmaṇas who introduced into the simple tenets of Buddhism speculative and ritualistic tendencies which destroyed its simplicity. Buddha personally avoided such tendencies into his doctrines and flatly refused to answer such questions. In course of time Buddhism became as complicated as any other older religion.

After having dominated the field of Indian Cultural activities for over a thousand years, and vied with the older religious faiths for a few hundred years more, Buddhism attracted scholars from countries like China and Ceylon, who visited the land of Buddha’s birth, and some of them stayed here for the first hand study of Buddhist and Brahmanic literature. Buddha, from the beginning, was very liberal in his outlook. He wanted each individual to master the faith in his own mother tongue (सकाय निष्पक्ष). As a result, the literature of the Buddhists is embodied, not in Vedic, Epic or Classical Sanskrit, but in languages current among the people. The people from southern or South-Asian countries specialised the form of language known as Pali, and embodies the literature of the Theravādins, while northern countries like China, Japan, Mongolia and Korea the Mahāyānism which specialised in a mixed dialect that must have been a popular and flexible form of Sanskrit. It is a well-known fact that the Universities of Nalanda and Vikramasila specialised in the literature in that Dialect, and when about 1210 A.D., Nalanda was destroyed and its scholars moved to safer places like Nepal, Tibet and China, they carried with them literature in manus-
cripts, mostly in that dialect. Only a negligible number of Pali works are found in these countries. The Chinese and Tibetan scholars, who were trained in India, with the collaboration of Indian Pandits, mass translated these works into Tibetan, Chinese and Mongolian languages. We now know the vastness of that literature from the published catalogues of Chinese and Tibetan translations. Some only of the original works have been discovered in Indian, Nepalese and Tibetan depositories of manuscripts.

How Buddhism disappeared from the land of its birth is a question shrouded in mystery. The records in this regard are scanty. The destruction of Nalanda and Vikramasila, or revival of Brahmanism or Hinduism, and consequent absorption of Buddhists into the fold of Hinduism seem to be the two principal explanations offered. The 15th century Banaras Pandit, Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa, the author of an encyclopaedic work called Toḍarānanda, states:

विज्ञाय वेदस्य तदा विनाशं।
देशो महाजीनपवं विवेशं॥

taking no notice of its spread in countries like Burma and Ceylon.

The Modern revival of the study of Buddhism in India is a recent story of about 100 years. The universities of Calcutta and Bombay first introduced the study of Pali literature some sixty years back under the influence of Anagārika Dhammapāla who came to India from Ceylon. The University of Calcutta later introduced and encouraged the study of Sanskrit Buddhism and consequent study of Tibetan and Chinese translations. There were some sporadic attempts to restore lost Sanskrit works from their Chinese and Tibetan translations into their original form. I had my own share in this field when I restored into original Sanskrit last nine chapters of Āryadeva’s Catuḥṣataka in 1923. A comparative study of original Sanskrit works on Buddhism and their Tibetan and Chinese translations, has also been undertaken in some Indian universities. In this context, I may warn the enthusiasts of Chinese and Tibetan translation who want to correct the text of a work available in the original Sanskrit
form on the strength of their Tibetan or Chinese translations which suggest additions, alterations or omissions into them. This attitude is fraught with dangers, because, after all, the Tibetan and Chinese translations are mass translations; further they were done by different scholars with varying academic qualifications; they were made from copies of manuscripts which they took with them from India. There were certainly left in India, Nepal and Tibet a number of these works. The versions supplied by these available original works in Sanskrit must be regarded as more reliable and authentic than their Tibetan and Chinese translations. A work available in the original form in manuscripts, is, in my opinion, more reliable and more valuable than its translation. For, we do not know the nature of the manuscript from which the translation was made, which might have belonged to a different version. In other words, an original Sanskrit work stands as a Śrut, while its translation is only a Smṛti. It is therefore better to concentrate on the study of those translations of which original Sanskrit works are not available. In fact, this form of study would be more fruitful as it would supply us information on new material the original of which is lost for us for ever.

Last month many of us met in a seminar at Nalanda which specialised Buddhist Culture of South Asian countries preserved in Pali language. The topics proposed to be discussed in the present seminar embrace a larger and broader field. The scholars participating in it have brought with them a varied fare, and I am confident that this seminar will go a step further in assessing the advance we have made in Buddhist Studies in India. My suggestion is that the seminars like one at Nalanda and the present one should meet once in five years to recapitulate the advance we have made in the field. With these words, I feel great pleasure in inaugurating the seminar on Buddhism through the Ages and wish it a great success.
II

Ideal of Kingship in Pāli Tripitaka

by

Dr. Yashpal

Kingship is one of the oldest institutions in India. Right from the Rigvedic times one could easily trace the existence of kings in this land. Kingship is very frequently referred to in the Early Pāli literature. Rājā, mahārājā and rājā cakkavatti are the usual words used for a small or a great king. Although the word rājā is used for various important officers of the state also, and that the ‘word’ “does not admit of a uniform interpretation and translation”, yet it is the usual word used for a king. The Vibhaṅga defines it as one who rules (yo koci rajjam karoti).

The Cullaniiddesa defines rājā thus: “Kshatriya, consecrated, victorious in battle, slaying his foes, fulfilling his desires, having his treasury and store-houses full” (khattiyo muddhābhīṣitto vijjitasangāmo nihitapaccāmitto laddhādhikkāyo paripun-nakosakoṭṭhāgāro). This was the popular definition.

Gautama through his ministry wanted to usher in an era of peace and willing cooperation. Force had no place in his way of thinking. The above definition of the king could not be easily reconciled with his thinking. So we find Gautama trying to explain the origin of kingship as a sort of social contract, rather than that ‘war begot the king’.

---

1. Suttanipāta vs. 422, 423, 568; Aṅguttara. i. 68; Dīgha. 87; Vinaya. i. 228, 246; Udāna. 11.
2. Suttanipāta. vs. 416; Samyutta. i. 75.
3. D. ii. 198; iii. 59; Majjhima. ii. 146. S.N. p. 106.
4. Vin. iii. 46.
6. Vin. iii. 222.
7. Śrinalanda Ed. p. 272.
In the story of genesis he asserts:—

"Now those beings, gathered themselves together and bewailed those things (evils), saying: 'From our evil deeds, sirs, becoming manifest inasmuch as stealing, censure, lying, punishment have become known, what if we were to select a certain being who should censure that which should rightly be censured and should banish him who deserves to be banished. But we will give him in return a proportion of the rice.

"Then those beings went to the being among them who was the handsomest, the best favoured, the most attractive, the most capable and said to him, 'Come now, good being, be indignant at that whereat one should rightly be indignant, censure that which should rightly be censured, banish him who deserves to be banished. And we will contribute to thee a proportion of our rice.'

"And he consented, and did so, and they gave him a proportion of their rice."

"Chosen by the whole people, is what is meant by Mahā Sammata. So Mahā Sammata (The Great Elect) was the first standing phrase to arise (for such a one). Lord of the fields is what is meant by khattiya, so Khattiya (Noble) was the next expression to arise. He charms the others by Dhamma (dhammena ranjjeti)—by what ought to (charm)—is what is meant by Rājā; so this was third standing phrase to arise."

Naturally this story could not be accepted as authentic. But Gautama made an attempt at explaining the position of the king, as he thought it ought to be. He asserted that not only was the king elected, but also that his most important duty was to maintain peace and order and protect the property of the subjects, in lieu of taxes. This election is almost


9. Cf. also Dr. R.S. Sharma, Aspects of Political Ideas and Institutions in India, p. 50 ff.
similar to the 'appointment' of Saul in the Book of Samuel, in the Old Testament.  

But once the king had come into existence, Gautama had no doubt that it was hereditary. However, there were many qualities that a king was expected to possess. It was asserted that the king should be well-born on both sides, pure in descent as far back as seven generations, both on his mother's and father's side.  

It was also desirable that he should have the quality of understanding things correctly (atthaññū), knowing the dhamma (dhammaññū), being familiar with measure (mattaññū) (in punishment and fine), knowing the right time for all work (kālaññū) (for pleasure, court work and touring) and knowing the assemblages of men (parisaññū) (i.e. who should be able to handle successfully those who approached him).  

The knowledge of dhamma and living by dhamma was very much emphasised for the kings. Gautama even went to the extent of relating the story of a certain king of Videhas, who lived by dhamma, who used to observe the Uposatha on the 15th, 14th and the 8th day of the lunar half months, and whose fame reached even the Heaven of Three and Thirty. This king was said to have visited the Heaven in person, and then returned to his realms.  

Thus in point of personal qualities, family, physical and those of character, the king had to be par excellence.  

It was also suggested that the King's four-fold army should be loyal and alert. His officers were to be discreet and intelligent. Similarly possession of great wealth, treasures, territories, vehicles, armies, power (iddhi), and potency were also essential for him.  

A very important attribute of a good government was that the country should be secure from within and without,

---

11. Cf. A. i. 163; D. i. 113, 137; S.N. p. 115.  
15. Ud. 11.
people at peace with one another, happy, their children dancing in their arms and the population able to keep their doors unlocked.16

But the most important concept for reconciling was that of the Cakkavatti king. This concept had been developed much earlier than the days of Gautama. The performance of the Asvamedha sacrifice was associated with him. In point of conquest, power, grandeur, goodness, he was superior to the ordinary king talked of above. This king was so natural to the political thought of the day that it was claimed that for those who were endowed with 32 marks on their body—such as Gautama was—only two careers were open; i.e. if the person chose to remain a house-holder, he was to become a cakkavatti king and if he was to be an ascetic, he was to become a path-finder.17

True, that the possession of 32 marks had nothing to do with the realities, as it would make the possessor look more like a monster than a man. But the description of the Cakkavatti king as conceived by Gautama is very interesting:—

So endowed, it was asserted, he would become a sovereign of the world, a conqueror, the protector of his people and possessor of the seven royal jewels (ratna), those of the Wheel, Elephant, Horse, Gem, Woman, Treasurer (gahapati) and Adviser (parināyaka). In addition he was to have a thousand sons, valiant, built on heroic lines, able to crush opposing armies, although he was to rule by dhamma, rather than by force.18

The qualities of these seven jewels and the manner in which these appeared to him, has also a significance of its own. Thus it was related that "a noble anointed king after bathing himself from head to foot, on a full moon Uposatha day, went to the upper story of his palace and there appeared to him the heavenly (dibba) Jewel of the Wheel, with one thousand spokes, with nave and tyre complete. The king had heard that if such a wheel appeared to a king, he would be-

17. D. ii. 16.
18. D. i. 88-9; ii. 16, 19, 146, 198; iii. 59, 142, 146, 177.
come the Cakkavatti rājā. Therefore, he rose from his seat and reverently uncovered his shoulder and holding the sacred water pot in his left hand, with his right hand he sprinkled water on the wheel and said, "Roll onwards, O', Jewel of the Wheel, and conquer." Then that wonderous wheel rolled onwards towards the east and following it went the king with his fourfold army. Wheresoever the Jewel of the Wheel stopped, the king along with army stopped. The king through whose territory he passed welcomed this King and said, "Come sire, you are welcome, sire (all is) yours, sire, instruct (us) sire". The Cakkavatti rājā said thus: "You shall not kill the living beings, or steal, or act wrongly in regard to sense pleasures, or tell a lie, or take strong drink. You shall eat in moderation." Thus the Wheel rolled on to the very boundaries of the earth and the ocean and then it went in a similar manner in all the other three directions and after that it returned to the royal capital and stood fixed by the axle to the gateway of the Cakkavatti Rājā's inner apartments, facing the hall of justice (attakarnapamukhe), as an adornment to his harem.  

Then the Jewel of Elephant appeared to him. He was the king of elephants and was named Uposatha. It was all white, sevenfold firm, possessed of supernatural powers, able to fly through the sky. Appearing to the king, it submitted to the king's control willingly. The king would ride on it and leaving his capital in the morning and covering the four corners of his kingdoms, return by the time of his morning meal. Similarly the king acquired the Jewel of Horse, which was named Valāhaka (cloud), the king of horses, who was all white, with black head, with a mane like the munīja grass wonderful in power and capable of flying through the sky. These two appear to be mythical animals.

Similarly there appeared to him the Jewel of Gem, bright of the finest quality, with eight facets, excellently wrought, clear, transparent, perfect in every way. Its lustre shone for a yojana all around, and in its light the fourfold army

19. D. ii. 172-4; M. iii. 172-3; D. iii. 59, 61, 148.
20. Cf. Lalita-Vistara, where a different name is mentioned.
could march at night and the people thought that the day had dawned. It was thus a weapon of war rather than an ornament.

This king also acquired as his espouse the Jewel of Woman. She was perfect in figure, beautiful in appearance and charming in manner. Her touch was that of a tuft of cotton or thistle down. She was warm in winter and cold in summer. From her body wafted the perfume of sandalwood and from her mouth that of a lotus. She served the king zealously and was never faithless.

Then he acquired the Jewel of a Treasurer. This person was endowed with a deva-like vision by which he could locate treasures and solve the king’s financial worries.

Finally he got a Jewel of an Adviser, learned, clever and wise. This adviser seems to have been more of an instrument of royal will, than a wise adviser. He could lead the king in anything that the king wanted.\textsuperscript{21}

If we were to analyse this mystique, we will find that the story, appearance and movement of the Wheel resembles more the famous horse-sacrifice, wherein the armies followed the horse. May be this was a sublimated form of the old tradition, or one given a Buddhist hue. But this lacks the mention of political subordination of the small rulers to the ‘universal monarch’. One could compare this to the tours of Aśoka, undertaken for the propagation of dhamma, rather than the progress of an all conquering hero. This tends to remind us of Aśoka’s dhammavijaya with which he decided to replace his digvijaya.

It is not indicated wherefrom all these special possession appeared to the king, but certainly the possesion of these acquisitions made him the most powerful king ever imaginable. No wonder we are told that the world could not have two such kings at the same time,\textsuperscript{22} and that such a king was worthy of stūpa.\textsuperscript{23}

It is added that all his subjects came to him. When an assemblage of the various castes and ascetics sought an

\textsuperscript{22} M. iii. 65; A. i. 28
\textsuperscript{23} D. ii. 142; A. i. 77; ii. 245.
audience with him, they were all filled with joy at seeing him. When the king spoke to them they were happy and heard him attentively, while they were ill at ease if he was silent.  

This idealised ruler of our literature, it is asserted over and over again, conquered not by stick, not by sword, but by dhamma and he ruled over the earth to its ocean boundaries. The earth under his control was free from barrenness, pitfalls and jungle and was bountiful, prosperous, secure fortunate and without blemish. The king was long lived and nobody could kill him. His officers were well-affected towards him. He would be recognised as the chief, the best, the foremost, the supreme and the paramount. Whatsoever things were worthy of a monarch, the treasures and belongings of a monarch, these he would quickly acquire. He would be popular amongst his people and officers. His word commanded attention. His subjects were pure at heart.  

What this law is, is made out in another story. A Cakkavatti King of olden times is seen advising his son in the following words:—

"Throughout thy kingdom let no wrong doing prevail. And whatsoever in the kingdom is poor, to him let wealth be given. And when dear son, in thy kingdom, men of religious life, renouncing the carelessness arising from the intoxication of the senses and devoted to forbearance and sympathy, shall come from time to time, and question thee concerning what is good and what is bad, what is criminal and what is not, what is to be done and what left undone, what like of action will in the long run work for weal or for woe, thou shouldst hear what they have to say and thou shouldst deter them from evil, and bade them take up what is good. This, dear son, is the Ariyan duty of a Cakkavatti king."  

All this could be easily compared to Asoka's decision to have dharmaghosha instead of bherighosha, and his efforts to propagate the dhamma with the help of stone inscriptions and

24. D. ii. 145; A. ii. 133.
26. D. iii. 146-78.
27. C. iii. 61.
Dhamma *Mahāmātrás*, was probably actuated by these very directions.

Thus we find that Gautama was not only trying to rationalise the concept of big and small kings, but was also trying to set up a standard for all the faithful kings-king who wanted to be true Buddhists and also be all conquering heroes. Through his sermons Gautama was trying to influence the activities of the kings. Not only Asoka's attempt at propagating his *dhamma*, but also his ideal of kingship, his attitude towards his subjects, his solicitation for their well-being, all fit into this *ideal* for a king. This very ideal was followed by other Buddhist kings, though to a lesser degree.
Buddhism and Burma

Devaprasad Guha

Buddhism and Burma are almost inseparable names, and one finds much of justification in the claim of a Burmese Buddhist that it is his country which preserves still now the orthodox tenets of Buddhism much more religiously than the sister countries where Buddhism is the dominating faith. Indeed, Buddhism of the Theravāda School, which incidentally was introduced into Burma some fifteen hundred years ago, has been for centuries and is even today a very vital factor in Burmese life and a great social force in that country. Buddhism again is the tie that binds Burma with India, and whatever is of any account in Burmese life and society is derived from that great religion. Of course, it cannot be denied that with the passage of time the face of Buddhism too has changed a lot. But, that is what is just expected, and therein we get the echo of the words of the Master that nothing is permanent in this world, and that everything is liable to change. Yet, the fact remains that if the Burmese Buddhists had amended the tenets of the Buddha to suit the changed time and circumstances, the change had been effected in letters only and definitely not in spirit. Indeed, the profound teachings of the Tathāgata still now inspire millions of people of the world, but amongst them the Burmese Buddhists can rightfully claim a place of great distinction. It is through Buddhism the Burmese people have developed a culture worth envying. It is Buddhism again which has generated in its Burmese rotary an outlook on life for which any person would be well proud of. Facts being such, we shall first make a brief historical survey of Buddhism in Burma, before we endeavour to find out how the teachings
of the Buddha moulded the life and character of the Burmese people.

Buddhism, rather its orthodox from known as the Theravāda, a faith now some twentyfive centuries old, was officially adopted by the Burmans, the major racial unit of the country, as early as the eleventh century A.D. Tradition, indigenous however, takes back the introduction of the faith into Burma even to the life-time of the Buddha when, according to the Shwe Dagon Ceti-daw Thamaing, a late native chronicle, it reached this country through the good offices of two Mon merchants, Tapusa and Bhallika, of Ukkala. The Buddha, so says the chronicle, was kind enough to give them the doevācika saranagamana formula and five precepts, besides gracing them with eight hair of his head. It further says that the two merchants returned home happy, and with the help of the reigning monarch they built a pagoda on the top of the Theinguttara hill to enshrine the precious relics and propagated the tenets they received from the Master. Incidentally, at the place where the relics were supposed to have been enshrined, now stands the famous Shwe Dagon pagoda which however, is not the only shrine of which Burma can boast. There are numerous religious edifices scattered all over the country, quite a few of which are fairly celebrated, the maximum number having been clustered together in a sixteen square mile area at Pagan, the ancient capital of Burma and the nerve centre of Burmese Buddhism. Turning back to the tradition of the hair-relics, it can be said that its authenticity is yet to be proved. Except the popular belief as recorded in the aforesaid chronicle, there is hardly any proof to substantiate the gift and later enshrinement of the relics. Besides, it should be noted that, while a series of sculptures, dated sixth century onwards, from Shrī-kṣetra near Prome and Pagan depict the meeting of the two merchants with the Buddha, nowhere there is any representation of the gift of the hair-relics. Then again, scholars are generally inclined to identify Ukkala of the text with Orissa and not with Rangoon as the orthodoxy tends to believe. In view of the facts stated above, we are left with no other alternative but to wait till further evidences to establish the popular belief are available.
Incidentally, it is worth referring to the Ceylonese chronicle *Mahāvamsa*. According to it, Buddhism reached Suvaṇṇabhūmi as early as the third century before Christ when the Mauryan emperor Asoka sent two Buddhist monks, Sona and Uttara, to propagate the teachings of the Master there. Kalyāṇī inscription of the late fifteenth century echoes the same sentiment. But the dispute about the exact location of Suvaṇṇabhūmi is yet to be settled. Some identify it with Thaton of Burma, others are inclined to locate it elsewhere in the country, while still others place it in Thailand or take it to denote broadly the whole of Indo-China.

We shall now come to more of definite evidences about the early existence of Buddhism, in all probability of its Theravāda form, in Burma. At Thaton has recently been found a bronze Buddha image which on stylistic grounds may be assigned to the late fifth century. About a decade back, when the Shwe Maw Daw pagoda of Pegu was being rebuilt, was unearthed a votive tablet. The obverse of it contains a Buddha figure, while the reverse the well-known Buddhist formula *ye dharmā* written in Mon characters of the sixth century. The other archaeological evidences are too well-known to be recounted. However, a few noteworthy ones are referred to here. They are the Buddha images from Tadagalay near Rangoon; gold, silver, bronze and terracotta images of the Buddha and Buddhist icons, as also gold, silver and stone Buddhist inscriptions from Shrī-kṣetra near Prome; a bell inscription as well as a few lithic records of Buddhist nature from the Akyab and Sandoway districts in Arakan division. All of them belong to the period between sixth and eighth centuries. These evidences amply testify to the existence of Buddhism in Burma at least as early as the sixth century. Besides, there are the traces of the early existence of the Mahāyāna form of Buddhism in the country, as also of some form of Tantrik Buddhism in the pre-Pagan period.

What has been said above goes to prove that Buddhism was an established faith in ancient Burma. An attempt will now be made to show how the Theravāda, which continues to be the most dominating religious faith in the country, came to thrive.
It appears that in the early eleventh century there had been a princely state in Upper Burma with its headquarters at Pagan. The rulers were Burmans, and were racially distinguished from the kings of Lower Burma who were Mons. The prevailing religion in Upper Burma, it appears, was some form of Tantric Buddhism, but, Theravāda dominated the south. Sudhammāvatī (identified with Taik-Kala in Bilin township of the Thaton district) was then the capital of Lower Burma and the accredited centre of the Theravāda faith.

The rise of Theravāda Buddhism in Upper Burma took place during the reign of Anoratha who ascended the throne at Pagan in A.D. 1044. The king, it seems, was disgusted with the religious faith then prevalent in his territory, and became converted to the Theravāda through Shin Arahan, a Mon Theravādin monk, who happened to be present at Pagan at the time. With the help of his spiritual adviser, he led a crusade against the Tantrik faith. Urged by Shin Arahan, Anoratha requested the Mon monarch Manuha of Thaton to kindly spare him a set of Pali Buddhist scriptures. The request, however, was rudely turned down whereon Anoratha waged war against Manuha, humbled him, ransacked his capital and brought to Pagan huge thirty sets of Pali scriptures which the Mon King so proudly possessed. Fitting honour was done to the scriptures which were housed with all solemnity at Pagan in a library specially built for the purpose. The people too envisaged a new ray of hope, obsessed as they were by the faith of the Aris and possibly also by a motley of other religious rites and practices. Thus, with this great acquisition, opened a new avenue of religious life to the people. The study of these scriptures, coupled with the pressure put forth by Shin Arahan, encouraged the king to make Theravāda the religion of the state. His unbridled enthusiasm set in motion a new era of religious reform. Pagodas rose after pagodas, new and still fresh programme of education was adopted, and the cause of culture strongly encouraged and advocated.

After the death of Anoratha in 1077, his son Kyanzittha religiously followed the father’s programme of reform. He sent a mission to India to restore the temple at Buddhagayā, an act which thus became the first official attempt on the
part of a Burmese king at establishing cultural contact with India. Shin Arahan continued to be the spiritual adviser of the king, and it was to him more than to anybody else that Burma owes the establishment of Theravāda Buddhism, and the era of pagoda-building which he inaugurated was the most creative age in Burmese religious and cultural history. It should be mentioned here that if Anorattha and his successors were not able or did not care to exterminate all the existing cults, they gradually made them weak by their unwavering patronage to the Theravāda. Having command over the sea-girt coast of Burma, they were able to keep in touch with the reigning Buddhist monarchs of Ceylon, to check their list of Pali books with the ones they themselves possessed and to receive and give help in matters religious.

Towards the end of the thirteenth century, Pagan fell before the onrush of the invading Tartars, and Burma was left in a state of prolonged anarchy and confusion. Buddhism naturally had its share in the general decline. Religion languished, clergy split up into sects, and though pagodas continued to be built, none of them could rival even the lesser temples of Pagon. This state of confusion continued till the second half of the fifteenth century when the Mon king Dhammazedi (1472-92) ascended the throne of Pegu, and a somewhat stable kingdom arose. Reform in the Samgha was necessary, and the monarch brought it about. Schisms were healed, and once again the ideal of a unified Church with the king as the guardian attained. With these reforms, Burma entered a new chapter in the history of Buddhism. Never again was the country so seriously concerned about its religious orthodoxy, and Buddhism became self-sufficient.

The early kings of the Toungoo dynasty (1486-1752) were too busy with political conquests to devote much of attention to internal organization of the Samgha. As conquerors they were missionaries, and in the annals shines forth the name of at least one king, that of Bayinnaung (1551-81), who stopped animal sacrifice in the Shan States and distributed scriptures amongst the people. Another noteworthy achievement of this dynasty was the step taken by its kings towards delimitation of religious lands and appointment of a
supreme civil officer for the purpose.

Coming to the Konbaung dynasty (1752-1885), the first thing that strikes our notice is the record of an embittered controversy that arose amongst the Buddhist monks during the reign of its founder king Alaungpaya (1752-60) and his four immediate successors. It was with reference to the proper way of wearing the monastic robe as to whether it should cover both the shoulders or leave the right one exposed. After a long struggle continuing for scores of years in which much of precious human blood was shed, the controversy at last came to an end during the time of Bodawpaya with the verdict in favour of those who insisted on covering both the shoulders.

Bodawpaya (1781-1819) was a great builder. During his reign, scores of pagodas were erected. Himself an ardent collector of books, he had many treatises, particularly those written in Sanskrit, brought from India, had them placed in the royal library, encouraged their study, and even got a number of them translated into Burmese. Besides, he invited to his royal court Sanskrit scholars from Banaras, and did them much of honour. His reign too saw a great increase in the pursuit of secular knowledge, even amongst the members of the Samgha. Subjects like astronomy and astrology, massage and medicine, divination and sooth-saying, archery and swordsmanship, and wrestling, arts and crafts, music and dancing attracted the attention of the people, both householders and members of the Samgha. At first the king tolerated. But, when he found the monks much too engrossed with the study and practice of these secular subjects, he apprehended future danger, cried halt and took stern measures to put the Samgha in order. His attempt was but partially successful, as there are references to the pursuit of secular knowledge by monks during the time of king Pagan, and even during the rule of king Mindon, though secretly.

Bodawpaya’s successors Bagyidaw (1819-38), Tharawaddy (1838-46) and Pagan (1846-53) were keen enthusiasts who too contributed immensely to the welfare of the Samgha. But real glorious period of the Burmese Buddhist ecclesiastical life is marked by the reign of the celebrated king Mindon (1853-78), the illustrious successor of king Pagan. With him we
enter into an era of peace and progress for the religion. The period of his rule was indeed a golden age for the Burmese Buddhist Saṅgha which enjoyed sincere patronage and ungrudging help of the king. He infused new vigour into the Order by taking interest in all its affairs. Religious studies were pursued by monks with zeal, and some of the best pieces of Burmese Buddhist tracts were composed during this period. The lay-followers too were inspired, and started vieing with one another in Matters of observance of the precepts enacted by the Master. Mindon’s encouragement and leadership gave a new lease of life to Burmese Buddhism. It was under his patronage the Fifth Buddhist Council was held at Mandalay, the last centre of Burmese monarchy, and the version of the sacred scriptures adopted in the Council was incised on as many as 729 stone slabs. It is this version which has formed the basis of the revision work of the Three Piṭakas done under the auspices of the Sixth Buddhist Council held in Rangoon in the fifties of this century to celebrate the 2500 Years of Buddhism.

Mindañ was succeeded by Thibaw who ruled for about seven years from 1878. The period was one of troubles only caused by palace and court intrigues. As such, the monarch could not devote much of his attention to foster the cause of the religion.

In 1885 the British occupied the whole of Burma, and the Burmese monarchy fell for good. Thibaw was placed under custody, and deported to India where a few years later he breathed his last absolutely unmourned.

The occupation of Mandalay by the British signalled the dawn of modern age in Burma, and that incidentally is a different story altogether.

We shall now speak a few words on the effect of the impact of Theravāda Buddhism on Burmese life and culture.

With the advent of the Theravāda in Burma, the country had undergone major changes in different spheres of life. A primitive Burman was either an animist or a votary of traditional deities. But, when Buddhism presented to her a new faith, Burma discarded her old creed and embraced the religion of the Lord. In the process of adoption of the new faith, she gradually gave up the old and miscellaneous gods. The
force of the new faith was so great the *Nats*, the powerful deities of primitive belief, became gradually absorbed by the more simple faith that brought light into the land, and hope in the minds of millions.

Buddhism brought Burma into the arena of a developed culture. The people, who were obsessed by rather primitive beliefs and customs, became, steadily moulded, and the new faith carved out of them a new people and enthused them into activities which make life beautiful and worth living. It encouraged them into the pursuit of art and literature. It brought into them the power of systematic thinking, and that is possibly why the abstruse philosophy of the Abhidhamma and the dry subject like Pali grammar could attract the Burmese attention so much.

The Buddhist faith has played an important role in unifying the peoples of Burma. Racial jealousy was rampant everywhere. But it was Buddhism which ultimately brought the discordant racial units into one unified whole under one banner in the name of Buddhism. When the Samgha became well-established, we find its leaders taking lively interest, nay even active part, in the political affairs of the country.

The social life in Burma too became greatly benefitted when the country came in contact with Buddhism. A society based on the theory of equality was soon developed. Democracy is the essence of Buddhism, and very few countries enjoy such a democratic social life as that Burma does today.

Buddhism has been instrumental in realising educational uplifts in Burma. Since times ancient, the Buddhist monks took upon themselves the task of imparting primary education to the people without any bias for the social units to which the thoughts might have belonged. The toil and labour, put forth by the monks in this direction, consequently enhanced the percentage of literacy amongst the Burmese, and this high percentage is still now the subject of envy of most people of the East.

On the growth of the Burmese language and literature too, Buddhism had its considerable contribution. Originally rather poor in ideas and vocabulary, Burmese became very much enriched and embellished by coming in contact with Pali language and literature. We now find many classical
works in Burmese which derive their materials directly or indirectly from the rich store-house that Pali literature is. And, it may be said with confidence that it was through Pali, its language and literature, that Burma found the way to intellectual development.

The most effective influence that Buddhism wielded over Burma is that on the nature of the people. The gospel of loving kindness and forgiveness, of philanthropy and generosity, and of other virtues, which have been depicted in and glorified by the Jātakas, have been woven into the daily life of the Burmese, thereby making them a people of fine culture and charming qualities. Besides the gift of moral renovation, Buddhism has imparted to the people of Burma deeper thoughts to contemplate upon, higher principles to abide by and nobler ideals to aspire for, thus introducing to a culturally handicapped nation a totally new outlook on life, an outlook which is thoroughly Buddhistic, and indeed that Buddhism is the Theravāda.
IV

Aspects of Buddhism in Ancient Indian Culture

By

Dr. L.M. Joshi.

1. *Buddhism in Indian Tradition*: The gradual decline and practical disappearance of Buddhism from the country of its rise and growth was perhaps a major tragedy in the annals of Indian culture. For about a thousand years now Buddhism has been almost a forgotten creed in India. In these days, when there is a beginning of a sort of revival of Buddhist learning and literature in India, it has become a fashion to treat Buddhism as a heretical branch of Hinduism. Doctrinally this view is quite incorrect and historically quite absurd. From the standpoint of Brahmanism alone Buddhism was a heresy; and vice versa, from the standpoint of Śramanism or Buddhism, Brahmanism too was a heresy. From the historical and synthetic viewpoints both Brahmanism and Buddhism were, at least in ancient India, fundamental ways of life and norms of human thought and culture. "The Buddha is the maker of modern Hinduism"¹, and his teachings are among the foundations of Indian culture. Even if we judge only by his posthumous effects on the civilizations of India and the world, Śākyamuni Buddha was certainly the greatest man to have been born in India, and the contribution of his gospel towards Indian history and culture was perhaps greater than that of Brahmanism and Jainism put together. Before becoming a major creed and a civilizing force in the world, Buddhism had been a mighty stream of thought and a tremendous fountain-head of humam culture in its homeland. Ignorance or negligence of the available

¹ S. Radhakrishnan, Foreword, p. xvi in *2500 years of Buddhism* ed. by P.V. Bapat, New Delhi, 1959 (1956).
Buddhist literature is not the only lacuna in our historical approach. The fact that the knowledge of Indian historical archaeology is confined to a handful of scholars is a major factor which has prevented most of us from viewing Buddhism in its entirety. "Archaeologically at least we cannot treat Buddhism merely as a heresy against a prevailing and fundamental Brahmanical orthodoxy". For, in spite of the ravages of time and destruction by Indian and foreign fanatics, Buddhism is still speaking vigorously and majestically, through its thousands of inscriptions, about one thousand rock-cut sanctuaries and monasteries, thousands of ruins of stūpas and monastic establishments, and an incalculable number of icons, sculptures, paintings and emblems that it prevailed universally among the classes and masses of India for over fifteen centuries after the age of Buddha, and that its ideas of peace, love, benevolence, rationalism, spiritualism and humanitarianism had formed the core of the superstructure of ancient Indian culture. What is proved by Buddhist archaeology is affirmed by Buddhist philosophy and literature also. Not only the numerical strength and volume of Buddhist texts extant in Pali, Buddhist Saṃskrit, chaste Saṃskrit, Apabhraṃṣa, or preserved in South and South-East Asian, Tibetan, Chinese and Central Asian languages and scripts, but also the variety, modernity, depth, and subtlety of Buddhist literature and philosophy prevent us from conceiving Buddhism in terms of a heretical growth.

In the following pages I intend to point out certain specific aspects of ancient Indian artistic pursuits, educational and social institutions, and political ideologies wherein the Buddhist inspiration seems to have been at work. To begin with arts and letters.

2. Arts and Letters: Buddhism was, from the very beginning, a twofold movement. Buddhism of the monks and nuns or ascetic Buddhism, and Buddhism of the laity or popular Buddhism. In the Brahmajālasutta, the Pātimokkha, and the Visuddhimagga, all worldly arts and crafts are described as unworthy of monks. Prohibitions of participation by monks and nuns in dances, songs, instrumental music, and

shows of entertainment, and use of the articles of personal beautification is the burden of 7th and 8th Śikṣāpadas.\(^3\) The case was different in popular Buddhism or Upāsaka-dharma. The Mahāparinibbānasutta\(^4\) narrates how the nobles and the commons both men as well as women of the Malla clan honoured the body of the Tathāgata with luxurious dancing and singing in accompaniment with instrumental music, garlands and perfumes. Similar artistic activities full of ceremonial dignity and aesthetic sense are reported in the Lalitavistara and the Buddhacarita to have been performed by men and women of Kapilavastu at the birth of the Bodhisattva Siddārtha.\(^5\)

The growth of Buddhist fine arts was due largely to the educational, religious, and devotional needs of the Buddhists. The supremely perfect supernal personality of Buddha’\(^6\) (Sarvāṅga-sundaram or Sarvākāravaropeta) was the greatest attraction for artists and poets and the supreme object of aesthetic contemplation for monks and mystics. Hence the growth of Budhology, Buddhist iconology and sculpture. With the emergence of the Mahāyāna, the Buddha image became the central plank of popular Buddhism and was manufactured in a thousand plastic forms. It is possible to suggest that the iconography of Viṣṇu, Śiva, and the Tīrthaṅkaras was influenced by that of Buddha. It was believed by some in Brahmanical circles\(^7\) that in order to obtain a beautiful body one should worship the image of Sugatamuni. The conception of Bodhisattva Maṇjuśrī as Kumārabhūta or ‘Youth embodied’ developed in Mahāyāna texts, seems to have influenced the iconography of Kumāra-Kārtikeya.

Of all the joys that of Dharma, dharma-prīti, was supreme. The Buddha had said that “the gift of Dharma

5. Lalitavistara, ed. by P.L. Vaidya, Darbhanga, 1958, Chapter VII; Buddhacarita, English Translation by E.B. Cowell, S.B. E. Vol. XLIX, Chapters I-II.
exceeds all other gifts”. This was the teaching of Emperor Aśoka also. The gift of Dharma included all that was conducive to nobler and higher life, including articles of faith and devotion, and all the other means of growing in holiness or expressing compassion and liberality. In this way Buddhism became the source of manifold artistic and literary activities reflecting the creative and aesthetic genius of its teachers and followers. With the passage of time old inhibitions receded into the background; moreover, the theory of ‘perfection in expedient means’, upāyakausalya pāramitā, naturally required and encouraged proficiency in various arts and sciences. The Bodhisattva ideal of Mahāyāna left no difference between Bhikṣus and Upāsakas, and the art and literature of Buddhism was produced not only by upāsakas and upāsikās but also by the monks and nuns. For instance, there are 827 Brāhmī inscriptions on the monuments of Sānci alone. Among the donors are mentioned the names of over two hundred monks and nuns; the rest are the lay followers. Similar is the case at a number of other centres of Buddhist art and culture. Hsuan Tsang has noted the names of a number of monks who established monasteries and erected images. Mention may be made of Jayasena of Yaśāvanka-vihāra, an Upāsaka but a great doctor and author of Buddhist Śāstras. The Nālandā Stone Inscription of Mālāda describes the monks of the University of Nālandā as “reputed experts in true scriptures and the arts”. The community of monks became in the course of time a community of teachers in society, and they have left a permanent influence on the country-people who esteem any tawney-clad fellow not only for his austere dress but also for his supposed proficiency in secular problems such as knowledge of medicine. King Duṭṭhagāmaṇi, for example,

7. Dhammapada, verse 354; Sabba dānam dhammadānam jināti.
8. Rock Edict XI; Nāvi etārisam yārisam dhamma-dānam.
11. Memoirs of Archaeological Survey of India, No. 66, Calcutta, 1942, p. 79 Sadāgama-Kalāvikhyāta-vidvadjanāḥ...
is reported to have said that "the very sight of the monks is auspicious and conducive to our protection".12 "The beggars" (bhikṣus), before whom kings and nobles bowed, had been the cultural leaders and religious teachers of society and a source of inspiration for the masses for several centuries before the sack of Nālandā by Bukhtyār Khilji. It was not merely an Imperial boast of Aśoka when he declared that he had won a righteous victory by silencing the bherīghoṣa and announcing the dharma-ghoṣa throughout his empire and along its frontiers. The author of the Hou-Hanshu has also noted that the people of India "practise the religion of the Buddha; it has become a habit with them not to kill and not to fight".13 The widespread influence of Buddhist ideas and practices in ancient India is suggested also by some classical Purāṇa texts which lament the universal rise of ‘Śūdra’ rulers, ‘demon’ teachers, and the popularity of non-Vedic practices and the decline in the prestige of Vedas and of the priests in the ‘dark-age’. Certain new ideas and practices were incorporated into the body of Brahmanism through the agency of Purāṇas in order to arrest the growing popularity of Buddhism in the country.14 The admission of Buddha as an Avatāra of Viṣṇu by Brahmanical authors was "a well conceived and bold stroke of policy"15 which resulted in the accomplishment of rapprochement between Buddhism and Brahmanism. This "bold stroke of policy" was occasioned by the tremendous influence the Buddha and his teachings had exerted in the life and works of the nation as a whole. The concept of Buddha was that of a timeless or transcendental Absolute. It had to be accepted and assimilated. And, moreover, as Gauḍapāda said, the Buddha had taught "a doctrine which could neither be controverted nor contradicted".16

14. R.C. Hazra, Studies in the Purānic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs, Dacca, 1940, Pt. II, Chapters II-IV.
The development of Pāli literature was entirely due to Buddhism. Of its great historical, cultural, literary and aesthetic value, there can be no genuine doubts. Pāli authors were the first to write 'histories' (Vaṃsas), e.g. the Buddhavaṃsa. Of the universal influence of Buddhist ascetic poetry or of the Jātaka tales in the subsequent sacred and secular literature in Samskrit and the vernaculars some evidence has been brought to light by Dr. Winternitz.\textsuperscript{17} The Pāli poetry is full of appreciation of the beauty of nature and the joy of renunciation, such as we find in some of the Apadānas, Thera and Therī gāthās. V. Fausboll had long ago suggested a strong influence of some Buddhist gāthās in the didactic and ascetic poetry of the Mahābhārata.\textsuperscript{18} The first dramatist in the history of Samskrit literature was a Buddhist poet, viz., Aśvaghoṣa. Nāgārjuna, the Mādhyaamika philosopher, was the first to write a philosophical classic in memorial verses or kārikās in Samskrit. The style was later adopted by many Buddhist and Brahmanical philosophers and authors. It may be added that Aśvaghoṣa, the author of a Gaṇḍistotra and Nāgārjuna, the author of the Prajñāpāramitāstava, were also the first to compose stotras in developed Samskrit. If Kālidāsa flourished in the 5th century A.D. as is now generally accepted, we must admit the fact that "the forerunner of the poets of classical chaste and ornate Samskrit"\textsuperscript{19} was also a Buddhist poet, viz., Āryaśūra. In Śāntideva’s Bodhicaryāvatāra we find "the loftiest flights of religious poetry",\textsuperscript{20} Buston’s statement that there were more than one hundred commentaries on the Bodhicaryāvatāra\textsuperscript{21} gives an idea of the extent to which Buddhist poems were capable of inspiring men of letters in ancient India. The mystical songs in Apabhraṃśa composed by the Buddhist Siddhas had greatly

\textsuperscript{17} History of Indian Literature, Vol. II, Calcutta, 1933, pp. 113 ff.
\textsuperscript{19} Jātakamālā, ed. by P.L. Vaidya, Darbhanga, 1959, Introduction, p. ix.
\textsuperscript{20} M. Winternitz, op. cit., p. 370.
\textsuperscript{21} E. Obermiller, Bu-sTon’s History of Buddhism, Pt. II, Heidelberg, 1932, p. 166.
influenced the beginnings of Hindi, Bangali and Oriya languages both in form and content.

The great mass of Buddhist art and literature, so rich, varied, deep, lofty, and inspiring in both śabda and artha, was inspired and influenced by the beauty of the dharma. This dharma itself was conceived as “beautiful in the beginning, beautiful in the middle, and beautiful in the end”.22 It is to be noted that the Buddhist seers make a distinction between the pursuit of abstract beauty which they found through the spotless spiritual eye of dharma, and the delights of its ephemeral beauty. All that is holy and utterly well and is conducive to the attainment of supreme goal, is indeed beautiful. Here we are faced with a spiritual aesthetic. It is in this light that we have to understand the following dialogue between Ānanda and Buddha:

“The half of the holy life, Lord”, said Ānanda, “is friendship with the beautiful, intimacy with the beautiful and association with the beautiful”. “Say not so, Ānanda” replied the Blessed One, “say not so; it is the whole (not the half) of the holy life. Of a monk who has friendship with the beautiful, intimacy with the beautiful, and association with the beautiful, it is expected that he would develop the noble eightfold path and make much of it”.23

I need hardly mention that the earliest and the best painting of ancient India is the Buddhist painting; that the best sculpture of the golden days of ancient Indian culture is the Buddhist sculpture, that the earliest historical sculpture of India is also the Buddhist sculpture. In the field of architecture also, Buddhism was the pioneer source of inspiration. In both structural and rock-cut architecture of

‘उपहद्भिमिद्ध भनो । ब्रह्मचर्यस्य—यद्विद्ध कल्याणमित्त्तता कल्याणसहायता कल्याणसम्पवञ्जकता’—‘मा हुंवं, आनन्द, मा हुंवं, आनन्द ! सकलभेँह हिंद् आनन्द, ब्रह्मचर्यस्य—यद्विद्ध कल्याणमित्त्तता कल्याणसहायता कल्याण- सम्पवञ्जकता । कल्याणमित्त्त्तसेत्त आनन्द, सिक्रुनो भापेक्कं कल्याण- सहायत्य कल्याणसम्पवञ्जकस्य अरियं अद्भुतिकं मम भावेससिति—
बुद्धीकारित्सति ।’
ancient India, Buddhist examples had provided a permanent legacy in planning, technique and style. The earliest historical buildings in brick are the ruins of Buddhist monasteries; the earliest man-made rock-cut halls are the vihāras of the Buddhist and Ājivika monks excavated under the orders of a Buddhist Emperor. Last but not least, the earliest and the best free standing monolithic pillars with beautiful capitals of animal figures were inspired by Buddhism and conceived by a Buddhist genius. All subsequent examples of Kārttistambhas and dhvajastambhas have been influenced by Aśokan lāṭs. Indian palaeography and epigraphy owe a great deal to the original and pioneer inspiration of Buddhism and its litthic records. The earliest historical inscriptions of India are the Buddhist inscriptions. The Dhammadipu of Aśoka became the permanent mother of all subsequent varieties of Brāhmi and its derivative Indian scripts.

3. Education: When the Buddha had found a band of 61 ‘homeless’ pupils at Varanasi, he commanded them in following words: “Walk, monks, on your tour for the blessing of the manifolk, for the happiness of the manifolk, out of compassion for the world, for the welfare, the blessing, the happiness of devas and men. Monks, teach Dhamma which is lovely at the beginning, lovely in the middle, lovely at the ending.”24 I quote this passage from Miss. I. B. Horner’s translation of the Mahāvagga to recall that Buddhism was from the very beginning a missionary spiritual movement, determined to spiritually transform the world of humanity, and to awaken it morally, intellectually and spiritually. Who can say how many millions of human beings had been awakened morally, intellectually and spiritually by the gospel of Buddhism in course of its long history? We can only imagine that an immeasurable multitude of creatures must have been awakened


चरणं, भिक्षुः, चारिकं बुज्जनहिताय बुज्जनसुखाय लोकानुकम्पाय, अत्याय हिताय सुखाय देवमनुस्तानं देसेयं भिक्षुः, घर्मं आदिकल्पायं मन्द्रेकल्पायं परियोसानकल्पायं।
in India alone. Buddhist monastic colleges and universities of ancient India threw open their doors to all those who wished to know, irrespective of caste, colour, creed or country. This universal attitude and catholic spirit of Buddhist culture and its educational centres earned a great international reputation for India and attracted students and scholars from far-off countries. The same cannot be said of Brahmanical system of education and its institutions. It is therefore, quite proper to attribute to the influence of Buddhism the rise of organised public educational institutions in ancient India. The influence of Buddhist monastic and educational institutions on the growth and propagation of Indian culture can scarcely be overestimated. It was through Buddhism that Indian art, literature, thought, and morals were transmitted through the highways and byways of Asia during the first millennium of Christian era. In India it was after the Buddhist model of an organised institution of monks that Śaṅkarācārya established Advaita Pīṭhas with an ordained and regulated community of Saiva-Vedantika monks.

4. Social life: Dr. Nalinaksa Dutt has observed that “Buddhism was never a social movement.” This is true only apparently. Buddhism may not have been a social movement in aim and form but it definitely moved society. It is impossible not to acknowledge the fact that Buddhism became a social force to be reckoned with, and that it strongly influenced the evolution and perspective of Indian society. The doctrine of Vargāśrama-dharma had been the bedrock of Brahmanism. Such an inseparable connection between the Path of Purity and the path of social life was not conceived in Buddhist quarters. In Buddhist view the joys of ordained homeless life were superior to the joys of married and household life. But it would be a grave error to suppose that Buddhism neglected the social life altogether. What is true
is that it made a clear distinction between spiritual ends and means on the one hand and social ends and means on the other. We have already noted that Buddhism of the monks was different from Buddhism of the laity. The aim of ascetic Buddhism was to attain Nirvāṇa while the aim of popular Buddhism was to attain good rebirth and heaven. Aśoka practised and preached this goal of good rebirth and svarga. But it is legitimate to suppose that the basic Buddhist social ideology practised in monastic order must have had its influence on lay members of Buddhist Pariṣads and on non-Buddhists of ancient India. The theory of four stages or āśramas is post-Buddhist in origin.²⁹ The introduction of the fourth āśrama in Brahmanical scheme is due to the influence of Buddhist ascetic order of monks. This is proved by the fact that the pre-Upaniṣadic Vedic literature does not know the Vānaprastha and the sannyāsa³⁰ and that the earliest authors of the Dharmasūtras like Gautama and Baudhāyana clearly state that the only stage of life prescribed by the Veda is that of the householder.³¹ The Mīmāṃsaka Jaimini held that all other āśramas were an obstacle to the grāhastha āśrama which was the only standard stage of life in Vedic culture.³² Buddhist Saṅgha made its existence and importance felt in Brahmanical society not only by the admission by Brahmanical authors of sannyāsa as the fourth stage of life but also by greatly relaxing the rigour of traditional successive order of āśramas. The fact that in Neo-Brahmanism or Hinduism also a person could become a sannyāsin even without going through the stage of a householder was certainly a lasting Buddhist influence and is seen even today among Brahmanical Hindus. In Dharmaśāstras the theory of the utter necessity of producing a putra in order to redeem one’s pītṛs from a certain mythical hell was advanced to put a barrier on the way of directly becoming a bhikṣu

without first becoming a grhastra. In short, Indian society owes its ascetic institutions to the influence of Buddhism and Jainism. A fundamental principle in Buddhist socio-moral ideology was that all beings are bound by their karmas and as such, it is the karmas or deeds of a person which determine his or her fortunes in this and the next life. All beings have the right to select a way of life suitable to them; it is one’s moral excellence and intrinsic worth, purity of life and nobility of character, control of mind and the senses and an insight into the real nature of things, in short it is the progress in triple course of training, sīla, samādhi and prajñā, which determines a person’s superiority over other persons.\(^{33}\) No distinctions of caste or birth, colour, creed and sex were of any value so far as man’s higher or holier life and its ways and means were concerned. This was a revolutionary doctrine from the standpoint of old Brahmanism which jealously guarded the Puruṣasūkta legend of the divine origin of four varnas and their dharma and forced a large section of society to servitude and ignorance. In the realm of social life Buddhism made the deepest impact on ancient Indian population three ways. Firstly, by relentlessly criticising the theory of castes and ridiculing the false claims to superiority of the priestly Brahmins, and thereby opening the doors to higher life and highest goal for the entire mass of humanity including the members of lower orders of Indian society.\(^{34}\) Buddhism did not aim directly at the abolition of casteism, but it did teach abundantly and successfully the evils and the unsoundness of the theory of castes. Kabiradāsa, Mahātmā Gāndhī and the Indian Constitution have testified to this fundamental influence of Buddhism on Indian social life. Secondly, it was through Buddhist influence and Buddhist teaching of social harmony and catholic spirit that hordes of outlandish and other foreign tribes of Greeks, Śakas, Pahlavas, Kuśāṇas and Hūṇas, who came to India and set-

\(^{33}\) See e.g. Dhammapada, Chapter XXVI; Suttanipāta, Vāseṭṭhasutta.

\(^{34}\) See Dīghanikāya, Ambaṭṭhasutta; Aggaññasutta; Majjhima Nikāya, Mādhuriyasutta; Kanṇatthalasutta; Assalāyanasutta; Esukāriasutta; Vajraśīci (attributed to Aśvaghoṣa) ed. in Visvabhārati Annals, Vol. II, 1949.
tled here in the course of centuries immediately preceding and following the Christian era, were assimilated in Indian society. This was a permanent contribution to social integration and national growth and it could not have been so easily accomplished in strictly Brahmanical scheme of social gradation without the wholesome effects of Buddhism’s disregard for varṇa-organisation and respect for the liberty of the individual. I am of the view that had Buddhism been a living force at the time of the Turkish invasions, the problems of Hindu-Muslim communal disharmony in medieval and modern India would not have taken such strong turn as it did. Because of the revival of traditional Brahmanical social scheme reinforced with fresh religious injunctions and because of the decline of Buddhism in India after the tenth century A.D., the mass of early medieval Islamic followers in India could not be assimilated and digested by Indian society.

The 84 Esoteric Masters or Siddhācāryas of early medieval age were the product of Tāntrika Buddhism. Most of them came from low castes and asserted their position by means of their success (siddhi) in Esoteric way. They attacked the theory of castes and stages and greatly reduced the complex evils of social inequality and religious discrimination. It was due to their influence that the medieval devotional poets and social reformers like—Kapilar, the Tamil author, Rāmānuja, Kabira, Gorakhanātha, Guru Nānaka, Saint Tukārāma, Saint Raidāsa, and others also championed the cause of equality and justice in the realm of social and religious life. Thirdly, Buddhism made a powerful influence on the position of women and contributed towards their emancipation in ancient India. All that may be said for Buddha’s preliminary hesitations with regard to the admission of women to monastic order, it is a fact that it was he who opened for the first time in history the doors of spiritual discipline and ascetic way of life to women, and established an order of nuns along the lines but independent of the order of monks. Buddhist Therīs and bhikṣunīs were the earliest female saints of India and their ascetic tradition was subsequently continued by Indian women.

5. Polity and Political Ideology : Buddhism had an important influence on the form and institutions of civil govern-
ment and the ideals of kingship in ancient India. Śākyamuni was an apostle of democracy, individual freedom, and the rule of law. The seven conditions of stability of a republican body-politic which he suggested to the Vesālian diplomats are the classic words of wisdom still applicable and useful to our contemporary Indian Republic. The influence of Buddhism on ancient Indian political theory and administrative organization could be understood in the light of (i) Buddhist speculations concerning the origin of state and government, (ii) Buddhist organization of the order of monks and its impact on democracies of ancient India, (iii) the influence of Buddha’s teachings on kings, queens, and their vassals and ministers, and (iv) certain concepts and institutions concerning political life which were inspired by Buddhism. I shall briefly analyse these four points. In the first place, the Buddhist theory of the origin of state and government as related in the Aggaṇasutta is of democratic import and resembles the views of J. J. Rousseau. A similar version in the Śāntiparvan seems to have been influenced by the Buddhist theory. The fact that many ancient Indian kings and authors of political thought felt that the king owes his authority to his sub jects seems to have been influenced by the Buddhist legend concerning Mahājanasammatā, the first traditional king. The Arthaśāstra of Kautilya, the Edicts of Aśoka, the Junāgarh Rock Inscription of Rudradāman I, the Mahābhārata, the Maṇjuśrīmūlakalpa and the Rājatarāṅgini prove that the tradition of the election of kings was continued till 12th century A.D. in India. With respect to the second point, it is a well-known fact that the organization and regulation of Buddhist Sangha was on democratic lines, and that the democratic traditions of the Buddhist republics of sixth century B.C. were continued till as late as the time of


37. For Vinaya account of Buddhist democratic tradition see Gokuldas, Democracy in Early Buddhist Sangha, Calcutta 1954. cf. R.C. Majumdar, Corporate Life in Ancient India, Calcutta; 1922.
Samudragupta (400 A.D.) who seems to have wiped out the republican states in his time. But the tradition survived in paura-jānapada assemblies and also in village administration and has come down to our own era in the form of grāma-paṅcāyatas.

With regard to the third point, namely the influence of Buddha's teachings on ancient Indian kings, queens, and their ministers, there is a mass of evidence in the form of literary, epigraphic, and foreign records and a modest volume could be written on this subject. It is impossible here even to mention the mere names of all the kings, queens, nobles, and ministers of ancient India who were Buddhists or were influenced by Buddhism. Among the kings who were Buddhist by faith I may count Bimbisāra, Ajātaśatru, Kālāśoka, Emperor Aśoka, Daśaratha Maurya, Bṛhadratha Maurya, Menander the Greek king, Kaniṣka I, the Kuśāna king, one of the Sātavāhanas, either Sīmuka or his son Kraṇa, Buddhagupta, Tathāgatagupta, Narasiṃhagupta Bālāditya of the Gupta dynasty, Pūrṇavarman of Magadha, Rājabhaṭa of Bengal, Rājayavardhana and Harṣavardhana of Thāneśvara, Dhruvasena or Dhruvabhaṭa of Mālavā, Meghavāhana of Kashmir, Subhākaradeva of Orissa, almost all the rulers of the Candra-dynasty, Khāḍga dynasty, Bhadra dynasty, and Bhaumakara dynasty of Bengal and Orissa, Gopāla and Dharmaṭāla and some other kings of the Pāla dynasty. This list is by no means comprehensive. Many of these kings were Paramopāsaka or Paramasagata. With the ignoble exception of about ten kings who persecuted Buddhism in their kingdoms, as a rule, most of kings of ancient India had sympathy and respect for Buddhism and patronised the monks and their establishments. The same is true of most of the queens and ministers whose patronage of Buddhism is known either through literature or through inscriptions or through foreign notices.

I must point out that India owes to Buddhist influence (i) the idea of a welfare state, (ii) the idea of a secular state, in the sense not of a state without any religion, but in the sense that political administration of a state should be free from sectarian policies and must respect the truly religious sentiments of different votaries that swell in a particular
state, is also a Buddhist legacy. Both these facts are proved by the inscriptions of Aśoka, the greatest of kings in all history. Aśokan ideals of kingship were directly responsible for the growth of the idea of a welfare state free from the exclusive influence of a particular church. (iii) The idea of Dharmavijaya or ‘conquest of Righteousness’ practiced and propagated by Aśoka, was inspired largely by Buddhism. This grand concept remained an ideal for many kings who came after Aśoka. Along with this concept of conquest through righteousness, Buddhism gave us (iv) the concept of an ‘inoffensive sacrifice’ by kings, a yajña entirely free from himsā and full of charity and purity. This concept was practised by Emperor Aśoka and king Meghavāhana of Kashmir. In the Nānāgāṭa cave Inscription of Nāganikā we hear of this non-violent sacrifice called ‘anārabhaniyo yaño’. Lastly, I may mention that ancient Indian political theory owes to Buddhism such institutions as that of Dharmamāhamātra, Dharmasamāja, Dharmadūta, and to Buddhist social thought such historical examples as kingship by Brāhmaṇas, Śūdras, or by Vaiśyas. It was through Buddhist influence that the early Brahmanical Smṛtis modified Vedic injunctions and revolutionised the conception of duties or dharmas of different Varṇas.

41. Brāhmaṇa kings are well known, e.g. Śuṅgas, Kāśyas, Kādambas, Vākāṭakas, Sātavāhanas. The Guptas were probably Vaiśyas by caste. For Śūdra and Vaiśya kings see Thomas Watters, op. cit. Vol. II, p. 252, Vol. I, p. 343; cf. F.E. Pargiter, Purāṇa Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age, Oxford, 1913. However, not all the ‘Śudra kings’ of the Purāṇas were really Śūdras. E.g. see H.C. Raychaudhuri, PHAI, 6th ed., pp. 355-56.
Did Early Buddhism have any Impact on the Gitā?

By

Dr. K. N. Upadhyaya

For nearly two thousand years, during which Buddhism had its sway in India, it grew and intermingled with several thought-currents of the land. It is, therefore, not possible to present in a short paper the various cross-influences of divergent Indian thoughts on one-another during this long period of history. Hence I propose to deal here only with the early phase of Buddhism and try to show how emerging from a peculiar thought-milieu of the land, it heralded a powerful movement which at once made its influence felt quite significantly on the traditional Indian thought. The discussion of this problem is specially important in view of the widely prevalent opinion among scholars that Buddhism in its early phase did not exert any influence on Indian thought.¹ In what follows I shall try to controvert this position and elucidate my point by examining the impact of Early Buddhism on the Gitā which, I think, was composed not much after the rise of Buddhism.

It is evident that the development of a thought does not take place in a closed room and even thinkers of eminence have to breathe in the intellectual atmosphere of their age. Hence they also like other people are, in no small measure, the product of their time. The questions which they try to

¹ The eminent scholar of Indian Philosophy, Prof. S. N. Dasgupta, for example, observes: "Hindu philosophy in later times seems to have been influenced by the later offshoots of the different schools of Buddhism, but it does not appear that Pali Buddhism had any share in it."—A History of Indian Philosophy, Vo. I, Cambridge University Press, 1957, p. 83. See also Radhakrishnan's Indian Philosophy, Vol. I, London 1958, pp. 526-7; R. G. Bhandarkar's Collected Works, Vol. IV, Poona 1929, pp. 38-39.
answer are those their contemporaries are raising and the solution which they give are relative to the traditions handed down to them. In other words, thought does not make an incongruous leap. The emergence of the Buddhist thought also is likewise a result of the criticism, acceptance and synthesis of different streams of the prevalent Indian thoughts.

It is well known to antiquarians that by the time immediately preceding the Buddha, the whole intellectual atmosphere of India was permeated with a diversity of religious and philosophical beliefs. A multitude of Vedic and non-Vedic sects, though somewhat blurred in their distinctions on account of the confluence of culture, were preached and practised. There abounded all kinds of ascetics (tāpasas), hermits (jatilas), wandering mendicants (paribbājakas) and numerous other sects (titthiyas). It is not possible here to go into the roots of the various strands of their thoughts. However, it seems pretty clear that the germs of asceticism and yoga in some form or other are traceable to the muni-cult of the pre-Vedic period. With the conquest of the Aryans and consequent ascendency of the Vedic and Brahmanical religion of rituals and sacrifices, the pre-Vedic culture seems to have been superseded and receded to the background. But gradually by the time of the Upanishads the Brahmanical religion of polytheistic ritualism by its own inner development reaches a monistic-idealist position tending to replace the performance of ritual by cultivation of knowledge. By this time the Vedic culture appears to have come closer to the non-Vedic culture and the fusion of the two seems to have silently ushered in a veritable revolution in the whole traditional religion of the land. The decay of old traditions and

2. We are referred to as many as 62 erroneous views in the Brahmajāla Sutta and Jaina sources enumerate as many as 363. Scholars have expressed doubt about the actual existence of all these views, but some of them, at least, are known to have existed. cf. Sir Charles Eliot—Hinduism and Buddhism, Vol. I, London 1921 p. 97; N. Dutta—Early Monastic Buddhism, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1958, p. 43, note. 4.

emergence of new ideas had naturally given rise to a tremendous spiritual unrest and intellectual ferment. The time was, thus, ripe for an epoch-making departure and it only needed some authoritative lead, a definite and clear direction from a strong-minded and convinced thinker. This was found in Gotam, the Buddha.

The disappearance of the sharp antagonism between the two cultures by the time of the late Upaniṣads is quite evident from the fact that the erstwhile despised and neglected śramaṇas and muṇḍakas had come to occupy a position equal to the brāhmaṇas, so much so that one of the Upaniṣads was called ‘Muṇḍakopaniṣad’ and the Pali literature placed saṃāṇas alongside the brāhmaṇas. But it is interesting to note that, as the Aryan culture assimilated some elements of the non-Aryan, the latter proved very weak before the former and ultimately had to lose ground. Though by the time of the Buddha, we find mention of so many saṃāṇas like Ājīvākas, Nigaṇṭhas etc. following predominantly non-Aryan cults like nudity and other practices of extreme self-torture, after the mighty movement of the middle path of the Buddha (which is styled as the Aryan path), none except the Jaina could hold any sway.

The wide-spread prevalence of the various sects of asceticism and mendicancy during the time of the Buddha indicates that by that time the renunciation of the worldly life had come to be accepted more or less as the first step to the pursuit of higher holy life. Further many of the Buddha’s contemporaries were preaching atheistic doctrines. The views of the six teachers (titthiyas), namely, Makkhali Gosāla, Pūraṇa Kassapa, Pakudha Kaccāyana, Ajītakesakambala, Saṅjaya Belatṭhiputta and Nigaṇṭhanāṭaputta who are often brought in for criticism were atheistic. The Buddha seems to have imbibed the common cultural ideas of his contemporaries but has taken care to avoid the various extremes preached by them. He directed his analytical method of inquiry (vibhajja-vāda) to the prevalent views of his time and pointed out that they all come under four pairs of extremes (antas), comprising thesis and antithesis. The truth lies in the middle and can be discovered by adopt-
ing the middle path (majjhima paṭipadā). Thus, the credit of the Buddha mainly consists in steering clear of all contending one-sided theories (ekānta-diṭṭhis) and in maintaining a balanced attitude reconciling the partial truth of the opposite sides.

From what has been said above, it is patent that Buddhism lends full support to the widespread tendency of the age to cut oneself aloof of the household life and to take to the life of a recluse. Again, like many of his contemporaneous thinkers who were atheists and indulged in mere moral discourse unassociated with any theistic faith, the Buddha brushed aside God and worship. It seems that these ideas, when forcefully championed by a powerful personality like the Buddha, posed such a serious challenge to the traditional Indian thought that the need was at once felt to put its house in order and meet the challenge by readjusting and remodelling its views in the light of the new developments. This seems to be one of the reasons why the author of the Gītā tries to shake off some crude elements of the traditional orthodoxy like animal sacrifice and external ceremonialism, reduces the rigour of caste, opens the gate of holy life to all without distinction, recognises the equality of all professions and compromises with the changing order of things while sharply reacting at the same time against renunciation or abandonment of worldly duties, atheism and anattā (denial of the permanent soul).

One, however, may object here that these trends of the Gītā cannot adequately establish the impact of Early Buddhism on it unless (i) the Gītā is chronologically shown to be later than Early Buddhism and further (ii) the former’s acquaintance with the latter is established through some other evidences. Regarding the first point the modern scholarship

---

4 The Buddha, through his doctrine of perpetual flux avoids the two extremes of eternalism (sāsvata-vāda) and annihilationism (uccheda-vāda); through his doctrine of dependent origination avoids the extremes of absolute determinism (niyati-vāda) and utter indeterminism (yadrečchāvāda); through his doctrine of man as partially free and partially dependent moral agent avoids the extremes of kriyāvāda and akriyāvāda and lastly through his teaching of moderate self-discipline he avoids the extremes of gross sense-indulgence and austere self-mortification.
does not seem to be unfavourable. But the second point does not find favour with scholars. They feel that the Gita, even if later in origin, has developed its views without being aware of the Buddhist movement.

The date of the Buddha is almost well-settled now. According to tradition he was born in 624 B.C., though the general consensus of historians is in favour of putting off this date a little later and assigning 563 B.C. as the date of his birth. In any case it is a narrow margin of about 60 years and there can be hardly any doubt that the Buddha, who attained enlightenment at the age of 35, was vigorously engaged in preaching and propagating his doctrines in the last quarter of the 6th century B.C. He died according to the later date in 483 B.C. i.e. the first quarter of the 5th century B.C. by which time the fundamental tenets of Buddhism appear to have been well propounded and established.5

Now the chronology of the Gita is not so well-settled. The earliest date assigned by Western scholars to the composition of the Gita is 200 B.C.8 But Indian scholars, with some plausible evidences in their support, argue for its greater antiquity. K.T. Telang thinks that "the latest date at which the Gita can have been composed must be earlier than the 3rd century B.C."7 R.G. Bhandarkar feels that it is at least as old as the 4th century B.C.8 B.G Tilak through his long-drawn arguments pleads in support of 500 B.C.9 and S. Radhakrishnan largely agreeing with him says that "its date may be assigned to the 5th century B.C., though the text may have received many alterations in subsequent times."10 Thus, at any rate

5. Cf. The dialogue between the Buddha and Māra where the former refuses to die unless his doctrine is wide-spread and well proclaimed among men and the latter replies that this mission has been duly achieved. D. II.106.


the consensus of opinion appears to be in favour of regarding it a post-Buddhist composition and evidences are weighty in its favour.

But none of these scholars is inclined to see any Buddhist influence on the Gitā. Telang and Bhandarkar both regard the Gitā as representing the thoughts of pre-Buddhist era. In the words of Bhandarkar, "The Bhagavadgitā is the result of development of the religious and philosophic speculation that prevailed before the rise of Buddhism". Tilak quite unambiguously asserts that "the elements of the Gitā are not borrowed from the Buddhist religion." Radhakrishnan also does not notice "any borrowing from Buddhism."

It is, no doubt, true that the Gitā does not contain any direct and clear allusion to the Buddha or Buddhism, yet there are some ideas, words and expressions in it which are strikingly Buddhistic in echo. They are conspicuous by their absence, in any of the pre-Buddhistic literature including the Upaniṣads from which the Gitā freely draws upon its material. There are again some pointed statements made in the Gitā which seem to be intended to counter those of early Buddhism. Besides, an indirect allusion to the view of Buddhism seems to be made by the Gitā when in the course of its denunciation of the adherents of faulty doctrines, it refers not only to materialists who regard this world as a place of sensual enjoyment but also to the followers of such a system of thought according to which the world is unsubstantial, unreal, without God and caused by desire. Though, the materialists also, like Buddhists, denounce God, they never, unlike the latter, regard this world as unsubstantial or unreal. Rather they consider it to be only solid reality. Nor do they regard this world as caused by desires.

We cannot make an exacting demand from the Gitā to make direct mention of the names of all such thinkers or their schools specially in view of not uncommon habit with

14. Asatyam apratiṣṭham te jagad āhur anāvaram,
   Aparasparasambhūtam kimanyat kāmahaitukam,, Gitā XVI.8.
ancient Indian Literatures to make indirect reference to various doctrines. The Gitā as usual is interested more in presenting or combating thoughts rather than thinkers. This alone explains why there is no mention either of the Upaniṣads or of the Cārvākas in the whole of the Gitā though their views are obviously referred to in its text.

Coming to the important words, ideas and passages of the Gitā which indicate its familiarity with Buddhism, we may first draw attention to the word ‘Nirvāṇa’ which repeatedly occurs in the Gitā and which is nowhere to be met with in the whole of the pre-Buddhistic Upaniṣads. It seems to have been made use of for the first time in its technical sense in Buddhism. Again virtues like nirvaira (VI. 55) adveśa, karunā and maitrī (XII. 13) also are the striking peculiarities of the Gitā and Buddhism and these words do not occur in the Upaniṣads. Similarly ‘rāga and dveṣa’ occur in compound in the Gitā (II. 64; III. 34 & XVIII. 51) just as in Buddhism. The way in which they are used in the Gitā II. 64 and Dhammapada 369, as well as in Gitā XVIII. 51 and Dhammapada 377 has a close resemblance. The epithets used for a muni in the Gitā like aniketa (XII. 19), nirmama (II. 71; III. 30; XII. 13 & XVIII. 53), nirāśī, (III. 30; IV. 21), nirāśraya (IV. 20), nirāhāra (II. 59) naiśkarmya (III. 4; XVIII. 49), sama-duṣṭkha-sukha (II. 15, 38; XII. 13, 18; XIV. 24), sama-nindā-stuti (XII. 19; XIV. 24), sama-mānāpamāna (XIV. 25) etc. are exactly the same as their corresponding Pali words of Early Buddhism. None of these words is traceable in the pre-Buddhistic Upaniṣads. Then the vices like krodha, mada, dambla, atimānī and aśūyā enumerated in the Gitā (XVI. 3, 4, 10 and 18) are strikingly similar to those listed in the Āmagandha Sutta (Kodho, mado, thambho...usuyya...mānātimāno—Sn, 44) and

15. Gitā, II. 72; V. 24; V. 25; V. 26 & VI. 15.
16. Gitā:—rāga-dveṣa-viyuktais tu......prasadam adhigacchatī Dh.:—chettvā rāgaṇ ca dosaṇ ca tato nibbānam chisi.
17. Gitā:—rāga-dveṣau vyudasya ca Dh.:—rāgaṇ ca dosaṇ ca vippamuccetha.
18. For corresponding Pali words of the Nikāyas—see Pali-English Dictionary (P.T.S.).
people having such vices are alike called nārādhamas (Gītā XVI. 19 and Sn. 44). Again just as the Buddha regards nāṇa-yanna (D.I. 147: Kūṭadanta Sutta) to be the best of all sacrifices, so also the Gītā (IV. 33) speaks of the jñāna-yajña as the best. Similarly the teachings of ‘samacariyā’ in Buddhism (D. I. 3; M. I. 125-9, 423-4) is well reflected in the teachings of ‘samatva’ in Gītā II. 38 and XIV. 24 and 25. Again the middle path of Buddhism is adopted in the Gītā while describing the practice of yoga (VI. 11, 16 and 17). The gradual psychological stages in the process of concentration as described in Buddhism (D.I. 73; M.I.37), viz. pāmuṣijjā, piti, passaddhi and sukha are somewhat similar to prasādam, prasannatā, śānti and sukha referred to in the Gītā (II. 64-66). Then the life has been characterised as suffering in the typical Buddhistic style (Gītā XIII. 8: janma-mṛtyu-jarā-vyādhi-duḥkha-doṣānudarśanam). Besides, there are a number of passages betraying similarity or close affinity between the Gītā and the Nikāyas. We may take here some of the important ones for illustration:—

**Gītā**

1. II. 46 yāvān artha udapāne sarvataḥ samplutodaya.
   Ud. 9, Kim Kayirā udapānena āpā ce sabbada siyumaṃ.

2. II. 16 & 28, avyaktādāni bhūtāni....avyaktanidhānāny eva tatra kā paridevanā.
   Sn. 113, yassa maggaṃ na jānāsi agatassa gatassa vā, ubho ante asampassam nirattham paridevasi
   ubhayor api drsṭo’ntaḥ.

3. VI. 5, uddhared ātmanā’tmānam.
   Dh. 379, attanaṃ codaya’ttānam...

4. VI. 32, ātmaupamyena sarvatra.
   Dh. 129-130; Sn. 137 attanaṃ upamaṃ katvā na haneyya na ghātaye.

5. II. 58 yadā saṃharate kāryaṃ kūrmo’ngāniya sarvasaṃ
dh. 7. kummo va aṅgāni sake Kapāle

6. II. 11 aśocyan anvānasocas tvaṃ...gatāsūnagatāsūms-
   S. I. 5. atitam nānusocanti nappajappanti nāgataṃ
ca nā’nuśocanti paṇḍitaḥ

7. II. 56, duḥkheṣvanudvignamanāḥ sukheṣu vigatasprḥāḥ

8. VII. 3, manuṣyānāṁ sahasreṣu kaścid yatati siddhaye

9. XI. 8. na tu māṁ śakṣe yase draṣṭum anenaiva svacakṣuṣā divyaṁ dadāmi te cakṣuḥ

10. XVI. 19 and 16. tāṁ dviṣataḥ...narādhamaṁ. prasaktāḥ kāmabhogesu patanti narake’sucau.

These similarities of expressions and ideas are ample indication to the fact that the Gītā has assimilated all those Buddhistic elements which it found convenient to fit into its scheme. But in other matters like renunciation, atheism and the doctrine of anattā (soullessness) etc. it sharply reacts against the Buddhist approach. If we examine, for example, the mode, tone and words of the dialogue of Kṛṣṇa and Arjuna with that of Asurendra Vepacitti and Surendra Śakra (which is almost the same as that of Mātali and Śakra) it becomes evident that the arguments of Asurendra Vepacitti (or of Mātali) are utilised by Kṛṣṇa to win over Arjuna who uses the arguments similar to those of Śakra.

A battle is said to have been fought between gods and demons in which the latter are defeated and their chief Vepacitti is caught and brought by gods before their king, Śakra. But Vepacitti, even though a captive, is abusing Śakra off and on in his very presence. At this Mātali tells Śakra that it would be simple weakness and fear on his part.

if he tolerates such abuses of Vepacitti, but Śakra replies that it would be unbecoming of an enlightened being like him to care for such fools.20 Mātali tells him that not to fight and control evil is to give encouragement to it but Śakra emphatically says that to remain awakened and silent at the anger of others is alone the best way to control it.21 Mātali further argues that by so doing he will not only be betraying his fear and weakness but will also earn ill fame to which Śakra replies that fame or ill fame, praise or slander, are immaterial to the really enlightened one. To resist force with force is only brutal and is really an indication of weakness. For the enlightened ones, it is tolerance and forgiveness which matters most.22 To fall victim to anger is a sin. The real victory lies in victory over anger. One who does not give way to anger does good both to himself as well as to others.23

Now one can find a clear echo of the same ideals when Arjuna places his point before Kṛṣṇa saying that he at least, who is sensible enough to realise the inherent sin and evil of the brutal act of fighting should not behave like his opponents who are stupid and deluded by greed.24 But Kṛṣṇa using the arguments of Mātali asks Arjuna to stick to his ‘svadharm’ and not to betray futile weakness of heart and fear.25 It is remarkable that the very same words namely ‘bhaya’ and

20. Mātali:— bhayā nu maghavā sakka dubbalyā na titikkhasi sunanto pharusaṁ vācaṁ sammukkā Vepacittino ti

Sakka:— nāhaṁ bhayā na dubbalyā khamāṁ Vepacittino, katham hi mādiso viśiñī bālena paṭīsamjuve’ti.—S.I. 221.

21. Mātali:— bhiyey bāla pakujheyyum no cassa paṭīsedhako tasma bhusena dandena dhoro bālam nisedhaye’ti.

Sakka:— etad eva ahaṁ maññe bālāsa paṭīsedhanaṁ param saṅkupitaṁ nātvā yo sato upasammati ti.—Ibid. I.221.

22. Sakka:— abalaṁ taṁ balaṁ āhu yassa bālabalam balaṁ, balassa dhammaguttassa paṭivaṭta na vijjati sadatḥaparamā āthā khantā bhiyeyo na vijjati.—Ibid. I. 222

23. Sakka:— tasseva tena pāpiyo yo kuddham patikujjhati kuddham apaṭikujjhanto saṅgāmaṁ jeti dujjayaṁ. Ubbhinnaṁ atthaṁ carati attano ca parassa ca.—Ibid. S.I. 2.2

24. yadyapy ete na paśyanti lobhopahata-cetasah

................. katham na jñeyam asmābhīḥ pāpād asmān nivartitum.—


25. klaibyaṁ mā sma gamah Pārthai, nai’tat tvayy upapadyate; kṣudraṁ hrdaya-daurbalyaṁ tyaktvottīṣṭha paraṁtapa—Gīta II.3.
‘daurbalya’ are used by Kṛṣṇa in relation to Arjuna (Gītā II. 3 & 35), which were used by Mātali in relation to Śakra (bhayaṁ nu maghavā sakka ḍubbalīyaṁ no titikkhasi, S. I. 221). Kṛṣṇa further reminds Arjuna of the evil consequences of ill fame and slander26 as Mātali had done. But in the light of the Buddhist approach Mātali was silenced when it was pointed out to him by Śakra that the man by meeting anger with anger only incurs sin (tasseva tena pāpiyo yo kuddhāṁ paṭikujjhati, S. I. 222). The Gītā, on the other hand, takes just the opposite stand when Arjuna is reminded by Kṛṣṇa of his ‘svadharma’ which when violated brings about sin, besides spoiling the worldly fame.27 The deciding factor, it may be noted, both in Buddhism as well as in the Gītā, is the moral consideration of ‘sin’ (tasseva tena pāpiyo—S. I. 222; pāpam avāpṣyasi—Gītā II. 33) but the measuring rod of sin, as indicated above, is different in the two systems.

Similarly the statements of Buddhism and the Gītā regarding the future of the warriors killed in the battlefield are in sharp opposition to each other. According to Buddhism such soldiers cannot but go to hell or are born in an animal species whereas the Gītā promises heaven for them.28 Thus it appears that the Gītā though absorbs some of the terms, concepts and ideas of Early Buddhism, it seems, nevertheless, to be more interested in counteracting the Buddhist tenets of renunciation, atheism and anattā by putting forward opposite views in keeping with the orthodox tradition.

Early Buddhism is quite unambiguous in exalting the life of utter renunciation. According to it, it is hardly possible for a householder to lead a holy life in all its purity and perfection. It is frequently stated: “Full of impediments is the household life, a dusty path (a path of defilements); whereas the life of renunciation is like the open sky (free from hindrances). It is not easy to lead this holy life in all its perfection and purity like a polished conch-shell by a per-

26. akārito ṣaṁ pāpiyo kathayīṣyanti te ‘vayāh;—Gītā II 34.
27. atha cet tvam imam dharmyam saṅgrāmaṁ na karisyasi; tataḥ svadharmaṁ kāritaṁ ca hitvā pāpam avāpṣyasi—Gītā II. 33.
son living the household life.”

The life of a householder is, therefore, termed ‘inferior’ (hīna) in comparison to the pure life of a recluse. Naturally the idea of practising the virtuous life while enjoying the life of a householder (bhoge ca bhuñjītum puññāni ca kātun, M. I. 461) is not looked upon as an ideal in Early Buddhism.

Now the Gītā, notwithstanding its compromise with the Buddhist ideal of renunciation, reacts against the undermining of the household life and in sharp opposition to Buddhism shows its preference for the life of a householder. It points out that the complete abandonment or renunciation of action is neither possible nor necessary. The root cause of bondage is not the action but the desire behind the action and so what is necessary for salvation is to abandon the desire and not the action as such. “The learned ones (budhāḥ) call him the wise whose undertakings are free from desire and selfish motive and whose actions are burnt up in the fire of wisdom. Having abandoned attachment to the fruit of action, ever content and free from any dependence, he (really) does nothing, even though (apparently) engaged in action.” Such a man “performing mere bodily action incurs no sin” (śārīram kevalam karma kurvan nā, ’pnoti kilbīṣam, Gītā IV. 21) and thus “even when he acts, he is not bound or contaminated” (kṛtvā’pi na nibadhyate, Gītā IV. 22; kurvann api na lipyate, Gītā V. 7). This skillfulness in action indeed, according to the Gītā, is the true import of ‘Yoga’ (yogaḥ karmasu kausalam, Gītā II. 50). This is how the Gītā shows that the abandonment of action is not necessary for salvation.

Then it argues that it is not possible to renounce all actions and remain inactive completely. Taking action in its broad sense (both physical and mental), it points out: “None can remain without doing action even for a moment” (Gītā. III. 5). So long as life remains, action is unavoidable. All are compelled to engage in action by the force of

---


bhayaḍ rañāḍ uparatam mamsyante tvām mahārathah—Gītā. II 35.

30. S. IV. 190; S. V. 53 300-301.

nature” (loc. cit.). “Even the maintenance of physical life is not possible without action” (Gītā III. 8).

Thus after having shown that the renunciation of action is neither necessary not possible, the Gītā further reinforces its argument by pointing out that the performance of action is very much desirable even for the maintenance of the world (Gītā III. 20). It is in this connection that the example of the King Janaka attaining to perfection in disinterested action is adduced (loc. cit.) and God himself is cited as an ideal who without any interest of his own is engaged in the work of maintaining the world-order (Gītā. III. 22-24). As the origin of the world is traced to God, it becomes the duty of man to live in the world and promote its welfare. One who does not discharge selfless service to the world is said to live in vain (moghaḥ pārtha sa jīvati,—Gītā III. 10).

Pursuing further the same line of argument, the Gītā exhorts that work alone is the true worship of God, man’s homage to the supreme. “Devoted each to one’s own profession,... by worshipping him through the performance of his own duty, man attains perfection” (Gītā XVIII. 45.46).

Lastly, the Gītā tries to score over Early Buddhism by pointing out that the path of renunciation of action is difficult and cannot be practised without cultivating the attitude of disinterestedness. But the path of disinterested action is easy and leads to perfection within a short time. It clearly says: “Renunciation is difficult to attain, O Arjuna, without disinterested action (yoga). But the sage endowed with yoga (following the path of disinterested action) attains to Brahman in no time.”

Thus, it is shown that the path of disinterested action (karmayoga) has the advantage of being easier and yet it leads to the same goal which is arrived at by the difficult path of renunciation. (Gītā V. 2) The raison d’etre of it according to the Gītā is that the essential factor responsible for salvation, viz., desirelessness or detachment is wholly contained in the disinterested action. In the words of the Gītā; “he,

who neither hates nor desires should be ever known as a renouncer (saṃnyāśi).”  

Thus, it appears that the Gītā is making a conscious effort to highlight the path of action (pravṛtti) in preference to that of renunciation (nivṛtti) as championed by Early Buddhism.

In its treatment of God also, the Gītā seems to make a similar conscious effort to vindicate its position and take care of the charges levelled by Early Buddhism against the existence of God.

The theism which Early Buddhism seems to be acquainted with and which it frequently brings in for criticism is at best the idea of Brahmā as creator and controller of the world. The Buddha exposes the absurdity of the eternity of Brahmā by pointing out that Brahmā is only a first-born being who appears at the beginning of the world-process (vivaṭṭamāne loke). Despite his very long span of life, he is as much subject to birth and death as the rest of beings who are born after him. But both Brahmā as well as other beings feel, under delusion, that the former is the supreme one, the creator and controller of the world.

Now it is interesting to notice that the Gītā is clearly averse to such crude theism. It explicitly states that God is superior to Brahmā, the creator-god (gariyase Brahmaṇo py ādikartre, Gītā XI. 37). Brahmā along with Śiva and hosts of other gods and demi-gods is shown to be all contained within the Supreme Divinity (Gītā XI. 15) Arjuna is clearly told that worlds up to the realm of Brahmā are subject to birth and death. One attains freedom from this cycle of birth and death only after reaching the Supreme God (Gītā. VIII. 16).

But there is yet a more serious objection. Whatever be the nature of Divinity, if God is the creator and controller of all, “then people commit murder, theft and unchaste deeds due to God’s act of creation, they are covetous, full of hate and hold wrong views due to God’s act of creation” The Gītā seems to offer a reply to this charge when it asserts

---

33. Gītā V.3.
34. D. I. 18; M. I. 326-327.
that God is only the impartial operator of the universal law of karma which is but a manifestation of His own nature (Prakṛti or svabhāva).\textsuperscript{36} It is repeatedly pointed out that God is not tainted by actions (na māṁ karmāṇi limpanti) for He has no yearning for the fruits of action (Gītā IV. 14). Referring to the acts of creation and dissolution, Kṛṣṇa, the incarnate God decries: “These actions do not bind me, O Arjuna (na ca māṁ tāni karmāṇi nibadhmanti dhananājaya) for I am seated as if indifferent and unattached in those actions.”\textsuperscript{37} The Gītā points out that people hold God responsible for good and evil of the world owing to their sheer ignorance. To use its own words: “The all-pervading spirit does neither take on the sin nor the merit of anyone. Knowledge is enveloped by ignorance and hence are the creatures deluded.”\textsuperscript{38}

It is again pointed out by Buddhism that the reliance on the super-natural creator is detrimental to moral incentive and self-effort. “Those who fall back on God’s act of creation as the essential factor lack the impulse and effort regarding what should be done and what should not be done.”\textsuperscript{39} Such people relying on God’s mercy and help, abandon efforts and offer vain prayers for the fulfilment of their desires. These prayers, the Buddha points out, are as futile as calling the other shore of the river to come to the opposite side.\textsuperscript{40}

The Gītā tries to escape this difficulty by giving an activist orientation to its theistic ideas. Work itself is considered the best worship of God. It is said that “man attains perfection by worshipping Him through his own action” (Gītā XVIII. 46). God Himself is conceived as ceaselessly active, placing his ideal before man (Gītā III. 22-24). This introduction of action into the tenet of devotion enables the Gītā to maintain that absolute dedication or surrender to God means ceaseless discharge of one’s duties. Kṛṣṇa says: “With perfect resignation to me, one while doing all

\textsuperscript{36} Gītā III. 27; V. 14; IX. 7.  
\textsuperscript{37} Gītā IX. 9.  
\textsuperscript{38} Gītā V. 15.  
\textsuperscript{39} A. I. 174.  
\textsuperscript{40} D. I. 244.
actions attains by My grace the eternal undecaying abode.” (Gīṭā XVIII. 56). Arjuna is, therefore, exhorted to perform his duty to the best of his ability by dedicating all his works to God (sarvakarmāṇi mayi saṃnyasya Gīṭā XVIII. 57). Having thus fortified itself with the activistic faith in God, the Gīṭā mounts its offensive against atheists and warns them in bitter words. Kṛṣṇa says: “The evil-doers, stupid and lowly men, possessed of demoniac nature do not seek refuse in Me on account of their minds being carried away by ignorance.”

“Such fools are born in demoniac species life after life and not attaining to Me go down to the lowest state.”

Thus, the closer examination of this polemic style and combating character of the Gīṭā which is significantly different from the vast mass of earlier traditional literature suggests that the impact of Early Buddhism had begun to make itself felt on Indian thought by the time when the Gīṭā was composed.

Even while highlighting its doctrine of soul in contradistinction to the Buddhist doctrine of anātta (soullessness), it is remarkable to note that the Gīṭā talks in a somewhat Buddhist fashion of the impermanence of worldly objects as also of their being sources of suffering. But unlike the Buddha, it does not go to the length of deducing the doctrine of soullessness therefrom.

The Buddha is frequently found to show by analysing the entire personality of man that each one of its constituents is transitory and, consequently, a source of suffering. He is then found to ask “Is it proper to look upon that which is impermanent, sorrowful and changeable as ‘this is mine, I am this, this is myself.” and the obvious reply comes: “Certainly not, Lord” (no hetām bhante). The Gīṭā also, in a like manner, while initiating its doctrine of immortal soul in the second chapter, observes: “Contacts with objects, O Arjuna, give rise to cold and heat, pleasure and pain. They come and go and are impermanent (anityāḥ).” And subse-

41. Gīṭā VII.15.
42. Gīṭā XVI.20.
43. Yāṁ pāṇa aniccam dukkhāṁ vipariśāmādhammaṁ, kallaṁ nu tāṁ samanupassitum—etam nāma eso'ham asmi eso me attā ti?
M. I. 232-233; S. III.88, 118.
44. Gīṭā II.14.
sequently it adds: “Whatever pleasures are born of contacts are only sources of suffering (duḥkhayonayaḥ). They have a beginning and an end, O Arjuna, No wise man delights in them.” Thus, it appears that the Gītā, like Buddhism arrives at the fact of worldly suffering from the impermanence of worldly objects and imparts the teaching of detachment from them. But it does not go all the way with Buddhism and parts company with it when the latter comes in open conflict with its avowed doctrine of the soul.

On the basis of these evidences, it appears fairly reasonable to conclude that the Gītā, in the light of the new approach to life heralded by Early Buddhism, makes necessary changes and adjustments in the traditional orthodoxy and absorbs some of those ideas and expressions of the new movement which could be conveniently fitted into its scheme, while trying at the same time to counteract vigorously the growing Buddhist influence of renunciation, atheism and anattā. Thus, the impact seems to be more by way of reaction than of adoption.

Abbreviations:

1. D. Dīgha Nikāya
2. M. Majjhima Nikāya
3. S. Saṃyutta Nikāya
4. A. Aṅguttara Nikāya
5. Dh. Dhammapada
6. Sn. Suttanipāta
7. Ud. Udāna

45. Gītā V.22.
VI

The Conception of Ideal Man in Pali Canon

by

Dr. N.H. Samtani

Man is the centre of all religious and philosophical thinking. The religious systems that have come to stay in this world, have for them, the man as the main theme in their sacred writings. To help the man to reach the state of perfection has been the aim of all religious teachers. It may be that the conception of perfection or an ideal stage may vary from one religion to other, but the main object towards which all the religious teachers have striven is to guide the man towards higher goal of life, to raise him, to uplift him, to make him ideal according to their conception of ideal stage.

Buddhism, having rejected the idea of God, the all powerful deity, who guides the destiny of man, is more concerned with, or is rather at pains to present, the ideal stage which could be won here and now. Although during the course of its long history, idea of Super-man, almost approaching to the idea of Brahmanical incarnation of God, was also developed, but in its early beginnings what Buddhism strived at was to present an ideal man, as he should be, in contradistinction to what he is.

Idea of Superman or Mahāpuruṣa with mental and even physical perfections is definitely a later growth in Buddhism. It is the result of later thinking process of the Buddhists when the ideal of Arhat failed to appeal them, when they wanted some higher substitute to replace the old ideal. Between the emergence of full-fledged Mahāyāna with numerous Buddhas and Bodhisattvas on one hand, and the narrow ideal of individual perfection, exemplified in the ideal of Arhatthood on the other, was conceived the idea of Superman with 32 physical marks. In this paper I am not elaborating the idea
of superman, as it forms the subject-matter of a separate paper itself. I am however trying to present two ideals viz. one of man who is leading a houseless life or, in other words, Bhikkhu (monk) and the other of a householder called ‘Upāsaka’, ‘Gīhi’ or ‘Āgārika’ in Buddhist terminology.

Let us now see who is an ideal monk. We get practically no information about the physical qualities of an ideal monk. All that has been stressed is his mental attainments, although it is mentioned that a monk who has attained Arhathood was enjoying a radiant physical health. It may however be mentioned that the concept of an ideal monk i.e. an Arhat is more clear than that of an ideal householder.

Monastic Buddhism laid stress on the houseless life, it dreaded renewed becomings and hence it was conceived that the Summum bonum of life was attainable in this very life


2. I may mention here that Buddhism does not present two ideals leading to ultimate liberation independently. The life of householder, however ideal, is definitely inferior to that of an Arhat according to early Buddhism. However, those who cannot, or do not aspire to become Arhats in the present birth, can also lead ideal householders’ life in their present birth in accordance with the instructions of the Buddha given in some Suttas addressed to householders. Vide infra.

3. For example in the Samyutta Nikāya (Vol. I p. 6 Devanāgarī Ed.) the Buddha in answer to a question put by a Devatā gives the reasons why the face of the Bhikkhu is always radiant: The question of Devatā is:

अर्थस्य विहरत्तां सत्ताः ब्रह्मचारिणः
एकस्मात्व स्वत्वागात् केन वन्यो प्रसीदति

(tr. Living in forests, leading a holy life and eating one meal (a day), how they (Arhats) come to possess radiant appearance?)

Answer given by the Buddha is:

अर्थस्य विहरत्तां सत्ताः ब्रह्मचारिणः
एकस्मात्व स्वत्वागात् केन वन्यो प्रसीदति

(tr. Thinking not of the past, neither of the future (but) living in present, they come to possess radiant appearance.);

Similarly when Sāriputta in the beginning of the formation of the Sangha meets Assaji, he is very much impressed by his physical appearance and says:

“विपरितानिश्चिते ते आदुशो इत्यत्यानि, परिसुद्धो ते छविवन्यो परिवादातो।”

(i.e. Your countenance, friend, is serene, your complexion is pure and bright etc.) See Mahāvagga p. 39 (Ed. J. Kashyap, Nalanda Pali Devanāgarī Series).
(diithe va dhamme). Saint or a monk was not ideal for every man but an ideal monk, who had selected a certain kind of life, detached earthly life and was living in his own world with aims and ideal suited to that world.

The idea that man had potential capability and power to rise above his lesser beings must have been present to the mind of the Buddha as well as to his followers. However, according to early Buddhism, achievement of perfectness depended upon the will to train aright the whole being, to make strenuous efforts for emergence of that perfect being; and by perfection was never meant some supernatural powers i.e. performance of miracles etc. Although the Buddha possessed such powers, and several other monks are mentioned in in Pali canon to have possessed those powers, but that was not the state to be longed for, much less to be sought after. Hence it is that Buddha deprecated the show of miraculous psychic powers. In the place of these super-normal powers such as levitation, passing through material objects etc., was substituted supreme spiritual prowess of the Arhats exhibited in the potency of his victory over kilesa-s and ñsava-s, the mental corruptions and intoxicants. In place of bodily asceticism, was substituted mental asceticism, mental discipline. Thus the concept of the Arhat came to be regarded as one involving many high ethical and intellectual qualities. To quote I.B. Horner, "These were thought to be brought to perfection only after a long and rigorous training in virtue and knowledge, lasting even in the case of the Buddha through countless spans. For, it must never be forgotten that Buddhism is unintelligible apart from the allied doctrine of Karma and rebirth. If a man or woman becomes an Arhan in this existence, it is because in previous rebirths "he has been working towards this end."  

The conception of Buddha as presented in early Buddhism is not that of intellectual giant, endowed with inconceivable super-normal attainments but of a human being who has risen above his petty self, who has conquered, or rather annihilated the roots of desire. He is not only considered the person

worthy of reverence and offerings but also one who has achieved the complete emancipation of mind. Arhats following his footsteps may not be able to teach like Buddha and lead multitudes towards goal of Nirvāṇa, but at least each can achieve alertness of mind, freedom of the heart which leads to Nibbāna. After this an Arhat has nothing to do, nothing to learn thereafter. He was asekha, a finished product. Thus Buddha introduced or reintroduced into Indian thought an ethical and moral outlook and taught that the exercise of right thoughts, right words and right deeds and that of self-control will lead to the stage of Nirvāṇa. And every monk was required to keep that ideal before him.

What was that Nirvāṇa? Its description is not found in many words but which appears to have stood for the realm of peace, state of perfect passionlessness, supreme emancipation of mind. Or was it only cessation of pain ‘Dukkhanirodha’? Or was it communion with some impersonal Brahman of the Upaniṣads where bliss alone pervades. Adjectives like Brahmabhūta and Stūbhūta—especially the former—for one who has attained Nirvāṇa are baffling. In later Sanskrit commentaries, for example in the Arthaviniscaya-Sūtra the word Brahma has been mentioned as a synonym for Nirvāṇa. On this point Horner writes:

"The Brahma of the Upaniṣads may have been taken by Śākya as the pattern on which to build its glowing manifold descriptions of Arhan. For there can be no doubt, I think, that the perfection which every true devotee of creed of Buddhism sought was of the nature of what is now called absolute perfection. Here we see that under Buddhism the great Upaniṣadic doctrine of immanent divinity of man, expressed in the classical phrase Tat tvamasi (with the emphasis on tvam) was no longer accepted. It was replaced by the corresponding doctrine of man becoming Brahma-like as

5. निर्वाणं ब्रह्मोच्चते (Arthaviniscaya-Sūtra Commentary, Ms. page 3 obverse side). Being published by K. P. Jayswal Research Institute Patna. Pali Text Society's Dictionary (Ed. Rhys Davids & Stede) entry on Brahma gives divine being, 'most excellent being', said of Buddha and Arhats. See article on Brahma p. 493. It appears either later commentators have reinterpreted Brahma in their own way or we have not understood the original significance of the word Brahma.
6. Horner uses Śākya for Buddha in her book.
opposed to his being Brahma-like. This was an Arhan theory: it claimed to see man accomplishing perfection, not simulating it. And for the accomplishing process the exercise of the will, a constant putting forth of energy was necessary.\(^7\)

According to Horner this new theory was expressed in the words सिद्धिहृदि ब्राह्मणभूता.\(^7\) All that I wish to show is that primitive Buddhism was an attempt to expand the तत्त्वमैसि of the Upanishads into तत्त्वमात्र भवासि. Man was not to be regarded as being That Self which was the Highest, but as potentially capable of becoming even as That Self.\(^8\)

Now let us see what is this अरहत, the ideal man of early Buddhism who has left his house to become a monk. The literal meaning of the word is ‘a worthy person’, ‘deserving’, ‘entitled’, ‘able’, ‘venerable’, ‘praised’, ‘celebrated’ etc. The word is a pre-Buddhist coinage but it was under Buddhism that the word came to have a tremendous import. It was adopted by the Buddhist as a technical term for one who has attained the ‘Summum bonum’ of religious aspiration i.e. निब्बाना.

The adjective with which the word is often met is खिनिसाव (one who has rooted out āsavas).\(^9\) What are these āsava-s? These are some mental factors which intoxicate the mind, bemuddle it so that it cannot rise to higher things. Freedom from these āsavas constitutes Arhatship. We get the stereotyped set of four āsavas viz, कमासाव, दिथि-साव, अविज्ञासाव, भविसाव i.e. intoxicating factor of sensuality, rebirth (lust for life), speculation (or wrong view) and ignorance.

There are many passages in Pali canon in which attainments of Arhat have been described in various epithets.

---
8. ibid 103.
9. For example, see the use of Khināsava is some verses and passages:

- खीणासाव जृतिमन्त्ये लोके परिनिघ्न्ता (Dhammapada 89)
- वस्सावाव परिनिघ्ना (Dhammapada 93).

- पह्लीमानसस्य अनासावस्य देवापि तस्स पित्रायत तादिनेन (Dhamma. 94).

- Or, द्वे में भिक्खवेः असनिध्या फलनित्या न सत्तसनि? कलमेहे?

- भिक्खु च खीणासाः सीहवो च मिगरासि।

(Tr. these two, monks, do not tremble at thunder clap. What two? A monk who has destroyed āsavas and a lion, King of beasts)—

The hero of the Pali canon is Arhat, the perfect man, whose descriptions have been graphically given in early Nikāyas. It is he who is the personification of excellence that one can conceive of. He is the paragon of the best in the world. His immaculate, impeccable and spotless character defies description in words. I am giving hereunder some of his attainments and virtues which have been frequently mentioned in various passages scattered throughout the Pali Nikāyas.\(^\text{10}\) Here are some of the Arhat’s attainments:—

1. He is without any craving (तण्ड्)  
2. He has uprooted T’ness or conceit (पष्टीनमालो)  
3. He is without āsava-s i.e. mental intoxicants (कीणासवो)  
4. He is without passion (राग), hatred (दोष) and delusion (मोह)  
5. He is unattached (विसन्ध्युत्तो)  
6. He is always mindful (सतो)  
7. He has become Brahma (ब्रह्मूत्तो)\(^\text{11}\)  
8. He is exempt from fear and dread (बौद्धरो)  
9. He is well-versed in three vijjas viz. सील, समाधि, वचन्त (10)  
10. He is well controlled in all the senses (सुदत्तो)  
11. He is steadfast and balanced (सुसमाहितो)  
12. His mind is translucent (अनाशिनिय चिन्त)  
13. His mind is calm (उपसन्धो चिन्त)  
14. He is not credulous (असंहर)\(^\text{12}\)  
15. He is free from mental ailments (अनाचुरो)

10. The Arhantavagga and Brāhmaṇavagga in the Dhammapada, Theravagga and Therī-Gāthā, ‘Arhanta-Sutta’ in the Samyutta Nikāya are only few canonical texts among them which describe the achievements and victories of the perfect man of the early Buddhism. It may be mentioned here that many of attainments are equally applied to Buddha although he is considered lokottara or Mahāpurusa after having become Sammāsambuddha.

11. Vide Supra.

12. lit. Unfaithful. He does not merely believe what others say, for he himself knows from personal experience.
(16) He is stainless (विरेण्ति चित्ति)
(17) He has tremendous patience (विष्मितवलो)
(18) He is never angry (अकोट्यः)
(19) He is having his last body (अन्तिमसरीरो)
(20) His knowledge is deep (सम्भीर पञ्च्चो)
(21) He is wise (मेघावी)
(22) He knows right and wrong path (सम्बाममस्स कोविदो)
(23) He is full of joy (पामोञ्ज बहुलो)
(24) His wants are few (अप्पिच्छो)
(25) He is cool (सीतिमृत्ती)
(26) He is friendly towards hostile (अप्पिच्छो)
(27) His speech is gentle and unoffending (अवधाक्षो)
(28) He is pure like moon (चन्द्र व बिमलं चित्तं)
(29) He has crossed the circle of birth and death (परंपं)
(30) He is conquerer of the world (संस्वलोकामिभू)
(31) He is hero (कोरो)
(32) He has washed away his sins (नहातको)
(33) He contemplates upon Universal love (मेताविहारो)
(34) He is homeless (अनागारिको)
(35) He is virtuous (सीलवा)
(36) He has greatly lived (शुभितवा)
(37) He is completely free (शुभितवी)
(38) He has disburdened himself (अोहितमारो)
(39) He has won his welfare i.e. highest goal of life viz. Nibbāna (अनुपत्तसंदन्तो)
(40) He has done what was to be done (कलं करणीयो)

Above makes a good inventory of attainments of an ideal monk or an Arhat although it cannot be called exhaustive list of all his attainments. Many more can still be added. With the passage of time the concept of an Arhat became

13. Vide Supra.
systematised and some set formulae also came into vogue. They are constantly used in the Nikāyas to describe the man who has reached perfection or sometimes the man himself is recorded to have uttered one or other formula at the moment of his attainment of the Arhathood:

िष्ठा जाति, वुसितं ब्रह्मचरियं, कतं करणीयं, नापरं इत्यतायति

(i.e., Destroyed is rebirth, lived is the good life, done is what had to be done, and now there is no more of this state of things)

अर्थं वीणासयं बुसितवा कलकरणीयं ओहित्वभारो
अनुप्तसद्भयं पवित्रीणभवसंयोजनो सम्मदण्ड्या विमुलो।

(i.e. The arhat, in whom the āsava-s are destroyed, who has greatly lived, who has done what ought to be done, who has shed his burden, and has won the aim (attha), whose bonds to becoming are now no more, is, having rightly come to know, set free)

ञ्जाणं च पन दस्मं उद्यादि। अकृत्य मे भेदो विस्मुल्ति। अर्थं अन्तिमा जाति।

नलिन्तं दाति पुनंवयों सि

(i.e. There arose in me the knowledge & insight unshakable for me is the release of mind, this is my last birth, there is now no further becoming for me).15

As regards ideal layman, as I have already stated, we do not get so clear a picture as that of an Arhat. Records of talks given by the Buddha to the householder are much rarer than those given to the monks although good number of talks addressed to monks can be equally applicable to, or

15. It may be mentioned here that in spite of the stress that the texts lay upon the monk life, it was not impossible for a layman to become an Arhat without formally entering into the Buddhist Order (Sangha). But living as lay people do, in surroundings which are generally not conducive to the development of man's higher spiritual powers, one wishing to become an Arhat had to seek the quiet and seclusion of the monastic life. Yet, there are examples—albeit frw—of lay people, contemporaries of Buddha, who attained Arhatship. Great majority, however, who wished to perfect themselves entered the Sangha.
beneficial for, layman. The reason is not far to seek. Those parts of Buddha’s teaching which refer to the homeless life directly or indirectly naturally made a greater appeal to the monks than did any other. For monks’ main interest was in homelessness rather than in household life. Hence such parts of teaching were both remembered and recorded by monks to the exclusion of sayings addressed to the householders only.

However, there are some Suttas which refer to the duties of layman. Among them Sigālovāda Sutta may be considered as a good guide for becoming ideal man. Buddhaghosa has rightly called this Sutta as Gihavinaya or a code of the householder. It presents such a refreshing picture of ideal household life that Rhys Davids was constrained to remark. “Happy would have been the village or the clan on the banks of the Ganges, where the people were full of the kindly spirit of fellow-feeling, the noble spirit of the justice which breathes through these naive and simple sayings.”

Scholars are of the view that Asoka’s Dhamma which has ignored, if not rejected, the monastic ideal of Arhathood and which has laid stress on ethical and moral rectitude was mainly inspired by such Suttas. We get a fairly good picture of an ideal householder from this Sutta. Following virtues and good habits are expected to be cultivated by a layman.

1. Practice of five Silas viz. abstinence from taking life, theft, adultery, lying, intoxicant drinks.
2. Service of mother and father
3. Respect for teachers and elders
4. Care of ascetics and brahmmins
5. Good behaviour towards servants and employees
6. Avoiding evil company

16. Take for example the following verse of Dhammapada (84):

न अत्तेद्यु न परस्स हेतु, न पुत्रामिच्छे न धनं न रत्न| 
न इच्छयु अश्वमन समिधिमत्तनो, स सीधवा पश्चात्तवा थम्मिको सिय।

(i.e. One should not aspire for a son, property or a kingdom for one’s own sake or for the sake of others; one should not also desire one’s own prosperity by unfair means. Such one is virtuous, wise and righteous). In my view such verses are addressed to, and are exclusively meant for, a monk who is supposed not to think in terms of family and clan, property or kingdom. Other half of verse however, is equally applicable to monks and laymen for it lays stress on virtue, wisdom and honesty.

(7) Giving up idleness
(8) Non-indulgence in gambling
(9) Tending the sick
(10) Helping friends in time of need etc. etc.

Besides these how a layman should be an ideal father, mother, husband, wife, master, servant, teacher, student etc. has been very well described in Sigālovādasutta. It prescribes a code of conduct for each of them. Reader is referred to read the whole Sutta to get the full idea of an ideal layman.

This, in short, is the conception of ideal man in Pali canon. But as stated above it is the picture of an Arhat, an ideal monk which emerges more manifest, more clear and more definite than that of an ideal layman in the earliest available records of Buddhists.
VII

Buddhism and Change

by

Dr. S.S. Barlingay

Whereas early Buddhism is associated with the doctrine of perpetual flux, Vedanta is associated with the opposite doctrine that Reality is one and unchanging. The Advaitic doctrine lays stress on the authority of the Vedas. The nature of the argument of Advaitism finally is this: Reality (or Brahman) is one because the Vadas say so. The diversity that appears to us is therefore unreal because it is inconsistent with the Šruti. The logical argument employed by Advaita is thus either negative in character or it is only a supplementary Pramāṇa. Buddhism, on the other hand, wants to discard Šruti or for that matter any authority as a Pramāṇa. It is attempting to become logical since it makes use of the law of causation specifically termed as Partitya Samutpadā. In spite of such differences, Buddhism in the history of thought, gradually came closer and closer to Advaitic thought and influenced the thought of philosophers like Shankaracharya as is evident from the criticism levelled against him as a Veiled Baudhā (Prachhanna Baudhā). What is the reason for this? I believe, among other things, two important tendencies in Buddhistic thinking are responsible for this somersault of Buddhism. The first of these is the hidden Platonic tendency in Buddhism. The second is the confusion between Metaphysical and Ethical point of view. It is my object in this paper to trace some important doctrines common to all forms of Buddhism and to show how the two tendencies referred to above are involved in those doctrines.

The first such doctrine is that everything is impermanent. This is the first seal or mudrā of Buddhism. Buddha also held that ‘everything is suffering. If we carefully examine the stories that are associated with Buddha’s name... before
he actually left the palace, it would be clear that he was absolutely convinced through his own observations that 'everything is painful'. He could get over this problem of suffering when, through penance, he realised the transient character of reality. Thus, for Buddha, the two propositions 'that everything is suffering' and 'that everything is impermanent' are correlated. And though Buddhism, in the early stage was mainly concerned with the ethical problem, namely, that of suffering, still it presupposed the metaphysical problem that everying is impermanent. A reference to a few parables in Dhammapada will make my point clear.

"The first parable relates that Sakra having on one occasion been conceived in the household of a potter, as the off-spring of the female ass that turned the mill, the ass, over-joyed at the prospect of the progeny, kicked her heels up and broke all the pitchers and pots which the master had made. On this, the man, taking a stick, belaboured the beast to such a degree that the newly formed foetus was destroyed and the prospect of offspring cut off". On this occasion Buddha repeated these lines. "Whatever exists is without endurance, and hence the terms 'flourishing' and 'decaying'. A man is born and then he dies. Oh, the happiness of escaping from the condition! For the life of men is but as the earthen vessels made in a potter's mill; formed with such care, they are all destined to destruction."

Similarly, on another occasion, Buddha spoke to Prasenajit, the king who had come back after finishing the funerals of the queen mother: "There are four things, O Raja" which from the first till now have been the causes of constant anxiety and fear to men—the fear of old age, of diseases, of death, and of grief consequent on death. Alas the life of man is but as the perish-ing things we see around us; today they flourish, tomorrow they are gone. Just as the water of five rivers are ever flowing on without cessation day and night such is the case with man—his life is ever ebbing away". "As the waters of a river ever hasten in and flow away, and once gone, never return, such is the life of man. That which is gone knows not any return".

Similarly, on a third occasion, Buddha seems to have
said: "Such is the fate of all that lives; it is thus it flourishes for a moment and then dies".

The above examples bring out the fact that Buddha believes that everything is impermanent, everything is momentary and everything has a duration. It is because of this tenet that Mrs. Rhys Davids says that "According to Buddhist, there is no being, there is only a becoming, the state of every individual being unstable, temporary and sure to pass away. Everything, be it a person, a thing or a God, is, therefore, merely a putting together of component elements. Further, in each individual without exception, the relation of its component parts is eternally changing and never the same for two consecutive moments. Putting together implies becoming, becoming means becoming different, and becoming different cannot arise without a dissolution, a passing away, which must inevitably at some time or other be complete".

Impermanence is a fact and as a fact it is self-evident. But why is it that all things are impermanent? The answer that Buddhism gives is very interesting and very much different from that of Bergson. It is due to a casual law that one state changes into another. The operation of this law is dependent upon certain conditions and, therefore, the law is known as the law of dependent origination or Pratitya Samutpada—that being present this becomes. As Yamakami Sogen, a great Japanese scholar of Buddhism, states, "Nothing in this phenomenal world can exist without some causes while the very name phenomenon presupposes origination, which again implies destruction, exactly in the same way as destruction invariably implies origination.........Buddha himself, as the Great Sutra of the Decease relates, said to his disciples: "Know that whatever exists arises from causes and conditions and is in every respect impermanent."

This impermanence is of three kinds:

(a) Impermanence of life period.
(b) Momentary impermanence.
(c) The Principle of Impermanence.

The impermanence of the life period can be easily understood. For, we ordinarily regard the same man as living between the period of his birth and death. By the words attributed to Buddha, 'where birth is, death will come' a
particular variety of continuity or becoming is recognized and this is in keeping with common-sense. "Death is a change of a body into four great elements: earth, water, fire and air. We experience such impermanence every now and then and is self-evident.

But this impermanence also presupposes momentary impermanence. Everything is undergoing change every moment; or rather a thing is an aggregate of such changes.

There does not appear any contradiction between the first kind of impermanence and the second one. The second one represents only another order of existence. The histories of things, like tables and chairs, and Beings like Ram and Lakshman represent one order and in modern thought we call it a macroscopic level or order. On the other hand, the momentary impermanence represents microscopic or atomic order. And it is only by making such a distinction that the confusion about the nature of physical things can be avoided. Impermanence of life period gives us immediate experience of duration and momentary experience gives us an experience of flow. This is perfectly in keeping with the facts of experience. Buddhism is the doctrine of Becoming in this sense, i.e. in the sense of momentary impermanence. But at the same time impermanence in the first sense gives it a scope for permanent (i.e., permanent in a relative sense ) bodies. But these permanent bodies looked at from a particular angle will be only nothing but change. It is in this sense that Buddha-ghosha says that strictly speaking the life duration of living being is exceedingly brief. "Just as a chariot wheel in rolling rolls merely at one point of the tyre and in resting rests only at one point, even so the life of living being endures only for the brief period of our thought and as soon as the thought has ceased, the being too, is said to have ceased. Thus the being of a past moment has lived, but does not live nor will it live; the being of a future moment will live but has not lived nor does it live; the being of the present moment does live but has not lived and will not live.

But the momentary impermanence according to Buddhist also presupposes another order of impermanence viz., the principle of impermanence or Śūnyatā. "This Doctrine of Śūnyatā has been sometimes criticized as a Doctrine of
Void. But it must be noted that it is not synonymous with Nothingness. It does not mean 'emptiness' but means the principle of perpetual change occurring at every step in this phenomenal world'. It is a principle which itself does not change but makes change possible. Śūnyatā is thus quite positive in 'meaning' though it does not stand for any bearer. It connotes though is not a name of any substance or an entity or Dravya. It is in this sense that Nagarjuna in his Mādhyamika—sāstra says a person who is able to understand and use the concept of Śūnya understands everything and one who is not able to use the concept of Śūnyatā does not understand anything. To interpret Śūnyata as something else i.e. sometimes void and sometimes mere transitoriness is due to confusion. For, it is neither of the two.

However, it is extremely difficult to formulate such a principle of Universal Impermanence which is to be thought of as logically prior to the concrete happenings of change. But, the Buddhist philosophy thinks that it is necessary to recognise such a principle, as without it ultimate Impermanence or change would be inconceivable. Such a position evidently smacks of deducing process of change from one 'a priori' principle just as the Hegelians try to deduce existence from Reason; one step ahead and we shall have to say that Śūnyatā is the real nature of things that are conditioned and if Śūnyatā is nothingness ever, ything will be nothing. If we do not understand the principle in this way, a metaphysical way, we shall have to regard it as a formal canon of Logic like "Dictum de Omni et nullo' where the events happen according to the law but where the law has not got a potentiality of creating the events. Now, in both these ways it is not necessary to postulate the law of 'Universal Impermanance'. When we say that everything is changing, we need not necessarily presuppose a principle that change alone is real. In postulating such a law it appears that Buddhists have a hidden belief that the law which is not of temporal process, exists, in some sense and is more real than the temporal process itself. Somehow or other it is assumed that Śūnyatā is a name of some ontological state. If so, Buddhists like Vedantins, use the word 'existence' in two
different senses: (1) First, in the sense of experience or a fact and (2) secondly, in the sense of 'eternity'. As soon as we equate eternity with existence—transitory existence ceases to be existence, and the momentary existence is rejected and we have to fall back upon some formal reality like that of 'Universal Impermanence', which itself does not change and which is of the nature of Plato's Idea. Thus acceptance of such a principle either leads to Hegelianism or Platonism and is a complete refutation of the Philosophy of Change, for, in so doing you objectify 'Change', make it a static principle and rob it of 'the flow or succession'. 'Change' or Śūnyatā thus objectified becomes a permanent entity. Again the eternal principle of Change does not seem to be a self-evident principle in the sense that the principle exists 'first' (in a non-temporal sense) and, therefore, changes conform to it. Rather such a principle may merely be an induction from experience. And a recognition of a metaphysical principle of Change may not be necessary. Further, if the above principle of Śūnyatā is taken to be a priori then Buddhism would involve certain immutables over and above Change—a natural contradiction to which it has led. It would mean that in order that impermanence be possible the principle of impermanence must be permanent or universal.

It appears to me, however, that Buddhists hold that this is a kind of logical principle according to which deduction takes place and is presupposed by the first and second kind of impermanence. If, 'Socrates is mortal' is the conclusion of a syllogism, it cannot be a valid conclusion unless all men are mortal or rather unless Ms are P. The deduction becomes possible because there is a specific correlation between all Ms and Ps and S is P. Similarly, Buddhists think that for a proposition to be true it must be supported by or presupposed by a formal proposition (or a canon of all changes). The first two kinds of Change—Universal Impermanence of life period and momentary impermanence seem to be in time or temporal in Nature. The principle of Śūnyatā on the other hand does not seem to be in time or temporal in character. Now, as already pointed out, such a postulation is not necessary. The whole world
therefore, it need not may be a change. But it may merely be continged one and, be necessary to deduce it from a certain Universal a priori principle.

But even if such a principle is postulated it should be a strictly logical principle, i.e., it should only suggest certain use and should in no way suggest either a physical or a metaphysical entity. It should not suggest any existence, but should suggest only "meaningfulness". But as is well known a transition from a logical to metaphysical point of view is common and it is change in point of view which creates some pseudo entities, Śūnyatā being one of them. In later Buddhism e.g. Nagajuna this shift from logical to metaphysical point of view has taken place.

Like Śūnyatā, Buddhism also accepts Nirvana as another category. This I believe is a value category and should not stand for existence. It need not be any reality having any denotation. It only suggests a "not yet" state and does not suggest "is" state. But to confuse an ethical category with some sort of ultimate reality is quite common and both Indian and Non-Indian systems have done so on several occasions. Thus Nagasena conceived Nirvana as an ontological category and considered it as a substratum of changes as ocean is a substratum of waves or Vivartta. On account of this changeover to metaphysical point of view the two originally non-metaphysical categories of Śūnyatā and Nirvana were combined and were ultimately unified. Perhaps, as the original meaning of both these terms suggest, Gautama the Buddha wanted to use them in a non-denotative but non-negative sense. But in the course of history either these terms were regarded as negative and representing void or they were regarded as some existent either in the ordinary or in the Platonic sense.

Let us now examine the second tenet of Buddhism, viz. Sarvam Anātma. 'All that is, is without atman or soul'. What is the meaning of this tenet? It is alleged by Buddhist philosophers that even Shankaraharya failed to comprehend its real import and so 'maligned it to condemnation'. Let us, therefore, see what the Buddhists mean by Anātmavāda 'or the doctrine of no soul. According to them Buddhism accepts two sorts of Anātman or non-ego. The first is the denial
of subjective Atman or a personal Ego, and the second is the
denial of the objective Atman or 'the Ego of the dharmas or
the phenomenal world'. By Atman is meant a permanent
substance or a Unitary principle which does not change and
which endures in spite of the changes of qualities or mental
states. Therefore, it follows that the existence which is
eternal Atman cannot be implied by the world which
is ceaselessly changing. A Buddhist would ask, 'why should
we assume such a substance, whether mental or physical?'
One might answer that unless a substance is accepted
the qualities would have to stand independently. Qualities
or Dharmas require a substratum, and mental states pre-
suppose a unity of apperception—a mind which synthesizes
different mental states into one. But a Buddhist would
discard it as a dogma. He would ask: Why do you suppose
that such a permanent substance is necessary. After all you
can never be aware of a physical substance or a mind. You
can only be aware of certain aggregate (of qualities)
Why then suppose that there is any physical substance
at all? or, for that matter, even a mental one? Why
not suppose that the aggregate (Sanghāta) is itself the
substance, mental or physical? The Buddhist, therefore,
comes to the conclusion that the substance is not in any way
different from five 'Skandhas' analogous to what are called
sense data to a very great extent. Buddhist theory, then,
may lead to some sort of Logical atomism like Russell's.
The Ego or substance which is merely to be inferred is,
thus, denied and our assumption of such an ego is regarded
merely as our prejudice. As soon as ego is denied the world
is reduced to momentary states (Sarvam Kshanikam) and
is corroborated by the first principle that everything is
changing. It is true that Buddhist believes in four different
kinds of atoms. But, either this might be a piece of
thinking of at tangent to the thinking of Sarvam Anatmam
or by some confusion and on account of the influence of
Vaisheshika School it might have entered the Philosophy of
Buddhism.

However, as this world is perceived as a ceaseless
flow it leads to a further principle, Sarvam Santānam
(Everything is Duration or continuity). But, it must
be remembered that this continuity exists without a Uniting Principle. Buddhism states that this continuity is perceived in two ways: (1) by Pravritti Vijñāna, where a physical thing is perceived as enduring and (2) by Ālaya Vijñāna, where mind is perceived as enduring. Thus, the four tenets of Buddhism viz. Sarvam Sanghātam, Sarvam Antarāntam, Sarvam Kṣanikam, Sarvam Santanam provide a ground fort he theory that Change is real. (There are of course passages in Buddhist literature which point out that ‘The Tathagata sometimes taught that the Atman exists’, but as Nagarjuna points out, such a Doctrine was taught only when he wanted to impart to his hearers the conventional Doctrine.

But like Śūnyatā or Nirvana, the doctrine of nosoulness also gets inverted and a permanent ego in the form of Mahātmatā is brought back by a backdoor. Here is a passage from Asanga’s Mahāyāna Sūtrālankara Śāstra which recommends “to the aspirants to Buddhahood to look upon the Universe as a mere conglomeration of conformation, Samskāra, devoid of an ego and fraught with suffering, and to take refuge from the bane of individualism in the mighty advantageous doctrine of Mahātmā—the great soul of Universe.” “Thus Buddhism not only acknowledges the permanence of the noumenal ego, but actually enjoins its adherents to train themselves in the manner as to be able to attain Union with Mahātmā.”

Sometimes we also find the word Parāmatman used for Mahātmā and Mahātmān, Paramātmān and Anātman-equated. Sometimes we also find the expression Tathāgata Garbha used for Mahātmān, etc. Thus, Buddhism again brings back the conception of non-changing reality by a backdoor. Anatmata or no-soulness, thus, becomes a denial of an individual soul but it suggests that there is one binding principle of the whole Universe which may be called Mahātmā. What can this principle be except the principle of Śūnyatā or the principle of Śūnyatā cum Nirvana?

It appears that initially the concept of Tathāgatagarbha or Paramātmā or Mahātmā has at least a superficial similarity with the Brahman of Advaitins. But when Paramātmā, Śūnyatā and Nirvana get united and an ontological
status is given to them they become almost identical with the Brahman of the advaitins.

In short, in Buddhism, concepts like Śūnyatā a logical concept, Nirvana, an Ethical concept and Mahātmā or Anātmata, a metaphysical concept, get mixed up and the result is that Buddhism has to believe in two kinds of Realities (1) That which is ceaselessly changing and (2) that which is beyond this change, that which is eternal. Buddhist Philosophy thus begins to suppose that the conditional existence, that is, that which has a place in the cause-effect-chain alone is in flux. But beyond this there is Nirvana, (Śūnyā) or Mahātman which is almost like the Brahman of Vedantin which is Eternal and Absolute. Buddhism thus beings to hold that the ethical ideal is a kind of a higher reality and that it is the duty of everyone to attain this reality. Buddhism thus paves the way for doctrine like that of Vedanta.

There is, however, a problem still about the lesser reality. There cannot be two realities, one less real and other more real, either the lesser Reality must be got rid of or Buddhism would have to be regarded as a doctrine of Dualism. The history of Buddhistic thought tells us that under the leadership of Nagarjuna Buddhism decided to regard the world of change as illusory and accepted Nirvana as the only reality Nirvanam santam was thus interpreted as a metaphysical proposition and was regarded as the only 'Calm', Calm being a kind of reality.

The acceptance of Nirvana as ultimately real impelled the followers of Buddhism to accept the illusory status of the world. This was done, as in Nagarjuna by identifying Samsara with Nirvana.

How does this identification laed to the illusoriness of Samsārā Samsāra is a ceaseless change. On the other hand, the Nirvana is an absolute and changeless reality. If both of them are identified, both cannot be real because of the contradictory characteristics. But certainly Nirvana must be real for it is regarded as an ultimate state and the end. Therefore, Samsara as it appears to us must only be illusory and the substratum of Samsara must only be Nirvana Samsara is superimposed on Nirvana on account of ignorance. Such a conclusion, however, would mean that in the later develop-
ment of Buddhist doctrine we see the beginning of Vedanta.

But to accept such a position is to give up the position that everything is Anitya or impermanent, to give up the position that impermanent and 'is' could be equated. But that everything is Anitya was a self-evident fact for Buddha because it was characterised by existence. And that which was self-evident reality could not have been denied later except by confounding the ethical standpoint with the metaphysical one as has been pointed out above.

To conclude, the somersault of Buddhism from 'Change alone is real' to the unchanging alone is real is due to the confusion of identifying logical and metaphysical categories on the one hand and Ethical and metaphysical categories on the other hand.
VIII
On Svabhāvavāda

by

Ryotai FukuHara

Chandrakīrti says in his Prasannapadā: “We are not nāstikas. We, rejecting both the theories of asti and nāsti, point out the non-dual path leading to the Castle of Nirvāṇa. We do not say that action, doer, reward, etc., do not exist. We simply set out a temporary statement that these things do not have svabhāva.” (p. 329).

To refute both āstikas and nāstikas was the aim of Mādhyamikas. And not only āstikas but also nāstikas were regarded as svabhāvavādins (note 1). Chandrakīrti refers by name to eleven opponent schools outside and inside Buddhism. But the main opponent supposed by the author of Mādhyamika-kārikās, was Vāibhāṣikas (note 2). So, here I would like to discuss about svabhāvavāda as meant by Vāibhāṣikas and that as refuted by Mādhyamikas, mainly

1. In Chap. XVIII of PP. Chandrakīrti enumerates three differences between Nāstikas and Mādhyamikas (p. 368. l. 4, p. 369. l. 7). There he says, “Mādhyamikas who are Pratityasamutpādavādins, talk about non-existence of all things belonging to this life and the other life with the reason that they are produced depending on hetu and pratyayas, but (we do) not (tell) in the same manner in which Nāstikas who are Svarūpavādins do. For, it is not from the point of Pratityasamutpāda and voidness of substance of things that Nāstikas understand non-existence of other lives. What they do is, that they, having recognized a thing of this life as substantial, do not see the thing coming from another life to this life or going from this life to another life. In other words, Nāstikas wrongly deny existence of things in other lives which are similar to things perceived in this life.” From this it is clear that Nāstikas are also regarded as svabhāvavādins.

2. This is known from the fact that topics dealt with in all chapters are the traditional subject-matters of Vāibhāṣikas’ Abhidharma books, and that opponent’s theories quoted in chapters I (four pratyayas), XVII (karma theory), XXIV (98 anusāya), etc. are apparently Vāibhāṣikas’.
on the ground of Abhidharma-Mahā-Vibhāṣā (AMV) and Prasannapadā (PP) (note 3).

First of all, we must pay attention to the fact that in PP, the word ‘svabhāva’ is used in two meanings. (1) Svabhāva discussed on in Chapter XV means ‘a special quality of a thing unshared by any other things’, such as auṣṇya of agni. It is defined as “yo dharmo yaṁ padārtham na vyabhicarati sa tasya svabhāva iti vyapadiṣyate, aparā-prati-baddhatvāt”, or as “ātmīyaṁ rūpam”, or as “nijaṁ rūpam”. (note 4). Svabhāva used in this meaning is synonymous with svalakṣana, svarūpa and prakṛiti, and its antonyms are sāmānya-lakṣaṇa and parabhāva (note 5). (2) In some other cases, svabhāva means ‘a self-established entity’, and when it is used in its adverbiai forms (svabhāvena or svabhāvatas), it is to be translated with such phrases as ‘by itself’ and ‘as a self-established entity’. For example: yadi hi svabhāvato duṣṭkāṁ syāt tadā svabhāvasyānapāyitvāt kuto’sya nirodhatvam (If there is pain as a self-established entity, how can it vanish? Because the self-established entity will never vanish. PP chap. 24. p. 507). Svabhāvatas of this meaning is synonymous with svātmanā in a passage like: na svata utpadyante bhāvāḥ, svātmanā vidyamānānāṁ punar utpāda-vaiyarthyaḥ (Things are not born from themselves, because to be born again is unnecessary for the things which are already existent by themselves. PP, chap. 1.p. 21). Antonym of this svabhāva is not sāmānya-lakṣaṇa or parabhāva, but parasparāpekṣa (note 6).

In AMV also, the word ‘zī-XING’ (‘nature of oneself’, a fixed translation word for ‘svabhāva’ in Chinese) is sometimes

3. It may seem improper to discuss on the subject comparing a text in Skt. and a text in Chinese. But authenticity of AMV can not be doubted, though its authorships and date is uncertain. I shall use Abhidharmakoṣa in order to embody my discussion by Skt. source.
4. Cf. PP. chap. XIII. p. 241. 7-9; XV. p. 260. l. 4-8; XV. p. 262. l. 12. p. 264. l. 2
5. This is clear from the statement in PP. chap. XV.
6. We find a passage, “(for these two things), parasparāpekṣikī siddhi is possible but not svabhāvikī siddhi” at three places of PP. (chap. I. p. 75. l. 10-11; chap. VIII. p. 189. l. 14-15; chap. IX p. 200. l. 2-3). This proves that svabhāva and Parasparāpekṣa are antonymous.
identified with ‘zi-XIĀNG, (‘appearance of oneself’-svalaśaṇa or svarūpa), and sometimes identified with ‘zi-TI’ (‘entity or body of oneself’—svātman) (note 7).

Here we must consider whether svalaśaṇa and svātman are the same or not, since both of them are synonymous with svabhāva. In other words, whether svabhāva can mean svalaśaṇa and svātman, simultaneously or it can mean only one of them in one context. In other words, again, whether svabhāva is a word of broader denotation which covers both svalaśaṇa and svātman, or it is totally equal to svalaśaṇa in one context and totally equal to svātman in another.

If the former is the case, we must prove that svalaśaṇa and svātman are identical. If the latter is the case we must ask why authors of PP and AMV used such a confusing word as svabhāva which means nothing but svalaśaṇa here and nothing but svātman there.

In PP, nowhere svalaśaṇa is identified directly with svātman. But in AMV, we often find a stereotyped phrase, i.e., “This is the svabhāva, ātmabhāva, lakṣaṇāṅga, svātman and prakriti of such and such a dharma” (note 8). Enumeration of these words in such a manner suggests us that these are almost synonymous, though not synonyms in the strict meaning of the term.

Svalaśaṇa and svātman are originally quite different ideas and there is a strict distinction in the usage of the two words in PP. For example, svalaśaṇa is never used in its adverbial form (svalaśaṇena) while svātman takes that form (svātmanā), and svātman can be a reflexive pronoun as in ‘tadeva darśanaṃ svātmānaṃ na paśyati’ while svalaśaṇa cannot.

But it is not too much or too wrong to say that svalaśaṇa and svātman are virtually synonymous, with the reason that substantial existence (svātmanā vidyamāna, svātmanā siddha) naturally implies possession of svalaśaṇa and possession of svalaśaṇa naturally implies substantial existence. I hereby set a hypothesis that the concept of svabhāva covers

7. Cf. Taishō vol. 27. p. 243. c; p. 680. c; p. 420. c; p. 249. b; p. 179. b.
8. Cf. ib. p. 237. c, etc.
both svalakṣaṇa and svātman and that through svabhāva, the
latter two can be identified.

There is another fact to prove that svabhāva is a loosely
defined word, in other words, a word used in wide sense.
It is one of the conventionalities of AMV that whenever
the author gives a definition to something, he indicates, almost
without exception, what is its svabhāva, sometimes with
reason. So we can find out the relation between a thing
and its svabhāva by surveying the text. There in AMV,
A is set down as svabhāva of B, sometimes because (1) A is
the cause of B (e.g. manas for dream), sometimes because
(2) A is the object of B (whole existing things for dream)
sometimes because (3) A includes B (citta-viprayukta-sams-, kāra
for nirodha-samāpatti), sometime because (4) A is inclu-
ded in B (98 anuśayas classified crossed with three dhātus,
darśana-mārga and bhāvanā-mārga for sapta-anuśaya) and
sometimes even because (5) pronunciation of A is similar
to that of B (māna for mada). Moreover, sometimes one
and the same thing is regarded as the svabhāva of several
dharmas (prajñā for daśabala, catur-vaiśāradya and mahā-
karanā-cīta). Here we cannot apply the definition of
svabhāva as ‘an essential character’ or ‘an entity’. Probably
distribution of svabhāva to each dharma to be defined in
AMV, was a measure to help make the definition clearer,
showing cause, object, larger category, components, etc., of
the dharma. And this is also one usage of ‘svabhāva’.

Chandrakirti attributes the following five characters to
svabhāva. (1) Svabhāva is inseparable from its possessor.
(2) It is unchangeable. (3) It is not something created.
(4) It does not depend on hetu and pratyaya in order to
come into existence. (5) It exists throughout the three
times, future, present and past (note 9).

Exactly the same description of svabhāva is found in
AMV also. (1) “There is no occasion when dharmas do
not hold svabhāva, for dharmas never abandon their own

511, 513, 521. Kārikās XV. 8, XXIV. 26. (3) Cf. PP. p. 260,
Kārikās XV. 1, 2. (5) Cf. PP. p. 262—264.
body” (Taisho vol. 27 p. 307a). (2) “Svabhāva in itself neither increases nor decreases. Hence it has got its name” (ibid. p. 308 a, 761 c, 844 b). “All the dharmas dwell in their own body, own self, own matter, own nature and own character. There is no parināma” (ibid p. 200a). (3) “All the dharmas originally possess svabhāva, for originally they dwell in their bodies and their own characters” (ibid p. 394 b). (4) “Dharmas possess svabhāva without any cause, for they possess their own body without depending on cause, and assistant causes.” (ibid. p. 307 a). (5) “Svabhāva of created existences are even-existent.” (ibid. p. 161 a).

Therefore when, either of these schools says, “This dharma exists as svabhāva” or “This dharma possess svabhāva, it is meant that the dharma is not changed, not created, not dependent on hetu and pratyaya, and is permanent. In this respect, the two schools stand on the same starting point, whence one develops svabhāvavāda and the other declines to rejection of it.

Now mādhyamikas say that if one admits existence of such svabhāva in each dharma, he will comit many mistakes. They point out many faults of svabhāvavāda. But we can summarize them into two major points.

**Criticism I:**

If a dharma possesses a permanent svabhāva, (1) it is not necessary for the dharma to be born again by hetu-pratyaya, because it is already existent, (2) and so the dharma will never perish, and (3) we cannot obtain anything new which did not exist before, because nothing is born newly, and so (4) the world will become motionless (kūṭastha), and thus (5) the svabhāvavādins will fall in nityavāda (note 10).

This criticism, though done triumphantly, is not proper, for it does not take into consideration the basic doctrine of ‘kriyā’ of Vaibhāṣika, which was often propounded in AMV and was brought under minute examination by Vasubandhu in his Abhidharmaṇaśa (AK. Chapter of Anuśaya-nirdese, kārikās No. 25—27). The doctrine of Vaibhāṣikas which

---

may be formulated as “sarve dharmā trikāle santi”, seems to be a nityavāda. But by introducing the concept of impermanent kriyā, they avoided the danger of nityavāda. The following passage of AMV shows it clearly.

“Pariṇāma (change, transformation) is two-fold. One is the pariṇāma of entity and the second is the pariṇāma of kriyā. If we are to talk in the sense of pariṇāma of entity, we should say that saṃskāras have no pariṇāma, because their entities are not something created (akṛitrimatvāt). If we are to talk in the meaning of pariṇāma of kriyā, we should say that saṃskāras have pariṇāma. Dharmas in the future time have not yet gotten kriyā. When they come into the present time, they get kriyā. And when they enter into the past, the kriyā perishes. In this sense, there is pariṇāma (of saṃskāras)” (Taisho vol. 27., p. 200. a—b).

Thus the ontology of Vaibhāṣikas is two-sided. But Mādhyamikas’ criticism as seen above is not based on due understanding of this dual theory. Though kriyā is examined in several chapters of Mādhyamika-kārikā and PP, it is only to point out faults inevitable when we assume kriyā as an entity and is not discussed in connection with ontology (note 11). Only at one place in PP, Chandrakīrti refers to the ontology of Vaibhāṣika (he quotes Vasumitra’s theory which is accepted as authentic by the author of AMV cf. Taisho Vol.—27. P. 393 a—396 a; AK. Peking Edition Vol. 115. 228-1-5 to—230-2-4). But there also, his refutation is very simple (cf. PP. chap. 20. P. 395 l. 11—p. 396. l. 6).

Criticism II:

The second criticism consists in a point that if something exists by itself (svabhāvatas), it must exist separately and independently from any other things, but that every thing exists in either (1) cause-effect relation; (2) mutual relativity, or (3) doing-done relation. Almost all the chapter of Mādhyamika śāstra is devoted for demonstrating this fact. The cause-effect relation is discussed in chapters 1, 4, 17, 20 and 23; mutual relativity in chapters 7, 11, 15, 16, 19, 20 and 25; doing-done relation in chapters 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 18 and 22.

11. Cf. PP. p. 79-81, p. 115, p. 118, etc.
The method of refutation is, as for doing-done relation for example, (1) to replace names of two things under examination with another two nouns derived from the same verb-root (e.g. agni is replaced with dāhaka and indhana with dahanīya, both being derived from the same root dāh), and then (2) to set a disjunctive: A is equal to B, A is different from B, A includes B, A is included in B, A possesses B, etc. and then (3) to demonstrate that every such case results in dilemma, and then finally (4) to conclude that single member of the pair does not exist as an entity. (note 12).

This looks like a vital attack to Vaibhāṣikas. But we must notice two points here. (1) Vaibhāṣikas were not ignorant of relativity of notions. In AMV, existence is classified into two, three and five kinds. In them, the last classification is: nominal existence such as horns of a rabbit; real existence such as skandha, āyatana, etc.; temporary existence such as army; existence as a collection of other things such as pudgala; relative existence such as longness and shortness (note 13). (2) Vaibhāṣikas never rejected causality. Simply they maintained that even if two things are in causal relation or in doing-done relation, each member can exist by itself. They may say, “Think of a piece of wood which is not now burning. This is a fuel (indhana), and existing separately from fire. Think of an eye covered by an eye-lid. This is a ‘seer’ or ‘seeing instrument’ (darśana) and existing independently from objects of eye-perception.” Thus, to Vaibhāṣikas,

12. As for the first stage, Madhyānikas replace mahābhūta and rūpakandha with kāraṇa and kārya (chap. 4), anāvaraṇa and ākāśa-dhātu with lakṣaṇa and lakṣya (chap. 5), keśa and pudgala with rāga and raktā (chap. 6), pudgala and indriya and skandha with upādāti and upādāna (chap. 9), rāgādi and sampākāra or pudgala with bandhana and bandhīya (chap. 16), tathāgata and his pañca-skandha with upādāti and upādāna (chap. 22), etc. As for the second stage, Nāgārjuna established five-fold disjunction, i.e. (1)tattva (or ekatva), (2) anyatva (or prithakta), (3) ādhāra, (4) ādheya and (5) tad-vat, and used it in chap. X. kārikā No 14, XX. No. 1. ‘Pañcadhā’ in XXII. No. 8 and XXIII. No. 5 means these five-fold disjunction. Chandrakīrti called it ‘pañca-pakṣa’ (chap. XX. p. 435. l. 3). The fifth, ‘tad-vat’ is again divided into two, i.e. vyatirekṣaṇa and avyatirekṣaṇa by Chandrakīrti (chap. X. p. 212. l. 9—14). Chandrakīrti says that the latter 3 limbs are nothing but sub-divisions of anyatva (chap. XX. p. 435. l. 3). Chandrakīrti established seven-fold disjunction in his Madhyamakāvatāra, chap. 6, kārikā No. 151, adding samudhatva and samsthānatava to Nāgārjuna’s five limbs.

dependence does not necessarily imply denial of substantial existence of each member of the pair (note 14).

Against this, to Mādhyamikas, a piece of wood which is not burning now is not a fuel, because a thing which is not now being burnt by fire cannot claim to be a fuel (agni-nirapekṣasya anidhyamānasya indhanatva-abhāvāt. PP. chap. X. p. 207. l. 6). Similarly, an eye which is not now seeing things is not an eye: “Nothing can be a seer if it is not seeing something now” (apaśyan na kim cid darśanaṃ bhavati. PP. chap. III, p. 115. Also see kārikās III. 4, XXIV. 24, 33, 37). Mādhyamikas’ discussion is always based on this premises. Only on this premise, they can assert that dependence of two things naturally leads to denial of substantial existence of single member of the pair.

But this premise is never admitted by Vaibhāṣikas. It is a premise forced to them by Mādhyamikas.

In short, both schools admit causality and dependence of things, but Vaibhāṣikas say that this fact does not deny independence and substantiality of things, while Mādhyamikas say that causality and dependence necessarily signifies non-substantiality (niḥsvabhāva, śúnyatā) of things. And to prove the latter, Mādhyamikas had to presume a wishful and forcible premise as mentioned above.

Thus both in the first and the second criticism, Mādhyamikas’ refutation does not just meet the point of Vaibhāṣikas’ assertion.

Vaibhāṣikas admitted substantial existence of things in future and past as well as present time, in order to fulfil the following three necessities. (1) Buddha taught existence of future and past dharmas. (2) We can perceive future and past dharmas in imagination and memory, and things percei-

14. Chapter X, kārikās No. 8 to 12, are set to refute an assertion of opponents that agni and indhana are dependent on each other and yet they are self-established entities separately. This opponent’s view represents Vaibhāṣika’s assertion. As for the view that eye is eye even if it is not seeing anything now, the following passage of AMV will give clear evidence. “What is eye ? that which has already seen rūpa, that which is now seeing rūpa, that which will see rūpa, and the rest are called eye......the rest means tat-sabhāga” (Taishō Vol. 27, p 732. b). Tat-sabhāga means an eye which though being born and existing now, does not see rūpa because of lack of condition, such as in darkness, eye-lid being closed, etc.
vable must have existence. (3) Karmas which we made in
the past must continue existing as substance so as to produce
their effect, otherwise moral law will not be established.
But since they had to make this theory compatible with the
iron principle of anityavāda of Buddhism, they added, "But
kriyā of dharmas are non-permanent" (note 15).

Though this theory of Vaibhāṣikas contains may defects
as pointed out by Vasubandhu, we should acknowledge that
it was such a purposeful, religious theory. If the theory can
be replaced with another faultless theory which fulfills the
above necessities as done by Vasubandhu (note 16), it is better.
But simple rejection of the theory without giving any counter-
theory, as done by Mādhyamikas, is not proper.

This is not to minimize the significance of Mādhyamika's philosophy. Mādhyamikas' devotion in rejection of
svabhāvavāda was also a purposeful one. Vaibhāṣikas say,
"There is no method other than examining existing things
(dharmāṇāṃ pravāyam) to tranquilize evil desires because
of which people of this world are wondering about in the
ocean of life (bhava—samsāra). Therefore the Master (Ṣāstr
—Buddha) preached this (abhidharma)." (AK. chap. I.
kārikā No. 3). This examination of existing things (pravāya)
was the way of approach to Buddhism adopted by Vaibhā-
ṣikas. Therefore they devoted themselves in defining, classi-
fying and systematizing dharmas. This way of approach is
all right if they are well aware that it is only a means to
obtain nirvāṇa (nirvāṇa-adhigama-upāyatva, cf. PP. chap.
XXIV. p. 494. l. 14). But otherwise they are always exposed
to a dangerous assumption, "This is the very truth" (idam-
satyā-abhiniveṣa, cf. PP. chap. 1. p. 45. l. 5—7). And to see
svabhāva in each dharma is the very cause of prapañca which
successively causes vikalpa, abhiniveṣa, klesa, karma and
samsāra (cf. PP. chap. XVIII. p. 350 l, 13—p. 351. l. 11).
To warn against this danger was the motive of Mādhyamikas.

From this view-point of motive and purpose, Mādhyamika philosophy can be highly appreciated. But their actual
method of refutation of Vaibhāṣika's svabhāvavāda was indeed
full of defects as shown above.

15. 15 and 16. Cf Abhidharmakośa chap. V. kārikā No. 25 27 and
commentary on the kārikās.
IX
The Satya—Siddhi and its Exposition of Buddhism
Prof. N. Aiyaswami Sastri

During the period (253 A.D.) when Harivarman composed his Satyasiddhi, Buddhist church was divided into different schools of interpretations. The most important amongst them were Sarvāstivādin, Dharmagupta, Mahīśāsaka, Kāśyapīya, Vātsiputriya and others who were contending mutually and drifting from the original spirit of the Master's teachings. There was also the Mahāsāṅghika following a Mahāyānic form of Buddhism. It was Kātyāyaniputra who started a perverted interpretation of the scripture on the pattern of the Brahmanical systems of thought. Harivarman cites an instance (in Ch. 92). The Sarvāstivādin accepts as a separate element dharma like prthakjanatva on the model of ghāvatva, paraṇa, etc. of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣikas. The author felt sorry for such state of affairs that the true import of the scripture was misrepresented as a result of wrong interpretation by other masters. This fact led the author to make an attempt to reassess the value of the master's teachings and thus rectify the blunders committed by his previous teachers. In his opinion a good treatise founded on the exegetical principle is a source of inspirations and right knowledge.

In the introductory part of the treatise the author says: there are ten points of dispute in Buddhism. They are:

1. Everything exists or not exists.
2. The past and future are real or unreal.
3. Intermediary life exists or not exists.
4. Induction of four noble truths is gradual or of one moment.
5. Arhan falls or never falls.
6. Anuśayas, residual forces, are mind's associate or dissociate.
(7) The mind is pure or impure by nature.
(8) The past action of unexhausted friction exists or not exists.
(9) Tathāgata is included or not included in the Sangha.
(10) Pudgala, soul, exists or not exists.
(1) The author remarks on the first point that to affirm existence leads to eternalism and to negate it to nihilism. So we must steer between the two, because the existence or non-existence is all stated by way of expediency, Upāyatayā.

(2) As to the second point the author comments:
The sensory conscious knows its object, but does not discriminate its existence or non-existence. The mind and mental states are devoid of their own objects, because they do not grasp the true nature of things. So things exist in the empirical plane but not in the absolute one.

(3) Third point, i.e. intermediary life is denied by the author as against the Sarvāstivādin's affirmation of the same.
(4) Induction of noble truth, (the fourth point) is of one moment and not gradual. The author holds that the noble truth is only one, that is cessation truth. Other truths, misery, etc. are not at all truths in fact.

(5) Arhan never falls from his sainthood and he is above an ordinary way of life.

(6) Anusaya is the mind's associate for the Sarvāstivādin and dissociate for the Mahāsāṅghika. The mind's association being denied by the author there is no such thing as the mind's associate or dissociate.

(7) The Mahāsāṅghika holds that the mind is pure by nature but becomes impure through pollution by defilements. Now the author remarks: The mind appears and disappears every moment; what defilement would pollute it?

(8) The Kāśyapīya says that the past action of unexhausted fruit exists. This is a perverted view says the author.

(9) The Mahāsāṅghika affirms that Tathāgata is included in the Saṅgha. The author declares it an absurd view.

(10) Vāśiputriya holds that there is an individual soul which is indescribable, but cognizable by six-fold consciousness. The soul is not describable as either identical with or different from the five groups of elements on the analogy of
fire and fuel. It is one of the five cognizable things: past, future, present, unmanifested and indescribable. Criticizing all the arguments of the opponent, the author concludes that the individual soul exists in the empirical plane alone, but never in the absolute one.

Next let us look into Harivarman’s conception of the matter. The early Buddhists, Sarvástivādi-Vaiśākikas divide the material element, rūpa into two groups: fundamental and derivative elements. The former comprises the four great elements, earth etc. while the latter their qualities, colour, taste, odour and touch.

The sense-organs which are material for early Buddhists are brought under the derivative elements. See my Pañca-Vastuaka. It was Buddhadeva who being a Sarvástivādin, opposed the above distinction and put so-called derivative elements on par with so-called fundamental elements. An opinion which was much favoured by the masters of the Dārśāntika-Sautrāntika-School. Now our author goes a step further. He pleads for reverse status between the fundamental and derivative elements. Thus the four great elements are formed on the basis of colour, taste, odour and touch. The sense-organs are formed on the basis of four great elements due to action, karman, and hence not different from the latter. Thus, according to the Satyasiddhi the colour and others, rūpādi are real elements while the four great elements and the Sense-organs are nominal, praṇāpatīsāt. We learn from a commentary on the Vimśatikā of Vasubandhu (in Chinese) that Harivarman propounded his conception of matter under the influence of the Sāṅkhya system which advocates that the great elements are evolved from their respective tanmārās, subtle elements. In spite of this indictment Harivarman’s theory that subtle elements are real, vastusat, has been accepted by the Dignāga school of Logic including Dharmakūrti. (Refer also Vasubandhu’s Vimśatikābhāsya for similar opinion).

The Sarvástivādin pleads further that the four great elements and their respective derivative elements appear always together in life. This opinion has also been criticised severely in the Satya-siddhi (Ch. 40).

The next topic of interest is the problem of perceptive
agent. Harivarman asks the question: Is it the sense-organ that produces the cognition or the consciousness residing in it? The early Buddhists, particularly the Sarvāstivādin, etc. maintain the sense-organ as the cognizer, but author objects: if it cognizes; it would do so all the objects simultaneously. The scriptural authority for the sensuous consciousness being cognizer is चक्षु ब्राह्मण द्वारे याब्देव स्वार्थ दर्शनाम, the eye is the door only for perceiving colours. This passage proves unmistakably that the sense-organ operates as an instrument whereas its consciousness is cognizer. The sensuous consciousness in the first moment is pure and free from every discursive thought, vikalpa. The Sarvāstivādin, on the other hand, says that there is a svabhāva-vikalpa present in every moment of consciousness. So Nīrṇīkālpa for him is that which is free from vikalpas other than svabhāva-vikalpa, which proposition has been criticised by Vasubandhu in his Kośa. It appears, therefore, that Harivarman was the first exponent of the perception as a pure sensation in the first moment which was later elaborated by Dignāga and Dharmakīrtī.

Another interesting feature of this author is the denial of separate reality to the mind and the mental elements. The early Buddhists assign a separate reality to the mind and a limited number of mental states pleading at the same time that a mind can be associated with one or more mental states. This is not admissible for Harivarman, because our thoughts always follow an order of sequence; they never operate simultaneously. It becomes now evident that so-called theory of Samprajñāga, i.e. one thought is associated with several mental states as admitted by the Sarvāstivādin, is not at all logical.

Theory of self-knowledge, sva-samvedana, propounded by a later branch of the Sautrāntika school and also accepted by Dignāga School is not favoured by this author. It is, however, conceded that all-comprehending knowledge, Sarvālambana-jñāna, can comprehend everything including the self. So it appears that the author’s denial of self-knowledge is concerned with the sensuous consciousness.

There are certain mental phenomena which are given a separate reality by Sarvāstivādin who implicitly has to maintain the Sāmkhya’s theory of Satkārya. In view of the opinion Sarvam asti, every thing exists, being opposed Satkārya
is also refuted by Harivarman. Consequently the mental phenomena are denied their separate reality. This denial demands a detailed explanation from our author how the phenomena like samjña, idea, vedanā, feeling and others could be accounted for. To conceive a nimitta, an empirical thing, is samjña. When the mind clings to an object there is feeling; there is only one feeling, not three. Cetanā, volition There is sanskāra. Cetanā is nothing but aspiration, prārthanā which is the same as prāṇidhāna. Similar explanations are made of other mental states, viz. sparsa, manaskāra, chanda, priti, śraddhā, vyāpāda, smṛti, vitarka, and vicāra and others. The Sarvāstivādin maintains that the mind is always associated with one or other of mental state: but our author would never subscribe to such opinion and pleads that they are gradual and appearing in a sequal order.

Of the mind’s dissociate elements only avijñāpti element has to be accepted; other elements, prāpti, jīvita, etc., exist only nominally, for the Sautrāntikas avijñāpti is also no-existent and it is an absence of action, akaraṇamātram avijñāptiḥ. This opinion is not confirmed in the scripture, says the author. The Sūtra says: He who donates the garden, grove, watershed and shelter increases his merits for ever, day and night. It is a positive force causing the doner’s well-being. The action in its origin is termed vijñāpti. Soon after the manifested action is ceased, it becomes avijñāpti otherwise called punya-pāpa. It is a cittaviniprayuktasanskāradharma, mind’s dissociate formation-element, brought under the formation-group, sanskāra-skandha. According to the Sarvāstivādin it is a part of the material group, Rūpa-skandha.

Kleśa, defilement, is an activity of filthy mind. Its main divisions are: greed, hate and infatuation. The root-cause of the defilement is ignorance, avidyā. It is a wrong knowledge and not an absence of knowledge. It is further defined as a pursuit of empirical things. Worldlings entertain the idea of soul due to the non-discerning, i.e. ignorance. It persists always in the person who does not understand Śūnyatā, non-substantiality of things. A man of Śūnyatā-vision may have also a perverted knowledge. All such ingorance is removed by means of knowledge which is secured by rightly understanding the Dependent Origination. The defilement is related
to the non-sensuous consciousness, but never to the sensuous one. For, the non-sensuous consciousness alone pursues concept, *sāṃjñā*, and brings about all the defilement in its train. The cause of construction, a *Sakti* in Śāntarakṣita’s terminology, pertains to the non-sensuous consciousness. This proves definitely that the five-fold consciousness is pure and simple, whereas the sixth one is totally a constructing agent.

According to the author there are two truths: absolute and conventional. The first comprises: colour, taste, odour, touch and Nirvāṇa and the second: *Prajñāpti*, nominalism. *Prajñāpti* is a thought constructive of *Puruṣa* on the basis of five aggragetes of elements or of a pitcher and such other things on the basis of colour, taste, odour and touch. Note here the colour and others are bases of the idea of pitcher, etc. and not the four great elements as have been explained previously in connection with the elucidation of great element. What is relative is *Prajñāpti*; for example, long and short, etc. The absolute is not relative; colour, and others do not depend on any other thing, but they are established in themselves. Things of Prajñāpti are surpassed by resorting to their constituent members, colour, etc. and the latter again by means of *Nirodhalaksana*, i.e. Nirvāṇa.

Philosophers are divided into four groups in their opinions about the universe versus the reality. The first group maintains the doctrine of identity, namely the colour, taste, odour and touch are the same as the pitcher: the second group holds that they are different from the pitcher i.e. diversity. The third group adheres to the doctrine of unspeakability, i.e. the colour, etc. and the pitcher are unspeakable as either identical or diverse. The last group advocates the doctrine of non-entity, i.e. the pitcher and other things are non-existent.

The advocate of non-entity further argues for the denial of the colour, sound, taste, odour, touch, non-sensuous consciousness and cause-effect-relationship, etc. As against this absolute denial of things the author sets up the empirical truth as a solution. Though the objective things may be reduced into non-existence, they are, nevertheless, empirically true. This attitude is necessary not only for the betterment of the ordinary folk but also for the progressive advancement of
the Buddha’s disciples in their spiritual aspirations. Harivarman appears to differ in this respect from the later Madhyamikas, who adhere to the extreme opinion of denying thing even empirically.

As to the Path-truth the author says that it consists of two parts in the main, viz. concentration and knowledge. The concentration, the mind’s one-pointedness causes the knowledge of things as they are which is no other than the knowledge of voidness (Śūnyatā). Samādhi is also termed prajñā because the mind knows things as they are.

The most important part in this section is the author’s elucidation of Nirodha-Samāpatti. He probably differs here from the Sautrāntika Vasumitra who advocates a subtle state of mind persisting even in this trance. Vasumitra’s argument is this: There is no any living being free from mind. Three elements: life-span, temperature and consciousness are invariably associated, mind continues in succession and in the absence of preceding mind no subsequent mind can arise. Therefore the mind does not cease absolutely in the cessation trance. Now the author observes: The Śūtra asks: What is the difference between the dead person and the person in the cessation trance? For the dead person the life-span, temperature and consciousness are all utterly ceased whereas in the case of the Yogan entering into the trance the mind alone is ceased, but the life-force and temperature exist as unseparated from the body. This proves that there is a living being freed from the mind. His mind reaches a stagnant state and for this reason he is termed sacitta, possessed of the mind. When he is termed acitta he is not similar to a tree or stone. The Śūtra also says that the consciousness is separated from the body. Therefore the argument that the three elements are invariably mutually associated is not applicable to each and every case.

Harivarman continues: I also hold that one mind is the causal factor of another mind. One may ask: How can a ceased mind produce its result? The ceased eye, e.g. does not produce its consciousness. It is, however, possible to reply that the ceased mind produces its result. The ceased action produces its resultant. The mind and its operating consciousness are so closely related and are not on par with the eye and its
consciousness. Therefore the example of the eye is not a proof (ahetu). The argument that at the stoppage of its flow the mind is ceased is not correct. It can revive on the support of life-force and temperature. But in the case of dead person it ceases once for all. Samyutta says: The person that has entered into cessation trance wakes up again on the support of six bases and a bodily animation (kāya-jīvita). Therefore the cessation-trance is a mindless state, i.e. a state wherein the mind remains inactive.

The author says again that there is no such stage where the mind and mental states are utterly ceased in the ordinary folk. They operate very discretely in that stage and hardly understandable. Therefore it is termed unconscious. The cessation-trance is so termed because the mind then is in an inoperative mood. These statements testify to the fact that Harivarmman intends to reform and rectify the Sautrāntika system strictly in conformity with the Śūtras. Note the Nyāyabindu Tīkā-Tiṭṭāṇi also arrives at a similar conclusion. (p. 31 ad I.16)

There are eleven concentration-causing-factors which are, elaborately treated by the author. They are: (1) Pure conduct (2) Right-knowledge (3) Protection of Sense-organs, (4) Awareness of the limit in food, (5) To be awake in the first and last part of the night, (6) Right considerations (Vitarka), (7) Good Resolve (adhimukti), (8) Endeavour, (9) Release-base, (10) Non-obscuration and (11) Non-entanglement.

The author's explanation of the last named concentration-factor deserves our attention. The eight-membered path is comparable with the stream of Ganges and the person faring along the path with a log floating in the stream. The log passing on along the stream joins the ocean at the end when it moves freed from eight inopportune moments. Its inopportune moments are: it neither approaches this shore nor other shore, neither lingers in the centre, nor perishes under the ground, neither becomes a catch by men and non-men, nor becomes rotten under the water. When the log gets entangled in one of these inopportune conditions, it will never reach the ocean. Just in the same manner, the monk, being freed from the eight similar obstacles enters into the ocean of Nirvāṇa. The eight inopportune conditions in
the case of monk are: six internal bases, six external bases, delight-passion, sense, association with the householders, Brahmacarya aimed at certain god, five sensuous objects and bad conduct. The monk when he is confronted by one or other of these unfavourable conditions can never enter into the Nirvāṇa-ocean. The idea of stream and ocean implied in the expression Srotāpanna (stream-entrant) has been amplified in accordance with the Samyutta (IV, Dārus-kandha).

The comparison of Nirvāṇa with the great ocean implies the unique conception of the Absolute as sum total of all and of one taste. The Buddhist denies an individual soul in the absolute realm of existence which idea implies that the absolute is super-person. This point draws a sharp line between the Buddhists and other systems of thought, Vedanta in particular, which upholds the Absolute both immanent and transcendent. In spite of an emphatic denial of the soul by the early Buddhists the doctrine of immanence appears to have found its way in a later phase of Buddhism. The following stanza echoes the idea of immanence:

भोजमूलमहः हस्तय सुसूक्ष्ममुपलक्षये ।
धातुपाषाणविबरे निलीनिमिब कामचन्म ॥

Yaśomitra remarks in this connection that the capacity to discern the seed of absolute as immanent in a man pertains to the Buddha alone and not other person like Śāriputra and others. So it appears that an ordinary intellectual faculty is quite incapable to penetrate deeply and discover true self-being of a man. To develop the intellectual faculty to the standard of the Buddha a supreme endeavour will be required.
Buddhist Mysticism

by

Dr. R.C. Dwivedi

There are conflicting opinions about the nature of Buddhist mysticism. This is mainly due to the possibility of different interpretations of metaphysical postulates involved in the doctrines of anattā and śūnyatā. Buddhism itself is not a single system. It admits of all facets of philosophical thought: Realism, Idealism and Absolutism. Then there is a pathetic anxiety to give metaphysical labels to an experience which defies all such labels and all the categories of intellect. The inherent imperfection of our linguistic tool does not permit us to go beyond the terms of 'no' and 'yes'. No wonder, therefore, the nirvāṇic experience is spoken of and interpreted as annihilation or as bliss. Our notions about religion that it can't be conceived without a God and Soul and some natural relationship between them add to our problem of understanding the nature of Buddhist mysticism. India's characteristic and much talked about spirituality based on the recognition of supremacy of spirit over matter seems to be offended when the permanence of and privileged place to spirit is denied. Thus the difficulties created by the established concepts of religion and philosophy, and imperfections of language are great hurdles. Buddha kept silence on many of the issues with which philosophy and religion had traditionally concerned themselves. I would also prefer silence. This choice may be allowed so that I may not be tempted to add to the confused noise. An exercise of such a choice here means restricting oneself, so far as possible, to a practical (as distinguished from speculative) analysis of experience that the Buddha had and his conserva-
tive (Hīnayānīst), 1 compassionate and catholic (Mahāyānīst) and erotic and esoteric following (Tāvārika) preached and practised; that means taking experience as forming a concrete way of life and not as leading to a way of thought. If this be granted, i.e. if mysticism be understood as living and leading others to live a life of new experience (nirvāṇa in the case of Buddhism) that gives freedom from suffering, then ineffability would be considered the mark of expression but not a characteristic of experience, transiency will belong to steps leading to a lasting experience and passivity will have to choose a different meaning for itself when serene contemplation is its object of denotation. The so-called characteristics of mystical experience, namely, ineffability, transiency and passivity are not valid characteristics for nirvāṇic experience. Once a Gautama becomes the Buddha, the Enlightened, he is Buddha for ever leading others thereafter to the same goal. Buddha is to know and to wake up. Buddhahood is thus knowledge and awakening. It is enlightenment, experience. And that is nirvāṇa. Dhammpada describes this experience of Buddha in the following hymn of victory which echoes the immediate reaction of Buddha to his experience:

Looking for the maker of this tabernacle
I ran to no avail.
Through a round of many births;
And wearisome is birth again and again.
But now, maker of the taberanacle, thou hast been seen;
Thou shalt not rear this tabernacle again.
All thy rafters are broen;
Thy ridge-pole is shattered;
The mind approaching the Eternal, 2
Has attained to the extinction of all desires. 3

1. The consensus among the Scholars prefers the use of Early Buddhism for the Hīnayāna but I have retained in this paper the word of common parlance.
2. The original is “Vasankhāragotam cittam” Henry Warren translates it “this mind has demolition reached”. Suzuki has pointed out how both the translators read their own meaning; one pointing to positive and the other to nihilistic or negativism.
This symbolised expression of experience underlines (i) weariness of existence through the symbol of repeated births (ii) seeing of the gahakāra, i.e. the 'ego' that binds us to a life of suffering, and (iii) freedom or sense of release symbolised by a mind free from all conditions or impressions or compounds. (Pot has been emptied of all its compounds, contents). This is then suchness (tathātā), egolessness (anattā) and śūnyatā. But all this sounds merely negative. A positive and more dynamic expression of experience is recorded in the Vinaya and the Majjhima Nikāya which runs as follows:

I have conquered and I know all,
I am enlightened quite by myself and have none as teacher.
There is no one that is the same as I in the whole world where there are many deities.
I am the one who is really worth,
I am the most supreme teacher.
I am the only one who is fully enlightened.
I am tranquillized.
I am now in Nirvana.

This records the conquest of all knowledge whereby the conqueror becomes enlightened, an absolute 'I', worthy, and tranquil. He is now Eckhart's man of freedom, who clings to nothing and to whom nothing clings.

For this conquest of enlightenment Buddha revealed the four Noble Truths and prescribed the Eightfold path as a

2. There is a similar Gāthā in the Dhammapada, V. 353, which echoes the dynamism of experience. It runs as follows:

   "I have conquered all, I know all, in all conditions of life I am free from taint. I have left all, and through the destruction of thirst I am free. Having by myself attained specific knowledge, to whom can I point as my teachers" quoted by Suzuki in Mysticism, p. 68.
3. The conqueror is thus described in the Dhammapada (p. 179).
He whose conquest nobody can conquer again,
Into whose conquest nobody in this world can enter—
By what tract can you trace him,
The awakened, of infinite range, the trackless?
part of last Truth; all in a meaningful order of succession. These Truths are on the (i) existence of suffering, (ii) cause of suffering, (iii) ending of suffering, and (iv) the path leading to the end. Majjhima Nikāya, 141 describes these as follows:

1. “What then is the Noble Truth of ill? Birth is ill, decay is ill, Sickness is ill. Death is ill. To be conjoined with what one dislikes means suffering. To be disjoined from what one likes means suffering. Not to get what one wants, also that means suffering. In short, all grasping at (any of) the five skandhas (involves) suffering”.

2. What then is the Noble Truth of the origination of ill? It it that craving (taṇhā) which leads to rebirth, accompanied by delight, now here, now there, i.e. craving for sensuous experience, craving to perpetuate oneself, craving for extinction.”

3. “What then is the Noble Truth of the stopping of ill? It is the complete stopping of that craving, the withdrawal from it, the renouncing of it, throwing it back, liberation from it, non-attachment to it.”

4. “What then is the Noble Truth of the Steps which lead to the stopping of ill? It is this Noble Eightfold Path which consists of (i) Right seeing (Sammādassana), (ii) right knowing (sammāsankappa) (iii) right speech, (iv) right conduct, (v) right life, (vi) right action, (vii) right thought, (viii) right concentration.”

Buddhist mysticism starts with the recognition of suffering, it finds taṇhā (trṣṇā in Sanskrit) as the cause of origination of suffering, it holds the hope of rooting out the cause of suffering and finally prescribes the ways of overcoming it. Dhammapada declares.1

“He who overcomes this contemptible thirst, sufferings fall of from him like water drops from a lotus-leaf”

It would be pertinent here to remark that the first item of the Noble Eight-fold Path is Sammādassana, right seeing. The right knowledge follows it, which in its turn, controls speech, conduct, life, actions and thought. This control leads to concentration. The basis of Buddhist mysticism is

---

1. The Dhammapada, tr. by Radhakrishnan, Verse 336.
'seeing' or 'experiencing' things as they really are. This was later on explained as anatta (egolessness), sukhness (tathata) and sunyata (vacuity, zeroness). From this proceeded the notion of a world of particulars. All this would debar any description of Buddhist mysticism either as Soul-mysticism,1 or as pan-theistic kind of God-mysticism. Buddhism admits no soul, no God. Realisation of self or return to God is not its ideal. Hence it would be inapt to give Buddhist mysticism labels such as mentioned above. But as proposed at the outset I would not like to go in my analysis beyond the periphery of purely religious or philosophical speculations. It is safer to remain at the coast when so may others are busy measuring the metaphysical depth of the Buddhism. At the end of enunciation of Four Noble truths Tathagaata warns the followers of his path to avoid two extremes. He says:

"There are two extremes, brothers, which must be avoided one by one who is striving towards liberation. The one, the desire to gratify passions and the desire for the joys of the senses which is lowest, vile, degrading and pernicious and is the path of the children of the world; the other that of violent mortification which is sad, painful, and useless. The intermediary path alone, which the Buddha found, avoids these two extremes, opens the eyes, enlightens the mind and leads to peace, wisdom, light, nirvana." 2

1. F.C. Happold in his book "Mysticism: A study and an Anthology," Penguin Books, 1963, divides mystical experience into two types; namely, the mysticism of knowledge and understanding and the mysticism of love and union (vide pp. 40-42). Approaching these varieties from a different angle he considers mysticism in its three aspects of Nature—mysticism, Soul-mysticism and God-mysticism. Nature-mysticism is characterised by a sense of the immanence of God or Soul in nature. At its heart lies what Zaehner, in "Mysticism: Sacred and Profane", calls the pan-en-henic experience, that is the experience of the All in the one and of the one in the all. It may be also called 'pan-theistic'. In the soul-mysticism the idea of the existence of God, is in any expressible form, absent. The chief object of man is the quest of his own self and of right knowledge about it. In God-mysticism the basic idea is that of the return of the spirit to its immortal and infinite ground, which is God. The mystical schools of Saarkara and Meister Eckhart combine, according to him, the Soul-mysticism with God-mysticism. Happold labels Buddhist mysticism as "analytical Soul-mysticism". The qualification to the nomenclature is added because he found it difficult to ignore the analytical and scientific foundations of Buddhism.

2. Sutra of the Foundation of Reign of Law Dhammacakkappavattana Sutta
However, Buddhism, as it is generally understood to have emerged in the first phase of the Hinayāṇa and the last phase of the Tantricism, seems not to have scrupulously adhered to the golden rule of avoiding the two extremes. The Hinayāṇist appears to have taken to the rigourous asceticism for his own perfection and the Tāntrika seems to adore the path of gratification of passions and the enjoyment of senses. Both are the Buddhists and yet standing apparently on the two extremes which the Buddha had enjoined upon all to avoid. A simple and somewhat naïve way to get out of this difficulty is to explain away Hinayāṇism as a somewhat unfaithful representative of Buddha’s teachings,¹ and to discredit Tāntricism with stock belief that it is corrupt form and degeneration of pure Buddhism. A similar difficulty (in the area of metaphysics) of understanding Buddhist mysticism without firm belief in a permanent Soul and God leads to the transformation of views in a modern exponent like Mrs. Rhys Davids² who changed her earlier interpretation so as to admit the possibility of Soul and God and the positive state of bliss in nīrūṇa. Some others, such as Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, find it safer to use from the very beginning the magical wand of upanishadic ideas and thus pave the way for others to confound the Buddhist mysticism with Vedantism. However

¹ As quoted by Jacques De Marquette in “Introduction to comparative Mysticism” (Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, 1965), p. 58.

² To quote Jacques De Marquette “It has become evident that Hinayāṇism, far from being the most faithful representative of the early teachings as it claims to be, is on the contrary an entirely new version and quite a perverted travesty of the tenets of Gautam”. Ibid, p. 83.

³ Disgusted with the Buddhism where God plays no part and man is denied any personal reality, Mrs. Rhys David approves its description as “barely hanging on the fringes of the world religious and being sacred more than a system of ethics.” Quoted in the Original Gospel of Buddha, p. 13.

⁴ The interpretation of Sūnyatā as an attributeless Reality escaping the grasp of intellectual comprehension and verbal exposition, the description of dharma (things) as unspeakable, unchanging, all-void quiescent and pure by Nāgārjuna, admission of the Tathatā-nature of things to be something substantial, permanent and unchanging, Yogācāra conception of the ultimate reality as the Abhūta-parikālya or as pure consciousness (Vijñānaparātha) “drive us very near to the Vedantic conception of the ultimate Reality as the Nirguna (attributeless) Brahman who transcends all knowledge, knower and the known”. Similarly the conception of Dharmakāya or
there are some scholars, like Prof. T.R.V. Murti, who have boldly asserted the central doctrine of Buddhism being fundamentally different from the Brāhmanical (Hinduism as a common denominator has led to many confusions about the different point of views which Indianism has upheld) doctrine of soul. But presently we are more concerned with the mystical experience than with its various metaphysical labels. It is necessary to restrict the scope of mysticism to a transphilosophical and trans-psychological as also trans-moral analysis of experience. Metaphysical interpretations vary from school to school and also within the same school, psychology has not so far reached a stage beyond the ego,¹ and morality is bound with shifting sands of social whims. The salvation is aimed at by all sorts of systems, such as, by pluralistic realism of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika, dualistic idealism of the Saṁkhyayoga, monistic absolutism of Śaṅkara, qualified monism of Rāmānuja, and by the ‘inconceivable difference-non-difference’ (acintyabhṛddgheda) of the Chaitanya School, and so on. Śaivism and Buddhism, through their different schools, admit of realism, idealism, absolutism monism, dualism and pluralism. The Kaivalya-experience of the Saṁkhya, Apavarga experience of Nyāya Vaiśeṣika, Mokṣa-experience of the Śaṅkara Vedanta, Sālokya, Sāyujya, Sāmīpya, and Sārūpya varieties of the Vaiṣṇavism and nirvānic experience of Buddhism don’t give warranty for any one particular type of philosophical description. This becomes evident when we realise the contradiction contained in the concept of salvation and the philosophical notion of a system. Take for example Saṁkhya and the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika systems. According to well-known philosophical position of the Saṁkhya, there are two ultimate principles, Puruṣa and Prakṛti, but the mystical experience of Kaivalya is final separation of Puruṣa from cosmic unity or the organised totality of things “seem to be just the same as that of the idea of the nirguṇa Brahman of the Upaniṣads”. Summed up from Ch. I. pp. 29-32 of “An Introduction to to Tantric Buddhism” by S.B. Dasgupta (University of Calcutta, 1958).

¹. D.T. Suzuki has said it aptly :
“The psychological analysis that cannot go further or deeper than the egolessness of the psychological ego fails to see into the egolessness of all things......” MYSTICISM p. 42.
Prakṛti. In experience the second ultimate should not figure. The Prakṛti must disappear immediately when she is seen. Philosophically the ultimates are two and this is supported by the Vivekakhyāti (Discrimination), but the salvation is an experience of being only one. The Nyāya-vaiśeṣika philosophy admits seven ultimate categories, namely, Dravya (Substance) Guṇa (quality), karman (Action) Sāmānya (Universal), Viśeṣa (Final differentia), Samavāya (Inherence) and Abhāva (Non-existence). Soul (ātman), according to this system, is a dravya, a substratum of consciousness—a quality arising in it under certain conditions. Realisation of the self, which is it goal of mystical experience, is a state when soul is in its true nature. The soul is a substance and the true nature of it can be being without quality (or a number of qualities). The Philosophical foundation of pluralistic realism must vanish in the mystical experience of the apavarga or Salvation. Apavarga-experience, thus does not found or sustain the philosophical system of either dualism of Sāṃkhya or realism of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika. Mysticism does not establish any particular School of philosophy. Mystical experience is the common goal of all the philosophical systems of India. It is the common (or rather universal) aim not because it gives credence to a particular shade of philosophical opinion but because it may admit all schools and transcend them all. It would be unwise, therefore, to insist on holding one particular philosophical explanation of mysticism in general and more particularly Buddhist and Śaiva mysticism which have, in fact, admitted a variety of followers, realist, idealist, absolutist, in their fold. Philosophical interpretations of Four Noble Truths being a doubtful guide or at best being of equally good value let me prefer the scope of this paper to methods of attaining the Enlightenment-experience by the ideal man of the Hinayāna, Mahāyāna and Tāntrism.

The Noble Eightfold Path explained earlier forms the part and parcel of the last among the Four Noble Truths, indicating thereby the inseparability of Truth and the Path leading

I. Vivekakhyāti or discriminating knowledge which distinguishes the two ultimates and is conscious of the two, must ultimately lead to the mystical experience of the Kaivalya.
to it. If this inseparability is not adhered to we will be cruelly defeated in our defence of mysticism against induced or artificial experiences and the veriegated forms of psychism, such as clairvoyance, psychometry and the like. The concept of ideal man of Hindu mysticism, such as Arhat in Hinayâna, Bodhisattva in Mahâyâna, Arhat in Jainism, Sthitaprajñâ in the Bhagavadgîtâ, guru (spiritual teacher) in Śaivism, esoteric Buddhism and Śâktism, Bhagavân in the Bhâgavat cult, and the doctrine of Jîvânmukti (liberation while alive) will have no value and universal validity if mysticism be understood as a way of thought as opposed to a life of ‘new’ experience. Mysticism ought concern itself with a way of life than with a way of thought. This will establish its independence from philosophy as also from artificial life created by drinks of various sorts. Difference of philosophical opinion or its interpretation is not material for mysticism. A mystic may hold any opinion or none. The crucial point will be whether he has pursued relentlessly the spiritual path and attained a life of awakening, of larger awareness, of cosmic consciousness. This ‘new’ life is then the natural life of the mystic. Artificial life created by the hypnotic devices or by any kind of psychism can never produce a Buddha or a Mahâvîra.

The Fourth Truth which is actually the Truth of the Way is generally summed up and elaborated in terms of the triad, Śîla (Moral and ethical Discipline). Samâdhi (contemplation) and Prajñâ (Wisdom). This moral discipline is commonly accepted by all the schools of Buddhism of all countries. The Śîla has ten items and is spoken of Daśa-Śîla. These forbid, (1) killing or any being (pânātipāta); (2) taking what is not given (adinnadāna); (3) indulgence in sexual desires, (4) misconduct (5) telling lies (musāvāda),

1. In fact many mystics openly abuse the philosophical speculations. Saha-jayâniists, among the Buddhists, are known for such a revolt against all passion for philosophy. Caitanya is credited to have said that it would be better to throw off the Śâstras. When Upâniṣads declared (Vide I Sa up.) that Vidyâ (Philosophical knowledge included) leads to greater darkness than the Avidyâ (Ignorance) they did realise he utter meaninglessness of the philosophical opinions. Śânkara also makes a similar sense when he says (though in his own framework of metaphysical commitment) that all epistemological knowledge leads to ignorance: avidyâvadviśayâni tâvad pratyâkṣâdîni pramânâni (Śânkaras Bhâṣya on Bādarâyana Śûtra).
(6) Slander (pisunavācā); (7) frivolous and senseless talk (samphappalāpa); (8) covetousness (abhijjhā) (9) malevolence (byāpada) and (10) wrong views (micchādiṭṭhiyā). The first four of these ten Silas, together with the abstinence from any state of indolence arising from the use of intoxicants (sura-meraya-majjapama-dathhana-vermaṇī), constitute what is known as ‘pañcasīla which is the minimal moral requirements¹ of Buddhism. Moreover, all Buddhists take the three Refuges in the Buddha, the Dharma and the Sangha, The monastic rules were minutely elaborated. The Theravāda prescribed 227 rules and the Mahāyāna 250 rules.² The first path of Sila is the fundamental basis to enter the second path of meditation. That the moral discipline is indispensable for the practice of meditation can be referred to from what are known as the four kinds of Pariśuddhi-sīla (morality of purification), namely, the Pātimokkha Samvara-sīla (restraint with regard to the monastic obligations), Indriya-Samvara-Śīla (restraint of the senses), ājiva-pariśuddhi-sīla (purity of means of livelihood) and paccaya-sannissita-sīla (morality in respect of the four monastic requisites). The rules of Vinaya are with slight difference in detail, common to all the schools and emphasise the ethical perfection as the invariable pre-requisite for embarking upon the spiritual journey to the path of meditation or Samādhi. The traditional definition of Samādhi is ‘cittas’ ekāggata or one-pointedness of the mind.

¹. Members of the Sangha are further enjoined to follow a discipline implying vows of chastity, frugality, humility and poverty which correspond to the vows of Christian monks.

². Buddhism does not only prescribe negations for moral discipline but also lays down the six pāramitās (perfections or virtues). These are the perfections of (1) giving (Dānapāramitā) (2) Morality (Śīla) (3) Patience (ksānti), (4) Vigour (Virya), (5) Meditation (dhyāna) and (6) Wisdom (Prajñā). Each of the six perfections has been dealt with at enormous length in extensive Mahāyāna literature. The extent of Prajñāpāramitā texts available in Mahāyāna seems to give a paramount emphasis to Prajñā. The Lankāvatāra sūtra speaks of three degrees in each perfection, viz., ordinary, extra-ordinary and superlative; when practised by ordinary people for the sake of worldly gains a perfection is said to be ordinary, when cultivated by the Hinayāṇists for the attainment of individual nirvāṇa, it is extra-ordinary but when developed by the Bodhisattvas not for their own nirvāṇa alone but for the sake of all it is superlative. Closely paralleling this is the distinction of mundane practice of a perfection and the Transcendental given in the Pancavinśatisāhasrikā.
Literally it means ‘firm fixation’ and can admit of a wide and diffuse connotation and is generally used in the sense of concentration of mind on a single object. Buddha has described it as follows in its sense of mindfulness and self-possession:

“And how, O king, is a monk endowed with mindfulness and self-possession? In this case a monk is self-possessed in advancing in withdrawing, in looking forward or looking around, in bending, or stretching his limbs, in wearing his inner and outer robes and bowl; in eating, drinking, masticating and tasting; in answering the calls of nature, in walking, standing, sitting, sleeping, waking, speaking, keeping silence. Thus, O King, is a monk endowed with mindfulness and self-possession.”

Buddhaghosa, in the II ch. of his work the Visuddhi Magga has given a very lucid and extensive information about the practice of meditation. He has collated from the Pali texts forty supports or divisions of meditation, under the term kammathaṁa which comprises the ten devices (kasīna) the ten Recollections (anusatti), the four sublime abodes (brahmavihāras) the four formless spheres (arupāyatana), perception of the loathsomeness of food and analysis of the four elements. The time and space at my disposal will not permit it to give any description of these. These, however, are essentially the elaborations of the four dhyānas described by the Buddha.¹

The first dhyāna emphasises reasoning, investigation, joy and concentration. In this the mystic “suffuses, pervades, fills and permeates his body with the pleasure (sukha) and joy (pītī) arising from seclusion, and there is nothing in all his body untouched by the pleasure and joy arising from seclusion.” In the second dhyāna there are “joy and pleasure arising from concentration and freedom from reasoning and investigation.” In the third the mystic experiences the pleasure that the noble ones call “dwelling with equanimity, mindful and happy.” The fourth dhyāna is “without pain and pleasure and with the purity of equanimity, mindfulness.” Some other texts

¹ Dighanikāya, I, 47. (tr. by Thomas in Early Buddhist Scriptures, p.
² Vide Early Buddhist Scriptures, pp. 63-64.
by reckoning the cessation of reason and cessation of investigation give a scheme of five dhyānas instead of four. The Jhāna in Prakrit is dhyāna in Sanskrit, Dzyan in Tibet ch’ an in chinese and Zen in Japan. It corresponds to the ‘Via Mystica of Christianity. It begins with the discipline of mind, body and senses and can be paralleled with ‘Via purgativa’. The fourth dhyāna, in which, as J. Evola has remarked, the body is not only pervaded but also covered by the new force, leads to states of development of liberating insight or the wisdom begins and the transcendental path (lokottara-magga) begins to bloom. It is thus ‘Via Illuminativa’ of Christianity.

Beyond the paths of ethical perfection (śīla) and meditation (samadhi) there is the path of Prajñā or Wisdom. It is through this wisdom that a Buddhist mystic realises the impermanence of all composite things (Sankhāra), that all composite things are sorrowful and that all things are egoless. And it is this realisation which leads to the disconcern from suffering. It is through Wisdom as D.T. Suzuki has explained, that the doctrine of non-ego, impermanence of things and a spirit of detachment are obtained. The wonder that Prajñā performs lies beyond the domain of psychology. It catches the ego, “not from outside but from within”; catches the actor in the midst of his action, he is not made to stop acting in order to be seen as actor. The actor is the acting, and the acting is the actor and of this unification or identification Prajñā is awakened (p. 40), Prajñā-institution is the same as Eickhart’s love “with which he (God) loves himself.” In it the opening of prajñā-eye which can see the world beyond the reach of psychology.

1. The Doctrine of Awakening, p. 196.
2. All composite things (sankhāra) are impermanent. When a man by wisdom realises (this), he needs not (this world) of sorrow, this is the path to purity. All composite things are sorrowful. When a man by wisdom realises (this) he needs not (this world of) Sorrow; this is the path to purity. All things (dhamma) are egoless when a man by wisdom realises (this) he needs not (this world of) sorrow; this is the path to purity.

Hinayāna Mystic and the ideal of Arhant

Śīla, Samādhi and Prajñā are thus the Pathways to Nirvāṇa. The last has been held as the path par excellence. The Hinayāna mystic passes through four stages. These are:

1. The stage of the Sotāpanna or one who has entered the stream.
2. The stage of the Sakyāgamin or of one who will return only once to this world.
3. The stage of the Anāgamin or of one who will not be reborn in the world.
4. The stage of the Arhat who is completely free from error, free from delusion and ignorance.

The Buddhists texts speak of the stage of Asekha i.e. a stage which lies beyond teaching and may perhaps be regarded a stage beyond that of the Arhat, but the transition from the latter to the former is natural. After the mahāparinirvāṇa of the Buddha a number of Buddhist communities came into existence, which differed in their understanding and interpretation of Buddha’s teachings. Different versions of scriptures followed. Sāriputrās version of Law, which was followed by the Theravādins and Sarvāstivadins was one of them. It held prajñā to be the highest of the five cardinal virtues, which are Faith, Vigour, Mindfulness, Meditation and Wisdom. According to this school of Sāriputra, which was later called Hinayāna, Wisdom can assure final salvation. Wisdom is used here in a special sense. It is “a kind of methodical contemplation based on the rules of the Abhidharma” (conze). It was to pursue this path of prajñā that the old school of Buddhism dedicated itself. The final goal was to attain Arhanthood which is thus described in the Dhammapada:

“To him who has finished the path and passed beyond sorrow, who has freed himself on all sides, and thrown away every fetter, there is no more fever of grief.” “For such there are no more births. Tranquil is the mind, tranquil the words and deeds of him who is thus tranquillised and made free by wisdom.” “They, having obtained the fruit of the fourth path, and immersed themselves, have received without price and are in the enjoyment of Nirvāṇa.”

1. Dhammapada, verses 90 and 98.
The above description of Arhant brings out two important characteristics of Nirvāṇa-experience: (1) The cessation of suffering through freedom from fetters and (2) The tranquility of mind. Nirvāṇa is extinction only in so far as it relates to the extinction of hoarded desires, extinction of the law of Karman, and the extinction of phenomenal existence.

Negative moment generates the freedom and leads to experience of perfect peace, bliss and perfect knowledge. The idea of jīvanmukti and Videhamukti is also to be found in the distinction between nibbāna and parinibbāna.

“When a Buddhist has become an Arhant, when he reached nirvāṇa, the fruit of the fourth path, he has extinguished upādāna and kleśa (error) but he is still alive.” It is the same as the state of Jīvanmukta.

When upadi, the skandhas, the body with all its power passes away. “There will then be nothing left to bring about the rise of a new set of Skandhas of a new individual and the Arhant will be no longer alive or existent in any sense at all, he will have reached parinibbāna, complete extinction or nir-upādiśeṣa nibbānahātu, extinction not only of Tānhā and of the fires of passion but also of the Upādi and the five skandhas”¹

The Avadāna Śataka (II.348) brings out the freedom from suffering through struggle and strain and attainment of super-knowledge and powers of an Arhant in a fuller description of an Arhant:

“He exerted himself, he strove and struggled and thus he realised that this circle of ‘Birth and death’ with its five constituents (Skandhas) is in constant flux. He rejected all the conditions of existence which are brought about by a compound of conditions since it is their nature to decay and crumble away, to change and to be destroyed. He abandoned all the defilement and won Arhantship. On becoming an Arhant he lost all his attachment with the ‘Triple world’ (i.e. the world of sense, desire, the world of form, the formless world.) Gold and clod of earth were to his mind the same. He remained cool (in danger) like the fragrant sandalwood

¹. Quoted from Fundamentals of Religion by Dr. N. Brahma, University of Calcutta, 1960.
to the axe which cuts it down. By his Gnosis he had torn the ‘eggshell’ of ignorance. He had obtained Gnosis, the superknowledge and the ‘powers of analytical Insight’. He became averse to worldly gains and honour, and he became worthy of being honoured, saluted and revered by the Devas, including Indra, Viṣṇu and Kṛṣṇa.”

**Mahāyāna Mystic and the ideal Bodhisattva**

The two words which occur almost on each page of the Mahāyāna literature are the words Bodhisattva and Śūnyatā. Literally Bodhisattva means an enlightenment-being. Early Buddhists, particularly the Sarvāstivādins, also conceived the idea of Bodhisattva. Abhidharma kośa (III, 94, II 191-2) has given a fine description of him. He was conceived to be a previous incarnation of the Buddha who took good of others as his own. However, it is only in Mahāyāna (also known as Bodhisattvayāna) that the conception of Bodhisattva becomes a valid ideal of the Buddhists. The concern of the Hinayānists was for individual’s perfection and his own Arhanthood. He followed the example of Bodhisattva, the previous incarnation of the Buddha, to win his own nirvāṇa as quickly as possible. This concern for the individual’s nirvāṇa was replaced by a new ideal of Bodhisattva, conceived not as a being anxiously working and awaiting for becoming Buddha, but as one who would wait until even the smallest creature had won the Summum bonnum of his life and would work for the welfare of all for the same ideal.

This ideal of Bodhisattva working for the freedom and good of all, and not merely striving to gain his own freedom, made the old ideal of Arhant, who achieved nirvāṇa for his own self and would be born no more, appear as rather selfish. A passage from the Prajñāpāramitā brings out this difference in the two ideals:

“How do the persons belonging to the Vehicle of the Disciples and Pratyekabuddha train themselves? They think, one single self we will tame, one single self we will pacify, one single self we will lead into nirvāṇa. Then they undertake exercises which bring about wholesome roots for the sake of taming themselves, pacifying themselves, nirvāṇising themsel-
ves; certainly, the Bodhisattva should not train himself like that. He should undertake exercises for bringing about roots wholesome with idea; Myself I will place in suchness and for the sake of helping all the world I will also place all beings in suchness; the immeasurable world of beings I will lead to nirvāṇa.¹

In Tibetan, Bodhisattva is translated as a Being with heroic mind. The hero does not abandon the fellows caught in suffering². The Hinayāna mysticism aimed at arhathood as the state of highest perfection and knowledge by an individual. It was individualistic quietism. Wisdom was taught here as the highest virtue, compassion was relegated to background or regarded as a subsidiary virtue. The ideal of Bodhisattva in Mahāyāna mysticism integrated the ideals of compassion and wisdom. This Bodhisattva had no concern for kingship of world, for heaven, salvation or glory, his simple concern is the suffering people. He suffered many hardships and remained ever prepared to sacrifice his life for the good of others. He undergoes all privations, hardships and troubles for the sake of others and declares:

"This effort of mine is not for attaining better existence nor for monarch's unrivalled imperial status, nor for unalloyed exalted, pleasures nor for spiritual glory or the happiness of liberation."³

The Bodhisattva does not only set himself free, he devises to make all others free. As Prajñāpāramitā puts it:

"Doers of what is hard are the Bodhisattvas, the great beings who have set out to win supreme enlightenment. They don't wish to attain their own private nirvāṇa. On the contrary, they have surveyed the highly painful world of being and yet desirous to win supreme enlightenment, they don't trouble at birth and death. They have set out for the benefit of the world, for the ease of the world, out of pity for the world. They have resolved: We will become a place of rest, the final relief of the world, a refuge for the world, the

1. Aṣṭasāhasrikā xi, 234-35. Quoted by Conze.
2. The heroic nature of the Bodhisattva is finely woven into the texture of Jātaka-tales.
world’s place of rest, the final relief of the world, islands of
the world, lights of the world, leaders of the world, the world
meaning of salvation.”

As contrasted with ethico-religious rigourism and quietistic
and individualistic mysticism of Hīnayāna which Asaṅga
characterises narrow in its aim of self-liberation, narrow
teachings to realise that aim, narrow method applied for
this realisation, insufficiency of equipment and the shortness
of time within which final liberation is guaranteed the
Bodhisattvayāna preferred attainment of perfect knowledge
as associated with Karuṇā. Bodhisattvahood means the at-
tainment of the Bodhimind which is defined as unified stat
of śūnyatā and universal compassion. Integral function of
unity of the philosophical truth or wisdom (Śūnyatā or prajñā)
and universal welfare is what we must understand from the
Buddhicitta.

Thus Bodhisattva is a heroic being full of knowledge and
compassion. For him then Saṁsāra and nirvāṇa cannot be
different. It is the doctrine of Karuṇā which is a key to the
understanding of the classic statement of Nāgārjuna that there
is not even the slightest difference between saṁsāra and nirvāṇa.
The quietist Hinayāna mysticism now enters the phase of
activistic mysticism in its second phase of Mahāyāna. The
mysticism of knowledge and understanding is combined with
the mysticism, of love for the fellow human-beings of the
world which then cannot be conceived different from the
nirvāṇa, the mystic ideal.

Another noteworthy feature of Mahāyāna is its con-
ception of the three bodies of the Buddha. The Buddha
is according to this concept, not a particular historical
personage, he is but the ultimate principle as the totality of
thought and beings in an unconditioned state of all-existence.
This principle has three aspects or bodies. viz., Dharmakāya
(primordial body or thatness of all existence), the Sam-
bhogakāya or the body of bliss and the Nirmāṇakāya (i.e. the
body of transformation).

1. Quoted in Buddhism by Conze, p. 128.
3. Śūnyatākaruṇābhinnam bodhicittamiti smṛtam. Śrīguhyasaṁāja-
tantra (G.O.S.I., p. 159).
With universal freedom as their ideal the Mahāyānists made their religion catholic enough to make it acceptable to even ordinary person. It was in this stage of Buddhism the popular religious beliefs and practices began to be incorporated that a new school developed which introduced Mantra-elements, like the Dhārīnīs, into the province of this religion. The Tattva-ratnāvali, in fact, divided Mahāyāna into two schools, viz., Pāramitānaya, or the discipline of Supreme Virtue and Mantra-naya which introduced all sorts of esoteric principles and practices in Buddhism. The Mantranaya was the precursor of Tāntric Buddhism which was mainly divided into three vehicles, viz., Vajrayāna, Kālacakrayāna and Sahajayāna. Belief in the efficacy of the mantra, etc. had existed even in the times of Buddha himself,¹ and Tāntric ideas of sexoyogic practice leading to blissful union were present in the sūtrā-laṅkāra itself. Belief in mysterious power of Mantra, worship of the Stūpa, reverence for the mystic Bodhimaṇḍala, or the Circle round the holy tree beneath which Buddha had attained his bodhi, were handed down from earlier traditions.² They paved the way for the vigorous propagation of the Mantra, Mudrā (posture & gestures) and Maṇḍala (Mystic diagram) by Tāntric Buddhism. Once the portals of Buddhism were flung open to esoteric elements the beliefs in gods, demi-gods, demons and ghosts, magic, charm and sorcery followed. To these again were added elements of yoga—Haṭhayoga, laya-yoga, mantra-yoga and Rājayoga. In the earlier phase of Tāntrism the emphasis was laid on Mantra, Mudrā, Maṇḍala and Abhiśekā but later on the sexo-yogic practice was held as the most important for the attainment of supreme bliss. It was through the enjoyment of the five objects of desire (Pancakāma-guṇa) and of the five accessories beginning with the syllable ‘m’ (Pañcamakāras), namely madya, Māṃsa; matysa, mudrā and Maithuna that the perfection is said to be achieved.

¹. Tattvaratnāvali in Ādyavajraśaṅgraha, p. 21.

See also An Introduction to Buddhist Esoterism by Dr. B. Bhattacharya, p. 48 and Introduction to Sādhanamālā (Vol.II) by Dr. Bhattacharya, pp. xvi-xvii.

². For occasional references to Tāntric practices including the sex-element see Dīgha-nikāya, Brahmajāla-sutta; Kathāvatthu, xvii, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, XXIII.2., Majjhimanikāya., Pali Text Society’s ed. I p. 305.
This erotic mysticism is known as Vajrayāna or the Adamantine way. It is generally divided into four classes. The first two namely kriyātantra and caryātantra are considered lower as they are concerned with rites and ceremonial worship of Gods, etc. and the last two, viz., Yoga-tantra and Anuttaratantra are considered higher inasmuch as they describe Yogic processes for the consideration and realisation of the ultimate truth.¹

Another School of Tantra, which is not considered independent from Vajrayāna by Dr. S.B. Dasgupta is known as Kālacakrayāna. It lays emphasis on the control of vital winds and results attained thereby. According to this school the universe with all its objects and localities is situated in the body and time in all its divisions is within the body in the processes of vital wind. The stress on body-centred yoga seems to be a special feature of Kālacakrayāna. Abhinavagupta in his Tantrāloka (Ch.III) has similarly explained the functioning of time within the body with reference to vital winds and the process of controlling time through the control of vital wind through yogic practices.

Buddhist Tantrism appears to have transformed the philosophical concepts of Mahāyāna. Thus Śūnyatā is spoken of as Vajra—firm, substantial, indivisible, impenetrable, incapable of being burnt and imperishable. The transformation of Śūnyatā into Vajra explained how all the Gods, articles for worship, yogic practices, rites and rituals were regarded of Vajra nature. The supreme deity of this Yāna is Vajrasattva which resembles the pure consciousness of the Vijñānavādin and the Brahman of Vedānta² The Mahāyānic idea of Bodhicitta as attainment of perfect wisdom combined with universal compassion was identified in Vajrayāna, more particularly in Sahajayāna with Prajñā and Upāya conceived as female and male respectively. Bodhicitta is thus a state produced through the union of passive female principle of Prajñā with active male principle of Upāya. The doctrine of Śūnyatā through its equation with Prajñā (feminine gender) was

1. Cf. division of Vaiṣṇavatantra into jñānapāda, yogapāda, kriyāpāda, and caryāpāda (found in the Padmatantra).
rendered female and the doctrine of Karuṇā which was a
dynamic principle for universal salvation was transformed into
male through its equation with Upāya (ms. gender).
Thus the union of Śūnyatā and Karuṇā or Prajñā and
Upāya was translated into the mystic union of female and male
through sexo-yogic practice.

This union known as Yoganaddha or non-dualism
(advaya) is described in terms of copulation or conjugal union
in Buddhist, Śaiva & Sākta Tantras. It results in great bliss
(Mahāsukha). There have always been two opinions on the
nature of Nirvāṇa being a negative or positive state. Some
passages in Pali texts do describe it as a state of infinite bliss¹.
Vijñānavādin also described it as "the Immutable element
which is beyond the reach of all mentation, it is all good, per-
manent, perfect bliss —it is liberation, the substance itself:"
². However, Buddhist Tantrism is very positive about the posi-
tively blissful state of nirvāṇa which it calls Mahāsukha. It is
described as Satata-Sukhamaya or eternally blissful, the place of
both enjoyment and liberation, changeless, supreme bliss, the
seed of all substance (Vastu).³

To conclude Buddhist mysticism aims at nirvāṇa, the
Enlightenment-experience through ethico-moral discipline of
mind, body and senses (as understood by the way of śīla),
through elaborate process of meditation (Samādhi) and finally
through the insight into the nature of Reality (Prajñā). A
Hinayāna mystic attains the individual nirvāṇa and a Mahā-
yānist is busy working out the salvation of others. The good
of the world is his own Summum bonum. The world and nirvāṇa
are not different.

The Hinayānist is only a step behind the Mahāyāna
mystic. While the former stops when he has realised his own

1. Milinda-pañha, ed. Trenckner, pp. 315-26. See also A Dictionary
   of Pa li Language under the word nibbāṇa. Other references (i)
   Suttani pāta, 933, (ii) Anguttara. IV, 239, (iii) Vimananavatthu, 51, (iv)
4. Bodhisattvabhūmi (edited by Dr. Nalinaksha Datta) describes the
   Sixteen Bhūmis or grounds. Out of these fifteen are common for all
   Buddhists, only the Bodhisattva-bhūmi expounding the ideal of
   universal freedom through compassion is exclusive to a Bodhisattva.
nirvāṇa, the Mahāyānist goes a step further to lead the world to the highest goal of human life—freedom from suffering and peace of mind.

Individual's freedom and peace is the goal of Hīnayāna mysticism, the goal of Mahāyāna is universal freedom and universal peace. The path leading to this is common:

The threefold paths of Śīla, Samādhi & Prajñā.
XI

Jinendrabuddhi's Contribution To
Sanskrit Grammar

Dr. Satya Vrat

The growth of the Sanskrit literature owes not a little
to the efforts of the Buddhists. Sanskrit grammar is no excep-
tion. We can easily identify here three prominent Buddhists,
Jinendrabuddhi, the author of the well known gloss on the
Kāśikā, the Kāśikāvivaraṇapaṇḍjikā or more popularly the Nyāsa,
Śaraṇadeva, the author of the explanatory comment on the
difficult (durghaṭa) sūtras of Pāṇini, the Durghaṭāvṛtti, and
Puruṣottamadeva the author of the commentary on only the
laukika sūtras of the Aṣṭādhyāyī, the Bhāṣāvṛtti. Of all these three
it is Jinendrabuddhi whose contribution to Sanskrit grammar
is most solid. His magnum opus, the Nyāsa, has won him well-
deserved laurels. It has been frequently and profusely quoted
in subsequent grammatical literature. The celebrated poet
Māgha has hallowed its memory by a reference to it in his
Mahākāvyā :

anutsūtrapadanyāsā sadviṣṭtih sannibandhanā
śabdavidyeva no bhāti Rājanītir apaspaśā.¹

Even the other commentator of the Kāśikā, Haradatta
Miśra, whose own contribution to Sanskrit grammar is not
negligible and who has written a more voluminous gloss on
the Kāśikā than even the Paṇijikā, relies heavily on his predece-
ssor (Jinendrabuddhi), paragraphs after paragraphs from
whose work can easily be identified to have been taken and
woven into his text by him with minor verbal changes here
and there. Such being the place of Jinendrabuddhi in Sans-
krit grammatical literature it would be worthwhile to discuss
his contribution to Sanskrit grammatical studies.

For one thing the Nyāsa does not happily confine itself
to the explanation of the cryptic Kāśikā. It goes further. It

¹. Śīlapālavadha, II. 112.
explains the śūtras and discusses points debated in the Mahābhāṣya adding at places whatever is left out there. Occasionally it raises points which have not been raised even in the Mahābhāṣya. It is instances such as these which mark out the Nyāsakāra from an ordinary commentator of the Kāśikā to an independent thinker on Sanskrit grammar. The present paper is an attempt to pinpoint a couple of these instances.¹

Under the śūtra ‘tad adhīte tad veda’ (4.2.59) the Nyāsakāra raises an interesting discussion with regard to the repetition of tad in the śūtra. The Kāśikākāra had pointed out that the purpose of this repetition (of tad) was to enjoin the taddhita suffix in either of the two senses of ‘to learn’ and ‘to know’. The Nyāsakāra points out that this cannot stand. Just as in the śūtra ‘tena divyati khanati jayati jītam’ (4.4.2) it is not the interpretation that the one tena should be construed with all the four senses simultaneously, similarly in the present instance too it is not necessary that tad be construed with the two senses simultaneously which means that a word in the accusative will come to have the Taddhita suffix in each of the senses of ‘one who learns’ and ‘one who knows.’ The Nyāsakāra’s explanation here is that the tad has been repeated for the sake of the following śūtra: ‘kratukthādibhyasā ṭhak’ (4.2.60) and ‘vasantādibhyasā ṭhak’ (4.2.63) where kratu and vasanta signifying action and season respectively would have no connection with learning and would therefore have to be understood to be in the sense of ‘learning a text connected with them’ (tatasahacarite granthe syāt). The idea of learning in such cases would be secondary. Now according to the maxim: Out of the primary and the secondary the rule would apply only in the primary (gaunamukhyayor mukhye kāryasampratvayah) the Taddhita suffix enjoined by the above mentioned śūtras would apply in the primary sense of ‘one who knows’ only and not in the secondary one of ‘one who learns.’ The repetition of tad in the present śūtra (which otherwise, as shown above is redundant) would enjoin the Taddhita suffix (ṭhak) in the sense of ‘one who learns’ too. That can well be the explanation for the repetition of tad in the śūtra ‘tad adhīte tad veda.’

¹. It owes inspiration to a valuable suggestion by my esteemed friend Professor R.C. Pandeya.
Under the sūtra ‘śi sarvanāmasthānam’ (1.1.42) Jinendrabuddhi gives us the interesting information that the big term sarvanāmasthāna had been in use among the earlier grammarians without any justification for its length. Pāṇini has adopted it in his grammar just to show the defectiveness of the earlier grammars and to avoid the charge on his grammar of being just a duplication of these (earlier grammars). It is only by pointing out the defects in earlier grammars that he could justify the writing of a new grammar.

Under the sūtra ‘mid aco’ntyāt paraḥ’ (1.1.47) Jinendrabuddhi raises the point that antyāt in the sūtra remains unqualified which would mean that a mit can come after anything in the end. There is no second ac in the sūtra which may qualify it. To this his reply is that it is a usual practice to understand the second thing to be of the same variety when it is distinguished from the first. When it is said that among the cows the dark one yields better milk it is clear that the dark one too is a cow, not a goat nor a mare. Similarly in the present instance when it is said that among the vowels the mit would come after the last one the implication is clear: the mit would come after the last vowel only.

Under this very sūtra Jinendrabuddhi gives us a technical term in use among the older grammarians, anusāṅga for penultimate n : nakāraṣṭropadhāyā anusāṅga iti pūrvācāryaiḥ sanjñā kṛtā. The references to older terms such as the present one have obviously their own value for tracing the history and evolution of Sanskrit grammatical terminological.

Under the sūtra ‘aco’ntyādī ṭi’ (1.1.64) Jinendrabuddhi raises the point that the very compound antyādī is indefensible as there is no sāmarthyā in it for the one component of it, antya, is connected in sense with acaḥ outside the compound. Jinendrabuddhi’s explanation here is that antya being a word indicative of relationship (sambandhiśabda) can well be compounded with another word though it may be connected in sense with a word outside the compound. The practice with regard to the words of relationship is that they requiring invariably as they do, another word for the completion of their sense (nitya sāpekṣa) can well be compounded with another word; they even implying the idea of the word outside the compound: sambandhiśabdānāṁ nityasāpekṣatvena gamakatvāt sāpekṣatveḥpi samāso bhavati.
Under the sūtra ‘tasmād ity uttarasya’ (1.1.67) Jinendrabuddhi raises a point: Why should iti here have been used when we could easily have its anuvṛtti from the preceding one ‘tasminn iti nirdiṣṭe pūrvasya’ (1.1.66)? To this the reply is that iti is here has the sense of ‘in this way’. It is used for the purpose of indicating that just as iti has its anuvṛtti into this sūtra in the same way nirdiṣṭa too has its anuvṛtti here. There is yet another explanation for it (anyas tv āha) which however is not acceptable to Jinendrabuddhi. The explanation is: The word iti is used here for the purpose of avoiding the dependence of the delimited (avadhimat) on the limit (avadhi) from which would follow the conclusion that the kārya (process) would take place to the one which immediately follows the limit which in the present instance is the word in the ablative case as mentioned in the sūtra and not to the one which may follow that word. This indication according to this contention is necessary for in the absence of it the delimited (avadhimat) would remain unspecified; the sense of the sūtra being that ‘one which follows the word in the ablative in the sūtra’, not necessarily follows immediately, just follows. In that case it may well come after the word which follows the word in the ablative in the sūtra. With the dependence of the delimited (avadhimat) on the limit (avadhi) such a possibility would be obviated. And it is precisely for obviating such a possibility that we have iti in this sūtra. This view, as said earlier, is not acceptable to Nyāsakāra. According to him the popular convention (lokataḥ) would correlate the limit and the delimited. In the popular expression tasmāc chāṭrād uttaro bhajyatāṃ it is a pupil immediately following (avadhimat) a particular one (avadhi) who is served meals and not the one following him. In the present instance too, says he, even without iti the correlation of the delimited and the limit would be possible to be understood. Hence there is little justification for the use of it (iti) in this sūtra. Nor does the Nyāsakāra subscribe to the view that iti is in this sūtra for the purpose of avoiding tasmāt to be taken as such (svaṇpakahananirāsārthaḥ) for he says there is no such case where tasmāt occurs in the sūtra and kārya is required to be enjoined to uttara, the following one (svaṇpābhāvāt). Even in ‘tasmāc chaso nāḥ purṃsi’ (6.1.103) where tasmāt actually occurs (svaṇpātah prayuṣyate) there is no possi-
bility of śas ever occurring before pūrvasavarnaḍīrgha. Hence no justification for iti for svarūppagrahaṇanirāsa. It has justification as said earlier, if it means 'in this way' and indicates the carrying forward (anuvṛtti) of mirdiṣte from the preceding sūtra in the same way as there is the carrying forward (anuvṛtti) of iti from it.
The Qualities Of An Ācārya On The Basis Of The Ācāryakriyasamuccaya Of Jagaddarpana

N. S. Shukla

The Buddhist tantric works attach a paramount importance to the proper instruction of the rituals to the followers, and in this context the position of a teacher or a guru well-versed in the teaching of these rites, becomes all the more important. The Hevajra tantra gives him not less than three names, viz., guru, ācārya and śāstr, whose responsibility is to find out the right means for his pupil of the tantric rites. These great teachers had to be conversant with several tantras at a time, and "it was the rule for them to teach those they were training in accordance with their propensities."

In this very tantra it is further established that "in the realization of the perfect truth there is neither wisdom nor means. By no other may it be told and from no one may it be received. It is known intuitively as a result of merit and of honouring one's guru and the set observances."

A tantric work, probably of a later date: the ĀCĀRTAKRĪTYA—SAMUCCAYA of JAGADDARPAŅA, reveals us a source of new indications and numerous precisions on this subject.

The Bibliothèque nationale of Paris possesses in its precious collection two manuscripts of the Ācāryakriyasamuccaya, the first in Nepali characters, Fonds sanscrit n° 15 (Ms. A), and the other in Devanāgarī characters, Fonds sanskrit n°303 (Ms. B).

We have worked on the manuscript in Nepali characters, utilising, in the case of necessity, the second for the verifications and the corrections.

These manuscripts were brought from Nepal in 1833, and, before they were given to the Bibliothèque nationale, belonged to the Hodgson-Burnouf Collection.

The manuscript A, on which is mainly based our text presented in the following pages, represents an ensemble of 162 folios written recto-verso, except the recto of the first folio, and is numbered on the left-hand side of the verso.

The name of the author, Jagaddarpana, is given in the colophons and also at the end of certain sections.

The Acaryakriyasamuccaya contains several details of the Buddhist tantric rites. The passage which interests us, is found in the beginning of the first section entitled Acarya-lakshaṇa-vidhi, and begins on the folio 1b and ends on the folio 3b.

During the course of transcription, we came across the difficulties of reading which are usually put forth by the modern Nepali manuscripts; viz., confusion of letters, particularly between the 'ba' and 'va'; 'na' and 'ra', the palatal 'śa' and the nasal cerebral 'ṇa', etc. Some other mistakes of the copyist: use of small vowels for the long ones and vice-versa, the employment of the guttural nasal for the anusvāra, displacement of the stop danḍas, some part of the phrase copied twice, etc.,—have also come to our notice.

In several cases, it has been possible to establish the text by comparing it with the manuscript in Devanāgarī characters; sometimes, it is the context which only permitted us to establish a doubtful term.

The Acaryakriyasamuccaya defines in eloquent terms the qualities of an acārya. One who shows the path of conduct of this world and of the next, is the acārya: laukikalokottarācāram darśayatiyācāryaḥ. One who takes away from the unrighteous practices, is not affected by any gain or loss, fame or disfame, censure or compliment, whose intellect has been augmented by his passive attitude towards pleasure and pain, he who takes interest in the mantras, is possessed of courage, skill and compassion, is bereft of jealousy and desires, knows the essence of the things of the world, has attained eminence and finally, he who is full of intellect, is the acārya. Quoting the authority of the Samvarāṇava tantra, Jagaddarpana mentions that the acārya is of three types: the house-holder (grhaṭha), the
śrāmaṇera (the follower of the Hinayāna) and the bhikṣu (the real tantric teacher). The best teacher is the bhikṣu, the middling type is the śrāmaṇera and the most inferior is the householder. The house-holder is initiated into the five abhiṣekas¹ and hence he is the most inferior. The śrāmaṇera is given training in the “ten-fold Course”² and thus, he is of the middling type. The bhikṣu obtains the abhiṣeka first and he holds the vajra and therefore, he is the most superior. If a teacher, endowed with the qualities mentioned above, is available then he is the fittest person to receive all reverence. Such a bhikṣu teacher is revered even by the Buddhas. Taking into consideration the qualities of a tantric teacher, more stress is laid on his knowledge of the mantras. The Paramārthasevā tantra establishes that a good bhikṣu is ten times more in quality than his ordinary brethren, a good teacher of the mantras is also ten times more in quality than a bhikṣu, by his superiority of chastity, meditation, friendliness and the ability of establishing the real essence of the things of the world.³ One who is free from all the afflictions of the world, can only proceed on the tantric path unhindered by the evils. In support of this statement, our author quotes from different authorities like the Paramārthasevā tantra, the Sugatakarmajñāpaka tantra, the Vairocanātisambodhitattva, the Paramādyamahāyoga tantra, the Sarvatathāga-tapatiṣṭhāmahāyoga tantra and the Hevajrodhavakurukullakalpa, and finally brings home the point that a recluse or a samnyāsin has no right to obtain initiation in the tantric rites. The real teacher is he, who, apart from other qualities, does not live like a monk, doesn’t shave his head and puts on good clothes and beautiful ornaments. Amongst other qualities of a teacher are counted his knowledge about the purificatory rites, his kind disposition, forbearing attitude, pleasing humour, maintenance of all the ācāras, insight in the art of architecture and in the science of the mantras, skill as a profound astronomer knowing all the beneficial moments and prosperous constellations.

¹. These are the five daily observances, viz., the Brahma yajña, the Deva yajña, the Bhūta yajña, the Piṭṭ yajña, and the Manuṣya yajña; Vide, Śat. Br. XI.5.6.1; Tait. Ār. II.10; Āśv.gr.III.1.1-4.
². This is the teaching of the ten sikhṣāpadas: Khuddakapāṭha, Sutta II.
³. The verse is quoted in the body of the text presented by us.
and his capability to select an auspicious plot for the construction of a stūpa and for the installation of the idol of the Buddha. While selecting the teacher of the tantric rites, those who are old, degenerated from the path of proper conduct, possess a harsh voice like a crow, who speak with a nasal accent, are emaciated, are of mottled skin, possess a fiery temperament, are wicked, lead an evil profession, remain ailing, know little, subsist on the income of the temples, suffer from elephantiasis, do not possess clear speech, are deaf, obese, have rough nails and coarse hair, work as actors, are mere argumentators, act as physicians, servants and farmers, have protruding teeth, have a goitre—such persons should always be avoided. The Buddhas installed by such teachers are never propitious and they bring destruction to wealth, life and sons. They bring evil to the ruling King and to one who constructs or one who gets the stūpa erected. Such teachers can be employed only in the evil acts.

This is in a nutshell the exposition of the qualities of an ācārya. The main purpose of presenting this text to the readers is to attract their attention to this repository of the tantric rites which has a strong raison d’être in the vast literature of the Buddhist tantras. If there is any lacuna left in the correct presentation of our text, we hope to make it good by comparing this text with its Tibetan translation found in Tandjou, Rgyud, LXXXIII, 77 and entitled as Vajrācāryakriyāsamuccaya.
[ fal 1 b ] प्रतिष्ठादिकिया: सर्वा
वचाचार्य पुनः (ऍ:)सरः।
तत्समालोकहितार्थायि
तस्य लक्षणमुच्यते ॥
तत्तत्वो तावद्विजा (चा) वैःलक्षणमाह। लोकिकलोकोतराचारं दर्शयतीत्याचार्यः। अथवा, आरातु दुरं पापकेम्यः ३ धर्मम्यस्वचर्ततीत्याचार्यः। नैस्वतेन विचिना सावनीयम्। यदा "वज्रामर्गदेशक आचार्यः" (आचार्यों) वचाचार्यः" इति।
वच्चाहन्बविषेषणं विवचारभूतं प्रतिपादते। स च कथोऽमूलः—
लाभ (भा) लाभवशोवशोविदित्वो सिद्धाश्रयो संस्कृतिः सिद्धाश्रयो संस्कृतिः
काश्यकुलमन्त्रनीतिसिद्धं निन्द्वमसंस्कृतिः
साधनवा लद्ध (लब्ध) प्रतिष्ठा ५ मतिमानाचार्य राजाः सदा ॥
स चोतमारिषेदेन श्रविषो भवति। तद्यथा—
आचार्यस्वचर्तत्वन्ते यथोक्तं सम्बरारः
गृहस्य: भामण्य (भामणे-) राज्यो निम्नक्षुचिति (०चिति) श्रविषा
भवेत् ॥
उत्तमो निम्नुराचार्यो वस्माद्वृत्तं तथागते।
संध्यम्: भामणराज्यो २ गृहस्यस्यथमो मतः ॥
शोकः: पशुविषय: भातो गृहस्यस्यथमो मतः।
प्रात्ववामिकिशोः हि भामणरस्तु संध्यम्।
अप्रामिकिशोः (०-लब्धो) हि निम्नुराचार्यो वस्यधूक् ॥

1. Ms. B पुर॰
2. Ms. B चायर्
3. Ms. B वापकेम्यः
4. Ms. B आचार्यः
5. Ms. B बलवान् प्रतिष्ठा
6. Ms. B भामणेष्यो
7. Ms. B लब्धो
पवजलाहायप्रारो दस्तानायपेणुः।
कोटितालाहायप्रारो न ते हुलास्यः स्मृताः।।
कोटिचि (२३) क्षत्रियः पूर्वाचार्यालोकां युगन्धरसामाकेरस्मातः।
उत्पन्ने बिहानानी(नेः)तु नारायण्या अन्यायप्रसन्नः।।
सत्सु त्रिवेण्यकेशेशु गृहपतः पूज्यते ८ यदा।
तवा बुद्धभर धर्मस्तं धर्मस्तं गच्छत्यागोरस्म्।।ईति।।
अतएव बुद्धावेदिनामि पूज्योऽसोः।।१० तदुक्तः—
अभियेतानालयः ११ हि बच्चाचार्यस्तथागतः।।
देवालिकाकस्तुः ब्रिकालमः १२ बंबर्ते।।ईति।।
यस्माद्यापितेयालक्ष्यस्तमालाशिक्षुः।।उक्तं परमार्थसेवायाम्—
स ख्रातुः १४ देवालिकाव्यूः सुभिक्षुः
भिक्षोविशाविभिक्षुः सुभिक्षुः।
भौताचर्यं समाचिना च
संयादिनातस्वमुनित्वेये॥
भौताचर्यंमिति।
भौताचारी युवतिप्रसंगी १५
तायां न वायस्य स्वरागतत्वः।।
विशेर्मोक्ता १६ विशेर्मोक्ता
न वायमोक्ता १७ भवति प्रसिद्धः।।
तस्मात्ममामाये अपापितेयालयः भिक्षुरविभिवे।।यतं प्रजोपायोगोन
गुरुपदेशत आन्तविद्येशमेवादयं परमार्थस्मिष्ठः।।१८ अतएव

8. Ms. A पूज्येऽते
9. Ms. A धर्मसंघो
10. Ms. A पूज्येऽसी
11. Ms. A "लिङ्गो; Ms. B "लिङ्गो
12. Ms. A O "घंस्तु (त) वागते।।
13. Ms. A ट्रिकालमेयो; Ms. B ट्रिकालम
14. Ms. A स सारः; Ms. B स ख्रातु
15. Ms. A "प्रसंग
16. Ms. A और B "भाक्ता
17. Ms. A और B "भोक्त्यो
18. Ms. A और B परेमायः
महामाते पञ्चविशो भिषु: पठवते। संजा भिषु: । भिक्षणशीलो भिषु: । भिन्नपत्तविशर्वादिभिषु:। शर्मोऽधिभिषु:। त्वय: च चुष्टार्थोपसम्पादितो भिषु:। भिक्षकलेशो भिन्नुद्देशीति। अत एवोक भगवता—“भिषु: वचन युगातु दुष्टगतनति तपस्” इति। भिन्नपत्त एव परं दुष्टगतनतिं यथो सत्त्व नाशस्ति। ये तु शर्मोऽधिभिषु: सम्पादिता भिन्नुद्देशीति श्रवजीवान्निषिद्धवचन:। तेषामाप्याविकारात् नाशस्ति। कुद्र: श्रवजीवान्निषिद्धवचन:। भिन्नुद्देशीति। अत एवोक मुितमकम्यम्यके । तस्मात् सत्त्व हस्तितमहाप्रूण्याभिरूहैं युक्ता:। यत: श्रवजीवान्निषिद्धवचन:। स्तवविचित्रतमामिदित्वम्। 

भिषुभाप्य स्वम्या ये । ये । तकं रत्ना:। न नराः।।

बुद्धभाप्य स्वम्या ये । तेषाम तत्षां न देशवेत् ।।

19. Ms. A पत्तारो
20. Ms. A भिषु: ।
21. Ms. A नार्तमः
22. Ms. B तत्पर्मिति
23. Ms. A नाधु
24. Ms. A “शर्माः”
25. Ms. A सुकिरम:; Ms. B सुकिरमेलापके
26. Ms. B “सुनु”
27. Ms. A and B युक्ता:।
28. Ms. A आसमः
29. Ms. A दोतः
30. Ms. B तत्त्व ज्ञाने
31. Ms. A “शानो”
32. Ms. B संजिनः
33. Ms. B “कारिण न”
34. Ms. A अङ्ग
35. Ms. A अङ्गोऽ पार्वता
36. Ms. A तक्ष रेता; Ms. B तक्षरता
वैरोचनानि
सम्बोधिततरसे च—
उपायरहितः नानां शिशा चापि स्थि वेदिता।
शाखानां महाबीर अवताराय तेषु बै।

परमाद्यहयोगस्त्रेः च—
कुष्ठर्नियमस्तैति॥

मूर्ति: श्रृण्यतः कुष्ठिता।
कुष्ठाधिशिष्यते चित्त।
क्षेपात्सिद्धिर्या॥

परमाःसेवायामपि—
न श्रीगुषुः रक्तपटावृताज्ञो
न श्रीगुषुः भिक्षुणिपात्रहस्तः।

न श्रीगुषुः कुष्ठवायुशुकली
न श्रीगुषुः पावपमुलवासी॥

इत्यादि विष्टरः। अन्तत्राप्यततः—"नासित सन्यासिनिः दीक्षाय मधिकारः।"
तत्कि सर्वविद्व नासित भिक्षोरिचिकारः। नास्त्यनेन कारणे।
"महानां सत्त्वर्यः पश्यन् यथा भवन्ता श्रीशाक्यमूः निना ज्ञानविशेषः मन्त्रयन्त्राः भविता
तथा भिक्षोरिपि शीलवर्य चौष्ट्रितिनः सर्वधममालोभििनस्य काययां
परित्यागुद्वापारणातिक चारयिल्वा च यथा परिपाद्य तथा प्राप्ताः यादुक्ताः
सुनितसिद्धियाः विश्वायुश्रित्वात् विश्वात: यथा परिपाठ: करणः।
तत्कि गौरीयवर्मन श्रीः न सर्वधामः। न, उत्तरोत्तरविश्वात:।
यथा उपासकः। आमणे: कियते आमणे: भिक्षुस्वति। तस्य किं भिक्षुमावे।

37. Ms. A "नासितः।
38. Ms. B "रहितः।
39. Ms. A "श्रृण्यतः।
40. Ms. A "शिक्षिका नारायावरी महस्तः; Ms. B "शिक्षिकरिः।
41. Ms. A "दीक्षा:; Ms. B "दीक्षा:"।
42. Mss. "त्येनेनाकारणेऽ
43. Ms. A Ink spilled on the letters: क्य मु
44. Ms. A "दकातिष्ठकादिनाभिविच्य; Ms. B "भिविच्य
45. Ms. A "इक्षुमथः।
46. Ms. A "भवेत स्यः।
47. Mss. "उपासकः।
48. Ms. A "आमणे:।"
सति उपासकादि। सम्बराकावो भवेत्?
अतो यथेऽव न स्याच्छः। वैतरागुल्मपहाय।
परस्माः गारादिसंसमन्वान् चक्करपुल्लभिंदित्तम रागणेव रागः।
प्रवाहानाय समा मन्त्रनयचयः दशितेषु भवतो वचनसंगतं स्यात्।
अतो भिक्षुपुप्पेन।
वच्चण्डात्तारणमवस्तं कतः परमभारागः।
नावः भिक्षुपुप्ता च वीतरागुख्युत्स्वल्येवनेन कारणेन।
अत एवोकन्न मन्त्रता सर्वथा-गतप्रलिष्ठा (3a) महायोगतुः।

अष्टाङ्गूलारिकेशाच्छ वस्त्राभरणमभिचतम्।
कुला वच्चापर: कायों भिक्षो।
वर्णन सति॥

अत्यथा नियमो नासीत्यादि। यद्य वैतरागुल्मपहेन वारशाणिकास्तां हि भवाण्शक-मर्यमेव विंचत रूपिनिर्माणश्रेण दर्शयति। अपि (च) हेवेयोवः मन्त्रकुक्लल्लाकल्ये चीतामुः।
“विक्षमसम्तवं विश्वामलिङ्गम च न कुर्याकोशः।
गुंरण मून्द्रा-सिद्धिविनाशिनम्।”
इति।
तस्मात्त तत्त्ववृहुप्पेन मन्त्रनयचयाः वृण्वुट्टा भवन्ति, न तैः शास्त्रकादिचयः
सुरक्तितः, न च मन्त्रनयचयां भवन्ति।
अत एव ते उपमसंवरम्यां शातु गुणपुरसुरसमस्तस्व-ब्रह्म
केवलमित्रियलोकायः।
विषयसुखतृणाया खान।
पाणादिकं कुला निरयगाभिनो भवन्ति।
तथा च—

बति यस्तु समासितः सम्यक्तो परिलक्षित इ।
स शीर्षमण॥

49. Mss. उपासकादिः
50. Mss. स्या ताहि
51. Ms. A "महाय
52. Ms. A रोग
53. Ms. A "हुपेम
54. Ms. A परमभाराग
55. Ms. "यमनेनामांकारेण
56. Ms. A मन्त्रे पययमर्ग
57. Mss. नियो
58. Ms. B कुर्याहु
59. Ms. B "अचेति
60. Ms. A "लोकम्यालु
61. Ms. A खाम
62. Ms. B "मान
अपरमपि—“अन्यदृष्टमन्यादृशी किया” इति। न घटेत यादृशी ६३ रूपं तादृशी परं किया शोभते। तथा ज——

या अवस्था: प्रपद्धेत ६४ स्वर्यं परवस्थितिः वा।
तास्वस्थ्यासु ६५ या शिखा: शिखेत्सा ६६ एव यज्ञत्। इति।
आचार्यः स तु विजेद्यः शान्तिके पौडीकालिवु।
प्रासादिको लक्षणाः तो वातत्वविपर्णाः।
क्षम्यभिन्नः ६७ प्रतिसात्मा सर्वसमयपालकः।
सर्वशिवलक्ष्मिनिः मन्त्रशास्त्रबिना दर्दः।
वारताराधकालोंस्या स्वालोकानहिः।
प्रतिष्ठा तु प्रकुर्बां यत्र राधो तु तत्र वेव।
स्याहृद्विदिवजयः ६८ शान्तिरारोग्यं धर्मवर्धनम्।
अनेन स्वापिता बुद्धा धनायुःसुवर्दयका।
कर्तर् च यशस्का लक्ष्म्या पुजः ६९विव्रेत्। प्रवद्धेते।
पितरस्तरस्य नन्त्वेत यावविविष्ठिति देवता।
ताबु ७१सहवारिः तुपिहे स शहीयते।
स्त्रानस्त्य देवतायास्त्रच चिरं वृद्धिश्च जायते।
अवि शान्तिकम्बिद ये चाये तु चिन्नित्वा:।
वृद्धाश्रम समर्प्यत्सा: काकस्त्वरानुनासिका:।
कुषा व्यक्ता अधिगांगाध्रच ७२ कुव्या ७५ वामनसुभुमका।

63. Mss. घटेतो यादृशी
64. Ms. A प्रपद्धेते
65. Ms. A तास्वस्थ्यासु; Ms. B तास्वस्थ्यास
66. Ms. A शिखेत्सा; Ms. B शिखेत्सा
67. Mss. छोम्माभिन्नः
68. Ms. A स्याहृद्विदिवजयः; Ms. B स्याहृद्विदिवि।
69. Mss. पत्र
70. Ms. A प्रवद्धेते
71. Mss. “बुद्ध”
72. Ms. A विमिनित्वा:
73. Mss. काकस्त्वरानुनासिका:
74. Mss. अधिकांगाध्रच
75. Mss. कुव्या
विक्रता: शाबला 76 (3b) रौध्रा 77 शाहा: कूरा: कुवृतिका: 11
पाप78 याघिरकिवर्चभा देवच्छायोपजीवका:।
वृक्कक्षा बांधरा: स्पूला: कुनलाश्च कुमृत्वा:।
सूचका79 ताभिकता वंद्या: सेवका: करकालत्या。
दस्तुरा: श्लोपदा: सर्वे 80 चारुविरा गलगण्डका।
एतस्तु स्थापिता बुझा धनायुतुन्नांशाका।
राष्ट्रे 81 राजोमृज्ञवाहो: कर्तृ: कारञ्चत्त्या।
नारकाते समास्थ्याता: कर्मूत्त्मवर्द्वास्त्या।
तास्तु सर्वानु मधुनभौत कूरकर्मसं 82 सर्ववा।
इति मण्डलचार्यवर्णविरचिते 83 कियासमुच्चये आचार्यलक्षणविद्ध।।

76. Ms. A शब्र
77. Ms. A रौध्रा; Ms. B रौध्रा:
78. Mss. पापि
79. Ms. A सुचिक्रा
80. Ms. A सवे
81. Ms. A राष्ट्रे
82. Ms. B कूरकर्मसं
83. Ms. A "विरचित"
FRAGMENTS FROM BUDDHIST TEXTS

by

Sudha Sengupta

The following are the readings of a number of folios of different Buddhist Sanskrit texts—altogether 68 in number. The originals are deposited with the Scindia Oriental Institute, Ujjain. According to the authorities of the Institute, these birch bark manuscripts were purchased from Kashmir in 1936. In all probability, these folios are fragments of some more Buddhist Sanskrit texts from Gilgit which has yielded a large number of most valuable Buddhist Sanskrit texts. Unfortunately these leaves do not constitute any single text, but a conglomeration of heterogeneous texts—without much connection among each other. The odd assortment of the folios leads one to form the opinion that whosoever had sold them, probably could not read them nor had any idea about the intrinsic value of the complete texts but knew that such type of manuscripts have a market value to the connoisseurs and so picked up most haphazardly a few leaves from different texts and sold them to different people piecemeal, obviously to get more money, thus doing a great harm to the scholarly world. Or he might have collected them in fragments only as we find now. But the prior surmise seems to be more possible.

Dr. P. V. Bapat, former Professor of Buddhist Studies in the University of Delhi, got photostat copies of the folios and when I joined the Department, I was entrusted with the work of deciphering and identifying them. After reading them I found the folios to be stray pieces of heterogeneous Buddhist Sanskrit texts with very few continuations. On paleographic grounds the folios may be ascribed to as early a period as 400-600 A.D. the characters mostly resembling those of Bower and Gilgit MSS. (cf. Bühler’s Paleographic chart No. Pl. VI. no. 1-VI). There are not less than three types of handwriting and the folios represent different recensions even in the same kind of text. The text is written in typical Buddhist Sanskrit, very often neglecting Sanskrit grammatical rules, peculiar coinage of words etc.
The subject-matter of the texts are quite common and well-known from similar Pāli texts. But though there are lots of quotations of evidence from various sources, e.g. "evamukam bhagavata....etc....in the absence of any title in the folios themselves, it was very difficult to ascertain to which text they belonged.

Anyhow, with the help of a Japanese Professor Dr. J. Takasaki, then of the Tokyo University, I could identify 38 folios as forming part of the 'Abhidharma-dharma-Skandhapāda Śāstra' —which was a very important text of the Sarvāstivādins. It is interesting to note that there is only one known Chinese version of the text which was translated by H. Tsang in about the middle of 7th A.D. (Taisho Ed. No. 1537) cf. Nanjio—catalogue no. 1296 but the fragments at our hand are not of the same text as was translated by H.T.—as is evident from the difference in arrangements. The Chinese text seems to be better arranged and hence might be a revised edition. From paleographic point of view also our ms. seems to be an earlier recension.

The rest of the 30 folios comprise fragments of various other texts which could not be identified with any Chinese or Tibetan texts. They are divided into different sets according to their subject-matter.

Many of the folios seem to be broken at the end, thus missing even 3/4 letters sometimes. The size of the folios is 12" × 2" and the size of the letters is 1/8". There are 10 lines in some folios, 9 in some and a set of 18 folios have got six lines in each of them. It is in a completely different handwriting though this too is not a continuous or complete text.

The first set comprise 38 folios which are similar to the 'Abhidharma-Dharma Skandhapāda Śāstra' mentioned above. They are again subdivided into 3 sections according to the topics dealt. For example, sec. A (28 pages) deal with Pratitya Samutpāda, sec. B. (8 pages) on Śikṣāpadas and the last two folios constituting sec. C, deal with the Apramāṇas. One curious factor about these manuscripts is that not only there is no colophon to indicate the end of title or to state the beginning of a text or topic; a new topic is started immediately at the end of another topic. Set No. II, has got 18 pages with 6 lines in each page. It also seems to be an Abhidharma text
which could not be identified with any Chinese or Tibetan text. As is mentioned above, this set is a distinct one in handwriting, as well as arrangement of lines.

Sec. III, comprises 11 folios containing mostly 9 lines. This section is also divided into 3 parts according to difference of topics. The contents describe different ‘lokas’ or heavenly abodes and the destination of people according to their deeds.

A single folio which cannot be incorporated into any of the above groups, describes the geneology of the great king Asoka but this geneology also does not conform to any of the traditionally recognised ones.

I publish the readings of these folios to bring them to the notice of the world of scholars of Buddhist literature with the hope that if any other person or institution is in the possession of similar MSS. either to fill up the lacunae or even to complement them, it might be possible to reconstruct the texts and thus restore a few at least of these valuable literature to save them from oblivion.

L. 1. Saṁmohah pramoho moham mohajamiyamucyte avidyā / avidyā pratayāh sarṣkārāh katame (?)/ evamuktaṁ bhagavatā /—avidyā bhikṣavo hetuṁ saṁrāgāya hetuṁ saṁ (mī?)dveśāya hetuṁ saṁ (mohāyā)

L. 2. yā sa samṛāgata samḍveṣatā saṁmohatā iyamucyte avidyā-pratayāh sarṣkārāh / api khalvevarṛhyuktaṁ bhagavatā/avidyā bhikṣavaḥ pūrvaṁ gamaṁ pūrvvani-mittamanekavidhānam pā (pa?) (kā)

L. 3. nāṁ dharmmaṁsamautépputpādiko bhavati / yaduta āhrītyam (kyaṁ?) vānapatṛpyam ca / ahrīmāṁ-bhikṣavo bhikṣuranapattrāpi mithyā āṛṣṭiko bhavatitatra bhikṣavo mithyā mithyādṛṣṭyā mithyā samkalpo bhava—(ti mithyā)

L. 4. samkalpāṁmithyā vācaṁ bhāṣati / mithyā vācā mithyā karmāntah prabhavati / mithyā karmmāntāṁmithyā-jīvaḥ prabhavati / mithyājīvāṁmithyā vyāyāmaḥ prabhavatī / mithyā vyayaḥ (mā?)—nmithyā smṛiti prabhavati—(mithyā smṛ-)
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L. 5. termithyā samādhilī prabhavati / iti yā sā mithyadṛṣṭir-
mithyā Saṁkalpo mithyā vāgmityā karmmānto mithyā-
-jivo mithyā vyayāmo mithyā smṛitiḥ mithyā samādhīrme
ucyaṁte avidyā (prayayā)

L. 6. saṁskārāḥ / api khalvevamuktaṁ bhagavatā ye kecid
bhikṣavonekavidhāḥ pāpakā akuśālā dharmmāḥ samabh-
varṇiti sarve te avidyā mūlakā avidyā samudayā avidyā
dītiyā (avidyā)

L. 7. prabhavā/avidyā gatohi bhikṣavaḥ ajānatkuśālā kuśalān
dharmmānyathābhūtaṁ na prajānāti sāvadyānadvadyāt
sevitavyā sevitavyān(?)hina pranitākṛṣṇa sūkla tsaprati-
bhāga prati (tya samu)

L. 8. tpannāndharmmānyathābhūta na prajānāti / sa evam-
kuśalā-kusalandharmmānyathābhūtama prajānatsāva-
dyānadvadyātsevitavyā sevita tsevya n (?) hina pranīta
kṛṣṇa sūkla sapratibhāga pra(?) (tya sa)

L. 9. mutpannāndharmmānyathābhūtama prajānanmityādṛṣ-
tiko bhavati tatra bhikṣavo mithyādṛṣṭyā mithyā
samkalpaḥ prabhavati vistareṇa yathā pūrvvoktāmima
ucyaate avidyā prayayā (saṁskārāḥ)

L. 1. api khalvevamuktaṁ bhagavatā kumbhopame vyākaraṇo
puṇyānamivam? (saṁskārā) rāmnabhisamśkaroti avidyā
prayayā na pūṇyā na myā (?) nirnįyā na.pi saṁskārā
nābhisaṁskaroti avidyā prayayāḥ pūṇyā saṁskārā—

L. 2. rātkarmma kuśalascitā caitaśikā dharmmāḥ / kuśala
scitā viprayuktāḥ saṁskārāḥ yadapi tatkuśalasyā
kāyakarma vākkarmmanaḥ kuśalānām citta cetasi-
kānam kuśalānām citta viprayuktānimām(?) saṁskārā/
ānām dirgha (rātra)

L. 3. yaṁ maṇāpaṁ vipākam pratīsamvedaye tatidamucyate
punyamiti vā punyaphalamiti vā pūnṣyaphalavipākamiti
vā apūnyāḥ saṁskārāḥ katame(?) āha / kuśalāṁ kāya-
karma vākkarma akuśalacitā cetasikā dharmmāḥ
aku—(ṣala ci)

L. 4. tta viprayuktām saṁskāra yaḍapi tadakuśalasya kāya-
karma vākkarmmanaḥ akuśalānām citta cetasikānām
dharmmanāmāmakusālānām citta viprayuktānām saṁskārānām dirgharaṭramanisṭamakāntamapriyamamanāpam pratisamve (?) (dyato ta-)

L. 5. ducyate apūnyamiti vā apūnyaphalamiti vā apūnyaphalvipākamiti vā ima ucyamte apuṇyaḥ saṁskārāḥ ānimjyāḥ / saṁskārā katame (?) āha catvāryā rūpyāṇyānimjyāṁityucyate II Katama puṇyātsamkārā na...

L. 6. te avidyā pratyayānāha atha khalvihakatyे rāgaparyavasiti dveṣa paryavasthitā moḥa paryavasthitāḥ kāyena duṣcaritāṃ carati vācā manasā duṣcaritāṃ carati iti me te akuśalaḥ kāya saṁskārā (vāk-)

L. 7. manaḥ saṁskāro ime ucyamte apuṇyā saṁskārā /yadapi taddhetostatpratyayāṃ kāyasya bhedānna kakeṣupadavye tatra yā saṁskāranabhinīrvarītayante evam apuṇyā saṁskārānabhisamskarotā avidyā pratyayā.

L. 8. nara keṣvēvaṁ tiryakpreteṣu kathāṁ puṇyātsamkārānabhisamskarotā avidyā pratyayānāhathā khalvihatyo manusya sukkhaṣvavekṣāvāṅbhavati pratīvaddhacitastasyaiṁ bhavatyahovatāha manusya sukhakānāṁ— (sabbā gata/)

L. 9. yāmupapadyeyamiti sa tam prāṛthayamānastaddhetuṣam savarttanīyāṁ kāyena sacaritāṁ carati vācā manasā sacaritāṁ carati iti ye te kuśalaḥ kāyasamkārā vā vāk - saṁskārā vā manaḥ saṁskārā vā (pu-)

L. 10. nyāḥ saṁskārāḥ yadapi taddhetu tatpratyayāṃ kāyasya bhedānmanuṣya sukhakānāḥ sabhāgataḥyāmupapadye tatra ca saṁskārānabhinīrvarītayete vāḥ puṇyātsamskārānabhisamskarotā avidyā pratyayānāha (?)

L. 1. nbhavati pratīvaddhacittāḥ api tvāvidyāyāḥ satyā - mavidyā saṁvedanāhatāḥ kāyena sacaritāṁ carati vācā manasā sacaritāṁ carati ittye te kuśalaḥ kāyasamkārā vistareṇa yāvamanuṣya sukhakānāṁ sabhāgataḥ (yā)— (mupapadye)

L. 2. tatra ca saṁskārānabhisamskarotā evam puṇyāt saṁskārānabhisamskurute avidyā pratyayāḥ yathā manusya sukhakānāmevarṁ cāturmmahārajakāyikānāṁ trayastrim-
śānaṁ yāmānāṁ tuṣītānāṁ nirmānāratāṁpan amaranirmiitäva—(śavartyīnāṁ)

L. 3. yathā khalviheko brahmakāyikānāṁ devānāmavekṣāvān bhavati pratīvadhacitāṁ tasyevam bhavatyahvatāhāṁ brahmakāyikānāṁ devānāṁ sābhāgaṭāyāmupapadyayāṁ satāṁ prārthayamānāṁ taddhētustatsarīvarttaṇīyaṁ viviktaṁ ca (?) (kṣuṁ vīvi—)

L. 4. ktaṁ pāpakairakuśālā dharmmaḥ saavitarkīkāṁ saivīcārāṁ vivekajāṁ prīti sukhaṁ prathamaṁ dhyaṇamupalasi padya viharati / tathā samāpannasya yat kāyaśārīvare vāksaṁvaratāḥ ājivapariṇāddhīḥ ima ucyānte pūnyāḥ saṁskārāḥ / yadapi (taddhētusta—)

L. 5. tprayayāṁ kāyasya bhedādbhahmakāyikānāṁ devānāṁ sābhāgaṭāyāmupapadyate tatra ca saṁskārāṇabhinirvarttayati evam pūnyat saṁskārāṇabhinirvarttayavidyā prayayāṇvahāvivekṣāvān bhavati pratīvad (dha) ci—(tva..?)

L. 6. tvavidyāyāṁ satyāmavidyā saṁvedanā hetorviviktaṁ kāmaīryāvat prathamaṁ dhyaṇamupalasi padya viharati tathā samāpannasya yah kāyaśārīvaro vāksaṁvaratā vistareṇa yāvattatra ca saṁskārā abhinirravyā—i—

L. 7. tsamštārāṇabhinirvarttayavidyā prayayāyāṁ yathā brahmakāyikānāmevaṁ brahma purohitānāṁ mahābrahmānaṁ parittābhūrānāmapramāṇābhānābhāsvaranāṁ paritta subhānāṁ apramāṇā—subhānāṁ subhakṛtṛṣnānāṁ ma—(hābrahma ?)

L. 8. nāṁ pūnyaprasabānāṁ vr̥hatpalānāṁ rju satveṣu yathā yogyāni dhyaṇāṁ vaktavyāni yathā khalvihaikatayaḥ asaṁjñiḥ satvānāṁ devānāmavekṣāvān bhavati pratīvadhacitāṁ tasyaivaṁ bhavatyahvatāhāṁ asaṁjñiḥ? (satvā?)

L. 9. nāṁ sābhāgaṭāyāmupapadyeyāṁ satāṁ prārthayamānāṣtaddhēto-statsarīvarttānīyaṁ saṁjñā maudārikato duḥkhilataḥ sthūlabhittikato manasi karoti asaṁjñiṇaṁ ca santataḥ praṇītata niṣsaraṇa—(to saṁjñāmau—?)

L.10. —dārikato duḥkhiłataḥ sthūlabhittikate manasikurvataḥ asaṁjñiṇaṁ ca santataḥ praṇītata niṣsaraṇataḥ saṁjñā antarāṣṭrayaṁasaṁjñiṇaṁ ca saṁsthihati yatṛasya saṁjñā antarāya (tyā) sajñi (kaṁ)....

L. 1. vānasamjñiḥ samāpattim samāpanna iti vaktavyam / tathā
samāpannasya yaḥ kāyasamāvaro vāksaṁvaraḥ ājīva viṣuddhirima ucyamte punyāḥ samśkārāḥ / yadapi taddhetostatprayāyam kāyasya bheda—

L. 2. gatāyāmupapadyate tatra ca samśkārānabhisamnirvartatayatyavidyā prayāyānna-haivāvekṣavānabhavati prati-vaddhacitte pī tvavidyāyāmā satyāmavidyābhisamvedanā hetoh śmañjanāmaudārikato duḥkkhile na...ra (?)—

L. 3. manasikurute āsajñikam ca santataḥ praṇītate niḥsaraṇataḥ tasya vistareṇa yāvadasaṁṛtikām samsthīhatye tāvadasamījñi sampattim samāpanna iti vaktavyām tathā samāpannasya yaḥ kāyasamāvaro....

L. 4. na yāvattatra ca samśkārānabhisnirvittayatevam punyā-samśkārānabhisamkarotyavidyā prayāyatkatamānityam samśkārāṇa bhisaṁākāretyavidyā prayāṇāha yathā khal-vihaikatyāḥ ākāśānantyāyata (na)....

L. 5. mavekṣavānabhavati prativaddhadittah tasyaivaṁ bhataya-vatāhāṁ ākāśānantyāyatanāṁ devānāṁ sabhāga-tāyāmupapadyeṇaṁ sa tathā prārthayamānaḥ taddhetostatsam-varttaniyam satvaso rupasana....

L. 6. tikramatpratigha samñjñānāmastaṁgamannāmātva sam-jñānāya manasikārādanantamākāśa mityākāśānantyāyatanamuparipadaya viharati tathā samāpannasya yā vedanā (cetanā cetitam cetanaṁimitaṁ).

L. 7. tam tvam (?) cetanāgataṁ cittābhisamākāra manaskarmanā ime ucyamte ānīmjñāḥ samākārāḥ yadapi staddhetostatprayāyam kāyasya bhedādākāśānantyāyatanānāṁ devānāṁ sabhāgatayāmupapadyate....

L. 8. skārānabhinirvartaya evamānimjñat samākārānabhi-nirvartayatyavidyā prayāyāṇnahovāvekṣāvānabhavati prativaddhacittah stvapi tvavidyāyāṁ satyāmavidyā-bhisamśetanā hetoh sattvaso rūpa samñjñānaṁ....

L. 9. kramadvistareṇa yāvadākāśānantyāyatanamuparasam-padya viharati tathā samāpannasya ya cetanā vistareṇa ime ucyamte ānīmjñāḥ (?) samākāra yadapi taddhetostatprayāyam kāyasya bhedādākāśāna (ntyāyat—)

L. 10. nānāṁ (devānāṁ) sabhagatayāmupapadyate tatra ca samākārānabhinirvarttayatevamanimjñā (hya?) tsa-rīkā rānabhinirvarttayatyavidyā prayāyāni (?) yathā kāśānantyāyatanānāmevarām vijñānānantyāyatanānāmā (kiṁ?)
L. 1. tanānāṁ naiva samjñā nāsaṁjñāyatanānāmetesāṁ pratyeke pretyekasāḥ ārūpya vaktavyaḥ iti ye te saṁskārā avidyāmāgamyāgamyāvidyāṁ nisṛtyāvidyāṁ pratiśṭhāya utpadyaṁti samutpadyate jāyanti samjñāyam (ti)—
L. 2. prādurbhavanti ima ucyarūte avidyā pratyayāsaṁskārāḥ II uddānaṁ hetuḥ pūrvvāṅgamaṁ valaṁ saṁskārāḥ kumbhena catuṣkaṁ II Uddānaṁ lobhaḥ alobhaḥ atha caksuḥ saṁskṛtaṁ kumbhopamena dvitiyaṁ catuṣkaṁ II saṁ—(skāra pratyaiyaṁ)
L. 3. vijñānaṁ katamadīha I Yathā tāvallobhasaha saṁvedaṁ naṁ pratītya lobhasahajasya vijñānasyaḥbhinirvṛttirbhabati prādurbhāvaṁśca dveṣāsahajam mohasahajam vedanāṁ pratītya mohasahajasya vijñānaṁ—(bhavaḥ)
L. 4. ti prādurbhāvaḥ taducyate saṁskāraḥ pratyayaṁ vijñānaṁ—vada lobhasahaja vedanā pratītya lobhasahajasya vijñānaṁṣyaḥbhinirvṛttirbhabati prādurbhāvaḥ adveṣaśahajam mohasahajam vedanāṁ pratītya mohasahajasya vijñānasyaḥbhinirvṛttirbhabati prādurbhāva taducyate saṃskārapratītyam vi(nā)—api khalu caksuḥ pratītya rūpāni cotpadyate caksurṣvijñānaṁ tatra caksuḥ saṁskṛtaṁ rūpāni ca vāhyam pratyayaṁ caksurṣvijñānasya taducyate saṁskāraḥ (raḥ) (evaim)
L. 5. śrotra ghrāṇa jihvā kāya manaḥ pratītya dharmmaṁ scotpadyate I Manovijñānaṁ tatra manaḥ saṁskṛtaṁ dharmmaṁścavāhyam pratyayaṁ manovijñānasya taducyate saṁskāraḥ pratyayaṁ vijñānaṁ api khaleveṣṭvaṁukuṁtaṁ . . .
L. 6. pamesminvyākaraṁśa tasya pūṇyātsaṁskāraṁbhisanśrṣṭya pūṇyopagaṁ bhavati vijñānaṁ api pūṇyāmanirvṛttiṣya pūṇyāsaṁskāraṁbhisanśrṣṭya vijñānaṁ bhavati vijñānaṁ kathamapūṇyānāṁ yathā kha(ñvi) . . .
L. 7. paryavasthito dveṣa paryavasthito mohaparyavasthitaṁ kāyaṁ duṣcaritaṁ carati vācā manasaḥ duṣcaritaṁ carati iti ye te akuśalāṁ kāya saṁskāraḥ vāksaṁskāraṁ manaḥ saṁskāraṁ (i) . . . (apu—)
L. 8. nyāḥ saṁskāraḥ ādapi taddhetostatpratyayaṁ kāyaṣya bhedānrakeṣuḥpapadyate tatra ca vijñānamabhinirvṛttayati evamapūṇyātsaṁskāraṁ bhisanśrṣṭye pūṇyopagaṁ vijñānaṁ bhavati yathā na . .
L. 9. teṣu katham pūṇyāsaṁskāraṁbhisanśrṣṭya pūṇyopagaṁ bhavati vijñānaṁ āha — atha khalvihaikatyo
manuṣya suhakasevakeśavāṁbhavati prativeddahicittah
vistareṇa yāvattra ca vijñānamabhi ? —
L.10. (dham) varṇa pūnyātsamskāraṁabhisamskṛtya pūṇyopagam bhavati vijñānam yathā manuṣya suhakānāmevaṁ yāvat-paranirmitavaśavarttināṁ brahmakāyikānaṁ viviktaṁ kāmairvviviktaṁ tatra ca vijñānamabhi

L. 1. yāvatvrihtphalāṇāṁ sarveṣuprati pratidhyānāṁ vaktavyāni kathamāniṁjyātsamskāraṁabhisamskṛtyāni jyāpagaṁ bhavativedviṇānam āha yathā kahlvihaikatya akāśanantyaṁyaṭanānaṁ devānāṁ (?) ma...?
L. 2. vaddhacittā vistareṇa tatra ca vijñānamabhinirvṛttāyati evam yāvannevaṁ samijñānaṁ samjñāyatanānaṁiti yāvadvedviṇānaṁ samśkāraṁśagamya vistaraḥ // lobha sahajāṁ vijñānamalobha sahajāṁ tathā na?? (dika?)
L. 3. caṁ svātivānanda eva ca uddānaṁ II Vijñāna pratityam nāmarūpaṁ kataradāha yathā tāvallobha sahajāṁ vijñānaṁ pratitya lobha sahajasya kāya karmma vākkarmanābhinirvṛttirbhavati prādurbhavo (?)....
L. 4. -haja vividhā utpādyante rūpi vikritam ya idam rūpasya tajjā vedanā samijñā samśkāra vijñānamidamāṁ nāmasya vijñāna pratyaṁ nāmarūpaṁ taducyate vijñānapratyaṁ nāmarūpaṁ eavān dvē-(ṣa?)
L. 5. moha sahajām viparyyya (?) yeṣa śuklapaṇḍeśvalobha sahajāmamohā sahajāṁ vaktavyāṁ api khalvevaṁkutraṁ bhagavata nādikāvavāde vyākaroṇa priyānaṁ nādikā jñātināṁ vipariṇāma....
L. 6. vadutpadyante śokaḥ parideva duḥkha daurmanasyopayasaḥ ityetu (?) cchoka sahajām vijñānam pratitya śoka sahajasya kāya vākkarmanābhinirvṛttirbhavati prādurbhava i(dam?)
L. 7. vedanā samijñā samaskāra vijñānam idaṁ nāmasya vijñānam vijñānasya pratyaṁ nāmarūpaṁ taducyate vijñānapratyaṁ nāmarūpaṁ api khalvevaṁkutraṁ bhagavata phalgunāvavāde vyāka—(raṇe)
L. 8. phalgunā āhāram yāvadevāyatyāṁ punarbhavasyābhinirvṛttyaye prādurbhavāya tat katadadvijñānam āha
yaddagandharvvasya caramañ cittan mano vijñānaṁ akītamupacitaṁ pratiṣṭhitamapraha—

L. 9. tamanirodhitamavārti (?) rūtam yasya vijñānasya sama-nantara mātuḥ kukṣo kalalāmabhāvobhi sampracchati kalalāmāṁmahāvamabhisampracchati iti idaṁ rūpasya tajjā vedanā samjñā saṁ— (skārā)

L.10. vijñānamidamāṁ nāmasya vijñāna pratyayaṁ nāmarūpasya taducyate vijñānapratyayāṁ nāmarūpaṁ asti khalve-vamuktaṁ bhagavatā svātim bhikṣuṁ kevanda (?) (kevaddhaputra?) pra ? nāmarabhyyatu yānāṁ

L. 1. sānnapārthāntuṣṭa kukṣo garbhayāvakrāntibhayati katamesāttrayāṁ iha bhikṣavo mātā pitaro rakto bhavataḥ san nipatito mātā ca kalyā bhavati rūtumati gangharvvośca pratyu—

L. 2. pasthīto bhavati imeśāṁ bhikṣavastrayāṁ sānnapātā-nāṁmātuṣṭa kukṣo garbhayāvakrāntibhayati iti yaddagarb-hasya caramañ cittam manovijñānam vistaraṇa yāva dvijñāna praty—

L. 3. yair nāmarūpasya taducyate vijñāna pratyayaṁ nāma rūpam asti khalvevamuktaṁ bhagavatā mahānāmāṁ paryāye vyākarane āyusmate ānandāya asti pratyaya-māṁśaṁ nāma

L. 4. rūpam prṣtaṁ sati asttasya vacanīyaṁ kīṁ pratyaya-māṁśaṁ nāmarūpaṁ vijñāna pratyayamiti syād vacanīyaṁ vijñāna pratyayamāṁśaṁ nāma rūpamiti mayā yadu—

L. 5. ktaṁ kīṁ ca metatpratyuktam vijñānam cedānamāṁ mātuḥ kukṣau nāpakramisyadapi nu nāmarūpaṁ kalalatvaṁ hi sampracchisyaḥ no bhadanta vijñānaṁ cedānamāṁ mātuḥ kukṣau avakramitvā pura (rā)

L. 6. kkramisyat api nu nāmarūpaṁ imaṁ dhūtamāgamisyaṁ-to bhadanta vijñānaṁ cedānaṁ dāveṣa dharā (ma) sya taruṇasya kumārakasya (?) ucchidyeta vinasīyeta na bhaveta api nu nāmaṁ

L. 7. ruhiṁ vai punyatāmāmpadyeta no bhadaṁca sarvvaśo vā punaṁ sarvvaśa ānanda vijñāne asati na nāmarūpaṁ
prajñāyatano bhadāmta tasmāddhi ānanda etanidā- namaṣa hetuḥ eṣa pratyato na...

L. 8. yaduta viññānam viññānapratyayamānanda nāma rupiti mayā yaduktamidaṁ metatprayuktam II uddānam II Dvaya prayatyaṇcā viññānam phalgunāṁ svātireva ca rāgajaṁ dveṣa mohaśca ānando bhavati...

L. 9. nāmarūpa prayayam viññānam katara āha / cakṣuḥ pratītya rūpaṇi cotpadyate cakṣurviññānam tatra yacca-
skṣuryāni ca rūpaṇī idam rūpasya taJJā vedanā samjñā saṁskāra viññānam ida?....

L.10. manasikāraṁ nāma prayayasya mano viññānasya taduc- yate nāmarūpa prayayam manovi (cca) jñānam evam śrotam ghrāṇāṁ jihvā kāyaṁ manah pratītya dharmmaṁ nāscopapadyate...?...mṛṣāvādāt-surā-maireya madyapra-
mādasthānādaprativirataḥ iyatā upāsakaḥ śikṣāsu yadbhū- yarkāri bhavati.

L. 1. tatra ye rūpiṇo manovijnā ya dharmmaṁ idam rūpasya tajjā vedanā samjñā saṁskārāṁ tajjam viññānam idam nāmarūpasya tajjāṁ manasikāraṁ nāma prayayasya manah viññānasya taducyate nāmarūpa-pratyayā...

L. 2 khalvaivamuktam bhagavatā phalgunāvavāde vyakaraṇo viññānam phalgunā hārāṁ-yāvadevāyatāṁ punarbhava syābhinirvṛttāya prādurbhāvāya tatakalatad viññānamā-
hayantagandharvasya caramāṁ cītarāṁ dhi(?) sa(?)...

L. 3. yasya Gandharvasya samanantaram mātuḥ kukoṣo kalala-
mātambahāvatām sampṛchchati kalalamātambahāvatām sampṛchchatiti idam rūpasya tajjā vedanā samjñā saṁskārā-
staJJāṁ viññānam idam namasya ityeta-da-yani nāma(?)..

L. 4. hajam nāmarūpaṁ pratītya mātuḥ kukoṣo viññānasya-
bhinekrvṛttirbhavati prādurbhavastaducyate nāmarūpa
pratyam viññānam api khalvevamuktam bhagavata svātim bhikṣurṁ kevatta putta(?) (putti?) nāmārebhyā
trayāṇa(?)..

L. 5. nnipātamatuḥ kukoṣo gurbhavyāvakraṁtirbhavati vista-
reṇa yavannityena mayo niśo manasikāreṇa sahajam
nāmarūpaṁ pratītya mātuḥ kukoṣo viññānasayaṅkrāntir-
bhavati prādurbhāvastasya....
L. 6. va pratyām vijñānam api khalvevamuktām bhagavatā mahānidiśaparyāye vastreṇā yāvadvijñānam cedānanda nāmarūpa pratiṣṭhām na labheta tathā pratiṣṭhīte vijñāne anatīruṣhe...

L. 7. bhava samudaya samutthā (?) paṁ ka (?) jāti jārā maraṇamahhinirvṛitte tathā bhadanta sarvaśo va punarānanda nāmarūpa asati api nu vijñānam prajñāyatano bhadanta tasmādā...

L. 8. nanda etannidanaṁ vistareṇa yathā purvvakām uddānanāṁ śītamuṇḍarāṁ ca bhogjanāṁ ca pānamudvartta (?) nam tathā śītādikā puṣkariṇīsvatireva ca rāgajām dveṣajām bairamohajām bhavati paści-

L. 9. manī II Nāmarūpapratyām sadāyatanam kataradāha / yathā khalvihaikatyaḥ śīta pracrāduṣṇāṁ gacchati tasya tata utpadyate uṣṇa sahaṝāni mahābhūtāni tattra yāṇi ca uṣṇa...

L.10. ? jāni mahābhūtāni idam rūpasya tajjā vedanā samjñā saṁskārā vijñānam idam nāmasya ityatecchitasaḥajam nāmarūpaṁ pratītya caksurindriyasopacayo bhavati

L. 1. jihvā kāya manopi tatra upaciyate taducyate nāmarūpa (pratyaya śādayātana) miti eṣa uṣṇa pracrācchītaṁ yathā khalvihaikatyo jiyatsādauvralyaparātaḥ śucipraṇita khādaniya bhogjanī(ya?)

L. 2. ? utpadyante bhojana sahaṝāni mahābhūtāni tatra yacca bhogjanāṁ yāṇi ca bhoganasahajāni mahābhūtāni idam rūpasya tajjā vedanā vistareṇa yathā purvvakām yathā khalvihaikatyaustūṣitaḥ kṣāntaṁ mim

L. 3. ?h śuci śitalam pāṇīyam pivati tasya tata utpadyarṇte pānasahajāni mahābhūtāni vistaraḥ yathā khalvihaikatyāḥ utsadana parimardana saṁvāhanāyāgamayanuykto viharati tasya tata utpadyarṇte utsa?(dama?)

L. 4. parimardana saṁvāhana sahaṝāni mahābhūtāni tatra yacca utsādananāṁ parimardana saṁvāhanam yāṇi ca utsadana-parimardana-saṁvāhanasahajāni mahābhūtāni idam rūpasya tajjā vedanā saṁjñā saṁskārāstājāṁ vi(jñā)?
L. 5. na midam nāmasya vistaraḥ yathā khalvihaikatyo gṛiṣ-mābhitaṇpo gṛiṣma paritastrīṣitaḥ klāntaḥ pipāsitaḥ vātātapa paridyunaḥ śītādikam puṣkariṇīmavagāhayet tasya tata upta (dyarite?)

L. 6. śītasahajāni mahābhūtāni tatra ca yacca śītan yāni ca śītasahajāni mahābhūtāni tasya tajjā vedanā vistaraḥ api khalvevamuktaṁ bhagavatā phalgunāvavāde vyāka-raṇe vi......

L. 7. na āhāraṁ yāvadāyatyaṁ punarbhavasyābhinirvṛttayato prādurbhāvāya yattātakaratadvijñānaṁ vistareṇa yāvat yasya vijñānasya samanantaram mātuḥ kukṣo kalalā- mātmabhāvamabhī ?......

L. 8. (ka?) lalamātmabhāvarī samśraccatiti idam rūpasya tajjā vedanā saṁjñā saṁskārastajjā vijñānamidam nāmasya ityetadā yō niśa manasikāra sahajam nāmarūpaṁ pratītya mātuḥ kuko ṣaṇṇā?.....

L. 9. mabhinirvṛttirbhavati prādurbhāvastaducyate nāma- rūpapratyayaṁ saḍāyatanaṁiti api khalvevamuktaṁ bhagavata svātīṁ bhikṣuṁ kaivartāpuruṣvīṇaṁārabhyā trayaṅāṁ bhikṣavāḥ saṁnipatātpa?.....

L. 10. vakkrāntirbhavati vistareṇa yāvatmātuḥ kuko ṣaṇṇā- mindriyānāṁmahinirvṛttirbhavati prādurbhāvah taducyate nāmarūpa pratayāya ūṣadāyatana pratayayaṁ namarupamiti yathā khalvi(hai).......

(The upper left and lower right corner of this folio is broken)

L. 1. ? paryavasthitino dveṣa paryavasthitau mo (ha) paryavas- thitaḥ kāyena duṣcaritaṁ carati vācā manasā duṣcāri- tam carati kāyena vācā duṣcaritaṁ carati idam rūpasya manasā duṣcāritamidam nāmasyadye.....

L. 2. rūpaṁ pratītya duḥkhādayaṁ duḥkhavipākaṁ kāyasya bhedānaranakēśupapadyate tatra ca ṣaṇṇāṁ pi trayānā- mabhinirvṛttirbhavati prādurbhāvāḥ taducyate nāma- rūpa pratayayaṁ ūṣadāyatanaṁ yathā na—
L. 3. kpratesu yathā khalvihaikayto manuṣya sukhakesvavkekṣāvānḥbhavati prativaddhacittāḥ tasyaivaṃ bhavatyahovatāhaṃ manuṣya sukhakānāṃ sabhagatāyamupapadyeṣāṃ sa tam prārthayamāno vistareṇa ya…. 

L. 4. vācā manasā sucariṭam caratiti idam rūpaṃ saṃtaṃ sukarṣati caratiti idam nāmasayatetakṣuṣālam nāmarupam pratītya sukhoḍayyaṃ sukhaviṃṣākam kayasya bhedātamanuṣya sukhakānāṃ sabhāgata—(āyāmu..?) 

L. 5. papadyate tatra ca śaṇāṃindriyānāṃmahinirvṛttirbhavati prādurbhāvaḥ taducyate nāma pratayayam ṣaḍāyatanamīti yathā manuṣya sukhakānāmevaṃ yāvatparam nirmīta vaśavartī…. 

L. 6. lvihaikatyo brahmakāyikānāṃ devānamavakesvānḥbhavati prativaddhacittāḥ vistareṇa yāvatathā samāpansasya yaḥ kāyasamānuḥ vāksamvareḥ ājīva viśuddhī idam rūpaṃ saṃtā vaṣṭvē…. 

L. 7. —danā vistareṇa yāvadvijñānam idam nāmasya ityetatkuṣālam nāmarupam pratītya sukhoḍayam sukhaṇpākam kāyasya bhedādbrahmakāyikānāṃ devānāṃ sabhāgatāyamupapadyate tatra ca— 

L. 8. śaṇāṃindriyānāṃmahinirvṛttirbhavati prādurbhāvaḥ taducyate nāmarupam pratayayam ṣaḍāyatanamīti yathā brahmakāyikānāmevaṃ yāvadasamāṃvānāṃ saṃgrihitānāṃ vr̥hatphalānāṃ tva ta?— 

L. 9. ? nam nāmarupamāṅgamyā (ṣa?) nāmarupam niśṛtya nāmarupam pratiṣṭhā(?)ya utpadyate samutpadyate jāyate sāriṣṭ programmes nirvarttayatyabhinirvarttayati samudāgacchati prādurbhavati idama(?)— 

L.10. pa pratayayam ṣaḍāyatanam nāmarupam pratayayāḥ sparśaḥ…. pratayācca sparśa phalgunāṁścātireva ca rāgajām dvesajām mohajām māna? na paṃcika bhava?? 

L. 1. caksuḥ pratītya rūpāṇi cotpadyate caksuvijñānam trayānāṃ samnipātāḥ sparśaḥ tatra yaccaksuryāni ca rūpāṇi idam rūpasya tajjā vedanā saṃjñā samśkāraśtajjām vijnānamidaṃ nāmasya tajjāṃ manasikāram nā(ṃa) pratya—(yā)
L. 2. saṁsparśasya taducyate nāmarūpa pratyayaḥ sparśaḥ
evaṁ śrotra-ghrāṇa-jīhvā-kāya-manaḥ pratītya dharm-
māṁscotpadyate manovijñānam trayāṁ karṇaḥ
carṇaḥ sparśaḥ tatra ye rūpiṇa manovijñāya dharmaḥ ida
(tṛūpa-) Such a change of perception is produced by

L. 3. sya tajjā vedanā samjñā samāskāra vijnānam idam
nā-
masya tajjām manasikāraṁ nāma pratayaṁ manasaṁ
sparśasya taducyate nāmarūpa pratyayaḥ sparśaḥ api
halvevamuktaṁ bhagavatā phalgunāvavade vyākaraṇo
vijñānam (pha-?) Such a change of perception is pro-

L. 4. igunāhaṁ yāvadevāyataṁ punarbhavasyābhiniṁvrti-
taye prādurbhāvya tāt kataradvijñānamāha yattad-
gandharvvisa caramāṁ cittāṁ manovijñānam vistareṇa
yāvat kalalamātmabhāvamabhisampracchatiti idam
rūpasya Such a change of perception is pro-

L. 5. tajjā vedanā samjñā samāskāraśtajjāṁ vijnānam idam
nāmasya ityetadayoniśo manasikāra sahitāṁ nāmarūpaṁ
pratītya māṭuḥ kukṣau sparśasyābhiniṁvrttirbhavati
prādurbhāvaḥ taducyate nāmarūpa— Such a change of perception is pro-

L. 6. pratyayaḥ sparśaḥ api halvevemuktaṁ bhagavatā
svātim bhikṣuṁ kaivarta pūrvināmārabhya trayāṁ
bhikṣavaḥ sannipatānmaṭuḥ kukṣau garbhsyāvakraṁtir-
bhavati vistareṇa yāvadayoniśo manasikā— Such a change of perception is pro-

L. 7. -ra sahajāṁ nāmarūpaṁ pratītya māṭuḥ kukṣau gar-
bhsyāvakraṁtirbhavati prādurbhāvastaducyate nāma-
rūpa pratyayaḥ sparśaḥ yathā khalvihaikatyo rāga paryav-
stashito dveṣa paryavasthitoh moha paryavasthitah
L. 8. kāyena duścaritam carati vācā manasa duścaritam
carati idam rūpasya manasa duścaritam caratīti idam
nāmasya ityetadayukšalam nāmarūpaṁ pratītya duḥkh-
dayaṁ duḥkha vipākaṁ kāyasya bhedannakūtaḥ
L. 9. padyate tatra ca sparśamabhinirvṛttayati taducyate
nāmarūpa pratyayaḥ sparsa iti yathā narakesvevam
tryakpreṣṭū yathā khalvihaikatyo manuṣya sukhaṁva-
vekṣāvāṁbhavati prativaddhacitto vi-
L. 10. (stare)na yāvatkāyena. vācā sucaritam caratīti idam
rūpasya manasa sucaritam caratīti idam rūpasya manasa
sucaritam, caratīti idam nāmasyeṣṭetakusalam nāma-
rūpaṁ pratītya vistareṇa Such a change of perception is pro-
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L. 1. yāvattatra ca sparśamabhinirvṛttayati taducyate nāmarūpa-papratyayaḥ sparṣa iti yathā manusyaḥ sukhakesu evam (?) ?mārat paramirmmitavāsavarttiṣu yathā khalvihaikatya brahmakāyikānām devānāmavekṣāvṛṇabhati pratibadha

L. 2. citto yāvattuthā samāpannasya yaḥ kāyasarīvaro vāksamvaraḥ ājīvaparīśuddhiridam rūpasya tajjā vedanā samjñā saṁskārastajjam vijñānamidam nāmasya ity etat kuśalaṁ nāmarūparām pratiyata vistareṇa yāvathatra, ca spa—

L. 3. rśambhinirvṛttayati taducyate nāmarūpa-papratyayaḥ sparṣaḥ yathā brahmakāyikānām evam yāvadasaṁjñā- satvo saṁprahṛitanām vṛhatphalānām api khalvevaṃkumārām bhagavatā mahānāmadāpayāsminvyākaraṇaṁ—

L. 4. yuṣmante ānandāya asti pratayayamānanda sparṣa iti vistareṇa yāvata yesāmānandākāraṇam yesāmuddesānaṁ sati nāma kāyasya praṇjāptirbhavati teṣāmākārāṁ teṣāmuddesānaṁ atasya

L. 5. pi nu adhivacana saṁsparṣaḥ praṇjāyatano bhadāṁta yesāmānanda kāraṇam yesāmuddesānaṁ sati rūpakāyaśa praṇjāptatbhavati teṣāmākāraṇam teṣāmuddesānaṁ atasyaṁ api nu pratigha saṁsparṣaḥ praṇjā-—

L. 6. yatano bhadāṁta sarvvaso va punarāṇanda nāmākāya rūpakāyaṇāmasati api nu sparṣaṁ vā praṇjāyaya sparṣa praṇjāptirbhavva no bhadānta tasmādhyānānnetannidānaṁ vistareṇa yavaddidānaṁ mayā ya—

L. 7. duktaṇḍaṁ tat pratyanām tathā cakṣu-radhāyāmkāṁ cakṣustā rūpā tasyaivaṁ na cakṣuṣtenām na rūpataḥ II Saḍāyatana pratayayaḥ sparṣaḥ katama aha cakṣu pratitya rūpāni cotpadyate cakṣu—

L. 8. rūvijñānāṁ trayāṇāṁ sannipātācakṣuradhāyāmīkāṁ tathā cakṣustā rūpā tasyaivaṁ na cakṣuṣtenām na rūpataḥ II Saḍāyatana pratayayaḥ sparṣaḥ katama aha cakṣu pratitya rūpāni cotpadyate cakṣu—

L. 9. cakṣuḥ pratitya rūpāni cotpadyate cakṣuvijñāna trayāṇāṁ sannipātāt sparṣaḥ ?? rādhyāyāmāṇayaṇa rūpā na vāhyāṁ pratrayayaḥ cakṣuḥ saṁsparṣāsaṁ taducyate saḍāyatana pratayayaḥ sparṣa iti api khalu

L. 10. śrotōm ghrāṇam jīhvā kāya manāḥ pratitya dharmāṁscotpadyate mano…nnipatasparsaḥ tatra ma(ye?) -na adhyāyāmāṇayaṇaṁ dharmāsca vāhyāṁ pratayayaṁ manāḥ saṁsparṣāsaṁ taducyate…. 
L. 1. nā pratyayaḥ sparśa iti api khalu caṣuḥ pratītya rūpa (pāṇi) cotpadyate ... m sannipatat sparśaḥ caṣuṣṭā rūpataśca caṣuṣvijñānataḥ evaṁ śrotra ghrāṇa jihvā kāya mano vakta (vya api) khalu caṣu—

L. 2. tya rūpāṇicotpadyate caṣuṣvijñānam trayāṇāṁ sannipatat sparśaḥ tatra sa caṣu ... rūpāṇi na caṣuṣvijñānam yā dveṣā trayāṇāṁ dharmanāṁ samgati sannitarṣaḥ sannipataḥ saṁsparśaḥ evaṁ śrotra ghrāṇa ji—

L. 3. hva kāya mano vaktavyaṁ maṇaḥ pratītya dharmanāṁscotpadyate manoviṣṇānam yātveṣā trayā (ṇāṁ) dharmanāṁ samgatiḥ sannikarṣaḥ samavāyaḥ saṁsparśaḥ taducyate ṣāḍāyatana pratītya sparśa iti sparśaḥ ṣāḍāya—

L. 4. tanamāgamya ṣāḍāyatanaṁ nisritya ṣāḍāyatanaṁpratiṣṭhāya utpadyate samuṣṭadyate jāyate saṃjāyate nirvarttatyabhinirvartayati samudāgacchati prādurbhavati ayamucyate ṣāḍāyatana pratītya Sparśa

L. 5. sparśa iti trayāṇāṁ sannipatajāyate yā hi vedanā sukha vedanīyaḥ sparśaḥ ghoṣiḥ(?)/ānanda eva ca uddānam II sparśa pratītya vedanā katamā āha caṣuḥ pratītya rūpaṇi cotpadyate

L. 6. caṣuṣvijñānam trayāṇāṁ sannipatat sparśaḥ sparśaḥ pratītya vedanā evaṁ śrotra ghrāṇa jihvā kāya maṇaḥ pratītya dharmanāṁscotpadyate manoviṣṇānam trayāṇāṁ sannipatat sparśaḥ sparśaḥ pratītya ve-

L. 7. danā api khalu caṣuḥ pratītya rūpaṇi cotpadyate caṣuṣvijñānam trayāṇāṁ sannipatat sparśaḥ sukha vedanīyaḥ duḥkha vedanīyo duḥkhāsukha vedanīyaḥ tatkhalu sukha vedanīyam sparśaṁ pratītyotpaa

L. 8. dyate sukha vedanā sukha vedaniyaṁ sparśaṁ pratītyotpadyate duḥkha vedanā aduhkhāsukha vedanīyaṁ sparśaṁ pratītyotpadyate duḥkha vedanā aduhkhāsukha vedanīyam sparśaṁ pratītyotpadyate aduhkha—

L. 9. khā vedanā taducyate sparśaḥ pratītya vedanā apikhala-vemamuktamāyumsata ānandena ghoṣilasya grhapateranye ca grhapate caṣuḥ dhāturyaṁ rūpa dhūturyaṁcaṣuṣvijñādadhatuḥ sukha vedaniyaṁ gr—

L. 10. hapate duḥkhāṁ pratītya vijñāṇasyotpāo bhavati trayāṇāṁ sannipatat sparśaṁ tatkhalu sukha vedani (yam)
sparśam prātityotpadyate sukha—vedanā anya eva yaśaduddhākha vedanīyam gṛhapate duḥkhāṃ prātitya—

L. 1. vijnānasyotpāda bhavati trayānām sannipātāt sparśaḥ duḥkha vedanīyāḥ tatkhālau duḥkha vedanīyāṃ sparśaṃ prātityotpāde duḥkha vedanā anya (?) eva yāvadduddhākhā sukha vedanīyam gṛhapate dva yaṃ prātitya vijnānasyo—

L. 2. -tpādo bhavati trayānāṃ sannipātaḥ sparśaḥ duḥkhā sukha vedanīyāḥ tat svalpa duḥkhāsukha vedanīyam sparśaṃ prātityotpadyate duḥkhāsukha vedanā anya (?) eva gṛhate srotra ghrāṇa jihvā kāya mano dhāturanyo (?) dharmma

L. 3. dhāturanyo manovijnāna dhātuḥ sukha vedanīyam gṛhapate dvayaṃ prātitya vistareṇa yathā purvvoaktariṇa taducyate sparśa pratyayā vedanā api khalvevamuktam bhagavatā mahānīdānapadāyasminvyakaranā āyusmate āna-

L. 4. ndāya asti pratyayamānanda vedanā vistareṇa yāvaccakṣuḥ saṁsparśaścedānanda na bhaviṣyadapi nu caksuḥ saṁsparśa pratyayamadhyātmamutpādyate sukham va duḥkham va duḥkhāsukham va no bhadanta evam śrotra

L. 5. ghrāṇa jihvā kāya manah saṁsparśaḥ syādānanda no bhaviṣyadapi nu manah saṁsparśa pratyayamadhyātmamutpādyate veditaṃ sukham va duḥkham va duḥkhāsukham va no bhadanta sarvvaso va ānanda sparṣesparsas- (i-?)

L. 6. ti vedanā prajñāyatano bhadāṃta tasmādhyānānychattanidānāṃ vistareṇa yāvadidadāṃ mayā yaduktamidam tatpratyayāṃ II Uddānam II caksuḥ prātityāsvadāṃ dvau (?)skandhou āyatanauguhyaṃparamdvayam mahānā-

L. 7. ma licchaviṣceva nidānāṃ pūrṇamāsikam ādānā pratyayā tṛṣṇā katakaimā āha caksuḥ prātitya rupāni cyotpadyate caksurvyijñānam trayānāṃ sannipātaḥ sparśaḥ sparśa pratyayā vedanā vedanā pratyayā-
L. 8. yā tṛṣṇā evaṁ śrotra ghrāṇa jihvā kāya manahḥ pratītya dharmmāscotpadyate manovijñānaṁ trayāṇāṁ sannipatāt sparsāḥ sparsa pratītya vedanā vedanā pratītya tṛṣṇā taducyate vedanāpratyayā tṛṣṇā api khalu caksu
L. 9. rāsvādam vedayita pratītya bhūyo bhūyoścakṣupi apratikulata samitiṣṭhate apratikule sati bhūyo bhūyaścakṣu pi utpādyate rāgaḥ samrāgaḥ ālayāni yam tiradhyavasaṁan tṛṣṇā evaṁ śrotra ghrāṇa jihvā
L. 10. kāya manahḥ āsvādam vedayitavyo pratītya bhūyo bhūyo manasi apratikulata samitiṣṭhate apratikule sati bhūyo bhūyo manasyutpadyata rāgaḥ samrāgaḥ ālayāni yam ti-radhyavasaṁan tṛṣṇā...

L. 1. Vedanā pratītya tṛṣṇā api khalvevamuktaṁ bhagavatā parṁcopedānaskandhindikervyākarāṇe rūpaśayāhām bhikṣavaḥ āsvāda paryesāṇāmavāksaṁ yā rūpe āsvādastamanubhāṭsatyavāṇārūpa āsvādaḥ praṇāyaṁ me samudṛṣṭa ityeta?
L. 2. sādam vedayitāṁ pratītya bhūyo bhūyo rūpe apratikulātā samitiṣṭhate apratikule sati bhūyo bhūyo rūpa utpādyate rāgaḥ samrāgaḥ ālayo nīrmaṁtiradhyavasaṁāṁ tṛṣṇā taducyate vedanā pratītya tṛṣṇā evaṁ vedanā ?
L. 3. samjñāyaḥ samākārānāṁ vijñānasyāham bhikṣavaḥ āsvāda paryesāṇāmavāksaṁ yo vijñāne āsvādastamanubhāṭsyaṁ yāvad vijñāne āsvādaḥ praṇāyamanudṛṣṭa ityetadvijñānāsvādam vedayitāṁ pratītya bhūyo bhūpo vijñāne a—
L. 4. pratikulata samitiṣṭhate apratikule sati bhūyo bhūyo vijñāna utpādyate rāgaḥ samrāgaḥ ālayāni yam tiradhyavasaṁāṁ tṛṣṇā taducyate vedanā pratītya yā tṛṣṇā api khalvevamuktaṁ bhagavatā parṁcopedānaskandhindike vyāka—
L. 5. kārāṇe rūpa cedbhikṣava āsvādaṁ bhavenna ye sattvā rūpa samrājayeraṁ yasmatu bhikṣavesti rūpa āsvādaḥ tena ye sattvā rūpa samrājayante ityetadrūpāsvādam vedayitāṁ pratītya bhūyo vistareṇa yāvadutpadyate tṛṣṇā
L. 6. vedanāyāṁ samijñāyā sanikkāreṣu vijñānā cedbhikṣavaḥ āsvāda na bhavennema satvā vijñāne samrajyeraṇa yasmāttu bhikṣavosti vijñāne āsvādastasmādime satvā vijñāna samrajyāṁte ityetadvijñānāsvādayitaṁ pratītya bhū—

L. 7. yo bhūyo vistareṇa yāvadutpadyate trṣṇā taducyate vedanā pratyayā trṣṇā api khalvevamuktam bhagavatā śaḍāyatanike vyākaraṇe caksūṣāham bhikṣava āsvāda paryēṣanāmacākṣatyaścaksuṣi āsvādastamanabhotsya-vyavāṁścaksuṣyā

L. 8. svādaḥ prajñāyāmesa sūḍṛṣṭaḥ ityetacaksuṣi āsvādaṁ vedayitam pratītya bhūyo vistareṇa yāvattrṣṇā tadutpadyate vedanā pratyayā trṣṇā evam śrotra ghrāṇa jihva kāya manah soham bhikṣavaḥ āsvāda paryēṣanāmacākṣam ya

L. 9. (ma) ? sanasyāśvādastamanabhotsyaṁ yāvat manasya-svādaḥ prajñāyāmesa sūḍṛṣṭa itya—(p. 50?) tat manasa āsvāda vedayitam pratītya bhūyo vistareṇa yāvattrṣṇā taducyate vedanā pratyayā trṣṇā api khalvevamuktam bhagavatā śaḍāyatanike

L. 10. vyakaraṇo caksuṣi bhikṣava āsvādaścenna bhavennema satvācaksuṣi samrajyeraṇi yasmāt bhikṣavaḥ asti caksuṣ-vāsvādastasmādime satvācaksuṣi samrajyāṁte ityetacaksuṣāsvādaṁ vedayitam vistareṇa pratītya yāvattrṣṇā tadu—

L. 1. cyate vedanā pratyayā trṣṇā evam śrotra ghrāṇa jihvāyaṁ kāya manasi cedbhikṣavaḥ āsvādo na bhavennema satvā manasi samrajyeraṇi yasmāt bhikṣavosti manasyāśvādastasmādime satvā manasi samrajyante ityetamanasa āsvāda veda—

L. 2. yitam pratītya bhūyo bhūyo manasya pratikulatā samtiṣṭhate vistareṇa yāvattrṣṇā taducyate vedanā pratyayā trṣṇa api khalvevamuktam bhagavatā śaḍāyatanike vyākaraṇe rūpasyāham bhikṣavaḥ āsvāda paryēṣanāmacākṣa ca

L. 3. yā rūpa āsvādastamanvubhotsya yāvadrupe āsvāda
prajñāyā mesa samudṛṣṭah ityetatdrūpāsvāda vedayitam pratītya yāvattṛṣṇā taducyate vedanā pratayā tṛṣṇā evam sadṛṣ̄arevaṁ (?) samyag-dharmmaṇāmaham bhikṣava āsvāda

L. 4. paryēṣanāmacākṣaṁ yo dharmme āsvādasta manu (?) bhotsyaṁ yāvāddharmmaṇāsvādaḥ prajñāyā me samudṛṣṭah ityetadva dyāsvāda vedayitam pratītya vistareṇa yavattṛṣṇā taducyate vedanā pratayā tṛṣṇā api khalvevamuktaṁ bhagava—

L. 5. tā śālayatanike vyākarāṇe rūpa cedhikṣava āsvāda na bhavenneme satvā rūpa samrājayoranyasmātta (?) bhikṣavosti rūpe āsvādastasmādime satvā rūpe samrājayate ityetadrūpāsvāda caidamidam pratītya vistareṇa yāva—

L. 6. tṛṣṇā taducyate vedanā pratayā tṛṣṇā evam śavda satvorā sampra (?) vye dharmma cedbhiksava āsvāda na bhavanneme sattvā dharmme samrājayaranī tasmātta bhikṣavosti dharmmesvāsvādastenema satvā

L. 7. dharma samrājayamte ityeta dharmmaṇāsvaṁ pratītya vedayitam vistareṇa yavattṛṣṇā taducyate vedanā pratayā tṛṣṇā II Api khlvevemuktaṁ bhagavatā mahānāmānāṃ licchavimāgamya rūpaṁ cetmahānāmannekānta duḥkhāṁ bhavennasukham na su—

L. 8. khāṇvaśatam na sukha saumanasya parītaṁavakkrānti-meva sukhena heturapi mahanār annaprajñā ye te satvānām rūpa samrāgāya na ce me satvā rūpe samrājayaraju yasmātta mahānāmanṛupanekānta duḥkhāṁ sukhum

L. 9. sukhānugataṁ sukha saumanasya parītaṁavakkrānta-meva sukhena tasmādime sattvā rūpe samrājayamte samraktaḥ samyujamte samyuktaḥ samkliśayamte ityetadrūpāsvāda vedayitam pratītya vistareṇa yāvattṛṣṇā taducya—

L.10. te vedanā pratayā tṛṣṇā vedanā samjñā samākāra vijñānam cenmahānāmannekānta duḥkhāṁ bhavenna sukham na sukhānugataṁ na sukha saumanasya parīta mavakkrāntam meva sukham na heturapi mahānāmannaprajñāyatasa (?)
(C)

L. 1. viññāna saṁrādhāya na ca ye satvā viññāna saṁrajyo-

raniyasmātta mahānāma viññānam nekāntadulhkham

sukham sukhaṁsugataṁ sukha saumanasya parītām

anavakkṛntāmeva sukhena tasmādime satvā viññāna

sa(mra) jyānte saṁrāta—

L. 2. yujyante samyuktaḥ saṁklisyamte ityeta tadviññānāśvāda

vedayitaṁ pratītyā vistareṇa yāvatṝṇaṁ taducyate

vedanā pratayā tṛṇaṁ api khalvevamuktām bhagavata

paunṛṇamāśike vyakaraṇe yadbhikṣavo rūpam pratītyo-

tpa—

L. 3. dyate sukhāmutpadyate saumanasyamayaṁ rūpa āsvā-

daḥ ityeta drūpāśvāda vedayitaṁ pratītya yavatṝṇaṁ

taducyate vedanā pratayā tṛṇaṁ yadbhikṣavo vedanā

saṁjñā saṁskāraṇyadvijñānām pratītyopadyate suha-

mupadyate suoma—

L. 4. nasya cenyam viññāna āsvāda ityeta viññānāśvāda veda-

yitaṁ pratītya bhūyo bhūyo viññāne apratikulatā saṁ-

mastiṣṭhate apratikule sati bhūyom bhūyo viññāna utpad-

yate rāgaḥ saṁrāgaḥ ālayo niyamirādhyavāsana ca (?)—

L. 5. tṛṇaṁ taducyate vedanā pratayā tṛṇaṁ api khalveva-

muktām bhagavatā mahānīdānaparīyaṁ āyusmatyān-

nande tatrāṇanda yā ca bhavatṝṇaṁ yā ca vibhava-

tṛṇaṁ iti me dve tṛṇā dvayena vedanā samavasara—

L. 6. na bhavataḥ taducyate vedanā pratayā tṛṇaṁ II Uddā-

nam II Tat prathamābhinipātaḥ kameścāveyavām-

tathā dṛṣṭi viciktāṁ upādānam vibhāsānandameva ca II

Tṛṇā pratayamupādānaṁ katamadāha I Yat prathamā-

bhinipātaṁ tṛṇā vai pūnyamupādānam yathā katha-

miti yathā khalvihaikatyaḥ kameśvāvēkṣavānḥ bhavati

prativeddhacittāḥ kāma rāga paryavasthāna-mutpāda-

yati sa tasmāt paryavasthānādanyam paryavasthāna-

mutpādaya—

L. 8. ti adhimātrādadhimaṭrataraṁ tibrattibrataṁ pūrṇaṁ

purūtataṁ prīmamupādānaṁ tṛṇaṁ pāscic

mamupādānaṁ tṛṇaṁ pratīyamupādānaṁ yathā

khalvikaikatyaṁ rūpēcārūpyesvāvēkṣavānḥ bhavati pra-

tivaddha citta

L. 9. ārupya rāga paryavasthānamutpādayati sa tasmāt parya-

vasthānādanyat paryavasthānamutpādayati adhimātrā-
dadhimātrataraṁ yāvat paripūrṇāt paripūrṇataramitī
pūrvakāṁ paryavasthānāṁ tṛṣṇā paścimamupādāna?
—

L.10. taducyate tṛṣṇā pratyayamupādānaṁ asti khalvevamuk-
tam bhagavatā pātaleya vyakaraṇo desītā vo bhikṣavo
mayā dharmmaḥ skandhānāṁ pravicayāya yaduta
catvāri smṛityupasthānāni catvāri samyakpradhānāṁ

L. 1. catvāra ṛddhipādā paṁcendriyānipaṁca (?) balāni
sapta bodhyaṁgānyādaśṭāṇiso? mārgga evaṁ desiteṣu
vo (?) bhikṣavo nā dharmmesu skandhānāṁ pravicayāya
atha ca punarihaikatyo moha (?) puruṣcna ti pracchandā
viharāntī na ti♭ saubhā na ti♭ (r) bra pra—

L. 2. māṇo na ti♭ bra pramādaste caktumevānuttamaṁ spṛśamti
yadutāsravānāṁ kṣayāya evaṁ desitesu vo bhikṣavo
mayā dharmmesu skandhānāṁ pravicayāya atha ca
punarihaikatyah kulaputrāḥ ativa ti♭racchandā viharāntī
ativa ti♭ bra nes—

L. 3. hā ativa ti♭ bra sncha (twice by mistake) ativa ti♭rapre-
mānotīva ti♭ bra prasādāstat kṣipramevānuttamaṁ
spṛśamti yadutāsravānāṁ kṣayāya evaṁ desitesu vo
bhikṣavo mayā dharmmesu skandhānāṁ pravicayāya
atha purarihaikatyo rupamātmanaḥ

L. 4. samanupāyati yā sā samanupaśyānāṁ saṁskārāste te
puṇaḥ saṁskārāḥ kinnidāṇāḥ kim samudayaḥ kim jāti-
yāḥ kim prabhavāḥ avidyā saṁsparśājama bhikṣavo
vedayitaṁ pratītya tṛṣṇātpanna tataste saṁskarastrīṇa
punarbikṣavaḥ

L. 5. kinnidāṇā kim samudaya kim jātiya kim prabhavā tṛṣṇā
bhikṣavo vedanā nidāṇā vedanā samudayaḥ vedanā jātiya
vedanā prabhavā vedanā punarbikṣavāḥ kninnidāṇā
kim samudaya kim jātiya kim prabhavā vedanā bhikṣavaḥ

L. 6. sparśa nidāṇā sparśa samudāya sparśa jātiya sparśa
prabhavāḥ sparśa kinnidāṇāḥ kim samudayaḥ kim
jātiyaḥ kim prabhavāḥ sparśa bhikṣavaḥ saḍāyatana
nidāṇāḥ saḍāyatana samudayaḥ saḍātaya—

L. 7. na jātiyaḥ saḍūyatana prabhavāḥ tatra bhikṣavaḥ saḍa-
yatanamanityam saṁskṛtam cetitaṁ pratītya samut-
pannam so pi sparśaḥ sāpi vedanā sāpi tṛṣṇā sāpi samanu-
pañyanā anityā samskṛtā veditā pra—
L. 8. itiyā samutpannā sarūpamātmati samanupaśyatītisat-

kāyadrśṭih paryavasthānamupādayati sa tasmātparya-

vasthānādanyatparyavasthānamutpādayati adhimātra-

dadhimātratara yāvatparipūrtāparipūṛṇata—
L. 9. ramitī-pūrvvakaṁ paryavasthānam tṛṣṇā pascimamup-

āṇāṃ taducyate tṛṣṇā pratayahupādānaṁ na haiva rūpamātmati samanupaśyatayapi tu rūpavantamātma-

naṁ samanupaśyati nahaiva rūpavantamātmaṁ samanupaśyatayapi

L.10. pi tu rūpamātmiyāṁ samanupaśyati na haiva rūpamātmi-

yāṁ samanupaśyatayapi tu rūpa ātmānam samanupaś-

yati na haiva rūpa ātmānam samanupaśyatayapi tu vedā-

nāṁmātmatāḥ samanupaśyati na haiva vedānā

L. 1. samanupaśyatayapi tu vedānāvantamātmaṁ samana-

paśyati na haiva vedānā ????? samanupaśyatayapi tu
vedānāṁātmiyāṁ samanūpaśyatayi na haiva vedānāṁāt-

miyāṁ samanupaśyati na haiva vedānāṁātmiyāṁ

samānapaśyayati tu vedānāyāmātmaṁ samanupa

(śyati)

L. 2. na haiva vedānāyāmātmanāṁ samanupaśyatayapi tu

saṁjñāmātmatāḥ samanupaśyatayapi tu saṁjñāvantamā-

tmānāṁ samanupaśyati na haiva saṁjñāvantamātma-

naṁ samanupaśyatayapi tu saṁjñāmātmi—

L. 3. yāṁ samanupaśyati na haiva saṁjñāmātmiyāṁ sam-

anupaśyatayapi tu saṁjñāyāmātmaṁ samanupaśyati na

haiva saṁjñāyāmātmaṁ samanupaśyatayapi tu saṁ-

skārāṇātmataḥ samanupaśyati na haiva saṁskārāṇāt-

mataḥ

L. 4. samanupaśyatayapi tu saṁskāravantamātmānāṁ sama-

nupaśyati vistaraḥ vijñānamātmatāḥ samanupaśyati na

haiva vijñānamātmatāḥ samanupaśyatayapi tu vijñāna-

vantamātmānāṁ samanupaśyati na haiva vijñānavan-

tamātmāna—

L. 5. samanupaśyati na haiva vijñānamātmiyāṁ samanupaś-
yatapi tu vijnāne ātmānāṁ samanupaśyati na haiva vijnāne ātmānāṁ samanupaśyatyapi tu kāṁkṣi bhavati vicikitsā na haiva kāṁkṣi bhavati vicikitsā api

L. 6. tu bhavadṛṣṭirbhavati vibhavadṛṣṭiḥ na haiva bhavadṛṣṭirbhavati vibhavadṛṣṭiḥ api tvastīti vācādhiyam bhavatyamahamasmīti samanupaśyatyai yā sāvamsityadhigama yamahamasmityadhigama yamamasmisamanupā—

L. 7. śyatām saṁskārāste te punaḥ saṁskārāḥ kim nidānāḥ kim samudayāḥ kim jātiyāḥ kim prabhavaṇā vistareṇa yāvattatra bhikṣavaṇā śaḍāyatanamāvidyāṁ saṁskṛtam cetitaṃ pratītya samutpānnaṁ sopi sparsaḥ sapā vedanaḥ sapā trṣṇā

L. 8. te pi saṁskārāḥ sā pi samanupaśyanā anityā saṁskṛtā veditā pratītya samutpānṇā asmiṇyadhigataḥ bhavatyamaḥ samamasmīti samanupaśyati satkāyadrśtī paryavasthānamutpādayati sa tasmāt paryavasthānādanyā

L. 9. tparvasthānamutpādayati adhitrādhitrādhitrātaraṃ tibrāṭibrātaram paripūṛṇātparipūṣnatarāmiti purvvaṃ paryavasthānam trṣṇā paścinamupādānam taducyate trṣṇā pratyayamupādānam api khalu śāsvato lo—

L. 10. kaḥ antagrāha dṛṣṭi paryavasthānamutpādayatyādhīmātraḥ mātraḥ mātraḥ mātras tāvat paripūrṇātparipūrṇātaraṃ tāvat paripūrṇātparipūrṇātaraṃ pūrvvakaḥ paryavasthānam trṣṇā paścinamupādānam sa taducyate trṣṇā pratyayamupādānam sa

L. 11. ? tyapi tu vijnāna vā (?) ? yaṁ samanupaśyati

L. 1. śāsvato lokah śāsvataścāśāsvataśca yena śāsvato nāśāsvataḥ antavallokaḥ anantavallokaḥ antavrānāntavrāṇāca naivam bhavamanantavāṁśca sajivasaccharitam anyomivonyaccharitam bhavati tathāgataḥ parama maraṇānaḥ bhavati ta—

L. 2. thāgataḥ parama maraṇādbhavati ca na ca bhavati ca naiva bhavati na na bhavati parama maraṇād tatrāḥ paryavasthāna dṛṣṭimutpādayati sa tasmāt paryavasthānādyāvat paripūrṇātparipūrṇātaramiti pūrvvakaḥ paryavasthānam trṣṇā paści—
L. 3. makamupādānaṁ taducyate tṛṣṇā pratyayamupādānaṁ api khalu na bhagavāṁstathāgatārahatsamyaksambuddhena vidyācarana sampannena sugato lokavidānuttaraḥ puruṣa damyasārathi śāstā devamanuṣyānāṁ buddha bhagāvam mithyādṛśi—

L. 4. śṭi paryavasthānamutpādāyati sa tasmātparyavasthānādvistareṇa paripūrṇatparipūrṇataśām taducyate tṛṣṇā pratyayamupādānaṁ na svākhyaśo bhagavata dharmmaṁsāṁdṛśṭiko na nijvaraḥ nākālikaḥ naupanāyike no

L. 5. bhi pasyākaḥ na pra (tyāmu)? pādanīyavijñānenaupratipanno bhagavataḥ śrāvakasaṅghēsu prjñā? pratipanno na nyāya pratipanno na sāmīcī pratipanno nānadharmacāri na mārgo na sarvasaṁskā—

L. 6. rā anityā na sarvva ḍharmma anātmāno na sātmanaścānamīti mithyādṛśti paryavasthānamutpādayati sa tasmātparyavasthānādanyatparyavasthānamutpādayati vistareṇa yāvaditi pūrvakam paryavasthānam

L. 7. tṛṣṇā paścimamupādānaṁ taducyate tṛṣṇā pra (tya) yamupādānamīti api khalu svāsvatyā loka idameva satyam mohamanvadiṛ dhṛṣṭi parāmarśa paryavasthānamutpādayati sa tasmātparyavasthānādanyatpa—

L. 8. ryavasthānamutpādayati vistareṇa yāvatpaścimakamupādānaṁ taducyate tṛṣṇā pratyayamupādānaṁ śāsvatyā loko vistareṇa yā rā (?) tra (?)iva bhavati tathāgataḥ param maraṇāditi idameva satyam mohamanva (?)

L. 9. dīti dhṛṣṭi parāmarśa paryavasthānamutpadāyati sa tasmātparyavasthānādanyatparyavasthānamutpadāyati vistareṇa yāvatpaścimakamupādānaṁ api khalu śīlam pa—

L. 10. rāmṛṣati śīla na sūcyati mucyati niryāti sukha duḥkham vyotikarāmaḥ sukha duḥkha vyatikramaḥ cānuprānapnoti śīla vrataparāmarśa paryavasthānamutpādayati sa tasmātparyavasthānādanyatparyavasthānam...
L. 2. pnoti śilabrata parāmarśa paryavasthānamutpādayati sa
tasmāt paryavasthānādanyat paryavasthānamutpādayati
vistareṇa yāvat paścimakumāpādānam taducyate trṣṇā
pratyayamupādānam api khalu tathāgato bhagavānar-
hatasa—
L. 3. myaksambuddheneti vicikitsā paryavasthānamutpāda-
yati sa tasmāt paryavasthānādanyat paryavasthāna-
mutpādayati vistareṇa yāvatpaścimakumāpādānah tadu-
cyate trṣṇā pratyayamupādānah vidyācaraṇa sampanno
da vidyā
carāṇasāṁpannaha sugato lokavit na sugato lokavit anut-
taro nānuttaraḥ puruṣa damya sārathiḥ na puruṣa damya-
sārathiḥ sāstā devamanusyaṇāṁ na sāstā devamanusyaṇa-
ṇāṁ buddho bhagavānna buddho bhagavā na
svākhyaṭo bhagavato dharmmo na svākhyaṭo bhagavato
dharmmaḥ sāmṛṣṭiko na samṛṣṭiko nijvaro na nijvarah
ākāliko nākālikah apanāyiko nopaṇāyikaḥ aihādaśike
naihādaśikaḥ pratyātme
cedyo vijñhoḥ na pratyātma vedanīyo vijñhoḥ supratipanno
bhagavataḥ śrāvaka samgho na supratipanno bhagava-
taḥ śrāvakasarṅghaḥ rju pratipanno na rjupratipanna
nyaya pratipanno na nyaya prati—
panno dharmmānudharmma pratipanno na dharmmānudharmma
pratipannaḥ sāmicī pratipanno na samicī
pratipannaḥ anudharmmacārānunudharmmacāri duḥ-
khaṁ na duḥkhain samudayo na samudyo nirodho na
nirodai margo na margaḥ sarvva saṁ—
skārā anityāḥ na sarvva saṁskārā anityāḥ sarvva dharmmā
anatmānah na sarvva dharmmā anātmānah sāntar
nirvāṇam na sāntar nirvāṇamiti vicikitsā paryavasthā-
namutpādayati vistareṇa yāvatpaścimakumāpādāna
cuo
L. 9. taducyate trṣṇā pratyayamupādānam api khalu sarvān-
yeva catvāryupādānāni trṣṇā samudayāni trṣṇā jatiyāni
trṣṇā prabhavāni katamāni catvāri kāmopādānaṁ
dṛṣṭopādānaṁ śilabratopādānam—
L. 10. tmāvādopādanam kāmopādanam katamadāha kāma
pratīsamuktaṁ dṛṣṭāṁ śilabrataṁ ca sthāpayāni rjāni
kāmapratīsamuktaṁ samyojana bandhanānuṣayopa
desaṃ paryavasthānāni idamucyate.
L. 1. kāmopādanaṁ drṣṭupādaṇaṁ katamadāha catasro
drṣṭayo drṣṭupādaṇaṁityucyate satkāya drṣṭi ra (?)
nta grā (?) ha drṣṭinmithyādṛṣṭi drṣṭi parāmarśa itimā (?)
scatasro drṣṭayo drṣṭvāpādaṇaṁityucyate śīla bratopā-
dānaṁ katama ya
L. 2. —thā khalvihākatyaḥ śīlam parāmṛsati vistāreṇa yāvat
ubha (?) yena śīla bratena śucyati mucyate niryyati sukha
dūkhkhaṁ byātikrāmata sukha dūkhka byātikramanu-
prāpnoti idamucyate śīlabratopādaṇaṁ ātmabratopā—
L. 3. dānaṁ ātmabratopādaṇaṁ katama rūpārupya prati-
samyuktā dṛṣṭiḥ śīlabratam ca sthāpya tadanyāni rūpā-
rūpya pratisamyuktāṁ saṁyojana bandhanānusayo
pañcase paryavasthānānidamucyate ātmabratopādaṇaṁ
L. 4. api khalvevamuktaṁ bhagavatā mahānīdāne vyākaraṇe
āyusmatyānande asti pratyamānandopādaṇaṁ vistāreṇa
yavattṛṣṇā cedānanda nā bhaviṣyadapi nu kasyacit-
kaccittṛṣṇā bhaviṣyannobhadanta sarvaśo vā punara—
L. 5. nanda trṣṇā yāmasatyomapi nu upādaṇaṁ prajñā-
māyatano bhadanta tasmātta hyānanda etannīda-
meṣa heturesa samudaya eṣa pratyayāḥ upādaṇasa
yaduta trṣṇā trṣṇāpratyayamupādaṇami—
L. 6. ti yaduktamaṁ metatpratyuktamiti II Bhavaḥ katama
āha upādaṇānyeva pratityānekavidhā bhava prajñāpti-
ruktā bhagavatā ekavidhā asti bhava prajñāpti ya
tra traḥdhatukāḥ paṃcaskandhā uktā bhagavatā
L. 7. asti bhavaprajñāpti ya (?) trāyatyāṁ punarbhavābhi-
nirvva uttrākam karmmo (?)ktam bhagavatā asti
bhavaprajñāpti yatropapatyāṅgikā paṃcaskandhā uktā
bhagavatā katamaḥ bhavaprajñāptityatra traḥdhatukāḥ
paṃcaskandhā bhava u—
L. 8. kta bhagavatā yaduktam trayo bhavaḥ kāma bhavo-
rūpa bhavaḥ arūpya bhavaḥ iyaṁ bhavaprajñāptityatra
traḥdhatukāḥ paṃcaskandhā bhava uktā bhagavatā
katamaḥ bhavaprajñāpti yatrāyatāṁ punarbhavati
nirvarttakāṁ karmmo (?)ktam bha—
L. 9. —gavatā yaduktaṁ yadapi tadānanda karmmāyatamaṁ
punarbhavāya samvartate idamatra bhavasya iyaṁ
bhavaprajñāpti yatrāyatāṁ punarbhavābhiniṛṛttakaṁ
karmma bhava uktam bhagavatā katamaḥ chavrprajñāpti
yatropaptayamsika (ḥ)
L. 10. paṁcaskandha bhava uktā bhagavatā yaduktāṁ vijñānam phalgunāhāram yāva devāyatyaṁ punarbhavābhir nirvṛttiye prādurbhāva ya iyam bhavaprajñapti yatropapatyamśikaḥ paṁcaskandha bhava uktam bhagavatā ā...?

L. 1. khalvaivamuktāṁ bhagavatā nidānaparyāye vyākaraṇe āyuṣmatyānanda asti pratayamānanda bhavo bistareṇa yāvatsarvvaso (?) vā punarānanda upādāne asati api nu bhavaḥ prajñāyatanā bhadanta tasmātta (hyā)nanda. eta?
L. 2. dānam ceṣa hetureṣa samudaya esa pratayyo bhavasya (?) yadutopādānam upādāna pratayamānanda bhava iti yadukatmidaṁ me tatpratyuktam II Bhava pratayā jātiḥ katamā (?) āha yathā khalvihaikatyo rāga paryavasthi—
L. 3. to dveṣa paryavasthitā moha paryavasthitāḥ kāyena duṣca ritaṁ carati vācā manasā duṣcaritaṁ carati ye te a kuṣala kāyasamśkārā vākkasamśkārā manaḥ samśkārā ayamucyate akuṣalaḥ karmma bhavaḥ yadapi taddhetu—
L. 4. tatpratyayāṁ kāyasya bhedānnarakesūpapadyate tatra yā jātiḥ samjātiravakramāṁtirabhinirvṛttiḥ prādurbhāvaḥ skandha pratiḷābho dhātu pratiḷābha āyatana pratiḷābha jivitendriyasya prādurbhāva itiyaṁ jāti
L. 5. rimāṁ bhavaṁ pratitya taducyate bhava pratayā jātiriti yathā narakeṣvevaṁ tiryak bhūtesu (?) yathā khalvihaika (tyā?) manuṣya sukha kaṇāmavekṣhaṁvān bhavati pratibaddhacitta tasyaivaṁ bhavatyahovatā-hamanuṣya subha—
L. 6. gānāṁ sabhāgatayāṁmupapadyeyamiti satapraṁthayamā nastaddhetostatsaṁvartta (?)niyāṁ kāyena sucaritaṁ carati vācā manasā sucaritaṁ carati ye te kuṣalaḥ kāyasamśakārā vākasamśkārā manaḥ samśkārā—
L. 7. ayamucyate kuṣalaḥ karmmahavaḥ yadapi taddhetu tatpratyayāṁ kāyasya bhedānamanumṣamanubhagānam sabhāgatayāṁmupapadyate tattayā jātiḥ samjātirbistarena taducyate bhava pratayā jāti yathā manuṣya—
L. 1. brahmakāyikānāṁ devānāṁ sabhāgatāyāmupapadyate tatra jātīḥ samjāṭirvistareṇa yāvadiyam jātirīmaṁ bhavari pratītya taducyate bhavapratyayā jātiriti yathā brahmakāyikānāmevaṁ brahma purohitānāṁ mahā-brahmaṁ

L. 2. yathā khalvihaṅkataḥ parittābhānāṁ devānāṁavekṣa-vāṁbhavati pratīvadhaṅcitaḥ tasyaivam bhavayaṅhavatāṁ parittābhānāṁ devānāṁ sabhāgatāyāmupapadyayamiti sa tavārthayamāno vitarka vicārānāṁ vyupasaṁ

L. 3. mādadhāyata samprasāḍāccetaṁ ekotibhavāvaḍavitar-kkamavicāraṁ samāḍhijam prītisukhaṁ dvitiyam dhyānamupasampadya viharati tathā samāpānasya yaḥ kāyaśarvārō vāksamvara ājiva pariśuddhiḥ āyamucyate

L. 4. kuśalaḥ karmmahavahaḥ yadapi taddhetu tavārthayamāno kāsyasya bhedatparittābhānāṁ devānāṁ sabhāgatāyāmupapadyate tatra ya jātīḥ samjāṭirvistareṇa jīvendriyasya prādurbhavahā iti yam jātirīyam bhava da (?)

L. 5. pratītya taducyate bhavapratyayā jātīḥ yathā parittabhānāmevaṁpramāṇābhānāṁbhavasarānāṁ yathā khalvihaṅkataḥ parītaḥ sūbhānāṁ devānāṁ avekṣa-vāṁbhavati pratīvadhaṅcitaḥ tasyaiva bhavayaṅhavatāṁ

L. 6. haṁ parītaḥ sūbhānāṁ devānāṁ sabhāgatāyāmupapadyayam sa tavārthayamānanātadhetostatsavmavartta-
niyam priterviragadupekṣako viharati smṛitiḥ samprajāna sukhām ca kāmena pratisaṁvedayate ya

L. 7. ttadāryā āvekṣate upekṣakaḥ smṛitimaṁ sukhaṁbhārīti triyam dhyāmaṁ sukhāvivahārīti
tathā samāpannasya yaḥ kāyaṁvaro vākṣamvaraḥ ājivapariśuddhirahamyacaceto kuśalaḥ karmmahāvahāḥ

L. 8. yaddhi taddhetu tatpratyayam kāyaṁ bhedātprattat-suhānāṁ devānāṁ sabhāgatāyamupapadyate tatra yā
ejātiḥ samjatirvistareṇa śamucayate bhavapratyayā jāti
eriḥ yathā paritta suhānāmeva

L. 9. mapramāṇabhānāṁ śubhakṛtsnaṁ yathā khalihaikatyaḥ anabhakrāṇāṁ devānāmaṃvekṣāvānabhavati
pratīvaddhacitātā tasyaivaṁ bhavatyahovatāhā (m?)
manabhakrāṇāṁ devānāṁ sabhāgatāyamupapadyeyama
mīti cā tatprā—

L. 10. rthayāmānastaddhetostatsamāvartanīyaṁ sukhasya ca
dhānāḥ duḥkkhasya ca prahānaḥ pūrvvameva ca soman
going a daurmanasayaurastagamaduḥkkhasukhamup
ekṣā smṛiti pariśuddham caturtham dhyāmaṁ pasam
padya vi (harati)

L. 1. tathā samāpannasya yaḥ kāyaṁvaro vākṣamvaraḥ ājivapariśuddhirahamyacate kuśalaḥ karmmahāvahāḥ yadapi
taddhetu tatpratyayam kāyaṁ bhedādananbhakrāṇāṁ
devānāṁ sabhāgatāyamum—

L. 2. papadyate tatra yā jātiḥ samjātiḥ vistarenā yāvajjivit
tendriyaṁ prādurbhāvaḥ iti yā jātirimaṁ bhavaṁ
dratitya taducaye bhava praghatāyā jātiḥ yathā ana
bhakrānātemaṁ puṇya-prasa—

L. 3. vānāmasamajñīṣattvā samgrihitānāṁ ca vṛihatphalānāṁ
yathākhalvihāikatyāḥ asamjñīṣatvānāṁ devānāmavekṣāvān
bhavati pratiṣuddha cittaḥ tasyaitvaṁ bhavatya
hovatāhamasamjñīṣatvānāṁ devānāṁ sabhā—

L. 4. gatāyāmupapadyeyamīti ca tathā praghatostatsamāvartanīyaṁ samjñāmoudārikatā duḥṣi(khi ?)
lataḥ sthū (?) labhitikato manasikaroti asamjñikam ca
śā (?) nta(?)taḥ pranītato niḥsaranatāḥ tasya samjña
mau
L. 5. dārikato duḥ śi(khi?)lataḥ sthū (?)labhittikato manasi-
kurvataḥ āsamjñikāṁ ca sāntataḥ pranītato niḥsar-
naṇaḥ samjñā antarīyate āsamjñikāṁ ca samsthihatiḥ iti
yattra (?) mama samjñā antā(?)vā yate āsam—
L. 6. jñikaṁ ca samsthihatyā tāvadasaṁjñi samāpattī samā-
pannaṁ vaktavyaṁ, tathā samāpannaisyā yāḥ kāyasat-
varo vāksaṁvaraḥ ājivapariśuddhirayamucyaṭe kuśalaḥ
karmmabhavaḥ Yadapi taddhetusta—
L. 7. trpaṭyaṁ kāyaśya bhedādasasaṁjñīṣattvānāṁ devānāṁ
sabhāgatāyāmupapadyate tatra yā jātiḥ samijātirvistarena
yāvajjivendriyasya prādurbhāvaḥ iti itiyaṁ jātirimaṁ
bhavam pratiṭyā taducyaṭe—
L. 8. bhavaprasyayā jātiriti yathā khalvihakatyāḥ ākāśāna
ntyāyatanāṇāṁ devānāmavekṣāvānbhavati pratibaddha-
cittaḥ tasyaivaṁ bhavatyahovatāḥam ākāśānantyaṭya-
tanāṇāṁ devānāṁ sabhāgatāyāmupapadye—
L. 9. yamiti sa tat prārthayamāṇastaddhetostatsamvartta-
yāṁ sarvvaso (?) rupasaṁjñāṇāṁ samatiikkramatpratiya
samijñānānastthagamānānāṁ tvasaṁjñāṇānāmanasikārā-
dananta mākāsamityākāśānantya—
L. 10. ta(NA)mupasaṁpadya viharati tathā samāpannaisyā
yā cetanā samcetanābhisamcetanā cetayiṁ cetanā-
gataṁ cittābhisaṁskāro manaskarmmānyayamucyaṭe
kuśalaḥ karmmabhavaḥ Yadapi taddhetu (sta?)

L. 1. trpaṭyaṁ kāyaśya bhedādākāśānantyaṭyaṇatanāṇāṁ de-
vānāṁ sabhāgatāyāmupapayate tatra yā jātiḥ samijātir-
vistareṇa yāva jīvendriya prādurbhāva itiyaṁ jāti-
rimaṁ bhavam pratiṭyā taducyaṭe
L. 2. bhavaprasyayā jātiriti yathā khalvihakatyō vijñān-
antyaṭyaṇatanāṇāṁ devānāṁ-avekṣāvānbhavati pra(ti)
vaddhacittaḥ tasyaivaṁ bhavatyahovatāḥam vijñā-
nantyaṭanāṇāṁ devānāṁ sabhāgatāyāmupapadye—
L. 3. yamiti sa tatprārthayamāṇastaddhetostatsamvarttaṁ
satvasu ākāśānantyaṭyatānāṁ samatikramyānastāṁ
vijñānamiti vijñāna vijñānānāntyāyatanamupasaṃpadya viharati tathā samāpannasya yā vedanā yāvaccı—

L. 4. ttābhisaṃskāro manaskarm光明ucyate kusālāḥ karm-

mabhāvaḥ yadapi taddhetu tat prayayaṁ kāyasya bhedād vijñānānāntyāyatanānāṁ devānāṁ sabbhāga
tāyāmupapadyate tatra yā jātiḥ samjātīḥ vi—

L. 5. stareṇa yāvajjivitendriyasya prādurbhāva itīyaṁ jātiri-
mam bhavaṁ pratītya taducyate bhava pratayaḥ jātiriti yathā khalvihaikatya akiṁcanyāyatānānām
devānāmavekṣāvān bhavati prativaddha—

L. 5. stareṇa yavajjivitendriyasya prādurbhāva itīyaṁ jātiri-
mam bhavaṁ pratītya taducyate bhava pratayaḥ jātiriti yathā khalvihaikatya akiṁcanyāyatānānām
devanāmavekṣāvān bhavati prativaddha—

L. 6. cittaḥ tasyaivam bhavatayohvatāhāṁ akiṁcanyāya-

tanānāṁ devānāṁ sabbhāgatayāmupapadyayamiti sa
tatprāttahyamānas taddhetostatsamvartanīyam satvaśo vijñānānāntyāyatanānāṁ samatikramya nā-

L. 7. sti kimcidityākiṁcanyāt anamupasaṃpadya viharati
tathā samāpannasya yā vedanā samvedanā vistareṇa
yāvaccīttābhisaṃskāro manaskarmāḥ avamucyate
kusālāḥ karmabhāvaḥ

L. 8. yadapi taddhetu tatprayayaṁ kāyasya bhedādākiṁ-
canyāyatānānāṁ devānāṁ sabbhāgatayāmupapadyate
tatra yā jātiḥ samjātīḥ vistareṇa yavajjivitendriyasya

L. 9. prā—
durbhāva itīyaṁ jātirimam bhavam pratītya taducyate
bhavaprayayā jātiriti yathā khalvihaikatyo naivasamjānā
nāsamjāyatanānāṁ devānāmavekṣāvān bhavati prati-
vaddhaicittah

L. 10. tasyaivam bhavatyabhojavatāḥāṁ naiva samjānā
nāsamjāyatanānāṁ devānāṁ sabbhāgatayāmupapadyaṁti
sa tatprāṛthayanānāstaddhetostat samvartanīyam akiṁ-
canyāyatānānāṁ samati—

L. 1. kramya nnevasamjānānāsamjāyatanamupasaṃpadya
viharati tathā samāpannasya yā vedanā vistareṇa
yāva cittābhismāskāro manaskarmāyamucyate kuśalaḥ karmma bhavaḥ—yadapi taddhetu tatpratyayam naivasamjñāna—

L. 2. samjñāyatanānāṁ devānāṁ sabhāgatāyāmupapadyate tatra yā jātiḥ samjñātiravakrāntirabhinnirvītiḥ prādurbhāvaḥ skandaḥ pratilābhāḥ āyatana pratilābhaḥ jīvitendriyasya prādurbhā—

L. 3. vaḥ ityāmaṁ jātirimaṁ bhavaṁ pratiyācetate bhavapratyayā jātiriti api khalvevamuktaṁ bhagavatā mahānīdānāparyāyā vyākaraṇe āyusmatyānandante asti pratyayamāṇanda jātiri praṃśairastū—

L. 4. ti vacanīyaṁ kiṁ pratyayā jātiriti bhava pratyayā iti vacaniyaṁ bhava pratyayāṇanda jātiriti me yaduktami-dam me tatraptiktam II Bhavaścedānanda na syādapi nu matsyāṇāṁ vā matsyatva pakshīṇānāṁ vā pa—

L. 5. kṣṭve sariśpāṇāṁ sarisripatve catuṣpadānāṁ vā catuṣpadatve nāgānāṁ vā nāgatve yaksāṇāṁ vā yaksatve bhūtānāṁ vā bhūtātve gandharvānāṁ vā gandharvavatve devānāṁ vā devatve manuṣyānāṁ vā manuṣya—

L. 6. tve tesāṁ tesāmāṇanda satvānāṁ tasmintasminsatvānāṁ api nu kasyacitravāchidbhavaḥ syānno bhadrantaḥ sarvvaśo vā punarāṇanda bhave asatyā pi nu kasyaci tva vijjati praṃśāyatone bhadraṁtaḥ—

L. 7. tasmāttachyānando tannidānnameṣa samudaya eṣa hetureṣa pratyayo jātyā yaduta bhavaḥ bhava pratyaya āṇanda jātiriti me yaduktamidad metatpratyantam II jāti pratyayam jārāmarṇamiti jāra katamo—

L. 8. āhayanteṣāṁteṣāṁ sandhānaṁ tasmām tasmām sandhānikāya jātiḥ samjñātiravakrāntirabhinnirvītīvistareṇa jīvitendriyasya prādurbhāvaḥ iyamucyate jātiḥ api khalvevamuktaṁ bhagavatā mahānīda—

L. 9. nāparyāye vyākaraṇe āyusmatyānandante asti pratyayaṁāṇanda jārāmarṇamiti praṃśairastū (ti) syādvacanīyaṁ vistareṇa yāvatjātiścedānanda na syādapi nu matsyāṇāṁ vā matsyatva pakshīṇāṁ vā

L. 10. pakṣhitva vistareṇa yāva devānāṁ devatve tesāṁ tesāmāṇanda satvānāṁ tasmām tasmāmsatva-nikāye api nu kasyacitrakacijātiḥ syānno bhadrantaḥ satva śovā va punarāṇāda jātyā (iti)
L. 1. api nu jāra marañam praṇāyatano bhadāmeta tasma-tahyānanda tannidānam esa samudaya esa heturesa pratayājāra marañasya yaduta jātiḥ pratayamāna-ndajarāmarañamiti me yadukta—

L. 2. metatpratyuktam II Jarā katamā yattatskhālityam pālit yaṁ vistareṇa yāvatsamskārāṇam puruṇibhāvo jajjarī bhāva iyamucyate jarāmaraṇam katamadāha yatteṣāṁ-teṣāṁ satvāṁ tasmāttasmātsattvani—

L. 3. kāyāccutisācyavan-ato bhedānta hāniḥ sammoṣaḥ pari-hāniśāyuso hāniruṣmaṇo hānīḥ skandānāṁ nīṣeṣop-jivitendriyasyoparodhe marañam kālakriyā idamucyate marañam śokaḥ katama ā—

L. 4. ha yattanmāṭī (ma)raṇo na pitṛi maraṇa na bhṛāṭri maraṇa no bhaghi maraṇa no jñātiṣayādhanakṣayād-bhoga kṣayāśprṣṭasya sāririkābhurvedanābhi duḥkhābhisātābhībhī kharabhiḥ katukābhiramanāpabhiḥ

L. 5. prāṇahārīṇītī vādāyaḥ samāṅyaḥ śokaḥ śocanāḥ śokaḥ yitattvamayamucyate śokaḥ parideva katama āha tathā daḥyate tathā paridahyate hā arīva hatah tathā bha ṭ? nihātra (?) taḥ (?) tadupādaya

L. 6. yadvākyāṁ vacanam dhyā (?) hāro bhāṣā. sinni (?) ruktirvākpatho vāgghoṣa vācā vākṣarman vāgvināpti vārtir-bhāsyam vipralāpaṇālāpyam lālapyanatā paridevaḥ paridevanātā ayamucya—

L. 7. te parideva I duḥkhham katamadāha—parīca viṁśana samprayuktamasitarī veditam vadanāgatamidamucyate duḥkhham daurnamanair̄ kataradāha—manovijñānāṁ samprayuktamasai rī veditam vedanāgatamidamucyate do-

L. 8. rmanamasyarī upāyāsāh katama āha—yaścetasa āyāsa upāyāsāḥ upāvāsantā ayamucyate upāyāsāḥ II api khalu vidyā duḥkhha skandham pratitya samśkāra duḥkhha skandhasyābhiniḥvīrttrībhava—

L. 9. ti praḍurdhvāh samśkāra duḥkhha skandham pratitya viṁśanām duḥkhahaskellasayābhiniḥvīrttrībhavati pra- durdbhāvaḥ viṁśāna duḥkhha skandham pratitya nāma-rūpa duḥkhha skandhāyābhiniḥvīrttrībhavati praḍur bhāvaḥ nāma

L. 10. rūpa duḥkhahaskellam pratitya śadāyatana duḥkhha-skandhāyābhiniḥvīrttrībhavati praḍurdbhāvaḥ śadā-
yatana duhkhashandham pratitya sparṣa duḥkha skandhasyābhinnirvīttirbhavati prādurbhāyah sparṣaḥ duḥ

L. 1. skandham pratitya vedanā duḥkha skandhasyābhinnir-vīttirbhavati prādurbhāvah / vedanā duḥkha skandham pratitya trīṣṇā duḥkha skandhasyābhinnirvīttirbhavati prādurbhāvah / trīṣṇā duḥkha skandham pratityo-pādāna duḥkha skandhasyābhini—

L. 2. vibhītirbhavati prādurbhāvah / upādāna duḥkha skandham pratitya bhava duḥkha skandhasyābhinnirvīttirbhavati prādurbhāvah / bhava duḥkha skandham pratitya jātiḥ duḥkha skandhasyābhinnirvīttirbhavati prādurbhāvah / jāti duḥkhashandha

L. 3. pratitya jarā ma (ra?) na duḥkhashandhasyābhinnirvīttirbhavati prādurbhāvah II II E v a m m a yā śrutame-kasminsamaye bhagavāṁschrāvastyāṁ viharati jeta-vane-nādhā (tha?) piṇḍadasayārāme tatra bhagavān-bhikṣunāmantrayate sma / yasya kasya cidbhi—

L. 4. kṣavaḥ paṁca bhayāni vairāṇyaśāntāni bhavanīti sa drīṣṭa eva dharmme vijñānam garhyo (?) bhavati / paścācānutāpyah kāyasya ca bhedātparam maraṇāda-pāya durggatim vinipātam naraṇeṣūpadadyate / katamāni paṁcābha—

L. 5. yāni vadyāni vairōṇyaśāntāni bhavanti / yatprāṇāti-pātikāḥ prāṇātipāta pratyaśaya vadyāṁ vairāṁ prasavati prāṇātipātādapraviratasya evamasyedam prathamāṁ bhayaṁ vadyāṁ vairamaśāntī bhavati ya—

L. 6. dadattaśdāyikāḥ kāmamithyācārīko mṛṣāvāvādikāḥ surāmaireyamadyaprampaśādasthāyikāḥ surāmelaya madya-prampaśādasthāna bhayaṁ vadyāṁ varīram prasavati surāmairaya madya pramaśādasthā-nādapra—

L. 7. tiviratasya evamasyedam paṁca bhayamavadyam vairamaśāntāṁ bhavati yasya kasyacidimāni paṁca bhayaṁ vadyāṁ vairāṇyaśāntāṁ bhavanīti sa drīṣṭa eva dharmme vijñānam garhyo (?) bhavati paścāscā nutāpyah—

L. 8. kāyasabhedārtparam. maraṇādapaṁya durggatim vini-
pātaṁ narakeṣūpapadyate yasya tu kasyacitpaṁca-

bhayaṁ vadyāṁ vairāṇi sāntāṁ bhavamti sadṛṣṭa
eva dharmme vijñānaṁ praśamyo bhavati paścāsanut-
pāpyaḥ—

L. 9. kāyasya ca bhedādsugatau svargaloke deveṣūpapadyate
katamāṁ paṁca bhayaṁ vadyāṁ vairāṇi sāntāṁ
bhavaṁti yatprāṇātipāṭikāḥ prāṇātipāṭa pratyayam-

bhayaṁ vadyāṁ vairāṁ prasavati prāṇāti—

L.10. pātā prativiratasya evamasyedam prathamaṁ vadyaṁ

vairāṁ sāntāṁ bhavati yadadattādāyikāḥ kāmanāthya-
cārīko mṛṣā vādīkaḥ surāmaireyamadyapradmādās

thāyikaḥ surāmaireyamadyapramāda—

L. 1. pratyayam bhayaṁ vadyaṁ vairaṁ prasavati surāma-

reya madyapramādasthānātprativiratasya evamasyed-
dam paṁcamaṁ bhayaṁ vadyaṁ vairaṁ sāntaṁ
bhavati yasya kasyacidimāṁ paṁca bhayaṁ vairāṇi
sāntāṁ bhavaṁti sa drśṭa eva dharmme—

L. 2. vijñānam praśasyo bhavati paścāccānanutāpyaḥ

kāyasya ca bhedādsugatau svargaloke deveṣūpapadyate
idamavocadbhagāvānidadāvākāva sugate hyathā para
metaduvāca sāstā II yaḥ prāṇāmati pādayati

mṛṣāvādam—

L. 3. babhāṣate loke adattamādattam paraḍāram ca gacchati
surāmeriya pānamca yo naro hyādhīṣvyati saktaḥ sa
paṁcasu dharṁesh duḥśila iti kathyate kāyasya bhedā-

duṣprajñā narakeṣūpapadyate yastu prāṇāṁ nātipāta—

L. 4. yati mṛṣāvādam na bhāṣate loke adattam nādatte para-

dāram na gacchati surāmaireya pānam ca yo naro
nādhīṣvyati muktaḥ paṁcasu dharṁmeṣu śīlavānīti
kathyate kāyasya bhedādsugato svargaloke deveṣūpa-

padyate i—

L. 5. damavocat II kiyatā upāsako bhavati yataśca grīḥ

avadāta vasanaḥ puruṣaḥ strīyeṣa samanvāgataḥ
buddham śaranaṁ gacchati dharmmaṁ saṁghaṁ
śarānaṁ gacchati cittamutpādayati vācaṁ ca bhāṣatī
upasaṁghaṁ śarānaṁ gacchati cittamutpādayati vācaṁ
cā bhāṣatī upā—
L. 6. sakam marī dhārayati iyatā upāsako bhavati kiyatā upāsakaḥ sikṣāsvekadesakārī bhavati yataścopāsakaḥ buddhaṁ saraṇaṁgato bhavati dharmaṁ saṁgham saraṇaṁgato bhavati prā—
L. 7. nātipiṭatpratimirataḥ adattadānāt-kāmamithyācārāṁnṛ-śāvādā PADATpārhitati iyatā upāsakaḥ sikṣāsvedesākārī bhavati kiyatā upāsakaḥ sikṣā—
L. 8. su pradeśakārī bhavati yatśocopāsakaḥ buddhaṁ saraṇaṁgato bhavati dharmaṁ saṁgham saraṇaṁgato bhavati prāṇātipiṭat-adattadānāt-pratimirataḥ kāmamithyācārāṁ-mṛśāvādāt-suraṁmai—
L. 9. reya madyapramādasthānādapatimirataḥ iyatā upāsakaḥ sikṣāsu pradeṣa-kārī bhavati kiyatā upāsakaḥ sikṣāsu yadbhūyaskārī bhavati yataścopāsakaḥ buddhaṁ saraṇaṁgato bhavati dharmaṁ saṁgham sa—
L. 10. saraṇaṁgato bhavati prāṇātipiṭat-adattadānāt-kāmamithyācārāṭpratimirataḥ mṛśāvādāt-sura-maireya madyapramāda-sthānādapatimirataḥ iyatā upāsakaḥ sikṣāsu yadbhūyaskārī bhavati.

L. 1. kiyatā upāsakaḥ sikṣāsu paripūrṇṇakārī bhavati yataścopāsakaḥ buddhaṁ saraṇaṁgato bhavati dharmaṁ saṁgham saraṇaṁgato bhavati prāṇātipiṭat-adattadānāt-kāmamithyācārāṁmṛśāvādāt pratimirataḥ suraṁmaiya-madya-pramā—
L. 2. dasthānādapatimirataḥ iyatā upāsakaḥ sikṣāsvaparipūrṇṇakārī bhavati kiyatā upāsakaḥ sikṣāsu paripūrṇṇakārī bhavati yataścopāsakaḥ buddhaṁ saraṇaṁgato bhavati dharmaṁ saṁgham saraṇaṁgato bhavati prāṇātipiṭat-pratimirataḥ adattadānāt-kāmamithyācārāṁmṛśāvādāt-sura-maireya-madya pramādasthānāt-pratimirataḥ iyatā upāsakaḥ sikṣāsu paripūrṇṇakārī bhavati II pāncavimsātī dharmaṁ saṁvanvāgataḥ upā—
L. 4. sakaḥ ātmahitāya pratipanno bhavati na parahitāya katamaiḥ pāncabhiḥ ātmanā prāṇātipiṭat-pratimirato bhavati no tu parāt-prāṇātipāte viramau samādāpayati ātmanā a—
L. 5. dattādānātkāmamithyācārān-mṛṣāvādāt-surāmoreyam-adya-prāmadasthā-nāt-pratīvirato bhavati no tu parāt-sūrā-maireya-madya-pramāda-sthāna viratau samādā-payati ebhīh paṁcabhīh

L. 6. dharmmāhī samanvāgata upāsaka ātambahitāya pratipanno bhavati parahitāya II daśabhīh dharmmāhī samanvāgata upāsakaḥ ātambahitāya pratipanno bhavati parahitāya ca ātmanā prāṇātipātāt-pratīvirato


tau samādāpayati ebhīrdasaḥbhī dharmmaissamanvāgataḥ upāsakaḥ ātambahitāya pratipanno bhavati parahitāya ca II paṁcadasabhī dharmmaissamanvāgata upāsakaḥ ātambahitāya pratipanno bhavati parahitāya ca

L. 8. vahujanahitāya vahujana sukhāya ca ātmanā prāṇātipātāt-pratīvirato bhavati parānapi prāṇātipātā viratau samādāpayati prāṇātipāta virtam ca drṣṭvā sumanojña bhavati ātmanā


L. 1. samanvāgataḥ upāsakaḥ ātambahitāya pratipanno bhavati parahitāya vahujanahitāya vahujanasukhāya ca II aṣṭabhī dharmmaissamanvāgata upāsakaḥ ātambahitāya pratipanno bhavati na parahitāya ātmanā

L. 2. śraddhā sampanno bhavati no tu parāṁcchṛaddhā sampadi samādāpayati ātma śilasampannastayaṅga sampannaḥ ābhikṣṇamārāmaṅgato bhavati bhikṣuṇān dasanāya avahita śrotra dharmmam śṛṇoti śrutānām dharmmaṅmām dhāraṇa jātuyā bha

L. 3. vati dhṛtānām dharmmaṅmāmarthoparpārīkṣ bhavati ātmanā uparīkṣitānām dharmmaṅmarthamājñāya dharmmaṅmajñāya dharmmaṅudharmma pratipanno
bhavati sāmicī pratipannānudharmmano tu parāndharmmacāri no tu parāndharmma—

L. 4. nudharmma pratipattau samādāpayati ebhiraṣṭabhī dharmmāiḥ samanvāgataḥ upāsakaḥ ātmahitāya pratipanno bhavati na parahitāya suṣaśabhi dharmmāiḥ samanvāgata upāsakaḥ ātmahitāya pratipanno bhavati

L. 5. parahitāya ca I ātmanā śraiddhā sampanno bhavati parānapisraddhā sampadi samādāpayati ātmanā śilasampannaśtgāya sampanno bhavatyātmanā abhikṣumārāmaṁ sāntā bhavati bhikṣuṇāṁ darśanāya a—

L. 6. vahita śrotra dharmmamāṃśroti śrutāṇāṁ dharppānantāṁ dhāraṇa jātiyo bhavati dhṛtāṇāṁ dharppānantāṁ upari-kṣīna jātiya bhavati ātmana upparikṣitāṁ nādharmmā nāmatrhamājñāya dharppānantāṁ dharppaṁ—

L. 7. nu dharppa pratipanno bhavati sāmicī pratipanno dharppāmacāri parāṁśca dharppānudharmma pratipattau samādāpayati / ebhīḥ suṣaśabhi dharppāiḥ samanvāgata upāsaka ātmahitāya

L. 8. pratipanno bhavati parahitāya ca I caturvīṃśatya dharppāmīssamanvāgata upāsakaḥ ātmahitāya pratipanno bhavati parahitāya bahujanahitāya vahujanasukhāya ca ātmanā śraiddhā sampanno bhavati parā—

L. 9. napi śraiddhā sampadi samādāpayati śraiddhā sampanna ca drṣtvā sumano bhavati ātmanā śilasampannaḥ tyāga sampannaḥ abhikṣumārāmaṁ ganto bhavati bhikṣuṇāṁ darśanāya avahita śrotraḥdharmaṁ śrṇoti śrutāṇāṁ dharppānantāṁ dhāraṇā jātiyo bhavati dhṛtāṇāṁ dharppānantāṁ (upa) parākṣi bhavati ātmanā upaparikṣitāṁ dharppānantāmarthamājñāya dharppānudharmma pratipanno bhavati sāmicī partipanno nu

L. 1. dharppa caṛī parānapi dharppānudharmma pratipasadamsamādāpayati —? ? ? aprati nna ca drṣtvā sumanojña bhavati ebhiścaturvīṃśatya dharppāiḥ samanvāgata upāsakaḥ ātmahitāya pratipanno bhavati parahitāya bahujanahitāya bahujanasu (khā)
L. 2. ya ca II daśabhir dharmaissamanvāgata upāsakaḥ kāyasya bhedātparānā marañādāpāyād urggali vinipātaṁ narakeśūpa-padyate ātmanā prāṇātipātiko bhavati adattādāyikaḥ kāmamithyācāriko mṛśāvādikaḥ piśunavādika- 

L. 3. paruṣavādikaḥ sambhinnapralāpiko mithyālurvvyā- 

L. 4. pannacitto mithyādṛṣṭikasā ca bhavati ebhirdaśabhir dharmmāḥ samanvāgata upāsakaḥ kāyasya bhedādyā- 

L. 5. vannarakeśūpapadyate vimśatyā dharmmāḥ samanv- 

L. 6. vāgata upāsakaḥ kāyasya bhedāt yāvannarakeśūpapadyate 

L. 7. trimśaṭa dharmmāḥ samanvāgata upāsakaḥ kāyasya- 

L. 8. bhedādyāvannarakeśūpapadyate ātmanā prā (nā)tipā- 

L. 9. tiko bhavati parānapi prāṇātipātikaṁ ca dṛṣṭvā sumanojnāno bhavati ātmanā adattādāyiko yāvanmithyādṛṣṭikam ca dṛṣṭvā sumanojnō bhavati ebhistīmisā (tyai ?) dharmmaih samanvāgataḥ upāsako yāvatākāyasya bhe- 

L. 10. dānrakeśūpapadyate catvārimśatā dharmmaissam- 

L. 11. anvāgata upāsakaḥ kāyasyabhedāt yāvannarakeśū- 

L. 12. papadyate ātmanā prāṇātipātiko bhavati parānapi prā (nā)t(i) pāte samādāpayati prāṇātipātikaṁ ca 

L. 13. dṛṣṭvā sumanojnō bhavati prāṇātipātasya ca varṇyam 

L. 14. bhāṣate ātmanā adattādāyiko yāvanmithyādṛṣṭeṣca varṇaṁ bhāṣate ebhiścatvārimśata dharmmaissaman- 

L. 15. vāgata u (pā)sakaḥ kāyasya bhedāt yāvannarakeśū- 

L. 16. papadyate II 

L. 17. daśabhi dharmmaih samanāgata upāsakaḥ kāyasya bhedāt sugato svargaloke deveśūpapadyate ātmanā prāṇātipātātprativirato bhavati ātmanā adattādā (nāt- 

L. 18. kāma)mithyācārāmṛśāvādātpaisunyātpaṛuṣya- 

L. 19. tsambhinnapralāpād anabhidhyālurabhyāppannacittaḥ samyagdṛṣṭiko bhavati ebhirdaśabhir dharmmaih sama- 

L. 20. nāgata upāsakaḥ kāyasya bhedātsugato svargalokeśu- 

L. 21. papadyate II vimśatā dharmaissamanvāgata upāsaka
L. 1. кāyasā bhedaďāyavadveșūpapadyate atmanā prāṇaţiptāţpratirīvīrato bhavati parānapi prāṇaţiptāţvīrīrato samādāpayati atmanā adattādanaďāyavadatamsayagdrșṭi bhavati parānapi samayagdrșṭau samādāpayati ebhi-

L. 2. rviṃșatā dharmmaiḥ samanvagata upāsako āvaddveșūpapadyate II Trīṃșatā dharmmaissamanvagata upāsakaḥ kāyasā bhedaďāyavadveșūpapadyate atmanā prāṇaţiptāţat pratirīvīrato bhavati parānapi prāṇaţiptāţvīr-
tau samādāpayati prāṇaţiptāţvīrīratoṃ ca drștvā sumanojño bhavati atmanā adattādanaďāyavadatamsayagdrșṭiKarṃ ca drștvā sumanojño bhavatyebhiṃșatā dharmmaiḥ samanvā (gata?) upāsakaḥ kāyasā bhedaďāyavadveșūpapadyate II

L. 3. catvāriṃșatā dharmmaissamanvagata upāsakaḥ kāyasā bhedaďatsugatau svaragaloke deveșūpapadyate atmanā prāṇaţiptāţpratirīvīrato bhavati parānapi prā (nā) tipata-
vīrīratau samādāpayati prāṇaţiptāţ-
vīrīrataṃ ca drștvā sumanojño bhavati prāṇaţiptāţvīrīrataśca varṇam bhāṣate atmanā adattādanaďātāmamithyācārātmṛșavādāt paśunyātpārusāsyaṃbhinā (pra) lāpātpratirīvīrato bhavatyānvabhidhyaľaluravyāpauṃpannacī-
taḥ samayagdrșṭiko bhavati parānapi samayagdrșṭau samādāpayati samayagdrșṭiKarṃ ca drștvā sumanojño bhavati samayagdrșṭeśca varṇam bhāṣate ebhișcatvāri-
ṃșatā dharmmaiḥ samanvagata upāsakaḥ kāyasā bhedaďatsugatau svaragaloke deveșūpapadyate / paṃco-
pāsakasya śikșāpadāni / yāvajjivam prāṇaţiptāţdvīrā-
tirupāsakasya śikșāpadāṃ / yāvajjivamadattādanaďātām-
mamithyācārānmṛșavādā-

L. 8. surāmairevamadyapramādasthānādviramaṇiṃupāsa-
kasya śikșāpadāṃ II ? II yāvajjivam prāṇaţiptāţdvīr-
ratirupāsakasya śikșāpadamiti tatra katarāḥ prāṇaţiptāțkatarāḥ prāṇi katamā prāṇaţiptāţdvī-
ramaṇiḥ / yaducyate prāṇaţiptāţdviramaṇiṃupāsakasya śikșāpadamityāha evam hyuktaṃ bhagavatā prāṇa-ti-pāti khalvihaiko bhavati raudra rudhira-paņiḥ hata prahata niviștaļ alajji adayāvatsandha sattva-

L. 10. prāṇibhūteșvantataļ kunta pipīlakāmapi prāṇāpāta-
dapratirīvīrato ayamucyate prāṇaţiptāțikāh / prāṇi kата-
mah / yasminprañini prañisamjñī jiye jivasamjñi sattve sattvasamjñi doše doṣasamjñi

L. 1. jñī pudgle pudgala samjñī ayamuchyate prañi prañatipātaḥ katama (āha yasmin) prañini prañā samjñīnāḥ sattve sattvasamjñīnāḥ doše doṣasamjñīnāḥ pudgale pudgalasamjñīnāḥ yat parākramamāgāmya yatpāpācittam (yat ?)

L. 2. kuṣala-cittam vadhaka-cittam hanana-cittam māraṇa-cittam ca pratypaṁśhitam bhavati tatra yaddharmāgāmya yā prayogamāgāmya yā prahāṃmāgāmya yadupakramamāgāmya prañino hanana māraṇam saṁcintya jīvitaṁ vyaparopaṇāmīti-

L. 3. yattaddharmma yāsau prayogah āśa upāyādupakramam yattatprañino hananaṁ māraṇam saṁcintya jīvita- dvya-paṇaṁ yamacyate prañātipātaḥ II Prañātįtipāti khalvihaiko bhavatīti ātmā prañātipāta-danārato bhavatītyapraviratās tatasa tena samanvā-gatastenāha prañātipāti khalvihaiko bhavati raudra iti raudrataḥ katama āha yattadā bilvandaṅdata bilva-sastrata bilvapaṁhaṅata iyamacyate raudratā-

L. 4. tenāha raudrata iti rudhirapaṇāriti rudhirapaṇāya ucyamte jāratrikāḥ kaukkuṭika saukarika māṣīka mṛgalubdhakaścorāḥ vadhyaṅgātakanāṁ ghātakānāṅgamanḍā ikāḥ (? ) śasavāgurikā bandhana-

L. 5. pālakāḥ sūcakāḥ kāraṇakārakā ima ucyamte rudhirapaṇāyaḥ kenaiva ucyamte rudhirapaṇāyaḥ āha kimcāpi ye susmāta bhavamīt suviliptāḥ kalpitakesaṅkhāvadā-tavastrapravṛtīṁ-

L. 6. āmuktamālyābharaṇā atha ca punaste rudhirapāṇaṁ evocyamte kiṁ kāraṇamāha yasmāte anārata abhirata apraviratāstasa rudhirasyotthāpanāya jānāṇya samjñānanāya samutpādāya-

L. 7. praviṣkaraṇa ? na kāraṇena rudhirapāṇaṁ ucyamte II hataprahata nivistā iti syāt prañi prahato na hataḥ syāt kṣato na prahataḥ syāddhastasa prahatsca prahatas-tāvanna hataḥ yathā tāvatprañi ākatito bhavati pāṇinā vā loṣṭena vā daṇḍena vā šastrenā vā anya-tamānyatamena vā vividhena praharaṇena na tu sarveṇa sarvvarāṁ jīvita-dvya-paṇopito bhavati evaṁ prañi hato bhavati na hataca ya etā tāvatprañi-
L.10. ąkoṭito bhavati pāṇinā và loṣtena và daṇḍena và sastreṇa và anyatamānyatamena và vividhena prahara-ñena sarveṣa và sarvam prāṇi jivitađ vyaparopito bhavati evam hataśca bhavati prahataśca-

L. 1. natpi (?) hata prahata niviṣṭaśca bhavati sanniṣṭa-ścāniviṣṭaśca tenāha hata prahata niviṣṭa iti II alajji adayāvān sarve sattvapraṇāḥbhūtasceti tatra katama prāṇaḥ katama bhūtāḥ yaducyate alajji adayāvānsarva sattvapraṇāḥbhūta-

L. 2. śtinyāha ārthagjanaḥ bhagavataḥ śrāvakabhuṭāḥ api khalu ya sattvāḥ sarāgāḥ sadveṣam samohā ima ucyamte bhūtāḥ api khalu ye sattvā vigataraṅgā vigatadveṣā viga-(ta?)moḥā ima ucyamte bhūtāḥ api khalu ye sattvā

L. 3. satṛṣṇā sopādāna ime ucyamte prāṇaḥ ye sattvā nistṛṣṇā nirupādāna ima ucyamte bhūtāḥ api khalu ye sattvā aniruddhāḥ ima ucyamte prāṇaḥ ye sattvā anāniiruddhāḥ apratīniiruddhā ime ucyamte bhūtā api khalu

L. 4. ye sattvā avidveṣā vidyāgata ima ucyamte prāṇaḥ ye sattvā vidveṣā vidyāgata ima ucyamte bhūtāḥ api (kha) lu ye sattvāḥ kāmebhyo vītaragāḥ pratiruddhā ime ucyamte prāṇaḥ ye sattvā kāmebhyo vītaragā ima ucyamte bhūtāḥ

L. 5. api khalu ye sattvāḥ kāmebhyo vītaragāṣṭatra bhagavataḥ śrāvakā ime ucyamte prāṇaḥ ye sattvā kāmebhyo vītaragāṣṭe ca bhagavataḥ śrāvakā ime ucyamte bhūtāḥ asmiristathā prthagjanāḥ prāṇaḥ bhagavataḥ

L. 6. śrāvakā bhūtāḥ kim karaṇām bhavanamucyate nirvāṇaḥ tattaḥ prāptam pratilabdhamadhigataṁ sprśtām sākṣātkṛtam yathā cāha samantānusāri lokāṁ diśaḥ sar-vamīritaḥ icchedhavanāmānam nādhigacchedanāṁ:-śritam II tadasmintathā prthagjanāḥ prāṇaḥ bhagavataḥ śrāvakā bhūtāḥ tadesāṁ prāṇabhūtāṇāmadayaḥ ya pratippanno bhavatyānaṇudayaḥ yā nānukampāya II sokaśvā-hāraṅaḥ kuta ucyamte.

L. 8. pipīlakāli pipīlakā eva asmātprāṇatipātādūpaśakaḥ pratisambhyāya rato bhavatypadruto pratvirataḥ samvṛtasca yatra yā akriyā akaraṇamanatyācāro na vyāpptiranāvyāpadanam
9. velä setulī vairamaṇī sthitiranatikkramā vyātikramo vyatikramaṇatā tenāha yāvajjī (va)nam prāṇātipātādvairamanirupāsakasya śikṣāpadamiti II Yāvajjivadattādānādvairamanirupāsaka (syā)

10. śikṣāpadamiti adattādānam katamat / evam hyuktarā bhagavatā adattādāyī khalyhaiiko bhavati sagraģmaga tamaranyāgataṁ vā paresāmaddattamiste ya samkhyāta paratte adattādānādaprātivirato bhavati idamu-(cyate).

1. masevayato bhāvayato bahulikurvataḥ taccittamāśthiḥati sasṭhiḥati upasthiḥati ekotabhavati samāvartteyatasca taccittamā śhitam ca bhavati samśhitam copasthitam dvyamade (?)

2. etāvatparīttam maitram cetaḥ samādhī samāpanna iti vaktyavyām / tathā samāpannasya yaccittamā manoviṁjānamidmucyate parīttam / maitriḥ sahābhuvam citte yā cetanā vistareṇa yāvadime pi dharmāṁ

3. te sarvva ime dharmmāḥ parīttam maitram cetaḥ samādhiriti vaktavyāḥ / katarāḥ / prayoga pramāṇasya maitrasya cetaḥ samādheḥ kathaṁ / prayuktaśca punarapramāṇam maitram cetaḥ samādhim samāpadyate /

4. maitraccetaḥ samādhau tam cittam damayitvā kārayitvā mvedayitvā parisvedayitvā rju kṛtvā mṛdukarmmanā yaṁ ārjavamāśravaṁ vidheyāṁ tataḥ paścādamprāmāṇaṁ sukhitam vata sattvā iti (da) ?

5. kṣīnāṁ paścimāmutterāṁ diśam tasyāpramāṇaṁ sukhitāvata sattvā iti sphurataḥ pūrvarām diśam dakṣīnāṁ paścimāmutterāṁ diśam taccittam vikṣipyatī visarati vidhāvati na ca

6. smṛtiḥ saṁtiṣata apramāṇaṁ sukhitāvata sattvā iti yadasya taccittam vikṣipyati vistareṇa yāvanudāram tāpramāṇaṁ maitri cetaḥ samādhīḥ samāpanna iti

7. ntam visarantaṁ vidhāvantaṁ tasminnevopasaharati tadeva manasi kurute apramāṇaṁ sukhitāvata sattvā iti evam manasikurvate yadvīryaṁ vistareṇa yāvadayam prayā-

8. samādhau evam prayuktaśca punarapramāṇaṁ mait-
raṁ cetaḥ samādhīḥ samāpanna iti vaktavyam tathā samāpannasya yaccittam manovijñānamidamucyate apramāṇām maitri sahabhuvam vi(sta)-

L. 9. reṇa yāvadimepi dharmmā apramāṇā maitri sahabhuvah āti tatsarvva imme dharmmāḥ apramāṇām maitri cetaḥ samādhiriti vaktavyā II karaṇā katamā / āha / duḥkhhitāvata sattvā iti /

L.10. annaśasya prāvivekajā adhyātmasamutthitā pratisamkhyā yā samutpannā kuśalarūpā pratisamiyuktā asti astiyātā duḥkhaduḥkhāyatā karaṇā karunāyaat ta (ducyate?)

L. 1. raya ?? pa yikaṁ pratirūpaṁ pradaksīnas ni ?? mṛga sambhārametaccittameṣa ca vā maitri cetaḥ samādhiriti vaktavyā / tathā samāpannasya yaccittam manovijñānamidamucyate maitri sahaṁgatā(veda-)

L. 2. nā abhisamvedanā cetitaṁ cetanāgatam cittābhisaṁskārā manaskarammā idamucyate maitrisahabhuvam karmma yaścetasodhimokṣa vimuktiradhimucyanatatā yamucyate maitri sahabhuvodhimokṣaḥ yadā-

L. 3. vedanā vā saṁjñā vā cchando vā sneho vā manasikāro vā śnātirvā samādhirvva prajñā vā iti yepi dharmmā maitrisahabhuvah āti tatsarvve ime dharmmāḥ maitri cetaḥ samādhiriti vaktavyah / maitri khalu bhave-

L. 4. parittasaḥpramāṇaḥ kaṭaraḥ prayogah parittasya maitrasya cetaḥ samādheḥ katham / prayuktascha punaḥ paritām maitram cetaḥ samādhiṁ samāpadyate / āha / yathā khalviḥakatyasya ye sattvā bhavatū? (ta)-

L. 5. na āpastaṁ yathā mātā vā pitaḥ vā bhrātā vā bhaginī vā anyatamānayatamō vā mitraṁ viṣṭālohitō vā ebhiḥ paritāiḥ sattvāḥ paritām maitri saha bhuvam citta-

L. 6. māsthāpayataḥ pra (?)

L. 7. yataḥ ekotikurvvataḥ samādadhataḥ taccitam vikśipyati
visarati vidhāvati nekotībhavati na ekāgrā smṛitiḥ saṃtiṣṭhate parītaṁ sukhiṭam vata sattvā iti yadasya taccittam vikṣi (py?)ati (?)

L. 8. na ekotībhavati na ekāgrā smṛitiḥ saṃtiṣṭhate parītaṁ/sukhiṭam vata sattvā iti na etāvatā parītaṁ maitraṁ cetaḥ samādhiḥ samāpanna iti vaktavyam / sa taccit-tam vikṣipyanantam visarantam

L. 9. saṃharati tadeva nimittaṁ manasikurute parītaṁ sukhiṭam vata sattvā iti evam manasikurvvato yadvīryam yo vyāyāmo niskkramaḥ parākkramaḥ sthāma ārambhā utsāha utsrāphira prati (?) hati ?

L. 10. tatyamayaṁ prayogaḥ parītasya maitrasya cetaḥ samādheḥ evam prayuktaśca punaḥ parītaṁ cetaḥ samādhinī samāpadyate sa tamutpannaṁ mārggamā-sevayati bhāvā ?

L. 1. prajā sandhāvati ahorātraṁ sadā mohena āvṛtā tāṁ tvavidyaṁ prahāyeka tamaskandham pradālya ca nā-sau punaḥ sama ṭa(?)hetustasya ?

L. 2. saṃyojanena catvāri II II Atra tu ime gāthe vaktvye tṛṣṇayā grathitā sattvā raktacittā bhavābhave/ te yogayuktā mārasya ayogakṣemino janāḥ / jārāmaṇa ?? —

L. 3. paka iva mātaram tāṁ tu tṛṣṇāṁ prahāyeca vītattrṣne bhavābhave tṛṣṇāyābhībhavābhībhikṣuricchuḥ parini-rvṛtaḥ II II yathā (a) nekavidhāḥ pāpakā akuśalā dharmmā aşṭau sūrā(ṇi) (iti)

L. 4. ye kecidanekavidhāḥ saṃyojanīyā aṣṭau sūtrāṇi (iti) II II Nāhamekadharmmamapi samanupasyāmi yena samanvāgatatāḥ sattvā dirghamadhvānaṁ samādhāvamti saṁsaramti yaduta-

L. 5. dyānivaraṇena avidyānivaraṇena samanvāgataḥ sattvā dirghamadhvānaṁ samādhāvamti saṁsaramti II II Etadeva sūtramuktvā gāthā atirikta nānyatra ekadharm- mena yeneyam nirvṛtā

L. 6. saṃdhāvati ahorātraṁ sadā mohatamovṛtaḥ I Tāntvavi-dyāṁ prahāyeka tamaska (?)ndhaṁ pradālya ca nāsa punaḥ saṁsaratī heturyasya na vidyate II II Nāhamekadharmmamapi samanupasyaḥ (mi?)
L. 1. yena samanvāgatānāṁ sattvānāṁ dirghamadhvānāṁ sandhāvatāṁ saṁsaratāṁ pūrvvā koṭir na praṇāyate duḥkhasya yaduta avidyānivaraṇena avidyānivaraṇena samanvāgatānāṁ sattvānāṁ dirghamadhvānāṁ sa (ndha)

L. 2. tāṁ saṁsaratāṁ pūrvvā koṭir na praṇāyate duḥkhasya II II etadeva sūtramuktvā punargāthā vācyā II Nānyatra ekadharmmeṇa yeneyam nivṛtā praṇā sandhāvati ahorātraṁ sadā mohatamovṛtā—

L. 3. tāṁ tvāvidyāṁ prahāyeḥa tamaskandham pradālya ca nāsa punaḥ saṁsaratī heturyasya na vidyate II II Nāhamekadharmamamapi saṁmanuṣāyāmi yena samanvāgatāḥ sattvā dirghamadhvānāṁ

L. 4. varṇi saṁsaramti yaduta trṣṇā saṁyojanatṛṣṇā saṁyojanena samanvāgatāḥ sattvā dirghamadhvānāṁ sandhāvarṇi saṁsaramti II II Etadeva sūtramuktvā gāthā vācyā II Trṣṇā dvi (tī?)

L. 5. puruṣaḥ sudirghadhvani saṁsaratpunaḥ? punarupādatte garbhameti punaḥ punaḥ ittham bhāvātyadhibhāvāt-sattvānāmāgatīṁ gatīṁ tāṁ tu trṣṇāṁ prahāyeḥa cchitvā sroto duratyayam nāsa punaḥ saṁsara (tī)

L. 6. sya na vidyate II II Nāhamekadharmamamapi saṁmanuṣāyāmi yena samanvāgatānāṁ dirghamadhvānāṁ sandhāvatāṁ saṁsaratāṁ pūrvvā koṭirna (praṇāyate du)ḥkha-

L. 1. samanvāgatānāṁ sattvānāṁ dirghamadhvānāṁ sandhāvatāṁ saṁsaratāṁ pūrvvā koṭir na praṇāyate duḥkhasya II II Etadeva sūtramuktvā gāthā vācyā II Trṣṇādvitiyaḥ puruṣaḥ sudiragadhvani saṁsaran/ pu

L. 2. naḥ punarupādatte garbhameti punaḥ punaḥ / ittham bhāvānyadhibhāvaṁ sattvānāmāgatīṁ gatīṁ / tāṁ tu trṣṇāṁ prahāyeḥa cchitvā sroto duratyayam / nāsa punaḥ saṁsaratī trṣṇā hyāsya na vidyate II II ya (?)

L. 3. satvoraṣṭau sūtrāṇi evam pudgalairaṣṭau sūtrāṇī II II Uddānaṁ / hetuḥ pūrvvarāgamāśeiva


L. 4. hetuḥ saṃrāgāya hetuḥ sadveṣāya hetuḥ sammohāya
vidyā heturasamrāgāya heturasamveṣāya heturasam-
mohāya iti hi bhikṣavaḥ karmmaheturupapattestṛ-ṇāhe (tu?)

L. 5. rabhinirvṛtteḥ iha kṛtasya karmmaṇaḥ kuśalasya sāsra-
vasya bhāvanāmayasya tatro' papanā sattvā vipākarā
prati saṃvedayamte tasmādaham sattvān yathā karmma-
pagān vadāmi II II

L. 6. vidyāpūrvvamgamam pūrvvānimitamanekavidhānām
pāpakānāmakusālaṇām dharmmaṇām samutpattaye
anvācayaḥ āhṛtikyanamanapatrāpyaṁca tat kasya heto-
rahriyāṁ hi bhikṣava na

L. 1. avidyāgato bhavati vidyā pūrvvamgamam pūrvva nimit-
tamanekavidhānām kuśalānām dharmmaṇām samut-
pattaye (II tātparya yaḥ II) hrīś ca vyapatrāpyam
ca tat kasya heto hrīmān hi bhikṣūrapatrāpi vidyāga-
to bhavati)

L. 2. kecidanekavidhāḥ pāpakā akusalā dharmmaḥ saṃbha-
vanti sarve te avidyā-mūlakā avidyāsamudayaḥ
avidyajātiyā avidyāprabhavā avidyāgato hi bhikṣura-
janan kuśalākuṣa-

L. 3. lān dharmmaṁ yathābhūtam na prajānāti sāvadyāna-
vadyāṁ sevitavyāsevitavyāṁ hīna prañīta kṛṣṇa šukla
sapratiḥbhāga pratītasyaṣamutpannān dharmmaṁ yathā-
bhūtam na prajānāti sa kuśalā (ku?)

L. 4. śalān dharmmaṁ yathābhūtam na prajānāti sāvadyā-
avadyān sevitavyāsevitavyānhinaprāṇīta kṛṣṇa šukla
sapratiḥbhāga pratītasyaṣamutpannān dharmmaṁ yathā-
bhūtamprajānanaḥ nadhi-

L. 5. gato bhavati ye kecidanekavidhāḥ kuśalā dharmmaḥ
saṃbhavāṁ sarve te vidyāmūlakā vidyāsamudayaḥ
vidyājātyā vidyāprabhavā vidyāmūlakāhi bhiksavo
ye keci (da?) (ne)

L. 6. (ka?) vidhāḥ kuśalā dharmmaḥ saṃbhavaṁti tat
kasya hetorvidyāgato hi bhikṣur jñānaṁ kuśalākuśalaṁ dharmmāṁ yathābhūtam prajānāti săvadyānavadyāṁ sevitavyāsevitavyāṁ hina pravidyāmūlakaḥ hi bhikṣavo ye kecid āvidhāḥ pāpakā akūsalā dharmmāḥ sambhavaṁti tat kasya heto ra*

L. 1. (kr)ṣṇa sukla satrapibhāga pratītya samutpānṇaṁ dharmmāṁ yathābhūtam prajānāti sa kuśalākuśalaṁ dharmmāṁ yathābhūtam prajānāti săvadyānavadyāṁ sevitavyāsevitavyāṁ hina praṇīta kṛṣṇa sukla (sa pra)

L. 2. tībhāga pratītya samutpānṇaṁ dharmmāṁ yathābhūtam prajānān vidyāgato bhavati II II etad eva sūtramuktvā gāthā vācyāḥ II yāḥ kāśca no durgatayaḥ asmin loke paratra ca āvidyā mūlikāḥ sa (?)

L. 3. icchā lobha samarppitaḥ yataśca bhavati pāpecchā pāpairācāragocare athāsau prasavate pāpam apāyān yena gacchati tasmālobhamatho dveṣamāvidyāṁ ca virāgaya?

L. 4. vīdyaṁ utpādayan bhikṣur duṣkhakṣayamāvāpnuyāt // // * // nāhameka dharmmāmapi samanupaśyāmi yadevamanarthāya samavarttate yaduta āvidyā nivarāṇañāṁ āvidyā nivaraṇā-

L. 5. manarthāya saṁvarttate II yathā anarthāya evamahitāya duṣkhhyāya vyasanāya vipattaye asamṛddhaye apāripūraye pariḥānāya II II Yathā āvidyā nivarāṇena kṛṣṇapakṣa evam

L. 6. tṛṣṇāsamyojanena kṛṣṇapakṣaḥ II II Nāhameka- dharmmāmapi samanupaśyāmi yena samanvāgato vālo mūḍho vyakta asatpurusō veditavyaḥ yathā āvidyānivarāṇena āvidyā-

L. 1. Samanvāgato vālo mūḍaḥ avyakta asatpurusō veditavyaḥ II Vālah kṣato bhalla upapadyate apāya durgati vinipātesu gacchati patati upapadyate dirghamadhvānāṁ (samādhāvati sarṁ)
.. 2. II II Yathā avidyānivaraṇena krṣṇapakṣa evaṁ ṭṛṣṇā-
samyojanena krṣṇapakṣaḥ II II Uddānaṁ—paṁca
nivaraṇotpādaḥ puruṣa strī viparyayaḥ tathobhayena
kṛtvēha vaśo bhavati samudditaḥ II II Nā(ḥa)
L. 3. mekadhammamapi samanupaśyāmi yenānuppanañh
ca kāmacchandaniivaraṇam utpadyate utpannāṁ ca
bhūyo bhāva vrddhi vipulatāṁ gacchati yathā asubhayā
(II anāsevitā II) abhāvitayā avahulikṛtayā asubhayāṁ
abhā (II anāse)
L. 4. vitayā avahulikṛtayā anutpannaṁ ca kāmacchanda
nivaraṇamutpadyate utpannāṁ ca bhūyo bhāva vrddhi
vipulatāṁ gacchati II II Nāhamekadharmmamapi
samanupaśyāmi yenānuppanñaṁ
L. 5. ca vyāpāda nivaraṇamutpadyate utpannāṁ ca bhūyo-
bhāva vrddhi vipulatāṁ gacchati yathā maitreyā
(anāsevitayā) abhāvitayā avahulikṛtayā maitreyā
(anāsevitayā) abhāvitayā avahulikṛtayā anutpannaṁ ca
vyāpādate
L. 6. (va)raṇamutpadyate utpannāṁ ca bhūyobhāvavṛddhīṁ
vipulatāṁ gacchati II II Nāhamekadharmmamapi
samanupaśyāmi yenānuppanñaṁ ca styānamiddha
nivaraṇamutpadyate utpannāṁ ca bhūyo bhāva
vrddhi (vipu) latāṁ gacchati II

L. 1. yathā anarthāyārthāyā pūrṇavat II II Nāhameka-
dharmmamapi samanupaśyāmi yena samanvāgato vālo
mūḍha avyakta asatpuruṣo veditavyaḥ yathā durākhya
(tena dharmmavinaye)
L. 2. dharmmavinayena samanvāgato vālo mūḍha avyakta
asatpuruṣo veditavyaḥ II II Nāhamekadharmmam-
api samanupaśyāmi yena samanvāgataḥ paṇḍito vyak-
taḥ satpuruṣo....(veditavya ?)
L. 3. (ya) thā svākhyaṭena dharmmavinayena [svākhyaṭena
dharmmavinayena] samanvāgataḥ paṇḍito vyaktaḥ
satpuruṣo veditavyaḥ II II Vālaḥ kṣato bhalla
upapadyate pūrvvavat II II Uddā (naṁ ?)
L. 4. makā akuśalā aṣṭau aṣṭa samyojanāstathā sattva sarīn
-
śabdītā aṣṭau pudgalairapi cāṣṭikā II  II Śrāvastyāṁ
nidānaṁ II Ye kecidanevakidhāḥ pāpakā akusāla dharmmā sam(u)

L. 5. sarvve te avidyā nivaraṇa [avidyā nivaraṇāṁ] teṣāma-
gramākhyātaṁ yaduta saṁgrahāya II  II Ye kecidane-
kvaidhāḥ pāpakā akusāla dharmmāḥ sambhavaṁti sarvve te avidyā nivaraṇo na ta-

L. 6. (avi)-dyā nivaraṇāṁ teṣāmagramākhyātaṁ yaduta
saṁgrahāya avidyā nivaraṇo saṁvahate evam teṣāṁ
samudghaṁo bhavati II 20:11 ye kecidanevakidhāḥ
pāpakā akusāla dharmmāḥ sam (bha)-

L. 1. sarvve te avidyā nivaraṇena avidyā nivaraṇāṁ teṣā-
gramākhyātaṁ yaduta saṁgrahāya / tadyathā yāḥ
kāścitkūṭāgare sopānasyaḥ sarvvaśāḥ kūṭāṃgamāḥ
kūṭānirṣṭāḥ kūṭāpratibaddhāḥ kū
c

L. 2. mavaṃsāṁ kūṭāstāṣāmagra ākhyāto yaduta saṁgrahāya
evameva ye kecidanevakidhāḥ pākakā akusālā dharmmāḥ
sambhavaṁti sarvve te avidyā nivaraṇena avidyā
nivaraṇāṁ (?) —

L. 3. magramākhyātaṁ yaduta saṁgrahāya II  II Ye
kecidanevakidhāḥ pāpakā akusālā dharmmāḥ sam-
bhavaṁti sarvve te avidyā nivaraṇena avidyā nivara-
ṇāṁ teṣām agramākhyātaṁ yaduta saṁgrahāya(ya)

L. 4. avidyā nivaraṇe samavahate evam teṣāṁ samudghaṁo
bhavati tadyathā yāḥ kāścitkūṭāgare sopānasyaḥ sarv-
vaśāḥ kūṭāṃgamāḥ kūṭā niṣṛṭāḥ kūṭā pratibaddhāḥ
kūta (?)

L. 5. saraṇāḥ kūṭāstāṣāmagra ākhyāto yaduta saṁgrahāya
kūṭā saṁvahate evam tāṣāṁ samudghaṁo bhavati
evameva ye kecidanevakidhāḥ pāpakā akusālā dharm-
māḥ sambhavanti sa—

L. 6. avidyā nivaraṇena avidyānivaraṇāṁ teṣāmagramā-
kvhyātaṁ yaduta, saṁgrahāya avidyānivaraṇo saṁ-
vahate evam teṣāṁ samudghaṁo bhavati I nānyatra
ekadharmmēna ce(?) —
L. 1. khyāte dharmma vinaye yathā samādāpyate bahuṣaḥ (puṇyo) prasavati evametabdhavati yathāpi taddurākhyāto dharmma viṇaye

L. 2. (e)evametabdhavati yathāpi tatsvākhyāto dhammadvinayāḥ II II durākhyāte dhammadvinaye yathā samādāpayati yaśca samādāpayate ubhā pa(?)

L. 3. -dbhavati yathāpi taddurākhyāto dhammadvinayāḥ svākhyāte dhammadvinaye yathā samādāpayati yaśca samādāpayate ubhā pa(?)

L. 4. tatsvākhyāto dhammadvinayāḥ II II Durākhyāte dhammadvinaye yasya samādāpayati yaśca samādāpayate yaśca samā-

L. 5. (pra?) savarṇti evametabdhavati yathāpi taddurākhyāto dhammadvinayāḥ svākhyāte dhammadvinaye yaśca samādāpayati yaśca samādāpayate ya(?)

L. 6. (puṇyaṁ prasavati evametabdhavati yathāpi tat svākhyāto dhammadvinayāḥ II II yathā samādāpanena cātvāri sūtrāṇi

L. 1. ta dharmma vinaye yathā yathā ārābdhavīryastathāārābdhavīrya
L. 1. ryante utpannāśca prahīyaṃte samutpannāḥ kuśalā dharmmā utpadyaṃte utpannāśca bhūyobhāva vṛddhi-vipulatāṁ gacchaṃti yathā kalyāṇa (a) (ṇaṃitra ta) yā kalyāṇa sahāyatāya kalyāṇa sanpapkkatāya tatka-

L. 2. (syā)hetoh kalyāṇaṃitrasya hi bhikṣorvviharataḥ kalyāṇasahāyasya kalyāṇasampapkkasya anutpannāśca (+pāpakā a+) kuśalā dharmmā nothpadyāṃte utpannāśca prahīyaṃte anutpannāḥ kuśalā dharmmāḥ utpa-

L. 3. (dyaṁ) te utpannāśca bhūyo bhāva vṛddhi vipulatāṁ gacchaṃti II II yathā ayoniśo manasikārenā yoniśo manasikārena evam kausidyena vīryārambheṇa pramaṇānām dharmmāḥ drṣṭyā-

L. 4. Samyagdrṣṭyā II II Mithyā drṣṭiḥ paramavad-vyānāṁ tat kasya hetormithyā drṣṭeḥ puruṣa pudgalasya yacca kāyyakarmaṃ tathā drṣṭer yadvākkarmaṃ yā cetanā yā prārthanā yaḥ praṇidhir ye ca sanāskārā-stadanvayāḥ sarvvesya te dharmmā anistatvāya sarv-varttamte akāntatvāya apiyatvāya apanāpatvāya amanojiṅnattvāya anahipretatvāya sarv-varttamte I Tat kasya hetor dṛṣṭirhi pāpiṅkā yaduta mi(?)

L. 5. thyādṛṣṭiḥ tadyathā bhikṣavastākālābuvijāni vā nimbaviṣṇu vā kāṣātakaṇi vijāni vā sukṣetre ropitāni syuḥ susnigdhe vā pṛthivipradesē upanikṣiptāni tāni yam yameva pṛthivyāḥ pṛ(?)

L. 1. ra samāddadate adbhyā abrasaṃṭejasastejorasam vāyorv-vāyurasam (sarvva)...rasāsti..ktatvāya samvarttamte kāṭvākaṭvāya avadudtvāya tat kasya hetor vijānīhi tiktāni katuṇyasāvāṇī evame(va)

L. 2. mithyādṛṣṭirbhikṣavaḥ paramavadyānāṁ mithyādṛṣṭeḥ puruṣa pudgalasya yacca kāyyakarmaṃ tathā drṣṭer yadvākkarmaṃ yā cetanā yā prārthanā yaḥ praṇidhir ye ca sanāskārāstatatvāḥ sarvvasya te dharmmā anistatvāya sarvā-

L. 3. (ktarī) te akāntatvāya apiyatvāya amanāpatvāya amanojiṅttvāya anahipretatvāya sarv-varttamte tat kasya
hetordṛṣṭirhi bhikṣavaḥ pāpiṇā yaduta mithyādṛṣṭīḥ samyagdṛṣṭirbhikṣavaḥ paramanavadyā

L. 4. (ta) tkasya hetoḥ samyagdṛṣṭe puruṣa pudgalasya yacca kāyakarma tathā dṛṣṭer yadvākkarma yā cetanā yā prāṛthanā yaḥ prayidhir ye ca samskārastatvāya sarvvasyete dharmmā īṣṭatvāya śaṁvarttamte kānta

L. 5. —priyatvāya manāpatvāya manojñatvāya abhipretatvāya śaṁvarttamte tat kasya hetordṛṣṭirhi bhikṣavo bhadrikā yaduta samyagdṛṣṭīḥ tadyathā ikṣuviṇī vā śālivijñi vā mṛdvikāvijñi vā sukṣe-

L. 6. pitāni suyuh susnigdhe vā prthivipradeśe upaniśiptāni tāni yam yameva prthivyāḥ prthivirasamādādate abbhyāḥ aprasamātjasastejorasam vāyorvāyurasam sarvvasyete rasā ati—

L. 1. rna śaṁvarttamte acaṭutvāya svādutvāya śaṁvarttamte tat kasya hetorvijāni hyatiktyākaṭūni svādūni evameva samyagdṛṣṭīḥ paramanavadyāni samyagdṛṣṭēḥ puruṣa pudgalasya yacca kāyakarma tathā dṛṣṭeryadvātmā yā cetanā yā prāṛthanā yaḥ prayidhirye ca sam skārastatvāya sarvvasyate dharmmā īṣṭatvāya śaṁvart tamte kāntatvāya priyatvāya manojñatvāya abhipretatvāya śaṁvarttamte tat kasya hetordṛṣṭirhi bhikṣavo bhadri

L. 2. kā (?)/yaduta samyagdṛṣṭīḥ II hīnān dharmmān na seveta pragādena na saṁvaset // mithyādṛṣṭir na roceta na bhavellokavardhanaḥ // samyagdṛṣṭiradhimātā laukiki yasya vidyate / api jātisahasraṇi nā-

L. 3. sau gacchati durgatim // Udānam—ahitam dāna dauḥśilaya (śilaṁ) manomaya dvayaṁ/ puṇyāṁ tathā-ṣṭikām kṛtvā kṣatikābhīryaṭṭūdṛdesatāh // 20 (?) // Eka dharmme loka updayate bahujanāhitāya ba—

L. 4. huj anaduhkhāya anarthāyāhitāya duḥkhāya devamanaṣyānām yaduta mātsaryam (śila) mātsaryam loke updayate bahujanāhitāya bahujana duḥkhāya anarthā-yāhitāya duḥkhāya deva manuṣyā—
L. 6. ਨਾਮ / eka dharma loke utpadyate bahujanahitāya bahujanasukhāya lokānukampāye arthāya hitāya sukhaṁ devamanusyānāṁ (+manāpatvāya+) yaduta vigata mala mātsaryaṁ [vigata mala mātsaryaṁ] lokā utpa-

L. 1. (dyā) te bahujanahitāya bahujanasukhāya lokānukampāye arthāya hitāya sukhaṁ devamanusyānāṁ //20// evam hi sattvā jānīyād dānasya phalaṁ dānasāmvibhāgasya ca phalavipākaṁ ya-

L. 2. dānasya phalaṁ dānasāmvibhāgasya ca phalavipākaṁ mapidānīṁ yo sau bhavatyapāścimāḥ kavataścarama ālopasatopi nādatvā nāsamvibhājya paribhumjīyāṁ sacellabheraṁ dakṣiṇāyaṁ pratigrāhakaṁ

L. 3. na caśāmutpanno mātsarya malascittam paryādāya tiṣṭhet yasmāt tarhi sattvā na jānaṁti dānasya phalaṁ dānasāmvibhāgasya ca phalavipākaṁ yathāhaṁ jānāmi dānasya phalaṁ dānasāmvibhāgasya ca

L. 4. phalavipākaṁ tasmādadattvā asarvāhījyāya paribhumjāte āgrhītena cetasaṁ utpannaṁ caśāṁ caśāṁ cittamasādāya tiṣṭhaṁ II evam hi sattvā jānīyur-yathā proktāṁ maharṣinā vipākaṁ

L. 5. vibhāgasya yathā bhavati mahārthikaḥ nādatvā pari- bhumjāryasayurāṃśarṣiṇastathā na caśāmāgrahe cittamutpadyeta kathāṁ ca naḥ yasmāttve te na jānaṁti bāla mohatamōvṛtāḥ adatvā bhūmijate tāṃsa-

L. 6. scā (?) he tena cetasaṁ utpannaṁ caśāṁ mātsaryaṁ cittamādāya tiṣṭhaṁ II II evam hi sattvā jānīyur-duḥśilāḥ pāpādharmaṁāṇā ātmano gatiṁ copapattāṁ cābbhisamvarāyaṁ ca yathāhaṁ jānāmi sattvānāṁ—

L. 1. [du] ḫīlām pāpakarmaṁāṇām gatiṁ copapattāṁ cātisamparāyaṁ ca apīdānāṁ mlāyeyuḥ sūṣyeyu vā na vā harītā nadāḥ āma... cchanna yasmāttarhi sattvā na jānaṁti duḥśilāḥ pāpā(ka)
L. 2. (ga)tim copapattiṁ căbhisaṁp(?) arāyaṁ ca tasmaṁt kāyena dusćaritaṁ caramti vācā manasā dusćaritaṁ caranti te kāyena dusćaritaṁ carītvā vācā manasā dusćaritaṁ carītvā taddhetu tatpratyaṁ kāyasya bhedāt paraṁ

L. 3. (ma)paṁśuṣadurgatīvinīpataṁ narakesuṇapad- yānte II evaṁ hi sattvā jāniyurathā proktam mahar- śīnā ya gatiḥ pāpakarmaṁ dūḥśilānāṁitaścyute mlāyeyuratha sūṣyeyustu(?)na vā haritaḥ

L. 4. latā yasmattu na prajānaṁti bālā mohatamovṛtāḥ tasmātkāyena vācā ca manasā cāpyasamovṛtāḥ kurv- varanti pāpakam karmma yadbhavati katukodayam II na tat karmma kṛtmaṁ sādhu kṛtvā yadānautépyate

L. 5. rudannāsrumukho yasya vipākam pratisevate tatra karmmakṛtmaṁ sādhu kṛtvā yannānutapyate yasya pratitaṁ suṇanā vipākam pratisevate II evaṁ hi sattvā jāniyuh śilavanto guṇavatāṁ peśalāṁ kalyāṇa- dharmmanāṁ

L. 6. atmano gatiṁ copapattiṁ căbhisaṁparāyaṁ ca yathā- harṁ jānāmi sattvānāṁ śilavātm guṇavatāṁ peśalānāṁ kalyāṇadharmmanāṁ gatiṁ copapattiṁ căbhisaṁ- parāyaṁ ca apīdānīmanacena pūtikāyena (?) tiya (?)

L. 1. jo hriyanto vitaranto vijugupsamānāṁ śastramapya- dhārayeyur vviṣamāṇi bhakṣayeyurajvavavaddhā mriyet prapatād vā prapate (yudda)...ḥ II evaṁ hi sattvā jāniyurathā (proktā maharśīnā)

L. 2. ya gatiḥ śilayuktānāṁ ya dharmmanāścī vināṁ anena pūtikāyena jātiyantaḥ punah punah śastramadāhara- yeyuste devalokābhīnandīnaḥ II II yo sau bhavati strī vā puruṣo vā dūḥśilāḥ.—

L. 3. pāpadharmma kāyaduscaritena samanvāgato vāg- mano duscaritena samanvāgatas tasya kāyasya bhedā- dayamevaṁrūpo manomayaḥ kāyobhīnirvarttate tadyathā kṛṣṇasya kutapasya nirbhāsah—

L. 4. ? tvakāra tamisrayā vā rātryā yeśāṁ divyāṁ cakṣuḥ suviśuddham tata enam pasyaṁti II II so sau
bhavati stri vā puruṣo vā śilavān kalyāṇadharmānā
ekāyasucaritena samanvāgato vāgmanāḥ

L. 5. (su)caritena samanvāgatas tasya kāyasya bhedādayame-
vāmrūpo manomayaḥ kāyobhirinirvarttate tadyathā
suklasya pāṭasya nirbhāsah ājyotsnāyā vā rātryā yeśāṁ
divyam caṅṣuḥ suviśuddham ta enam pa—

L. 6. (śya) nti II II mā .yūyam bhikṣavāḥ pūṇyebhyo
tai (?) śa tat kasya hetoḥ sukhasye tadadhivacanamiś-
tasya kāntasya priyasya manāpasya yaduta pūṇyānti
apūṇyātta yūyam bhikṣavo vi (?)—

L. 1. (ta)kasya heto duḥkhasyetadadhivacanamaniśasyā-
kāntasya priyasyāmanāpā (+tā (?) +) sya yadutaḥ pūṇyā
nīti / abhijānāmāyaha bhikṣav(o) d(ī) rghā) rātra
kṛtām prāṇāmām dīrghātātrimiṣṭam kāntām priyām
manāpām (+ tā)

L. 2. vipākam pratyāhavāmām saptahāṁ varṣāṇi māitraṁ
cittam bhāvayitvā saptā sarivarttā vivarttā kalpān
naṁ lokamupāgamāṁ samviśnīyaṁ loke abhā-
svaṁ devanikāya upapadye vivarttāmāne (ā)

L. 3. loke śūnye brahma vīmāne upapadye tatrāhaṁ bhavāṁi
brahmaṁ mahābrahmaṁ abhībhūranaabhībhūtonyatara
daśaśata vaśavarttā mahābrahmaṁ teśāṁ sattvānāmagra
ākhyātaḥ śadvyānātṛtvaścāhāṃ

L. 4. śak(?)ro bhūvandevāṃmadhāreṇa śata kṛtvāca
rājābhūvaṁ caṅkra vérūta catūraṇito vijetā dhārmikō
dharmmarājaḥ saptaratasamanvāgataḥ tasya mama
imānyevas rūpāṇi saptaratnānya

L. 5. bhūvanātṛtyadāḥ caṅkra-rājāḥ hastiratmasaṁvrata-
naṁ maṁ darmanāṁ sthirātmanāṁ āhāpatiratnāṁ parinā-
yakaratnavajya saptamaṁ pūrṇāṁ cēbhūtsaharaṁ
putraṅaṁ śūraṅaṁ virāṅaṁ (verangu)parātsarūpiṇāṁ
parasainya

L. 6. pramarāddakāṇāṁ sohāpāṁcēva samudraparyaṁtaṁ
mahāpṛthivimakhilāmakaṅkāraṁ utpītāma daṇḍe-
nāsastreṇa dharmena samenaḥbhūnirjītyā vyavasitavān
tasya mayaitad bha(?)
1. kasyaitat karmmanañh phalam kasyaisa karmmanañh phalavipäko yenäsmyetahyevarm mahardhikä evam mahänubhāva iti tasya mayaitadabhavatrayänätet karmmanañh phaläni tryänapameša (karma).

2. phalavipäko yenäsmyetahyevarm mahardhikä evam mahänubhāvah katamesäm tryänapäm yaduta dānasya damasya samyamasya vipākaṁ mahaṁsyamānaṁ kuśalānāṁ sukhaśīśāṁ maitram cittam bhā—

3. vayitvā sapta vartāni bhiksāvah sapta sarvārtvā vaiśvarta-śrīvam lokamupágamane sarvārtamānā lokesmin bhavāmyābhāsvaropagah vivartamānā ca bhavānyathā brahmopagehyahin sapta-

4. kṛtvā mahābrahmā vaśavartyabhavatpurāṇaḥ sațtrim- sadgunkṛtvāsca devarājaṇamakārayāṁ anekeśata kṛtvāsca rājābhūvatpratāpavān pūrvaḥbhāṣikāḥ kṣatriyo jāṁ puṣāṇḍocarasmadā a—

5. nōdorāsastrenā vijitya prthivimāṁ asahasenaḥ dharmenaḥ samyagevānuśīstāvaṇ dharmanācamākram vart-tayītvā asmin prthivimāṇdale mahādbhāne mahābhoge jātoḥam tādrśo

6. loke sarvātravyopasampanno ratnah saptabhireva ca prabhuṭavittopakarano rājā bhuvat pratāpāvān esa heturhi māhātmye prabhutvam yena jāyate buddhāḥ samgrāhakāloke—

1. śatasahasrāṇi viśkambhenā saha dvipaiḥ, evameva yāmena samantaparikṣepeṇā paramā (?) ? ? ? śāti-yojanasahasrāṇi gāṁbhīrīye (?) na kāṁcanaṁayāni mahāprthivyāṁ pratiśthi(taḥ) suñmeruparvvatarāja aśyitojanaśaha-

2. srāṇyadhaḥ kāṁcanaṁayāṁ mahāprthivyāṁ pratiśthi-taḥ aśyitojanaśahasrāṇyodakādabhyudgataḥ saṣṭham yojanaśatasahasramucchatvena aśyitojanaśahasrāṇyāyāmaṇa aśyitojanaśahasrāṇi viśkambhenā viṁśāni tri—

3. ni yojanaśatasahasrāṇi samantaparikshepēṇā abhī- rūpo darsāniyaḥ prāśādikaḥ caturatnamayāḥ yatra devāstrayastrīṁśāḥ pratisaṃtaṇi II suñmeroḥ parvvata-
राज्यानं भावती पार्वत्त्य पुर्ववर्त पार्वत्य धार्शिन वा
पार्वत्य।

4. मुत्तररों पार्वत्य पुर्ववर्त्य स्थानिकत्वमात्र पार्वत्य
धार्शिन भावती वैद्युर्यांकमात्र पार्वत्य।

5. पुर्ववर्त् कुमार पांचविंशति योजनानि योजनासाति
वा यामान राज्यानं पार्वत्य धार्शिन वा
विष्कांभेना पार्वत्य।

6. सुमेरों पर्वत्यांशृणां अभ्युद्गता अभिरूप धार्
शानि याकाश प्रसादिकाश स्थानिकत्वमात्र यात्रा वाज्रपाण्यो
याकाश प्रतिवसांति द्विदाह धार्शिन कुमार पांचविंशति
योजनानि योजनासाति कत्रा?

7. ना पार्वत्यांशिष्ट योजनानि योजनासाति वा विष्कांभेना
पार्वत्य धार्शिन वा
विष्कांभेना पार्वत्य धार्शिन वा
समान्तपरिदेशेना

8. माया यात्रा वाज्रपाण्यो याकाश प्रतिवसांति द्विदाह
कुमार पांचविंशति योजनानि योजनासाति वा
विष्कांभेना पार्वत्य धार्शिन वा
समान्तपरिदेशेना

9. क्षेपणा अथा पार्वत्यांशिष्ट योजनासाति सुमेरों पर्व
त्यांशृणां अभ्युद्गता अभिरूप धार्शिन वा
समान्तपरिदेशेना

1. ता योजना साति वा यामान राज्यानं पार्वत्य धार्शिन
योजनासाति वा विष्कांभेना पार्वत्य धार्शिन वा
समान्तपरिदेशेना

2. याथा प्रसादिकां सावरणो यात्रा वाज्रपाण्यो याकाश
प्रतिवसांति द्विदाह राज्यानं

3. ना पार्वत्यांशिष्ट योजनासाति सुमेरों पर्व
त्यांशृणां अभ्युद्गता अभिरूप धार्शिन वा
समान्तपरिदेशेना
caturatnamayaḥ yatra karoṭapāṇayo devāḥ prativas-
anti II Daśa yoganaḥ sahasrāṇi pratha—

L. 4. —maṃ palaṇḍamavahāya dvitīyāḥ palaṇḍāḥ aṣṭa-
yojanasahasrāṇi sumerōḥ parvatarājīṇāḥ nirgataḥ abhi-
rūpo darśanīyāḥ prāsādikaḥ caturatnamayaḥ yatra
mālādhara devāḥ prativasanti II

L. 5. daśayojanasahasrāṇi dvitīyam palaṇḍamavahāyatriti-
yāḥ palaṇḍāḥ catvāri yojanasahasrāṇi sumeroḥ
parvatarājīṇānirgataḥ abhirūpo darśanīyāḥ prāśa-
dikaḥ caturatnamayo

L. 6. yatra sadāmattaḥ devāḥ prativasanti II daśayojana-
sahasrāṇi tritīyam palaṇḍamavahāya caturthaḥ
palaṇḍāḥ dve yojanasahsre sumeroḥ parvatarājī-
jāḥ ni(r)gataḥ abhirūpo darśanī—

L. 7. yaḥ prāśadikāḥ caturatnamayo yatra catvāro mahārājā-
naḥ prativasanti II aṣṭiyojananasahasrāṇi sumeruṁ
parvatarājāmavahāya yugandharo nāma parvata-
rājā aṣṭiyojananasahasrāṇyu—

L. 8. dakādadhāḥ kāṃcanaṃmayām mahāprithivyāṁ prati-
ṣṭhītaḥ catvārimśadyojanaṃahasrāṇyudakādabhyud-
gataḥ tathaiva viśkambhaṁabhirūpo darśanīyaḥ prāśa-
dikāḥ kāṃcanaṃayaḥ tatra caturmahārājākāyikānāṁ

L. 9. devānām grāma-nagara-janapadāḥ I kena kāraṇena
yugandharo nāma parvatarājā ityucyate I āha I yuga-
ndharasya parvatarājīṇāḥ kūṭā abhirūpā darśanīyāḥ
prāśadikāḥ tad yathā rathayugaṁ anena kāraṇe-

L. 1. ?? caturtho yogana u? .............. (kāṃcana) mayaḥ
tasyābhyamśaro bhūmibhā (ga).......mayaḥ prāśadikāḥ
kāṃcanaṃvalukāśtriṇāḥ candanaṃvarisiktaḥ tatra
yātka ??....

L 2. amanāpaṃ samkaram vataśtam vāta(?) śtaṁ vāta
yena mānusyaś vāyusamyogena bahirabhinirharanti
tasya samantenāśtam prāgbhāra sahasrāṇi te pi sarvvaś
abhirūpaḥ darśanīyaḥ prāśadikāḥ kāṃcanaṃayaḥ....

L. 3. taro bhūmibhāgaḥ abhirūpadarśanīyaḥ prāśadikāḥ
kāṃcanabālukāśtriṇāḥ candana-pariśiktāḥ teśvapi
yatikincitprapatati amanojnāṁ sam(?) karaṁ vā kaṭhannāṁ vā tama manusya vāyusaranyogena Bahirabhīni......

L. 4. tasyā mārggo trīṃśadyojanānyāyāmena diva(r)dhāṁ(?) yojanāṁ viskāṃbhaṇa abhirūpo dar(śa)nīyaḥ prāsādikāḥ kāṅcanaヴァulukāstīrṇaḥ candanaヴァarīsiktaḥ tatraṇī yatikincitprapatati amanojnāṁ kāṣṭhaṁ vā śaṅkaraṁ

L. 5. tama manusya vāyusaranyogena bahirabhiniḥhrarānti asurapāśvasya......rasya dakṣinena viṁśatibhiryo-janaiḥ supratiṣṭhito nāma sālarājā II saptabhiḥ sāla-parāṅktibhiranuparikśiptaiḥ su—

L. 6. tiṣṭhitasya sālarājñāḥ caturuddaśa vyomā nimnatābhini-vesaḥ ......māyāḥ sālapaṃktyāḥ ......trayodaśavyo-ma-nimnatābhini-vesaḥ dvitiyāya dvādaśas tri蒂yāya ekāda-saḥ caturthyā daśa parṁ(ca)

L. 7. myā va śṭhyā aṣṭau saptamyaḥ sālapaṃktyāḥ sapta vyomā nimnatābhini-vesaḥ yatpratiṣṭhitasya sāla-rājñāḥ sākhā patrapalāśaṁ tatprathamāyaṁ sālapaṃktyāṁ pratiṣṭhitam yat pratha—

L. 8. yaṁ sālapaṃktyāṁ sākhā patra palāśaṁ taddvitiyāyaṁ pratiṣṭhitam yat dvitiyāyaṁ tatṛitiyāyaṁ yattri蒂yāyaṁ taccaturthyā yaccaturthyāḥ tatpaṃcamyaṁ yat parcamyaṁ tat śaṭhyāṁ yat śaṭhyāṁ tat saptamyaḥ yat sa (pta ?) myā—

L. 9. tra palāśaṁ tannabhaḥ sa(thai) ritvāni patita sā(tyan) taro bhūmibhāgaḥ abhirūpo darśaṇiyaḥ prāsādikaḥ kāṅcanaヴァulukāstīrṇaḥ candanaヴァarīsiktaḥ tatra yatki-incitprapatatyamanojnaṁ kāṣṭhaṁ ca (?)......

L. 1. caturvvidhā sudhā madhu madhavaṁ panaṁ harm-yāni kūṭāgāra ṣṝhaṇi prāsādāścāsakaḥ? avalokanakāni sarāṅkramaṇakāni nārīgaヴァavirājitāni apsarasaṁ yat-sevitāni? tyatādābhivāditāni nānāgandha sa-

L. 2. miritāni ulātātyanna(?) pānenanna(?) tu(?) devāstra yastriṁsāḥ(?) saparivāraḥ pri(?) tanta(?) ramante pariva-rayanti(?) svam ca karmmaphalam pratya tu(?) dbha-vanti devapurasya madhye śakrasya devendrasya nive-sana ma ca(?) tritiyaṁ yojanaśatānyā-
L. 3. yā me (?) na a (su ?) ra tritīyāni yā jā (na?) satāni viśkarm-bhena de (?) yā jā na sa (?) tāni samantaparkṣepenā di (?) vyām jānānti purādabhūygataṁ tasya khalu catvāri dvāraṁ ekaikasmīnyāre paṁca satāni nilavās-asāṁ yaksāṇāma-

L. 4. vasthitāṁ sannaddhāṁ sannimitakapālāṁ yāvadeva śakrasya devendrasya raksārtham guptyartham sobhārtham tasya madhye vajayaṁto nāma prāsādaḥ pākyo (?) sadyo jātāṇyāyayāṁ manapavakyo (?) sadyo jātāṇi viśkambho sa (?) dve mā jāma

L. 5. subhasamastaparkṣepenā abhi ādu darśanīyaḥ prāsādikah ava (?) tritīyāni yojanāni tasmāniveśa-nādabhūydgataṁ vajayaṁtasya prāśadasya prācīna-nī (?) māmitāṁ caturvvidhāṁ tadyathā sauvar- 

L. 6. rṇāṁ yāvatsaphaṭikamayāṁ vajayaṁtasya prāśadasya nyāsānyastai (?) caturvvidhā nyāsā tadyathā sauvarṇā yāvantī (?) sphaṭikamayāṁ vajayaṁtasya prāśadasya stambhaucchāpitāṁ caturvvidhāṁ tadyathā sauvarṇā

L. 7. yāvatsaphaṭikamayāṁ sauvarṇāṁ stambhāṁ rūpyamayaḥ kumbhakaḥ śīrṣajāṁ kri (?) kaṭakaḥ gosādhakaḥ māpi-taḥ rūpyamaya san varṇāḥ vaidūryamayaḥ sphaṭika- 

L. 8. mayaḥ sphaṭikamayāṁ stambhāvaśānti rūpyamayaḥ śīrṣa gosādha
dhā

L. 9. kandāka? kā māmitakaḥ vajayaṁteprāśade stambha (?) gra (pra ?) nī mā (ya?) pitāni caturvvidhānyā tva (?) gra (?) nī tadyathā sauvarṇāṁ rūpyamayaṁi sphaṭikamayāṁ vaidūryamayaṁi vajayaṁte prāśade baladharanyo māpitō
caturvvidhā baladharanyāṁ (?) tadyathā sauvarṇāḥ
yāvatte sphaṭikamayasya vajayaṁte prāśade yāvacca- 

caturvvidhā āvasaṁgāma pitā babhūvulḥ tadyathā sauvar- 

L. 10 ? hāmāpitā babhūvulḥ tadyathā sauvarṇāḥ yāvatte sphaṭikamayaḥ caturvvidhāṁ phalakāiḥ cchannai babhūvulḥ sauvarṇāi yāvatte sphaṭikamayaḥ vaijyaṁte prāśade caturvvidhāṁ saudhāṁ māpitāṁ
L. 1. parvavataḥ aparekam trayāṇāṁ kāla...muttareṇa apare trayāḥ kālakāḥ parvavataḥ aparekam trayāṇāṁ kālākāṇāṁ parvavatamuttareṇa himavān parvavatārājā himavatāḥ parvavatārājīñāḥ uttareṇa?

L. 2. naḥ parvavatārājā gandhamādanasya parvavatārājīñāḥ pratyaḥ na daśabhīrayojanaidāsaṇā nāma mahodadhīḥ anvataapta ityucyate I daśo mahodadhīḥ paṃcāśadyo-janātāyomata paṃcāśadvikṣambheṇa divaṅa-adhā

L. 3. tāṁ samantaparikṣepaṇa abhirūpo darśanīyaḥ prāśā-dikaḥ pūrṇaḥ śītena vārinā kaśuḍrakalpenāmbūṇā upala padma kumuda puṇḍarika saṃcchannava (tvah?) yata imaścatasā mahānadyaḥ pravahanti tadyathā ga?

L. 4. kṣuḥ śītā purvveṇa gaṅgā pravahati gajamukhena soda-kam mahodadhīṁ pradaṃṣniṅkrtvā paṃcābhirnadiśataiḥ sārdham purvvaṁ mahāsamudramupaiṁ I daksinena sindhuḥ pravahati rṣabhamukhena sa daśaṁ mahoda—

L. 5. kṣiṃkrtvā paṃcābhirnadiśataiḥ sārdham daksināṁ mahāsamudramupaiṁ I Paścimena vakṣuḥ pravahati hayamukhena sa daśaṁ mahodadhīṁ pradaṃṣniṅkrtvā paṃcābhirnadiśataiḥ sārdham paścimāṁ mahāsamudramupaiṁ—

L. 6. uttareṇa śītā pravahati kesarimukhena sa daśaṁ mahodadhīṁ pradaṃṣniṅkrtvā paṃcābhirnadiśataiḥ sārdham muttaram mahāsamudramupaiṁ II yathā cāḥ I uttareṇa kadhivāṁkaḥ jalo yamareṇa tu i ci?

L. 7. mahodadhistratrā prthakṣrotākāre mahānā I gaṅgā ca sindhuśca nadī ca vakṣuḥ śītāpi ca rukminī natamā-linī vahantī ?? ca turopi śiṣṭādiśaṅcatasro vistritāḥ samantāt gaṅgā hi yāti purimāṁ samudraṁ pra?

L. 8. ti sindhuṣvathā daksināṁ hradam vakṣuḥ punaryāti paścimāṁ sāgaram tathottaram sāgaram yāti śītā I evaṁ nadināṁ prvaṃṣaṅcatasraḥ sraṃvanti parama-vakam ekaḥ pratyekamādaṇya sutāni paṃca upeti pe??

1. tāni khalu sopānāni caturvidhābhīriṣṭakābhīscitāni
  tadyathā sauvarṇābhiryāvat sphaṭikamayibhiḥ vaijaya-
  antaḥ prāśadacaturvidhābhīrvedikābhīranuparikṣipt-
  taḥ sauvarṇābhiryāvat sphaṭikamayibhiḥ sauva (r?)
  nāyā vedikāyā ru(?)

2. mayi prācī alam vatamadhiṣṭhānam māpitam rūpya-
  mayyāḥ sauvarṇām sphaṭikamayyāḥ vaidūryam vaid-
  dūryamayyāḥ sphaṭikamayaṁ II antaroddānam
  II prācīna nyāśasta? tmanvānyā valadharanyāḥ utsaṅgā
  niryuhakāḥ pā?

3. kā sopānam vedikā bhavati pāscimāḥ II vaijayantī-
  prāśade ekamantāṁ niryūhakā saṭam ekaikasminniryū-
  hāīḥ sapta kūṭāgāraḥ ekaikasin kūṭāgāre sapta
  saṃtāvapāraṇaḥ ekaikasminnavāra kauṭalām

4. saṃtāprasaraṇaḥ ekaikasyā apsarasaḥ sapta parīcārikāḥ
  vaijayantasyā prāśadasya purataḥ vijaya nāma puṣkariṇī
  parīcāsadyojanānāyaśāyāmena parīcāsadyojanaṇī
  viṣkambheṇa deve yojanaśate samanta—

5. parīkṣepeṇa tasyāḥ khalu puṣkariṇīyāḥ caturdiṣṭāṁ
caturvidhāni sopānāni māpitam tāni khalu sopānāni
caturvidhābhāriṣṭakābhīsinthāni tadyathā sauvarṇābhiḥ
  rūpyamayibhir

6. vaidūryamayibhiḥ sphaṭikamayibhiḥ sā khalu puṣkariṇī
caturvidhābhırvedikābhīranuparikṣiptā caturvidhābhī-
  rvedikābhīrvistareṇābhīrūpo darśanīyā prāśadikā pūrṇa-
  śītēna

7. vāriṇā kṣaudrakalpenāmbunā utpala padma kumuda
  puṇḍarika saṃchannā vividhā jalajāś sakunayo valgu-
  varā manojaṇasvarā madhurasvarāḥ kāmarūpiṇobhīni-
  kūjantī I tasyā sāmantena vividhā

8. puṣpavrksāḥ phalavrksāḥ sujatāḥ susāmsthitāḥ supari-
  nātaḥ āpiḍakajātās tadyathā daksēṇa mālākāreṇa mālā-
  kārāntevasinā vā mālāguṇā sugranthitāvatarāṁsakāṇī
cā sukṛtāni vivi—

9. dhāḥ sthalajāś sakunayo valguṣvarā manojaṇasvarā
  madhurasvarāḥ kāmarūpiṇobhīnīkūjantī caturvidhāḥ
  kalpavrksāḥ sitā (ḥ) pītā lohitā avadatāḥ catur-
  vidhāni tuṇḍi cetāni ?? I
L. 1. da (?) ya va ? man (?) va yaṁ tāvatprāṅṭātipātino ya (?) nnu (?) vayaṁ prāṅṭātipātātpratīvāramamaḥ te ? . . . . tpratīvāramanti teṣāṁ prāṅṭātipātātpratīvīratānāṁ daśa-varṣ(ā)yuṣāṁ) manusyaṇāṁ vināśati varṣāyusāḥ putra jāyā

L. 2. daśa vistareṇa yāvadāśīti varṣasahasrayuṣāṁ manusyaṇāṁ ayam jambūdīvāpaḥ ruddhaśca bhavati sphiṭaśca kṣemaśca subhikṣaścākila bahujaṇamanusyaśca vistareṇa kukkuṭa sampti (?) kā?) grām?) manignama rājarāṣṭra (?) dhānyo (?) bhavanti

L. 3. varṣa sata jāṭākacyasva (ṣca?) mi no (nu ?) tu(nu ?) pradeyya bhavati trayairēvā bhavanti ichā ānaśanāṁ jarā (?) śasyāni mahānti bhavanti pa (?) ramamahānti tadyathā indrākhal (?) sāmpannāṁi paramasampannāṁi apye katpa (?) cchikṣācācāvāri prai (?)

L. 4. sītyanti II yasmin samaye durbhikṣāntarakalpaḥ āyu (?) vibhava irpagaṭāḥ utpāda ā daśavarṣāyuṣastasmin samaye manusyaḥ bhavanti daśavarṣāyuṣāṁ manusyaṇāḥ yaścraṁ jīvati sa daśavarsṇi vistareṇa yavaddaśa (?)

L. 5. yuṣāḥ manusyaḥ adharmmacārīṇo bhavanti viṣama-cārīṇāḥ teṣāṁ ya dhammacārīṇāṁ viṣama-cārīṇāṁ devena kālenaśca samyagcāricārāmsṛjati devasya khalu na kālena kālaṁ samyagcāricāra (?) tṣīja

L. 6. durbhikṣam bhavati kṛcchram kartāram caṁca salākā vr̥ttiḥ caītam hi durbhikṣamityāḥa taṃmin samaye durlabhaḥ pindaṁ yācanakāṇāṁ tenāḥa durbhikṣamiti III kisakamityāḥa tasmin samaye te manusyaḥ maha ?

L. 7. na mahā vyapadāyena mahārambheṇa mahāsa (?)rī (?)ra pi (?) ta ya bhakṣaścādanasamabhinipdādayanti tenāḥa kimśāriṁiti II kāntāramityāḥa yathaiva hi mahāta-vikāntāramudakakāntāram corakāntāramevaṁ tasmin sa (?)

L. 8. ye mahāntam pānabhojanacchādandanakāntāram bhavati tenāḥa kāntāramiti II cămcetāāya ya etad hi (?) patitastasya tena kālena tena samayena caṁca iti samāṇā bhavati tadā te manusyaḥ jiyatsa (tma ?) de (?) tva (?) lya
L. 9. प्रथिव्यां परपातं क्षिप्रतितास्च ना नकुवन्ति 
उत्तहातृं नाप्येषां कः सितसमार्थां (ठो?) 
भवत्युत- 
थापयितृं तत्र ततावाम कलान्त कर्मवन्ति 
तत्सराणी- 
न्यायं परुशः कलागताहृ कर्मचे 
न्या कर्मचं कर्मचं इति 
कर्मचं कर्मचं इति सा (?)

L. 1. स्थिताम भवति वेमेवा तेषां (शाम?) मनुष्यां- 
णमत्यात्यां द्रष्टृवा साता (?) प्रा (?) ? हा (?) ? ? 
प्रा ता गृहावर्म सानुकाम्पा चित्तां च प्रत्युपस्थि (?) 

L. 2. भवति वयाम अनाय एदर्म्यायाय विषाम- 
यावणे व्यासामान्यपाण्य ज्ञातिक्षयान्य 
द्वाखास्यावमुपात्ता याम नु वयाम कैसिदापि?....

L. 3. रामां तावत्प्राण्तीतिन्यान्य वयाम प्रणात्प्राण- 
प्रतिविमें ता प्रणात्प्राणत्प्रतिविरामम्ती तेषां 
प्रणात्प्राणत्प्रतिविरातानाम दसावर्षयुसाम मनुष्यां- 
णाम वि

L. 4. जायम्ति दुहितरास्च विष्टरेणा यावदासितिवर्षसहस्रायुसाम 
मनुष्याण्याम सायानि महाति भवान्ति पराम 
महाति तद्यथा इन्द्रा वे (?)निः सामपन्नानि 
भवान्ति पराम का (?)

L. 5. कार्कामक्षक्षाक्काक्कात्वारित्रेणा निशिर्यांति II यास्मन 
समये तेजां सरिवार्ता (?)नि आमक्कम (?) 
भवान्ति 
उपागात उत्पादा या असितिवर्षसहस्रायुसास तास्म सम- 
मये मा

L. 6. असितिवर्षसहस्रायुसाम मनुष्याण्यामयाम जाबुद्वि- 
पे रुद्धास्च स्पितास्च क्षेमास्च सुभिप्क्षांसाकिर्षा 
(ला?) 
भावजनामुनुष्यास्च भवान्ति असितिवर्षसहस्रायु- 
साम मनुष्याण्याम

L. 7. सांपिकाग्रामनिगमाराष्ठरागाध्यन्याभावान्ति 
असितिवर्षसहस्रायुसाम मनुष्याण्याम 
पार्मचावर्षासाता 
जाता कान्या स्वामिनेप्रित्तेया भवान्ति तद्यथातिदभि 
(ठो?) मनुष्याण्याम बिस्ता

L. 8. असितिवर्षसहस्रायुसाम मनुष्याण्याम त्रा (?)यो रोगाः 
भवान्ति तद्यथा इच्छा अनारामाजार् (?) (?) 
असितिवर्षसहस्रायुसाम मनुष्याण्याम साया (?) 
नि महान्तानि 
भवान्ति पराममहान्तानि ता....
L. 1. bhavati II api khalu saṁvaddhaḥ caṁca ityucyate I
tādā te manuṣyā nānādyāni dhānāyāni samudger (dre?)
prakṣipya kālaṁ kurvanti imā tanapa . . . . . tā
yā vijā dharmanāni bhaviṣyanti tenāha canca iti II ? ?
śalākāvṛttiriti āha
L. 2. maye manuṣyā yāni prthivyām vijāni ropayanti tānī
bhavantyalphalāni ekā śalākāni ti api khalvalpā-
yuṣāṁ manuṣyānāṁ kulaparyāyeṇa śalākācaryā te
adya kulapatinā paribhuktāṁśca kulapatipati pā—
L. 3. bhokṣayanti I adyaśaryuputraṇa paribhuktaṁśca ārya-
duḥita paribhokṣyatī I api khalu tasmin samaye manu-
ṣyā dhānāyāgare śasyāgārebhyaḥ śalākāyā vividha
dhānypahalakāni niṣṭavya bahūdokāyāṁ pithavyāṁ
prakṣipya mi—
L. 4. dikāṁ kvāthya pibamti tenāha śalākāvṛttimiti II svet-
tasthitistadā tasmin samaye te manuṣyā jiyatsadotvalya
parītaḥ kālaṁ kurvanti teṣāṁ tānāhīni rukṣāni
bhavanti nisneḥāni svetāyapi khalu tasmin sa (ma)—
L. 5. ye te manuṣyā nānādyāni asthiṇi, samudānayitvā bahū-
dakāyāṁ prthivyāṁ prakṣipyaśthyuṅaṁ kvāthya pibam-
nti tenāha svetasthitī evamādayaśca bhāvāḥ paryāya
vaktavyāḥ (?) (?) evamvidhaḥ sa tasmin ve—
L. 6. mahādurbhikṣántarakalpo bhavati tena khalu samay-
yena yaḥ kaścitkālāṁ karoti sattvāḥ saḥ preteśupapadya-
nte sa ca bhavati durbhikṣántarakalpaḥ saptavarsāni
sapatā māsa sapta raṭrim diva—
L. 7. saptānāṁ varṣānāṁ saptānāṁ māsānāṁ saptānāṁ raṭ-
rimdivasānāṁ māvayāta tasya durbhikṣántarakalpasya
loke niryānaṁ bhavati I tatra ye te manuṣyāṁ tena
durbhikṣántarakalpenātyāyanti hṛdayaṁ
L. 8. raṁti piśugupamṛti te mahānaḍīśu gatvā mahā sarasu
mahāhradesu mahātaḍāgeṣu mahāpalvalesu gatvā
śyāmaṇa śaka śalukena yāpayanti I satnam (pta?)
pakṣānāṁ saptānāṁ māsānāṁ saptānāṁ raṭrimdina—
L. 9. nāmatyayāt punarapi grāma nigama rājarāṣṭradhān-
nyāḥ samavasaranti I teṣāmatyautyaṁ dṛṣṭvā tibra
snehaśca prema ca gauravaṁ cânukampā cittāṁ ca
pratyupasthitam bhavati evaṁ cāhujjīvantam vata
bhoḥ sattvā—

L.10. kṣma jīvantāṁ vata bho sma tvāmadrākṣma ti I tadya-
thomhi manuṣyānāṁ mātuḥ priyameta...ṣṭānāṁ vā
navānāṁ vā māsānāmatayayena dṛṣṭvā tī...ṣca
prema ca gauravaṁ cânukampa cittāṁ ca...
L. 8. bhavati yadā uttarakuruṣu na kaścit sattvo vaśiṣṭho bhavati etāvānayam lokāḥ saṁvṛtto vaktvyo yaduta naraṅka sattvā saṁvarttanyā tiryake.
L. 9. jā kāyikeṣu deveṣvatyuttamaḥ sattvonupadeśena dhanatā pratilābhika prathamadhyānaṁ samāpadyate I sa tathā . . . . . .
L.10. —evaṁ pra ? vīdeo . . . . . .
L. 1. ? ? kama pratu vākṣamāropayatha pravāraṇāya II II uddānaṁ—I vāyurapāsca prthivī samudro-
bhyantaro bahīḥ sumeruh pārśvānikūlaḥ palaśaṇḍaśca parvataḥ yathā ca prthivī jātā vāyorāpāsca
L. 2. sarśthitāḥ tatsarvvanupūrveṇa pravakṣyāmi nibo-
dhata vāyavo vāṁti ākāśe sverāṁbhā nāma nāmataḥ yatra pratiśṭhitā āpaḥ prthivī cápsu niśrā parvataś-
caturvo dvīpāḥ utsā nadyaḥ sarāṁsi ca ?
L. 3. mahodadhiṣca vipulaḥ timiṅgalajhaśaṅkulaḥ ruddha-
spīṭā janapadā grāmāṇi nagarāṇi ca I sarve te kām-
caṇāṁ prthivīmanupūrvaṁ pratiśṭhitāḥ yadākāśe
vāyumaṇḍalam pratiśṭhitam tadvāyumaṇḍalam śo—
L. 4. ḍaśa yojanāsatasaḥhasṛṇi koṭirbahulatvena tīryag
asamkhyeyamaprīṃmaṇam yāvadvāyumaṇḍale āpmanḍ-
alam pratiśṭhitam tadāpmaṇḍalam II aṣṭau yojana-
satasaḥhasṛṇi koṭirbahulatvena dvādāsayaojana
L. 5. satasaḥhasṛṇi triṇī ca yojanasaḥhasṛṇi ardha pariṇa-
māṇi ca yojanaśatāṇi tiryataḥ ṣaṭṭrimśadyojanaśata
saḥhasṛṇi daśa ca yojanasaḥhasṛṇi ardhacaturthāni
caya janasaṭāṇi sa—
L. 6. mantaparikṣepa pāṃmaṇḍale kāṃśacananayā mahā-
prthivī pratiśṭhitā sā kāṃśacananaya mahāprthivī vim-
sāṁ ni triṇī yojanasaṭasahasṛṇi koṭirbahulatvena dvā-
dāsayaojana—
L. 7. tasahasṛṇi triṇī ca yojanasaḥhasṛṇi ardhapariṇa-
māṇi ca yojanaśatāṇi tiryayaḥ ṣaṭṭrimśadyojaṇaśata-
sahasṛṇi daśa ca yojanasaḥhasṛṇi ardhacaturthāni ca
yojanaśatāṇi sa—
L. 8. mantaparikṣepa II abhyantaro mahāsāmudraḥ
cottałe dve yojanasahasre āyāmena cottałe dve yojanaśatasahasre viśkambheṇa ṣaṭṭhmal nava yojana śatasahasṛāṇi samantaparikṣepena

L. 9. aśtiyojanasahasṛāṇi gāmbhīryena kāṁcanaṁayyaṁ mahāprthivyāṁ śhītaḥ bāhye mahāsamudre viṁśati trini yojanaśatasahasṛāṇi bheṇādhina dvīpaiḥ dvā- viṁśati triṁ yojana-

L. 1. samanantaram prasenajinnāma rājā babhūva tena sapta varṣāṇi rājyaisvāryādhipatyāṁ kāritaṁ rājñāḥ prasenajitaḥ samanantaram nando nāma rājā babhūva I tena daśa varṣāṇi rājyaisvāryādhipatyāṁ kāritaṁ I rājñāḥ nandasya

L. 2. samanantaram dvau rājānau bhavataḥ candraśca parvavataśca tābhyaṁ ekaikaṁ varṣaṁ rājyaisvāryādhipatyāṁ kāritaṁ candraparvvatayoḥ samanantaram candragupto nāma rājā babhūva tena paṁcaviṁśati varṣāṇi rājyaisvāryādhipatyāṁ

L. 3. kāritaṁ sapta ca māsāḥ rājñāscandraguptasya bindusāro nāma putro babhūva tena paṁcaviṁśati varṣāṇi rājyaisvāryādhipatyāṁ kāritaṁ I paṁca ca māsā I iti tābhyaṁ pitāputrābhyaṁ paṁcāśad varṣāṇi rājyaisvāryādhipatyāṁ

L. 4. kāritaṁ I rājño bindusārasya aśoko nāma kumāraḥ putro babhūva I dhārmikā bhagavataḥ caturaśtaṁ dharmmarājīkā sahasra kāritaṁ tena śattraṁśadvāraṇi rājyaisvāryādhipatyāṁ kāritaṁ rājñāḥ aśokasya saharopaṭimāma putro babhūva tenaśṭadaśa varṣāṇi rājyaisvāryādhipatyāṁ kāritaṁ I rājñāḥ saharpateḥ samanantarāṁ dṛḍhādhāranāma rājā babhūva

L. 5. śvāryādhipatyāṁ kāritaṁ rājñāḥ aśokasya saharopaṭimāma putro babhūva tenaśṭadaśa varṣāṇi rājyaisvāryādhipatyāṁ kāritaṁ I rājñāḥ saharopaṭeḥ samanantarāṁ dṛḍhādhāranāma rājā babhūva

L. 6. tena paṁcadaśa varṣāṇi rājyaisvāryādhipatyāṁ kāritaṁ I rājño dṛḍhādhanoḥ samanantarāṁ śatadhanurāma rājā babhūva tena caturddasa varṣāṇi rājyaisvāryādhipatyāṁ kāritaṁ I rājñāḥ śatadhanuṣaḥ

L. 7. samanantarāṁ bṛhadratho nāma rājā babhūva tena trayodaśa varṣāṇi rājyaisvāryādhipatyāṁ kāritaṁ I rājño bṛhadrathasya samanantarāṁ pūnyasyārmmo nāma rājā babhūva I tena dvāviṁśati varṣāṇi rājyaisvā-
L. 8. rṛyāḍhipatyāṁ kāritaṁ I rājñō puṇyasarmanāḥ sama- nantaram pṛṇyamitra nāma rājā babhūva brāhmaṇa- rājā yena mauryyavamśamutpādyā svayameva pāṭalī- putramākrāntāṁ tena caturvṛttaṁ varṣāṇi

L. 9. rājyaiśvāryāḍhipatyāṁ kāritaṁ iti hi paṁcavarṣaśa- tāni catvārimśadvārṣāṇi yatpuṣyamitrena rājā maury- yavamśamutpādyā svayameva pāṭalīputramākrāntam eṣā hi rājapamktir yadāyaṁ loko vivṛtavān(?).
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